1	(Thursday, 11 April 2024)	1	did you work with Mr McGrail?
2	(10.00)	2	A. I began in the RGP in 1985 and I think
3	MR SANTOS: Good morning, sir. We are	3	Mr McGrail started the year before. So I
4	moving into the next phase of the hearing	4	have known him throughout that time, but we
5	now, into the questioning phase. The first	5	haven't really worked together other than
6	witness will be Paul Richardson. Just to go	6	when I was superintendent crime and he was
7	over, the procedure will be me first as CTI,	7	the Commissioner.
8	followed by Mr Wagner for Mr McGrail, and	8	Q. And how long sorry.
9	then Sir Peter Caruana KC for the	9	THE CHAIRMAN: I think you are
10	government parties, and finally Mr Gibbs KC	10	speaking, understandably, to Mr Santos. I
11	for Mr Richardson. So, I think the next step	11	am not just completely sure the microphone
12	is to ask Mr Paul Richardson to take his place	12	is picking everything up.
13	in the witness area.	13	A. Hello.
14	MR PAUL RICHARDSON, sworn	14	Q. I think that is better.
15	Examination-in-chief by MR SANTOS	15	THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, that is better.
16	MR SANTOS: Welcome Mr Richardson.	16	MR SANTOS: And if you could speak to the
17	A. Thank you.	17	chairman.
18	Q. Can I ask you first of all to take the	18	THE CHAIRMAN: He can speak as he is
19	bundle in front of you that is marked	19	most comfortable.
20	"Witness statements" and to look behind the	20	MR SANTOS: Okay, speak to whoever you
21	first tab. I think it is a yellow tab. Take as	21	prefer to speak to. Sorry, I think you just
22	much time as you need, but is that your	22	said that you really only worked together
23	second witness statement to this inquiry?	23	with him for a certain period of time. How
24	A. It is.	24	long was that roughly?
25	Q. And can I ask you to turn to the final	25	A. It would have been from approximately
	Dago 1		Dago 2
	Page 1		Page 3
1	page of that document. Is that your	1	2000 the very end of 2018, when I was
1 2	page of that document. Is that your signature?	1 2	2000 the very end of 2018, when I was promoted, to when Mr McGrail left, I think it
2	signature?	2	promoted, to when Mr McGrail left, I think it
2 3	signature? A. It is.	2 3	promoted, to when Mr McGrail left, I think it was June 2020. Although there was a brief
2 3 4	signature?  A. It is.  Q. Can you confirm that the contents of that	2 3 4	promoted, to when Mr McGrail left, I think it was June 2020. Although there was a brief period of time that we were both shift
2 3 4 5	signature?  A. It is.  Q. Can you confirm that the contents of that witness statement are true to the best of your	2 3 4 5	promoted, to when Mr McGrail left, I think it was June 2020. Although there was a brief period of time that we were both shift inspectors at the same time and so we
2 3 4 5 6	signature?  A. It is.  Q. Can you confirm that the contents of that witness statement are true to the best of your knowledge, information and belief?	2 3 4 5 6	promoted, to when Mr McGrail left, I think it was June 2020. Although there was a brief period of time that we were both shift inspectors at the same time and so we coincided on duty one after the other or one
2 3 4 5 6 7	signature?  A. It is.  Q. Can you confirm that the contents of that witness statement are true to the best of your knowledge, information and belief?  A. I can.	2 3 4 5 6 7	promoted, to when Mr McGrail left, I think it was June 2020. Although there was a brief period of time that we were both shift inspectors at the same time and so we coincided on duty one after the other or one before the other.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	signature?  A. It is.  Q. Can you confirm that the contents of that witness statement are true to the best of your knowledge, information and belief?  A. I can.  Q. Thank you. And then behind the second	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	promoted, to when Mr McGrail left, I think it was June 2020. Although there was a brief period of time that we were both shift inspectors at the same time and so we coincided on duty one after the other or one before the other.  Q. And how would you describe your
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	signature?  A. It is.  Q. Can you confirm that the contents of that witness statement are true to the best of your knowledge, information and belief?  A. I can.  Q. Thank you. And then behind the second tab, the blue tab, that should be your third	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	promoted, to when Mr McGrail left, I think it was June 2020. Although there was a brief period of time that we were both shift inspectors at the same time and so we coincided on duty one after the other or one before the other.  Q. And how would you describe your working relationship with him?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	signature?  A. It is.  Q. Can you confirm that the contents of that witness statement are true to the best of your knowledge, information and belief?  A. I can.  Q. Thank you. And then behind the second tab, the blue tab, that should be your third witness statement to this inquiry and I would	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	promoted, to when Mr McGrail left, I think it was June 2020. Although there was a brief period of time that we were both shift inspectors at the same time and so we coincided on duty one after the other or one before the other.  Q. And how would you describe your working relationship with him?  A. It has always been a professional
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	signature?  A. It is.  Q. Can you confirm that the contents of that witness statement are true to the best of your knowledge, information and belief?  A. I can.  Q. Thank you. And then behind the second tab, the blue tab, that should be your third witness statement to this inquiry and I would ask you to just check and confirm that it is.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	promoted, to when Mr McGrail left, I think it was June 2020. Although there was a brief period of time that we were both shift inspectors at the same time and so we coincided on duty one after the other or one before the other.  Q. And how would you describe your working relationship with him?  A. It has always been a professional relationship. I have known Mr McGrail
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	signature?  A. It is.  Q. Can you confirm that the contents of that witness statement are true to the best of your knowledge, information and belief?  A. I can.  Q. Thank you. And then behind the second tab, the blue tab, that should be your third witness statement to this inquiry and I would ask you to just check and confirm that it is. (Pause).	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	promoted, to when Mr McGrail left, I think it was June 2020. Although there was a brief period of time that we were both shift inspectors at the same time and so we coincided on duty one after the other or one before the other.  Q. And how would you describe your working relationship with him?  A. It has always been a professional relationship. I have known Mr McGrail since we were in school together, but we
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	signature?  A. It is.  Q. Can you confirm that the contents of that witness statement are true to the best of your knowledge, information and belief?  A. I can.  Q. Thank you. And then behind the second tab, the blue tab, that should be your third witness statement to this inquiry and I would ask you to just check and confirm that it is. (Pause).  A. It is.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	promoted, to when Mr McGrail left, I think it was June 2020. Although there was a brief period of time that we were both shift inspectors at the same time and so we coincided on duty one after the other or one before the other.  Q. And how would you describe your working relationship with him?  A. It has always been a professional relationship. I have known Mr McGrail since we were in school together, but we weren't friends in school. Our friendship has
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	signature?  A. It is.  Q. Can you confirm that the contents of that witness statement are true to the best of your knowledge, information and belief?  A. I can.  Q. Thank you. And then behind the second tab, the blue tab, that should be your third witness statement to this inquiry and I would ask you to just check and confirm that it is. (Pause).  A. It is.  Q. And on the final page should be your	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	promoted, to when Mr McGrail left, I think it was June 2020. Although there was a brief period of time that we were both shift inspectors at the same time and so we coincided on duty one after the other or one before the other.  Q. And how would you describe your working relationship with him?  A. It has always been a professional relationship. I have known Mr McGrail since we were in school together, but we weren't friends in school. Our friendship has developed after the events of June 2020.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	signature?  A. It is.  Q. Can you confirm that the contents of that witness statement are true to the best of your knowledge, information and belief?  A. I can.  Q. Thank you. And then behind the second tab, the blue tab, that should be your third witness statement to this inquiry and I would ask you to just check and confirm that it is. (Pause).  A. It is.  Q. And on the final page should be your signature. Can you please confirm that is the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	promoted, to when Mr McGrail left, I think it was June 2020. Although there was a brief period of time that we were both shift inspectors at the same time and so we coincided on duty one after the other or one before the other.  Q. And how would you describe your working relationship with him?  A. It has always been a professional relationship. I have known Mr McGrail since we were in school together, but we weren't friends in school. Our friendship has developed after the events of June 2020.  Q. Now, can we turn, please, to bundle A/3,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	signature?  A. It is.  Q. Can you confirm that the contents of that witness statement are true to the best of your knowledge, information and belief?  A. I can.  Q. Thank you. And then behind the second tab, the blue tab, that should be your third witness statement to this inquiry and I would ask you to just check and confirm that it is. (Pause).  A. It is.  Q. And on the final page should be your signature. Can you please confirm that is the case?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	promoted, to when Mr McGrail left, I think it was June 2020. Although there was a brief period of time that we were both shift inspectors at the same time and so we coincided on duty one after the other or one before the other.  Q. And how would you describe your working relationship with him?  A. It has always been a professional relationship. I have known Mr McGrail since we were in school together, but we weren't friends in school. Our friendship has developed after the events of June 2020.  Q. Now, can we turn, please, to bundle A/3, page 3 of bundle A. I think it will appear on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	signature?  A. It is.  Q. Can you confirm that the contents of that witness statement are true to the best of your knowledge, information and belief?  A. I can.  Q. Thank you. And then behind the second tab, the blue tab, that should be your third witness statement to this inquiry and I would ask you to just check and confirm that it is. (Pause).  A. It is.  Q. And on the final page should be your signature. Can you please confirm that is the case?  A. That is correct.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	promoted, to when Mr McGrail left, I think it was June 2020. Although there was a brief period of time that we were both shift inspectors at the same time and so we coincided on duty one after the other or one before the other.  Q. And how would you describe your working relationship with him?  A. It has always been a professional relationship. I have known Mr McGrail since we were in school together, but we weren't friends in school. Our friendship has developed after the events of June 2020.  Q. Now, can we turn, please, to bundle A/3, page 3 of bundle A. I think it will appear on your screen actually. Now, paragraph 7
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	signature?  A. It is.  Q. Can you confirm that the contents of that witness statement are true to the best of your knowledge, information and belief?  A. I can.  Q. Thank you. And then behind the second tab, the blue tab, that should be your third witness statement to this inquiry and I would ask you to just check and confirm that it is. (Pause).  A. It is.  Q. And on the final page should be your signature. Can you please confirm that is the case?  A. That is correct.  Q. And do you confirm that that witness	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	promoted, to when Mr McGrail left, I think it was June 2020. Although there was a brief period of time that we were both shift inspectors at the same time and so we coincided on duty one after the other or one before the other.  Q. And how would you describe your working relationship with him?  A. It has always been a professional relationship. I have known Mr McGrail since we were in school together, but we weren't friends in school. Our friendship has developed after the events of June 2020.  Q. Now, can we turn, please, to bundle A/3, page 3 of bundle A. I think it will appear on your screen actually. Now, paragraph 7 there, Mr McGrail states that Operation Delhi
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	signature?  A. It is.  Q. Can you confirm that the contents of that witness statement are true to the best of your knowledge, information and belief?  A. I can.  Q. Thank you. And then behind the second tab, the blue tab, that should be your third witness statement to this inquiry and I would ask you to just check and confirm that it is. (Pause).  A. It is.  Q. And on the final page should be your signature. Can you please confirm that is the case?  A. That is correct.  Q. And do you confirm that that witness statement, the contents of that witness	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	promoted, to when Mr McGrail left, I think it was June 2020. Although there was a brief period of time that we were both shift inspectors at the same time and so we coincided on duty one after the other or one before the other.  Q. And how would you describe your working relationship with him?  A. It has always been a professional relationship. I have known Mr McGrail since we were in school together, but we weren't friends in school. Our friendship has developed after the events of June 2020.  Q. Now, can we turn, please, to bundle A/3, page 3 of bundle A. I think it will appear on your screen actually. Now, paragraph 7 there, Mr McGrail states that Operation Delhi was commenced on 15 October 2018. Can
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	signature?  A. It is.  Q. Can you confirm that the contents of that witness statement are true to the best of your knowledge, information and belief?  A. I can.  Q. Thank you. And then behind the second tab, the blue tab, that should be your third witness statement to this inquiry and I would ask you to just check and confirm that it is. (Pause).  A. It is.  Q. And on the final page should be your signature. Can you please confirm that is the case?  A. That is correct.  Q. And do you confirm that that witness statement, the contents of that witness statement, are true to the best of your	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	promoted, to when Mr McGrail left, I think it was June 2020. Although there was a brief period of time that we were both shift inspectors at the same time and so we coincided on duty one after the other or one before the other.  Q. And how would you describe your working relationship with him?  A. It has always been a professional relationship. I have known Mr McGrail since we were in school together, but we weren't friends in school. Our friendship has developed after the events of June 2020.  Q. Now, can we turn, please, to bundle A/3, page 3 of bundle A. I think it will appear on your screen actually. Now, paragraph 7 there, Mr McGrail states that Operation Delhi was commenced on 15 October 2018. Can you just explain to us what exactly is meant
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	signature?  A. It is.  Q. Can you confirm that the contents of that witness statement are true to the best of your knowledge, information and belief?  A. I can.  Q. Thank you. And then behind the second tab, the blue tab, that should be your third witness statement to this inquiry and I would ask you to just check and confirm that it is. (Pause).  A. It is.  Q. And on the final page should be your signature. Can you please confirm that is the case?  A. That is correct.  Q. And do you confirm that that witness statement, the contents of that witness statement, are true to the best of your knowledge, information and belief?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	promoted, to when Mr McGrail left, I think it was June 2020. Although there was a brief period of time that we were both shift inspectors at the same time and so we coincided on duty one after the other or one before the other.  Q. And how would you describe your working relationship with him?  A. It has always been a professional relationship. I have known Mr McGrail since we were in school together, but we weren't friends in school. Our friendship has developed after the events of June 2020.  Q. Now, can we turn, please, to bundle A/3, page 3 of bundle A. I think it will appear on your screen actually. Now, paragraph 7 there, Mr McGrail states that Operation Delhi was commenced on 15 October 2018. Can you just explain to us what exactly is meant by an operation commencing and what
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	signature?  A. It is.  Q. Can you confirm that the contents of that witness statement are true to the best of your knowledge, information and belief?  A. I can.  Q. Thank you. And then behind the second tab, the blue tab, that should be your third witness statement to this inquiry and I would ask you to just check and confirm that it is. (Pause).  A. It is.  Q. And on the final page should be your signature. Can you please confirm that is the case?  A. That is correct.  Q. And do you confirm that that witness statement, the contents of that witness statement, are true to the best of your knowledge, information and belief?  A. I can.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	promoted, to when Mr McGrail left, I think it was June 2020. Although there was a brief period of time that we were both shift inspectors at the same time and so we coincided on duty one after the other or one before the other.  Q. And how would you describe your working relationship with him?  A. It has always been a professional relationship. I have known Mr McGrail since we were in school together, but we weren't friends in school. Our friendship has developed after the events of June 2020.  Q. Now, can we turn, please, to bundle A/3, page 3 of bundle A. I think it will appear on your screen actually. Now, paragraph 7 there, Mr McGrail states that Operation Delhi was commenced on 15 October 2018. Can you just explain to us what exactly is meant by an operation commencing and what happens when an operation is commenced?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	signature?  A. It is.  Q. Can you confirm that the contents of that witness statement are true to the best of your knowledge, information and belief?  A. I can.  Q. Thank you. And then behind the second tab, the blue tab, that should be your third witness statement to this inquiry and I would ask you to just check and confirm that it is. (Pause).  A. It is.  Q. And on the final page should be your signature. Can you please confirm that is the case?  A. That is correct.  Q. And do you confirm that that witness statement, the contents of that witness statement, are true to the best of your knowledge, information and belief?  A. I can.  Q. Thank you. Just to start with a couple of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	promoted, to when Mr McGrail left, I think it was June 2020. Although there was a brief period of time that we were both shift inspectors at the same time and so we coincided on duty one after the other or one before the other.  Q. And how would you describe your working relationship with him?  A. It has always been a professional relationship. I have known Mr McGrail since we were in school together, but we weren't friends in school. Our friendship has developed after the events of June 2020.  Q. Now, can we turn, please, to bundle A/3, page 3 of bundle A. I think it will appear on your screen actually. Now, paragraph 7 there, Mr McGrail states that Operation Delhi was commenced on 15 October 2018. Can you just explain to us what exactly is meant by an operation commencing and what happens when an operation is commenced?  A. An operation concerns the investigation
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	signature?  A. It is.  Q. Can you confirm that the contents of that witness statement are true to the best of your knowledge, information and belief?  A. I can.  Q. Thank you. And then behind the second tab, the blue tab, that should be your third witness statement to this inquiry and I would ask you to just check and confirm that it is. (Pause).  A. It is.  Q. And on the final page should be your signature. Can you please confirm that is the case?  A. That is correct.  Q. And do you confirm that that witness statement, the contents of that witness statement, are true to the best of your knowledge, information and belief?  A. I can.  Q. Thank you. Just to start with a couple of questions about your working relationship	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	promoted, to when Mr McGrail left, I think it was June 2020. Although there was a brief period of time that we were both shift inspectors at the same time and so we coincided on duty one after the other or one before the other.  Q. And how would you describe your working relationship with him?  A. It has always been a professional relationship. I have known Mr McGrail since we were in school together, but we weren't friends in school. Our friendship has developed after the events of June 2020.  Q. Now, can we turn, please, to bundle A/3, page 3 of bundle A. I think it will appear on your screen actually. Now, paragraph 7 there, Mr McGrail states that Operation Delhi was commenced on 15 October 2018. Can you just explain to us what exactly is meant by an operation commencing and what happens when an operation is commenced?  A. An operation concerns the investigation of a crime and so when a crime is reported
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	signature?  A. It is.  Q. Can you confirm that the contents of that witness statement are true to the best of your knowledge, information and belief?  A. I can.  Q. Thank you. And then behind the second tab, the blue tab, that should be your third witness statement to this inquiry and I would ask you to just check and confirm that it is. (Pause).  A. It is.  Q. And on the final page should be your signature. Can you please confirm that is the case?  A. That is correct.  Q. And do you confirm that that witness statement, the contents of that witness statement, are true to the best of your knowledge, information and belief?  A. I can.  Q. Thank you. Just to start with a couple of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	promoted, to when Mr McGrail left, I think it was June 2020. Although there was a brief period of time that we were both shift inspectors at the same time and so we coincided on duty one after the other or one before the other.  Q. And how would you describe your working relationship with him?  A. It has always been a professional relationship. I have known Mr McGrail since we were in school together, but we weren't friends in school. Our friendship has developed after the events of June 2020.  Q. Now, can we turn, please, to bundle A/3, page 3 of bundle A. I think it will appear on your screen actually. Now, paragraph 7 there, Mr McGrail states that Operation Delhi was commenced on 15 October 2018. Can you just explain to us what exactly is meant by an operation commencing and what happens when an operation is commenced?  A. An operation concerns the investigation
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	signature?  A. It is.  Q. Can you confirm that the contents of that witness statement are true to the best of your knowledge, information and belief?  A. I can.  Q. Thank you. And then behind the second tab, the blue tab, that should be your third witness statement to this inquiry and I would ask you to just check and confirm that it is. (Pause).  A. It is.  Q. And on the final page should be your signature. Can you please confirm that is the case?  A. That is correct.  Q. And do you confirm that that witness statement, the contents of that witness statement, are true to the best of your knowledge, information and belief?  A. I can.  Q. Thank you. Just to start with a couple of questions about your working relationship	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	promoted, to when Mr McGrail left, I think it was June 2020. Although there was a brief period of time that we were both shift inspectors at the same time and so we coincided on duty one after the other or one before the other.  Q. And how would you describe your working relationship with him?  A. It has always been a professional relationship. I have known Mr McGrail since we were in school together, but we weren't friends in school. Our friendship has developed after the events of June 2020.  Q. Now, can we turn, please, to bundle A/3, page 3 of bundle A. I think it will appear on your screen actually. Now, paragraph 7 there, Mr McGrail states that Operation Delhi was commenced on 15 October 2018. Can you just explain to us what exactly is meant by an operation commencing and what happens when an operation is commenced?  A. An operation concerns the investigation of a crime and so when a crime is reported

1	it is an operation it is a more serious crime	1	Police and so he had responsibility for the
2	rather than just a crime that is investigated by	2	whole force. But I took over responsibility
3	an officer. And an operation implies that	3	for Operation Delhi.
4	there is more than one person involved in	4	Q. So how involved would Mr McGrail have
5	that. So when an operation is commenced it	5	been in the operation?
6	is when the complaint is received.	6	A. At the very beginning stages he
7	Q. Now, you became the Senior	7	facilitated a conference call with Mr Gaggero
8	Investigating Officer of Operation Delhi	8	where we spoke to the complainant for the
9	from late December 2018. Can you just	9	first time, myself, I think it was Mr Finlayson
10	explain to us what that role as Senior	10	and the Commissioner held a conference call.
11	Investigating Officer entails?	11	From thereafter I would brief him
12	A. I had at that time superintendence of the	12	periodically on where we were going, but he
13	investigation. Mr McGrail had wanted the	13	had no direct involvement in the
14	investigation to be kept as confidential as	14	investigation.
15	possible because of the implications that	15	Q. Now, the inquiry has received what is
16	concerned the national security system. And	16	referred to as the daybook, or your daybook,
17	so at the beginning of that operation there	17	relating to Operation Delhi. Perhaps I should
18	was only myself and former Chief Inspector	18	just clarify that. Was that an operation
19	Brian Finlayson that were involved in the	19	daybook or was it your personal daybook in
20	investigation, together with one high tech	20	which you included information about the
21	crime officer. As the investigation developed	21	operation?
22	and it became clear that more resources were	22	A. The operation daybook for Operation
23	required, one of my roles was to seek more	23	Delhi has been handed to me this morning by
24	assistance, and funding even, to progress that	24	the RGP. It was specifically in relation to
25	investigation. And other officers were	25	Operation Delhi. I had a normal daybook for
	Page 5		Page 7
1	brought on board and Mr Wyan was	1	each year, which you have copies of the
2	appointed some time later as the officer in	2	relevant sections.
3	charge of the investigation.	3	Q. Sorry, so just to clarify, the Operation
4	Q. Was there a senior investigating officer	4	Delhi daybook, does the inquiry have are
5	on Operation Delhi before you and, if so,	5	you saying that there is a different daybook?
6	who was it?	6	A. No, you have a scanned copy of the
7	A. I don't think so because the complaint for	7	Operation Delhi daybook, with the exception
8	Operation Delhi, the actual complaint from	8	to one and a half pages that was redacted
9	Mr Gaggero, didn't arrive until late	9	because I had made an entry for a different
10	December. So I'm not sure exactly what	10	inquiry in the wrong book.
11	happened in October 2018, but my	11	Q. Thank you. And can you just explain
12	involvement began when the RGP received	12	what a daybook is?
13	the letter of complaint from Mr Gaggero	13	A. A daybook is where senior officers record
14	setting out what he was alleging had	14	their day-to-day business or things that they
15	happened.	15	need to be reminded about, actions that need
16	Q. So are you able to assist at all with what	16	following up, things that need recording for
17	steps were taken in Operation Delhi prior to	17	future purposes. I use my daybook to keep
18	your involvement in December 2018?	18	notes of briefings that officers gave me, or
19	A. No, I'm sorry, I can't.	19	briefings that I would give to the
20	Q. Can you explain what Mr McGrail's role,	20	Commissioner for dissipation in meetings,
21	once you joined the operation and became its	21	etc.
22	Senior Investigating Officer, can you explain	22	Q. And would you record things like
23	what Mr McGrail's role was in the	23	meetings and the matters that you have
24	investigation?	24	described, would you record those
25	A. Mr McGrail was the Commissioner of	25	contemporaneously, as in while the meeting
Ī		I	
	Page 6		Page 8

1	is going on, or is this something that you	1	that.
2	would do after the meeting or is this	2	MR GIBBS: Thank you.
3	something that you would do some days	3	MR SANTOS: Thank you, Mr Gibbs.
4	later?	4	(Pause).
5	A. For the most part I would record in my	5	A. This is a briefing, this is the
6	daybooks meetings and notes as they	6	Commissioner briefing me.
7	happened. There are occasions when I was	7	Q. Thank you. And the note says that John
8	not able to this because, for example, I may	8	Perez shows up to see the Commissioner of
9	have received a call whilst I was at home or	9	Police. I do not want to put words in your
10	whilst I was in somebody else's office or	10	mouth, but am I right in saying that that is
11	whilst I didn't have my daybook with me.	11	a reference to a previous meeting rather than
12	And on those occasions I would have made	12	Mr Perez turning up at the meeting that you
13	a note on a piece of paper and later	13	are recording there?
14	transcribed the entry into my daybook.	14	A. You are correct.
15	Q. What was the sort of longest period that	15	Q. Yes. Can I take you a few pages further
16	you would go without entering something	16	on to 1659? It should be two pages further.
17	into the daybook? I mean apart from	17	That is a meeting between you and
18	extraordinary occasions, would it normally	18	Mr McGrail and Mr Finlayson on 8
19	be on the same day or some days later?	19	January 2019. And towards the bottom do
20	A. Normally it would have been on the same	20	you have that?
21	day, but there was a time in Operation Delhi	21	A. Yes, I do.
22	when Operation Delhi and Operation Kram	22	Q. Yes. Towards the bottom of that page
23	were running simultaneously and my	23	you note the following: "JG, advised by
24	attention was diverted or shared between	24	COP, SIO and DEP." Do you know what
25	several major operations running at the same	25	advice was given at that stage?
	Page 9		Page 11
1		1	A NI TI T 14 11 1 441 4
1	time that I ended up making notes on pieces	1	A. No, I'm sorry I can't recall what that
2	of paper and then transcribing them	2	refers to.
2 3	of paper and then transcribing them afterwards. There may have been some	2 3	<ul><li>refers to.</li><li>Q. If we can then move forward two pages,</li></ul>
2 3 4	of paper and then transcribing them afterwards. There may have been some delay at that point in putting from loose	2 3 4	refers to.  Q. If we can then move forward two pages, 1661, I think this is the same meeting. There
2 3 4 5	of paper and then transcribing them afterwards. There may have been some delay at that point in putting from loose pieces of paper into my book.	2 3 4 5	refers to.  Q. If we can then move forward two pages, 1661, I think this is the same meeting. There is a reference there, halfway down the page:
2 3 4 5 6	of paper and then transcribing them afterwards. There may have been some delay at that point in putting from loose pieces of paper into my book.  Q. Can I take you now to some entries in	2 3 4 5 6	refers to.  Q. If we can then move forward two pages, 1661, I think this is the same meeting. There is a reference there, halfway down the page: "COP meeting with Sir Peter to clear legal
2 3 4 5 6 7	of paper and then transcribing them afterwards. There may have been some delay at that point in putting from loose pieces of paper into my book.  Q. Can I take you now to some entries in your daybook in January 2019, very early on	2 3 4 5 6 7	refers to.  Q. If we can then move forward two pages, 1661, I think this is the same meeting. There is a reference there, halfway down the page: "COP meeting with Sir Peter to clear legal approach." I do not think it is controversial
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	of paper and then transcribing them afterwards. There may have been some delay at that point in putting from loose pieces of paper into my book.  Q. Can I take you now to some entries in your daybook in January 2019, very early on in your role as SIA. The first is C/1657. The	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	refers to.  Q. If we can then move forward two pages, 1661, I think this is the same meeting. There is a reference there, halfway down the page: "COP meeting with Sir Peter to clear legal approach." I do not think it is controversial to say that Sir Peter, I understand that to be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	of paper and then transcribing them afterwards. There may have been some delay at that point in putting from loose pieces of paper into my book.  Q. Can I take you now to some entries in your daybook in January 2019, very early on in your role as SIA. The first is C/1657. The heading there is: "Briefing with COP and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	refers to.  Q. If we can then move forward two pages, 1661, I think this is the same meeting. There is a reference there, halfway down the page: "COP meeting with Sir Peter to clear legal approach." I do not think it is controversial to say that Sir Peter, I understand that to be a reference to Sir Peter Caruana KC. Would
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	of paper and then transcribing them afterwards. There may have been some delay at that point in putting from loose pieces of paper into my book.  Q. Can I take you now to some entries in your daybook in January 2019, very early on in your role as SIA. The first is C/1657. The heading there is: "Briefing with COP and BF". Presumably that is a reference to Brian	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	refers to.  Q. If we can then move forward two pages, 1661, I think this is the same meeting. There is a reference there, halfway down the page: "COP meeting with Sir Peter to clear legal approach." I do not think it is controversial to say that Sir Peter, I understand that to be a reference to Sir Peter Caruana KC. Would you agree?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	of paper and then transcribing them afterwards. There may have been some delay at that point in putting from loose pieces of paper into my book.  Q. Can I take you now to some entries in your daybook in January 2019, very early on in your role as SIA. The first is C/1657. The heading there is: "Briefing with COP and BF". Presumably that is a reference to Brian Finlayson, who you just mentioned.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	refers to.  Q. If we can then move forward two pages, 1661, I think this is the same meeting. There is a reference there, halfway down the page: "COP meeting with Sir Peter to clear legal approach." I do not think it is controversial to say that Sir Peter, I understand that to be a reference to Sir Peter Caruana KC. Would you agree?  A. That is correct, yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	of paper and then transcribing them afterwards. There may have been some delay at that point in putting from loose pieces of paper into my book.  Q. Can I take you now to some entries in your daybook in January 2019, very early on in your role as SIA. The first is C/1657. The heading there is: "Briefing with COP and BF". Presumably that is a reference to Brian Finlayson, who you just mentioned.  A. That is correct.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	refers to.  Q. If we can then move forward two pages, 1661, I think this is the same meeting. There is a reference there, halfway down the page: "COP meeting with Sir Peter to clear legal approach." I do not think it is controversial to say that Sir Peter, I understand that to be a reference to Sir Peter Caruana KC. Would you agree?  A. That is correct, yes.  Q. Can you tell us what the meeting with Sir
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	of paper and then transcribing them afterwards. There may have been some delay at that point in putting from loose pieces of paper into my book.  Q. Can I take you now to some entries in your daybook in January 2019, very early on in your role as SIA. The first is C/1657. The heading there is: "Briefing with COP and BF". Presumably that is a reference to Brian Finlayson, who you just mentioned.  A. That is correct.  Q. The title of this note is, as I say: "Briefing	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	refers to.  Q. If we can then move forward two pages, 1661, I think this is the same meeting. There is a reference there, halfway down the page: "COP meeting with Sir Peter to clear legal approach." I do not think it is controversial to say that Sir Peter, I understand that to be a reference to Sir Peter Caruana KC. Would you agree?  A. That is correct, yes.  Q. Can you tell us what the meeting with Sir Peter was to be about?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	of paper and then transcribing them afterwards. There may have been some delay at that point in putting from loose pieces of paper into my book.  Q. Can I take you now to some entries in your daybook in January 2019, very early on in your role as SIA. The first is C/1657. The heading there is: "Briefing with COP and BF". Presumably that is a reference to Brian Finlayson, who you just mentioned.  A. That is correct.  Q. The title of this note is, as I say: "Briefing with COP". Does that mean that the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	refers to.  Q. If we can then move forward two pages, 1661, I think this is the same meeting. There is a reference there, halfway down the page: "COP meeting with Sir Peter to clear legal approach." I do not think it is controversial to say that Sir Peter, I understand that to be a reference to Sir Peter Caruana KC. Would you agree?  A. That is correct, yes.  Q. Can you tell us what the meeting with Sir Peter was to be about?  A. Yes, um, the complaints, as you are
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	of paper and then transcribing them afterwards. There may have been some delay at that point in putting from loose pieces of paper into my book.  Q. Can I take you now to some entries in your daybook in January 2019, very early on in your role as SIA. The first is C/1657. The heading there is: "Briefing with COP and BF". Presumably that is a reference to Brian Finlayson, who you just mentioned.  A. That is correct.  Q. The title of this note is, as I say: "Briefing with COP". Does that mean that the Commission of Police was briefing you or	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	refers to.  Q. If we can then move forward two pages, 1661, I think this is the same meeting. There is a reference there, halfway down the page: "COP meeting with Sir Peter to clear legal approach." I do not think it is controversial to say that Sir Peter, I understand that to be a reference to Sir Peter Caruana KC. Would you agree?  A. That is correct, yes.  Q. Can you tell us what the meeting with Sir Peter was to be about?  A. Yes, um, the complaints, as you are aware, involved serious hacking the of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	of paper and then transcribing them afterwards. There may have been some delay at that point in putting from loose pieces of paper into my book.  Q. Can I take you now to some entries in your daybook in January 2019, very early on in your role as SIA. The first is C/1657. The heading there is: "Briefing with COP and BF". Presumably that is a reference to Brian Finlayson, who you just mentioned.  A. That is correct.  Q. The title of this note is, as I say: "Briefing with COP". Does that mean that the Commission of Police was briefing you or that you were briefing the Commissioner of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	refers to.  Q. If we can then move forward two pages, 1661, I think this is the same meeting. There is a reference there, halfway down the page: "COP meeting with Sir Peter to clear legal approach." I do not think it is controversial to say that Sir Peter, I understand that to be a reference to Sir Peter Caruana KC. Would you agree?  A. That is correct, yes.  Q. Can you tell us what the meeting with Sir Peter was to be about?  A. Yes, um, the complaints, as you are aware, involved serious hacking the of NSCIS platform and an allegation of fraud
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	of paper and then transcribing them afterwards. There may have been some delay at that point in putting from loose pieces of paper into my book.  Q. Can I take you now to some entries in your daybook in January 2019, very early on in your role as SIA. The first is C/1657. The heading there is: "Briefing with COP and BF". Presumably that is a reference to Brian Finlayson, who you just mentioned.  A. That is correct.  Q. The title of this note is, as I say: "Briefing with COP". Does that mean that the Commission of Police was briefing you or that you were briefing the Commissioner of Police?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	refers to.  Q. If we can then move forward two pages, 1661, I think this is the same meeting. There is a reference there, halfway down the page: "COP meeting with Sir Peter to clear legal approach." I do not think it is controversial to say that Sir Peter, I understand that to be a reference to Sir Peter Caruana KC. Would you agree?  A. That is correct, yes.  Q. Can you tell us what the meeting with Sir Peter was to be about?  A. Yes, um, the complaints, as you are aware, involved serious hacking the of NSCIS platform and an allegation of fraud and our understanding was that Sir Peter was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	of paper and then transcribing them afterwards. There may have been some delay at that point in putting from loose pieces of paper into my book.  Q. Can I take you now to some entries in your daybook in January 2019, very early on in your role as SIA. The first is C/1657. The heading there is: "Briefing with COP and BF". Presumably that is a reference to Brian Finlayson, who you just mentioned.  A. That is correct.  Q. The title of this note is, as I say: "Briefing with COP". Does that mean that the Commission of Police was briefing you or that you were briefing the Commissioner of Police?  A. Just let me read it, please.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	refers to.  Q. If we can then move forward two pages, 1661, I think this is the same meeting. There is a reference there, halfway down the page: "COP meeting with Sir Peter to clear legal approach." I do not think it is controversial to say that Sir Peter, I understand that to be a reference to Sir Peter Caruana KC. Would you agree?  A. That is correct, yes.  Q. Can you tell us what the meeting with Sir Peter was to be about?  A. Yes, um, the complaints, as you are aware, involved serious hacking the of NSCIS platform and an allegation of fraud and our understanding was that Sir Peter was taking civil action on behalf of Bland's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	of paper and then transcribing them afterwards. There may have been some delay at that point in putting from loose pieces of paper into my book.  Q. Can I take you now to some entries in your daybook in January 2019, very early on in your role as SIA. The first is C/1657. The heading there is: "Briefing with COP and BF". Presumably that is a reference to Brian Finlayson, who you just mentioned.  A. That is correct.  Q. The title of this note is, as I say: "Briefing with COP". Does that mean that the Commission of Police was briefing you or that you were briefing the Commissioner of Police?  A. Just let me read it, please.  Q. Yes, please do so. (Pause).	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	refers to.  Q. If we can then move forward two pages, 1661, I think this is the same meeting. There is a reference there, halfway down the page: "COP meeting with Sir Peter to clear legal approach." I do not think it is controversial to say that Sir Peter, I understand that to be a reference to Sir Peter Caruana KC. Would you agree?  A. That is correct, yes.  Q. Can you tell us what the meeting with Sir Peter was to be about?  A. Yes, um, the complaints, as you are aware, involved serious hacking the of NSCIS platform and an allegation of fraud and our understanding was that Sir Peter was taking civil action on behalf of Bland's against the defendants and part of that action
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	of paper and then transcribing them afterwards. There may have been some delay at that point in putting from loose pieces of paper into my book.  Q. Can I take you now to some entries in your daybook in January 2019, very early on in your role as SIA. The first is C/1657. The heading there is: "Briefing with COP and BF". Presumably that is a reference to Brian Finlayson, who you just mentioned.  A. That is correct.  Q. The title of this note is, as I say: "Briefing with COP". Does that mean that the Commission of Police was briefing you or that you were briefing the Commissioner of Police?  A. Just let me read it, please.  Q. Yes, please do so. (Pause).  MR GIBBS: It is in the daybook.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	refers to.  Q. If we can then move forward two pages, 1661, I think this is the same meeting. There is a reference there, halfway down the page: "COP meeting with Sir Peter to clear legal approach." I do not think it is controversial to say that Sir Peter, I understand that to be a reference to Sir Peter Caruana KC. Would you agree?  A. That is correct, yes.  Q. Can you tell us what the meeting with Sir Peter was to be about?  A. Yes, um, the complaints, as you are aware, involved serious hacking the of NSCIS platform and an allegation of fraud and our understanding was that Sir Peter was taking civil action on behalf of Bland's against the defendants and part of that action would have involved laying information in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	of paper and then transcribing them afterwards. There may have been some delay at that point in putting from loose pieces of paper into my book.  Q. Can I take you now to some entries in your daybook in January 2019, very early on in your role as SIA. The first is C/1657. The heading there is: "Briefing with COP and BF". Presumably that is a reference to Brian Finlayson, who you just mentioned.  A. That is correct.  Q. The title of this note is, as I say: "Briefing with COP". Does that mean that the Commission of Police was briefing you or that you were briefing the Commissioner of Police?  A. Just let me read it, please.  Q. Yes, please do so. (Pause).  MR GIBBS: It is in the daybook.  MR SANTOS: Sorry, yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	refers to.  Q. If we can then move forward two pages, 1661, I think this is the same meeting. There is a reference there, halfway down the page: "COP meeting with Sir Peter to clear legal approach." I do not think it is controversial to say that Sir Peter, I understand that to be a reference to Sir Peter Caruana KC. Would you agree?  A. That is correct, yes.  Q. Can you tell us what the meeting with Sir Peter was to be about?  A. Yes, um, the complaints, as you are aware, involved serious hacking the of NSCIS platform and an allegation of fraud and our understanding was that Sir Peter was taking civil action on behalf of Bland's against the defendants and part of that action would have involved laying information in courts that the defendants would have had
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	of paper and then transcribing them afterwards. There may have been some delay at that point in putting from loose pieces of paper into my book.  Q. Can I take you now to some entries in your daybook in January 2019, very early on in your role as SIA. The first is C/1657. The heading there is: "Briefing with COP and BF". Presumably that is a reference to Brian Finlayson, who you just mentioned.  A. That is correct.  Q. The title of this note is, as I say: "Briefing with COP". Does that mean that the Commission of Police was briefing you or that you were briefing the Commissioner of Police?  A. Just let me read it, please.  Q. Yes, please do so. (Pause).  MR GIBBS: It is in the daybook.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	refers to.  Q. If we can then move forward two pages, 1661, I think this is the same meeting. There is a reference there, halfway down the page: "COP meeting with Sir Peter to clear legal approach." I do not think it is controversial to say that Sir Peter, I understand that to be a reference to Sir Peter Caruana KC. Would you agree?  A. That is correct, yes.  Q. Can you tell us what the meeting with Sir Peter was to be about?  A. Yes, um, the complaints, as you are aware, involved serious hacking the of NSCIS platform and an allegation of fraud and our understanding was that Sir Peter was taking civil action on behalf of Bland's against the defendants and part of that action would have involved laying information in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	of paper and then transcribing them afterwards. There may have been some delay at that point in putting from loose pieces of paper into my book.  Q. Can I take you now to some entries in your daybook in January 2019, very early on in your role as SIA. The first is C/1657. The heading there is: "Briefing with COP and BF". Presumably that is a reference to Brian Finlayson, who you just mentioned.  A. That is correct.  Q. The title of this note is, as I say: "Briefing with COP". Does that mean that the Commission of Police was briefing you or that you were briefing the Commissioner of Police?  A. Just let me read it, please.  Q. Yes, please do so. (Pause).  MR GIBBS: It is in the daybook.  MR SANTOS: Sorry, yes.  MR GIBBS: I think the (inaudible) the witness.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	refers to.  Q. If we can then move forward two pages, 1661, I think this is the same meeting. There is a reference there, halfway down the page: "COP meeting with Sir Peter to clear legal approach." I do not think it is controversial to say that Sir Peter, I understand that to be a reference to Sir Peter Caruana KC. Would you agree?  A. That is correct, yes.  Q. Can you tell us what the meeting with Sir Peter was to be about?  A. Yes, um, the complaints, as you are aware, involved serious hacking the of NSCIS platform and an allegation of fraud and our understanding was that Sir Peter was taking civil action on behalf of Bland's against the defendants and part of that action would have involved laying information in courts that the defendants would have had access to, and we were concerned that if that information was available before we had
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	of paper and then transcribing them afterwards. There may have been some delay at that point in putting from loose pieces of paper into my book. Q. Can I take you now to some entries in your daybook in January 2019, very early on in your role as SIA. The first is C/1657. The heading there is: "Briefing with COP and BF". Presumably that is a reference to Brian Finlayson, who you just mentioned.  A. That is correct. Q. The title of this note is, as I say: "Briefing with COP". Does that mean that the Commission of Police was briefing you or that you were briefing the Commissioner of Police?  A. Just let me read it, please. Q. Yes, please do so. (Pause). MR GIBBS: It is in the daybook. MR SANTOS: Sorry, yes. MR GIBBS: I think the (inaudible) the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	refers to.  Q. If we can then move forward two pages, 1661, I think this is the same meeting. There is a reference there, halfway down the page: "COP meeting with Sir Peter to clear legal approach." I do not think it is controversial to say that Sir Peter, I understand that to be a reference to Sir Peter Caruana KC. Would you agree?  A. That is correct, yes.  Q. Can you tell us what the meeting with Sir Peter was to be about?  A. Yes, um, the complaints, as you are aware, involved serious hacking the of NSCIS platform and an allegation of fraud and our understanding was that Sir Peter was taking civil action on behalf of Bland's against the defendants and part of that action would have involved laying information in courts that the defendants would have had access to, and we were concerned that if that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	of paper and then transcribing them afterwards. There may have been some delay at that point in putting from loose pieces of paper into my book. Q. Can I take you now to some entries in your daybook in January 2019, very early on in your role as SIA. The first is C/1657. The heading there is: "Briefing with COP and BF". Presumably that is a reference to Brian Finlayson, who you just mentioned.  A. That is correct. Q. The title of this note is, as I say: "Briefing with COP". Does that mean that the Commission of Police was briefing you or that you were briefing the Commissioner of Police?  A. Just let me read it, please. Q. Yes, please do so. (Pause). MR GIBBS: It is in the daybook. MR SANTOS: Sorry, yes. MR GIBBS: I think the (inaudible) the witness. MR SANTOS: Yes, I think that you have the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	refers to.  Q. If we can then move forward two pages, 1661, I think this is the same meeting. There is a reference there, halfway down the page: "COP meeting with Sir Peter to clear legal approach." I do not think it is controversial to say that Sir Peter, I understand that to be a reference to Sir Peter Caruana KC. Would you agree?  A. That is correct, yes.  Q. Can you tell us what the meeting with Sir Peter was to be about?  A. Yes, um, the complaints, as you are aware, involved serious hacking the of NSCIS platform and an allegation of fraud and our understanding was that Sir Peter was taking civil action on behalf of Bland's against the defendants and part of that action would have involved laying information in courts that the defendants would have had access to, and we were concerned that if that information was available before we had an opportunity to speak to people, it would

1	clearing the legal approach refers to that.	1	"I was advised of the arrests by Paul
2	Q. Now, can we now turn, it is a fair bit	2	Richardson on the day. I cannot recall
3	forward, C/1733, so it is probably around 70	3	whether I was informed before or after the
4	pages or 72 pages, I think, ahead for you. It	4	arrests themselves. It will have been over
5	is a note of 11 May 2019. Halfway down the	5	a telephone call."
6	page.	6	And then the following paragraph says:
7	A. Yes, I have it.	7	"As it happened, on the day of the arrests I
8	Q. This is 11 May 2019, it was the day after,	8	was walking towards the convent, the
9 10	I believe, Mr Cornelio and Mr Perez and another individual were arrested. Is that	9	governor's residence, at around midday. I
10 11	another individual were arrested. Is that correct?	10 11	happened to see the Chief Minister driving past me in his car. His driver stopped the car
12	A. That is correct.	12	and he opened the window to say hello. I
13	Q. This is a note on 11 May of a telephone	13	mentioned to him that I had heard that there
13	call at 10.01 to 10.12 with Mr James	14	was progress with the police investigation
15	Gaggero. Is that correct?	15	and that actions had been taken that day."
16	A. That is correct.	16	So he refers in the first line of 78, he says: "I
17	Q. Now, you state JG there, the first line	17	was advised of the arrests by Paul
18	there. Can I ask you to read that first line	18	Richardson on the day." Now, your account
19	out?	19	just now was that in fact he had learned from
20	A. It says, it's in bullet points. The first line	20	an employee. I just want to ask you to
21	reads: "JG had heard of arrests from	21	confirm your position, having read that.
22	employee."	22	A. Yes, I noticed this in preparation for the
23	Q. Is that still your recollection?	23	inquiry. I think Mr Gaggero is mistaken and
24	A. It certainly is.	24	has confused the day that the three Delhi
25	Q. And then if we go to the bottom line on	25	defendants were arrested with the arrest of
	Page 13		Page 15
	<u> </u>		<u> </u>
1	the screen, I think it should be the same on	1	Mr Sanchez a few days later.
2	your hard copy, I think can you just read, it	2	Q. Is it typical to contact complainants when
2 3	your hard copy, I think can you just read, it starts with: "COP".	2 3	Q. Is it typical to contact complainants when a suspect is arrested?
2 3 4	your hard copy, I think can you just read, it starts with: "COP".  A. Yes, it says: "COP had wanted me to call	2 3 4	<ul><li>Q. Is it typical to contact complainants when a suspect is arrested?</li><li>A. It depends on the case. In this particular</li></ul>
2 3 4 5	your hard copy, I think can you just read, it starts with: "COP".  A. Yes, it says: "COP had wanted me to call yesterday."	2 3 4 5	<ul><li>Q. Is it typical to contact complainants when a suspect is arrested?</li><li>A. It depends on the case. In this particular case there was civil action pending that was</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6	your hard copy, I think can you just read, it starts with: "COP".  A. Yes, it says: "COP had wanted me to call yesterday."  Q. Yes. What do you mean by that, sorry?	2 3 4 5 6	<ul><li>Q. Is it typical to contact complainants when a suspect is arrested?</li><li>A. It depends on the case. In this particular case there was civil action pending that was ready to go, just waiting for the police to</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	your hard copy, I think can you just read, it starts with: "COP".  A. Yes, it says: "COP had wanted me to call yesterday."  Q. Yes. What do you mean by that, sorry?  A. Well, Mr Gaggero was the complainant	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>Q. Is it typical to contact complainants when a suspect is arrested?</li> <li>A. It depends on the case. In this particular case there was civil action pending that was ready to go, just waiting for the police to intervene with the people that were suspected</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	your hard copy, I think can you just read, it starts with: "COP".  A. Yes, it says: "COP had wanted me to call yesterday."  Q. Yes. What do you mean by that, sorry?  A. Well, Mr Gaggero was the complainant in this matter and had been waiting very	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>Q. Is it typical to contact complainants when a suspect is arrested?</li> <li>A. It depends on the case. In this particular case there was civil action pending that was ready to go, just waiting for the police to intervene with the people that were suspected of committing the crime. So in this case it</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	your hard copy, I think can you just read, it starts with: "COP".  A. Yes, it says: "COP had wanted me to call yesterday."  Q. Yes. What do you mean by that, sorry?  A. Well, Mr Gaggero was the complainant in this matter and had been waiting very patiently for us to take executive action. Um,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q. Is it typical to contact complainants when a suspect is arrested?</li> <li>A. It depends on the case. In this particular case there was civil action pending that was ready to go, just waiting for the police to intervene with the people that were suspected of committing the crime. So in this case it was particularly important to let him know</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	your hard copy, I think can you just read, it starts with: "COP".  A. Yes, it says: "COP had wanted me to call yesterday."  Q. Yes. What do you mean by that, sorry?  A. Well, Mr Gaggero was the complainant in this matter and had been waiting very patiently for us to take executive action. Um, Mr McGrail had wanted me to advise	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q. Is it typical to contact complainants when a suspect is arrested?  A. It depends on the case. In this particular case there was civil action pending that was ready to go, just waiting for the police to intervene with the people that were suspected of committing the crime. So in this case it was particularly important to let him know when it was safe to do so.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	your hard copy, I think can you just read, it starts with: "COP".  A. Yes, it says: "COP had wanted me to call yesterday."  Q. Yes. What do you mean by that, sorry?  A. Well, Mr Gaggero was the complainant in this matter and had been waiting very patiently for us to take executive action. Um, Mr McGrail had wanted me to advise  Mr Gaggero of the arrests after they had	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q. Is it typical to contact complainants when a suspect is arrested?</li> <li>A. It depends on the case. In this particular case there was civil action pending that was ready to go, just waiting for the police to intervene with the people that were suspected of committing the crime. So in this case it was particularly important to let him know when it was safe to do so.</li> <li>Q. Just going to the next paragraph of this</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	your hard copy, I think can you just read, it starts with: "COP".  A. Yes, it says: "COP had wanted me to call yesterday."  Q. Yes. What do you mean by that, sorry?  A. Well, Mr Gaggero was the complainant in this matter and had been waiting very patiently for us to take executive action. Um, Mr McGrail had wanted me to advise	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q. Is it typical to contact complainants when a suspect is arrested?  A. It depends on the case. In this particular case there was civil action pending that was ready to go, just waiting for the police to intervene with the people that were suspected of committing the crime. So in this case it was particularly important to let him know when it was safe to do so.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	your hard copy, I think can you just read, it starts with: "COP".  A. Yes, it says: "COP had wanted me to call yesterday."  Q. Yes. What do you mean by that, sorry?  A. Well, Mr Gaggero was the complainant in this matter and had been waiting very patiently for us to take executive action. Um, Mr McGrail had wanted me to advise  Mr Gaggero of the arrests after they had happened and I had resisted that because, in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Q. Is it typical to contact complainants when a suspect is arrested?</li> <li>A. It depends on the case. In this particular case there was civil action pending that was ready to go, just waiting for the police to intervene with the people that were suspected of committing the crime. So in this case it was particularly important to let him know when it was safe to do so.</li> <li>Q. Just going to the next paragraph of this statement, paragraph 80, Mr Gaggero says as</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	your hard copy, I think can you just read, it starts with: "COP".  A. Yes, it says: "COP had wanted me to call yesterday."  Q. Yes. What do you mean by that, sorry?  A. Well, Mr Gaggero was the complainant in this matter and had been waiting very patiently for us to take executive action. Um, Mr McGrail had wanted me to advise  Mr Gaggero of the arrests after they had happened and I had resisted that because, in fact the words in my text to him are: "I would	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q. Is it typical to contact complainants when a suspect is arrested?  A. It depends on the case. In this particular case there was civil action pending that was ready to go, just waiting for the police to intervene with the people that were suspected of committing the crime. So in this case it was particularly important to let him know when it was safe to do so.  Q. Just going to the next paragraph of this statement, paragraph 80, Mr Gaggero says as follows:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	your hard copy, I think can you just read, it starts with: "COP".  A. Yes, it says: "COP had wanted me to call yesterday."  Q. Yes. What do you mean by that, sorry?  A. Well, Mr Gaggero was the complainant in this matter and had been waiting very patiently for us to take executive action. Um, Mr McGrail had wanted me to advise  Mr Gaggero of the arrests after they had happened and I had resisted that because, in fact the words in my text to him are: "I would like to keep Mr Gaggero at arm's length" and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q. Is it typical to contact complainants when a suspect is arrested?  A. It depends on the case. In this particular case there was civil action pending that was ready to go, just waiting for the police to intervene with the people that were suspected of committing the crime. So in this case it was particularly important to let him know when it was safe to do so.  Q. Just going to the next paragraph of this statement, paragraph 80, Mr Gaggero says as follows:  "I recall receiving a call from DSI Paul
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	your hard copy, I think can you just read, it starts with: "COP".  A. Yes, it says: "COP had wanted me to call yesterday."  Q. Yes. What do you mean by that, sorry?  A. Well, Mr Gaggero was the complainant in this matter and had been waiting very patiently for us to take executive action. Um, Mr McGrail had wanted me to advise  Mr Gaggero of the arrests after they had happened and I had resisted that because, in fact the words in my text to him are: "I would like to keep Mr Gaggero at arm's length" and I didn't want to speak to him until after they	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q. Is it typical to contact complainants when a suspect is arrested?  A. It depends on the case. In this particular case there was civil action pending that was ready to go, just waiting for the police to intervene with the people that were suspected of committing the crime. So in this case it was particularly important to let him know when it was safe to do so.  Q. Just going to the next paragraph of this statement, paragraph 80, Mr Gaggero says as follows:  "I recall receiving a call from DSI Paul Richardson very shortly afterwards, possibly
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	your hard copy, I think can you just read, it starts with: "COP".  A. Yes, it says: "COP had wanted me to call yesterday."  Q. Yes. What do you mean by that, sorry?  A. Well, Mr Gaggero was the complainant in this matter and had been waiting very patiently for us to take executive action. Um, Mr McGrail had wanted me to advise  Mr Gaggero of the arrests after they had happened and I had resisted that because, in fact the words in my text to him are: "I would like to keep Mr Gaggero at arm's length" and I didn't want to speak to him until after they had been bailed. He in the event called me	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. Is it typical to contact complainants when a suspect is arrested?  A. It depends on the case. In this particular case there was civil action pending that was ready to go, just waiting for the police to intervene with the people that were suspected of committing the crime. So in this case it was particularly important to let him know when it was safe to do so.  Q. Just going to the next paragraph of this statement, paragraph 80, Mr Gaggero says as follows:  "I recall receiving a call from DSI Paul Richardson very shortly afterwards, possibly on the same day. Inspector Richardson was very upset that any information which had been provided to me as a complainant should
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	your hard copy, I think can you just read, it starts with: "COP".  A. Yes, it says: "COP had wanted me to call yesterday."  Q. Yes. What do you mean by that, sorry?  A. Well, Mr Gaggero was the complainant in this matter and had been waiting very patiently for us to take executive action. Um, Mr McGrail had wanted me to advise Mr Gaggero of the arrests after they had happened and I had resisted that because, in fact the words in my text to him are: "I would like to keep Mr Gaggero at arm's length" and I didn't want to speak to him until after they had been bailed. He in the event called me the following day. I was in Spain and he called me and that is a note of that conversation.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. Is it typical to contact complainants when a suspect is arrested?  A. It depends on the case. In this particular case there was civil action pending that was ready to go, just waiting for the police to intervene with the people that were suspected of committing the crime. So in this case it was particularly important to let him know when it was safe to do so.  Q. Just going to the next paragraph of this statement, paragraph 80, Mr Gaggero says as follows:  "I recall receiving a call from DSI Paul Richardson very shortly afterwards, possibly on the same day. Inspector Richardson was very upset that any information which had been provided to me as a complainant should have been passed on by me to the Chief
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	your hard copy, I think can you just read, it starts with: "COP".  A. Yes, it says: "COP had wanted me to call yesterday."  Q. Yes. What do you mean by that, sorry?  A. Well, Mr Gaggero was the complainant in this matter and had been waiting very patiently for us to take executive action. Um, Mr McGrail had wanted me to advise Mr Gaggero of the arrests after they had happened and I had resisted that because, in fact the words in my text to him are: "I would like to keep Mr Gaggero at arm's length" and I didn't want to speak to him until after they had been bailed. He in the event called me the following day. I was in Spain and he called me and that is a note of that conversation.  Q. Can we actually go to Mr Gaggero's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. Is it typical to contact complainants when a suspect is arrested?  A. It depends on the case. In this particular case there was civil action pending that was ready to go, just waiting for the police to intervene with the people that were suspected of committing the crime. So in this case it was particularly important to let him know when it was safe to do so.  Q. Just going to the next paragraph of this statement, paragraph 80, Mr Gaggero says as follows:  "I recall receiving a call from DSI Paul Richardson very shortly afterwards, possibly on the same day. Inspector Richardson was very upset that any information which had been provided to me as a complainant should have been passed on by me to the Chief Minister. I apologised profusely and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	your hard copy, I think can you just read, it starts with: "COP".  A. Yes, it says: "COP had wanted me to call yesterday."  Q. Yes. What do you mean by that, sorry?  A. Well, Mr Gaggero was the complainant in this matter and had been waiting very patiently for us to take executive action. Um, Mr McGrail had wanted me to advise Mr Gaggero of the arrests after they had happened and I had resisted that because, in fact the words in my text to him are: "I would like to keep Mr Gaggero at arm's length" and I didn't want to speak to him until after they had been bailed. He in the event called me the following day. I was in Spain and he called me and that is a note of that conversation.  Q. Can we actually go to Mr Gaggero's evidence. It is A/1374, please. That will	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. Is it typical to contact complainants when a suspect is arrested?  A. It depends on the case. In this particular case there was civil action pending that was ready to go, just waiting for the police to intervene with the people that were suspected of committing the crime. So in this case it was particularly important to let him know when it was safe to do so.  Q. Just going to the next paragraph of this statement, paragraph 80, Mr Gaggero says as follows:  "I recall receiving a call from DSI Paul Richardson very shortly afterwards, possibly on the same day. Inspector Richardson was very upset that any information which had been provided to me as a complainant should have been passed on by me to the Chief Minister. I apologised profusely and confirmed that my comment to the Chief
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	your hard copy, I think can you just read, it starts with: "COP".  A. Yes, it says: "COP had wanted me to call yesterday."  Q. Yes. What do you mean by that, sorry?  A. Well, Mr Gaggero was the complainant in this matter and had been waiting very patiently for us to take executive action. Um, Mr McGrail had wanted me to advise Mr Gaggero of the arrests after they had happened and I had resisted that because, in fact the words in my text to him are: "I would like to keep Mr Gaggero at arm's length" and I didn't want to speak to him until after they had been bailed. He in the event called me the following day. I was in Spain and he called me and that is a note of that conversation.  Q. Can we actually go to Mr Gaggero's evidence. It is A/1374, please. That will appear on the screen. Paragraph 78, please.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. Is it typical to contact complainants when a suspect is arrested?  A. It depends on the case. In this particular case there was civil action pending that was ready to go, just waiting for the police to intervene with the people that were suspected of committing the crime. So in this case it was particularly important to let him know when it was safe to do so.  Q. Just going to the next paragraph of this statement, paragraph 80, Mr Gaggero says as follows:  "I recall receiving a call from DSI Paul Richardson very shortly afterwards, possibly on the same day. Inspector Richardson was very upset that any information which had been provided to me as a complainant should have been passed on by me to the Chief Minister. I apologised profusely and confirmed that my comment to the Chief Minister had been perfectly innocent but that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	your hard copy, I think can you just read, it starts with: "COP".  A. Yes, it says: "COP had wanted me to call yesterday."  Q. Yes. What do you mean by that, sorry?  A. Well, Mr Gaggero was the complainant in this matter and had been waiting very patiently for us to take executive action. Um, Mr McGrail had wanted me to advise  Mr Gaggero of the arrests after they had happened and I had resisted that because, in fact the words in my text to him are: "I would like to keep Mr Gaggero at arm's length" and I didn't want to speak to him until after they had been bailed. He in the event called me the following day. I was in Spain and he called me and that is a note of that conversation.  Q. Can we actually go to Mr Gaggero's evidence. It is A/1374, please. That will appear on the screen. Paragraph 78, please. (Pause). Yes. We do have a hard copy if	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. Is it typical to contact complainants when a suspect is arrested?  A. It depends on the case. In this particular case there was civil action pending that was ready to go, just waiting for the police to intervene with the people that were suspected of committing the crime. So in this case it was particularly important to let him know when it was safe to do so.  Q. Just going to the next paragraph of this statement, paragraph 80, Mr Gaggero says as follows:  "I recall receiving a call from DSI Paul Richardson very shortly afterwards, possibly on the same day. Inspector Richardson was very upset that any information which had been provided to me as a complainant should have been passed on by me to the Chief Minister. I apologised profusely and confirmed that my comment to the Chief Minister had been perfectly innocent but that it would not happen again. After that date
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	your hard copy, I think can you just read, it starts with: "COP".  A. Yes, it says: "COP had wanted me to call yesterday."  Q. Yes. What do you mean by that, sorry?  A. Well, Mr Gaggero was the complainant in this matter and had been waiting very patiently for us to take executive action. Um, Mr McGrail had wanted me to advise Mr Gaggero of the arrests after they had happened and I had resisted that because, in fact the words in my text to him are: "I would like to keep Mr Gaggero at arm's length" and I didn't want to speak to him until after they had been bailed. He in the event called me the following day. I was in Spain and he called me and that is a note of that conversation.  Q. Can we actually go to Mr Gaggero's evidence. It is A/1374, please. That will appear on the screen. Paragraph 78, please. (Pause). Yes. We do have a hard copy if you want it, but I am only going to take you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. Is it typical to contact complainants when a suspect is arrested?  A. It depends on the case. In this particular case there was civil action pending that was ready to go, just waiting for the police to intervene with the people that were suspected of committing the crime. So in this case it was particularly important to let him know when it was safe to do so.  Q. Just going to the next paragraph of this statement, paragraph 80, Mr Gaggero says as follows:  "I recall receiving a call from DSI Paul Richardson very shortly afterwards, possibly on the same day. Inspector Richardson was very upset that any information which had been provided to me as a complainant should have been passed on by me to the Chief Minister. I apologised profusely and confirmed that my comment to the Chief Minister had been perfectly innocent but that it would not happen again. After that date little if any information was shared with me
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	your hard copy, I think can you just read, it starts with: "COP".  A. Yes, it says: "COP had wanted me to call yesterday."  Q. Yes. What do you mean by that, sorry?  A. Well, Mr Gaggero was the complainant in this matter and had been waiting very patiently for us to take executive action. Um, Mr McGrail had wanted me to advise  Mr Gaggero of the arrests after they had happened and I had resisted that because, in fact the words in my text to him are: "I would like to keep Mr Gaggero at arm's length" and I didn't want to speak to him until after they had been bailed. He in the event called me the following day. I was in Spain and he called me and that is a note of that conversation.  Q. Can we actually go to Mr Gaggero's evidence. It is A/1374, please. That will appear on the screen. Paragraph 78, please. (Pause). Yes. We do have a hard copy if	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. Is it typical to contact complainants when a suspect is arrested?  A. It depends on the case. In this particular case there was civil action pending that was ready to go, just waiting for the police to intervene with the people that were suspected of committing the crime. So in this case it was particularly important to let him know when it was safe to do so.  Q. Just going to the next paragraph of this statement, paragraph 80, Mr Gaggero says as follows:  "I recall receiving a call from DSI Paul Richardson very shortly afterwards, possibly on the same day. Inspector Richardson was very upset that any information which had been provided to me as a complainant should have been passed on by me to the Chief Minister. I apologised profusely and confirmed that my comment to the Chief Minister had been perfectly innocent but that it would not happen again. After that date
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	your hard copy, I think can you just read, it starts with: "COP".  A. Yes, it says: "COP had wanted me to call yesterday."  Q. Yes. What do you mean by that, sorry?  A. Well, Mr Gaggero was the complainant in this matter and had been waiting very patiently for us to take executive action. Um, Mr McGrail had wanted me to advise Mr Gaggero of the arrests after they had happened and I had resisted that because, in fact the words in my text to him are: "I would like to keep Mr Gaggero at arm's length" and I didn't want to speak to him until after they had been bailed. He in the event called me the following day. I was in Spain and he called me and that is a note of that conversation.  Q. Can we actually go to Mr Gaggero's evidence. It is A/1374, please. That will appear on the screen. Paragraph 78, please. (Pause). Yes. We do have a hard copy if you want it, but I am only going to take you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. Is it typical to contact complainants when a suspect is arrested?  A. It depends on the case. In this particular case there was civil action pending that was ready to go, just waiting for the police to intervene with the people that were suspected of committing the crime. So in this case it was particularly important to let him know when it was safe to do so.  Q. Just going to the next paragraph of this statement, paragraph 80, Mr Gaggero says as follows:  "I recall receiving a call from DSI Paul Richardson very shortly afterwards, possibly on the same day. Inspector Richardson was very upset that any information which had been provided to me as a complainant should have been passed on by me to the Chief Minister. I apologised profusely and confirmed that my comment to the Chief Minister had been perfectly innocent but that it would not happen again. After that date little if any information was shared with me

1	shared by me with the RGP was shared by	1	samuant Caina Sanahaz IIa advisad ma of
2	me only with the senior executive team at	1	servant, Caine Sanchez. He advised me of
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	2	the meeting by WhatsApp and I prepared
3	Bland or its legal team."	3	a briefing note for him in advance. I have
4 5	Now, we already know that you disagree with Mr Gaggero's recollection, but do you	4	a copy of that note because it was shared
	agree that a conversation took place to that	5	with him by WhatsApp. Our WhatsApp
6	effect?	6	exchange is set out below."
7		7	And then there is a WhatsApp exchange and
8 9	A. It did, but I am not sure whether he called me or I called him. I think it was he called	8	there is a reference there by Mr McGrail, the
10	me. I wouldn't have known about his	9	fourth message down, to the Attorney
11	interaction with the Chief Minister unless he	11	General being in London. I should now just
12	told me.	12	take you to paragraph 70 of your statement, which is on 1436. And that says, this is what
13	Q. Can we turn to C/1735, please, which is	13	you say in response to the Attorney General's
13	in your daybook as well. I think it is	14	affidavit where the I will just read out 70:
15	a couple of pages on from the page you were	15	"At paragraph 25 the AG states that
16	looking at. Halfway down the page, 14	16	Mr McGrail had raised most of these
17	May 2019, that is a record of a call from	17	concerns with him in May 2019. I was not
18	James Gaggero.	18	aware that the Commissioner had met with
	A. Yes.	19	
19			the AG in May 2019. If the AG is referring
20	Q. Is that a reference to the conversation that	20 21	to the meeting of 13 May 2019 my record
21	you just mentioned?  A. It is.		does not list him as being present. In fact,
22		22	a message exchange between myself and the Commissioner at around this time refers to
23	Q. Now, I think at the top of this page there	23	
24	is a reference to a meeting on 13 May	24	the AG's absence in England: (see paragraph
25	between you, the Chief Minister, the DPP,	25	59 above)."
	Page 17		Page 19
1	Mr Costa, the then Minister of Justice,	1	Just to confirm your position, your evidence
1 2	Mr Costa, the then Minister of Justice, Mr Mena and Mr Grech. Is that everyone	1 2	Just to confirm your position, your evidence and your recollection, was the AG present at
2	Mr Mena and Mr Grech. Is that everyone	2	and your recollection, was the AG present at
2 3	Mr Mena and Mr Grech. Is that everyone who according to you was present at that	2 3	and your recollection, was the AG present at that meeting on 13 May 2019?
2 3 4	Mr Mena and Mr Grech. Is that everyone who according to you was present at that meeting or would you have missed any	2 3 4	and your recollection, was the AG present at that meeting on 13 May 2019?  A. My recollection is that he was not present
2 3 4 5	Mr Mena and Mr Grech. Is that everyone who according to you was present at that meeting or would you have missed any attendee out?	2 3 4 5	and your recollection, was the AG present at that meeting on 13 May 2019?  A. My recollection is that he was not present physically. There is a possibility that he
2 3 4 5 6	Mr Mena and Mr Grech. Is that everyone who according to you was present at that meeting or would you have missed any attendee out?  A. According to my recollection, those are	2 3 4 5 6	and your recollection, was the AG present at that meeting on 13 May 2019?  A. My recollection is that he was not present physically. There is a possibility that he attended the meeting by telephone
2 3 4 5 6 7	Mr Mena and Mr Grech. Is that everyone who according to you was present at that meeting or would you have missed any attendee out?  A. According to my recollection, those are the people that were present at that meeting.	2 3 4 5 6 7	and your recollection, was the AG present at that meeting on 13 May 2019?  A. My recollection is that he was not present physically. There is a possibility that he attended the meeting by telephone conversation, but I don't remember him being
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Mr Mena and Mr Grech. Is that everyone who according to you was present at that meeting or would you have missed any attendee out?  A. According to my recollection, those are the people that were present at that meeting.  Q. And it may be an obvious question, but	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	and your recollection, was the AG present at that meeting on 13 May 2019?  A. My recollection is that he was not present physically. There is a possibility that he attended the meeting by telephone conversation, but I don't remember him being there physically. And neither do I remember
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Mr Mena and Mr Grech. Is that everyone who according to you was present at that meeting or would you have missed any attendee out?  A. According to my recollection, those are the people that were present at that meeting.  Q. And it may be an obvious question, but when you recorded in your daybook would	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	and your recollection, was the AG present at that meeting on 13 May 2019?  A. My recollection is that he was not present physically. There is a possibility that he attended the meeting by telephone conversation, but I don't remember him being there physically. And neither do I remember specifically that he was there participating
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Mr Mena and Mr Grech. Is that everyone who according to you was present at that meeting or would you have missed any attendee out?  A. According to my recollection, those are the people that were present at that meeting.  Q. And it may be an obvious question, but when you recorded in your daybook would you normally leave anybody out?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	and your recollection, was the AG present at that meeting on 13 May 2019?  A. My recollection is that he was not present physically. There is a possibility that he attended the meeting by telephone conversation, but I don't remember him being there physically. And neither do I remember specifically that he was there participating via telephone.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Mr Mena and Mr Grech. Is that everyone who according to you was present at that meeting or would you have missed any attendee out?  A. According to my recollection, those are the people that were present at that meeting.  Q. And it may be an obvious question, but when you recorded in your daybook would you normally leave anybody out?  A. No, of course not.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	and your recollection, was the AG present at that meeting on 13 May 2019?  A. My recollection is that he was not present physically. There is a possibility that he attended the meeting by telephone conversation, but I don't remember him being there physically. And neither do I remember specifically that he was there participating via telephone.  Q. Do you recall the purpose of that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Mr Mena and Mr Grech. Is that everyone who according to you was present at that meeting or would you have missed any attendee out?  A. According to my recollection, those are the people that were present at that meeting.  Q. And it may be an obvious question, but when you recorded in your daybook would you normally leave anybody out?  A. No, of course not.  Q. Your evidence, can I take you to your	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	and your recollection, was the AG present at that meeting on 13 May 2019?  A. My recollection is that he was not present physically. There is a possibility that he attended the meeting by telephone conversation, but I don't remember him being there physically. And neither do I remember specifically that he was there participating via telephone.  Q. Do you recall the purpose of that meeting?  A. Yes, I do.  Q. Can you explain what that was?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Mr Mena and Mr Grech. Is that everyone who according to you was present at that meeting or would you have missed any attendee out?  A. According to my recollection, those are the people that were present at that meeting.  Q. And it may be an obvious question, but when you recorded in your daybook would you normally leave anybody out?  A. No, of course not.  Q. Your evidence, can I take you to your third witness statement, so the second one in your bundle, paragraph 57, please. It is A/1436.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	and your recollection, was the AG present at that meeting on 13 May 2019?  A. My recollection is that he was not present physically. There is a possibility that he attended the meeting by telephone conversation, but I don't remember him being there physically. And neither do I remember specifically that he was there participating via telephone.  Q. Do you recall the purpose of that meeting?  A. Yes, I do.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Mr Mena and Mr Grech. Is that everyone who according to you was present at that meeting or would you have missed any attendee out?  A. According to my recollection, those are the people that were present at that meeting.  Q. And it may be an obvious question, but when you recorded in your daybook would you normally leave anybody out?  A. No, of course not.  Q. Your evidence, can I take you to your third witness statement, so the second one in your bundle, paragraph 57, please. It is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	and your recollection, was the AG present at that meeting on 13 May 2019?  A. My recollection is that he was not present physically. There is a possibility that he attended the meeting by telephone conversation, but I don't remember him being there physically. And neither do I remember specifically that he was there participating via telephone.  Q. Do you recall the purpose of that meeting?  A. Yes, I do.  Q. Can you explain what that was?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Mr Mena and Mr Grech. Is that everyone who according to you was present at that meeting or would you have missed any attendee out?  A. According to my recollection, those are the people that were present at that meeting.  Q. And it may be an obvious question, but when you recorded in your daybook would you normally leave anybody out?  A. No, of course not.  Q. Your evidence, can I take you to your third witness statement, so the second one in your bundle, paragraph 57, please. It is A/1436.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	and your recollection, was the AG present at that meeting on 13 May 2019?  A. My recollection is that he was not present physically. There is a possibility that he attended the meeting by telephone conversation, but I don't remember him being there physically. And neither do I remember specifically that he was there participating via telephone.  Q. Do you recall the purpose of that meeting?  A. Yes, I do.  Q. Can you explain what that was?  A. This was because after we had arrested the three principal suspects in the Operation Delhi case, an examination of their forensic
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Mr Mena and Mr Grech. Is that everyone who according to you was present at that meeting or would you have missed any attendee out?  A. According to my recollection, those are the people that were present at that meeting.  Q. And it may be an obvious question, but when you recorded in your daybook would you normally leave anybody out?  A. No, of course not.  Q. Your evidence, can I take you to your third witness statement, so the second one in your bundle, paragraph 57, please. It is A/1436.  A. Sorry, did you say the second or the third witness statement?  Q. Sorry, the third witness statement. Sorry,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	and your recollection, was the AG present at that meeting on 13 May 2019?  A. My recollection is that he was not present physically. There is a possibility that he attended the meeting by telephone conversation, but I don't remember him being there physically. And neither do I remember specifically that he was there participating via telephone.  Q. Do you recall the purpose of that meeting?  A. Yes, I do. Q. Can you explain what that was?  A. This was because after we had arrested the three principal suspects in the Operation
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Mr Mena and Mr Grech. Is that everyone who according to you was present at that meeting or would you have missed any attendee out?  A. According to my recollection, those are the people that were present at that meeting.  Q. And it may be an obvious question, but when you recorded in your daybook would you normally leave anybody out?  A. No, of course not.  Q. Your evidence, can I take you to your third witness statement, so the second one in your bundle, paragraph 57, please. It is A/1436.  A. Sorry, did you say the second or the third witness statement?  Q. Sorry, the third witness statement. Sorry, I have been trying to be helpful, I think I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	and your recollection, was the AG present at that meeting on 13 May 2019?  A. My recollection is that he was not present physically. There is a possibility that he attended the meeting by telephone conversation, but I don't remember him being there physically. And neither do I remember specifically that he was there participating via telephone.  Q. Do you recall the purpose of that meeting?  A. Yes, I do.  Q. Can you explain what that was?  A. This was because after we had arrested the three principal suspects in the Operation Delhi case, an examination of their forensic devices had indicated the involvement of Caine Sanchez, who was a senior civil
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Mr Mena and Mr Grech. Is that everyone who according to you was present at that meeting or would you have missed any attendee out?  A. According to my recollection, those are the people that were present at that meeting.  Q. And it may be an obvious question, but when you recorded in your daybook would you normally leave anybody out?  A. No, of course not.  Q. Your evidence, can I take you to your third witness statement, so the second one in your bundle, paragraph 57, please. It is A/1436.  A. Sorry, did you say the second or the third witness statement?  Q. Sorry, the third witness statement. Sorry, I have been trying to be helpful, I think I confused you. Paragraph 57.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	and your recollection, was the AG present at that meeting on 13 May 2019?  A. My recollection is that he was not present physically. There is a possibility that he attended the meeting by telephone conversation, but I don't remember him being there physically. And neither do I remember specifically that he was there participating via telephone.  Q. Do you recall the purpose of that meeting?  A. Yes, I do.  Q. Can you explain what that was?  A. This was because after we had arrested the three principal suspects in the Operation Delhi case, an examination of their forensic devices had indicated the involvement of Caine Sanchez, who was a senior civil servant and is still in post, and Mr McGrail
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Mr Mena and Mr Grech. Is that everyone who according to you was present at that meeting or would you have missed any attendee out?  A. According to my recollection, those are the people that were present at that meeting.  Q. And it may be an obvious question, but when you recorded in your daybook would you normally leave anybody out?  A. No, of course not.  Q. Your evidence, can I take you to your third witness statement, so the second one in your bundle, paragraph 57, please. It is A/1436.  A. Sorry, did you say the second or the third witness statement?  Q. Sorry, the third witness statement. Sorry, I have been trying to be helpful, I think I confused you. Paragraph 57.  A. Fifty-seven, yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	and your recollection, was the AG present at that meeting on 13 May 2019?  A. My recollection is that he was not present physically. There is a possibility that he attended the meeting by telephone conversation, but I don't remember him being there physically. And neither do I remember specifically that he was there participating via telephone.  Q. Do you recall the purpose of that meeting?  A. Yes, I do.  Q. Can you explain what that was?  A. This was because after we had arrested the three principal suspects in the Operation Delhi case, an examination of their forensic devices had indicated the involvement of Caine Sanchez, who was a senior civil servant and is still in post, and Mr McGrail had wanted to brief the Chief Minister
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Mr Mena and Mr Grech. Is that everyone who according to you was present at that meeting or would you have missed any attendee out?  A. According to my recollection, those are the people that were present at that meeting.  Q. And it may be an obvious question, but when you recorded in your daybook would you normally leave anybody out?  A. No, of course not.  Q. Your evidence, can I take you to your third witness statement, so the second one in your bundle, paragraph 57, please. It is A/1436.  A. Sorry, did you say the second or the third witness statement?  Q. Sorry, the third witness statement. Sorry, I have been trying to be helpful, I think I confused you. Paragraph 57.  A. Fifty-seven, yes.  Q. You explain there:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	and your recollection, was the AG present at that meeting on 13 May 2019?  A. My recollection is that he was not present physically. There is a possibility that he attended the meeting by telephone conversation, but I don't remember him being there physically. And neither do I remember specifically that he was there participating via telephone.  Q. Do you recall the purpose of that meeting?  A. Yes, I do.  Q. Can you explain what that was?  A. This was because after we had arrested the three principal suspects in the Operation Delhi case, an examination of their forensic devices had indicated the involvement of Caine Sanchez, who was a senior civil servant and is still in post, and Mr McGrail had wanted to brief the Chief Minister because it would progressing that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Mr Mena and Mr Grech. Is that everyone who according to you was present at that meeting or would you have missed any attendee out?  A. According to my recollection, those are the people that were present at that meeting.  Q. And it may be an obvious question, but when you recorded in your daybook would you normally leave anybody out?  A. No, of course not.  Q. Your evidence, can I take you to your third witness statement, so the second one in your bundle, paragraph 57, please. It is A/1436.  A. Sorry, did you say the second or the third witness statement?  Q. Sorry, the third witness statement. Sorry, I have been trying to be helpful, I think I confused you. Paragraph 57.  A. Fifty-seven, yes.  Q. You explain there:  "Mr McGrail arranged the meeting in order	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	and your recollection, was the AG present at that meeting on 13 May 2019?  A. My recollection is that he was not present physically. There is a possibility that he attended the meeting by telephone conversation, but I don't remember him being there physically. And neither do I remember specifically that he was there participating via telephone.  Q. Do you recall the purpose of that meeting?  A. Yes, I do.  Q. Can you explain what that was?  A. This was because after we had arrested the three principal suspects in the Operation Delhi case, an examination of their forensic devices had indicated the involvement of Caine Sanchez, who was a senior civil servant and is still in post, and Mr McGrail had wanted to brief the Chief Minister because it would progressing that investigation would have involved executing
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Mr Mena and Mr Grech. Is that everyone who according to you was present at that meeting or would you have missed any attendee out?  A. According to my recollection, those are the people that were present at that meeting.  Q. And it may be an obvious question, but when you recorded in your daybook would you normally leave anybody out?  A. No, of course not.  Q. Your evidence, can I take you to your third witness statement, so the second one in your bundle, paragraph 57, please. It is A/1436.  A. Sorry, did you say the second or the third witness statement?  Q. Sorry, the third witness statement. Sorry, I have been trying to be helpful, I think I confused you. Paragraph 57.  A. Fifty-seven, yes.  Q. You explain there:  "Mr McGrail arranged the meeting in order to provide a brief on Operation Delhi	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	and your recollection, was the AG present at that meeting on 13 May 2019?  A. My recollection is that he was not present physically. There is a possibility that he attended the meeting by telephone conversation, but I don't remember him being there physically. And neither do I remember specifically that he was there participating via telephone.  Q. Do you recall the purpose of that meeting?  A. Yes, I do.  Q. Can you explain what that was?  A. This was because after we had arrested the three principal suspects in the Operation Delhi case, an examination of their forensic devices had indicated the involvement of Caine Sanchez, who was a senior civil servant and is still in post, and Mr McGrail had wanted to brief the Chief Minister because it would progressing that investigation would have involved executing search warrants and arresting and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Mr Mena and Mr Grech. Is that everyone who according to you was present at that meeting or would you have missed any attendee out?  A. According to my recollection, those are the people that were present at that meeting.  Q. And it may be an obvious question, but when you recorded in your daybook would you normally leave anybody out?  A. No, of course not.  Q. Your evidence, can I take you to your third witness statement, so the second one in your bundle, paragraph 57, please. It is A/1436.  A. Sorry, did you say the second or the third witness statement?  Q. Sorry, the third witness statement. Sorry, I have been trying to be helpful, I think I confused you. Paragraph 57.  A. Fifty-seven, yes.  Q. You explain there:  "Mr McGrail arranged the meeting in order	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	and your recollection, was the AG present at that meeting on 13 May 2019?  A. My recollection is that he was not present physically. There is a possibility that he attended the meeting by telephone conversation, but I don't remember him being there physically. And neither do I remember specifically that he was there participating via telephone.  Q. Do you recall the purpose of that meeting?  A. Yes, I do.  Q. Can you explain what that was?  A. This was because after we had arrested the three principal suspects in the Operation Delhi case, an examination of their forensic devices had indicated the involvement of Caine Sanchez, who was a senior civil servant and is still in post, and Mr McGrail had wanted to brief the Chief Minister because it would progressing that investigation would have involved executing
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Mr Mena and Mr Grech. Is that everyone who according to you was present at that meeting or would you have missed any attendee out?  A. According to my recollection, those are the people that were present at that meeting.  Q. And it may be an obvious question, but when you recorded in your daybook would you normally leave anybody out?  A. No, of course not.  Q. Your evidence, can I take you to your third witness statement, so the second one in your bundle, paragraph 57, please. It is A/1436.  A. Sorry, did you say the second or the third witness statement?  Q. Sorry, the third witness statement. Sorry, I have been trying to be helpful, I think I confused you. Paragraph 57.  A. Fifty-seven, yes.  Q. You explain there:  "Mr McGrail arranged the meeting in order to provide a brief on Operation Delhi	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	and your recollection, was the AG present at that meeting on 13 May 2019?  A. My recollection is that he was not present physically. There is a possibility that he attended the meeting by telephone conversation, but I don't remember him being there physically. And neither do I remember specifically that he was there participating via telephone.  Q. Do you recall the purpose of that meeting?  A. Yes, I do.  Q. Can you explain what that was?  A. This was because after we had arrested the three principal suspects in the Operation Delhi case, an examination of their forensic devices had indicated the involvement of Caine Sanchez, who was a senior civil servant and is still in post, and Mr McGrail had wanted to brief the Chief Minister because it would progressing that investigation would have involved executing search warrants and arresting and

O. Can we just go back to your note of that 1 saving: "Suspect this to be Mr Levv" but we 2 2 meeting, which you have in your daybook? did not know, had not confirmed at that 3 3 It is C -stage, that JL was in fact James Levy. 4 4 A. I have it. Q. So, thank you for that clarification, but 5 Q. Mr Triay is faster than me as well. The 5 just going back to the question that I asked, 6 note states, the final line of that note says: 6 did you or Mr McGrail mention Mr Levy as 7 "Will need to speak to senior partner at 7 a person of interest? 8 Hassans." 8 A. This is why I mentioned the summary. If 9 9 In your evidence in Richardson, in your third Mr McGrail read out the relevant sections he 10 10 witness statement, paragraph 60, you clarify would have read out that text, but I cannot what you meant when you recorded that in 11 11 remember if he mentioned it or not. 12 your note. Paragraph 60, you say: 12 Q. And how and when did you become 13 "The CM told us that we would need to 13 aware of the connection between Mr Levy 14 14 and 36 North? speak to the Senior Partner at Hassans not 15 15 that he would." A. It would have been sometime after the 16 16 Can you recall what prompted the Chief arrest of Caine Sanchez and the interrogation 17 17 Minister to say this and what he meant or of his electronic devices and sometime after 18 intended by saying that? 18 that and before, um, I started writing the 19 19 A. I cannot tell you what he intended to say notes in my daybook, which I think were in 20 20 February 2020. by this. I can tell you what I remembered Q. Can I take you to your third witness 21 and that that comment came at the very end 21 22 22 statement, paragraphs 3 to 7. It is at A/1426. of the meeting. We had got up from the table 23 and people were leaving and I was stood to 23 (Pause). 24 24 the side while the Commissioner was A. Mm. 25 25 speaking to the Chief Minister and the Chief Q. That is the evidence that you give as to Page 21 Page 23 1 Minister made that comment. And it seemed 1 when and how you became aware of 2 odd to me at that time that he would say this 2 Mr Levy. Is that still your evidence today? 3 3 because we had known that JL, Mr Levy, we A. Yes, it is. But that note there regarding 4 suspected that Mr Levy had some 4 the, um, it's concerning an email that was 5 5 involvement in this matter but did not know recovered forensically from Eddie Askis to 6 the extent of his involvement at that time. 6 Mr Levy. That was in relation to a business 7 7 Q. And is that all he said about the matter, relationship. We had no knowledge at that 8 8 was just that one comment, or did he say stage of any suspicion of Mr Levy's 9 9 anything else? involvement. 10 A. It's all I can recall. It is what I have made 10 Q. Can we move to an entry in your daybook 11 a note of because it struck me at that time 11 for 15 November 2019. That is at C/1760. 12 strange that he would have said that. 12 A. Sorry, which date? 13 Q. Just to clarify, did you or Mr McGrail or 13 Q. It is 15 November 2019. (Pause). 14 anyone on behalf of the investigation team, 14 A. I have it. 15 prior to the Chief Minister saying this, did 15 Q. The fourth bullet point there, correct me 16 16 you suggest that Mr Levy was a person of if I am wrong, but I believe it reads: 17 17 interest or was he mentioned for some other "Workflows for bail periods." A. It does. 18 reason? 18 19 19 Q. And then the third bullet point, do you A. From memory, part of the briefing note 20 20 that I had prepared for the Commissioner, mind just reading that out? 21 21 there is somewhere in the notes A. The third bullet point says: 22 22 "Bottom out ownership issues - MW [which a commissioner's briefing notes on Caine 23 Sanchez's involvement as we understood it 23 is Mark Wyan] 24 24 from the messages from other people. There Mark Wyan proposes as fallback position of 25 is a reference to JL there and I had a note 25 conspiracy to deprive Bland's of the Page 22 Page 24

1	maintenance contract as opposed to the	1	been exposed in this investigation, and that
2	platform."	2	there would be a need to choose the most
3	(10.31)	3	appropriate ones.
4	Q. Are we to take from the note that this was	4	Q. Now, can we move to B3452, please.
5	Mark Wyan's idea? This fallback position.	5	This is a document headed "NDM
6	A. I'm not sure if it was an idea; it was - it	6	assessment regarding the involvement of
7	was a proposal to deal with an investigation	7	Heine Judah Levy with 36 North Limited.
8	that was - that had a difficulty.	8	Can you please explain what an NDM is?
9	Q. Well, that it was Mark Wyan's proposal	9	A. NDM stands for the National Decision-
10	A. Yes.	10	making Mod Module, and it is a - a means
11	Q rather than him proposing it on behalf	11	of explaining your rationale for conducting a
12	of somebody else?	12	- a line of business or a line of inquiry, or any
13	A. As far as I know, yes.	13	decision.
14	Q. Can we now turn to bundle B, 3717.	14	Q. Why did you choose to draft an NDM in
15	That should appear on the screen for you.	15	this case?
16	And, this is a typed-out version of notes	16	A. Principally because I was - I was advised
17	taken by Mr Wyan of a meeting on 21	17	to do so. I had never done one before, but it
18	January 2020. It records that a meeting took	18	was pointed out to me the value of this
19	place on that date between you, Mr Wyan,	19	exercise, and I'm - and I did it.
20	Mr Field and Mr Clarke. Do you recall what	20	Q. I think you say in your evidence who -
21	was discussed at that meeting?	21	who it was who advised you to do so?
22	A. Can I look at my own notes, to see if I've	22	A. Yes, I did. It was Superintendent Yeats,
23	got any?	23	at that time.
24	Q. Yes, yes, yes. I am told that C1764, for	24	Q. Thank you. If we go to 3455, please. We
25	the screen, is the 1764.	25	have the conclusion there. The NDM
	Page 25		Page 27
1	MD CIDDS: (in and it la) 21 I amount	1	document concludes that the RGP has
1	MR GIBBS: (inaudible) 21 January	1	
2	(inaudible).	2	reasonable grounds to suspect that JL
2 3	(inaudible). MR SANTOS: 22nd.	2 3	reasonable grounds to suspect that JL committed the offence of conspiracy to
2 3 4	(inaudible). MR SANTOS: 22nd. THE CHAIRMAN (?): 21st.	2 3 4	reasonable grounds to suspect that JL committed the offence of conspiracy to defraud, and at paragraph 23 (just above the
2 3 4 5	(inaudible). MR SANTOS: 22nd. THE CHAIRMAN (?): 21st. Q. 21 January 2020.	2 3 4 5	reasonable grounds to suspect that JL committed the offence of conspiracy to defraud, and at paragraph 23 (just above the conclusions) you set out your basis for
2 3 4 5 6	(inaudible). MR SANTOS: 22nd. THE CHAIRMAN (?): 21st. Q. 21 January 2020. A. Sorry, I have just read the wrong entry.	2 3 4 5 6	reasonable grounds to suspect that JL committed the offence of conspiracy to defraud, and at paragraph 23 (just above the conclusions) you set out your basis for believing that Mr Levy had acted dishonestly.
2 3 4 5 6 7	(inaudible). MR SANTOS: 22nd. THE CHAIRMAN (?): 21st. Q. 21 January 2020. A. Sorry, I have just read the wrong entry. Yes, I have read my entry.	2 3 4 5 6 7	reasonable grounds to suspect that JL committed the offence of conspiracy to defraud, and at paragraph 23 (just above the conclusions) you set out your basis for believing that Mr Levy had acted dishonestly. If we can just go up a little bit further,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	(inaudible).  MR SANTOS: 22nd.  THE CHAIRMAN (?): 21st. Q. 21 January 2020.  A. Sorry, I have just read the wrong entry.  Yes, I have read my entry. Q. My question to you was: do you recall	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	reasonable grounds to suspect that JL committed the offence of conspiracy to defraud, and at paragraph 23 (just above the conclusions) you set out your basis for believing that Mr Levy had acted dishonestly. If we can just go up a little bit further, because the heading is there by "dishonesty",
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	(inaudible). MR SANTOS: 22nd. THE CHAIRMAN (?): 21st. Q. 21 January 2020. A. Sorry, I have just read the wrong entry. Yes, I have read my entry. Q. My question to you was: do you recall what was discussed?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	reasonable grounds to suspect that JL committed the offence of conspiracy to defraud, and at paragraph 23 (just above the conclusions) you set out your basis for believing that Mr Levy had acted dishonestly. If we can just go up a little bit further, because the heading is there by "dishonesty", and you say, "The question is whether the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	(inaudible).  MR SANTOS: 22nd.  THE CHAIRMAN (?): 21st. Q. 21 January 2020.  A. Sorry, I have just read the wrong entry.  Yes, I have read my entry. Q. My question to you was: do you recall what was discussed?  A. I recall what I have written, I don't know	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	reasonable grounds to suspect that JL committed the offence of conspiracy to defraud, and at paragraph 23 (just above the conclusions) you set out your basis for believing that Mr Levy had acted dishonestly. If we can just go up a little bit further, because the heading is there by "dishonesty", and you say, "The question is whether the agreement to deprive Bland Limited of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	(inaudible).  MR SANTOS: 22nd.  THE CHAIRMAN (?): 21st. Q. 21 January 2020.  A. Sorry, I have just read the wrong entry.  Yes, I have read my entry. Q. My question to you was: do you recall what was discussed?  A. I recall what I have written, I don't know if there was anything else that was said there.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	reasonable grounds to suspect that JL committed the offence of conspiracy to defraud, and at paragraph 23 (just above the conclusions) you set out your basis for believing that Mr Levy had acted dishonestly. If we can just go up a little bit further, because the heading is there by "dishonesty", and you say, "The question is whether the agreement to deprive Bland Limited of the NSCIS maintenance contract was to do so by
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	(inaudible).  MR SANTOS: 22nd.  THE CHAIRMAN (?): 21st. Q. 21 January 2020.  A. Sorry, I have just read the wrong entry.  Yes, I have read my entry. Q. My question to you was: do you recall what was discussed?  A. I recall what I have written, I don't know if there was anything else that was said there. Q. Well, can I take you to the specific thing I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	reasonable grounds to suspect that JL committed the offence of conspiracy to defraud, and at paragraph 23 (just above the conclusions) you set out your basis for believing that Mr Levy had acted dishonestly. If we can just go up a little bit further, because the heading is there by "dishonesty", and you say, "The question is whether the agreement to deprive Bland Limited of the NSCIS maintenance contract was to do so by dishonesty. The grounds to suspect that this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	(inaudible).  MR SANTOS: 22nd.  THE CHAIRMAN (?): 21st. Q. 21 January 2020.  A. Sorry, I have just read the wrong entry.  Yes, I have read my entry. Q. My question to you was: do you recall what was discussed?  A. I recall what I have written, I don't know if there was anything else that was said there.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	reasonable grounds to suspect that JL committed the offence of conspiracy to defraud, and at paragraph 23 (just above the conclusions) you set out your basis for believing that Mr Levy had acted dishonestly. If we can just go up a little bit further, because the heading is there by "dishonesty", and you say, "The question is whether the agreement to deprive Bland Limited of the NSCIS maintenance contract was to do so by
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	(inaudible).  MR SANTOS: 22nd.  THE CHAIRMAN (?): 21st. Q. 21 January 2020.  A. Sorry, I have just read the wrong entry.  Yes, I have read my entry. Q. My question to you was: do you recall what was discussed?  A. I recall what I have written, I don't know if there was anything else that was said there. Q. Well, can I take you to the specific thing I would like to ask you about, which is: we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	reasonable grounds to suspect that JL committed the offence of conspiracy to defraud, and at paragraph 23 (just above the conclusions) you set out your basis for believing that Mr Levy had acted dishonestly. If we can just go up a little bit further, because the heading is there by "dishonesty", and you say, "The question is whether the agreement to deprive Bland Limited of the NSCIS maintenance contract was to do so by dishonesty. The grounds to suspect that this was the case are based on the following".
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	(inaudible).  MR SANTOS: 22nd.  THE CHAIRMAN (?): 21st. Q. 21 January 2020.  A. Sorry, I have just read the wrong entry.  Yes, I have read my entry. Q. My question to you was: do you recall what was discussed?  A. I recall what I have written, I don't know if there was anything else that was said there. Q. Well, can I take you to the specific thing I would like to ask you about, which is: we cannot find a reference to it in your note, but	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	reasonable grounds to suspect that JL committed the offence of conspiracy to defraud, and at paragraph 23 (just above the conclusions) you set out your basis for believing that Mr Levy had acted dishonestly. If we can just go up a little bit further, because the heading is there by "dishonesty", and you say, "The question is whether the agreement to deprive Bland Limited of the NSCIS maintenance contract was to do so by dishonesty. The grounds to suspect that this was the case are based on the following". Looking back now, and with the benefit of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	(inaudible).  MR SANTOS: 22nd.  THE CHAIRMAN (?): 21st. Q. 21 January 2020.  A. Sorry, I have just read the wrong entry.  Yes, I have read my entry. Q. My question to you was: do you recall what was discussed?  A. I recall what I have written, I don't know if there was anything else that was said there. Q. Well, can I take you to the specific thing I would like to ask you about, which is: we cannot find a reference to it in your note, but in bundle B (this is why we take you to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	reasonable grounds to suspect that JL committed the offence of conspiracy to defraud, and at paragraph 23 (just above the conclusions) you set out your basis for believing that Mr Levy had acted dishonestly. If we can just go up a little bit further, because the heading is there by "dishonesty", and you say, "The question is whether the agreement to deprive Bland Limited of the NSCIS maintenance contract was to do so by dishonesty. The grounds to suspect that this was the case are based on the following". Looking back now, and with the benefit of hindsight of everything that has happened, do
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	(inaudible).  MR SANTOS: 22nd.  THE CHAIRMAN (?): 21st. Q. 21 January 2020.  A. Sorry, I have just read the wrong entry.  Yes, I have read my entry. Q. My question to you was: do you recall what was discussed?  A. I recall what I have written, I don't know if there was anything else that was said there. Q. Well, can I take you to the specific thing I would like to ask you about, which is: we cannot find a reference to it in your note, but in bundle B (this is why we take you to bundle B) there is a reference there by Mr	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	reasonable grounds to suspect that JL committed the offence of conspiracy to defraud, and at paragraph 23 (just above the conclusions) you set out your basis for believing that Mr Levy had acted dishonestly. If we can just go up a little bit further, because the heading is there by "dishonesty", and you say, "The question is whether the agreement to deprive Bland Limited of the NSCIS maintenance contract was to do so by dishonesty. The grounds to suspect that this was the case are based on the following". Looking back now, and with the benefit of hindsight of everything that has happened, do you still consider that these constituted
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	(inaudible).  MR SANTOS: 22nd.  THE CHAIRMAN (?): 21st. Q. 21 January 2020.  A. Sorry, I have just read the wrong entry.  Yes, I have read my entry. Q. My question to you was: do you recall what was discussed?  A. I recall what I have written, I don't know if there was anything else that was said there. Q. Well, can I take you to the specific thing I would like to ask you about, which is: we cannot find a reference to it in your note, but in bundle B (this is why we take you to bundle B) there is a reference there by Mr Wyan to the third bullet point, "charges",	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	reasonable grounds to suspect that JL committed the offence of conspiracy to defraud, and at paragraph 23 (just above the conclusions) you set out your basis for believing that Mr Levy had acted dishonestly. If we can just go up a little bit further, because the heading is there by "dishonesty", and you say, "The question is whether the agreement to deprive Bland Limited of the NSCIS maintenance contract was to do so by dishonesty. The grounds to suspect that this was the case are based on the following". Looking back now, and with the benefit of hindsight of everything that has happened, do you still consider that these constituted reasonable grounds to suspect Mr Levy of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	(inaudible).  MR SANTOS: 22nd.  THE CHAIRMAN (?): 21st. Q. 21 January 2020.  A. Sorry, I have just read the wrong entry.  Yes, I have read my entry. Q. My question to you was: do you recall what was discussed?  A. I recall what I have written, I don't know if there was anything else that was said there. Q. Well, can I take you to the specific thing I would like to ask you about, which is: we cannot find a reference to it in your note, but in bundle B (this is why we take you to bundle B) there is a reference there by Mr Wyan to the third bullet point, "charges", "over 50 possible charges identified,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	reasonable grounds to suspect that JL committed the offence of conspiracy to defraud, and at paragraph 23 (just above the conclusions) you set out your basis for believing that Mr Levy had acted dishonestly. If we can just go up a little bit further, because the heading is there by "dishonesty", and you say, "The question is whether the agreement to deprive Bland Limited of the NSCIS maintenance contract was to do so by dishonesty. The grounds to suspect that this was the case are based on the following". Looking back now, and with the benefit of hindsight of everything that has happened, do you still consider that these constituted reasonable grounds to suspect Mr Levy of conspiracy to defraud and dishonesty?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	(inaudible).  MR SANTOS: 22nd.  THE CHAIRMAN (?): 21st. Q. 21 January 2020.  A. Sorry, I have just read the wrong entry.  Yes, I have read my entry. Q. My question to you was: do you recall what was discussed?  A. I recall what I have written, I don't know if there was anything else that was said there. Q. Well, can I take you to the specific thing I would like to ask you about, which is: we cannot find a reference to it in your note, but in bundle B (this is why we take you to bundle B) there is a reference there by Mr Wyan to the third bullet point, "charges", "over 50 possible charges identified, predominantly computer misuse, to be refined down". Can I ask you: when did the RGP intend to do that refining down?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	reasonable grounds to suspect that JL committed the offence of conspiracy to defraud, and at paragraph 23 (just above the conclusions) you set out your basis for believing that Mr Levy had acted dishonestly. If we can just go up a little bit further, because the heading is there by "dishonesty", and you say, "The question is whether the agreement to deprive Bland Limited of the NSCIS maintenance contract was to do so by dishonesty. The grounds to suspect that this was the case are based on the following". Looking back now, and with the benefit of hindsight of everything that has happened, do you still consider that these constituted reasonable grounds to suspect Mr Levy of conspiracy to defraud and dishonesty?  A. I-I do. But, the - that entry is not as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	(inaudible).  MR SANTOS: 22nd.  THE CHAIRMAN (?): 21st. Q. 21 January 2020.  A. Sorry, I have just read the wrong entry.  Yes, I have read my entry. Q. My question to you was: do you recall what was discussed?  A. I recall what I have written, I don't know if there was anything else that was said there. Q. Well, can I take you to the specific thing I would like to ask you about, which is: we cannot find a reference to it in your note, but in bundle B (this is why we take you to bundle B) there is a reference there by Mr Wyan to the third bullet point, "charges", "over 50 possible charges identified, predominantly computer misuse, to be refined down". Can I ask you: when did the RGP intend to do that refining down?  A. I can't recall when - when we decided to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	reasonable grounds to suspect that JL committed the offence of conspiracy to defraud, and at paragraph 23 (just above the conclusions) you set out your basis for believing that Mr Levy had acted dishonestly. If we can just go up a little bit further, because the heading is there by "dishonesty", and you say, "The question is whether the agreement to deprive Bland Limited of the NSCIS maintenance contract was to do so by dishonesty. The grounds to suspect that this was the case are based on the following". Looking back now, and with the benefit of hindsight of everything that has happened, do you still consider that these constituted reasonable grounds to suspect Mr Levy of conspiracy to defraud and dishonesty?  A. I - I do. But, the - that entry is not as comprehensive as it could have been.  Q. When you say that, is there something in particular on your mind that is omitted from
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	(inaudible).  MR SANTOS: 22nd.  THE CHAIRMAN (?): 21st. Q. 21 January 2020.  A. Sorry, I have just read the wrong entry.  Yes, I have read my entry. Q. My question to you was: do you recall what was discussed?  A. I recall what I have written, I don't know if there was anything else that was said there. Q. Well, can I take you to the specific thing I would like to ask you about, which is: we cannot find a reference to it in your note, but in bundle B (this is why we take you to bundle B) there is a reference there by Mr Wyan to the third bullet point, "charges", "over 50 possible charges identified, predominantly computer misuse, to be refined down". Can I ask you: when did the RGP intend to do that refining down?  A. I can't recall when - when we decided to take that exercise. It was clear from the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	reasonable grounds to suspect that JL committed the offence of conspiracy to defraud, and at paragraph 23 (just above the conclusions) you set out your basis for believing that Mr Levy had acted dishonestly. If we can just go up a little bit further, because the heading is there by "dishonesty", and you say, "The question is whether the agreement to deprive Bland Limited of the NSCIS maintenance contract was to do so by dishonesty. The grounds to suspect that this was the case are based on the following". Looking back now, and with the benefit of hindsight of everything that has happened, do you still consider that these constituted reasonable grounds to suspect Mr Levy of conspiracy to defraud and dishonesty?  A. I - I do. But, the - that entry is not as comprehensive as it could have been.  Q. When you say that, is there something in particular on your mind that is omitted from there or are you just saying that in a general
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	(inaudible).  MR SANTOS: 22nd.  THE CHAIRMAN (?): 21st. Q. 21 January 2020.  A. Sorry, I have just read the wrong entry.  Yes, I have read my entry. Q. My question to you was: do you recall what was discussed?  A. I recall what I have written, I don't know if there was anything else that was said there. Q. Well, can I take you to the specific thing I would like to ask you about, which is: we cannot find a reference to it in your note, but in bundle B (this is why we take you to bundle B) there is a reference there by Mr Wyan to the third bullet point, "charges", "over 50 possible charges identified, predominantly computer misuse, to be refined down". Can I ask you: when did the RGP intend to do that refining down?  A. I can't recall when - when we decided to take that exercise. It was clear from the beginning that there were many offences	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	reasonable grounds to suspect that JL committed the offence of conspiracy to defraud, and at paragraph 23 (just above the conclusions) you set out your basis for believing that Mr Levy had acted dishonestly. If we can just go up a little bit further, because the heading is there by "dishonesty", and you say, "The question is whether the agreement to deprive Bland Limited of the NSCIS maintenance contract was to do so by dishonesty. The grounds to suspect that this was the case are based on the following". Looking back now, and with the benefit of hindsight of everything that has happened, do you still consider that these constituted reasonable grounds to suspect Mr Levy of conspiracy to defraud and dishonesty?  A. I - I do. But, the - that entry is not as comprehensive as it could have been.  Q. When you say that, is there something in particular on your mind that is omitted from there or are you just saying that in a general sense.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	(inaudible).  MR SANTOS: 22nd.  THE CHAIRMAN (?): 21st. Q. 21 January 2020.  A. Sorry, I have just read the wrong entry.  Yes, I have read my entry. Q. My question to you was: do you recall what was discussed?  A. I recall what I have written, I don't know if there was anything else that was said there. Q. Well, can I take you to the specific thing I would like to ask you about, which is: we cannot find a reference to it in your note, but in bundle B (this is why we take you to bundle B) there is a reference there by Mr Wyan to the third bullet point, "charges", "over 50 possible charges identified, predominantly computer misuse, to be refined down". Can I ask you: when did the RGP intend to do that refining down?  A. I can't recall when - when we decided to take that exercise. It was clear from the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	reasonable grounds to suspect that JL committed the offence of conspiracy to defraud, and at paragraph 23 (just above the conclusions) you set out your basis for believing that Mr Levy had acted dishonestly. If we can just go up a little bit further, because the heading is there by "dishonesty", and you say, "The question is whether the agreement to deprive Bland Limited of the NSCIS maintenance contract was to do so by dishonesty. The grounds to suspect that this was the case are based on the following". Looking back now, and with the benefit of hindsight of everything that has happened, do you still consider that these constituted reasonable grounds to suspect Mr Levy of conspiracy to defraud and dishonesty?  A. I - I do. But, the - that entry is not as comprehensive as it could have been.  Q. When you say that, is there something in particular on your mind that is omitted from there or are you just saying that in a general
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	(inaudible).  MR SANTOS: 22nd.  THE CHAIRMAN (?): 21st. Q. 21 January 2020.  A. Sorry, I have just read the wrong entry.  Yes, I have read my entry. Q. My question to you was: do you recall what was discussed?  A. I recall what I have written, I don't know if there was anything else that was said there. Q. Well, can I take you to the specific thing I would like to ask you about, which is: we cannot find a reference to it in your note, but in bundle B (this is why we take you to bundle B) there is a reference there by Mr Wyan to the third bullet point, "charges", "over 50 possible charges identified, predominantly computer misuse, to be refined down". Can I ask you: when did the RGP intend to do that refining down?  A. I can't recall when - when we decided to take that exercise. It was clear from the beginning that there were many offences	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	reasonable grounds to suspect that JL committed the offence of conspiracy to defraud, and at paragraph 23 (just above the conclusions) you set out your basis for believing that Mr Levy had acted dishonestly. If we can just go up a little bit further, because the heading is there by "dishonesty", and you say, "The question is whether the agreement to deprive Bland Limited of the NSCIS maintenance contract was to do so by dishonesty. The grounds to suspect that this was the case are based on the following". Looking back now, and with the benefit of hindsight of everything that has happened, do you still consider that these constituted reasonable grounds to suspect Mr Levy of conspiracy to defraud and dishonesty?  A. I - I do. But, the - that entry is not as comprehensive as it could have been.  Q. When you say that, is there something in particular on your mind that is omitted from there or are you just saying that in a general sense.

1	inasmuch as - or, sorry, it is omitted from that	1	And, when we attended he elected a lawyer
2	in that paragraph, but attached to that	2	from the UK - or, a UK lawyer.
3	document was a comprehensive table of all	3	Q. At paragraph 35 you state that, "Given
4	the exchanges between some of the other	4	the political sensitivities and potential
5	suspects and Mr Levy.	5	reluctance for a JP to issue a warrant for
6	Q. On 3456, the following page, we have	6	Hassan law practice, the warrant should be
7	your proposed next steps. And, at paragraph	7	requested from the Chief Justice." Why did
8	28 you state that, "TC, JP and EA were	8	you ultimately not go down this route?
9	arrested, and their properties searched,	9	A. I can't tell you that. My - my planning
10	simultaneously in order to prevent conferring	10	was that we should have applied from the
11	with each other and the potential loss of	11	Chief Justice.
12	evidence." Then at 30 you say, "The	12	Q. Sorry, are you saying it was not your
13	necessity to arrest JL will not be met, in the	13	decision to go to the Stipendiary Magistrate,
14	event that he consents to a voluntary	14	as opposed to the Chief Justice?
15	attendance police interview." Why did you	15	A. No, it wasn't.
16	adopt this different approach to Mr Levy?	16	Q. Can I please take you to B3272. This is
17	A. At that stage of the investigation, when	17	an email exchange where you send the NDM
18	the first three people were arrested, we	18	to Mr McGrail, Commissioner of Police.
19	obviously worked on the assumption that	19	Can I just ask: why did you send the NDM to
20	they had no idea that we were going to be	20	Mr McGrail?
21	intervening at that stage. And, there was a	21	A. Because the NDM set out our intents, and
22	nec it was necessary to secure their at the	22	the intents included executing a warrant at
23	attendance of the three people at the same	23	Hassans law practice. It is proper that the
24	time. Mr Levy's intervention was sometime	24	Commissioner of Police had been briefed on
25	later (I think it was more than a year after	25	that; he may have had alternative views.
	Page 29		Page 31
1	this), and therefore those same requirements	1	Q. Did you consider that you needed his
1 2	this), and therefore those same requirements did not exist.		Q. Did you consider that you needed his approval to proceed, or were you just seeking
	did not exist.	1 2 3	Q. Did you consider that you needed his approval to proceed, or were you just seeking his advice?
2	did not exist.  Q. Did you consider that there was any risk	2	approval to proceed, or were you just seeking his advice?
2 3	did not exist.	2 3	approval to proceed, or were you just seeking
2 3 4	did not exist.  Q. Did you consider that there was any risk of Mr Levy conferring with others at that	2 3 4	approval to proceed, or were you just seeking his advice?  A. I would have thought in law I would not
2 3 4 5	did not exist.  Q. Did you consider that there was any risk of Mr Levy conferring with others at that stage?	2 3 4 5	<ul><li>approval to proceed, or were you just seeking his advice?</li><li>A. I would have thought in law I would not need his approval, but he - he may have had</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6	did not exist.  Q. Did you consider that there was any risk of Mr Levy conferring with others at that stage?  A. If Mr Levy had co it was clear that Mr	2 3 4 5 6	approval to proceed, or were you just seeking his advice?  A. I would have thought in law I would not need his approval, but he - he may have had information that - that I didn't, and I would
2 3 4 5 6 7	did not exist.  Q. Did you consider that there was any risk of Mr Levy conferring with others at that stage?  A. If Mr Levy had co it was clear that Mr Levy had been conferring with others,	2 3 4 5 6 7	approval to proceed, or were you just seeking his advice?  A. I would have thought in law I would not need his approval, but he - he may have had information that - that I didn't, and I would have had to listen to his advice.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	did not exist.  Q. Did you consider that there was any risk of Mr Levy conferring with others at that stage?  A. If Mr Levy had co it was clear that Mr Levy had been conferring with others, because of the text exchanges between him	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	approval to proceed, or were you just seeking his advice?  A. I would have thought in law I would not need his approval, but he - he may have had information that - that I didn't, and I would have had to listen to his advice.  Q. Mr McGrail replies to your email, if we
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	did not exist.  Q. Did you consider that there was any risk of Mr Levy conferring with others at that stage?  A. If Mr Levy had co it was clear that Mr Levy had been conferring with others, because of the text exchanges between him and the other people.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	approval to proceed, or were you just seeking his advice?  A. I would have thought in law I would not need his approval, but he - he may have had information that - that I didn't, and I would have had to listen to his advice.  Q. Mr McGrail replies to your email, if we scroll down. First of all, can we scroll down
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	did not exist.  Q. Did you consider that there was any risk of Mr Levy conferring with others at that stage?  A. If Mr Levy had co it was clear that Mr Levy had been conferring with others, because of the text exchanges between him and the other people.  Q. And, did you consider that there was any	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	approval to proceed, or were you just seeking his advice?  A. I would have thought in law I would not need his approval, but he - he may have had information that - that I didn't, and I would have had to listen to his advice.  Q. Mr McGrail replies to your email, if we scroll down. First of all, can we scroll down to the bottom. There is your email to Mr McGrail, "Please find attached my assessment of J Levy's involvement in 36 N
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	did not exist.  Q. Did you consider that there was any risk of Mr Levy conferring with others at that stage?  A. If Mr Levy had co it was clear that Mr Levy had been conferring with others, because of the text exchanges between him and the other people.  Q. And, did you consider that there was any risk of Mr Levy destroying evidence?  A. Yes, we did.  Q. At paragraph 33 you state that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	approval to proceed, or were you just seeking his advice?  A. I would have thought in law I would not need his approval, but he - he may have had information that - that I didn't, and I would have had to listen to his advice.  Q. Mr McGrail replies to your email, if we scroll down. First of all, can we scroll down to the bottom. There is your email to Mr McGrail, "Please find attached my
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	did not exist.  Q. Did you consider that there was any risk of Mr Levy conferring with others at that stage?  A. If Mr Levy had co it was clear that Mr Levy had been conferring with others, because of the text exchanges between him and the other people.  Q. And, did you consider that there was any risk of Mr Levy destroying evidence?  A. Yes, we did.  Q. At paragraph 33 you state that  "Examination of any content seized from JL	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	approval to proceed, or were you just seeking his advice?  A. I would have thought in law I would not need his approval, but he - he may have had information that - that I didn't, and I would have had to listen to his advice.  Q. Mr McGrail replies to your email, if we scroll down. First of all, can we scroll down to the bottom. There is your email to Mr McGrail, "Please find attached my assessment of J Levy's involvement in 36 N and planned course of action. I am of course at your disposal if you wish to discuss."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	did not exist.  Q. Did you consider that there was any risk of Mr Levy conferring with others at that stage?  A. If Mr Levy had co it was clear that Mr Levy had been conferring with others, because of the text exchanges between him and the other people.  Q. And, did you consider that there was any risk of Mr Levy destroying evidence?  A. Yes, we did.  Q. At paragraph 33 you state that "Examination of any content seized from JL may become complicated by claims of legal	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	approval to proceed, or were you just seeking his advice?  A. I would have thought in law I would not need his approval, but he - he may have had information that - that I didn't, and I would have had to listen to his advice.  Q. Mr McGrail replies to your email, if we scroll down. First of all, can we scroll down to the bottom. There is your email to Mr McGrail, "Please find attached my assessment of J Levy's involvement in 36 N and planned course of action. I am of course at your disposal if you wish to discuss."  Then, if we can now scroll up to the - thank
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	did not exist.  Q. Did you consider that there was any risk of Mr Levy conferring with others at that stage?  A. If Mr Levy had co it was clear that Mr Levy had been conferring with others, because of the text exchanges between him and the other people.  Q. And, did you consider that there was any risk of Mr Levy destroying evidence?  A. Yes, we did.  Q. At paragraph 33 you state that "Examination of any content seized from JL may become complicated by claims of legal privilege, in that event the material will be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	approval to proceed, or were you just seeking his advice?  A. I would have thought in law I would not need his approval, but he - he may have had information that - that I didn't, and I would have had to listen to his advice.  Q. Mr McGrail replies to your email, if we scroll down. First of all, can we scroll down to the bottom. There is your email to Mr McGrail, "Please find attached my assessment of J Levy's involvement in 36 N and planned course of action. I am of course at your disposal if you wish to discuss."  Then, if we can now scroll up to the - thank you - to the response. Mr McGrail says as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	did not exist.  Q. Did you consider that there was any risk of Mr Levy conferring with others at that stage?  A. If Mr Levy had co it was clear that Mr Levy had been conferring with others, because of the text exchanges between him and the other people.  Q. And, did you consider that there was any risk of Mr Levy destroying evidence?  A. Yes, we did.  Q. At paragraph 33 you state that "Examination of any content seized from JL may become complicated by claims of legal privilege, in that event the material will be reviewed by a lawyer first." Did you make	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	approval to proceed, or were you just seeking his advice?  A. I would have thought in law I would not need his approval, but he - he may have had information that - that I didn't, and I would have had to listen to his advice.  Q. Mr McGrail replies to your email, if we scroll down. First of all, can we scroll down to the bottom. There is your email to Mr McGrail, "Please find attached my assessment of J Levy's involvement in 36 N and planned course of action. I am of course at your disposal if you wish to discuss."  Then, if we can now scroll up to the - thank you - to the response. Mr McGrail says as follows, "Paul, I have perused the document
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	did not exist.  Q. Did you consider that there was any risk of Mr Levy conferring with others at that stage?  A. If Mr Levy had co it was clear that Mr Levy had been conferring with others, because of the text exchanges between him and the other people.  Q. And, did you consider that there was any risk of Mr Levy destroying evidence?  A. Yes, we did.  Q. At paragraph 33 you state that "Examination of any content seized from JL may become complicated by claims of legal privilege, in that event the material will be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	approval to proceed, or were you just seeking his advice?  A. I would have thought in law I would not need his approval, but he - he may have had information that - that I didn't, and I would have had to listen to his advice.  Q. Mr McGrail replies to your email, if we scroll down. First of all, can we scroll down to the bottom. There is your email to Mr McGrail, "Please find attached my assessment of J Levy's involvement in 36 N and planned course of action. I am of course at your disposal if you wish to discuss."  Then, if we can now scroll up to the - thank you - to the response. Mr McGrail says as follows, "Paul, I have perused the document you attach to your email below. On the basis
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	did not exist.  Q. Did you consider that there was any risk of Mr Levy conferring with others at that stage?  A. If Mr Levy had co it was clear that Mr Levy had been conferring with others, because of the text exchanges between him and the other people.  Q. And, did you consider that there was any risk of Mr Levy destroying evidence?  A. Yes, we did.  Q. At paragraph 33 you state that "Examination of any content seized from JL may become complicated by claims of legal privilege, in that event the material will be reviewed by a lawyer first." Did you make arrangements for this to happen?  A. My recollection is that I - is that I would	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	approval to proceed, or were you just seeking his advice?  A. I would have thought in law I would not need his approval, but he - he may have had information that - that I didn't, and I would have had to listen to his advice.  Q. Mr McGrail replies to your email, if we scroll down. First of all, can we scroll down to the bottom. There is your email to Mr McGrail, "Please find attached my assessment of J Levy's involvement in 36 N and planned course of action. I am of course at your disposal if you wish to discuss."  Then, if we can now scroll up to the - thank you - to the response. Mr McGrail says as follows, "Paul, I have perused the document you attach to your email below. On the basis of the information contained in this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	did not exist.  Q. Did you consider that there was any risk of Mr Levy conferring with others at that stage?  A. If Mr Levy had co it was clear that Mr Levy had been conferring with others, because of the text exchanges between him and the other people.  Q. And, did you consider that there was any risk of Mr Levy destroying evidence?  A. Yes, we did.  Q. At paragraph 33 you state that "Examination of any content seized from JL may become complicated by claims of legal privilege, in that event the material will be reviewed by a lawyer first." Did you make arrangements for this to happen?  A. My recollection is that I - is that I would have discussed this with the DPP, because we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	approval to proceed, or were you just seeking his advice?  A. I would have thought in law I would not need his approval, but he - he may have had information that - that I didn't, and I would have had to listen to his advice.  Q. Mr McGrail replies to your email, if we scroll down. First of all, can we scroll down to the bottom. There is your email to Mr McGrail, "Please find attached my assessment of J Levy's involvement in 36 N and planned course of action. I am of course at your disposal if you wish to discuss."  Then, if we can now scroll up to the - thank you - to the response. Mr McGrail says as follows, "Paul, I have perused the document you attach to your email below. On the basis of the information contained in this document I support in principle the suggested
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	did not exist.  Q. Did you consider that there was any risk of Mr Levy conferring with others at that stage?  A. If Mr Levy had co it was clear that Mr Levy had been conferring with others, because of the text exchanges between him and the other people.  Q. And, did you consider that there was any risk of Mr Levy destroying evidence?  A. Yes, we did.  Q. At paragraph 33 you state that "Examination of any content seized from JL may become complicated by claims of legal privilege, in that event the material will be reviewed by a lawyer first." Did you make arrangements for this to happen?  A. My recollection is that I - is that I would have discussed this with the DPP, because we would need access to a lawyer in order to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	approval to proceed, or were you just seeking his advice?  A. I would have thought in law I would not need his approval, but he - he may have had information that - that I didn't, and I would have had to listen to his advice.  Q. Mr McGrail replies to your email, if we scroll down. First of all, can we scroll down to the bottom. There is your email to Mr McGrail, "Please find attached my assessment of J Levy's involvement in 36 N and planned course of action. I am of course at your disposal if you wish to discuss."  Then, if we can now scroll up to the - thank you - to the response. Mr McGrail says as follows, "Paul, I have perused the document you attach to your email below. On the basis of the information contained in this document I support in principle the suggested course of action. As you know, the tactical
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	did not exist.  Q. Did you consider that there was any risk of Mr Levy conferring with others at that stage?  A. If Mr Levy had co it was clear that Mr Levy had been conferring with others, because of the text exchanges between him and the other people.  Q. And, did you consider that there was any risk of Mr Levy destroying evidence?  A. Yes, we did.  Q. At paragraph 33 you state that "Examination of any content seized from JL may become complicated by claims of legal privilege, in that event the material will be reviewed by a lawyer first." Did you make arrangements for this to happen?  A. My recollection is that I - is that I would have discussed this with the DPP, because we would need access to a lawyer in order to conduct this exercise. My memory of this is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	approval to proceed, or were you just seeking his advice?  A. I would have thought in law I would not need his approval, but he - he may have had information that - that I didn't, and I would have had to listen to his advice.  Q. Mr McGrail replies to your email, if we scroll down. First of all, can we scroll down to the bottom. There is your email to Mr McGrail, "Please find attached my assessment of J Levy's involvement in 36 N and planned course of action. I am of course at your disposal if you wish to discuss."  Then, if we can now scroll up to the - thank you - to the response. Mr McGrail says as follows, "Paul, I have perused the document you attach to your email below. On the basis of the information contained in this document I support in principle the suggested course of action. As you know, the tactical detail of how you intend to set to achieve the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	did not exist.  Q. Did you consider that there was any risk of Mr Levy conferring with others at that stage?  A. If Mr Levy had co it was clear that Mr Levy had been conferring with others, because of the text exchanges between him and the other people.  Q. And, did you consider that there was any risk of Mr Levy destroying evidence?  A. Yes, we did.  Q. At paragraph 33 you state that "Examination of any content seized from JL may become complicated by claims of legal privilege, in that event the material will be reviewed by a lawyer first." Did you make arrangements for this to happen?  A. My recollection is that I - is that I would have discussed this with the DPP, because we would need access to a lawyer in order to conduct this exercise. My memory of this is that we had agreed that we would ask Mr	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	approval to proceed, or were you just seeking his advice?  A. I would have thought in law I would not need his approval, but he - he may have had information that - that I didn't, and I would have had to listen to his advice.  Q. Mr McGrail replies to your email, if we scroll down. First of all, can we scroll down to the bottom. There is your email to Mr McGrail, "Please find attached my assessment of J Levy's involvement in 36 N and planned course of action. I am of course at your disposal if you wish to discuss."  Then, if we can now scroll up to the - thank you - to the response. Mr McGrail says as follows, "Paul, I have perused the document you attach to your email below. On the basis of the information contained in this document I support in principle the suggested course of action. As you know, the tactical detail of how you intend to set to achieve the objectives will be subject of further
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	did not exist.  Q. Did you consider that there was any risk of Mr Levy conferring with others at that stage?  A. If Mr Levy had co it was clear that Mr Levy had been conferring with others, because of the text exchanges between him and the other people.  Q. And, did you consider that there was any risk of Mr Levy destroying evidence?  A. Yes, we did.  Q. At paragraph 33 you state that "Examination of any content seized from JL may become complicated by claims of legal privilege, in that event the material will be reviewed by a lawyer first." Did you make arrangements for this to happen?  A. My recollection is that I - is that I would have discussed this with the DPP, because we would need access to a lawyer in order to conduct this exercise. My memory of this is that we had agreed that we would ask Mr Levy to choose a lawyer, whether from	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	approval to proceed, or were you just seeking his advice?  A. I would have thought in law I would not need his approval, but he - he may have had information that - that I didn't, and I would have had to listen to his advice.  Q. Mr McGrail replies to your email, if we scroll down. First of all, can we scroll down to the bottom. There is your email to Mr McGrail, "Please find attached my assessment of J Levy's involvement in 36 N and planned course of action. I am of course at your disposal if you wish to discuss."  Then, if we can now scroll up to the - thank you - to the response. Mr McGrail says as follows, "Paul, I have perused the document you attach to your email below. On the basis of the information contained in this document I support in principle the suggested course of action. As you know, the tactical detail of how you intend to set to achieve the objectives will be subject of further consideration, mainly to safeguard
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	did not exist.  Q. Did you consider that there was any risk of Mr Levy conferring with others at that stage?  A. If Mr Levy had co it was clear that Mr Levy had been conferring with others, because of the text exchanges between him and the other people.  Q. And, did you consider that there was any risk of Mr Levy destroying evidence?  A. Yes, we did.  Q. At paragraph 33 you state that "Examination of any content seized from JL may become complicated by claims of legal privilege, in that event the material will be reviewed by a lawyer first." Did you make arrangements for this to happen?  A. My recollection is that I - is that I would have discussed this with the DPP, because we would need access to a lawyer in order to conduct this exercise. My memory of this is that we had agreed that we would ask Mr	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	approval to proceed, or were you just seeking his advice?  A. I would have thought in law I would not need his approval, but he - he may have had information that - that I didn't, and I would have had to listen to his advice.  Q. Mr McGrail replies to your email, if we scroll down. First of all, can we scroll down to the bottom. There is your email to Mr McGrail, "Please find attached my assessment of J Levy's involvement in 36 N and planned course of action. I am of course at your disposal if you wish to discuss."  Then, if we can now scroll up to the - thank you - to the response. Mr McGrail says as follows, "Paul, I have perused the document you attach to your email below. On the basis of the information contained in this document I support in principle the suggested course of action. As you know, the tactical detail of how you intend to set to achieve the objectives will be subject of further

1	nature of this investigation and the	1	considerable amount of evidence that
2	reputational risks at stake, I would ask that	2	implicated Mr Levy. I will let you read 15.
3	you consult with the DPP to ensure our	3	A. Yes.
4	intended activity is legally supported." Just	4	Q. Can I just ask: why were you seeking the
5	to ask you about some of the phrases that he	5	DPP's advice on the involvement of JL
6	uses there, what did you understand Mr	6	before he had seen this evidence?
7	McGrail to mean by "tactical detail"?	7	A. The reason that we went to speak to the
8	A. This - this, I think, was a reference to	8	DPP was because Mr McGrail had asked us
9	keeping the operation as confidential as	9	to - to do so, as is in - referred to in the
10	possible until we were actually effecting the -	10	previous emails. When we st when we
11	the entry into the premises.	11	briefed Mr Rocca he was of the very strong
12	Q. And, when he says in the final line,	12	opinion that this was sharp business practice,
13	"consult with the DPP to ensure our intended	13	and that it - it w it hadn't overstretched the
14	activity is legally supported", what do you	14	boundaries between dishonesty and in - and
15	understand him to mean by "our intended	15	into criminal conduct. Whenever this was, in
16	activity"?	16	April '20. And, a lot of evidence had been
17	A. The activity that was outlined in the	17	gathered; we hadn't consulted with the DPP
18	NDM, which was to obtain a search warrant	18	at this stage because we had not finished out
19	and seize evidence and - from Mr Levy and	19	inquiries. The inquiry started with - with two
20	from Hassans.	20	or three individuals, and it spread further
21	Q. Did you understand from this, then, that	21	than that. So, the reason why we took the
22	you needed to seek advice from the DPP on	22	decision to send Mr - Mr Rocca the evidence
23	the decision to seek to apply for a search	23	that had been gathered that far (or a summary
24	warrant and execute a search warrant?	24	of that evidence) is because he had - he was
25	A. I don't think he was referring to	25	giving us his opinion that the conduct we
	_		
	Page 33		Page 35
1	permission to apply for a search warrant. I	1	were alleging was criminal was in fact sharp
1 2	permission to apply for a search warrant. I think he was saying: speak to the DPP and	1 2	business practice.
	think he was saying: speak to the DPP and seek his advice on whether he can draw the		business practice.  Q. My question to you is: given that he had
2 3 4	think he was saying: speak to the DPP and seek his advice on whether he can draw the same conclusions as you have, that Mr Levy	2 3 4	business practice.  Q. My question to you is: given that he had not seen all of the evidence Let me put it
2 3 4 5	think he was saying: speak to the DPP and seek his advice on whether he can draw the same conclusions as you have, that Mr Levy is a suspect, and let him know that what our	2 3 4 5	business practice.  Q. My question to you is: given that he had not seen all of the evidence Let me put it in a different way: why were you seeking his
2 3 4 5 6	think he was saying: speak to the DPP and seek his advice on whether he can draw the same conclusions as you have, that Mr Levy	2 3 4 5 6	business practice.  Q. My question to you is: given that he had not seen all of the evidence Let me put it in a different way: why were you seeking his advice without him seeing all of the
2 3 4 5 6 7	think he was saying: speak to the DPP and seek his advice on whether he can draw the same conclusions as you have, that Mr Levy is a suspect, and let him know that what our intended course of action is to obtain a search warrant.	2 3 4 5 6 7	business practice.  Q. My question to you is: given that he had not seen all of the evidence Let me put it in a different way: why were you seeking his advice without him seeing all of the evidence?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	think he was saying: speak to the DPP and seek his advice on whether he can draw the same conclusions as you have, that Mr Levy is a suspect, and let him know that what our intended course of action is to obtain a search warrant.  Q. Now, just at the top of the page, in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	business practice.  Q. My question to you is: given that he had not seen all of the evidence Let me put it in a different way: why were you seeking his advice without him seeing all of the evidence?  A. We weren't - we would have sought his
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	think he was saying: speak to the DPP and seek his advice on whether he can draw the same conclusions as you have, that Mr Levy is a suspect, and let him know that what our intended course of action is to obtain a search warrant.  Q. Now, just at the top of the page, in response you reply, "All noted, will raise	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	business practice.  Q. My question to you is: given that he had not seen all of the evidence Let me put it in a different way: why were you seeking his advice without him seeing all of the evidence?  A. We weren't - we would have sought his advice on charging and presented all the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	think he was saying: speak to the DPP and seek his advice on whether he can draw the same conclusions as you have, that Mr Levy is a suspect, and let him know that what our intended course of action is to obtain a search warrant.  Q. Now, just at the top of the page, in response you reply, "All noted, will raise with the DPP this week." Do you recall	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	business practice. Q. My question to you is: given that he had not seen all of the evidence Let me put it in a different way: why were you seeking his advice without him seeing all of the evidence?  A. We weren't - we would have sought his advice on charging and presented all the evidence, that's the - the stage where the DPP
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	think he was saying: speak to the DPP and seek his advice on whether he can draw the same conclusions as you have, that Mr Levy is a suspect, and let him know that what our intended course of action is to obtain a search warrant.  Q. Now, just at the top of the page, in response you reply, "All noted, will raise with the DPP this week." Do you recall when you in fact raised the matter with the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	business practice. Q. My question to you is: given that he had not seen all of the evidence Let me put it in a different way: why were you seeking his advice without him seeing all of the evidence? A. We weren't - we would have sought his advice on charging and presented all the evidence, that's the - the stage where the DPP would normally get - or the prosecutors
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	think he was saying: speak to the DPP and seek his advice on whether he can draw the same conclusions as you have, that Mr Levy is a suspect, and let him know that what our intended course of action is to obtain a search warrant.  Q. Now, just at the top of the page, in response you reply, "All noted, will raise with the DPP this week." Do you recall when you in fact raised the matter with the DPP?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	business practice.  Q. My question to you is: given that he had not seen all of the evidence Let me put it in a different way: why were you seeking his advice without him seeing all of the evidence?  A. We weren't - we would have sought his advice on charging and presented all the evidence, that's the - the stage where the DPP would normally get - or the prosecutors would normally see the evidence. This was -
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	think he was saying: speak to the DPP and seek his advice on whether he can draw the same conclusions as you have, that Mr Levy is a suspect, and let him know that what our intended course of action is to obtain a search warrant.  Q. Now, just at the top of the page, in response you reply, "All noted, will raise with the DPP this week." Do you recall when you in fact raised the matter with the DPP?  A. I think it was on 3 March 2020.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	business practice.  Q. My question to you is: given that he had not seen all of the evidence Let me put it in a different way: why were you seeking his advice without him seeing all of the evidence?  A. We weren't - we would have sought his advice on charging and presented all the evidence, that's the - the stage where the DPP would normally get - or the prosecutors would normally see the evidence. This was - this was seeking his advice on a proposed
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	think he was saying: speak to the DPP and seek his advice on whether he can draw the same conclusions as you have, that Mr Levy is a suspect, and let him know that what our intended course of action is to obtain a search warrant.  Q. Now, just at the top of the page, in response you reply, "All noted, will raise with the DPP this week." Do you recall when you in fact raised the matter with the DPP?  A. I think it was on 3 March 2020.  Q. Can we just go to your third witness	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	business practice.  Q. My question to you is: given that he had not seen all of the evidence Let me put it in a different way: why were you seeking his advice without him seeing all of the evidence?  A. We weren't - we would have sought his advice on charging and presented all the evidence, that's the - the stage where the DPP would normally get - or the prosecutors would normally see the evidence. This was - this was seeking his advice on a proposed course of action, and whether he could form
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	think he was saying: speak to the DPP and seek his advice on whether he can draw the same conclusions as you have, that Mr Levy is a suspect, and let him know that what our intended course of action is to obtain a search warrant.  Q. Now, just at the top of the page, in response you reply, "All noted, will raise with the DPP this week." Do you recall when you in fact raised the matter with the DPP?  A. I think it was on 3 March 2020.  Q. Can we just go to your third witness statement, paragraph 14, A1427. Paragraph	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	business practice.  Q. My question to you is: given that he had not seen all of the evidence Let me put it in a different way: why were you seeking his advice without him seeing all of the evidence?  A. We weren't - we would have sought his advice on charging and presented all the evidence, that's the - the stage where the DPP would normally get - or the prosecutors would normally see the evidence. This was - this was seeking his advice on a proposed course of action, and whether he could form the same view that we did: that JL was - was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	think he was saying: speak to the DPP and seek his advice on whether he can draw the same conclusions as you have, that Mr Levy is a suspect, and let him know that what our intended course of action is to obtain a search warrant.  Q. Now, just at the top of the page, in response you reply, "All noted, will raise with the DPP this week." Do you recall when you in fact raised the matter with the DPP?  A. I think it was on 3 March 2020.  Q. Can we just go to your third witness statement, paragraph 14, A1427. Paragraph 14 I will give you the chance to read that.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	business practice.  Q. My question to you is: given that he had not seen all of the evidence Let me put it in a different way: why were you seeking his advice without him seeing all of the evidence?  A. We weren't - we would have sought his advice on charging and presented all the evidence, that's the - the stage where the DPP would normally get - or the prosecutors would normally see the evidence. This was - this was seeking his advice on a proposed course of action, and whether he could form the same view that we did: that JL was - was a suspect.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	think he was saying: speak to the DPP and seek his advice on whether he can draw the same conclusions as you have, that Mr Levy is a suspect, and let him know that what our intended course of action is to obtain a search warrant.  Q. Now, just at the top of the page, in response you reply, "All noted, will raise with the DPP this week." Do you recall when you in fact raised the matter with the DPP?  A. I think it was on 3 March 2020.  Q. Can we just go to your third witness statement, paragraph 14, A1427. Paragraph 14 I will give you the chance to read that.  A. Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	business practice.  Q. My question to you is: given that he had not seen all of the evidence Let me put it in a different way: why were you seeking his advice without him seeing all of the evidence?  A. We weren't - we would have sought his advice on charging and presented all the evidence, that's the - the stage where the DPP would normally get - or the prosecutors would normally see the evidence. This was - this was seeking his advice on a proposed course of action, and whether he could form the same view that we did: that JL was - was a suspect.  Q. Did you record this meeting in your
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	think he was saying: speak to the DPP and seek his advice on whether he can draw the same conclusions as you have, that Mr Levy is a suspect, and let him know that what our intended course of action is to obtain a search warrant.  Q. Now, just at the top of the page, in response you reply, "All noted, will raise with the DPP this week." Do you recall when you in fact raised the matter with the DPP?  A. I think it was on 3 March 2020.  Q. Can we just go to your third witness statement, paragraph 14, A1427. Paragraph 14 I will give you the chance to read that.  A. Yes.  Q. You state that the meeting was to discuss	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	business practice.  Q. My question to you is: given that he had not seen all of the evidence Let me put it in a different way: why were you seeking his advice without him seeing all of the evidence?  A. We weren't - we would have sought his advice on charging and presented all the evidence, that's the - the stage where the DPP would normally get - or the prosecutors would normally see the evidence. This was - this was seeking his advice on a proposed course of action, and whether he could form the same view that we did: that JL was - was a suspect.  Q. Did you record this meeting in your daybook?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	think he was saying: speak to the DPP and seek his advice on whether he can draw the same conclusions as you have, that Mr Levy is a suspect, and let him know that what our intended course of action is to obtain a search warrant.  Q. Now, just at the top of the page, in response you reply, "All noted, will raise with the DPP this week." Do you recall when you in fact raised the matter with the DPP?  A. I think it was on 3 March 2020.  Q. Can we just go to your third witness statement, paragraph 14, A1427. Paragraph 14 I will give you the chance to read that.  A. Yes.  Q. You state that the meeting was to discuss Operation Delhi, JL's involvement and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	business practice.  Q. My question to you is: given that he had not seen all of the evidence Let me put it in a different way: why were you seeking his advice without him seeing all of the evidence?  A. We weren't - we would have sought his advice on charging and presented all the evidence, that's the - the stage where the DPP would normally get - or the prosecutors would normally see the evidence. This was - this was seeking his advice on a proposed course of action, and whether he could form the same view that we did: that JL was - was a suspect.  Q. Did you record this meeting in your daybook?  A. No I didn't, and this is something that -
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	think he was saying: speak to the DPP and seek his advice on whether he can draw the same conclusions as you have, that Mr Levy is a suspect, and let him know that what our intended course of action is to obtain a search warrant.  Q. Now, just at the top of the page, in response you reply, "All noted, will raise with the DPP this week." Do you recall when you in fact raised the matter with the DPP?  A. I think it was on 3 March 2020.  Q. Can we just go to your third witness statement, paragraph 14, A1427. Paragraph 14 I will give you the chance to read that.  A. Yes.  Q. You state that the meeting was to discuss Operation Delhi, JL's involvement and whether he should be interviewed. Did you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	business practice.  Q. My question to you is: given that he had not seen all of the evidence Let me put it in a different way: why were you seeking his advice without him seeing all of the evidence?  A. We weren't - we would have sought his advice on charging and presented all the evidence, that's the - the stage where the DPP would normally get - or the prosecutors would normally see the evidence. This was - this was seeking his advice on a proposed course of action, and whether he could form the same view that we did: that JL was - was a suspect.  Q. Did you record this meeting in your daybook?  A. No I didn't, and this is something that - that was pointed out to me: it is recorded in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	think he was saying: speak to the DPP and seek his advice on whether he can draw the same conclusions as you have, that Mr Levy is a suspect, and let him know that what our intended course of action is to obtain a search warrant.  Q. Now, just at the top of the page, in response you reply, "All noted, will raise with the DPP this week." Do you recall when you in fact raised the matter with the DPP?  A. I think it was on 3 March 2020.  Q. Can we just go to your third witness statement, paragraph 14, A1427. Paragraph 14 I will give you the chance to read that.  A. Yes.  Q. You state that the meeting was to discuss Operation Delhi, JL's involvement and whether he should be interviewed. Did you typically consult the DPP on whether to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	business practice.  Q. My question to you is: given that he had not seen all of the evidence Let me put it in a different way: why were you seeking his advice without him seeing all of the evidence?  A. We weren't - we would have sought his advice on charging and presented all the evidence, that's the - the stage where the DPP would normally get - or the prosecutors would normally see the evidence. This was - this was seeking his advice on a proposed course of action, and whether he could form the same view that we did: that JL was - was a suspect.  Q. Did you record this meeting in your daybook?  A. No I didn't, and this is something that - that was pointed out to me: it is recorded in Mr Wyan's notes, but not in mine.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	think he was saying: speak to the DPP and seek his advice on whether he can draw the same conclusions as you have, that Mr Levy is a suspect, and let him know that what our intended course of action is to obtain a search warrant.  Q. Now, just at the top of the page, in response you reply, "All noted, will raise with the DPP this week." Do you recall when you in fact raised the matter with the DPP?  A. I think it was on 3 March 2020.  Q. Can we just go to your third witness statement, paragraph 14, A1427. Paragraph 14 I will give you the chance to read that.  A. Yes.  Q. You state that the meeting was to discuss Operation Delhi, JL's involvement and whether he should be interviewed. Did you typically consult the DPP on whether to interview a person of interest?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	business practice.  Q. My question to you is: given that he had not seen all of the evidence Let me put it in a different way: why were you seeking his advice without him seeing all of the evidence?  A. We weren't - we would have sought his advice on charging and presented all the evidence, that's the - the stage where the DPP would normally get - or the prosecutors would normally see the evidence. This was - this was seeking his advice on a proposed course of action, and whether he could form the same view that we did: that JL was - was a suspect.  Q. Did you record this meeting in your daybook?  A. No I didn't, and this is something that - that was pointed out to me: it is recorded in Mr Wyan's notes, but not in mine.  Q. Given the DPP's advice, and his view
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	think he was saying: speak to the DPP and seek his advice on whether he can draw the same conclusions as you have, that Mr Levy is a suspect, and let him know that what our intended course of action is to obtain a search warrant.  Q. Now, just at the top of the page, in response you reply, "All noted, will raise with the DPP this week." Do you recall when you in fact raised the matter with the DPP?  A. I think it was on 3 March 2020.  Q. Can we just go to your third witness statement, paragraph 14, A1427. Paragraph 14 I will give you the chance to read that.  A. Yes.  Q. You state that the meeting was to discuss Operation Delhi, JL's involvement and whether he should be interviewed. Did you typically consult the DPP on whether to interview a person of interest?  A. No.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	business practice.  Q. My question to you is: given that he had not seen all of the evidence Let me put it in a different way: why were you seeking his advice without him seeing all of the evidence?  A. We weren't - we would have sought his advice on charging and presented all the evidence, that's the - the stage where the DPP would normally get - or the prosecutors would normally see the evidence. This was - this was seeking his advice on a proposed course of action, and whether he could form the same view that we did: that JL was - was a suspect.  Q. Did you record this meeting in your daybook?  A. No I didn't, and this is something that - that was pointed out to me: it is recorded in Mr Wyan's notes, but not in mine.  Q. Given the DPP's advice, and his view being that it was more a case of sharp
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	think he was saying: speak to the DPP and seek his advice on whether he can draw the same conclusions as you have, that Mr Levy is a suspect, and let him know that what our intended course of action is to obtain a search warrant.  Q. Now, just at the top of the page, in response you reply, "All noted, will raise with the DPP this week." Do you recall when you in fact raised the matter with the DPP?  A. I think it was on 3 March 2020.  Q. Can we just go to your third witness statement, paragraph 14, A1427. Paragraph 14 I will give you the chance to read that.  A. Yes.  Q. You state that the meeting was to discuss Operation Delhi, JL's involvement and whether he should be interviewed. Did you typically consult the DPP on whether to interview a person of interest?  A. No.  Q. You state in paragraph 15 that before this	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	business practice.  Q. My question to you is: given that he had not seen all of the evidence Let me put it in a different way: why were you seeking his advice without him seeing all of the evidence?  A. We weren't - we would have sought his advice on charging and presented all the evidence, that's the - the stage where the DPP would normally get - or the prosecutors would normally see the evidence. This was - this was seeking his advice on a proposed course of action, and whether he could form the same view that we did: that JL was - was a suspect.  Q. Did you record this meeting in your daybook?  A. No I didn't, and this is something that - that was pointed out to me: it is recorded in Mr Wyan's notes, but not in mine.  Q. Given the DPP's advice, and his view being that it was more a case of sharp business practice than criminal activity, do
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	think he was saying: speak to the DPP and seek his advice on whether he can draw the same conclusions as you have, that Mr Levy is a suspect, and let him know that what our intended course of action is to obtain a search warrant.  Q. Now, just at the top of the page, in response you reply, "All noted, will raise with the DPP this week." Do you recall when you in fact raised the matter with the DPP?  A. I think it was on 3 March 2020.  Q. Can we just go to your third witness statement, paragraph 14, A1427. Paragraph 14 I will give you the chance to read that.  A. Yes.  Q. You state that the meeting was to discuss Operation Delhi, JL's involvement and whether he should be interviewed. Did you typically consult the DPP on whether to interview a person of interest?  A. No.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	business practice.  Q. My question to you is: given that he had not seen all of the evidence Let me put it in a different way: why were you seeking his advice without him seeing all of the evidence?  A. We weren't - we would have sought his advice on charging and presented all the evidence, that's the - the stage where the DPP would normally get - or the prosecutors would normally see the evidence. This was - this was seeking his advice on a proposed course of action, and whether he could form the same view that we did: that JL was - was a suspect.  Q. Did you record this meeting in your daybook?  A. No I didn't, and this is something that - that was pointed out to me: it is recorded in Mr Wyan's notes, but not in mine.  Q. Given the DPP's advice, and his view being that it was more a case of sharp
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	think he was saying: speak to the DPP and seek his advice on whether he can draw the same conclusions as you have, that Mr Levy is a suspect, and let him know that what our intended course of action is to obtain a search warrant.  Q. Now, just at the top of the page, in response you reply, "All noted, will raise with the DPP this week." Do you recall when you in fact raised the matter with the DPP?  A. I think it was on 3 March 2020.  Q. Can we just go to your third witness statement, paragraph 14, A1427. Paragraph 14 I will give you the chance to read that.  A. Yes.  Q. You state that the meeting was to discuss Operation Delhi, JL's involvement and whether he should be interviewed. Did you typically consult the DPP on whether to interview a person of interest?  A. No.  Q. You state in paragraph 15 that before this	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	business practice.  Q. My question to you is: given that he had not seen all of the evidence Let me put it in a different way: why were you seeking his advice without him seeing all of the evidence?  A. We weren't - we would have sought his advice on charging and presented all the evidence, that's the - the stage where the DPP would normally get - or the prosecutors would normally see the evidence. This was - this was seeking his advice on a proposed course of action, and whether he could form the same view that we did: that JL was - was a suspect.  Q. Did you record this meeting in your daybook?  A. No I didn't, and this is something that - that was pointed out to me: it is recorded in Mr Wyan's notes, but not in mine.  Q. Given the DPP's advice, and his view being that it was more a case of sharp business practice than criminal activity, do

1	that advice in your daybook?	1	a comprehensive entry, or at least why I
2	A. In retrospect it - it was. I believe that Mr	2	didn't make a comprehensive entry. I think at
3	Wyan had been deputed to take a note of that	3	that time our priority was to look again at
4	and - and in fact he did.	4	what we had done, and make sure that we
5	Q. So, is that why Sorry, obvious	5	were drawing the right conclusions from the
6	question, but is that your reason why you did	6	evidence that we had got. Mr Rocca had a
7	not record it in your day book?	7	very strong opinion that the evidence that the
8	A. I would think so, yes. It is recorded that	8	- that the involvement of Mr Levy was - was
9	the meeting took place though, in my	9	sharp business practice, unscrupulous
10	Outlook calendar.	10	perhaps but not criminal. But Mr Rocca had
11	Q. Now can we turn to bundle B, page 3197.	11	not seen any of the evidence at that stage, so
12	This is Mr Wyan's note of the meeting. It	12	the focus was on getting a report to Mr Rocca
13	says, "Meeting with DPP regarding JL,	13	so that he could hopefully draw the same
14	advice requested on whether his involvement	14	conclusion that we did.
15 16	amounts to a criminal offence. Full report	15	Q. I think you then say in your evidence
	drafted by Superintendent Richardson. Relevance: consideration of whether JL has	16	Actually, if we can turn to paragraph 18 of
17		17	your third statement, you state that you
18	committed a criminal offence." The note	18 19	offered to provide the DPP with a summary
19	refers to a "Full report drafted by		of the evidence against JL so far. I will just
20	Superintendent Richardson", what do you	20 21	let you read that, but
21 22	understand that reference - what is the report that is referred to there?	22	A. Paragraph 18? Q. Yes.
23		23	A. Yes.
23	A. I think that Mr Wyan refers to the NDM	23	
25	assessment. Q. Did you give the DPP a copy of the NDM	25	Q. Can I ask you why I think you have already covered this, but just for clarity's
23	Q. Did you give the DFF a copy of the NDM	23	already covered this, but just for clarity's
	Page 37		Page 39
1	assessment, at that meeting or prior to it?	1	sake: why do you ask Mr Wyan to prepare
2	A. Not at that meeting, not from my	2	this summary of evidence?
3	recollection and not from perusing (?) the	3	A. Because we wanted the DPP to have an
4	notes.	4	opportunity to have access to a summary of
5	Q. Did you give it to him before that	5	the evidence that we had seen so far.
6	meeting?	6	Q. Yes. Sorry, just going back to an answer
7	A. I don't think so, because there is an email	7	you gave. You said "hopefully" the DPP
8	trail showing that I emailed it to him - I think	8	would come to the same conclusion as you
9	it was on 1 April.	9	would. Why do you say "hopefully" the DPP
10	Q. I was going to turn to that. We see an	10	would come to the same conclusion as you
11	email where you provide it, was that the first	11	would?
12	time (as far as you are aware) that you	12	A. Because if he did not, we had been an
13	provided him with the NDM?	13	investigating an offence that wasn't made out,
14	A. Provided him, yes. It may have been	14	and we would have wasted - not (?) wasted -
15	referred to in the - in the meeting of 3 March.	15	we would have lost a - a year's work and had
16	Q. Again, this note does not actually record	16	to - had to effectively just bin it and move on.
17	what the DPP's advice was. Is there any	17	Q. Can we now turn to the charging - I think
18	reason why the DPP's advice was not	18	you call it the charging advice, I call it the
19	recorded anywhere?	19	charging report but I am happy to use your
20	A. There is no reason that I can think of.	20	description, B3612. This is addressed - I
21	Q. I think you say in your evidence that the	21	think you are right to call it the charging
~ ~		22	advice, or at least recharging advice - this is
22	meeting lasted two hours. Can you just	1	
23	explain why you only have the briefest of	23	addressed to the Commissioner of Police but
23 24	explain why you only have the briefest of notes, between the two of you?	23 24	addressed to the Commissioner of Police but marked for your attention. We cannot find
23	explain why you only have the briefest of	23	addressed to the Commissioner of Police but
23 24	explain why you only have the briefest of notes, between the two of you?	23 24	addressed to the Commissioner of Police but marked for your attention. We cannot find

charging report, doy out know whether this was shown to Mr McGrail?  A. A Jon't know whether he was shown it.  Q. Would it have been normal practice to show it to Mr McGrail?  A. No, not particularly at this stage. I can tell you why it is addressed to the Commissioner of Police.  D. Please do.  A. And, that is because we were taught.  many years ago, that all correspondence will be addressed to the Commissioner of Police, even if it was not intended for that - for his attention.  Q. So you are not aware, are you Let me ask the question and not put words in your mouth. Do you know whether Mr McGrail saw the charging advice document before it was sent to the DPP?  A. The not sure, but there was an email that I sent to Mr McGrail with the NDM. I am not certain at this point if that was included with it, it will be on the - on the record of the 2 sent to Mr McGrail with the NDM. I am not 23 certain at this point if that was included with 4 DPP as to what charges should be preferred; that is in paragraph three. Is that the typical practice?  A. In a case as complex as this, yes. Q. And, the charging report identified 76 possible charges. Is it typical to identify that many charges?  A. A. At that stage, it had not been considered. I think it is important to point out that although the document is entitled 'charging advice." it was not being used for that purpose at that time! When I had abked Mr Wyan to produce a summary of the evidence for Mr Levy and the form the document.  10 Q. Please do.  11 A. That is that on the oconomic red.  12 many years ago, that all correspondence will be addressed to the Commissioner of Police, even if it was not intended for that - for his attention.  13 ask the question and not put words in your assert to the DPP?  24 A. I'm not sure, but there was an email that I sent to Mr McGrail with the NDM. I am not creat a this point if that was included with a the point of the vidence for Mr Levy was in no doubt that Cornelio, and that he had been contracted to maintain and the point of th				
3 was shown to Mr McGrail? 4 A. I don't know whether he was shown it. 5 Q. Would it have been normal practice to show it to Mr McGrail? A. No, not particularly at this stage. I can tell you why it is addressed to the Commissioner of Police. D. Please do. A. And, that is because we were taught, many years ago, that all correspondence will be addressed to the Commissioner of Police, cern if it was not intended for that - for his attention. D. Soy you are not aware, are you Let me ask the question and not put words in your mouth. Do you know whether Mr McGrail saw the charging advice document before it sent to the DPP? A. I'm not sure, but there was an email that 1 sent to the DPP? A. I'm not sure, but there was an email that 1 certain at this point if that was included with the DM. I am not certain at this point if that was included with the DM. I am not 23 certain at this point if that was included with the DM. I am not 24 certain at this point if that was included with the DM. I am not 25 attachments.  Page 41  1 Q. Now 3612, can we turn to 3612, please. Oh, sorry, we are there. In the report, Mr Wyan requests that advice be sought from the DPP as to what charges should be preferred; that is in paragraph three. Is that the typical practice? A. In a case as complex as this, yes. Q. And, the charging report identified 76 possible charges. Is it typical to identify that many charges? A. I think it is implied in document that he had been doing, he - he adopted the same document.  22 in the based ocument that he had been doing, he - he adopted the same document.  23 can do Mr Perez. And then 134 says, "The evidence indicates that Levy discussed the forensic team with Cornelio, and that he had given him advice about the situation. Then there is a section headed "NNEOSIS report for the report, Mr Wyan requests that advice be sought from the DPP as to what charges should be preferred; that is in paragraph three. Is that the proper tidentified 76 possible charges. Is it typical to identify that many charges?  A. It d	1	between you and Mr Wyan about the	1	considered in accordance with the code for
4. A. At that stage, it had not been considered.  5. Q. Would it have been normal practice to show it to Mr McGrai?  7. A. No, not particularly at this stage. I can tell you why it is addressed to the Commissioner of Police.  9. Commissioner of Police.  10. Q. Please do.  11. A. And, that is because we were taught, many years ago, that all correspondence will be addressed to the Commissioner of Police, even if it was not intended for that - for his attention.  12. A. And, that is because we were taught, many years ago, that all correspondence will be addressed to the Commissioner of Police, even if it was not intended for that - for his attention.  13. And, that is because we were taught, many years ago, that all correspondence will be addressed to the Commissioner of Police, even if it was not intended for that - for his attention.  14. A. And, that is important to point out that although the document is entitled "charging advice." it was not being used for that purpose at the time. When I had asked Mr Wyan to produce a summary of the evidence for Mr Rocca, he relied on a document that he had been doing, he - he adopted the same document.  15. Q. For you know whether Mr McGrail saw the charging advice document before it was sent to the DPP?  16. Q. So you are not aware, are you Let me ask the question and not put words in your ask the question and not put words in your ask the question and not put words in your ask the question and not put words in your ask the question was sent to the DPP?  17. A. If mot sure, but there was an email that I sent to Mr McGrail with the NDM. I am not certain at this point if that was included with the sent to Mr McGrail with the NDM. I am not certain at this point if that was included with a sent to Mr McGrail with the NDM. I am not certain at this point if that was included with a sent to Mr McGrail with the NDM. I am not certain at this point if that was included with a sent to Mr McGrail with the NDM. I am not certain at this point if that was included with a sent to Mr Mc				
5 Q. Would it have been normal practice to 6 show it to Mr McGrail? 7 A. No, not particularly at this stage. I can 8 tell you why it is addressed to the 9 Commissioner of Police. 10 Q. Please do. 11 A. And, that is because we were taught, 12 many years ago, that all correspondence will 13 be addressed to the Commissioner of Police, 14 even if it was not intended for that - for his 15 attention. 16 Q. So you are not aware, are you Let me 16 ask the question and not put words in your 18 mouth. Do you know whether Mr McGrail 19 saw the charging advice document before it 20 was sent to the DPP? 21 A. I'm not sure, but there was an email that I 22 sent to Mr McGrail with the NDM. I am not 23 certain at this point if that was included with 24 it, it will be on the - on the record of the 25 attachments.  Page 41  1 Q. Now 3612, can we turn to 3612, please. 2 Oh, sorry, we are there. In the report, Mr Wyan requests that advice be sught from the 2 DPP as to what charges should be preferred; 2 that is in paragraph three. Is that the typical 2 practice? 3 A. I a case as complex as this, yes. 4 Q. And, the charging report identified 76 3 possible charges. Is it typical to identify that 10 many charges? 1 A. It depends on the case that you are 12 investigating. This case involved computer 13 misuse offences, and each instance of an 14 unlawful access to computer material 15 amounted to an offence. So, there would 16 have to be at some point a decision about 17 which of those many instances of computer 18 misuse would - would result in a charge, and 19 which ones would be left on file. 20 Q. Can we now turn to 3635 please, that is 21 paragraph 337. Sorry, lam not sure I have 22 got the right 3666. At that stage was it the 23 paragraph 337. Sorry, lam not sure I have 24 "In light of the evidence proffered above, it is 25 requested that the 76 proposed charges be	_			
show it to Mr McGrail?  A. No, not particularly at this stage. I can tell you why it is addressed to the Commissioner of Police.  O. Please do.  A. And, that is because we were taught, many years ago, that all correspondence will be addressed to the Commissioner of Police, even if it was not intended for that - for his attention.  O. So you are not aware, are you Let me ask the question and not put words in your mouth. Do you know whether Mr McGrail saw the charging advice document before it was sent to the DPP?  A. I'm not sure, but there was an email that I sent to Mr McGrail with the NDM. I am not certain at this point if that was included with it, it will be on the - on the record of the attachments.  Page 41  1 Q. Now 3612, can we turn to 3612, please, Oh, sorry, we are there. In the report, Mr Wyan requests that advice be sought from the DPP as to what charges should be preferred; that is in parngraph three. Is that the typical practice?  A. In depends on the case that you are investigating. This case involved computer misuse offences, and each instance of an unlawful access to computer material amounted to an offence. So, there would have to be at some point a decision about which of those many instances of computer misuse offences, and each instance of an unlawful access to computer material amounted to an offence. So, there would have to be at some point a decision about which of those many instances of computer misuse offences, and each instance of an unlawful access to computer material amounted to an offence. So, there would have to be at some point a decision about which of those many instances of computer misuse offences, and cach instance of an unlawful access to computer material amounted to an offence. So, there would in house of the carrier, and which ones would be left on file.  Q. Can we now turn to 3635 please, that is intention, so, just to read that paragraph, and the properson is particularly and the control of the evidence of one puter in interview.  Q. Can we now turn to 3635 ple				•
A. No, not particularly at this stage. I can 8 tell you why it is addressed to the 9 Commissioner of Police. 10 Q. Please do. 11 A. And, that is because we were taught, 12 many years ago, that all correspondence will 13 be addressed to the Commissioner of Police, 14 even if it was not intended for that - for his 15 attention. 16 Q. So you are not aware, are you Let me 16 ask the question and not put words in your 18 mouth. Do you know whether Mr McGrail 19 saw the charging advice document before it 20 was sent to the DPP? 21 A. I'm not sure, but there was an email that I sent to Mr McGrail with the NDM. I am not certain at this point if that was included with it, it will be on the - on the record of the 25 attachments.  Page 41  1 Q. Now 3612, can we turn to 3612, please. 2 Oh, sorry, we are there. In the report, Mr Wyan requests that advice be sought from the DPP as to what charges should be preferred; bthat is in paragraph three. Is that the typical practice?  A. In a case as complex as this, yes. Q. And, the charging report identified 76 possible charges. Is it typical to identify that many charges? 11 A. It depends on the ease that you are investigating. This case involved computer misuse offences, and each instance of an unlawful access to computer material amunded to an offence. So, there would have to be at some point a decision about which ones would be left on file. 20 Q. Can we now turn to 3635 please, that is paragraph 337. Sorry, I am not sure I have got the right 3666. At that stage was it the given him of the evidence proffered above, it is requested that the 76 proposed charges be right. 3666. At that stage was it the intervent of the complete in interview. 21 In light of the evidence proffered above, it is requested that the 76 proposed charges be right. 360 on the part of Mr Levy, sa far as you are concered? 22 In light of the evidence proffered above, it is requested that the 76 proposed charges be right. 37. Sorry, I am not sure I have got the right 3666. At that stage was it the int	_			
tell you why it is addressed to the Commissioner of Police.  Q. Please do.  A. And, that is because we were taught, many years ago, that all correspondence will be addressed to the Commissioner of Police, even if it was not intended for that - for his attention. Q. So you are not aware, are you Let me ask the question and not put words in your mouth. Do you know whether Mr McGrail saw the charging advice document before it you was sent to the DPP? A. I'm not sure, but there was an email that I sent to Mr McGrail with the NDM. I am not case cratian at this point if that was included with it, it will be on the - on the record of the attachments.  Page 41  Q. Now 3612, can we turn to 3612, please. Oh, sorry, we are there. In the report, Mr Wyan requests that advice be sought from the DPP as to what charges should be preferred; that is in paragraph three. Is that the typical practice? A. In a case as complex as this, yes. Q. And, the charging report identified 76 possible charges. Is it typical to identify that many charges?  A. It depends on the case that you are investigating. This case involved computer missisc offences, and each instance of an unlawful access to computer material amounted to an offence. So, there would have to be at some point a decision about which ones would be left on file. Q. Can we now turn to 3635 please, that is paragraph 337. Sorry, I am not sure I have got the right 3666. At that stage was it the initiation so, just to read that paragraph, 4. "In light of the evidence proffered above, it is requested that the root on the commandation and for that - for his and the revidence of Mr the vexteneen indicates that Levy deathere, 125 to 134, about the same document.  10 Rocea, he relided. So rather than redo all the work again that he had been doing, he - he adopted the same document.  11 the had been doing, he - he adopted the same document.  12 the wexteneen from Cornelio, Mr Levy and Mr Percz. And then 134 says, "The evidence indicates that Levy distant the had been doing, he - he	_			
Commissioner of Police. Q. Please do. 11. A. And, that is because we were taught, 12. many years ago, that all correspondence will 13. be addressed to the Commissioner of Police, 14. even if it was not intended for that - for his 15. attention. 16. Q. So you are not aware, are you Let me 17. ask the question and not put words in your 18. mouth. Do you know whether Mr McGrail 19. saw the charging advice document before it 20. was sent to the DPP? 21. A. I'm not sure, but there was an email that I 22. sent to Mr McGrail with the NDM. I am not 23. certain at this point if that was included with 24. it, it will be on the - on the record of the 25. attendments.  Page 41  10. Rocca, he relied on a document that he had been doing, he - he adopted the same document. 20. If we just go back up to 3630 there are in the same document. 21. vent to Mr McGrail with the NDM. I am not certain at this point if that was included with it, it will be on the - on the record of the attachments.  Page 41  22. do, how 3612, can we turn to 3612, please. 23. Oh, sorry, we are there. In the report, Mr 24. Wayan requests that advice be sought from the 25. DPP as to what charges should be preferred; that is in paragraph three. Is that the typical of practice? 24. In a case as complex as this, yes. 25. Q. And, the charging report identified 76 possible charges. Is it typical to identify that many charges? 26. A. It a case as complex as this, yes. 27. A. It a case as complex as this, yes. 38. Q. And, the charging report identified 76 possible charges. Is it typical to identify that many charges? 39. A. It depends on the case that you are investigating. This case involved computer misuse offences, and each instance of an unlawful access to computer material misuse offences, and each instance of computer misuse offences, and each instance of an unlawful access to computer material misuse offences, and e				~ · ·
10   Q. Please do.   11   Many years ago, that all correspondence will 2   2   2   2   2   2   2   2   2   2		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
been preparing as the investigation had unfolded. So rather than redo all the work addressed to the Commissioner of Police, even if it was not intended for that - for his attention.  15 attention.  16 Q. So you are not aware, are you Let me ask the question and not put words in your mouth. Do you know whether Mr McGrail saw the charging advice document before it was sent to the DPP?  21 A. I'm not sure, but there was an email that I sent to Mr McGrail with the NDM. I am not certain at this point if that was included with it, it will be on the - on the record of the attachments.  Page 41  1 Q. Now 3612, can we turn to 3612, please. Oh, sorry, we are there. In the report, Mr Wyan requests that advice be sought from the DPP as to what charges should be preferred; that is in paragraph three. Is that the typical practice?  A. In a case a complex as this, yes. Q. And, the charging report identified 76 possible charges. Is it typical to identify that many charges?  A. In a case a complex as this, yes. Q. And, the charging report identified 76 possible charges. Is it typical to identify that many charges?  A. In a case a complex as this, yes. Q. And, the charging report identified 76 possible charges. Is it typical to identify that many charges?  A. It depends on the case that you are investigating. This case involved computer misuse offences, and each instance of an unlawful access to computer material amounted to an offence. So, there would have to be at some point a decision about which of those many instances of computer misuse offences, and each instance of an unlawful access to computer misuse offences, and each instance of an unlawful access to computer misuse offences, and each instance of an unlawful access to computer misuse offences, and each instance of an unlawful access to computer misuse offences, and each instance of an unlawful access to computer misuse offences, and each instance of an unlawful access to computer misuse offences, and each instance of an unlawful access to computer misuse offences,				
many years ago, that all correspondence will be addressed to the Commissioner of Police, even if it was not intended for that -for his attention.  Q. So you are not aware, are you Let me ask the question and not put words in your mouth. Do you know whether Mr McGrail saw the charging advice document before it was sent to the DPP?  A. I'm not sure, but there was an email that I sent to Mr McGrail with the NDM. I am not cast that it, it will be on the - on the record of the attachments.  Page 41  Q. Now 3612, can we turn to 3612, please. Oh, sorry, we are there. In the report, Mr Wyan requests that advice be sought from the DPP as to what charges should be preferred; that is in paragraph three. Is that the typical practice?  A. In a case as complex as this, yes. Q. And, the charging report identified 76 possible charges. Is it typical to identify that many charges?  A. It depends on the case that you are investigating. This case involved computer misuse offences, and each instance of an unlawful access to computer material amounted to an offence. So, there would have to be at some point a decision about which or those many instances of computer misuse would - would result in a charge, and which ones would be left on file.  Q. Can we now turn to 3635 please, that is paragraph 337. Sorry, I am not sure I have got the right 3666. At that stage was it the intention so, just to read that paragraph, 24 "In light of the evidence proffered above, it is requested that the 76 proposed charges be				
be addressed to the Commissioner of Police, even if it was not intended for that - for his attention.  3 again that he had been doing, he - he adopted the same document.  4 Co. So you are not aware, are you Let me ask the question and not put words in your ask the question and not put words in your ask the question and not put words in your ask the question and not put words in your ask the question and not put words in your ask the question and not put words in your ask the question and not put words in your ask the question and hot put words in your ask the question and hot put words in your ask the paragraph shere, 132 to 134, about exchanges between Mr Cornelio, Mr Levy and Mr Perez. And then 134 says, "The evidence indicates that Levy discussed the forensic team with Cornelio, and that he had given him advice about the situation. Then there is a section headed "NSCIS report for sanchez/Levy", and the paragraph says, "By it will be on the - on the record of the attachments.  4 Q. Now 3612, can we turn to 3612, please.  5 Oh, sorry, we are there. In the report, Mr Wyan requests that advice be sought from the DPP as to what charges should be preferred; that is in paragraph three. Is that the typical practice?  A. In a case as complex as this, yes.  Q. And, the charging report identified 76 possible charges. Is it typical to identify that many charges?  A. It depends on the ease that you are investigating. This case involved computer missuse offences, and each instance of an unlawful access to computer missuse offences, and each instance of an unlawful access to computer missuse offences, and each instance of an unlawful access to computer missuse offences, and each instance of an unlawful access to computer material amounted to an offence. So, there would have to be at some point a decision about which ones would be left on file.  Q. Can we now turn to 3635 please, that is paragraph 337. Sorry, I am not sure I have got the right 3666. At that stage was it the interval of the paragraph and the paragraph,		_		
the same document.  2				
15 attention.  Q. So you are not aware, are you Let me ask the question and not put words in your mouth. Do you know whether Mr McGrail saw the charging advice document before it was sent to the DPP?  21 A. I'm not sure, but there was an email that I sent to Mr McGrail with the NDM. I am not certain at this point if that was included with it, it will be on the - on the record of the attachments.  Page 41  1 Q. Now 3612, can we turn to 3612, please. 2 Oh, sorry, we are there. In the report, Mr Wyan requests that advice be sought from the DPP as to what charges should be preferred; that is in paragraph three. Is that the typical practice?  A. In a case as complex as this, yes. Q. And, the charging report identified 76 possible charges. Is it typical to identify that many charges? 11 A. It depends on the case that you are investigating. This case involved computer misuse offences, and each instance of an unlawful access to computer material amounted to an offence. So, there would have to be at some point a decision about the which of those many instances of computer misuse offences, and each instance of an which ones would be left on file. Q. Can we now turn to 3635 please, that is paragraph 337. Sorry, I am not sure I have got the right 3666. At that stage was it the paragraph 337. Sorry, I am not sure I have got the right 3666. At that stage was it the interior and this point and the paragraph and the paragraph is as excion headed "NSCIS report for Sanchez/Levy", and the paragraph says, "By 2019 Levy was in no doubt that Cornelio and 36 North had not been contracted to maintain Page 43  1 the NSCIS platform. Despite this fact, he did not question Cornelio accessing the system in April 2019." So, did you culusion to be that there proved the was sufficient evidence of Mr Levy's knowledge of the computer misuse offences?  A. It depends on the case that you are investigating. This case involved computer misuse offences?  A. It depends on the case that you are investigating. This case involved to may be a co				
16 Q. So you are not aware, are you Let me ask the question and not put words in your mouth. Do you know whether Mr McGrail 18 aways the charging advice document before it was sent to the DPP? 20 was sent to the DPP? 21 A. I'm not sure, but there was an email that I 22 sent to Mr McGrail with the NDM. I am not certain at this point if that was included with it, it will be on the - on the record of the attachments.  Page 41  1 Q. Now 3612, can we turn to 3612, please. 25 oh, sorry, we are there. In the report, Mr 26 Wayan requests that advice be sought from the DPP as to what charges should be preferred; that is in paragraph three. Is that the typical possible charges. Is it typical to identify that many charges?  A. In a case as complex as this, yes. 8 Q. And, the charging report identified 76 possible charges. Is it typical to identify that many charges?  A. It depends on the case that you are investigating. This case involved computer misuse offences, and each instance of an unlawful access to computer material amounted to an offence. So, there would which ones would be left on file. Q. Can we now turn to 3635 please, that is paragraph 337. Sorry, I am not sure I have got the right 3666. At that stage was it the intention so, just to read that paragraph, 24 "In light of the evidence proffered above, it is requested that the 76 proposed charges be				
ask the question and not put words in your mouth. Do you know whether Mr McGrail saw the charging advice document before it was sent to the DPP?  A. I'm not sure, but there was an email that I sent to Mr McGrail with the NDM. I am not 22 careful at this point if that was included with it, it will be on the - on the record of the attachments.  Page 41  Q. Now 3612, can we turn to 3612, please. Oh, sorry, we are there. In the report, Mr Wyan requests that advice be sought from the DPP as to what charges should be preferred; that is in paragraph three. Is that the typical practice? A. In a case as complex as this, yes. Q. And, the charging report identified 76 possible charges? A. In a case as complex as this, yes. Q. And, the charging report identified 76 possible charges? A. It depends on the case that you are investigating. This case involved computer misuse offences, and each instance of an unlawful access to computer material amounted to an offence. So, there would which ones would be left on file. Q. Can we now turn to 3635 please, that is paragraph 337. Sorry, I am not sure I have got the right 3666. At that stage was it the intention so, just to read that paragraph, 24 "In light of the evidence proffered above, it is requested that the 76 proposed charges be				
mouth. Do you know whether Mr McGrail saw the charging advice document before it was sent to the DPP?  A. I'm not sure, but there was an email that I sent to Mr McGrail with the NDM. I am not certain at this point if that was included with it, it will be on the - on the record of the attachments.  Page 41  Q. Now 3612, can we turn to 3612, please. Oh, sorry, we are there. In the report, Mr Wyan requests that advice be sought from the DPP as to what charges should be preferred; that is in paragraph three. Is that the typical practice?  A. In a case as complex as this, yes. Q. And, the charging advice document before it which of those many instances of computer misuse offences, and each instance of an unlawful access to computer material amounted to an offence. So, there would which ones would be left on file. Q. Can we now turn to 3635 please, that is paragraph 337. Sorry, I am not sure I have got the right 3666. At that stage was it the intention so, just to read that paragraph, and may charges?  and Mr Perez. And then 134 says, "The evidence indicates that Levy discussed the forence indicates that Levy discussed the forenes it and Mr Perez. And then 134 says, "The evidence indicates that Levy discussed the forenes in the relocation. Then there is a section headed "NSCIS report for Sanchez/Levy", and the paragraph says, "By 2019 Levy was in no doubt that Cornelio and 36 North had not been contracted to maintain  Page 43  the NSCIS platform. Despite this fact, he did not question Cornelio accessing the system in April 2019." So, did you understand from the report, Mr Wayn's conclusion to be that the revidence of Mr Levy's knowledge of the computer misuse offences?  A. I a case a complex as this, yes. Q. And, think it is implied in your answer that you agreed with that conclusion?  A. Yes. Q. Can we now turn to 3635 please, that is paragraph 337. Sorry, I am n		The state of the s		
saw the charging advice document before it was sent to the DPP?  A. I'm not sure, but there was an email that I sent to Mr McGrail with the NDM. I am not certain at this point if that was included with it, it will be on the - on the record of the attachments.  Page 41  Q. Now 3612, can we turn to 3612, please. Oh, sorry, we are there. In the report, Mr Wyan requests that advice be sought from the DPP as to what charges should be preferred; that is in paragraph three. Is that the typical practice?  A. In a case as complex as this, yes. Q. And, the charging report identified 76 possible charges. Is it typical to identify that many charges?  A. I depends on the case that you are investigating. This case involved computer misuse offences, and each instance of an unlawful access to computer material amounted to an offence. So, there would which ones would be left on file.  Q. Can we now turn to 3635 please, that is paragraph 337. Sorry, I am not sure I have got the right 3666. At that stage was it the intention so, just to read that paragraph, "In light of the evidence proffered above, it is requested that the 76 proposed charges be		÷ • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
20 was sent to the DPP? 21 A. I'm not sure, but there was an email that I 22 sent to Mr McGrail with the NDM. I am not 23 certain at this point if that was included with 24 it, it will be on the - on the record of the 25 attachments.  Page 41  1 Q. Now 3612, can we turn to 3612, please. 2 Oh, sorry, we are there. In the report, Mr 3 Wyan requests that advice be sought from the 4 DPP as to what charges should be preferred; 5 that is in paragraph three. Is that the typical 6 practice?  A. In a case as complex as this, yes. Q. And, the charging report identified 76 possible charges. Is it typical to identify that many charges? A. It depends on the case that you are investigating. This case involved computer misuse offences, and each instance of an unlawful access to computer material misuse would - would result in a charge, and which of those many instances of computer misuse would - would result in a charge, and which ones would be left on file. Q. Can we now turn to 3635 please, that is paragraph 337. Sorry, I am not sure I have 22 got the right 3666. At that stage was it the 23 intention so, just to read that paragraph, 24 "In light of the evidence proffered above, it is 25 requested that the 76 proposed charges be		•		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
21  A. I'm not sure, but there was an email that I sent to Mr McGrail with the NDM. I am not certain at this point if that was included with it, it will be on the - on the record of the attachments.  Page 41  22				
sent to Mr McGrail with the NDM. I am not certain at this point if that was included with it, it will be on the - on the record of the attachments.  Page 41  Q. Now 3612, can we turn to 3612, please. Oh, sorry, we are there. In the report, Mr Wyan requests that advice be sought from the DPP as to what charges should be preferred; that is in paragraph three. Is that the typical practice? A. In a case as complex as this, yes. Q. And, the charging report identified 76 possible charges. Is it typical to many charges? A. It depends on the case that you are investigating. This case involved computer misuse offences, and each instance of an unlawful access to computer material amounted to an offence. So, there would have to be at some point a decision about which ones would be left on file. Q. Can we now turn to 3635 please, that is paragraph 337. Sorry, I am not sure I have got the right 3666. At that stage was it the intention so, just to read that paragraph, "In light of the evidence proffered above, it is requested that the 76 proposed charges be				
23 certain at this point if that was included with it, it will be on the - on the record of the attachments.  Page 41  1 Q. Now 3612, can we turn to 3612, please. 2 Oh, sorry, we are there. In the report, Mr 3 Wyan requests that advice be sought from the DPP as to what charges should be preferred; that is in paragraph three. Is that the typical practice?  A. In a case as complex as this, yes. Q. And, the charging report identified 76 possible charges. Is it typical to many charges?  A. It depends on the case that you are investigating. This case involved computer misuse offences, and each instance of an unlawful access to computer material amounted to an offence. So, there would which ones would be left on file. Q. Can we now turn to 3635 please, that is paragraph 337. Sorry, I am not sure I have got the right 3666. At that stage was it the intention so, just to read that paragraph, "In light of the evidence proffered above, it is requested that the 76 proposed charges be		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
ti, it will be on the - on the record of the attachments.  Page 41  Q. Now 3612, can we turn to 3612, please. Oh, sorry, we are there. In the report, Mr Wyan requests that advice be sought from the DPP as to what charges should be preferred; that is in paragraph three. Is that the typical practice? A. In a case as complex as this, yes. Q. And, the charging report identified 76 possible charges. Is it typical to identify that many charges? A. It depends on the case that you are investigating. This case involved computer misuse offences, and each instance of an unlawful access to computer material amounted to an offence. So, there would have to be at some point a decision about which one swould be left on file. Q. Can we now turn to 3615 please. 11 the NSCIS platform. Despite this fact, he did not question Cornelio accessing the system in 3 April 2019, "So, did you understand from the report, Mr Wyan's conclusion to be that there was sufficient evidence of Mr Levy's knowledge of the computer misuse offences? A. It dispends on the case that you are investigating. This case involved computer misuse offences, and each instance of an unlawful access to computer material amounted to an offence. So, there would have to be at some point a decision about which of those many instances of computer misuse would - would result in a charge, and which one would be left on file. Q. Can we now turn to 3635 please, that is paragraph 337. Sorry, I am not sure I have got the right 3666. At that stage was it the intention so, just to read that paragraph, "In light of the evidence proffered above, it is requested that the 76 proposed charges be  24 2019 Levy was in no doubt that Comelio and and the wold maintain  25 2018 vas in not due to maintain  26 4 10 No Nordin had not vestion for the report, Mr wan's conclusion to be that the report, Mr Wyan's conclusion to the that there was sufficient evidence of Mr Levy's knowledge of the computer in interview.  26 C. And, I think it is implied in your answer that you agreed with that				
25 attachments.  Page 41  Q. Now 3612, can we turn to 3612, please. Oh, sorry, we are there. In the report, Mr Wyan requests that advice be sought from the DPP as to what charges should be preferred; that is in paragraph three. Is that the typical practice? A. In a case as complex as this, yes. Q. And, the charging report identified 76 possible charges. Is it typical to identify that many charges? A. It depends on the case that you are investigating. This case involved computer misuse offences, and each instance of an unlawful access to computer material amounted to an offence. So, there would have to be at some point a decision about which of those many instances of computer misuse would - would result in a charge, and which ones would be left on file. Q. Can we now turn to 3612, please.  1 the NSCIS platform. Despite this fact, he did not question Cornelio accessing the system in April 2019." So, did you understand from the report, Mr Wyan's conclusion to be that there was sufficient evidence of Mr Levy's knowledge of the computer misuse offences? A. It think there was sufficient evidence to form a reasonable ground of suspicion; those questions would have to be developed further in interview.  11 Q. And, I think it is implied in your answer that you agreed with that conclusion? A. Yes. 12 Can you please explain, on the basis of 13 the NSCIS platform. Despite this fact, he did not question Cornelio accessing the system in April 2019." So, did you understand from the report, Mr Wyan's conclusion to be that the report, Mr Wyan's conclusion to be developed further in interview.  Q. And, I think it is implied in your answer that you agreed with that conclusion? A. Yes.  Q. Can you please explain, on the basis of that message at 132 and the text referred to in 133, how they show knowledge of sabota				
Page 41  Q. Now 3612, can we turn to 3612, please. Oh, sorry, we are there. In the report, Mr Wyan requests that advice be sought from the DPP as to what charges should be preferred; that is in paragraph three. Is that the typical practice?  A. In a case as complex as this, yes. Q. And, the charging report identified 76 possible charges. Is it typical to identify that many charges? A. It depends on the case that you are investigating. This case involved computer misuse offences, and each instance of an unlawful access to computer material many that to be at some point a decision about which of those many instances of computer misuse would - would result in a charge, and which ones would be left on file. Q. Can we now turn to 3635 please, that is paragraph 377. Sorry, I am not sure I have got the right 3666. At that stage was it the intention so, just to read that paragraph, "In light of the evidence proffered above, it is requested that the 76 proposed charges be				
1 Q. Now 3612, can we turn to 3612, please. 2 Oh, sorry, we are there. In the report, Mr 3 Wyan requests that advice be sought from the 4 DPP as to what charges should be preferred; 5 that is in paragraph three. Is that the typical 6 practice? 6 Q. And, the charging report identified 76 9 possible charges. Is it typical to identify that 10 many charges? 11 A. It depends on the case that you are 12 investigating. This case involved computer 13 misuse offences, and each instance of an 14 unlawful access to computer material 15 amounted to an offence. So, there would 16 have to be at some point a decision about 17 which of those many instances of computer 18 misuse would - would result in a charge, and 19 which ones would be left on file. 20 Q. Can we now turn to 3635 please, that is 21 paragraph 337. Sorry, I am not sure I have 22 got the right 3666. At that stage was it the 23 intention so, just to read that paragraph, 24 "In light of the evidence proffered above, it is 25 requested that the 76 proposed charges be  1 the NSCIS platform. Despite this fact, he did not question cornelio accessing the system in 2 anot question Cornelio accessing the system in 2 april 2019." So, did you understand from 2 the report, Mr Wyan's conclusion to be that 2 there was sufficient evidence of Mr Levy's 2 knowledge of the computer misuse offences? 4 A. It hink there was sufficient evidence of Mr Levy's 2 knowledge of the computer misuse offences? 4 A. It think there was sufficient evidence of Mr Levy's 2 knowledge of the computer with ereport, Mr Wyan's conclusion to be that 2 there was sufficient evidence of Mr Levy's 2 knowledge of the computer wisuse offences? 4 A. It hink there was sufficient evidence of Mr Levy's 2 knowledge of the computer wisuse offences? 4 A. It hink there was sufficient evidence of Mr Levy's 2 knowledge of the computer wisuse offences? 4 A. It hink there was sufficient evidence of Mr Levy's 2 knowledge of the computer that you agreed with that conclusion? 3 A. Yes.  Q. And, I think it is implied i	23	attachments.	23	30 I volui had not occii conducted to maniam
Oh, sorry, we are there. In the report, Mr Wyan requests that advice be sought from the DPP as to what charges should be preferred; that is in paragraph three. Is that the typical practice?  A. In a case as complex as this, yes. Q. And, the charging report identified 76 possible charges. Is it typical to identify that many charges?  A. It depends on the case that you are investigating. This case involved computer misuse offences, and each instance of an unlawful access to computer material amounted to an offence. So, there would have to be at some point a decision about which of those many instances of computer misuse would - would result in a charge, and which ones would be left on file. Q. Can we now turn to 3635 please, that is paragraph 337. Sorry, I am not sure I have got the right 3666. At that stage was it the intention so, just to read that paragraph, Till light of the evidence proffered above, it is requested that the 76 proposed charges be  not question Cornelio accessing the system in April 2019." So, did you understand from the report, Mr Wyan's conclusion to be that there was sufficient evidence of Mr Levy's knowledge of the computer misuse offences? A. It think there was sufficient evidence of Mr Levy's knowledge of the computer wisuse offences? A. It think there was sufficient evidence of Mr Levy's  R. It think there was sufficient evidence of Mr Levy's  Q. And, I think it is implied in your answer that you agreed with that conclusion?  A. Yes. Q. Can you please explain, on the basis of that message at 132 and the text referred to in 133, how they show knowledge of sabotage on the part of Mr Levy, as far as you are concerned?  A. Mr Cornelio appears to be telling Mr Levy, very confidential note, "Gaggero has brought in a forensic team of six to look at anything that John and I may have done to tamper with the system etc. Gaggero is going all-out, it seems." Now, in October 2018 was around the time of one of the		Page 41		Page 43
Oh, sorry, we are there. In the report, Mr Wyan requests that advice be sought from the DPP as to what charges should be preferred; that is in paragraph three. Is that the typical practice?  A. In a case as complex as this, yes. Q. And, the charging report identified 76 possible charges. Is it typical to identify that many charges?  A. It depends on the case that you are investigating. This case involved computer misuse offences, and each instance of an unlawful access to computer material amounted to an offence. So, there would have to be at some point a decision about which of those many instances of computer misuse would - would result in a charge, and which ones would be left on file. Q. Can we now turn to 3635 please, that is paragraph 337. Sorry, I am not sure I have got the right 3666. At that stage was it the intention so, just to read that paragraph, "In light of the evidence proffered above, it is requested that the 76 proposed charges be  anot question Cornelio accessing the system in April 2019." So, did you understand from the report, Mr Wyan's conclusion to be that the report, Mr Evey's a knowledge of the computer wisuse offences?  A. I think there was sufficient evidence of Mr Levy's a. It hink there was sufficient evidence to form a reasonable ground of suspicion; those questions would have to be developed further in interview.  Q. And, I think it is implied in your answer that you agreed with that conclusion?  A. Yes.  Q. Can you please explain, on the basis of that mess				
Wyan requests that advice be sought from the DPP as to what charges should be preferred; that is in paragraph three. Is that the typical practice?  A. In a case as complex as this, yes. Q. And, the charging report identified 76 possible charges. Is it typical to identify that many charges?  A. It depends on the case that you are investigating. This case involved computer misuse offences, and each instance of an unlawful access to computer material amounted to an offence. So, there would have to be at some point a decision about which of those many instances of computer misuse would - would result in a charge, and which ones would be left on file. Q. Can we now turn to 3635 please, that is paragraph 337. Sorry, I am not sure I have got the right 3666. At that stage was it the intention so, just to read that paragraph, "In light of the evidence proffered above, it is requested that the 76 proposed charges be  A. It think there was sufficient evidence of Mr Levy's knowledge of the computer misuse offences? A. It think there was sufficient evidence of Mr Levy's form a reasonable ground of suspicion; those questions would have to be developed further in interview.  Q. And, I think it is implied in your answer that you agreed with that conclusion?  A. Yes.  Q. Can you please explain, on the basis of that message at 132 and the text referred to in 133, how they show knowledge of sabotage on the part of Mr Levy, as far as you are concerned?  A. Mr Cornelio appears to be telling Mr Levy, very confidential note, "Gaggero has brought in a forensic team of six to look at anything that John and I may have done to tamper with the system etc. Gaggero is going all-out, it seems." Now, in October 2018 was around the time of one of the	1	O. Now 3612, can we turn to 3612, please.	1 1	the NSCIS platform. Despite this fact, he did
that is in paragraph three. Is that the typical practice?  A. In a case as complex as this, yes.  Q. And, the charging report identified 76 possible charges. Is it typical to identify that many charges?  A. It depends on the case that you are investigating. This case involved computer misuse offences, and each instance of an unlawful access to computer material amounted to an offence. So, there would have to be at some point a decision about which of those many instances of computer misuse would - would result in a charge, and which ones would be left on file.  Q. Can we now turn to 3635 please, that is paragraph 337. Sorry, I am not sure I have got the right 3666. At that stage was it the intention so, just to read that paragraph, "In light of the evidence proffered above, it is requested that the 76 proposed charges be the sum of the that the report, Mr Wyan's conclusion to be that there was sufficient evidence of Mr Levy's knowledge of the computer misuse offences?  A. It think there was sufficient evidence to form a reasonable ground of suspicion; those questions would have to be developed further in interview.  Q. And, I think it is implied in your answer that that you agreed with that conclusion?  A. Yes.  Q. Can you please explain, on the basis of that message at 132 and the text referred to in 133, how they show knowledge of sabotage on the part of Mr Levy, as far as you are concerned?  A. Mr Cornelio appears to be telling Mr Levy, very confidential note, "Gaggero has brought in a forensic team of six to look at anything that John and I may have done to tamper with the system etc. Gaggero is going all-out, it seems." Now, in October 2018 was around the time of one of the	_	<del>_</del>		
that is in paragraph three. Is that the typical practice?  7 A. In a case as complex as this, yes.  8 Q. And, the charging report identified 76 possible charges. Is it typical to identify that many charges?  11 A. It depends on the case that you are investigating. This case involved computer misuse offences, and each instance of an unlawful access to computer material amounted to an offence. So, there would have to be at some point a decision about which of those many instances of computer misuse would - would result in a charge, and which ones would be left on file.  10 Q. Can we now turn to 3635 please, that is paragraph 337. Sorry, I am not sure I have got the right 3666. At that stage was it the intention so, just to read that paragraph, "In light of the evidence proffered above, it is requested that the 76 proposed charges be to dentate the role of the computer misuse offences?  A. I think there was sufficient evidence of Mr Levy's knowledge of the computer misuse offences?  A. I think there was sufficient evidence to form a reasonable ground of suspicion; those questions would have to be developed further in interview.  10 Q. And, I think it is implied in your answer that you agreed with that conclusion?  11 A. Yes.  12 U. Can you please explain, on the basis of that message at 132 and the text referred to in 133, how they show knowledge of sabotage on the part of Mr Levy, as far as you are concerned?  12 A. Mr Cornelio appears to be telling Mr Levy, very confidential note, "Gaggero has brought in a forensic team of six to look at anything that John and I may have done to tamper with the system etc. Gaggero is going all-out, it seems." Now, in October 2018 was around the time of one of the	2	Oh, sorry, we are there. In the report, Mr	2	not question Cornelio accessing the system in
6 practice? 7 A. In a case as complex as this, yes. 8 Q. And, the charging report identified 76 9 possible charges. Is it typical to identify that many charges? 11 A. It depends on the case that you are investigating. This case involved computer misuse offences, and each instance of an unlawful access to computer material amounted to an offence. So, there would have to be at some point a decision about which of those many instances of computer misuse would - would result in a charge, and which ones would be left on file. 20 Q. Can we now turn to 3635 please, that is paragraph 337. Sorry, I am not sure I have got the right 3666. At that stage was it the intention so, just to read that paragraph, "In light of the evidence proffered above, it is requested that the 76 proposed charges be considered in the formulation of the suspicion; those questions would have to be developed further in interview.  8 A. It think there was sufficient evidence to form a reasonable ground of suspicion; those questions would have to be developed further in interview.  9 Q. And, I think it is implied in your answer that you agreed with that conclusion?  12 A. Yes.  13 A. Yes.  14 Q. Can you please explain, on the basis of that message at 132 and the text referred to in 133, how they show knowledge of sabotage on the part of Mr Levy, as far as you are concerned?  18 A. Mr Cornelio appears to be telling Mr Levy, very confidential note, "Gaggero has brought in a forensic team of six to look at anything that John and I may have done to tamper with the system etc. Gaggero is going all-out, it seems." Now, in October 2018 was around the time of one of the	2 3	Oh, sorry, we are there. In the report, Mr Wyan requests that advice be sought from the	2 3	not question Cornelio accessing the system in April 2019." So, did you understand from
A. In a case as complex as this, yes.  Q. And, the charging report identified 76 possible charges. Is it typical to identify that many charges?  A. It depends on the case that you are investigating. This case involved computer misuse offences, and each instance of an unlawful access to computer material amounted to an offence. So, there would have to be at some point a decision about which of those many instances of computer misuse would - would result in a charge, and which ones would be left on file.  Q. Can we now turn to 3635 please, that is paragraph 337. Sorry, I am not sure I have got the right 3666. At that stage was it the intention so, just to read that paragraph, "In light of the evidence proffered above, it is requested that the 76 proposed charges be  A. I think there was sufficient evidence to form a reasonable ground of suspicion; those questions would have to be developed further in interview.  Q. And, I think it is implied in your answer that you agreed with that conclusion?  A. Yes.  Q. Can you please explain, on the basis of that message at 132 and the text referred to in 133, how they show knowledge of sabotage on the part of Mr Levy, as far as you are concerned?  A. Mr Cornelio appears to be telling Mr Levy, very confidential note, "Gaggero has brought in a forensic team of six to look at anything that John and I may have done to tamper with the system etc. Gaggero is going all-out, it seems." Now, in October 2018 was around the time of one of the	2 3 4	Oh, sorry, we are there. In the report, Mr Wyan requests that advice be sought from the DPP as to what charges should be preferred;	2 3 4	not question Cornelio accessing the system in April 2019." So, did you understand from the report, Mr Wyan's conclusion to be that
Q. And, the charging report identified 76 possible charges. Is it typical to identify that many charges?  A. It depends on the case that you are investigating. This case involved computer misuse offences, and each instance of an unlawful access to computer material amounted to an offence. So, there would have to be at some point a decision about which of those many instances of computer misuse would - would result in a charge, and which ones would be left on file. Q. Can we now turn to 3635 please, that is paragraph 337. Sorry, I am not sure I have got the right 3666. At that stage was it the line in interview.  Q. And, I think it is implied in your answer that you agreed with that conclusion? A. Yes.  Q. Can you please explain, on the basis of that message at 132 and the text referred to in 133, how they show knowledge of sabotage on the part of Mr Levy, as far as you are concerned?  A. Mr Cornelio appears to be telling Mr Levy, very confidential note, "Gaggero has brought in a forensic team of six to look at anything that John and I may have done to tamper with the system etc. Gaggero is going all-out, it seems." Now, in October 2018 was around the time of one of the	2 3 4 5	Oh, sorry, we are there. In the report, Mr Wyan requests that advice be sought from the DPP as to what charges should be preferred; that is in paragraph three. Is that the typical	2 3 4 5	not question Cornelio accessing the system in April 2019." So, did you understand from the report, Mr Wyan's conclusion to be that there was sufficient evidence of Mr Levy's
many charges?  10 in interview.  11 A. It depends on the case that you are investigating. This case involved computer 12 investigating. This case involved computer 13 misuse offences, and each instance of an unlawful access to computer material 14 unlawful access to computer material 15 amounted to an offence. So, there would 16 have to be at some point a decision about 17 which of those many instances of computer 18 misuse would - would result in a charge, and 19 which ones would be left on file. 10 Q. Can we now turn to 3635 please, that is 20 paragraph 337. Sorry, I am not sure I have 21 got the right 3666. At that stage was it the 22 intention so, just to read that paragraph, 23 "In light of the evidence proffered above, it is requested that the 76 proposed charges be 20 In in interview. 21 Q. And, I think it is implied in your answer that you agreed with that conclusion? 22 A. Yes. 23 A. Yes. 24 Q. Can you please explain, on the basis of that message at 132 and the text referred to in 133, how they show knowledge of sabotage on the part of Mr Levy, as far as you are concerned? 24 Levy, very confidential note, "Gaggero has brought in a forensic team of six to look at anything that John and I may have done to tamper with the system etc. Gaggero is going all-out, it seems." Now, in October 2018 was around the time of one of the	2 3 4 5 6	Oh, sorry, we are there. In the report, Mr Wyan requests that advice be sought from the DPP as to what charges should be preferred; that is in paragraph three. Is that the typical practice?	2 3 4 5 6	not question Cornelio accessing the system in April 2019." So, did you understand from the report, Mr Wyan's conclusion to be that there was sufficient evidence of Mr Levy's knowledge of the computer misuse offences?
A. It depends on the case that you are investigating. This case involved computer misuse offences, and each instance of an unlawful access to computer material amounted to an offence. So, there would have to be at some point a decision about which of those many instances of computer misuse would - would result in a charge, and which ones would be left on file.  Q. Can you please explain, on the basis of that message at 132 and the text referred to in 133, how they show knowledge of sabotage on the part of Mr Levy, as far as you are concerned?  A. Mr Cornelio appears to be telling Mr Levy, very confidential note, "Gaggero has brought in a forensic team of six to look at anything that John and I may have done to tamper with the system etc. Gaggero is going all-out, it seems." Now, in October 2018 was around the time of one of the	2 3 4 5 6 7	Oh, sorry, we are there. In the report, Mr Wyan requests that advice be sought from the DPP as to what charges should be preferred; that is in paragraph three. Is that the typical practice?  A. In a case as complex as this, yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7	not question Cornelio accessing the system in April 2019." So, did you understand from the report, Mr Wyan's conclusion to be that there was sufficient evidence of Mr Levy's knowledge of the computer misuse offences?  A. I think there was sufficient evidence to
investigating. This case involved computer misuse offences, and each instance of an unlawful access to computer material amounted to an offence. So, there would have to be at some point a decision about which of those many instances of computer misuse would - would result in a charge, and which ones would be left on file.  Q. Can we now turn to 3635 please, that is paragraph 337. Sorry, I am not sure I have got the right 3666. At that stage was it the intention so, just to read that paragraph, This case involved computer and an	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Oh, sorry, we are there. In the report, Mr Wyan requests that advice be sought from the DPP as to what charges should be preferred; that is in paragraph three. Is that the typical practice?  A. In a case as complex as this, yes.  Q. And, the charging report identified 76	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	not question Cornelio accessing the system in April 2019." So, did you understand from the report, Mr Wyan's conclusion to be that there was sufficient evidence of Mr Levy's knowledge of the computer misuse offences?  A. I think there was sufficient evidence to form a reasonable ground of suspicion; those
misuse offences, and each instance of an unlawful access to computer material amounted to an offence. So, there would have to be at some point a decision about which of those many instances of computer misuse would - would result in a charge, and which ones would be left on file.  Q. Can we now turn to 3635 please, that is paragraph 337. Sorry, I am not sure I have got the right 3666. At that stage was it the intention so, just to read that paragraph, Tin light of the evidence proffered above, it is requested that the 76 proposed charges be  M. Yes.  A. Yes.  Q. Can you please explain, on the basis of that message at 132 and the text referred to in 133, how they show knowledge of sabotage on the part of Mr Levy, as far as you are concerned?  A. Mr Cornelio appears to be telling Mr Levy, very confidential note, "Gaggero has brought in a forensic team of six to look at anything that John and I may have done to tamper with the system etc. Gaggero is going all-out, it seems." Now, in October 2018 was around the time of one of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Oh, sorry, we are there. In the report, Mr Wyan requests that advice be sought from the DPP as to what charges should be preferred; that is in paragraph three. Is that the typical practice?  A. In a case as complex as this, yes.  Q. And, the charging report identified 76 possible charges. Is it typical to identify that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	not question Cornelio accessing the system in April 2019." So, did you understand from the report, Mr Wyan's conclusion to be that there was sufficient evidence of Mr Levy's knowledge of the computer misuse offences?  A. I think there was sufficient evidence to form a reasonable ground of suspicion; those questions would have to be developed further
unlawful access to computer material amounted to an offence. So, there would have to be at some point a decision about which of those many instances of computer misuse would - would result in a charge, and which ones would be left on file.  Q. Can you please explain, on the basis of that message at 132 and the text referred to in 133, how they show knowledge of sabotage on the part of Mr Levy, as far as you are concerned?  A. Mr Cornelio appears to be telling Mr Levy, very confidential note, "Gaggero has paragraph 337. Sorry, I am not sure I have got the right 3666. At that stage was it the intention so, just to read that paragraph, "In light of the evidence proffered above, it is requested that the 76 proposed charges be  14 Q. Can you please explain, on the basis of that message at 132 and the text referred to in 133, how they show knowledge of sabotage on the part of Mr Levy, as far as you are concerned?  A. Mr Cornelio appears to be telling Mr Levy, very confidential note, "Gaggero has brought in a forensic team of six to look at anything that John and I may have done to tamper with the system etc. Gaggero is going all-out, it seems." Now, in October 25 requested that the 76 proposed charges be 26 2018 was around the time of one of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Oh, sorry, we are there. In the report, Mr Wyan requests that advice be sought from the DPP as to what charges should be preferred; that is in paragraph three. Is that the typical practice?  A. In a case as complex as this, yes.  Q. And, the charging report identified 76 possible charges. Is it typical to identify that many charges?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	not question Cornelio accessing the system in April 2019." So, did you understand from the report, Mr Wyan's conclusion to be that there was sufficient evidence of Mr Levy's knowledge of the computer misuse offences?  A. I think there was sufficient evidence to form a reasonable ground of suspicion; those questions would have to be developed further in interview.
that message at 132 and the text referred to in have to be at some point a decision about which of those many instances of computer misuse would - would result in a charge, and which ones would be left on file.  Q. Can we now turn to 3635 please, that is paragraph 337. Sorry, I am not sure I have got the right 3666. At that stage was it the intention so, just to read that paragraph, "In light of the evidence proffered above, it is requested that the 76 proposed charges be  15 that message at 132 and the text referred to in 133, how they show knowledge of sabotage on the part of Mr Levy, as far as you are concerned?  A. Mr Cornelio appears to be telling Mr Levy, very confidential note, "Gaggero has brought in a forensic team of six to look at anything that John and I may have done to tamper with the system etc. Gaggero is going all-out, it seems." Now, in October 25 2018 was around the time of one of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Oh, sorry, we are there. In the report, Mr Wyan requests that advice be sought from the DPP as to what charges should be preferred; that is in paragraph three. Is that the typical practice?  A. In a case as complex as this, yes. Q. And, the charging report identified 76 possible charges. Is it typical to identify that many charges?  A. It depends on the case that you are	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	not question Cornelio accessing the system in April 2019." So, did you understand from the report, Mr Wyan's conclusion to be that there was sufficient evidence of Mr Levy's knowledge of the computer misuse offences?  A. I think there was sufficient evidence to form a reasonable ground of suspicion; those questions would have to be developed further in interview.  Q. And, I think it is implied in your answer
have to be at some point a decision about which of those many instances of computer misuse would - would result in a charge, and which ones would be left on file.  Q. Can we now turn to 3635 please, that is paragraph 337. Sorry, I am not sure I have got the right 3666. At that stage was it the intention so, just to read that paragraph, "In light of the evidence proffered above, it is requested that the 76 proposed charges be  16 133, how they show knowledge of sabotage on the part of Mr Levy, as far as you are concerned?  A. Mr Cornelio appears to be telling Mr Levy, very confidential note, "Gaggero has brought in a forensic team of six to look at anything that John and I may have done to tamper with the system etc. Gaggero is going all-out, it seems." Now, in October 25 2018 was around the time of one of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Oh, sorry, we are there. In the report, Mr Wyan requests that advice be sought from the DPP as to what charges should be preferred; that is in paragraph three. Is that the typical practice?  A. In a case as complex as this, yes. Q. And, the charging report identified 76 possible charges. Is it typical to identify that many charges?  A. It depends on the case that you are investigating. This case involved computer	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	not question Cornelio accessing the system in April 2019." So, did you understand from the report, Mr Wyan's conclusion to be that there was sufficient evidence of Mr Levy's knowledge of the computer misuse offences?  A. I think there was sufficient evidence to form a reasonable ground of suspicion; those questions would have to be developed further in interview.  Q. And, I think it is implied in your answer that you agreed with that conclusion?  A. Yes.
which of those many instances of computer misuse would - would result in a charge, and which ones would be left on file.  Q. Can we now turn to 3635 please, that is paragraph 337. Sorry, I am not sure I have got the right 3666. At that stage was it the intention so, just to read that paragraph, "In light of the evidence proffered above, it is requested that the 76 proposed charges be  17 on the part of Mr Levy, as far as you are concerned?  A. Mr Cornelio appears to be telling Mr Levy, very confidential note, "Gaggero has brought in a forensic team of six to look at anything that John and I may have done to tamper with the system etc. Gaggero is going all-out, it seems." Now, in October 25 going all-out, it seems." Now, in October 26 2018 was around the time of one of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Oh, sorry, we are there. In the report, Mr Wyan requests that advice be sought from the DPP as to what charges should be preferred; that is in paragraph three. Is that the typical practice?  A. In a case as complex as this, yes. Q. And, the charging report identified 76 possible charges. Is it typical to identify that many charges?  A. It depends on the case that you are investigating. This case involved computer misuse offences, and each instance of an unlawful access to computer material	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	not question Cornelio accessing the system in April 2019." So, did you understand from the report, Mr Wyan's conclusion to be that there was sufficient evidence of Mr Levy's knowledge of the computer misuse offences?  A. I think there was sufficient evidence to form a reasonable ground of suspicion; those questions would have to be developed further in interview.  Q. And, I think it is implied in your answer that you agreed with that conclusion?  A. Yes.  Q. Can you please explain, on the basis of
misuse would - would result in a charge, and which ones would be left on file.  Q. Can we now turn to 3635 please, that is paragraph 337. Sorry, I am not sure I have got the right 3666. At that stage was it the intention so, just to read that paragraph, "In light of the evidence proffered above, it is requested that the 76 proposed charges be  18 concerned?  A. Mr Cornelio appears to be telling Mr Levy, very confidential note, "Gaggero has brought in a forensic team of six to look at anything that John and I may have done to tamper with the system etc. Gaggero is going all-out, it seems." Now, in October 25 2018 was around the time of one of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Oh, sorry, we are there. In the report, Mr Wyan requests that advice be sought from the DPP as to what charges should be preferred; that is in paragraph three. Is that the typical practice?  A. In a case as complex as this, yes. Q. And, the charging report identified 76 possible charges. Is it typical to identify that many charges?  A. It depends on the case that you are investigating. This case involved computer misuse offences, and each instance of an unlawful access to computer material amounted to an offence. So, there would	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	not question Cornelio accessing the system in April 2019." So, did you understand from the report, Mr Wyan's conclusion to be that there was sufficient evidence of Mr Levy's knowledge of the computer misuse offences?  A. I think there was sufficient evidence to form a reasonable ground of suspicion; those questions would have to be developed further in interview.  Q. And, I think it is implied in your answer that you agreed with that conclusion?  A. Yes.  Q. Can you please explain, on the basis of that message at 132 and the text referred to in
which ones would be left on file.  Q. Can we now turn to 3635 please, that is paragraph 337. Sorry, I am not sure I have got the right 3666. At that stage was it the intention so, just to read that paragraph, "In light of the evidence proffered above, it is requested that the 76 proposed charges be  19  A. Mr Cornelio appears to be telling Mr  20  Levy, very confidential note, "Gaggero has brought in a forensic team of six to look at anything that John and I may have done to tamper with the system etc. Gaggero is going all-out, it seems." Now, in October 25  2018 was around the time of one of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Oh, sorry, we are there. In the report, Mr Wyan requests that advice be sought from the DPP as to what charges should be preferred; that is in paragraph three. Is that the typical practice?  A. In a case as complex as this, yes. Q. And, the charging report identified 76 possible charges. Is it typical to identify that many charges?  A. It depends on the case that you are investigating. This case involved computer misuse offences, and each instance of an unlawful access to computer material amounted to an offence. So, there would have to be at some point a decision about	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	not question Cornelio accessing the system in April 2019." So, did you understand from the report, Mr Wyan's conclusion to be that there was sufficient evidence of Mr Levy's knowledge of the computer misuse offences?  A. I think there was sufficient evidence to form a reasonable ground of suspicion; those questions would have to be developed further in interview.  Q. And, I think it is implied in your answer that you agreed with that conclusion?  A. Yes.  Q. Can you please explain, on the basis of that message at 132 and the text referred to in 133, how they show knowledge of sabotage
Q. Can we now turn to 3635 please, that is paragraph 337. Sorry, I am not sure I have got the right 3666. At that stage was it the intention so, just to read that paragraph, "In light of the evidence proffered above, it is requested that the 76 proposed charges be  Levy, very confidential note, "Gaggero has brought in a forensic team of six to look at anything that John and I may have done to tamper with the system etc. Gaggero is going all-out, it seems." Now, in October 25 2018 was around the time of one of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Oh, sorry, we are there. In the report, Mr Wyan requests that advice be sought from the DPP as to what charges should be preferred; that is in paragraph three. Is that the typical practice?  A. In a case as complex as this, yes. Q. And, the charging report identified 76 possible charges. Is it typical to identify that many charges?  A. It depends on the case that you are investigating. This case involved computer misuse offences, and each instance of an unlawful access to computer material amounted to an offence. So, there would have to be at some point a decision about which of those many instances of computer	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	not question Cornelio accessing the system in April 2019." So, did you understand from the report, Mr Wyan's conclusion to be that there was sufficient evidence of Mr Levy's knowledge of the computer misuse offences?  A. I think there was sufficient evidence to form a reasonable ground of suspicion; those questions would have to be developed further in interview.  Q. And, I think it is implied in your answer that you agreed with that conclusion?  A. Yes.  Q. Can you please explain, on the basis of that message at 132 and the text referred to in 133, how they show knowledge of sabotage on the part of Mr Levy, as far as you are
paragraph 337. Sorry, I am not sure I have got the right 3666. At that stage was it the intention so, just to read that paragraph, "In light of the evidence proffered above, it is requested that the 76 proposed charges be 21 brought in a forensic team of six to look at anything that John and I may have done to tamper with the system etc. Gaggero is going all-out, it seems." Now, in October 25 2018 was around the time of one of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Oh, sorry, we are there. In the report, Mr Wyan requests that advice be sought from the DPP as to what charges should be preferred; that is in paragraph three. Is that the typical practice?  A. In a case as complex as this, yes. Q. And, the charging report identified 76 possible charges. Is it typical to identify that many charges? A. It depends on the case that you are investigating. This case involved computer misuse offences, and each instance of an unlawful access to computer material amounted to an offence. So, there would have to be at some point a decision about which of those many instances of computer misuse would - would result in a charge, and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	not question Cornelio accessing the system in April 2019." So, did you understand from the report, Mr Wyan's conclusion to be that there was sufficient evidence of Mr Levy's knowledge of the computer misuse offences?  A. I think there was sufficient evidence to form a reasonable ground of suspicion; those questions would have to be developed further in interview.  Q. And, I think it is implied in your answer that you agreed with that conclusion?  A. Yes.  Q. Can you please explain, on the basis of that message at 132 and the text referred to in 133, how they show knowledge of sabotage on the part of Mr Levy, as far as you are concerned?
got the right 3666. At that stage was it the intention so, just to read that paragraph, "In light of the evidence proffered above, it is requested that the 76 proposed charges be  22 anything that John and I may have done to tamper with the system etc. Gaggero is going all-out, it seems." Now, in October 25 2018 was around the time of one of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Oh, sorry, we are there. In the report, Mr Wyan requests that advice be sought from the DPP as to what charges should be preferred; that is in paragraph three. Is that the typical practice?  A. In a case as complex as this, yes. Q. And, the charging report identified 76 possible charges. Is it typical to identify that many charges?  A. It depends on the case that you are investigating. This case involved computer misuse offences, and each instance of an unlawful access to computer material amounted to an offence. So, there would have to be at some point a decision about which of those many instances of computer misuse would - would result in a charge, and which ones would be left on file.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	not question Cornelio accessing the system in April 2019." So, did you understand from the report, Mr Wyan's conclusion to be that there was sufficient evidence of Mr Levy's knowledge of the computer misuse offences?  A. I think there was sufficient evidence to form a reasonable ground of suspicion; those questions would have to be developed further in interview.  Q. And, I think it is implied in your answer that you agreed with that conclusion?  A. Yes.  Q. Can you please explain, on the basis of that message at 132 and the text referred to in 133, how they show knowledge of sabotage on the part of Mr Levy, as far as you are concerned?  A. Mr Cornelio appears to be telling Mr
intention so, just to read that paragraph,  In light of the evidence proffered above, it is requested that the 76 proposed charges be  23 tamper with the system etc. Gaggero is going all-out, it seems." Now, in October 25 2018 was around the time of one of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Oh, sorry, we are there. In the report, Mr Wyan requests that advice be sought from the DPP as to what charges should be preferred; that is in paragraph three. Is that the typical practice?  A. In a case as complex as this, yes. Q. And, the charging report identified 76 possible charges. Is it typical to identify that many charges?  A. It depends on the case that you are investigating. This case involved computer misuse offences, and each instance of an unlawful access to computer material amounted to an offence. So, there would have to be at some point a decision about which of those many instances of computer misuse would - would result in a charge, and which ones would be left on file. Q. Can we now turn to 3635 please, that is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	not question Cornelio accessing the system in April 2019." So, did you understand from the report, Mr Wyan's conclusion to be that there was sufficient evidence of Mr Levy's knowledge of the computer misuse offences?  A. I think there was sufficient evidence to form a reasonable ground of suspicion; those questions would have to be developed further in interview.  Q. And, I think it is implied in your answer that you agreed with that conclusion?  A. Yes.  Q. Can you please explain, on the basis of that message at 132 and the text referred to in 133, how they show knowledge of sabotage on the part of Mr Levy, as far as you are concerned?  A. Mr Cornelio appears to be telling Mr Levy, very confidential note, "Gaggero has
24 "In light of the evidence proffered above, it is requested that the 76 proposed charges be 25 going all-out, it seems." Now, in October 26 2018 was around the time of one of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Oh, sorry, we are there. In the report, Mr Wyan requests that advice be sought from the DPP as to what charges should be preferred; that is in paragraph three. Is that the typical practice?  A. In a case as complex as this, yes. Q. And, the charging report identified 76 possible charges. Is it typical to identify that many charges?  A. It depends on the case that you are investigating. This case involved computer misuse offences, and each instance of an unlawful access to computer material amounted to an offence. So, there would have to be at some point a decision about which of those many instances of computer misuse would - would result in a charge, and which ones would be left on file. Q. Can we now turn to 3635 please, that is paragraph 337. Sorry, I am not sure I have	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	not question Cornelio accessing the system in April 2019." So, did you understand from the report, Mr Wyan's conclusion to be that there was sufficient evidence of Mr Levy's knowledge of the computer misuse offences?  A. I think there was sufficient evidence to form a reasonable ground of suspicion; those questions would have to be developed further in interview.  Q. And, I think it is implied in your answer that you agreed with that conclusion?  A. Yes.  Q. Can you please explain, on the basis of that message at 132 and the text referred to in 133, how they show knowledge of sabotage on the part of Mr Levy, as far as you are concerned?  A. Mr Cornelio appears to be telling Mr Levy, very confidential note, "Gaggero has brought in a forensic team of six to look at
requested that the 76 proposed charges be 25 <b>2018 was around the time of one of the</b>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Oh, sorry, we are there. In the report, Mr Wyan requests that advice be sought from the DPP as to what charges should be preferred; that is in paragraph three. Is that the typical practice?  A. In a case as complex as this, yes. Q. And, the charging report identified 76 possible charges. Is it typical to identify that many charges?  A. It depends on the case that you are investigating. This case involved computer misuse offences, and each instance of an unlawful access to computer material amounted to an offence. So, there would have to be at some point a decision about which of those many instances of computer misuse would - would result in a charge, and which ones would be left on file. Q. Can we now turn to 3635 please, that is paragraph 337. Sorry, I am not sure I have got the right 3666. At that stage was it the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	not question Cornelio accessing the system in April 2019." So, did you understand from the report, Mr Wyan's conclusion to be that there was sufficient evidence of Mr Levy's knowledge of the computer misuse offences?  A. I think there was sufficient evidence to form a reasonable ground of suspicion; those questions would have to be developed further in interview.  Q. And, I think it is implied in your answer that you agreed with that conclusion?  A. Yes.  Q. Can you please explain, on the basis of that message at 132 and the text referred to in 133, how they show knowledge of sabotage on the part of Mr Levy, as far as you are concerned?  A. Mr Cornelio appears to be telling Mr Levy, very confidential note, "Gaggero has brought in a forensic team of six to look at anything that John and I may have done to
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Oh, sorry, we are there. In the report, Mr Wyan requests that advice be sought from the DPP as to what charges should be preferred; that is in paragraph three. Is that the typical practice?  A. In a case as complex as this, yes. Q. And, the charging report identified 76 possible charges. Is it typical to identify that many charges?  A. It depends on the case that you are investigating. This case involved computer misuse offences, and each instance of an unlawful access to computer material amounted to an offence. So, there would have to be at some point a decision about which of those many instances of computer misuse would - would result in a charge, and which ones would be left on file. Q. Can we now turn to 3635 please, that is paragraph 337. Sorry, I am not sure I have got the right 3666. At that stage was it the intention so, just to read that paragraph,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	not question Cornelio accessing the system in April 2019." So, did you understand from the report, Mr Wyan's conclusion to be that there was sufficient evidence of Mr Levy's knowledge of the computer misuse offences?  A. I think there was sufficient evidence to form a reasonable ground of suspicion; those questions would have to be developed further in interview.  Q. And, I think it is implied in your answer that you agreed with that conclusion?  A. Yes.  Q. Can you please explain, on the basis of that message at 132 and the text referred to in 133, how they show knowledge of sabotage on the part of Mr Levy, as far as you are concerned?  A. Mr Cornelio appears to be telling Mr Levy, very confidential note, "Gaggero has brought in a forensic team of six to look at anything that John and I may have done to tamper with the system etc. Gaggero is
Page 42 Page 44	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Oh, sorry, we are there. In the report, Mr Wyan requests that advice be sought from the DPP as to what charges should be preferred; that is in paragraph three. Is that the typical practice?  A. In a case as complex as this, yes. Q. And, the charging report identified 76 possible charges. Is it typical to identify that many charges?  A. It depends on the case that you are investigating. This case involved computer misuse offences, and each instance of an unlawful access to computer material amounted to an offence. So, there would have to be at some point a decision about which of those many instances of computer misuse would - would result in a charge, and which ones would be left on file. Q. Can we now turn to 3635 please, that is paragraph 337. Sorry, I am not sure I have got the right 3666. At that stage was it the intention so, just to read that paragraph, "In light of the evidence proffered above, it is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	not question Cornelio accessing the system in April 2019." So, did you understand from the report, Mr Wyan's conclusion to be that there was sufficient evidence of Mr Levy's knowledge of the computer misuse offences?  A. I think there was sufficient evidence to form a reasonable ground of suspicion; those questions would have to be developed further in interview.  Q. And, I think it is implied in your answer that you agreed with that conclusion?  A. Yes.  Q. Can you please explain, on the basis of that message at 132 and the text referred to in 133, how they show knowledge of sabotage on the part of Mr Levy, as far as you are concerned?  A. Mr Cornelio appears to be telling Mr Levy, very confidential note, "Gaggero has brought in a forensic team of six to look at anything that John and I may have done to tamper with the system etc. Gaggero is going all-out, it seems." Now, in October
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Oh, sorry, we are there. In the report, Mr Wyan requests that advice be sought from the DPP as to what charges should be preferred; that is in paragraph three. Is that the typical practice?  A. In a case as complex as this, yes. Q. And, the charging report identified 76 possible charges. Is it typical to identify that many charges?  A. It depends on the case that you are investigating. This case involved computer misuse offences, and each instance of an unlawful access to computer material amounted to an offence. So, there would have to be at some point a decision about which of those many instances of computer misuse would - would result in a charge, and which ones would be left on file. Q. Can we now turn to 3635 please, that is paragraph 337. Sorry, I am not sure I have got the right 3666. At that stage was it the intention so, just to read that paragraph, "In light of the evidence proffered above, it is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	not question Cornelio accessing the system in April 2019." So, did you understand from the report, Mr Wyan's conclusion to be that there was sufficient evidence of Mr Levy's knowledge of the computer misuse offences?  A. I think there was sufficient evidence to form a reasonable ground of suspicion; those questions would have to be developed further in interview.  Q. And, I think it is implied in your answer that you agreed with that conclusion?  A. Yes.  Q. Can you please explain, on the basis of that message at 132 and the text referred to in 133, how they show knowledge of sabotage on the part of Mr Levy, as far as you are concerned?  A. Mr Cornelio appears to be telling Mr Levy, very confidential note, "Gaggero has brought in a forensic team of six to look at anything that John and I may have done to tamper with the system etc. Gaggero is going all-out, it seems." Now, in October

1	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1	
1	serious outages of NSCIS, that caused	1	evidence showed that he was accessing the
2	significant risk to Gibraltar. And, Blands had	2	system at that time, there was a forensic
3	contracted a forensic team of digital	3	review of that which Mr Cornelio had
4	investigators to interrogate the system, and	4	become aware of. Mr Levy must have
5	they were in Gibraltar carrying out that	5	known that Cornelio was no longer entitled
6	search. It appears to suggest that Mr	6	to access the system because there was
7	Gaggero (SIC) was aware of this, and - and	7	communication between them about getting
8	was letting Mr Levy know: confidentially, I	8	the platform back, and Mr Cornelio seems
9	found this out, let you know that they're	9	comfortable in relaying this information that
10	looking to see whether we have tampered	10	a forensic team may be uncovering or
11	with the system.	11	looking into any evidence that he may have
12	Q. The next section is paragraphs, as I say,	12	tampered with the system.
13	135 to 137. Now, I am going to ask you a	13	MR SANTOS: Can I now ask you to move
14	question about this but there are (I just pause	14	to paragraph 338 on B 3666, please. It reads
15	to note, for your benefit and everybody's	15	as follows: "In addition to the proposed
16	benefit) redacted parts of those messages,	16	charges, advice is also sought as to whether,
17	and the questions that I ask, and I would ask	17	based on the above evidence, there are
18	that you answer them as best as you can	18	reasonable grounds to suspect that Levy has
19	without reference to the information that is	19	committed (A) the offence of conspiracy to
20	redacted, because the redactions are there to	20	defraud and/or (B) any other criminal
21	protect information that is a subject of the	21	offences." The next paragraph reads: "In the
22	Restriction Notice.	22	event that there are reasonable grounds to
23	(11.01)	23	suspect Levy has committed any offence, the
24	Obviously if you would like to give a fuller	24	police will consider whether it is necessary to
25	answer or if you are unable to give an answer	25	conduct further investigations in the form of
	Page 45		Page 47
	1 age +3		1 agc +/
1	at all without reference to that information,	1	search warrants, interview under caution." Is
2	then we will go into private at the end of	2	it correct to interpret that as meaning that you
3	your evidence for you to do so. But for the	3	were seeking advice on whether there were
4	time being I would ask you to just give your	4	reasonable grounds to suspect commission of
5	answer without reference to that information.	5	the offence of conspiracy to defraud and any
6	How did you consider that this	6	other criminal offences but you were not
7	communication in 136 added to your grounds	7	seeking the DPP's advice at that stage
8	to suspect Mr Levy?	8	anyway as to whether a search warrant could
9	A. I'll just read it, if I may.	9	and should be obtained?
10	Q. Yes, sorry, I should have given you that	10	A. That is correct.
11	chance. (Pause)	11	Q. In fact, it is fair to say that paragraph 339
12	A. Okay. Could you repeat the question,	12	the second line says: "the police will
13	please?	13	consider whether it is necessary to conduct
14	Q. Yes. How did you consider that that	14	further investigations in the form of search
15	message added to or contributed to your	15	warrants" That is signposting - would you
16	grounds to suspect Mr Levy?	16	agree? - that you were reserving that
17	THE CHAIRMAN: It is that and the	17	decision for the police.
18	message at 132 which you have already	18	A. That is correct.
19	referred to.	19	Q. Why would you reserve that decision for
20	A. Yes. Could I see 132? Yes. This came	20	the police?
21	at a time when Mr Cornelio had been	21	A. It was RGP practice at that time, and
22	expressly prohibited from accessing the	22	perhaps still is now, that applications for
23	NSCIS platform by the Chief Minister via a	23	warrants and production orders are made by
24	message through his personal secretary Mr	24	the police. They're not drafted by lawyers. It
25	Canessa, and notwithstanding that the	25	was also the view of the DPP that the
	, /		
	Page 46		Page 48
			12 (D 45 : 40)

1		1	
1	obtaining and execution of search warrants	1	status within the community, that we
2	was an operational matter for the police, and	2	consulted with the DPP.
3	so by mutual consent we dealt with it	3	Q. My question was more aimed at what is
4	because we thought it was the best way to	4	the reason behind the policy of not seeking
5	deal with it in that way.	5	advice on operational matters.
6	Q. That term "operational matters" is one	6	A. Because the DPP, the Prosecution
7	that comes up again and again, so can I ask	7	Service, don't get involved in operational
8	you to explain your understanding of what is	8	matters. They are matters for the police.
9	meant by "operational matters".	9	Q. On this occasion, and again with the
10	A. The seizing, the searching for	10	benefit of hindsight I accept, do you think
11	information, is a police function. It is an	11	you may have benefited from legal advice,
12	operational matter.	12	independent legal advice, as to the decision
13	Q. What other actions fall within the	13	whether to proceed with a search warrant?
14	definition of "operational matters" by way of	14	A. Yes, I do.
15	example?	15	Q. If we can then go to B 3610, please, this
16	A. The arrest of defendants, the interviewing	16	is an email which you were referring to
17	of them, the interrogation of evidence that's	17	earlier which is 1 April 2020 and that is your
18	been seized, the production of a docket for	18	email to the DPP sending this charging
19	consideration.	19	advice. You have already said it was not
20	Q. Can I just ask you then, you just referred	20	really seeking an advice on charging but the
21	to an interview but we did see earlier that	21	report prepared by Mr Wyan. You refer to
22	there was reference to seeking advice from	22	the NDM in that email. Can I just point that
23	the DPP as to whether to interview. You	23	out to you. It is the third substantive
24	confirmed that it was not usual to seek DPP	24	paragraph down.
25	advice as to an interview but do you accept	25	A. Yes.
	Page 49		Page 51
1	that on this occasion the DPP's advice was	1	Q. You say: "I have also included my NDM
2	sought as far as an interview is concerned?	2	assessment of the need to interview JL which
3	A. I'm not sure whether I said that his advice	3	sets out my rationale. Although this
4	was sought with regards to the need to	4	document is not intended as the basis of
5	interview Mr Levy. His advice was sought	5	seeking legal advice, I hope that it will assist
6	whether he agreed, whether he could come to	6	in the understanding of why we feel that it is
7	the same conclusion that we had that there	7	necessary to follow the course of action that
8	were reasonable grounds of suspecting him	8	is proposed." Then you say: "What we are
9	of committing an offence. If that was the	9	seeking is your advice on whether the
10	case, it followed therefore that we would	10	charges that we propose are warranted by the
11	interview or take what action we considered	11	advice, whether there is a reasonable
12	appropriate.	12	prospect of conviction and, given the
13	Q. Can I ask you from your understanding,	13	inherent political nature of this investigation,
14	your knowledge, why is that red line	14	that it is in the public interest to proceed. In
15	apparently drawn between seeking legal	15	addition, and in respect of James Levy, we
16	advice on whether an offence has been	16	are seeking legal advice as to whether there
17	committed, whether there are grounds to	17	are reasonable grounds to suspect that he has
18	suspect - why is there a bright line between	18	committed the offence as alleged." Are these
19	that and operational matters, as far as your	19	questions on which you would typically seek
20	understanding is concerned?	20	advice from the DPP?
21	A. I think in most cases it's clear, but in this	21	A. I suppose it depends on the case. I mean,
22	case the suspect was a lawyer and a lawyer	22	I haven't been involved in enough cases to
23	that may have been giving legal advice in	23	give you an opinion on whether that's
23	relation to this matter, and it was for that	24	something that's typical. I can tell you that in
25	reason principally and, of course, Mr Levy's	25	my view it was appropriate to consult his
2.5	reason principany and, or course, Mr Levy s	23	my view it was appropriate to consuit his
	Page 50		Page 52

1	advice, given the implications of the actions	1	and the Commissioner of Police in the
2	which we were about to embark on.	2	Cabinet Room. In this email Mr McGrail
3	Q. The first paragraph that I read out to you:	3	says in the second - well, can I ask you to
4	is it your position that you were or you were	4	read the first two paragraphs to yourself,
5	not seeking legal advice on the steps that are	5	please? (Pause)
6	referred to in your NDM? You can re-read	6	A. I read it.
7	that paragraph but are we to interpret from	7	Q. I just want to focus on the penultimate
8	that paragraph that you were seeking advice	8	sentence of the second paragraph that you
9	on the NDM assessment and the need to	9	have read. It says: "At most of these
10	interview, or that you were not?	10	meetings with the AG, particularly the latter
11	A. No, I think the paragraph says we are not	11	ones, I have been accompanied by
12	seeking advice on this but we had pointed out	12	Superintendent Richardson." Do you know
13	what our intended course of action was.	13	which meetings are being referred to by Mr
14	Q. Did you know of, just more generally on	14	McGrail there?
15	Operation Delhi, in the period between the	15	A. I'm assuming that they are the meetings
16	May 2019 meeting that we started talking	16	of 13, 15 and 20 May, because those were
17	about and April 2020 were you aware of any	17	meetings that I was present at with the
18	contact between the Attorney General and	18	Attorney General and others and the
19	the Commissioner of Police in relation to	19	Commissioner of Police, and also the
20	Operation Delhi?	20	meeting of 7 April 2020 which in my notes I
21	A. The only contact that I'd had with the	21	recorded as 4 May.
22	Attorney General, I think up to that point,	22	Q. Just to help you, this is an email dated 12
23	though it may not even have been then, there	23	May 2020, so the 13th, 15th and 20th would
24	was a meeting that I attended with the	24	postdate that email. You refer to a meeting
25	Commissioner of Police and the Attorney	25	of 7 April. Were you aware of any other
	D 52		D 55
	Page 53		Page 55
1	General, but I think that was on 7 April.	1	meetings that might have been referred to in
2	Q. Before that, between May 2019 and 7	2	that email?
3	April, to the best of your recollection, how	3	A. No.
4	many meetings were there between the	4	MR SANTOS: This is slightly early for our
5	Attorney General and the Commissioner of	5	mid-morning break, Mr Chairman, but I
6	Police on Delhi?	6	think this is a natural pause that perhaps we
7	A. I'm not aware of any.	7	can take our mid-morning break now and
8	Q. Do you know of any notes that you have	8	then come back, because I am about to turn
9	of any meetings between the Attorney	9	to the 7 April 2020 meeting.
10	General and the Commissioner of Police?	10	THE CHAIRMAN: Certainly.
11	A. Only the ones that have already been	11	(11.16)
12	referred to in my statement.	12	(Adjourned for a short time)
13	Q. If the Commissioner of Police had met	13	(11.28)
14	the Attorney General on Operation Delhi,	14	MR SANTOS: Mr Richardson, at some
15	would you have expected to be present at that	15	stage in either April or May 2020 there was a
16	meeting?	16	meeting between you, Mr McGrail, the
17	A. If the meeting was specifically to do with	17	Attorney General, Mr DeVincenzi, to discuss
18	Operation Delhi, well then, I would say yes.	18	the proposed charges. It seems from your
19	Q. Can we please turn to B 74. This is an	19	answers of earlier this morning that you are
20	email that Mr McGrail sent himself on the	20	already aware that there is some
21	evening of 12 May 2020. You may be well	21	disagreement in the evidence as to where or
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	22	what the date of that meeting was. The
22	aware of the significance of that date and you	22	what the date of that meeting was. The
22 23	aware of the significance of that date and you may recall it, but just for the benefit of	23	Attorney General and Mr DeVincenzi believe
			=
23	may recall it, but just for the benefit of	23	Attorney General and Mr DeVincenzi believe
23 24	may recall it, but just for the benefit of everybody, that is the day of the meeting between Mr McGrail and the Chief Minister	23 24	Attorney General and Mr DeVincenzi believe it was 7 April 2020. You initially believed that it was on 4 May 2020 but I sensed from
23 24	may recall it, but just for the benefit of everybody, that is the day of the meeting	23 24	Attorney General and Mr DeVincenzi believe it was 7 April 2020. You initially believed

1	your answer earlier today that you may now	1	writing a timeline of events and I realised
2	accept that it was actually on 7 April.	2	that this particular meeting hadn't been
3	A. I think it's far more likely that it was on 7	3	included.
4	April than 4 May, but if I may say, my	4	Q. Certainly this entry postdates 12 May
5	recollection isn't that the meeting was to	5	2020.
6	discuss the charges.	6	A. Yes.
7	Q. We will go to that meeting now, thank	7	Q. This meeting that you were referring to.
8	you. I just wanted to clarify the date. Is your	8	Can you please explain why - maybe you
9	position that there was only a meeting on 7	9	consider you already have but to give you
10	April or that there was a meeting on 7 April	10	another opportunity - why are there no notes
11	and also on 4 May?	11	on the contents of the meeting?
12	A. No, just 7 April.	12	THE CHAIRMAN: The meeting of 7 April.
13	Q. Can we go to C 1788, which is a page	13	MR SANTOS: Yes, the meeting that is
14	from your Operation Delhi daybook. As I	14	referred to there wrongly as having taken
15	already indicated, your day book records that	15	place on 4 May.
16	as being 7 May 2020. Can you just explain	16	A. The first thing is I wasn't given notice of
17	to us, please, why you believe it is that it	17	the meeting. I think Mr McGrail advised me
18	records the meeting as taking place on 7	18	of it maybe ten minutes, 15 minutes before
19	May?	19	we were going down. I was puzzled at why
	•		
20	A. Sorry, this is in relation to James	20 21	we were having a meeting with the AG
21	Q. Sorry.		because I had been dealing extensively with
22	THE CHAIRMAN: I think you have the	22	the DPP up to that point and to my
23	wrong -	23	knowledge we had never consulted the AG.
24	MR SANTOS: I have the wrong page.	24	So I attended the meeting and the meeting
25	THE CHAIRMAN: Or the wrong page has	25	concerned that certainly Mr Llamas had
	Page 57		Page 59
1	been put up. You want -	1	raised the issue of rationalising the charges
2	MR SANTOS: 1788, sorry. apologies. (To	2	down. Again, that was something that I was
3	the witness) Tuesday 4 May 2020. You	3	puzzled with because we were dealing with
4	have explained that you now believe that it is	4	that matter directly with the DPP, and we
5	more likely that it took place on 7 April	5	talked about or it was mentioned the
6	2020. Can you please explain how it is, as	6	possibility of considering Caine Sanchez
	far as your knowledge and belief is	7	
7	, 8		under the Disciplinary Code, which I was
8	concerned, that it came to be dated Tuesday 4	8	very shocked at. Why I haven't made a
9	May 2020?	9	record of that meeting afterwards when I got
10	A. Yes. This entry was made post the event,	10	back: I think it was because almost straight
11	probably quite some time after the event.	11	after that was when we received the video
12	What happened on the meeting which I	12	conference with the DS or the DPP, and we
13	presume was on 7 April was that Mr McGrail	13	were very relieved that he had formed the
14	had called me into the meeting at very short	14	same view as we had with regard to JL's
15	notice. I hadn't been given prior notice of it	15	status as a suspect, and it must have been
16	and so didn't take my daybook with me on	16	overlooked. It wasn't a meeting, as I said,
17	that day. The meeting went ahead, we	17	that we were going to take advice from the
18	carried on with other business. The day after	18	AG. In fact, I think my notes say that he had
19	that, if it was 7 April, was the day that we got	19	called the meeting because he was advising
20	the advice from the DPP on considering that	20	the Government on ownership.
21	JL was a suspect, and it wasn't until the	21	Q. Your note is set out in your third witness
22	events leading up to Mr McGrail's request to	22	statement at A 1436. That says: "Meeting
23	retire that I sat down and started piecing	23	with AG number one. Also present IM, PR,
24	together some notes that I had that hadn't	24	Lloyd DeVincenzi, 4 May 2020, 09.45 hours.
25	made it into my book, and I commenced	25	AG called the meeting as advising the
	D 50		P
	Page 58		Page 60

1	Covernment with record to ever eaching of the	1	retire, so it must have been around 22 May.
2	Government with regard to ownership of the platform. Governor has no records on	2	Q. Had you discussed with Mr McGrail his
3	ownership. AG asks that we rationalise the	3	exchanges with the Attorney General on 12
4	charges down from 70-plus to whittle out	4	May and subsequently? Had you discussed
5	those that depend on ownership and then see	5	that with Mr McGrail prior to preparing this
6	what remains. We argue that the case does	6	note?
7	not fall or stand on ownership alone. JL's	7	A. I don't think so. I think he restricted his
8	involvement discussed and AG makes a note	8	conversation to say he'd had the dressing
9	on the back of a typed document, sensitive	9	down of a lifetime and that the CM had said
10	shares", etc., etc. AG states that	10	we had no idea on how to investigate white
11	A. Mr Santos, could I interrupt you? My	11	collar crime, but I wasn't aware of any of the
12	elderly mother is calling and I'm trying to	12	details beyond that.
13	block the call and I can't.	13	Q. Specifically, were you aware that there
14	Q. Yes, of course. If she keeps calling we	14	was a disagreement between them as to what
15	will take another break for you to answer the	15	had been agreed at the meeting of 7 April
16	call.	16	2020 prior to preparing this note?
17	A. Thank you.	17	A. I don't think so but now obviously I know
18	Q. The next bullet point says: "AG states	18	what the subject of those conversations are,
19	that if Government was owner of platform	19	so I'm not sure if I'm remembering from now
20	then we would need a complaint from them.	20	or from before.
21	Chief Secretary would have to provide an	21	Q. Your note states, as I read out: "AG asks
22	additional statement explaining this."	22	that we rationalise the charges down from
23	A. I'm sorry, where are we?	23	70-plus to whittle out those that depend on
24	Q. I am on the sixth bullet point. " Chief	24	ownership and then see what remains." You
25	Secretary would have to provide an	25	say that the AG asks that we rationalise
	Page 61		Page 63
1	additional statement explaining this. I said	1	down. Did you interpret this as a suggestion
2	how could they not complain. CS was	2	or a direction from the Attorney General?
3	corrupt from what we had seen." I think that is a reference to Sanchez, not the Chief	3 4	A. I think it was more a suggestion. This wasn't a meeting where formal advice was
4 5	Secretary.	5	sought and given. There was no follow-up
6	A. Correct, yes.	6	with the notes. I remember the AG making a
7	Q. "IM leaves meeting in a rush to attend	7	note of the charges that we proposed and
8	Covid meeting at Number 6. I apologised to	8	drawing a line from 76 down to whatever
9	AG for being frank and he replies that it is	9	=
			number remained if we took out any issue
10	welcome." You say that you prepared this		number remained if we took out any issue concerning with the Government ownership
10 11	welcome." You say that you prepared this note shortly after Mr McGrail retired, I	10	concerning with the Government ownership
	welcome." You say that you prepared this note shortly after Mr McGrail retired, I believe you say.		concerning with the Government ownership or their asserted ownership of the platform.
11	note shortly after Mr McGrail retired, I	10 11	concerning with the Government ownership or their asserted ownership of the platform. Q. Mr DeVincenzi in his evidence says that
11 12	note shortly after Mr McGrail retired, I believe you say.	10 11 12	concerning with the Government ownership or their asserted ownership of the platform.
11 12 13	note shortly after Mr McGrail retired, I believe you say.  A. No, Mr Santos. It was after the meetings	10 11 12 13	concerning with the Government ownership or their asserted ownership of the platform.  Q. Mr DeVincenzi in his evidence says that his impression was that you and Mr McGrail
11 12 13 14	note shortly after Mr McGrail retired, I believe you say.  A. No, Mr Santos. It was after the meetings with the AG of 13th, 15th and the 20th and	10 11 12 13 14	concerning with the Government ownership or their asserted ownership of the platform.  Q. Mr DeVincenzi in his evidence says that his impression was that you and Mr McGrail were open to undertaking this exercise if not
11 12 13 14 15 16 17	note shortly after Mr McGrail retired, I believe you say.  A. No, Mr Santos. It was after the meetings with the AG of 13th, 15th and the 20th and before Mr McGrail retired.  Q. Correct. I think at 65 you say: "I created two timelines shortly before Mr McGrail	10 11 12 13 14 15	concerning with the Government ownership or their asserted ownership of the platform.  Q. Mr DeVincenzi in his evidence says that his impression was that you and Mr McGrail were open to undertaking this exercise if not wholly convinced it was necessary. Is that a
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	note shortly after Mr McGrail retired, I believe you say.  A. No, Mr Santos. It was after the meetings with the AG of 13th, 15th and the 20th and before Mr McGrail retired.  Q. Correct. I think at 65 you say: "I created two timelines shortly before Mr McGrail retired. RGP kindly provided me with access	10 11 12 13 14 15 16	concerning with the Government ownership or their asserted ownership of the platform.  Q. Mr DeVincenzi in his evidence says that his impression was that you and Mr McGrail were open to undertaking this exercise if not wholly convinced it was necessary. Is that a fair characterisation of your position?
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	note shortly after Mr McGrail retired, I believe you say.  A. No, Mr Santos. It was after the meetings with the AG of 13th, 15th and the 20th and before Mr McGrail retired.  Q. Correct. I think at 65 you say: "I created two timelines shortly before Mr McGrail retired. RGP kindly provided me with access to copy and I labelled them PR33 and PR34."	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	concerning with the Government ownership or their asserted ownership of the platform.  Q. Mr DeVincenzi in his evidence says that his impression was that you and Mr McGrail were open to undertaking this exercise if not wholly convinced it was necessary. Is that a fair characterisation of your position?  A. Yes, it is.
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	note shortly after Mr McGrail retired, I believe you say.  A. No, Mr Santos. It was after the meetings with the AG of 13th, 15th and the 20th and before Mr McGrail retired.  Q. Correct. I think at 65 you say: "I created two timelines shortly before Mr McGrail retired. RGP kindly provided me with access to copy and I labelled them PR33 and PR34." I think you did, but just to confirm, are you	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	concerning with the Government ownership or their asserted ownership of the platform.  Q. Mr DeVincenzi in his evidence says that his impression was that you and Mr McGrail were open to undertaking this exercise if not wholly convinced it was necessary. Is that a fair characterisation of your position?  A. Yes, it is.  Q. Why were you not convinced that it was necessary?  A. Because we had already discussed this
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	note shortly after Mr McGrail retired, I believe you say.  A. No, Mr Santos. It was after the meetings with the AG of 13th, 15th and the 20th and before Mr McGrail retired.  Q. Correct. I think at 65 you say: "I created two timelines shortly before Mr McGrail retired. RGP kindly provided me with access to copy and I labelled them PR33 and PR34." I think you did, but just to confirm, are you able to give a rough date for when you	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	concerning with the Government ownership or their asserted ownership of the platform.  Q. Mr DeVincenzi in his evidence says that his impression was that you and Mr McGrail were open to undertaking this exercise if not wholly convinced it was necessary. Is that a fair characterisation of your position?  A. Yes, it is.  Q. Why were you not convinced that it was necessary?  A. Because we had already discussed this with the DPP. You can see from the
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	note shortly after Mr McGrail retired, I believe you say.  A. No, Mr Santos. It was after the meetings with the AG of 13th, 15th and the 20th and before Mr McGrail retired.  Q. Correct. I think at 65 you say: "I created two timelines shortly before Mr McGrail retired. RGP kindly provided me with access to copy and I labelled them PR33 and PR34." I think you did, but just to confirm, are you able to give a rough date for when you prepared the note?	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	concerning with the Government ownership or their asserted ownership of the platform.  Q. Mr DeVincenzi in his evidence says that his impression was that you and Mr McGrail were open to undertaking this exercise if not wholly convinced it was necessary. Is that a fair characterisation of your position?  A. Yes, it is.  Q. Why were you not convinced that it was necessary?  A. Because we had already discussed this with the DPP. You can see from the charging advice that was sent on 1 April that
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	note shortly after Mr McGrail retired, I believe you say.  A. No, Mr Santos. It was after the meetings with the AG of 13th, 15th and the 20th and before Mr McGrail retired.  Q. Correct. I think at 65 you say: "I created two timelines shortly before Mr McGrail retired. RGP kindly provided me with access to copy and I labelled them PR33 and PR34." I think you did, but just to confirm, are you able to give a rough date for when you prepared the note?  A. As I said, it would have been after the	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	concerning with the Government ownership or their asserted ownership of the platform.  Q. Mr DeVincenzi in his evidence says that his impression was that you and Mr McGrail were open to undertaking this exercise if not wholly convinced it was necessary. Is that a fair characterisation of your position?  A. Yes, it is.  Q. Why were you not convinced that it was necessary?  A. Because we had already discussed this with the DPP. You can see from the charging advice that was sent on 1 April that we had considered the need to rationalise -
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	note shortly after Mr McGrail retired, I believe you say.  A. No, Mr Santos. It was after the meetings with the AG of 13th, 15th and the 20th and before Mr McGrail retired.  Q. Correct. I think at 65 you say: "I created two timelines shortly before Mr McGrail retired. RGP kindly provided me with access to copy and I labelled them PR33 and PR34." I think you did, but just to confirm, are you able to give a rough date for when you prepared the note?  A. As I said, it would have been after the meetings of the 13th, 15th and the 20th with	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	concerning with the Government ownership or their asserted ownership of the platform.  Q. Mr DeVincenzi in his evidence says that his impression was that you and Mr McGrail were open to undertaking this exercise if not wholly convinced it was necessary. Is that a fair characterisation of your position?  A. Yes, it is.  Q. Why were you not convinced that it was necessary?  A. Because we had already discussed this with the DPP. You can see from the charging advice that was sent on 1 April that we had considered the need to rationalise - I'm not sure if that's the word; I think "whittle
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	note shortly after Mr McGrail retired, I believe you say.  A. No, Mr Santos. It was after the meetings with the AG of 13th, 15th and the 20th and before Mr McGrail retired.  Q. Correct. I think at 65 you say: "I created two timelines shortly before Mr McGrail retired. RGP kindly provided me with access to copy and I labelled them PR33 and PR34." I think you did, but just to confirm, are you able to give a rough date for when you prepared the note?  A. As I said, it would have been after the	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	concerning with the Government ownership or their asserted ownership of the platform.  Q. Mr DeVincenzi in his evidence says that his impression was that you and Mr McGrail were open to undertaking this exercise if not wholly convinced it was necessary. Is that a fair characterisation of your position?  A. Yes, it is.  Q. Why were you not convinced that it was necessary?  A. Because we had already discussed this with the DPP. You can see from the charging advice that was sent on 1 April that we had considered the need to rationalise -

1	we were alive to that the need of that from	1	agreement, are you saying that there was no
1 2	we were alive to that, the need of that, from way back.	2	such agreement or that you just cannot
3	Q. So your position then is that you agreed	3	remember whether there was such an
4	that it was necessary to whittle down, to	4	agreement?
5	bring down the number of charges.	5	A. I'm saying that I don't remember ever that
6	A. It was part of our investigative process,	6	being discussed that we wouldn't take any
7	yes.	7	further action until the Commissioner
8	Q. Can we look at your third statement	8	reverted to the Attorney General.
9	paragraph 71, please, which is just over the	9	Q. As to whether you agreed to meet and
10	page. You say at paragraph 32: "I do not	10	that nothing would happen until you met
11	recall any agreement being reached that the	11	again, you say: "I do not remember agreeing
12	RGP would not take any further action until	12	that nothing would happen until we met
13	we had clarified the question of ownership	13	again." I just ask you again: are you saying
14	and rationalised the number of charges.	14	that from your recollection no such
15	Furthermore, I do not remember agreeing	15	agreement was reached, or are you saying
16	that nothing would happen until we met	16	you just cannot remember whether or not an
17	again." That is in reference to the Attorney	17	agreement was reached?
18	General's assertions as far as an agreement	18	A. I'm saying that I can't remember that
19	was concerned, is it not?	19	being discussed, and I set out the reasons
20	A. Sorry, could you repeat that?	20	why
21	Q. Apologies, I will make it clearer. Your	21	Q. Yes.
22	evidence in paragraph 71, am I right in	22	A if it had happened, what would have
23	thinking it is in a section headed "Response	23	happened.
24	to Attorney General's affidavit dated 24 June	24	Q. I just want to be as clear as we can on
25	2022." The Attorney General's position is	25	this. Did you or Mr McGrail agree to meet in
	Page 65		Page 67
	1 age 03		1 age 0/
1	that there was an agreement that you would	1	the future with the Attorney General?
2	not take any further action until the question	2	Independently of whether you agreed not to
3	of ownership had been clarified and the	3	take any further action before that meeting,
4	number of charges had been rationalised and	4	was there an agreement to meet at a later
5	your response to that is in 71. You say: "I do	5	stage to discuss
6	not recall any agreement being reached I	6	A. I can't say.
7	do not remember agreeing that nothing	7	Q. Your evidence is that there were other
8	would happen until we met again." I am just	8	steps to be taken - sorry, I am just trying to
9	giving you the benefit of your evidence but I	9	find the reference. Never mind. I will just
10	just want to break that down. Do you accept	10	clarify that later if necessary. Just moving
11	that you agreed to rationalise the charges	11	on, just to give you a chance to respond to
12	down?	12	the Attorney General's position, what is your
13	A. That was in our mind anyway, so there	13	response to his evidence that the agreement
14	was no need to agree to that course of action.	14	to rationalise the charges and resolve the
15	Q. Did you or Mr McGrail agree to resolve	15	ownership issue and then meet him before
16	the ownership issue?	16	taking any further steps was clear beyond
17	A. That was something that we were trying	17	peradventure? That is his position. What is
18 19	to address and had been trying to address for	18 19	your response to that?
20	quite some considerable time, again, so it	20	A. First, I had to look up the word "peradventure". I was puzzled by that,
20	was nothing that we weren't already considering.	20 21	because at that stage we had met with the
22	Q. Then you say you do not recall an	22	DPP on 3 March, we had explained our
23	agreement that the RGP would not take any	23	concerns about Mr Levy's status and what we
24	further action until those two things had been	24	thought. We'd followed it up with an NDM
25	done. When you say you do not recall an	25	assessment and the charging advice report on
		-	assessment and the charging autice report on
	Page 66		Page 68
			17 (Pages 65 to 68)

1 April. He had yet to respond to that, so we 1 meeting at paragraph 24. A 1429. You say 2 2 did not know at that point what the DPP's as follows: "In conclusion, JL was 3 advice was, bearing in mind that from my 3 considered a person of interest by April 4 4 2019. In February 2020 I decided he might perspective we'd never consulted with the 5 AG. I was waiting for advice from the DPP, 5 be a suspect. After a review of the evidence 6 which is normal in these cases, and the DPP's 6 the DPP confirmed he was a suspect during 7 advice came the following day on 8 April. 7 the video conference call on 8 April 2020." 8 8 Sorry, on 7 April. Or was it 8 April? What is your best recollection as to exactly 9 Q. Yes, yes. you say: "For me to have 9 what the DPP said about whether or not Mr 10 proceeded to obtain a warrant and continued 10 Levy was a suspect? 11 11 with an investigation against the express A. It is as recorded in my daybook that we 12 instructions of the Attorney General would 12 have just referred to. 13 have been unthinkable." Can you explain 13 Q. When you say that he considered Mr 14 why you say that it would have been 14 Levy a suspect, what you mean is that he said 15 15 "reasonable grounds to question, would be a unthinkable? 16 16 A. If the Attorney General had advised the lingering doubt otherwise, obligation to 17 17 Commissioner of Police and/or a senior interview under caution." 18 police officer not to do this, for that police 18 A. Yes, but you need to read that in concert 19 19 officer to have gone ahead and done it, it with the paragraph above. 20 20 would have ended his career. Q. In your notes. 21 Q. You also say that had such an agreement 21 A. Yes. 22 been reached you would have made a record 22 Q. "Re conspiracy to defraud charges, there 23 of it either at the time or once you returned to 23 is sufficient evidence to lead a jury to a 24 24 realistic prospect of conviction." Is that a your office. 25 25 A. That is correct. reference to Mr Levy alone? Page 69 Page 71 1 Q. But it is right to point out that that note in 1 A. No, it is a reference to the investigation 2 your daybook is not a note that is made on 2 and the conspiracy to defraud charges which 3 3 the same day or shortly after that meeting. It included an allegation at that point that Mr 4 was made some time later. 4 Levy was involved as well. 5 5 Q. Why then is there the need for the A. That is correct. 6 Q. Can we now turn to the meeting with the 6 separate reference to Mr Levy below? 7 7 DPP on 8 April 2020. That is C 1783, A. Because that was specifically with -- All 8 8 please. It is in your daybook. the other people had been arrested and 9 9 A. Yes, I'm looking for it. Yes, I have it. interviewed and their property had been 10 10 Q. It says just above two-thirds of the way searched. This point in the investigation -11 down: "Re JL. Reasonable grounds to 11 and that was a year before that. At this point 12 question. Would be a lingering doubt 12 in the investigation we were at the point of 13 otherwise. Obligation to interview under 13 taking action with regards to Mr Levy, and so caution." Who said that? 14 14 there's a specific section there on the need to 15 15 intervene with him. A. The DPP. Q. And what did you understand the DPP to 16 16 Q. Now, would you agree with the Chief 17 17 mean by "would be a lingering doubt Minister's suggestion that he has made 18 18 subsequently that the question of whether Mr otherwise"? 19 19 A. That if we hadn't gone through that Levy should be a suspect was, to use his 20 20 word, borderline for you and the DPP? process of intervening or interviewing Mr 21 21 Levy of seeking his account and not A. No, I wouldn't say it was borderline. 22 22 proceeded with that, there would always be a Q. Why not? 23 lingering doubt as to what the level of his 23 A. Well, I'm not sure what evidence the 24 24 involvement was. Chief Minister has seen but I have seen a 25 25 Q. In your statement you deal with this considerable amount of evidence which Page 70 Page 72

1	suggested that there were reasonable grounds	1	face-to-face meeting, although, having said
2	to suspect that Mr Levy had committed an	2	that, we had met with the AG in real life the
3	offence and therefore my understanding at	3	day before, so it wasn't that unusual. It was
4	that time and the understanding of the team	4	unusual that we hadn't received the advice in
5	and in my view the opinion of the DPP was	5	writing, given that we had written and set out
6	that there was a reasonable ground and it	6	our case. And so I didn't know what
	wasn't a borderline ground, it was enough	7	conclusions the DPP was going to draw on
7		8	the work that we'd done so far. As I went
8 9	grounds to be able to seek a search warrant.  Q. Can we now look at your paragraph 41 of	9	through the meeting, and I can see that it
10	your third witness statement, please. You	10	lasted for almost 20 minutes, there was some
11	say: "At the time of the application we did	11	
12	not know of any concerns on the part of	12	relief for my part as the SIO and from Mr Wyan as the OIC that the DPP had drawn the
13	either the DPP or AG. At the end of the	13	same conclusions as we had, and that was
14	video conference call on 8 April 2020 I	14	
15	remember the DPP confirming that he	15	what was foremost in my mind. The issue about whether to use a production order or a
16	understood our rationale for preferring a	16	search warrant was incidental to that. It
17	warrant to a production order. This was an	17	wasn't the main thing that stuck in my mind
	<u>*</u>	18	•
18 19	operational decision for the police. Although he would have opted for a production order	18	at that time and, as has been said, we considered those matters to be operational
20	rather than a warrant, whatever we chose he	20	matters and not for the DPP.
21	would back us. At that point the choice	21	Q. It also does not feature in Mr Wyan's
22	between a warrant and a production order	22	notes of the meeting. Do you know why it
	<u> •</u>	23	does not feature in his notes?
23	was secondary to the DPP agreeing that JL	1	
24 25	should be treated as a suspect and I did not	24 25	A. I hadn't seen Mr Wyan's notes until after
23	note this exchange." Would you agree that,	23	the event, so no. His notes are usually much
	Page 73		Page 75
1	even though you had not specifically sought	1	briefer than mine. It's also worth pointing
2	his advice on this matter, it was nevertheless	2	out, Mr Santos, that this isn't a minuted
3	an important exchange when the DPP gave	3	meeting. These are making notes as we are
4	his preference as to a production order over a	4	having a conversation, and so it is me making
5	search warrant?	5	a record of what I considered important at
6	Q. A. In retrospect, yes, I do.	6	that time, or not. Just what somebody had
7	Q. Your charging report and covering email	7	said. It's not an accurate record of everything
8	did not seek advice on the warrant, and you	8	that was said and discussed.
9	also say that it was not the practice to seek	9	Q. What was your reaction to the DPP's
10	advice on the warrant. How did it happen	10	comment that he would have opted or he
11	that the DPP nevertheless gave his views on	11	would have preferred a production order?
12	this issue?	12	A. I explained why we would prefer a search
13	A. I don't know why the DPP offered that	13	warrant and he had said he understood our
14	comment. It was at the very, very end of our	14	rationale, that we were police officers or that
15	conversation.	15	he wasn't a police officer and we weren't
16	Q. Can you please explain why your note of	16	lawyers and he understood our rationale for
17	that meeting in the daybook does not include	17	choosing one against the other.
18	a reference to the DPP's expression of a	18	Q. Did it make you pause and consider
19	preference for a production order rather than	19	whether a warrant was the better option, as
20	a search warrant?	20	opposed to a production order?
21	A. I've thought about this for some time and	21	A. I suppose it made us think about it at that
22	why I didn't record that. What I remember is	22	time, but our main consideration for choosing
23	that it was a strange way to take advice	23	a warrant as opposed to a production order
24	because it was during Covid, so we were	24	was that a production order in Gibraltar
25	holding a video conference as opposed to a	25	would have to be on notice.
	Page 74		Page 76
	Page 74		Page 76

1 Q. We will come to that, but a related but 1 at later stage. If we need to pull in Levy then 2 2 slightly different question: did it make you so be it." 3 3 think that you should take legal advice on the Can you just explain what is meant by those 4 4 last three lines. It may be clear to you but I question of going for a search warrant rather 5 than a production order, the fact that the DPP 5 just want it confirmed. 6 had expressed a preference for the latter? 6 A. Yes. A lot of times when I make notes I 7 7 am recording what people are saying, not A. No. 8 8 (11.55)what I was saying, obviously. My 9 9 recollection of this is that the DPP is saying Q. Can we go to B5506, please. This is the 10 10 timeline that you have referred to that you that there is no public interest grounds for not 11 11 prepared - sorry, I think if we can just rotate proceeding at this moment and the AG is in 12 this page, please, to avoid neck aches. Thank 12 agreement with me. If we don't, names may 13 you. This is the timeline that you referred to 13 come out at a later stage when the other 14 14 that you prepared, you say giving your best defendants would be charged. 15 15 answer, something around 22 May. I just Q. Sorry, names. Can I just, just to 16 16 want to look at a couple of entries. I think it specifically address that. Names? What 17 17 is materially the same as your day book but names are being referred to there? 18 just to focus on a couple of things. On the 18 A. He didn't specify what names would be 19 19 first page: referred to, but I am assuming that he is 20 20 "DPP had long chat with MZ. Pretty much referring to JL. 21 agreed they were very comfortable to run the 21 Q. Yes, just because he says names rather 22 22 case on the basis of summary of evidence than name that I just wanted to make ... 23 23 provided. No grounds at this stage to pull A. An intervention with JL may have 24 any prosecution. AG could speak to COP re 24 resulted in other names being subject to 25 25 public interest." investigation. Page 77 Page 79 1 Can you just explain what those last two 1 O. What other names? 2 lines are recording? 2 A. There was communication between Mr 3 3 A. Well, exactly what it says, Mr Santos, Levy and the Chief Minister that we only had 4 that the AG - the AG - the DPP ad said that 4 a very small snapshot of what was being said. 5 5 he had considered the matter with Mark Q. Then the final line: 6 Zammit, Crown Counsel Mark Zammit, and 6 "If we need to pull in Levy then so be it." 7 7 What does he mean by pull in Levy? he explained that they were very comfortable 8 8 in running the case, and that there were no A. I think that's a reference to the NDM 9 9 grounds at that stage to pull the case in public where we said that there would be no 10 10 interest. It is one of his functions, is to necessity to arrest Mr Levy if we could 11 11 proceed with a voluntary interview, determine whether there is a realistic 12 prospect of conviction or whether it is in the 12 attendance by voluntary interview at a police 13 public interest to proceed. So he was giving 13 station, which is what we had intended to do. 14 an opinion that there was no grounds to pull 14 Q. Can we turn to B3681, please. This is an 15 15 the prosecution at this stage and that the email from you to Superintendent Wyan, 16 16 Attorney General could speak to the saying: 17 17 Commissioner of Police re public interest. "Please check for accuracy and revert." 18 18 Q. Thank you. Then over the page there is a That is your note of 8 April 2020. Again, it 19 19 similar reference when discussing JL, just at seems that it is the same in substance as the 20 20 entry in your day book which we have the bottom: 21 21 "JL needs looking at. Ownership may not be already seen. Was the day book entry 22 critical but may direct who is charged and 22 contemporaneous --23 23 with what. Agrees completely let's drill A. Yes, it was. 24 down into this. Public interest not pulling. 24 Q. ... the same day? 25 AG in full agreement. Names may come out 25 A. And it was for that reason that I didn't Page 78 Page 80

1	have written down that last comment about	1	and we will back you whichever route that
2	the preference of a production order to a	2	you take."
3	search warrant.	3	Q. Can we now turn to Mr McGrail's
4	Q. If that is the case, fan I just ask why you	4	statement. It is bundle A, page 7, paragraph
5	sent this version to Mr Wyan for accuracy on	5	23. He refers to the NDM. He says he did so
6	21 April, to check it for accuracy on 21	6	because of the sensitivities attached to this
7	A. It's dated 8 April.	7	particular case. It included the investigating
8	Q. Sorry the email is dated 21 April 2020.	8	team's assessment of JL's suspected criminal
9	So you, on 21April 2020, are sending to Mr	9	activity and how they intended to address
10	Wyan:	10	him.
11	"Please check for accuracy and revert,"	11	
12	and then you set out your note of 8 April	12	"Based on the information provided by Superintendent Richardson I concurred with
13	2020.	13	his approach but asked him by return email
14	A. I can't be certain. This is a briefing note	14	to engage with the DPP to ensure the team's
15	for the Commissioner. Perhaps the	15	assessment was correct. I understand that
16	Commissioner asked me to produce a record	16	Superintendent Richardson did in fact
17	of that advice, and I produced my record of	17	communicate with the DPP, who confirmed
18	the meeting and asked Mr Wyan to check it	18	that JL was to be treated as a suspect.
19	against his own notes - I hadn't seen his own	19	Furthermore, that he would not advise on the
20	notes at that stage.	20	team's intended course of action as this was
20	Q. Just sticking to the 8 April meeting, Mr	20	purely an operational matter for the RGP to
22	McGrail was not at that meeting - correct?	22	decide upon, but that he would defend the
23	A. That is correct.	23	actions if and when it was needed to.
24	Q. Did you report back to him about that	24	Superintendent Richardson will no doubt be
25	meeting?	25	able to corroborate this. The way persons
23	meeting?	23	able to corroborate this. The way persons
	Page 81		Page 83
1	A. Yes, I did.	1	who are suspected of having committed a
2	Q. What exactly did you report back to him?	2	criminal offence are dealt with is enshrined,"
3	A. I would imagine the contents of that - the	3	etc etc etc. There is no reference there to the
4	briefing note that is there is pretty much the	4	DPP's preference, would you accept?
5	same as what is in my day book. I would	5	A. Yes, I accept that there is no reference
6	have explained what I have explained here	6	there.
7	today.	7	Q. Is that because you explained only what
8	Q. Did you report back the DPP's preference	8	he then sets out in 23 and did not refer to the
9	for a production order rather than a search	9	preference?
10	warrant?	10	A. I can't say why Mr McGrail chose to
11	A. I cannot be certain whether I did or	11	write those words in that way.
12	whether I didn't.	12	Q. Can we go to bundle C, page 1784,
13	Q. Would you not agree that that is quite an	13	please. Halfway down there is a record of a
14	important thing to report to the	14	call between you and the DPP, it says on 20
15	Commissioner of Police if the DPP expresses	15	April 2020. It appears, but please correct me
16	a preference for a production order rather	16	- I will let you read it actually. (Pause) Yes.
17	than a search warrant?	17	It seems to be a conversation about the
18	A. It is important if it was explained in a	18	impact of Covid restrictions on the
19	way that added importance to it. It was	19	Magistrates' Court procedures. Then four
20	almost - at the end of that conversation the	20	lines from the bottom there is a sentence -
21	DPP said: "The only thing that we would do	21	actually it starts on the preceding line but I
22	different is we would choose a production	22	just wanted to check whether we have read it
23	order over a search warrant, but we are not	23	correctly. I think it says:
24	police officers and you are not lawyers and	24	"Still waiting for JL to be processed and US
25	this is an operational decision for the police	25	inc."
	D 02		D 04
	Page 82		Page 84
			21 (Pages 81 to 84)

## A. That is correct. 1 on the first line: 2 2 Q. Can you just please explain what that "The intention of this report is to consider the 3 3 options available when dealing with Mr means? 4 4 Heine Levy in respect of Operation Delhi." A. This conversation was with regard to the 5 Delhi defendants being on bail and their bail 5 Did you discuss this report with Mr Wyan? 6 being extended, and that if we were pushed 6 A. I would imagine I did, yes. 7 in a position where we would have to charge 7 Q. There is no entry in your day book as to 8 8 those people without dealing with Mr Levy, any discussion of this document with Mr 9 who the action was still pending, it is setting 9 Wyan. Would you expect there to be one? 10 out what our position would be: that we were 10 A. Not necessarily. I had many 11 11 still waiting for Mr Levy to be processed, conversations with Mr Wyan on a daily 12 there were enquiries in the United States, 12 basis. 13 there was an international letter of request 13 Q. Just turning to some of the detail of this, 14 14 that had been processed, and the effect on paragraph 4 says: 15 15 those outcomes was uncertain. Our position "Whilst there has been a substantial time 16 16 was that we were ready to charge, that Covid since the alleged offences took place there is 17 17 came along and whatever interview of JL is still a requirement to seize the digital 18 needed, the US evidence had been delayed 18 devices. Given that we suspect that an 19 and it was delayed considerably because of 19 offence may have been committed and in 20 20 the Covid crisis and the need for social order to prevent loss/destruction of evidence 21 distancing, and it would be senseless to 21 we would ideally secure the evidence in situ 22 22 and without giving Mr Levy prior notice of charge at this time. 23 23 Q. When you say you were ready to charge, our intent." 24 24 do you mean in respect of the other suspects Is Mr Wyan referring there to a search 25 25 or do you also include JL within that -warrant effectively? Page 85 Page 87 1 A. No, no, this is in relation to the other 1 A. I would imagine so, ves. 2 2 Q. Did you agree with this assessment by Mr suspects. 3 3 Q. Can we now turn to B3277, please. This Wyan? 4 is an email from Superintendent Wyan to you 4 A. Yes, I did. 5 5 Q. Then paragraph 5 says: saying - actually Detective Inspector at that 6 6 "On arrival at the premises we would 7 7 therefore seek in the first instance to be "Sir, as requested, please see attached report 8 granted access to the relevant devices 8 in relation to options for interviewing Mr 9 9 Levy. Kind regards, Mark." without the use of a warrant. A warrant 10 10 That email is to you and nobody else. Then would only require execution where 11 cooperation was not offered." 11 over the page there is what you were 12 referring to before, the fact that it is 12 So do you mean there that you would ask for 13 addressed to the Commissioner of Police, 13 a voluntary handover of the devices, or that 14 that does not necessarily mean that it went to 14 you would ask for a voluntary search? 15 the Commissioner of Police. Do you know 15 A. It's Mr Wyan's report so --16 16 whether this document was seen by Mr Q. Sorry. 17 17 McGrail? A. ... he is telling me that when we arrive at 18 A. I couldn't say. If it was, it would 18 the premises armed with a warrant, that we 19 19 probably have been by email so there would would seek the cooperation of Mr Levy to 20 20 be a trace of it. hand over the items voluntarily, in which 21 21 Q. Do you know whether this was sent by case there would be no need to execute the 22 Mr Wyan or you to the DPP? 22 search warrant. In fact that is what 23 A. No, I don't know. 23 happened. Q. Did you discuss the options - we refer to 24 24 Q. Presumably you agreed with this 25 this as the options report just because it says 25 proposal. Page 86 Page 88

1	A. Yes, I did.	1	A. Because we feared that there was a
2	Q. Now, can we go to paragraphs 15 and 16.	2	reasonable chance of losing evidence if we
3	This is one of the options that is put forward,	3	proceeded on notice.
4	request Mr Levy attend NMH, and it says the	4	Q. Mr Wyan states:
5	following:	5	"We are in the process of starting to draft
6	"Mr Levy could be requested to attend the	6	schedule 1 warrants."
7	police station. In doing so he could be asked	7	Who was the person actually drafting the
8	to bring any devices for analysis and to	8	who was the person actuarry drafting the warrants?
9	submit to an interview. However, this would	9	A. I think he would be referring to his team.
10	notify Mr Levy of our intentions and would	10	Q. Then he says:
11	thereby risk a loss of evidence. This would	11	"When you get a moment I would like to
12	be contrary to the way we have dealt with the	12	discuss which lawyer we would be
13	other suspects, although we could argue that	13	instructing. It is unlikely we could use a
14	given the amount of time he will be well	14	lawyer from the OCPL."
15	aware of the arrests and of the police	15	Sorry, I should have read the preceding
16	investigation."	16	sentence:
17	Did you agree with this argument that he	17	"At this stage we need to consider putting the
18	refers to?	18	safeguards in place in order to deal with
19	A. I am not sure if I agreed with it at the	19	legally privileged material."
20	time. I can tell you now that reading it now I	20	Had you by that point already agreed that
21	don't agree with that line and I don't know	21	you would instruct a lawyer?
22	whether he qualifies it further in that	22	A. It indicates that we had agreed that that
23	document.	23	was necessary, yes.
24	Q. I think it is fair to say at that paragraph 18	24	Q. Then just up from there, we can see a
25	he says:	25	response:
23	ne says.	23	response.
	Page 89		Page 91
1	"In my view we should approach Mr Levy at	1	"Mark, happy to discuss this afternoon,"
2	work,"	2	on the same day, 23 April. What was
3	so he ultimately opts against, I think it is fair	3	decided in terms of which lawyer you would
4	to say, that approach. But can I just ask this:	4	be discussing and - sorry, that: what was
5	given that that argument had been raised with	5	decided in terms of which lawyer you would
6	you, do you know why it was not included as	6	be discussing?
7	a potential counter-argument in the	7	A. I am just looking in my day book entry.
8	information that was ultimately put before	8	There is no entry for that date. From
9	the magistrate?	9	recollection and I seem to remember that
10	A. I do not.	10	there was an exchange of emails between
11	Q. Can we go to 3283, please. Sorry, just on	11	myself and Mr Wyan about this subject.
12	the preceding page we can see that this is an	12	From recollection, I think that we decided to
13	email from Mr Wyan to you on 23 April, and	13	leave it until we attended Hassans and put
14	it says:	14	that question to Mr Levy and allow him to
15	"Sir, we are in the process of starting to draft	15	make that decision.
16	schedule 1 warrants in respect of Levy."	16	Q. I will take you, to be fair to you, to the
17	So he by then appears to have been	17	subsequent emails. There is 3285, 30 April.
18	proceeding on the basis that the RGP would	18	This is- again just to show you the top, 30
19	seek a warrant. Did you approve that?	19	April at 5.29, and the bit in red:
20	A. Yes.	20	"All going well. The above should be all
21	Q. I think you have already referred to this	21	ready next week. This still leaves two
22	but just to give you the opportunity to give	22	problems: (1) we have no lawyer to review
23	the fullest explanation you want to give, why	23	the privileged material. I would suggest that
24	did you and Mr Wyan ultimately decide to	24	we contact the DPP to see whether
25	proceed with a warrant?	25	instructing/contacting a lawyer is a viable
	Decc 00		Dagg 02
	Page 90		Page 92

1		1	A That :
1	option,"	1	A. That is correct.
2	and then a chaser, I think on 4 May, above	2	Q. Turning to consider the information itself,
3	this:	3	but just your evidence in relation to it is at
4	"Grateful if you could please consider the	4	A1290 in 18(b). In response to the question
5	issues raised in my previous email below in	5	by the Inquiry:
6	respect of the Levy search warrant. With	6	"What documents, including applications,
7	your permission"	7	witness statements, exhibits, correspondence
8	MALE SPEAKER: I think, Mr Santos, you	8	and written submissions were relied on when
9	missed out the word "local" in referring to a	9	apply for the search warrants?"
10	lawyer, which I think is quite important	10	you say:
11	context.	11	"There was a single information which I
12	MR SANTOS: Thank you. Just to re-read	12	believe was drafted by Mr Wyan and which I
13	(1):	13	had approved. I think he had used the
14	"We have no lawyer to review the privileged	14	charging report as the basis for the
15	material. I would suggest that we contact the	15	information. I cannot remember whether
16	DPP to see whether instructing or contacting	16	there were any documents appended to the
17	a local lawyer is a viable option."	17	information. The warrant application was
18	Thank you for that clarification. Then a	18	signed by Sergeant Paul Clarke and approved
19	chaser:	19	by Detective Inspector Craig Goldwin of the
20	"Grateful if you could please consider the	20	RGP Money Laundering Investigation Unit.
21	issues raised in my previous email below in	21	This was because Mr Wyan was on leave on
22	respect of the Levy search warrant. With	22	the day of the application of the warrants."
23	your permission I would like to write to the	23	Then you say at paragraph 26 of your third
24	DPP and ask whether he would have an issue	24	statement, sorry, A1430, you say the
25	instructing a local lawyer for privileged	25	following at 26:
	Page 93		Page 95
1	material."	1	
1		1 2	"I do not remember seeing and approving the
2	Did you or Mr Wyan then contact the DPP	2	application before it was submitted to the
2 3	Did you or Mr Wyan then contact the DPP about this?	2 3	application before it was submitted to the Magistrates' Court. I knew it was likely to be
2 3 4	Did you or Mr Wyan then contact the DPP about this?  A. I don't know if we wrote to the DPP. My	2 3 4	application before it was submitted to the Magistrates' Court. I knew it was likely to be based on Mr Wyan's summary of evidence
2 3 4 5	Did you or Mr Wyan then contact the DPP about this?  A. I don't know if we wrote to the DPP. My recollection is that it would have been	2 3 4 5	application before it was submitted to the Magistrates' Court. I knew it was likely to be based on Mr Wyan's summary of evidence relating to JL which he and I had considered
2 3 4 5 6	Did you or Mr Wyan then contact the DPP about this?  A. I don't know if we wrote to the DPP. My recollection is that it would have been discussed and we agreed that we would	2 3 4 5 6	application before it was submitted to the Magistrates' Court. I knew it was likely to be based on Mr Wyan's summary of evidence relating to JL which he and I had considered in detail with the DPP on 8 April 2020. At
2 3 4 5 6 7	Did you or Mr Wyan then contact the DPP about this?  A. I don't know if we wrote to the DPP. My recollection is that it would have been discussed and we agreed that we would consult with Mr Levy to see what preference	2 3 4 5 6 7	application before it was submitted to the Magistrates' Court. I knew it was likely to be based on Mr Wyan's summary of evidence relating to JL which he and I had considered in detail with the DPP on 8 April 2020. At paragraph 44 of his statement dated 21
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Did you or Mr Wyan then contact the DPP about this?  A. I don't know if we wrote to the DPP. My recollection is that it would have been discussed and we agreed that we would consult with Mr Levy to see what preference he had. In fact this is what is recorded on the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	application before it was submitted to the Magistrates' Court. I knew it was likely to be based on Mr Wyan's summary of evidence relating to JL which he and I had considered in detail with the DPP on 8 April 2020. At paragraph 44 of his statement dated 21 November 2022 Mr Wyan confirms that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Did you or Mr Wyan then contact the DPP about this?  A. I don't know if we wrote to the DPP. My recollection is that it would have been discussed and we agreed that we would consult with Mr Levy to see what preference he had. In fact this is what is recorded on the body worn camera footage at that meeting.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	application before it was submitted to the Magistrates' Court. I knew it was likely to be based on Mr Wyan's summary of evidence relating to JL which he and I had considered in detail with the DPP on 8 April 2020. At paragraph 44 of his statement dated 21 November 2022 Mr Wyan confirms that Detective Constable Clarke produced a 38
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Did you or Mr Wyan then contact the DPP about this?  A. I don't know if we wrote to the DPP. My recollection is that it would have been discussed and we agreed that we would consult with Mr Levy to see what preference he had. In fact this is what is recorded on the body worn camera footage at that meeting.  Q. Can we now turn to the warrant	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	application before it was submitted to the Magistrates' Court. I knew it was likely to be based on Mr Wyan's summary of evidence relating to JL which he and I had considered in detail with the DPP on 8 April 2020. At paragraph 44 of his statement dated 21 November 2022 Mr Wyan confirms that Detective Constable Clarke produced a 38 page information document in support of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Did you or Mr Wyan then contact the DPP about this?  A. I don't know if we wrote to the DPP. My recollection is that it would have been discussed and we agreed that we would consult with Mr Levy to see what preference he had. In fact this is what is recorded on the body worn camera footage at that meeting.  Q. Can we now turn to the warrant applications. If we go to your third witness	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	application before it was submitted to the Magistrates' Court. I knew it was likely to be based on Mr Wyan's summary of evidence relating to JL which he and I had considered in detail with the DPP on 8 April 2020. At paragraph 44 of his statement dated 21 November 2022 Mr Wyan confirms that Detective Constable Clarke produced a 38 page information document in support of the application."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Did you or Mr Wyan then contact the DPP about this?  A. I don't know if we wrote to the DPP. My recollection is that it would have been discussed and we agreed that we would consult with Mr Levy to see what preference he had. In fact this is what is recorded on the body worn camera footage at that meeting.  Q. Can we now turn to the warrant applications. If we go to your third witness statement, paragraph 34, A1431, you say:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	application before it was submitted to the Magistrates' Court. I knew it was likely to be based on Mr Wyan's summary of evidence relating to JL which he and I had considered in detail with the DPP on 8 April 2020. At paragraph 44 of his statement dated 21 November 2022 Mr Wyan confirms that Detective Constable Clarke produced a 38 page information document in support of the application."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Did you or Mr Wyan then contact the DPP about this?  A. I don't know if we wrote to the DPP. My recollection is that it would have been discussed and we agreed that we would consult with Mr Levy to see what preference he had. In fact this is what is recorded on the body worn camera footage at that meeting.  Q. Can we now turn to the warrant applications. If we go to your third witness statement, paragraph 34, A1431, you say:  "I remember also discussing the execution of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	application before it was submitted to the Magistrates' Court. I knew it was likely to be based on Mr Wyan's summary of evidence relating to JL which he and I had considered in detail with the DPP on 8 April 2020. At paragraph 44 of his statement dated 21 November 2022 Mr Wyan confirms that Detective Constable Clarke produced a 38 page information document in support of the application."  So are we to take it that your second statement is the more accurate of those two
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Did you or Mr Wyan then contact the DPP about this?  A. I don't know if we wrote to the DPP. My recollection is that it would have been discussed and we agreed that we would consult with Mr Levy to see what preference he had. In fact this is what is recorded on the body worn camera footage at that meeting.  Q. Can we now turn to the warrant applications. If we go to your third witness statement, paragraph 34, A1431, you say:  "I remember also discussing the execution of the search warrant at Hassans with Mr	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	application before it was submitted to the Magistrates' Court. I knew it was likely to be based on Mr Wyan's summary of evidence relating to JL which he and I had considered in detail with the DPP on 8 April 2020. At paragraph 44 of his statement dated 21 November 2022 Mr Wyan confirms that Detective Constable Clarke produced a 38 page information document in support of the application."  So are we to take it that your second statement is the more accurate of those two accounts, in that you did not approve the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Did you or Mr Wyan then contact the DPP about this?  A. I don't know if we wrote to the DPP. My recollection is that it would have been discussed and we agreed that we would consult with Mr Levy to see what preference he had. In fact this is what is recorded on the body worn camera footage at that meeting.  Q. Can we now turn to the warrant applications. If we go to your third witness statement, paragraph 34, A1431, you say:  "I remember also discussing the execution of the search warrant at Hassans with Mr McGrail. He said that the execution should	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	application before it was submitted to the Magistrates' Court. I knew it was likely to be based on Mr Wyan's summary of evidence relating to JL which he and I had considered in detail with the DPP on 8 April 2020. At paragraph 44 of his statement dated 21 November 2022 Mr Wyan confirms that Detective Constable Clarke produced a 38 page information document in support of the application."  So are we to take it that your second statement is the more accurate of those two accounts, in that you did not approve the information?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Did you or Mr Wyan then contact the DPP about this?  A. I don't know if we wrote to the DPP. My recollection is that it would have been discussed and we agreed that we would consult with Mr Levy to see what preference he had. In fact this is what is recorded on the body worn camera footage at that meeting.  Q. Can we now turn to the warrant applications. If we go to your third witness statement, paragraph 34, A1431, you say:  "I remember also discussing the execution of the search warrant at Hassans with Mr McGrail. He said that the execution should be kept secret as far as possible until the last	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	application before it was submitted to the Magistrates' Court. I knew it was likely to be based on Mr Wyan's summary of evidence relating to JL which he and I had considered in detail with the DPP on 8 April 2020. At paragraph 44 of his statement dated 21 November 2022 Mr Wyan confirms that Detective Constable Clarke produced a 38 page information document in support of the application."  So are we to take it that your second statement is the more accurate of those two accounts, in that you did not approve the information?  A. I am sorry, I don't understand what the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Did you or Mr Wyan then contact the DPP about this?  A. I don't know if we wrote to the DPP. My recollection is that it would have been discussed and we agreed that we would consult with Mr Levy to see what preference he had. In fact this is what is recorded on the body worn camera footage at that meeting.  Q. Can we now turn to the warrant applications. If we go to your third witness statement, paragraph 34, A1431, you say:  "I remember also discussing the execution of the search warrant at Hassans with Mr McGrail. He said that the execution should be kept secret as far as possible until the last minute to protect the operational security of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	application before it was submitted to the Magistrates' Court. I knew it was likely to be based on Mr Wyan's summary of evidence relating to JL which he and I had considered in detail with the DPP on 8 April 2020. At paragraph 44 of his statement dated 21 November 2022 Mr Wyan confirms that Detective Constable Clarke produced a 38 page information document in support of the application."  So are we to take it that your second statement is the more accurate of those two accounts, in that you did not approve the information?  A. I am sorry, I don't understand what the difference is between one and the other.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Did you or Mr Wyan then contact the DPP about this?  A. I don't know if we wrote to the DPP. My recollection is that it would have been discussed and we agreed that we would consult with Mr Levy to see what preference he had. In fact this is what is recorded on the body worn camera footage at that meeting.  Q. Can we now turn to the warrant applications. If we go to your third witness statement, paragraph 34, A1431, you say: "I remember also discussing the execution of the search warrant at Hassans with Mr McGrail. He said that the execution should be kept secret as far as possible until the last minute to protect the operational security of the investigation. He also suggested that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	application before it was submitted to the Magistrates' Court. I knew it was likely to be based on Mr Wyan's summary of evidence relating to JL which he and I had considered in detail with the DPP on 8 April 2020. At paragraph 44 of his statement dated 21 November 2022 Mr Wyan confirms that Detective Constable Clarke produced a 38 page information document in support of the application."  So are we to take it that your second statement is the more accurate of those two accounts, in that you did not approve the information?  A. I am sorry, I don't understand what the difference is between one and the other.  Q. Sorry. It is just because paragraph 18(b)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Did you or Mr Wyan then contact the DPP about this?  A. I don't know if we wrote to the DPP. My recollection is that it would have been discussed and we agreed that we would consult with Mr Levy to see what preference he had. In fact this is what is recorded on the body worn camera footage at that meeting.  Q. Can we now turn to the warrant applications. If we go to your third witness statement, paragraph 34, A1431, you say:  "I remember also discussing the execution of the search warrant at Hassans with Mr McGrail. He said that the execution should be kept secret as far as possible until the last minute to protect the operational security of the investigation. He also suggested that body worn footage should be taken at	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	application before it was submitted to the Magistrates' Court. I knew it was likely to be based on Mr Wyan's summary of evidence relating to JL which he and I had considered in detail with the DPP on 8 April 2020. At paragraph 44 of his statement dated 21 November 2022 Mr Wyan confirms that Detective Constable Clarke produced a 38 page information document in support of the application."  So are we to take it that your second statement is the more accurate of those two accounts, in that you did not approve the information?  A. I am sorry, I don't understand what the difference is between one and the other.  Q. Sorry. It is just because paragraph 18(b) on 1290 you said - sorry, I should have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Did you or Mr Wyan then contact the DPP about this?  A. I don't know if we wrote to the DPP. My recollection is that it would have been discussed and we agreed that we would consult with Mr Levy to see what preference he had. In fact this is what is recorded on the body worn camera footage at that meeting.  Q. Can we now turn to the warrant applications. If we go to your third witness statement, paragraph 34, A1431, you say: "I remember also discussing the execution of the search warrant at Hassans with Mr McGrail. He said that the execution should be kept secret as far as possible until the last minute to protect the operational security of the investigation. He also suggested that body worn footage should be taken at Hassans to prevent any misunderstandings.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	application before it was submitted to the Magistrates' Court. I knew it was likely to be based on Mr Wyan's summary of evidence relating to JL which he and I had considered in detail with the DPP on 8 April 2020. At paragraph 44 of his statement dated 21 November 2022 Mr Wyan confirms that Detective Constable Clarke produced a 38 page information document in support of the application."  So are we to take it that your second statement is the more accurate of those two accounts, in that you did not approve the information?  A. I am sorry, I don't understand what the difference is between one and the other.  Q. Sorry. It is just because paragraph 18(b) on 1290 you said - sorry, I should have pointed this out to you:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Did you or Mr Wyan then contact the DPP about this?  A. I don't know if we wrote to the DPP. My recollection is that it would have been discussed and we agreed that we would consult with Mr Levy to see what preference he had. In fact this is what is recorded on the body worn camera footage at that meeting.  Q. Can we now turn to the warrant applications. If we go to your third witness statement, paragraph 34, A1431, you say: "I remember also discussing the execution of the search warrant at Hassans with Mr McGrail. He said that the execution should be kept secret as far as possible until the last minute to protect the operational security of the investigation. He also suggested that body worn footage should be taken at Hassans to prevent any misunderstandings. He advised making the application to the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	application before it was submitted to the Magistrates' Court. I knew it was likely to be based on Mr Wyan's summary of evidence relating to JL which he and I had considered in detail with the DPP on 8 April 2020. At paragraph 44 of his statement dated 21 November 2022 Mr Wyan confirms that Detective Constable Clarke produced a 38 page information document in support of the application."  So are we to take it that your second statement is the more accurate of those two accounts, in that you did not approve the information?  A. I am sorry, I don't understand what the difference is between one and the other.  Q. Sorry. It is just because paragraph 18(b) on 1290 you said - sorry, I should have pointed this out to you:  "There was a single information which I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Did you or Mr Wyan then contact the DPP about this?  A. I don't know if we wrote to the DPP. My recollection is that it would have been discussed and we agreed that we would consult with Mr Levy to see what preference he had. In fact this is what is recorded on the body worn camera footage at that meeting.  Q. Can we now turn to the warrant applications. If we go to your third witness statement, paragraph 34, A1431, you say: "I remember also discussing the execution of the search warrant at Hassans with Mr McGrail. He said that the execution should be kept secret as far as possible until the last minute to protect the operational security of the investigation. He also suggested that body worn footage should be taken at Hassans to prevent any misunderstandings. He advised making the application to the Supreme Court."	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	application before it was submitted to the Magistrates' Court. I knew it was likely to be based on Mr Wyan's summary of evidence relating to JL which he and I had considered in detail with the DPP on 8 April 2020. At paragraph 44 of his statement dated 21 November 2022 Mr Wyan confirms that Detective Constable Clarke produced a 38 page information document in support of the application."  So are we to take it that your second statement is the more accurate of those two accounts, in that you did not approve the information?  A. I am sorry, I don't understand what the difference is between one and the other.  Q. Sorry. It is just because paragraph 18(b) on 1290 you said - sorry, I should have pointed this out to you:  "There was a single information which I believe was drafted by
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Did you or Mr Wyan then contact the DPP about this?  A. I don't know if we wrote to the DPP. My recollection is that it would have been discussed and we agreed that we would consult with Mr Levy to see what preference he had. In fact this is what is recorded on the body worn camera footage at that meeting.  Q. Can we now turn to the warrant applications. If we go to your third witness statement, paragraph 34, A1431, you say: "I remember also discussing the execution of the search warrant at Hassans with Mr McGrail. He said that the execution should be kept secret as far as possible until the last minute to protect the operational security of the investigation. He also suggested that body worn footage should be taken at Hassans to prevent any misunderstandings. He advised making the application to the Supreme Court."  Now, you have already said that you do not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	application before it was submitted to the Magistrates' Court. I knew it was likely to be based on Mr Wyan's summary of evidence relating to JL which he and I had considered in detail with the DPP on 8 April 2020. At paragraph 44 of his statement dated 21 November 2022 Mr Wyan confirms that Detective Constable Clarke produced a 38 page information document in support of the application."  So are we to take it that your second statement is the more accurate of those two accounts, in that you did not approve the information?  A. I am sorry, I don't understand what the difference is between one and the other.  Q. Sorry. It is just because paragraph 18(b) on 1290 you said - sorry, I should have pointed this out to you:  "There was a single information which I believe was drafted by  A. Sorry, where are you? What
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Did you or Mr Wyan then contact the DPP about this?  A. I don't know if we wrote to the DPP. My recollection is that it would have been discussed and we agreed that we would consult with Mr Levy to see what preference he had. In fact this is what is recorded on the body worn camera footage at that meeting.  Q. Can we now turn to the warrant applications. If we go to your third witness statement, paragraph 34, A1431, you say:  "I remember also discussing the execution of the search warrant at Hassans with Mr McGrail. He said that the execution should be kept secret as far as possible until the last minute to protect the operational security of the investigation. He also suggested that body worn footage should be taken at Hassans to prevent any misunderstandings. He advised making the application to the Supreme Court."  Now, you have already said that you do not know why the decision was taken to go to the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	application before it was submitted to the Magistrates' Court. I knew it was likely to be based on Mr Wyan's summary of evidence relating to JL which he and I had considered in detail with the DPP on 8 April 2020. At paragraph 44 of his statement dated 21 November 2022 Mr Wyan confirms that Detective Constable Clarke produced a 38 page information document in support of the application."  So are we to take it that your second statement is the more accurate of those two accounts, in that you did not approve the information?  A. I am sorry, I don't understand what the difference is between one and the other.  Q. Sorry. It is just because paragraph 18(b) on 1290 you said - sorry, I should have pointed this out to you:  "There was a single information which I believe was drafted by  A. Sorry, where are you? What paragraph are you referring to?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Did you or Mr Wyan then contact the DPP about this?  A. I don't know if we wrote to the DPP. My recollection is that it would have been discussed and we agreed that we would consult with Mr Levy to see what preference he had. In fact this is what is recorded on the body worn camera footage at that meeting.  Q. Can we now turn to the warrant applications. If we go to your third witness statement, paragraph 34, A1431, you say: "I remember also discussing the execution of the search warrant at Hassans with Mr McGrail. He said that the execution should be kept secret as far as possible until the last minute to protect the operational security of the investigation. He also suggested that body worn footage should be taken at Hassans to prevent any misunderstandings. He advised making the application to the Supreme Court."  Now, you have already said that you do not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	application before it was submitted to the Magistrates' Court. I knew it was likely to be based on Mr Wyan's summary of evidence relating to JL which he and I had considered in detail with the DPP on 8 April 2020. At paragraph 44 of his statement dated 21 November 2022 Mr Wyan confirms that Detective Constable Clarke produced a 38 page information document in support of the application."  So are we to take it that your second statement is the more accurate of those two accounts, in that you did not approve the information?  A. I am sorry, I don't understand what the difference is between one and the other.  Q. Sorry. It is just because paragraph 18(b) on 1290 you said - sorry, I should have pointed this out to you:  "There was a single information which I believe was drafted by  A. Sorry, where are you? What
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Did you or Mr Wyan then contact the DPP about this?  A. I don't know if we wrote to the DPP. My recollection is that it would have been discussed and we agreed that we would consult with Mr Levy to see what preference he had. In fact this is what is recorded on the body worn camera footage at that meeting.  Q. Can we now turn to the warrant applications. If we go to your third witness statement, paragraph 34, A1431, you say:  "I remember also discussing the execution of the search warrant at Hassans with Mr McGrail. He said that the execution should be kept secret as far as possible until the last minute to protect the operational security of the investigation. He also suggested that body worn footage should be taken at Hassans to prevent any misunderstandings. He advised making the application to the Supreme Court."  Now, you have already said that you do not know why the decision was taken to go to the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	application before it was submitted to the Magistrates' Court. I knew it was likely to be based on Mr Wyan's summary of evidence relating to JL which he and I had considered in detail with the DPP on 8 April 2020. At paragraph 44 of his statement dated 21 November 2022 Mr Wyan confirms that Detective Constable Clarke produced a 38 page information document in support of the application."  So are we to take it that your second statement is the more accurate of those two accounts, in that you did not approve the information?  A. I am sorry, I don't understand what the difference is between one and the other.  Q. Sorry. It is just because paragraph 18(b) on 1290 you said - sorry, I should have pointed this out to you:  "There was a single information which I believe was drafted by  A. Sorry, where are you? What paragraph are you referring to?

1	A TTI- LL	,	
1	A. Uh-huh.	1	you still do not know why?
2 3	Q. "There was a single information which I believe was drafted by Mr Wyan and which I	$\begin{bmatrix} 2\\ 3 \end{bmatrix}$	A. I don't know with any certainty. From a vague recollection, it may have been that the
4	had approved."	4	advice was that these applications are made
5	I think in fairness to you this was drafted	5	before the magistrate and not before a judge.
_	before you had access to all of your papers.	6	I really do not know. I know that an
6	A. That is correct.		
7		7	appointment had been made with the
8	Q. Then you prepared your third statement	8	magistrate by the time that I was informed
9	where you say that in fact you did not - so if	9	that the appointment had been made and we
10	you go to your third statement, paragraph 26,	10	needed to go to court.
11	you say:	11 12	Q. Can we just go back to your 18(b) in
12	"I do not remember seeing and approving the	l .	Richardson - in your second statement,
13	application before it was submitted to the	13	please, which is on A1290. You say that you
14	Magistrates' Court. I knew it was likely to be	14	did not see Crown Counsel or counsel's
15	based on Mr Wyan's summary of evidence," and then the final two lines:	15	advice on the information. I think we have
16		16	established - well, I ask the question: is that
17	"Mr Wyan confirms that Detective Constable	17	typical RGP practice?
18	Clarke produced the information."	18	A. Sorry, where are you on the document?
19	Is that your evidence now, as opposed	19	Q. Sorry. 18(b).
20	A. Since the disclosure of the application -	20	A. Yes.
21	yes, since the disclosure of the information	21	Q. Sorry, 18(c):
22	for the application for the warrant, I also had	22	"Was Crown Counsel or external counsel
23	disclosure from the RGP and over this	23	instructed to address the court when seeking
24	weekend I saw that one of the documents that	24	the search warrant? If so, who was instructed
25	I had requested disclosure of has my	25	and how were they chosen.
	Page 97		Page 99
1	handwritten notes on it, so it is likely that I	1	"Counsel was not instructed."
2	saw that application, probably on the day that	2	Does that reflect typical RGP practice in
3	it was going to court because I had my	3	relation to the information seeking a warrant?
4	handwritten notes on it querying certain	4	A. It did at that time. I don't know if that
5	things there. So it is fair to say that I	5	position has changed.
6	approved as going for the application but	6	Q. Sorry, yes, at the time. Was the
7	probably had not had much time to consider	7	information as far as you were aware sent to
8	it before we went to court.	8	the DPP prior to the application being made?
9	Q. Does an application, an information of	9	A. Not as far as I was aware.
10	that nature, normally need to be signed off by	10	Q. Can we now turn to the information itself,
11	the SIO?	11	which is at B3243. The information at
12	A. No.	12	paragraph 319 says the following:
13	Q. No. Do you know whether Mr McGrail	13	"The above paragraphs demonstrate Levy
14	had seen or approved the application?	14	was involved in the plan to remove the
15	A. I don't think so.	15	NSCIS contract from Bland."
16	Q. You said earlier that you do not know	16	Do you agree that the evidence set out in the
17	why they went before the stipendiary	17	information supported that conclusion?
18	magistrate as opposed to the Chief Justice.	18	A. In retrospect perhaps it didn't go into
19	Now that you recognise that you saw the	19	enough detail on that in the application.
20	information did it occur to you that they were	20	Q. The basis is set out in (a) to (e). I will
21	going to the stipendiary magistrate as	21	just read those out:
22	opposed	22	"(a) Messages between Levy and Sanchez
23	A. Yes, yes.	23	show communication discussing moving the
24	Q. So then you were aware that they were	24	contract away from Bland in early 2018,
25	going - but you do not - is your evidence that	25	referring to paragraphs 45 to 47 above."
ĺ			
	Page 98		Page 100

1	Then:	1	then that is something we can deal with
2	"(b) Levy was instrumental in the creation of	2	afterwards, but do you agree - yes or no - that
3	36 North,"	3	this was sufficient evidence for your
4	and it sets out his ownership and the fact that	4	conclusion that there were reasonable
5	he injected a large sum of money, then:	5	grounds to suspect that Mr Levy knew about
6	"(c) He was using his influence with the	6	Mr Cornelio's sabotage, alleged sabotage?
7	Chief Minister to the advantage of 36 North.	7	A. I am sorry, Mr Santos, I can't answer that
8	"(d) He was regularly contacting both	8	question yes or no. I can tell you the
9	Cornelio and Perez in relation to 36 North	9	knowledge that I had and that the team had,
10	whilst they were still employed by Blands	10	had reasonable grounds to suspect it, but it
11	and following their resignation, referring to	11	may not be reflected in that information.
12	paragraph 61 to 89,"	12	Q. Is there anything that springs to mind that
13	and then:	13	is not referred to there?
14	"(e) Communications show he was aware of	14	A. Again it is difficult to explain that
15	the computer misuse offences committed by	15	because the seriousness of the impact on
16	Cornelio, paragraphs 99 to 100."	16	NSCIS is something that we are not allowed
17	Can I take you to those paragraphs, actually	17	to discuss.
18	to 98 which starts on 3218. Paragraph 98	18	Q. We can discuss that in private if you feel
19	says, and again we just have to bear in mind	19	the need to do so. I know that you are -
20	that there is something redacted for the same	20	sorry, I think that is all I have to ask about
21	reason, that:	21	that. Then if we can go to 322, which is on
22	"On 11 April 2019 Cornelio wrote to Levy:	22	B3244, here the information states that
23	'We are going to have a field day on the	23	material sought is not - can I just find that
24	national security report. Just wait until you	24	reference. Hang on. Yes, it is halfway down
25	see it. For now I am reviewing every single	25	the third paragraph:
	Page 101		Page 103
	module one by one "	1 1	"The material sought is not and does not
1 2	module one by one."  Then at 99:	1 2	"The material sought is not and does not
2	Then at 99:	2	contain any legal privileged material.
2 3	Then at 99: "On 19 October 2018 Cornelio wrote to Levy	2 3	contain any legal privileged material. However, it is understood legally privileged
2 3 4	Then at 99: "On 19 October 2018 Cornelio wrote to Levy saying: 'Morning, James. Very confidential	2 3 4	contain any legal privileged material.  However, it is understood legally privileged material may be present on digital devices
2 3 4 5	Then at 99: "On 19 October 2018 Cornelio wrote to Levy saying: 'Morning, James. Very confidential note. Gaggero has brought in a forensic team	2 3 4 5	contain any legal privileged material.  However, it is understood legally privileged material may be present on digital devices which will be seized."
2 3 4 5 6	Then at 99: "On 19 October 2018 Cornelio wrote to Levy saying: 'Morning, James. Very confidential note. Gaggero has brought in a forensic team of six to look at anything John and I may	2 3 4 5 6	contain any legal privileged material.  However, it is understood legally privileged material may be present on digital devices which will be seized."  Obviously I accept you are not a lawyer, but
2 3 4 5 6 7	Then at 99: "On 19 October 2018 Cornelio wrote to Levy saying: 'Morning, James. Very confidential note. Gaggero has brought in a forensic team of six to look at anything John and I may have done to tamper with the system, etc.	2 3 4 5 6 7	contain any legal privileged material.  However, it is understood legally privileged material may be present on digital devices which will be seized."  Obviously I accept you are not a lawyer, but what was your understanding of why the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Then at 99: "On 19 October 2018 Cornelio wrote to Levy saying: 'Morning, James. Very confidential note. Gaggero has brought in a forensic team of six to look at anything John and I may have done to tamper with the system, etc. Gaggero is going all out it seems."	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	contain any legal privileged material.  However, it is understood legally privileged material may be present on digital devices which will be seized."  Obviously I accept you are not a lawyer, but what was your understanding of why the material that was sought was not privileged?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Then at 99: "On 19 October 2018 Cornelio wrote to Levy saying: 'Morning, James. Very confidential note. Gaggero has brought in a forensic team of six to look at anything John and I may have done to tamper with the system, etc. Gaggero is going all out it seems." Then 100:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	contain any legal privileged material.  However, it is understood legally privileged material may be present on digital devices which will be seized."  Obviously I accept you are not a lawyer, but what was your understanding of why the material that was sought was not privileged?  A. Because we considered Mr Levy to be a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Then at 99: "On 19 October 2018 Cornelio wrote to Levy saying: 'Morning, James. Very confidential note. Gaggero has brought in a forensic team of six to look at anything John and I may have done to tamper with the system, etc. Gaggero is going all out it seems." Then 100: "On the same day Cornelio wrote to Perez	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	contain any legal privileged material.  However, it is understood legally privileged material may be present on digital devices which will be seized."  Obviously I accept you are not a lawyer, but what was your understanding of why the material that was sought was not privileged?  A. Because we considered Mr Levy to be a suspect in his own right and that he was not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Then at 99: "On 19 October 2018 Cornelio wrote to Levy saying: 'Morning, James. Very confidential note. Gaggero has brought in a forensic team of six to look at anything John and I may have done to tamper with the system, etc. Gaggero is going all out it seems." Then 100: "On the same day Cornelio wrote to Perez saying: 'Spoke to James ref forensic team	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	contain any legal privileged material.  However, it is understood legally privileged material may be present on digital devices which will be seized."  Obviously I accept you are not a lawyer, but what was your understanding of why the material that was sought was not privileged?  A. Because we considered Mr Levy to be a suspect in his own right and that he was not advising in a lawyer/client relationship the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Then at 99: "On 19 October 2018 Cornelio wrote to Levy saying: 'Morning, James. Very confidential note. Gaggero has brought in a forensic team of six to look at anything John and I may have done to tamper with the system, etc. Gaggero is going all out it seems." Then 100: "On the same day Cornelio wrote to Perez saying: 'Spoke to James ref forensic team confidentially. Spoke to him on the phone.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	contain any legal privileged material.  However, it is understood legally privileged material may be present on digital devices which will be seized."  Obviously I accept you are not a lawyer, but what was your understanding of why the material that was sought was not privileged?  A. Because we considered Mr Levy to be a suspect in his own right and that he was not advising in a lawyer/client relationship the other people suspected in 36 North. In fact
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Then at 99: "On 19 October 2018 Cornelio wrote to Levy saying: 'Morning, James. Very confidential note. Gaggero has brought in a forensic team of six to look at anything John and I may have done to tamper with the system, etc. Gaggero is going all out it seems." Then 100: "On the same day Cornelio wrote to Perez saying: 'Spoke to James ref forensic team confidentially. Spoke to him on the phone. Corne and I can discuss. He says not to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	contain any legal privileged material.  However, it is understood legally privileged material may be present on digital devices which will be seized."  Obviously I accept you are not a lawyer, but what was your understanding of why the material that was sought was not privileged?  A. Because we considered Mr Levy to be a suspect in his own right and that he was not advising in a lawyer/client relationship the other people suspected in 36 North. In fact this was the very first contact that I had had
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Then at 99: "On 19 October 2018 Cornelio wrote to Levy saying: 'Morning, James. Very confidential note. Gaggero has brought in a forensic team of six to look at anything John and I may have done to tamper with the system, etc. Gaggero is going all out it seems." Then 100: "On the same day Cornelio wrote to Perez saying: 'Spoke to James ref forensic team confidentially. Spoke to him on the phone. Corne and I can discuss. He says not to worry, I am very concerned that they will try	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	contain any legal privileged material.  However, it is understood legally privileged material may be present on digital devices which will be seized."  Obviously I accept you are not a lawyer, but what was your understanding of why the material that was sought was not privileged?  A. Because we considered Mr Levy to be a suspect in his own right and that he was not advising in a lawyer/client relationship the other people suspected in 36 North. In fact this was the very first contact that I had had with the DPP, was to consider that matter.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Then at 99: "On 19 October 2018 Cornelio wrote to Levy saying: 'Morning, James. Very confidential note. Gaggero has brought in a forensic team of six to look at anything John and I may have done to tamper with the system, etc. Gaggero is going all out it seems." Then 100: "On the same day Cornelio wrote to Perez saying: 'Spoke to James ref forensic team confidentially. Spoke to him on the phone. Corne and I can discuss. He says not to worry, I am very concerned that they will try to prove I have acted to sabotage the system	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	contain any legal privileged material.  However, it is understood legally privileged material may be present on digital devices which will be seized."  Obviously I accept you are not a lawyer, but what was your understanding of why the material that was sought was not privileged?  A. Because we considered Mr Levy to be a suspect in his own right and that he was not advising in a lawyer/client relationship the other people suspected in 36 North. In fact this was the very first contact that I had had
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Then at 99: "On 19 October 2018 Cornelio wrote to Levy saying: 'Morning, James. Very confidential note. Gaggero has brought in a forensic team of six to look at anything John and I may have done to tamper with the system, etc. Gaggero is going all out it seems." Then 100: "On the same day Cornelio wrote to Perez saying: 'Spoke to James ref forensic team confidentially. Spoke to him on the phone. Corne and I can discuss. He says not to worry, I am very concerned that they will try	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	contain any legal privileged material.  However, it is understood legally privileged material may be present on digital devices which will be seized."  Obviously I accept you are not a lawyer, but what was your understanding of why the material that was sought was not privileged?  A. Because we considered Mr Levy to be a suspect in his own right and that he was not advising in a lawyer/client relationship the other people suspected in 36 North. In fact this was the very first contact that I had had with the DPP, was to consider that matter.  Q. Was your understanding that it was lawful to obtain a search warrant for a device
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Then at 99: "On 19 October 2018 Cornelio wrote to Levy saying: 'Morning, James. Very confidential note. Gaggero has brought in a forensic team of six to look at anything John and I may have done to tamper with the system, etc. Gaggero is going all out it seems." Then 100: "On the same day Cornelio wrote to Perez saying: 'Spoke to James ref forensic team confidentially. Spoke to him on the phone. Corne and I can discuss. He says not to worry, I am very concerned that they will try to prove I have acted to sabotage the system in any way," etc. Then 101:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	contain any legal privileged material.  However, it is understood legally privileged material may be present on digital devices which will be seized."  Obviously I accept you are not a lawyer, but what was your understanding of why the material that was sought was not privileged?  A. Because we considered Mr Levy to be a suspect in his own right and that he was not advising in a lawyer/client relationship the other people suspected in 36 North. In fact this was the very first contact that I had had with the DPP, was to consider that matter.  Q. Was your understanding that it was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Then at 99: "On 19 October 2018 Cornelio wrote to Levy saying: 'Morning, James. Very confidential note. Gaggero has brought in a forensic team of six to look at anything John and I may have done to tamper with the system, etc. Gaggero is going all out it seems." Then 100: "On the same day Cornelio wrote to Perez saying: 'Spoke to James ref forensic team confidentially. Spoke to him on the phone. Corne and I can discuss. He says not to worry, I am very concerned that they will try to prove I have acted to sabotage the system in any way,"	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	contain any legal privileged material.  However, it is understood legally privileged material may be present on digital devices which will be seized."  Obviously I accept you are not a lawyer, but what was your understanding of why the material that was sought was not privileged?  A. Because we considered Mr Levy to be a suspect in his own right and that he was not advising in a lawyer/client relationship the other people suspected in 36 North. In fact this was the very first contact that I had had with the DPP, was to consider that matter.  Q. Was your understanding that it was lawful to obtain a search warrant for a device containing or potentially containing
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Then at 99: "On 19 October 2018 Cornelio wrote to Levy saying: 'Morning, James. Very confidential note. Gaggero has brought in a forensic team of six to look at anything John and I may have done to tamper with the system, etc. Gaggero is going all out it seems." Then 100: "On the same day Cornelio wrote to Perez saying: 'Spoke to James ref forensic team confidentially. Spoke to him on the phone. Corne and I can discuss. He says not to worry, I am very concerned that they will try to prove I have acted to sabotage the system in any way," etc. Then 101: "The evidence indicates that Levy discussed	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	contain any legal privileged material.  However, it is understood legally privileged material may be present on digital devices which will be seized."  Obviously I accept you are not a lawyer, but what was your understanding of why the material that was sought was not privileged?  A. Because we considered Mr Levy to be a suspect in his own right and that he was not advising in a lawyer/client relationship the other people suspected in 36 North. In fact this was the very first contact that I had had with the DPP, was to consider that matter.  Q. Was your understanding that it was lawful to obtain a search warrant for a device containing or potentially containing privileged material as long as the material of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Then at 99: "On 19 October 2018 Cornelio wrote to Levy saying: 'Morning, James. Very confidential note. Gaggero has brought in a forensic team of six to look at anything John and I may have done to tamper with the system, etc. Gaggero is going all out it seems." Then 100: "On the same day Cornelio wrote to Perez saying: 'Spoke to James ref forensic team confidentially. Spoke to him on the phone. Corne and I can discuss. He says not to worry, I am very concerned that they will try to prove I have acted to sabotage the system in any way," etc. Then 101: "The evidence indicates that Levy discussed with the forensic team"	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	contain any legal privileged material.  However, it is understood legally privileged material may be present on digital devices which will be seized."  Obviously I accept you are not a lawyer, but what was your understanding of why the material that was sought was not privileged?  A. Because we considered Mr Levy to be a suspect in his own right and that he was not advising in a lawyer/client relationship the other people suspected in 36 North. In fact this was the very first contact that I had had with the DPP, was to consider that matter.  Q. Was your understanding that it was lawful to obtain a search warrant for a device containing or potentially containing privileged material as long as the material of interest was not privileged?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Then at 99: "On 19 October 2018 Cornelio wrote to Levy saying: 'Morning, James. Very confidential note. Gaggero has brought in a forensic team of six to look at anything John and I may have done to tamper with the system, etc. Gaggero is going all out it seems."  Then 100: "On the same day Cornelio wrote to Perez saying: 'Spoke to James ref forensic team confidentially. Spoke to him on the phone. Corne and I can discuss. He says not to worry, I am very concerned that they will try to prove I have acted to sabotage the system in any way," etc. Then 101: "The evidence indicates that Levy discussed with the forensic team" Sorry, sorry.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	contain any legal privileged material.  However, it is understood legally privileged material may be present on digital devices which will be seized."  Obviously I accept you are not a lawyer, but what was your understanding of why the material that was sought was not privileged?  A. Because we considered Mr Levy to be a suspect in his own right and that he was not advising in a lawyer/client relationship the other people suspected in 36 North. In fact this was the very first contact that I had had with the DPP, was to consider that matter.  Q. Was your understanding that it was lawful to obtain a search warrant for a device containing or potentially containing privileged material as long as the material of interest was not privileged?  A. Sorry, could you repeat that?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Then at 99:  "On 19 October 2018 Cornelio wrote to Levy saying: 'Morning, James. Very confidential note. Gaggero has brought in a forensic team of six to look at anything John and I may have done to tamper with the system, etc. Gaggero is going all out it seems."  Then 100:  "On the same day Cornelio wrote to Perez saying: 'Spoke to James ref forensic team confidentially. Spoke to him on the phone. Corne and I can discuss. He says not to worry, I am very concerned that they will try to prove I have acted to sabotage the system in any way,"  etc. Then 101:  "The evidence indicates that Levy discussed with the forensic team"  Sorry, sorry.  "The evidence indicates that Levy discussed	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	contain any legal privileged material.  However, it is understood legally privileged material may be present on digital devices which will be seized."  Obviously I accept you are not a lawyer, but what was your understanding of why the material that was sought was not privileged?  A. Because we considered Mr Levy to be a suspect in his own right and that he was not advising in a lawyer/client relationship the other people suspected in 36 North. In fact this was the very first contact that I had had with the DPP, was to consider that matter.  Q. Was your understanding that it was lawful to obtain a search warrant for a device containing or potentially containing privileged material as long as the material of interest was not privileged?  A. Sorry, could you repeat that?  Q. Sorry. Was your understanding that it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Then at 99:  "On 19 October 2018 Cornelio wrote to Levy saying: 'Morning, James. Very confidential note. Gaggero has brought in a forensic team of six to look at anything John and I may have done to tamper with the system, etc. Gaggero is going all out it seems."  Then 100:  "On the same day Cornelio wrote to Perez saying: 'Spoke to James ref forensic team confidentially. Spoke to him on the phone. Corne and I can discuss. He says not to worry, I am very concerned that they will try to prove I have acted to sabotage the system in any way,"  etc. Then 101:  "The evidence indicates that Levy discussed with the forensic team"  Sorry, sorry.  "The evidence indicates that Levy discussed the forensic team with Cornelio and that he	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	contain any legal privileged material.  However, it is understood legally privileged material may be present on digital devices which will be seized."  Obviously I accept you are not a lawyer, but what was your understanding of why the material that was sought was not privileged?  A. Because we considered Mr Levy to be a suspect in his own right and that he was not advising in a lawyer/client relationship the other people suspected in 36 North. In fact this was the very first contact that I had had with the DPP, was to consider that matter.  Q. Was your understanding that it was lawful to obtain a search warrant for a device containing or potentially containing privileged material as long as the material of interest was not privileged?  A. Sorry, could you repeat that?  Q. Sorry. Was your understanding that it was lawful to get a search warrant for a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Then at 99:  "On 19 October 2018 Cornelio wrote to Levy saying: 'Morning, James. Very confidential note. Gaggero has brought in a forensic team of six to look at anything John and I may have done to tamper with the system, etc. Gaggero is going all out it seems."  Then 100:  "On the same day Cornelio wrote to Perez saying: 'Spoke to James ref forensic team confidentially. Spoke to him on the phone. Corne and I can discuss. He says not to worry, I am very concerned that they will try to prove I have acted to sabotage the system in any way," etc. Then 101:  "The evidence indicates that Levy discussed with the forensic team" Sorry, sorry.  "The evidence indicates that Levy discussed the forensic team with Cornelio and that he had given him advice about the situation."	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	contain any legal privileged material.  However, it is understood legally privileged material may be present on digital devices which will be seized."  Obviously I accept you are not a lawyer, but what was your understanding of why the material that was sought was not privileged?  A. Because we considered Mr Levy to be a suspect in his own right and that he was not advising in a lawyer/client relationship the other people suspected in 36 North. In fact this was the very first contact that I had had with the DPP, was to consider that matter.  Q. Was your understanding that it was lawful to obtain a search warrant for a device containing or potentially containing privileged material as long as the material of interest was not privileged?  A. Sorry, could you repeat that?  Q. Sorry. Was your understanding that it was lawful to get a search warrant for a device that might contain or did contain
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Then at 99: "On 19 October 2018 Cornelio wrote to Levy saying: 'Morning, James. Very confidential note. Gaggero has brought in a forensic team of six to look at anything John and I may have done to tamper with the system, etc. Gaggero is going all out it seems."  Then 100: "On the same day Cornelio wrote to Perez saying: 'Spoke to James ref forensic team confidentially. Spoke to him on the phone. Corne and I can discuss. He says not to worry, I am very concerned that they will try to prove I have acted to sabotage the system in any way," etc. Then 101: "The evidence indicates that Levy discussed with the forensic team" Sorry, sorry. "The evidence indicates that Levy discussed the forensic team with Cornelio and that he had given him advice about the situation." Again, please do not stray into anything that is redacted, and if you feel you do need to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	contain any legal privileged material.  However, it is understood legally privileged material may be present on digital devices which will be seized."  Obviously I accept you are not a lawyer, but what was your understanding of why the material that was sought was not privileged?  A. Because we considered Mr Levy to be a suspect in his own right and that he was not advising in a lawyer/client relationship the other people suspected in 36 North. In fact this was the very first contact that I had had with the DPP, was to consider that matter.  Q. Was your understanding that it was lawful to obtain a search warrant for a device containing or potentially containing privileged material as long as the material of interest was not privileged?  A. Sorry, could you repeat that?  Q. Sorry. Was your understanding that it was lawful to get a search warrant for a device that might contain or did contain privileged material, it was lawful to do so if actually the material of interest was not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Then at 99:  "On 19 October 2018 Cornelio wrote to Levy saying: 'Morning, James. Very confidential note. Gaggero has brought in a forensic team of six to look at anything John and I may have done to tamper with the system, etc. Gaggero is going all out it seems."  Then 100:  "On the same day Cornelio wrote to Perez saying: 'Spoke to James ref forensic team confidentially. Spoke to him on the phone. Corne and I can discuss. He says not to worry, I am very concerned that they will try to prove I have acted to sabotage the system in any way,"  etc. Then 101:  "The evidence indicates that Levy discussed with the forensic team"  Sorry, sorry.  "The evidence indicates that Levy discussed the forensic team with Cornelio and that he had given him advice about the situation."  Again, please do not stray into anything that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	contain any legal privileged material.  However, it is understood legally privileged material may be present on digital devices which will be seized."  Obviously I accept you are not a lawyer, but what was your understanding of why the material that was sought was not privileged?  A. Because we considered Mr Levy to be a suspect in his own right and that he was not advising in a lawyer/client relationship the other people suspected in 36 North. In fact this was the very first contact that I had had with the DPP, was to consider that matter.  Q. Was your understanding that it was lawful to obtain a search warrant for a device containing or potentially containing privileged material as long as the material of interest was not privileged?  A. Sorry, could you repeat that?  Q. Sorry. Was your understanding that it was lawful to get a search warrant for a device that might contain or did contain privileged material, it was lawful to do so if

	1	
1 privileged?	1	A. Not at that time, no.
2 A. I am sorry, I haven't understoo	od what it is 2	Q. Do you know if anybody else did?
3 that you are asking me.	3	A. I do not.
4 Q. Let me see if I can put it in a dif	ferent 4	Q. The information then says:
5 way. Was your understanding that	a search 5	"All digital devices,"
6 warrant could seek - why do I not to		sorry, going back to the paragraph we were
7 320 above, the previous page:	7	at, 322, the final sentence of the largest
8 "I now seek to recover: (1) electron:	ic 8	paragraph:
9 devices, including but not limited to	mobile 9	"All digital devices will be reviewed by an
10 telephones and computers capable of	of sending 10	appointed independent legal representative
and receiving text messages, instant	11	prior to the OIC being given access to any
12 messages and/or electronic mail ow	ned 12	material."
13 and/or used by Heine Levy and any	device 13	I think your position is that those
14 capable of storing any of the aforem	nentioned 14	arrangements had not been made and that
15 communications."	15	you were going to consult Mr Levy about
16 You were aware of course that Mr I	Levy was 16	those arrangements and which lawyer should
17 a lawyer.	17	be instructed.
18 A. That is correct.	18	A. That is correct.
19 Q. Chances are that any electronic		Q. Is that correct? When was it intended
20 capable of sending and receiving ter		that the legal representative would start
21 messages, instant messages and/or e		reviewing the material?
22 mail would have included privileged		A. Well, we couldn't make those
23 material, and you accept	23	arrangements until we had spoken to Mr
24 A. That is correct.	24	Levy. That happened on the day of the
25 THE CHAIRMAN: You mean priv		warrant and, as you know, the consent to
		, ,
Page 105		Page 107
1	1	
1 material relating to clients other		examine his devices was withdrawn the same
2 MR SANTOS: Other than.	$\frac{2}{2}$	day that it was given.
3 THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.	3	Q. Do you think in retrospect that the drafter
4 MR SANTOS: Yes, and your po		of this document could have benefited from
5 that the material that you were a		legal advice?
6 messages, communications relati	_	A. Without any doubt at all.
7 North, was not privileged.	7	Q. If we look at paragraph 324, the heading
8 A. That is correct.	8	is:
9 Q. But you accept that the device		"Other methods of obtaining the material
sought, there was a likelihood th		have not been tried because it appeared they
11 would have contained privileged		were bound to fail,"
12 relating to other matters.	12	and then underneath it says the following:
13 A. That is correct.	13	"The material sought is held by a subject in
14 Q. But as far as you were conce		this case and it is feared if notice was given
15 nevertheless lawful to seek the se		to the subject to provide this material to the
16 warrant because the material that	•	OIC, the subject would destroy, alter, deface
17 after was not, as far as you were		or conceal the material sought."
18 privileged.	18	What was, as far as you understand it, the
19 A. That is correct.	19	basis for making that assertion?
Q. Thank you. Did you conside	-	A. I think there were a number of
that paragraph (1) under 320 mo		considerations there. The first one was the
	nd 22	seriousness of the offence that we were
22 to only capture the documents ar	.44. 1	:
23 communications that you were in		investigating, which involved the alleged
communications that you were in and that you did not consider to	be 24	hacking of the National Centralised Security
23 communications that you were in		
communications that you were in and that you did not consider to	be 24	hacking of the National Centralised Security

1	a fraud, and the fact that Mr Levy was a	1	"The material sought is held by a subject in
2	senior lawyer is something that was clearly	2	this case and it is feared if notice was given
3	on our minds there, and it is sad to think that	3	to the subject to provide this material to the
4	Mr Levy may have been involved in this.	4	OIC, the subject would destroy, alter, deface
5	But there was a risk, we considered that there	5	or conceal the material sought."
6	was a very real risk that the evidence would	6	Do you agree that it is fair to say that that
7	be destroyed, lost or defaced because it had	7	explanation, what is on the page, could apply
8	happened before when we interceded with	8	to any suspect?
9	Mr Sanchez. We know that he had deleted	9	A. Not necessarily. We often find when we
10	communications before we managed to see	10	intercede with people that they do not delete
11	him. He was recalled from the UK on a	11	information even though they know that the
12	certain day and by the time he had arrived a	12	police are investigating them. So it is not
13	large chunk of his communications had been	13	unusual for people not to delete information
14	deleted. So we had part of the conversations	14	even though they may suspect that they have
15	between Mr Levy and other people - in fact	15	been involved in an investigation.
16	on most occasions there was no response -	16	THE CHAIRMAN: Can I put a question? It
17	but we also knew that he was using another	17	looks to me as if that sentence comes straight
18	device and so had we lost that opportunity to	18	out of a template.
19	seize them without notice, we would not	19	MR SANTOS: The Chairman's statement is
20	have been able to progress that investigation.	20	that it looks to him like that statement comes
21	Q. Can we just look, in fairness to you, at	21	straight out of a template. Are you aware
22	your third statement, paragraph 38, please,	22	whether it comes straight out of a template?
23	which is A1431. You say this:	23	A. I am not but I am aware that in the UK
24	"Although he had been aware of the	24	they have access to a set of templates in the
25	investigation for over a year, JL did not	25	Criminal Procedure Rules that we don't use
	Page 109		Page 111
1			
	know, so far as I was aware, how much	1 1	in the RGP. My understanding is that the
1 2	know, so far as I was aware, how much information we had collected that implicated	$\begin{vmatrix} 1\\2 \end{vmatrix}$	in the RGP. My understanding is that the forms that we use were drafted by ourselves.
2	information we had collected that implicated	2	forms that we use were drafted by ourselves.
2 3	information we had collected that implicated him. If he had deleted communications from	l	forms that we use were drafted by ourselves. Q. But
2 3 4	information we had collected that implicated him. If he had deleted communications from his digital devices after the earlier arrests, as	2 3 4	forms that we use were drafted by ourselves.  Q. But THE CHAIRMAN: Hang on. The template
2 3 4 5	information we had collected that implicated him. If he had deleted communications from his digital devices after the earlier arrests, as CS had done, notice of an application for a	2 3	Q. But THE CHAIRMAN: Hang on. The template may well have been drafted by the RGP but
2 3 4	information we had collected that implicated him. If he had deleted communications from his digital devices after the earlier arrests, as CS had done, notice of an application for a production order might have resulted in him	2 3 4 5	forms that we use were drafted by ourselves.  Q. But THE CHAIRMAN: Hang on. The template may well have been drafted by the RGP but that looks to me as if it comes straight off a
2 3 4 5 6 7	information we had collected that implicated him. If he had deleted communications from his digital devices after the earlier arrests, as CS had done, notice of an application for a production order might have resulted in him arranging for his devices to be professionally	2 3 4 5 6 7	forms that we use were drafted by ourselves.  Q. But THE CHAIRMAN: Hang on. The template may well have been drafted by the RGP but that looks to me as if it comes straight off a template. Is that right or not?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	information we had collected that implicated him. If he had deleted communications from his digital devices after the earlier arrests, as CS had done, notice of an application for a production order might have resulted in him arranging for his devices to be professionally wiped. That would have meant that any	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	forms that we use were drafted by ourselves.  Q. But THE CHAIRMAN: Hang on. The template may well have been drafted by the RGP but that looks to me as if it comes straight off a template. Is that right or not?  A. I'm sorry, sir, I don't know whether a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	information we had collected that implicated him. If he had deleted communications from his digital devices after the earlier arrests, as CS had done, notice of an application for a production order might have resulted in him arranging for his devices to be professionally wiped. That would have meant that any deletions which might themselves have been	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	forms that we use were drafted by ourselves.  Q. But THE CHAIRMAN: Hang on. The template may well have been drafted by the RGP but that looks to me as if it comes straight off a template. Is that right or not?  A. I'm sorry, sir, I don't know whether a template was used or not.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	information we had collected that implicated him. If he had deleted communications from his digital devices after the earlier arrests, as CS had done, notice of an application for a production order might have resulted in him arranging for his devices to be professionally wiped. That would have meant that any deletions which might themselves have been relevant evidence and which might have been	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	forms that we use were drafted by ourselves.  Q. But THE CHAIRMAN: Hang on. The template may well have been drafted by the RGP but that looks to me as if it comes straight off a template. Is that right or not?  A. I'm sorry, sir, I don't know whether a template was used or not.  THE CHAIRMAN: Because it does not refer
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	information we had collected that implicated him. If he had deleted communications from his digital devices after the earlier arrests, as CS had done, notice of an application for a production order might have resulted in him arranging for his devices to be professionally wiped. That would have meant that any deletions which might themselves have been relevant evidence and which might have been forensically recovered would have been	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	G. But THE CHAIRMAN: Hang on. The template may well have been drafted by the RGP but that looks to me as if it comes straight off a template. Is that right or not?  A. I'm sorry, sir, I don't know whether a template was used or not.  THE CHAIRMAN: Because it does not refer to any of the circumstances of the particular
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	information we had collected that implicated him. If he had deleted communications from his digital devices after the earlier arrests, as CS had done, notice of an application for a production order might have resulted in him arranging for his devices to be professionally wiped. That would have meant that any deletions which might themselves have been relevant evidence and which might have been forensically recovered would have been destroyed. We were conscious of JL's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	G. But THE CHAIRMAN: Hang on. The template may well have been drafted by the RGP but that looks to me as if it comes straight off a template. Is that right or not?  A. I'm sorry, sir, I don't know whether a template was used or not.  THE CHAIRMAN: Because it does not refer to any of the circumstances of the particular case.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	information we had collected that implicated him. If he had deleted communications from his digital devices after the earlier arrests, as CS had done, notice of an application for a production order might have resulted in him arranging for his devices to be professionally wiped. That would have meant that any deletions which might themselves have been relevant evidence and which might have been forensically recovered would have been destroyed. We were conscious of JL's standing in the legal profession in Gibraltar.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	G. But THE CHAIRMAN: Hang on. The template may well have been drafted by the RGP but that looks to me as if it comes straight off a template. Is that right or not?  A. I'm sorry, sir, I don't know whether a template was used or not.  THE CHAIRMAN: Because it does not refer to any of the circumstances of the particular case.  MR SANTOS: That was going to be my
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	information we had collected that implicated him. If he had deleted communications from his digital devices after the earlier arrests, as CS had done, notice of an application for a production order might have resulted in him arranging for his devices to be professionally wiped. That would have meant that any deletions which might themselves have been relevant evidence and which might have been forensically recovered would have been destroyed. We were conscious of JL's standing in the legal profession in Gibraltar. We tried to treat him with sensitivity and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	forms that we use were drafted by ourselves.  Q. But THE CHAIRMAN: Hang on. The template may well have been drafted by the RGP but that looks to me as if it comes straight off a template. Is that right or not?  A. I'm sorry, sir, I don't know whether a template was used or not.  THE CHAIRMAN: Because it does not refer to any of the circumstances of the particular case.  MR SANTOS: That was going to be my next question to you, which is: the matters
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	information we had collected that implicated him. If he had deleted communications from his digital devices after the earlier arrests, as CS had done, notice of an application for a production order might have resulted in him arranging for his devices to be professionally wiped. That would have meant that any deletions which might themselves have been relevant evidence and which might have been forensically recovered would have been destroyed. We were conscious of JL's standing in the legal profession in Gibraltar. We tried to treat him with sensitivity and respect in so far as that was compatible with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	forms that we use were drafted by ourselves.  Q. But THE CHAIRMAN: Hang on. The template may well have been drafted by the RGP but that looks to me as if it comes straight off a template. Is that right or not?  A. I'm sorry, sir, I don't know whether a template was used or not.  THE CHAIRMAN: Because it does not refer to any of the circumstances of the particular case.  MR SANTOS: That was going to be my next question to you, which is: the matters that you have described in your evidence that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	information we had collected that implicated him. If he had deleted communications from his digital devices after the earlier arrests, as CS had done, notice of an application for a production order might have resulted in him arranging for his devices to be professionally wiped. That would have meant that any deletions which might themselves have been relevant evidence and which might have been forensically recovered would have been destroyed. We were conscious of JL's standing in the legal profession in Gibraltar. We tried to treat him with sensitivity and respect in so far as that was compatible with treating him in the same way as other	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. But THE CHAIRMAN: Hang on. The template may well have been drafted by the RGP but that looks to me as if it comes straight off a template. Is that right or not?  A. I'm sorry, sir, I don't know whether a template was used or not. THE CHAIRMAN: Because it does not refer to any of the circumstances of the particular case. MR SANTOS: That was going to be my next question to you, which is: the matters that you have described in your evidence that drove you to consider that a search warrant
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	information we had collected that implicated him. If he had deleted communications from his digital devices after the earlier arrests, as CS had done, notice of an application for a production order might have resulted in him arranging for his devices to be professionally wiped. That would have meant that any deletions which might themselves have been relevant evidence and which might have been forensically recovered would have been destroyed. We were conscious of JL's standing in the legal profession in Gibraltar. We tried to treat him with sensitivity and respect in so far as that was compatible with treating him in the same way as other suspects,"	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. But THE CHAIRMAN: Hang on. The template may well have been drafted by the RGP but that looks to me as if it comes straight off a template. Is that right or not?  A. I'm sorry, sir, I don't know whether a template was used or not.  THE CHAIRMAN: Because it does not refer to any of the circumstances of the particular case.  MR SANTOS: That was going to be my next question to you, which is: the matters that you have described in your evidence that drove you to consider that a search warrant was more appropriate in respect of Mr Levy
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	information we had collected that implicated him. If he had deleted communications from his digital devices after the earlier arrests, as CS had done, notice of an application for a production order might have resulted in him arranging for his devices to be professionally wiped. That would have meant that any deletions which might themselves have been relevant evidence and which might have been forensically recovered would have been destroyed. We were conscious of JL's standing in the legal profession in Gibraltar. We tried to treat him with sensitivity and respect in so far as that was compatible with treating him in the same way as other suspects," and you say:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	G. But THE CHAIRMAN: Hang on. The template may well have been drafted by the RGP but that looks to me as if it comes straight off a template. Is that right or not?  A. I'm sorry, sir, I don't know whether a template was used or not.  THE CHAIRMAN: Because it does not refer to any of the circumstances of the particular case.  MR SANTOS: That was going to be my next question to you, which is: the matters that you have described in your evidence that drove you to consider that a search warrant was more appropriate in respect of Mr Levy specifically, do not feature in that paragraph.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	information we had collected that implicated him. If he had deleted communications from his digital devices after the earlier arrests, as CS had done, notice of an application for a production order might have resulted in him arranging for his devices to be professionally wiped. That would have meant that any deletions which might themselves have been relevant evidence and which might have been forensically recovered would have been destroyed. We were conscious of JL's standing in the legal profession in Gibraltar. We tried to treat him with sensitivity and respect in so far as that was compatible with treating him in the same way as other suspects," and you say:  "However, it is likely that JL did receive	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	G. But THE CHAIRMAN: Hang on. The template may well have been drafted by the RGP but that looks to me as if it comes straight off a template. Is that right or not?  A. I'm sorry, sir, I don't know whether a template was used or not.  THE CHAIRMAN: Because it does not refer to any of the circumstances of the particular case.  MR SANTOS: That was going to be my next question to you, which is: the matters that you have described in your evidence that drove you to consider that a search warrant was more appropriate in respect of Mr Levy specifically, do not feature in that paragraph. Do you accept that?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	information we had collected that implicated him. If he had deleted communications from his digital devices after the earlier arrests, as CS had done, notice of an application for a production order might have resulted in him arranging for his devices to be professionally wiped. That would have meant that any deletions which might themselves have been relevant evidence and which might have been forensically recovered would have been destroyed. We were conscious of JL's standing in the legal profession in Gibraltar. We tried to treat him with sensitivity and respect in so far as that was compatible with treating him in the same way as other suspects," and you say:  "However, it is likely that JL did receive preferential treatment after all,"	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. But THE CHAIRMAN: Hang on. The template may well have been drafted by the RGP but that looks to me as if it comes straight off a template. Is that right or not?  A. I'm sorry, sir, I don't know whether a template was used or not. THE CHAIRMAN: Because it does not refer to any of the circumstances of the particular case. MR SANTOS: That was going to be my next question to you, which is: the matters that you have described in your evidence that drove you to consider that a search warrant was more appropriate in respect of Mr Levy specifically, do not feature in that paragraph. Do you accept that?  A. Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	information we had collected that implicated him. If he had deleted communications from his digital devices after the earlier arrests, as CS had done, notice of an application for a production order might have resulted in him arranging for his devices to be professionally wiped. That would have meant that any deletions which might themselves have been relevant evidence and which might have been forensically recovered would have been destroyed. We were conscious of JL's standing in the legal profession in Gibraltar. We tried to treat him with sensitivity and respect in so far as that was compatible with treating him in the same way as other suspects," and you say:  "However, it is likely that JL did receive preferential treatment after all," and then you stray into other things which we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. But THE CHAIRMAN: Hang on. The template may well have been drafted by the RGP but that looks to me as if it comes straight off a template. Is that right or not?  A. I'm sorry, sir, I don't know whether a template was used or not.  THE CHAIRMAN: Because it does not refer to any of the circumstances of the particular case.  MR SANTOS: That was going to be my next question to you, which is: the matters that you have described in your evidence that drove you to consider that a search warrant was more appropriate in respect of Mr Levy specifically, do not feature in that paragraph. Do you accept that?  A. Yes.  Q. Do you know why?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	information we had collected that implicated him. If he had deleted communications from his digital devices after the earlier arrests, as CS had done, notice of an application for a production order might have resulted in him arranging for his devices to be professionally wiped. That would have meant that any deletions which might themselves have been relevant evidence and which might have been forensically recovered would have been destroyed. We were conscious of JL's standing in the legal profession in Gibraltar. We tried to treat him with sensitivity and respect in so far as that was compatible with treating him in the same way as other suspects," and you say:  "However, it is likely that JL did receive preferential treatment after all," and then you stray into other things which we will come to. But just going back to the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. But THE CHAIRMAN: Hang on. The template may well have been drafted by the RGP but that looks to me as if it comes straight off a template. Is that right or not?  A. I'm sorry, sir, I don't know whether a template was used or not. THE CHAIRMAN: Because it does not refer to any of the circumstances of the particular case. MR SANTOS: That was going to be my next question to you, which is: the matters that you have described in your evidence that drove you to consider that a search warrant was more appropriate in respect of Mr Levy specifically, do not feature in that paragraph. Do you accept that?  A. Yes. Q. Do you know why? A. I would imagine it is because we did not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	information we had collected that implicated him. If he had deleted communications from his digital devices after the earlier arrests, as CS had done, notice of an application for a production order might have resulted in him arranging for his devices to be professionally wiped. That would have meant that any deletions which might themselves have been relevant evidence and which might have been forensically recovered would have been destroyed. We were conscious of JL's standing in the legal profession in Gibraltar. We tried to treat him with sensitivity and respect in so far as that was compatible with treating him in the same way as other suspects," and you say:  "However, it is likely that JL did receive preferential treatment after all," and then you stray into other things which we will come to. But just going back to the information, that paragraph 324 on B3245, it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. But THE CHAIRMAN: Hang on. The template may well have been drafted by the RGP but that looks to me as if it comes straight off a template. Is that right or not?  A. I'm sorry, sir, I don't know whether a template was used or not. THE CHAIRMAN: Because it does not refer to any of the circumstances of the particular case. MR SANTOS: That was going to be my next question to you, which is: the matters that you have described in your evidence that drove you to consider that a search warrant was more appropriate in respect of Mr Levy specifically, do not feature in that paragraph. Do you accept that?  A. Yes. Q. Do you know why? A. I would imagine it is because we did not have the benefit of legal advice in drafting up
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	information we had collected that implicated him. If he had deleted communications from his digital devices after the earlier arrests, as CS had done, notice of an application for a production order might have resulted in him arranging for his devices to be professionally wiped. That would have meant that any deletions which might themselves have been relevant evidence and which might have been forensically recovered would have been destroyed. We were conscious of JL's standing in the legal profession in Gibraltar. We tried to treat him with sensitivity and respect in so far as that was compatible with treating him in the same way as other suspects," and you say:  "However, it is likely that JL did receive preferential treatment after all," and then you stray into other things which we will come to. But just going back to the information, that paragraph 324 on B3245, it is a paragraph there at the top of the page,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. But THE CHAIRMAN: Hang on. The template may well have been drafted by the RGP but that looks to me as if it comes straight off a template. Is that right or not?  A. I'm sorry, sir, I don't know whether a template was used or not. THE CHAIRMAN: Because it does not refer to any of the circumstances of the particular case.  MR SANTOS: That was going to be my next question to you, which is: the matters that you have described in your evidence that drove you to consider that a search warrant was more appropriate in respect of Mr Levy specifically, do not feature in that paragraph. Do you accept that?  A. Yes. Q. Do you know why?  A. I would imagine it is because we did not have the benefit of legal advice in drafting up this application.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	information we had collected that implicated him. If he had deleted communications from his digital devices after the earlier arrests, as CS had done, notice of an application for a production order might have resulted in him arranging for his devices to be professionally wiped. That would have meant that any deletions which might themselves have been relevant evidence and which might have been forensically recovered would have been destroyed. We were conscious of JL's standing in the legal profession in Gibraltar. We tried to treat him with sensitivity and respect in so far as that was compatible with treating him in the same way as other suspects," and you say:  "However, it is likely that JL did receive preferential treatment after all," and then you stray into other things which we will come to. But just going back to the information, that paragraph 324 on B3245, it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. But THE CHAIRMAN: Hang on. The template may well have been drafted by the RGP but that looks to me as if it comes straight off a template. Is that right or not?  A. I'm sorry, sir, I don't know whether a template was used or not. THE CHAIRMAN: Because it does not refer to any of the circumstances of the particular case. MR SANTOS: That was going to be my next question to you, which is: the matters that you have described in your evidence that drove you to consider that a search warrant was more appropriate in respect of Mr Levy specifically, do not feature in that paragraph. Do you accept that?  A. Yes. Q. Do you know why? A. I would imagine it is because we did not have the benefit of legal advice in drafting up
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	information we had collected that implicated him. If he had deleted communications from his digital devices after the earlier arrests, as CS had done, notice of an application for a production order might have resulted in him arranging for his devices to be professionally wiped. That would have meant that any deletions which might themselves have been relevant evidence and which might have been forensically recovered would have been destroyed. We were conscious of JL's standing in the legal profession in Gibraltar. We tried to treat him with sensitivity and respect in so far as that was compatible with treating him in the same way as other suspects," and you say:  "However, it is likely that JL did receive preferential treatment after all," and then you stray into other things which we will come to. But just going back to the information, that paragraph 324 on B3245, it is a paragraph there at the top of the page,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. But THE CHAIRMAN: Hang on. The template may well have been drafted by the RGP but that looks to me as if it comes straight off a template. Is that right or not?  A. I'm sorry, sir, I don't know whether a template was used or not. THE CHAIRMAN: Because it does not refer to any of the circumstances of the particular case.  MR SANTOS: That was going to be my next question to you, which is: the matters that you have described in your evidence that drove you to consider that a search warrant was more appropriate in respect of Mr Levy specifically, do not feature in that paragraph. Do you accept that?  A. Yes. Q. Do you know why?  A. I would imagine it is because we did not have the benefit of legal advice in drafting up this application.

1	that paragraph does not mention the counter-	1	ought to know that when you are deciding
2	argument that Mr Wyan had made in the	2	whether or not it is fair to grant the
3	options report, that Mr Levy had known	3	application.
4	about the investigation for a long time and	4	A. Yes, sir. But I am not certain what we
5	therefore it might be said there was less of a	5	said to the magistrate, and I do not remember
6	risk of destruction of evidence?	6	what questions he asked and what we
7	A. I do not know.	7	responded. It is possible that the DPP's
8	Q. You were aware of course, as we have	8	preference was discussed, and that we said to
9	established, that the DPP's preference was for	9	him that it - that we had decided that it was
10	a search warrant. Given that this was	10	an operational matter and that the - the DPP
11	A. No, Mr Santos, his preference was for a	11	would back us whatever route that we chose.
12	production order.	12	But, unfortunately I do not have a record of -
13	Q. Sorry, sorry, thank you very much for the	13	of what was discussed during that
14	correction. You were aware of course that	14	application.
15	the DPP's preference was for a production	15	Q. Can I ask you to turn to D2900, please.
16	order. Given that this was an ex parte	16	This is a document with the electronic
17	application, do you know why this was not	17	document title "Levy warrant notes", which
18	included in the information, the DPP's	18	we understand is a document prepared by DS
19	preference?	19	Clarke.
20	(12.40)	20	THE CHAIRMAN: Did you give the right
21	A. Again, I would have to say that, because	21	reference, there?
22	we didn't have the - we did it was not	22	MR SANTOS: Sorry?
23	practice to seek legal advice on the drafting	23	THE CHAIRMAN: Sorry, I was wondering
24	of - of applications at that stage, and may not	24	if you gave the right reference.
25	be still today, I do not know.	25	Q. D2900. My understanding is that the
			, c
	Page 113		Page 115
1	THE CHAIRMAN: No but that is not quite	1	electronic file is named "Levy warrant
1 2	THE CHAIRMAN: No, but that is not quite an answer to the question	1 2	electronic file is named "Levy warrant
2	an answer to the question.	2	notes"; obviously, I recognise that is not
2 3	an answer to the question.  Q. Yes, because I accept (well, it is not for	2 3	notes"; obviously, I recognise that is not reflected in the heading on the actual page,
2 3 4	an answer to the question.  Q. Yes, because I accept (well, it is not for me to accept or otherwise, but I understand)	2 3 4	notes"; obviously, I recognise that is not reflected in the heading on the actual page, but on the computer the file shows up with a
2 3 4 5	an answer to the question.  Q. Yes, because I accept (well, it is not for me to accept or otherwise, but I understand) your evidence, which is that it was not	2 3 4 5	notes"; obviously, I recognise that is not reflected in the heading on the actual page, but on the computer the file shows up with a description, "Levy warrant notes". Do you
2 3 4 5 6	an answer to the question.  Q. Yes, because I accept (well, it is not for me to accept or otherwise, but I understand) your evidence, which is that it was not practice. But as it happened, you had	2 3 4 5 6	notes"; obviously, I recognise that is not reflected in the heading on the actual page, but on the computer the file shows up with a description, "Levy warrant notes". Do you know who prepared this document?
2 3 4 5 6 7	an answer to the question.  Q. Yes, because I accept (well, it is not for me to accept or otherwise, but I understand) your evidence, which is that it was not practice. But as it happened, you had received the DPP's indication as to his	2 3 4 5 6 7	notes"; obviously, I recognise that is not reflected in the heading on the actual page, but on the computer the file shows up with a description, "Levy warrant notes". Do you know who prepared this document?  A. No.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	an answer to the question.  Q. Yes, because I accept (well, it is not for me to accept or otherwise, but I understand) your evidence, which is that it was not practice. But as it happened, you had received the DPP's indication as to his preference in those circumstances; why was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	notes"; obviously, I recognise that is not reflected in the heading on the actual page, but on the computer the file shows up with a description, "Levy warrant notes". Do you know who prepared this document?  A. No.  Q. Can we go to 2905, please. The final
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	an answer to the question.  Q. Yes, because I accept (well, it is not for me to accept or otherwise, but I understand) your evidence, which is that it was not practice. But as it happened, you had received the DPP's indication as to his preference in those circumstances; why was that not reflected in the information?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	notes"; obviously, I recognise that is not reflected in the heading on the actual page, but on the computer the file shows up with a description, "Levy warrant notes". Do you know who prepared this document?  A. No.  Q. Can we go to 2905, please. The final paragraph of that page just says, "Necessity.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	an answer to the question.  Q. Yes, because I accept (well, it is not for me to accept or otherwise, but I understand) your evidence, which is that it was not practice. But as it happened, you had received the DPP's indication as to his preference in those circumstances; why was that not reflected in the information?  A. Because the DPP's preference was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	notes"; obviously, I recognise that is not reflected in the heading on the actual page, but on the computer the file shows up with a description, "Levy warrant notes". Do you know who prepared this document?  A. No.  Q. Can we go to 2905, please. The final paragraph of that page just says, "Necessity. DPP, CoP and Detective Superintendent
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	an answer to the question.  Q. Yes, because I accept (well, it is not for me to accept or otherwise, but I understand) your evidence, which is that it was not practice. But as it happened, you had received the DPP's indication as to his preference in those circumstances; why was that not reflected in the information?  A. Because the DPP's preference was qualified with his - his opinion that he	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	notes"; obviously, I recognise that is not reflected in the heading on the actual page, but on the computer the file shows up with a description, "Levy warrant notes". Do you know who prepared this document?  A. No.  Q. Can we go to 2905, please. The final paragraph of that page just says, "Necessity. DPP, CoP and Detective Superintendent consulted with, who recommend course of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	an answer to the question.  Q. Yes, because I accept (well, it is not for me to accept or otherwise, but I understand) your evidence, which is that it was not practice. But as it happened, you had received the DPP's indication as to his preference in those circumstances; why was that not reflected in the information?  A. Because the DPP's preference was qualified with his - his opinion that he understood why we would choose to elect a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	notes"; obviously, I recognise that is not reflected in the heading on the actual page, but on the computer the file shows up with a description, "Levy warrant notes". Do you know who prepared this document?  A. No.  Q. Can we go to 2905, please. The final paragraph of that page just says, "Necessity. DPP, CoP and Detective Superintendent consulted with, who recommend course of action. It is necessary to execute these search
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	an answer to the question.  Q. Yes, because I accept (well, it is not for me to accept or otherwise, but I understand) your evidence, which is that it was not practice. But as it happened, you had received the DPP's indication as to his preference in those circumstances; why was that not reflected in the information?  A. Because the DPP's preference was qualified with his - his opinion that he understood why we would choose to elect a search warrant as opposed to a production	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	notes"; obviously, I recognise that is not reflected in the heading on the actual page, but on the computer the file shows up with a description, "Levy warrant notes". Do you know who prepared this document?  A. No.  Q. Can we go to 2905, please. The final paragraph of that page just says, "Necessity. DPP, CoP and Detective Superintendent consulted with, who recommend course of action. It is necessary to execute these search warrants to seize devices and inform Levy
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	an answer to the question.  Q. Yes, because I accept (well, it is not for me to accept or otherwise, but I understand) your evidence, which is that it was not practice. But as it happened, you had received the DPP's indication as to his preference in those circumstances; why was that not reflected in the information?  A. Because the DPP's preference was qualified with his - his opinion that he understood why we would choose to elect a search warrant as opposed to a production order, and that - would back us whichever	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	notes"; obviously, I recognise that is not reflected in the heading on the actual page, but on the computer the file shows up with a description, "Levy warrant notes". Do you know who prepared this document?  A. No.  Q. Can we go to 2905, please. The final paragraph of that page just says, "Necessity. DPP, CoP and Detective Superintendent consulted with, who recommend course of action. It is necessary to execute these search warrants to seize devices and inform Levy our intention to interview him. Levy will not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	an answer to the question.  Q. Yes, because I accept (well, it is not for me to accept or otherwise, but I understand) your evidence, which is that it was not practice. But as it happened, you had received the DPP's indication as to his preference in those circumstances; why was that not reflected in the information?  A. Because the DPP's preference was qualified with his - his opinion that he understood why we would choose to elect a search warrant as opposed to a production order, and that - would back us whichever decision we would take. In fact, in meetings	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	notes"; obviously, I recognise that is not reflected in the heading on the actual page, but on the computer the file shows up with a description, "Levy warrant notes". Do you know who prepared this document?  A. No.  Q. Can we go to 2905, please. The final paragraph of that page just says, "Necessity. DPP, CoP and Detective Superintendent consulted with, who recommend course of action. It is necessary to execute these search warrants to seize devices and inform Levy our intention to interview him. Levy will not be arrested." Can you explain, based on your
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	an answer to the question.  Q. Yes, because I accept (well, it is not for me to accept or otherwise, but I understand) your evidence, which is that it was not practice. But as it happened, you had received the DPP's indication as to his preference in those circumstances; why was that not reflected in the information?  A. Because the DPP's preference was qualified with his - his opinion that he understood why we would choose to elect a search warrant as opposed to a production order, and that - would back us whichever decision we would take. In fact, in meetings that followed that the - the DPP opined that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	notes"; obviously, I recognise that is not reflected in the heading on the actual page, but on the computer the file shows up with a description, "Levy warrant notes". Do you know who prepared this document?  A. No.  Q. Can we go to 2905, please. The final paragraph of that page just says, "Necessity. DPP, CoP and Detective Superintendent consulted with, who recommend course of action. It is necessary to execute these search warrants to seize devices and inform Levy our intention to interview him. Levy will not be arrested." Can you explain, based on your knowledge, why that document says what it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	an answer to the question.  Q. Yes, because I accept (well, it is not for me to accept or otherwise, but I understand) your evidence, which is that it was not practice. But as it happened, you had received the DPP's indication as to his preference in those circumstances; why was that not reflected in the information?  A. Because the DPP's preference was qualified with his - his opinion that he understood why we would choose to elect a search warrant as opposed to a production order, and that - would back us whichever decision we would take. In fact, in meetings that followed that the - the DPP opined that our decision to obtain a search warrant would	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	notes"; obviously, I recognise that is not reflected in the heading on the actual page, but on the computer the file shows up with a description, "Levy warrant notes". Do you know who prepared this document?  A. No.  Q. Can we go to 2905, please. The final paragraph of that page just says, "Necessity. DPP, CoP and Detective Superintendent consulted with, who recommend course of action. It is necessary to execute these search warrants to seize devices and inform Levy our intention to interview him. Levy will not be arrested." Can you explain, based on your knowledge, why that document says what it says?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	an answer to the question.  Q. Yes, because I accept (well, it is not for me to accept or otherwise, but I understand) your evidence, which is that it was not practice. But as it happened, you had received the DPP's indication as to his preference in those circumstances; why was that not reflected in the information?  A. Because the DPP's preference was qualified with his - his opinion that he understood why we would choose to elect a search warrant as opposed to a production order, and that - would back us whichever decision we would take. In fact, in meetings that followed that the - the DPP opined that our decision to obtain a search warrant would be defensible at JR.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	notes"; obviously, I recognise that is not reflected in the heading on the actual page, but on the computer the file shows up with a description, "Levy warrant notes". Do you know who prepared this document?  A. No.  Q. Can we go to 2905, please. The final paragraph of that page just says, "Necessity. DPP, CoP and Detective Superintendent consulted with, who recommend course of action. It is necessary to execute these search warrants to seize devices and inform Levy our intention to interview him. Levy will not be arrested." Can you explain, based on your knowledge, why that document says what it says?  A. I'm not certain who wrote this document,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	an answer to the question.  Q. Yes, because I accept (well, it is not for me to accept or otherwise, but I understand) your evidence, which is that it was not practice. But as it happened, you had received the DPP's indication as to his preference in those circumstances; why was that not reflected in the information?  A. Because the DPP's preference was qualified with his - his opinion that he understood why we would choose to elect a search warrant as opposed to a production order, and that - would back us whichever decision we would take. In fact, in meetings that followed that the - the DPP opined that our decision to obtain a search warrant would be defensible at JR.  THE CHAIRMAN: All that the magistrate	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	notes"; obviously, I recognise that is not reflected in the heading on the actual page, but on the computer the file shows up with a description, "Levy warrant notes". Do you know who prepared this document?  A. No.  Q. Can we go to 2905, please. The final paragraph of that page just says, "Necessity. DPP, CoP and Detective Superintendent consulted with, who recommend course of action. It is necessary to execute these search warrants to seize devices and inform Levy our intention to interview him. Levy will not be arrested." Can you explain, based on your knowledge, why that document says what it says?  A. I'm not certain who wrote this document, so I am not - I don't know why - why it was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	an answer to the question.  Q. Yes, because I accept (well, it is not for me to accept or otherwise, but I understand) your evidence, which is that it was not practice. But as it happened, you had received the DPP's indication as to his preference in those circumstances; why was that not reflected in the information?  A. Because the DPP's preference was qualified with his - his opinion that he understood why we would choose to elect a search warrant as opposed to a production order, and that - would back us whichever decision we would take. In fact, in meetings that followed that the - the DPP opined that our decision to obtain a search warrant would be defensible at JR.  THE CHAIRMAN: All that the magistrate knows is what you tell him.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	notes"; obviously, I recognise that is not reflected in the heading on the actual page, but on the computer the file shows up with a description, "Levy warrant notes". Do you know who prepared this document?  A. No.  Q. Can we go to 2905, please. The final paragraph of that page just says, "Necessity. DPP, CoP and Detective Superintendent consulted with, who recommend course of action. It is necessary to execute these search warrants to seize devices and inform Levy our intention to interview him. Levy will not be arrested." Can you explain, based on your knowledge, why that document says what it says?  A. I'm not certain who wrote this document, so I am not - I don't know why - why it was written.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	an answer to the question.  Q. Yes, because I accept (well, it is not for me to accept or otherwise, but I understand) your evidence, which is that it was not practice. But as it happened, you had received the DPP's indication as to his preference in those circumstances; why was that not reflected in the information?  A. Because the DPP's preference was qualified with his - his opinion that he understood why we would choose to elect a search warrant as opposed to a production order, and that - would back us whichever decision we would take. In fact, in meetings that followed that the - the DPP opined that our decision to obtain a search warrant would be defensible at JR.  THE CHAIRMAN: All that the magistrate knows is what you tell him.  A. That is correct, sir.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	notes"; obviously, I recognise that is not reflected in the heading on the actual page, but on the computer the file shows up with a description, "Levy warrant notes". Do you know who prepared this document?  A. No.  Q. Can we go to 2905, please. The final paragraph of that page just says, "Necessity. DPP, CoP and Detective Superintendent consulted with, who recommend course of action. It is necessary to execute these search warrants to seize devices and inform Levy our intention to interview him. Levy will not be arrested." Can you explain, based on your knowledge, why that document says what it says?  A. I'm not certain who wrote this document, so I am not - I don't know why - why it was written.  Q. No, no, if you do not know that is fine; I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	an answer to the question.  Q. Yes, because I accept (well, it is not for me to accept or otherwise, but I understand) your evidence, which is that it was not practice. But as it happened, you had received the DPP's indication as to his preference in those circumstances; why was that not reflected in the information?  A. Because the DPP's preference was qualified with his - his opinion that he understood why we would choose to elect a search warrant as opposed to a production order, and that - would back us whichever decision we would take. In fact, in meetings that followed that the - the DPP opined that our decision to obtain a search warrant would be defensible at JR.  THE CHAIRMAN: All that the magistrate knows is what you tell him.  A. That is correct, sir.  THE CHAIRMAN: Did you not think it was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	notes"; obviously, I recognise that is not reflected in the heading on the actual page, but on the computer the file shows up with a description, "Levy warrant notes". Do you know who prepared this document?  A. No.  Q. Can we go to 2905, please. The final paragraph of that page just says, "Necessity. DPP, CoP and Detective Superintendent consulted with, who recommend course of action. It is necessary to execute these search warrants to seize devices and inform Levy our intention to interview him. Levy will not be arrested." Can you explain, based on your knowledge, why that document says what it says?  A. I'm not certain who wrote this document, so I am not - I don't know why - why it was written.  Q. No, no, if you do not know that is fine; I just wanted to give you the opportunity to do
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	an answer to the question.  Q. Yes, because I accept (well, it is not for me to accept or otherwise, but I understand) your evidence, which is that it was not practice. But as it happened, you had received the DPP's indication as to his preference in those circumstances; why was that not reflected in the information?  A. Because the DPP's preference was qualified with his - his opinion that he understood why we would choose to elect a search warrant as opposed to a production order, and that - would back us whichever decision we would take. In fact, in meetings that followed that the - the DPP opined that our decision to obtain a search warrant would be defensible at JR.  THE CHAIRMAN: All that the magistrate knows is what you tell him.  A. That is correct, sir.  THE CHAIRMAN: Did you not think it was rather important to tell that: actually, we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	notes"; obviously, I recognise that is not reflected in the heading on the actual page, but on the computer the file shows up with a description, "Levy warrant notes". Do you know who prepared this document?  A. No.  Q. Can we go to 2905, please. The final paragraph of that page just says, "Necessity. DPP, CoP and Detective Superintendent consulted with, who recommend course of action. It is necessary to execute these search warrants to seize devices and inform Levy our intention to interview him. Levy will not be arrested." Can you explain, based on your knowledge, why that document says what it says?  A. I'm not certain who wrote this document, so I am not - I don't know why - why it was written.  Q. No, no, if you do not know that is fine; I just wanted to give you the opportunity to do so. Can we then In terms of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	an answer to the question.  Q. Yes, because I accept (well, it is not for me to accept or otherwise, but I understand) your evidence, which is that it was not practice. But as it happened, you had received the DPP's indication as to his preference in those circumstances; why was that not reflected in the information?  A. Because the DPP's preference was qualified with his - his opinion that he understood why we would choose to elect a search warrant as opposed to a production order, and that - would back us whichever decision we would take. In fact, in meetings that followed that the - the DPP opined that our decision to obtain a search warrant would be defensible at JR.  THE CHAIRMAN: All that the magistrate knows is what you tell him.  A. That is correct, sir.  THE CHAIRMAN: Did you not think it was rather important to tell that: actually, we discussed this with the DPP and his	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	notes"; obviously, I recognise that is not reflected in the heading on the actual page, but on the computer the file shows up with a description, "Levy warrant notes". Do you know who prepared this document?  A. No.  Q. Can we go to 2905, please. The final paragraph of that page just says, "Necessity. DPP, CoP and Detective Superintendent consulted with, who recommend course of action. It is necessary to execute these search warrants to seize devices and inform Levy our intention to interview him. Levy will not be arrested." Can you explain, based on your knowledge, why that document says what it says?  A. I'm not certain who wrote this document, so I am not - I don't know why - why it was written.  Q. No, no, if you do not know that is fine; I just wanted to give you the opportunity to do so. Can we then In terms of the applications before the magistrate, I think
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	an answer to the question.  Q. Yes, because I accept (well, it is not for me to accept or otherwise, but I understand) your evidence, which is that it was not practice. But as it happened, you had received the DPP's indication as to his preference in those circumstances; why was that not reflected in the information?  A. Because the DPP's preference was qualified with his - his opinion that he understood why we would choose to elect a search warrant as opposed to a production order, and that - would back us whichever decision we would take. In fact, in meetings that followed that the - the DPP opined that our decision to obtain a search warrant would be defensible at JR.  THE CHAIRMAN: All that the magistrate knows is what you tell him.  A. That is correct, sir.  THE CHAIRMAN: Did you not think it was rather important to tell that: actually, we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	notes"; obviously, I recognise that is not reflected in the heading on the actual page, but on the computer the file shows up with a description, "Levy warrant notes". Do you know who prepared this document?  A. No.  Q. Can we go to 2905, please. The final paragraph of that page just says, "Necessity. DPP, CoP and Detective Superintendent consulted with, who recommend course of action. It is necessary to execute these search warrants to seize devices and inform Levy our intention to interview him. Levy will not be arrested." Can you explain, based on your knowledge, why that document says what it says?  A. I'm not certain who wrote this document, so I am not - I don't know why - why it was written.  Q. No, no, if you do not know that is fine; I just wanted to give you the opportunity to do so. Can we then In terms of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	an answer to the question.  Q. Yes, because I accept (well, it is not for me to accept or otherwise, but I understand) your evidence, which is that it was not practice. But as it happened, you had received the DPP's indication as to his preference in those circumstances; why was that not reflected in the information?  A. Because the DPP's preference was qualified with his - his opinion that he understood why we would choose to elect a search warrant as opposed to a production order, and that - would back us whichever decision we would take. In fact, in meetings that followed that the - the DPP opined that our decision to obtain a search warrant would be defensible at JR.  THE CHAIRMAN: All that the magistrate knows is what you tell him.  A. That is correct, sir.  THE CHAIRMAN: Did you not think it was rather important to tell that: actually, we discussed this with the DPP and his	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	notes"; obviously, I recognise that is not reflected in the heading on the actual page, but on the computer the file shows up with a description, "Levy warrant notes". Do you know who prepared this document?  A. No.  Q. Can we go to 2905, please. The final paragraph of that page just says, "Necessity. DPP, CoP and Detective Superintendent consulted with, who recommend course of action. It is necessary to execute these search warrants to seize devices and inform Levy our intention to interview him. Levy will not be arrested." Can you explain, based on your knowledge, why that document says what it says?  A. I'm not certain who wrote this document, so I am not - I don't know why - why it was written.  Q. No, no, if you do not know that is fine; I just wanted to give you the opportunity to do so. Can we then In terms of the applications before the magistrate, I think

looking at the papers. Initially you said that 1 1 A. Sorry, which... 2 there was one application; then, when you 2 Q. A1290. 3 looked at the documents you recalled that 3 A. Yes, I have it. 4 4 there were two applications before the Q. The naming of this statement "Second 5 5 witness statement" has been a thorn in a side magistrate --6 6 A. Yes. in preparation, I have to say. Although I 7 7 completely understand why it is named Q. -- there was one --8 8 A. Yes, yes. second. 9 Q. -- and then an amendment. 9 A. It is the second but the third, yes. 10 A. Yes. 10 Q. Yes. Sorry, as far as you are concerned it 11 11 is the one behind the yellow tab: 18 --Q. And, the amendment was to include the 12 second limb of what you were seeking on the 12 A. I have it, I have it. 13 warrant. I am happy to take you - in fact I 13 Q. Okay, great, thank you. 18(d), "Were 14 14 can take you to Sergeant Clarke's statement, submission made to the court in writing 15 15 A1063, paragraphs four to six. Sorry, five, and/or orally when seeking the search 16 16 he says, "The initial application stipulated the warrants? If oral submissions were made 17 material sought to be", and it is what I read 17 how long did they take?" "I attended the 18 out to you earlier: the first paragraph of the 18 hearing, Mr Wyan was not there. DS Paul 19 material sought. And then, over the page he 19 Clarke went through the information and 20 20 says, "The second application detailed the answered questions raised by the Stipendiary 21 above material, and in addition to this any 21 Magistrate. The hearing lasted over an hour." 22 documentation relating to 30 North Limited, 22 Do you recall what the questions asked by 23 Astelon Limited and/or ICODE Limited, 23 the magistrates were? 24 24 whether held digitally or otherwise." Which A. No, I'm sorry. 25 25 of those two hearings did you attend, as far Q. Do you recall whether he asked any Page 117 Page 119 1 as you can recall? 1 questions about the RGP's position (the 2 A. Only the first one. 2 position taken in the information) that Mr 3 3 Q. The first one. And how long, as far as Levy might destroy evidence. 4 you can recall, did that last? 4 A. I can't remember any - any questions at 5 5 A. Something between an hour and a half to 6 two hours. 6 Q. Can we go now to C1789, please. This is 7 7 Q. Now, Sergeant Clarke says that he read your daybook, and it is the 7 May conference 8 8 out the information; do you recall him doing call with James Gaggero, which I think took 9 9 place in the Commissioner of Police's office. 10 10 A. I can't specifically recall that he did, but I A. That's correct. 11 - that's probably correct. 11 Q. You were present, as was (it seems from 12 Q. If he did that, that would probably have 12 your notes) the Commissioner of Police. taken up most of the one and a half to two 13 13 A. That's correct. 14 hours. 14 Q. I will just give you the chance to read it. 15 15 A. Thank you. Okay. A. I can't remember. 16 16 Q. You cannot remember. In your second Q. Thank you. Do you recall the purpose of 17 statement of the three, you say that the 17 the phone call? A. No. I've recorded what was said in the 18 magistrate asked questions. Do you want to 18 19 19 see what you say about that? meeting but I don't remember the purpose of 20 20 A. Yes, please. 21 21 Q. It is paragraph 18(d) of your second Q. Can I please take you to your notes on 22 statement. Sorry, that is the third statement; 22 1790. Actually, just before we go there, the 23 we have to go to the second statement. 23 preceding page. The Commissioner of Police 24 THE CHAIRMAN: Or, is it the first 24 I think says: "Not swayed by RF letter." 25 statement? 25 A. Whereabouts is that? Page 118 Page 120

1	Q. Can you see that on	1	Delhi and that Mr Levy was saying that he'd
2	A. Yes, I can see it, yes.	2	felt let down and betrayed, presumably, or at
3	Q. And then the next page: "Me"	3	least I took that to understand by the
4	A. That's me speaking.	4	defendants in the Operation Delhi case.
5	Q. That is you. I think that this is a	5	Q. Can I ask why you referred to him as
6	reference to the content of that letter and	6	grey man?
7	your responses to that.	7	A. I didn't refer to him as the grey man.
8	A. That's correct.	8	Q. Sorry.
9	Q. That letter, RF is a reference to Robert	9	A. It was Mr Gaggero.
10	Fischel KC who was Mr Perez and Mr	10	Q. Do you know why Mr Gaggero referred
11 12	Cornelio's lawyer at the time. Is that correct? <b>A. That is correct.</b>	11 12	to him as the grey man?  A. I think that's best a question for Mr
13	Q. Do you recall why this letter was raised	13	Gaggero but I think that he's referring to the
13	on the call with Mr Gaggero?	14	fact that he was in the shadows and therefore
15	A. I don't, no.	15	not out in the light.
16	Q. Is it usual to discuss representations made	16	Q. Can we now move to 12 May 2020,
17	on behalf of a suspect with the complainant?	17	which is obviously the day of the warrants. I
18	A. I can't say whether it's unusual but Mr	18	accept that they were not ultimately executed
19	Fischel had alleged that Mr Gaggero had	19	but there were assessments made and it was
20	committed offences and so we were looking	20	determined I think in the NDM that you
21	at whether there was any merit in	21	should wear body-worn footage.
22	investigating or following up those lines of	22	A. Not that we should wear body-worn
23	enquiry.	23	footage. That we should take a body-worn
24	Q. Can I now just take you half way down	24	camera.
25	page 1790, the same page that we are on.	25	Q. Yes, sorry, that you should take a body-
	Page 121		Page 123
1	Just after the two question marks, can you	1	worn camera.
1 2	Just after the two question marks, can you just read out what is after that bullet point.	1 2	worn camera. THE CHAIRMAN: If you are moving on to
_			
2	just read out what is after that bullet point.	2	THE CHAIRMAN: If you are moving on to
2 3	just read out what is after that bullet point.  A. The one that starts "Grey man"?	2 3	THE CHAIRMAN: If you are moving on to 12 May, is that perhaps a good point to
2 3 4	just read out what is after that bullet point.  A. The one that starts "Grey man"?  Q. Yes.  A. "Grey man in joint meeting with COP.  Made him feel very uncomfortable of	2 3 4	THE CHAIRMAN: If you are moving on to 12 May, is that perhaps a good point to break?
2 3 4 5	just read out what is after that bullet point.  A. The one that starts "Grey man"?  Q. Yes.  A. "Grey man in joint meeting with COP.  Made him feel very uncomfortable of  Government involvement. Grey man had	2 3 4 5	THE CHAIRMAN: If you are moving on to 12 May, is that perhaps a good point to break?  MR SANTOS: I think that is probably sensible actually, yes.  THE CHAIRMAN: Let us do that.
2 3 4 5 6	just read out what is after that bullet point.  A. The one that starts "Grey man"?  Q. Yes.  A. "Grey man in joint meeting with COP.  Made him feel very uncomfortable of  Government involvement. Grey man had approached him. Grey man feels let down	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	THE CHAIRMAN: If you are moving on to 12 May, is that perhaps a good point to break?  MR SANTOS: I think that is probably sensible actually, yes.  THE CHAIRMAN: Let us do that.  MR SANTOS: Just in terms of progress, I
2 3 4 5 6 7	just read out what is after that bullet point.  A. The one that starts "Grey man"?  Q. Yes.  A. "Grey man in joint meeting with COP.  Made him feel very uncomfortable of Government involvement. Grey man had approached him. Grey man feels let down and betrayed."	2 3 4 5 6 7	THE CHAIRMAN: If you are moving on to 12 May, is that perhaps a good point to break?  MR SANTOS: I think that is probably sensible actually, yes.  THE CHAIRMAN: Let us do that.  MR SANTOS: Just in terms of progress, I will definitely be done by three o'clock,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	just read out what is after that bullet point.  A. The one that starts "Grey man"?  Q. Yes.  A. "Grey man in joint meeting with COP.  Made him feel very uncomfortable of Government involvement. Grey man had approached him. Grey man feels let down and betrayed."  Q. Can I just ask who you are referring to as	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	THE CHAIRMAN: If you are moving on to 12 May, is that perhaps a good point to break?  MR SANTOS: I think that is probably sensible actually, yes.  THE CHAIRMAN: Let us do that.  MR SANTOS: Just in terms of progress, I will definitely be done by three o'clock, hopefully sooner than that, but certainly there
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	just read out what is after that bullet point.  A. The one that starts "Grey man"?  Q. Yes.  A. "Grey man in joint meeting with COP.  Made him feel very uncomfortable of Government involvement. Grey man had approached him. Grey man feels let down and betrayed."  Q. Can I just ask who you are referring to as "grey man"?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	THE CHAIRMAN: If you are moving on to 12 May, is that perhaps a good point to break?  MR SANTOS: I think that is probably sensible actually, yes.  THE CHAIRMAN: Let us do that.  MR SANTOS: Just in terms of progress, I will definitely be done by three o'clock, hopefully sooner than that, but certainly there is another half-hour at least.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	just read out what is after that bullet point.  A. The one that starts "Grey man"?  Q. Yes.  A. "Grey man in joint meeting with COP.  Made him feel very uncomfortable of  Government involvement. Grey man had approached him. Grey man feels let down and betrayed."  Q. Can I just ask who you are referring to as "grey man"?  A. It wasn't me referring to the grey man, it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	THE CHAIRMAN: If you are moving on to 12 May, is that perhaps a good point to break?  MR SANTOS: I think that is probably sensible actually, yes.  THE CHAIRMAN: Let us do that.  MR SANTOS: Just in terms of progress, I will definitely be done by three o'clock, hopefully sooner than that, but certainly there is another half-hour at least.  THE CHAIRMAN: Shall we say two
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	just read out what is after that bullet point.  A. The one that starts "Grey man"?  Q. Yes.  A. "Grey man in joint meeting with COP.  Made him feel very uncomfortable of Government involvement. Grey man had approached him. Grey man feels let down and betrayed."  Q. Can I just ask who you are referring to as "grey man"?  A. It wasn't me referring to the grey man, it was Mr Gaggero, and he was referring to Mr	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	THE CHAIRMAN: If you are moving on to 12 May, is that perhaps a good point to break?  MR SANTOS: I think that is probably sensible actually, yes.  THE CHAIRMAN: Let us do that.  MR SANTOS: Just in terms of progress, I will definitely be done by three o'clock, hopefully sooner than that, but certainly there is another half-hour at least.  THE CHAIRMAN: Shall we say two o'clock?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	just read out what is after that bullet point.  A. The one that starts "Grey man"?  Q. Yes.  A. "Grey man in joint meeting with COP.  Made him feel very uncomfortable of Government involvement. Grey man had approached him. Grey man feels let down and betrayed."  Q. Can I just ask who you are referring to as "grey man"?  A. It wasn't me referring to the grey man, it was Mr Gaggero, and he was referring to Mr Levy.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	THE CHAIRMAN: If you are moving on to 12 May, is that perhaps a good point to break?  MR SANTOS: I think that is probably sensible actually, yes.  THE CHAIRMAN: Let us do that.  MR SANTOS: Just in terms of progress, I will definitely be done by three o'clock, hopefully sooner than that, but certainly there is another half-hour at least.  THE CHAIRMAN: Shall we say two o'clock?  MR SANTOS: Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	just read out what is after that bullet point.  A. The one that starts "Grey man"?  Q. Yes.  A. "Grey man in joint meeting with COP.  Made him feel very uncomfortable of Government involvement. Grey man had approached him. Grey man feels let down and betrayed."  Q. Can I just ask who you are referring to as "grey man"?  A. It wasn't me referring to the grey man, it was Mr Gaggero, and he was referring to Mr Levy.  Q. And what is being referred to when it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	THE CHAIRMAN: If you are moving on to 12 May, is that perhaps a good point to break?  MR SANTOS: I think that is probably sensible actually, yes.  THE CHAIRMAN: Let us do that.  MR SANTOS: Just in terms of progress, I will definitely be done by three o'clock, hopefully sooner than that, but certainly there is another half-hour at least.  THE CHAIRMAN: Shall we say two o'clock?  MR SANTOS: Yes.  THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	just read out what is after that bullet point.  A. The one that starts "Grey man"?  Q. Yes.  A. "Grey man in joint meeting with COP.  Made him feel very uncomfortable of Government involvement. Grey man had approached him. Grey man feels let down and betrayed."  Q. Can I just ask who you are referring to as "grey man"?  A. It wasn't me referring to the grey man, it was Mr Gaggero, and he was referring to Mr Levy.  Q. And what is being referred to when it says "Grey man feels let down and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	THE CHAIRMAN: If you are moving on to 12 May, is that perhaps a good point to break?  MR SANTOS: I think that is probably sensible actually, yes.  THE CHAIRMAN: Let us do that.  MR SANTOS: Just in terms of progress, I will definitely be done by three o'clock, hopefully sooner than that, but certainly there is another half-hour at least.  THE CHAIRMAN: Shall we say two o'clock?  MR SANTOS: Yes.  THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you.  (12.56)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	just read out what is after that bullet point.  A. The one that starts "Grey man"?  Q. Yes.  A. "Grey man in joint meeting with COP.  Made him feel very uncomfortable of Government involvement. Grey man had approached him. Grey man feels let down and betrayed."  Q. Can I just ask who you are referring to as "grey man"?  A. It wasn't me referring to the grey man, it was Mr Gaggero, and he was referring to Mr Levy.  Q. And what is being referred to when it says "Grey man feels let down and betrayed"? What did he feel let down and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	THE CHAIRMAN: If you are moving on to 12 May, is that perhaps a good point to break?  MR SANTOS: I think that is probably sensible actually, yes.  THE CHAIRMAN: Let us do that.  MR SANTOS: Just in terms of progress, I will definitely be done by three o'clock, hopefully sooner than that, but certainly there is another half-hour at least.  THE CHAIRMAN: Shall we say two o'clock?  MR SANTOS: Yes.  THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you.  (12.56)  (The luncheon adjournment)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	just read out what is after that bullet point.  A. The one that starts "Grey man"?  Q. Yes.  A. "Grey man in joint meeting with COP.  Made him feel very uncomfortable of Government involvement. Grey man had approached him. Grey man feels let down and betrayed."  Q. Can I just ask who you are referring to as "grey man"?  A. It wasn't me referring to the grey man, it was Mr Gaggero, and he was referring to Mr Levy.  Q. And what is being referred to when it says "Grey man feels let down and betrayed"? What did he feel let down and betrayed about, as far as you can recall?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	THE CHAIRMAN: If you are moving on to 12 May, is that perhaps a good point to break?  MR SANTOS: I think that is probably sensible actually, yes.  THE CHAIRMAN: Let us do that.  MR SANTOS: Just in terms of progress, I will definitely be done by three o'clock, hopefully sooner than that, but certainly there is another half-hour at least.  THE CHAIRMAN: Shall we say two o'clock?  MR SANTOS: Yes.  THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you.  (12.56)  (The luncheon adjournment)  (14.01)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	just read out what is after that bullet point.  A. The one that starts "Grey man"?  Q. Yes.  A. "Grey man in joint meeting with COP.  Made him feel very uncomfortable of Government involvement. Grey man had approached him. Grey man feels let down and betrayed."  Q. Can I just ask who you are referring to as "grey man"?  A. It wasn't me referring to the grey man, it was Mr Gaggero, and he was referring to Mr Levy.  Q. And what is being referred to when it says "Grey man feels let down and betrayed"? What did he feel let down and betrayed about, as far as you can recall?  A. I don't know what the grey man had felt	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	THE CHAIRMAN: If you are moving on to 12 May, is that perhaps a good point to break?  MR SANTOS: I think that is probably sensible actually, yes.  THE CHAIRMAN: Let us do that.  MR SANTOS: Just in terms of progress, I will definitely be done by three o'clock, hopefully sooner than that, but certainly there is another half-hour at least.  THE CHAIRMAN: Shall we say two o'clock?  MR SANTOS: Yes.  THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you.  (12.56)  (The luncheon adjournment)  (14.01)  MR SANTOS: We were just turning to 12
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	just read out what is after that bullet point.  A. The one that starts "Grey man"?  Q. Yes.  A. "Grey man in joint meeting with COP.  Made him feel very uncomfortable of  Government involvement. Grey man had approached him. Grey man feels let down and betrayed."  Q. Can I just ask who you are referring to as "grey man"?  A. It wasn't me referring to the grey man, it was Mr Gaggero, and he was referring to Mr  Levy.  Q. And what is being referred to when it says "Grey man feels let down and betrayed"? What did he feel let down and betrayed about, as far as you can recall?  A. I don't know what the grey man had felt let down and betrayed about but my	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	THE CHAIRMAN: If you are moving on to 12 May, is that perhaps a good point to break?  MR SANTOS: I think that is probably sensible actually, yes.  THE CHAIRMAN: Let us do that.  MR SANTOS: Just in terms of progress, I will definitely be done by three o'clock, hopefully sooner than that, but certainly there is another half-hour at least.  THE CHAIRMAN: Shall we say two o'clock?  MR SANTOS: Yes.  THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you.  (12.56)  (The luncheon adjournment)  (14.01)  MR SANTOS: We were just turning to 12  May 2020. That was the day on which you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	just read out what is after that bullet point.  A. The one that starts "Grey man"?  Q. Yes.  A. "Grey man in joint meeting with COP.  Made him feel very uncomfortable of  Government involvement. Grey man had approached him. Grey man feels let down and betrayed."  Q. Can I just ask who you are referring to as "grey man"?  A. It wasn't me referring to the grey man, it was Mr Gaggero, and he was referring to Mr Levy.  Q. And what is being referred to when it says "Grey man feels let down and betrayed"? What did he feel let down and betrayed about, as far as you can recall?  A. I don't know what the grey man had felt let down and betrayed about but my recollection is that Mr Gaggero was saying	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	THE CHAIRMAN: If you are moving on to 12 May, is that perhaps a good point to break?  MR SANTOS: I think that is probably sensible actually, yes.  THE CHAIRMAN: Let us do that.  MR SANTOS: Just in terms of progress, I will definitely be done by three o'clock, hopefully sooner than that, but certainly there is another half-hour at least.  THE CHAIRMAN: Shall we say two o'clock?  MR SANTOS: Yes.  THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you.  (12.56)  (The luncheon adjournment)  (14.01)  MR SANTOS: We were just turning to 12  May 2020. That was the day on which you attended Hassans with Mr Wyan in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	just read out what is after that bullet point.  A. The one that starts "Grey man"?  Q. Yes.  A. "Grey man in joint meeting with COP.  Made him feel very uncomfortable of Government involvement. Grey man had approached him. Grey man feels let down and betrayed."  Q. Can I just ask who you are referring to as "grey man"?  A. It wasn't me referring to the grey man, it was Mr Gaggero, and he was referring to Mr Levy.  Q. And what is being referred to when it says "Grey man feels let down and betrayed"? What did he feel let down and betrayed about, as far as you can recall?  A. I don't know what the grey man had felt let down and betrayed about but my recollection is that Mr Gaggero was saying that he had been cornered or came across Mr	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	THE CHAIRMAN: If you are moving on to 12 May, is that perhaps a good point to break?  MR SANTOS: I think that is probably sensible actually, yes.  THE CHAIRMAN: Let us do that.  MR SANTOS: Just in terms of progress, I will definitely be done by three o'clock, hopefully sooner than that, but certainly there is another half-hour at least.  THE CHAIRMAN: Shall we say two o'clock?  MR SANTOS: Yes.  THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you.  (12.56)  (The luncheon adjournment)  (14.01)  MR SANTOS: We were just turning to 12  May 2020. That was the day on which you attended Hassans with Mr Wyan in possession of the search warrant. The
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	just read out what is after that bullet point.  A. The one that starts "Grey man"?  Q. Yes.  A. "Grey man in joint meeting with COP.  Made him feel very uncomfortable of Government involvement. Grey man had approached him. Grey man feels let down and betrayed."  Q. Can I just ask who you are referring to as "grey man"?  A. It wasn't me referring to the grey man, it was Mr Gaggero, and he was referring to Mr Levy.  Q. And what is being referred to when it says "Grey man feels let down and betrayed"? What did he feel let down and betrayed about, as far as you can recall?  A. I don't know what the grey man had felt let down and betrayed about but my recollection is that Mr Gaggero was saying that he had been cornered or came across Mr Levy, who he referred to as the grey man,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	THE CHAIRMAN: If you are moving on to 12 May, is that perhaps a good point to break?  MR SANTOS: I think that is probably sensible actually, yes.  THE CHAIRMAN: Let us do that.  MR SANTOS: Just in terms of progress, I will definitely be done by three o'clock, hopefully sooner than that, but certainly there is another half-hour at least.  THE CHAIRMAN: Shall we say two o'clock?  MR SANTOS: Yes.  THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you.  (12.56)  (The luncheon adjournment)  (14.01)  MR SANTOS: We were just turning to 12  May 2020. That was the day on which you attended Hassans with Mr Wyan in possession of the search warrant. The Inquiry has the benefit of the footage taken
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	just read out what is after that bullet point.  A. The one that starts "Grey man"?  Q. Yes.  A. "Grey man in joint meeting with COP.  Made him feel very uncomfortable of Government involvement. Grey man had approached him. Grey man feels let down and betrayed."  Q. Can I just ask who you are referring to as "grey man"?  A. It wasn't me referring to the grey man, it was Mr Gaggero, and he was referring to Mr Levy.  Q. And what is being referred to when it says "Grey man feels let down and betrayed"? What did he feel let down and betrayed about, as far as you can recall?  A. I don't know what the grey man had felt let down and betrayed about but my recollection is that Mr Gaggero was saying that he had been cornered or came across Mr Levy, who he referred to as the grey man, and that they had discussed presumably the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	THE CHAIRMAN: If you are moving on to 12 May, is that perhaps a good point to break?  MR SANTOS: I think that is probably sensible actually, yes.  THE CHAIRMAN: Let us do that.  MR SANTOS: Just in terms of progress, I will definitely be done by three o'clock, hopefully sooner than that, but certainly there is another half-hour at least.  THE CHAIRMAN: Shall we say two o'clock?  MR SANTOS: Yes.  THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you.  (12.56)  (The luncheon adjournment)  (14.01)  MR SANTOS: We were just turning to 12  May 2020. That was the day on which you attended Hassans with Mr Wyan in possession of the search warrant. The Inquiry has the benefit of the footage taken from the body-worn camera on that day, but I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	just read out what is after that bullet point.  A. The one that starts "Grey man"?  Q. Yes.  A. "Grey man in joint meeting with COP.  Made him feel very uncomfortable of Government involvement. Grey man had approached him. Grey man feels let down and betrayed."  Q. Can I just ask who you are referring to as "grey man"?  A. It wasn't me referring to the grey man, it was Mr Gaggero, and he was referring to Mr Levy.  Q. And what is being referred to when it says "Grey man feels let down and betrayed"? What did he feel let down and betrayed about, as far as you can recall?  A. I don't know what the grey man had felt let down and betrayed about but my recollection is that Mr Gaggero was saying that he had been cornered or came across Mr Levy, who he referred to as the grey man,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	THE CHAIRMAN: If you are moving on to 12 May, is that perhaps a good point to break?  MR SANTOS: I think that is probably sensible actually, yes.  THE CHAIRMAN: Let us do that.  MR SANTOS: Just in terms of progress, I will definitely be done by three o'clock, hopefully sooner than that, but certainly there is another half-hour at least.  THE CHAIRMAN: Shall we say two o'clock?  MR SANTOS: Yes.  THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you.  (12.56)  (The luncheon adjournment)  (14.01)  MR SANTOS: We were just turning to 12  May 2020. That was the day on which you attended Hassans with Mr Wyan in possession of the search warrant. The Inquiry has the benefit of the footage taken
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	just read out what is after that bullet point.  A. The one that starts "Grey man"?  Q. Yes.  A. "Grey man in joint meeting with COP.  Made him feel very uncomfortable of Government involvement. Grey man had approached him. Grey man feels let down and betrayed."  Q. Can I just ask who you are referring to as "grey man"?  A. It wasn't me referring to the grey man, it was Mr Gaggero, and he was referring to Mr Levy.  Q. And what is being referred to when it says "Grey man feels let down and betrayed"? What did he feel let down and betrayed about, as far as you can recall?  A. I don't know what the grey man had felt let down and betrayed about but my recollection is that Mr Gaggero was saying that he had been cornered or came across Mr Levy, who he referred to as the grey man, and that they had discussed presumably the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	THE CHAIRMAN: If you are moving on to 12 May, is that perhaps a good point to break?  MR SANTOS: I think that is probably sensible actually, yes.  THE CHAIRMAN: Let us do that.  MR SANTOS: Just in terms of progress, I will definitely be done by three o'clock, hopefully sooner than that, but certainly there is another half-hour at least.  THE CHAIRMAN: Shall we say two o'clock?  MR SANTOS: Yes.  THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you.  (12.56)  (The luncheon adjournment)  (14.01)  MR SANTOS: We were just turning to 12  May 2020. That was the day on which you attended Hassans with Mr Wyan in possession of the search warrant. The Inquiry has the benefit of the footage taken from the body-worn camera on that day, but I

commences once you are in the boardroom. 1 possible. It was a very sensitive matter." 2 2 Can I ask you to explain why it was only Q. You said 12 o'clock. I think I am 3 switched on at that point? 3 becoming better at reading your handwriting 4 4 A. Because originally when we attended than you are. I think that says 12.30. 5 Hassans' premises there was no indication 5 A. Yes, 12.30, that's correct. 6 6 Q. At 12.50 I think the entry says: "Javier about what we would be attending for and so 7 I'd arranged entry through a schoolfriend of 7 calls Hiene by phone." I think it is fair to say 8 8 mine, Javier Chincotta and it wasn't until I that the entry before that does not actually 9 9 explain what you said in terms of the told him about what was happening that we 10 10 found out that Mr Levy wasn't actually in the substance to Javier. It says that you said you 11 11 premises and so we had to request him to needed to be discreet, that it was very 12 come to Hassans, and when he came to 12 sensitive, but what did you say to Mr 13 Hassans that when the body-worn camera 13 Chincotta that then caused him to call Mr 14 14 footage began. Levy by phone. 15 15 Q. What was said or done - I think you have A. I don't remember exact words that were 16 16 sort of covered it but just to make sure it is said but I would have told him that we 17 17 clear - before the camera was switched on? I needed to speak to Mr Levy, that we had a 18 think you talk about discussions with Mr 18 search warrant for Hassans and a search 19 19 Chincotta. What was said, for example, to warrant for his house and that what I would 20 20 like him to do is to ask Mr Levy to come into him? 21 A. Should I read from my notes? 21 the boardroom rather than us go looking for 22 22 Q. Yes, with the benefit of your notes, yes. him. In other words, we would be dealing 23 23 Obviously if you remember something other with it as sensitively as possible. 24 24 than what is in your notes, then by all means Q. Then at some point I think you say: 25 25 say so. Let us turn to your notes. "Javier calls Heine by phone. Can't do now. Page 125 Page 127 1 A. Page 143 of my daybook. 1 Will speak tomorrow." 2 Q. Thank you. C 1794. Can you tell us 2 A. "Consequences." 3 3 what occurred before the footage was Q. What is that reference to "consequences"? 4 switched on? 4 A. There will be consequences in you asking 5 5 A. I think it was the same morning I had me to go in because there's a warrant. That's 6 texted Javier who, as I said, was a 6 what I understood that to mean. 7 7 schoolfriend of mine, and told him that I Q. So that was something that Mr Levy had 8 8 needed to speak to him about a sensitive said to Mr Chincotta over the phone as a 9 9 message for you. matter, if I could come and see him, and he 10 10 said something along the lines of: "Yes, sure, A. I'm not a hundred per cent certain if it 11 come down." We agreed, whatever. So I 11 wasn't on speakerphone, although I do seem 12 came down. Mr Wyan and myself in plain 12 to remember at some point Javier gave me 13 clothes went to the security station at the 13 the phone and I spoke to Mr Levy. I can't 14 bottom of the building, told them that we had 14 remember whether this was on speakerphone 15 a meeting with Mr Chincotta. I don't know if 15 16 16 we were escorted up in the lift or we went up Q. He was saying to you or intended for 17 in the lift. We met with Mr Chincotta. And 17 your attention: "There will be consequences 18 18 of you requiring me to attend." Is that what then at 12.00 hours I explained to him the 19 19 reason for our visit, and my entry says: you say? 20 20 "Atter Sands, 11th Floor, boardroom number A. The note that I have recorded of what was 2.1 21 two, re interview of JL. Met Javier Chincotta said was - I explained what we were there 22 22 with DI Mark Wyan. Javier is managing for and asked him to come to the office. We 23 23 partner of Hassans. Explained thanks for had expected him to be at his office that 24 24 seeing us, apology for not being clear before morning at that time and so this caught us a 25 the meeting and the need to be as discreet as 25 little bit off guard. So it was Javier that Page 126 Page 128

1	called him and asked him to come into the	1	those four minutes is what you have just told
2	office, and I think that he didn't want to come	2	us was the conversation with Mr Chincotta as
3	in so I had to speak to him and when I	3	to the purpose of the visit.
4	explained to him what the reason was he	4	A. Yes.
5	says: "I can't come in now. I'll come in	5	Q. Can I just ask you: we see in the footage
6	tomorrow. We'll speak tomorrow. There	6	the conversation that takes place and then the
7	will be consequences."	7	footage ends. There is no footage of
8	Q. Then there is an entry, 13.04 maybe.	8	anything that took place at Mr Levy's home,
9	A. That's correct.	9	there is no footage after that meeting. Why
10	Q. I will ask you to read it, rather than me	10	is it that those parts of your dealings with Mr
11	try and guess.	11	Levy were not filmed?
12	A. "Call back JL." So I'm not sure if we	12	A. I suppose that's my fault for not taking
13	called him back or he called us. I think it's	13	the camera with me when I went to Mr
14	suggesting that we called or Javier called.	14	Levy's office and to his house. He had asked
15	"When do you want to do the search? To	15	me specifically to go on my own with him to
16	discuss with my family. Offered to ask	16	do this, to be as discreet as possible, and I
17	family to exercise. No, I have no secrets	17	agreed to that. At that time the exchange
18	from my family. Will come into the office	18	between us was very amicable and I agreed
19	and maybe what I say will avoid the need to	19	and we went off to do it, and I probably
20	search. PIN. Will give you PIN."	20	didn't even realise until afterwards that we
21	Q. And then 13.56, the next entry, is a	21	hadn't taken the camera with us.
22	reference to him leaving the room with Mr	22	Q. Can we go to Mr Levy's second witness
23	Chincotta to consult privately before	23	statement which is A 1514, please. There at
24	deciding whether to challenge the search	24	9.4 in relation to allegations made by Mr
25	warrant.	25	McGrail he says: "I see that Mr McGrail also
	D 400		D 424
	Page 129		Page 131
1	A. Yes. I'm not sure if it's 56 or 55, but I	1	repeats this allegation in his fifth affidavit,
2	don't think it makes much difference.	2	nearly four years after the event. I do not
3	Q. Thank you. Am I right in saying that by	3	recall how my legal representative Mr
4	the time of that entry the body-worn camera	4	Baglietto may have been given to understand
5	was operating?	5	that the DPP had advised against the making
6	A. That is correct.	6	of the application for the warrants. However,
7	Q. Can we also take you to B 3497. These, I	7	even if this information came from the Chief
8	believe, are Mr Wyan's handwritten notes of	8	Minister I do not consider it improper for my
9	that meeting. If you do not know, you do not	9	legal representative to have been told this
10	know.	10	when the RGP had, whilst at my office with
11	A. They appear to be.	11	the warrants, told me that they had taken
12	Q. And that says: "12.30 arrival. Wait for J	12	advice 'from the highest level', or similar
13	Chincotta. 12.30 boardroom 12. Officers	13	words." Did you tell Mr Levy that the search
14	wait downstairs. Three officers including DS	14	warrant had been approved from the highest
15	Clarke. Then officers at house. Three other	15	level, or similar words?
16	officers. Instructions to officers at house to	16	A. I don't remember discussing that - sorry?
17	follow. 12.46. Discussion with J Chincotta."	17	MALE SPEAKER: I noticed that the
18	Your initials.	18	question you asked was different to what is
19	A. Yes.	19	written in the statement, taking advice from
20	Q. "Explore reason for wait."	20	and -
21	A. "Visit", I think.	21	MR SANTOS: "Approved". I take the
22	Q. "Including reason search warrants. Intent	22	point. (To the witness) I will just read the
23	to interview." Then: "12.50 call made by J	23	allegation by Mr Levy as to what was said
	Chinasta to II II Ca than form minutes	24	and then I will just ask you to confirm
24	Chincotta to JL." So those four minutes	1	
24 25	between 12.46 and 12.50: what was said in	25	whether you have any recollection of saying
	between 12.46 and 12.50: what was said in	1	whether you have any recollection of saying
		1	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·

1			
1	it. Mr Levy says that the RGP had, whilst at	1	A. Well, I wasn't engaged with the other
2	my office with the warrants, told me that they	2	suspects so I didn't go to the warrants. I
3	had taken advice 'from the highest level', or	3	didn't go to the arrests.
4	similar words. Do you recall that?	4	Q. Sorry, I just meant other suspects in
5	A. I recall a conversation with Mr Chincotta	5	general.
6	specifically in the lift on the way down and	6	A. In general. Well, obviously you adapt
7	Javier and I were discussing the fact that this	7	your style towards the person that you are
8	was very serious and that it wasn't a run of	8	dealing with. If you're dealing with. If
9	the mill situation and what I will have said to	9	you're dealing with somebody that is
10	Javier is: "Please don't think that we've just	10	struggling and is resisting you and is being
11	taken level from a junior counsel. We have	11	offensive, you don't act the same way as you
12	taken level - we have taken advice at a high	12	do with somebody of Mr Levy's standing and
13	level." It wouldn't have been specifically we	13	respect within our community.
14	have taken advice regarding the search	14	Q. In your third witness statement you say at
15	warrant but about the intervention, given that	15	paragraph 39, A 1431: "We were conscious
16	we had taken advice about considering Mr	16	of JL -"
17	Levy as a suspect.	17	A. Where is this?
18	Q. When you say about the intervention you	18	Q. Sorry, paragraph 39 of your third witness
19	mean	19	statement, so the back one for you. "We
20	A. Attending Hassans with the search	20	were conscious of JL's standing in the legal
21	warrant.	21	profession in Gibraltar. We tried to treat him
22	Q. Sorry. So you said: "We have taken	22	with sensitivity and respect insofar as that
23	advice from the highest level in relation to	23	was compatible with treating him in the same
24	the intervention."	24	way as other suspects. However, it is likely
25	A. Yes, in considering Mr Levy a suspect,	25	that JL did receive preferential treatment
	D 422		D 425
	Page 133		Page 135
1	which led us to attend to Hassans with a	1	after all. For example, another suspect of
2	search warrant with the intention of inviting	2	standing, JP, who had been the commanding
3	him to attend a voluntary police interview.	3	officer of the Gibraltar Regiment, was
4	Q. Did you mention to him that, in fact, the	4	formally arrested and interviewed under
5	DPP had preferred a different course?	5	caution. JL was treated rather differently."
6	A. No. In fact, I was speaking with Javier,	6	A. That is correct.
7	not with Mr Levy, as far as I can recall.	7	Q. Why did you take a different approach to
	not with Mr Levy, as far as I can recall.  Q. As far as Mr Levy is concerned, do you	7 8	Q. Why did you take a different approach to Mr Levy as opposed to Mr Perez, although
7	Q. As far as Mr Levy is concerned, do you		Mr Levy as opposed to Mr Perez, although
7 8	Q. As far as Mr Levy is concerned, do you have any recollection of saying something	8	
7 8 9	Q. As far as Mr Levy is concerned, do you	8 9	Mr Levy as opposed to Mr Perez, although Mr Perez was also a person of standing?
7 8 9 10	Q. As far as Mr Levy is concerned, do you have any recollection of saying something along those lines to Mr Levy?	8 9 10	Mr Levy as opposed to Mr Perez, although Mr Perez was also a person of standing?  A. There are a number of reasons. The first
7 8 9 10 11	<ul><li>Q. As far as Mr Levy is concerned, do you have any recollection of saying something along those lines to Mr Levy?</li><li>A. No.</li></ul>	8 9 10 11	Mr Levy as opposed to Mr Perez, although Mr Perez was also a person of standing?  A. There are a number of reasons. The first one is that at the time that we took action in
7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Q. As far as Mr Levy is concerned, do you have any recollection of saying something along those lines to Mr Levy?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. The conversation between you and Mr</li> </ul>	8 9 10 11 12	Mr Levy as opposed to Mr Perez, although Mr Perez was also a person of standing?  A. There are a number of reasons. The first one is that at the time that we took action in connection with Mr Perez, it was at the same
7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Q. As far as Mr Levy is concerned, do you have any recollection of saying something along those lines to Mr Levy?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. The conversation between you and Mr Levy was cordial. I think you make that</li> </ul>	8 9 10 11 12 13	Mr Levy as opposed to Mr Perez, although Mr Perez was also a person of standing? A. There are a number of reasons. The first one is that at the time that we took action in connection with Mr Perez, it was at the same time as taking action with Mr Cornelio and
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Q. As far as Mr Levy is concerned, do you have any recollection of saying something along those lines to Mr Levy?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. The conversation between you and Mr Levy was cordial. I think you make that point and Mr Levy does as well. Did you</li> </ul>	8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Mr Levy as opposed to Mr Perez, although Mr Perez was also a person of standing? A. There are a number of reasons. The first one is that at the time that we took action in connection with Mr Perez, it was at the same time as taking action with Mr Cornelio and Mr Askis(?) at that time, and so there was a
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Q. As far as Mr Levy is concerned, do you have any recollection of saying something along those lines to Mr Levy?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. The conversation between you and Mr Levy was cordial. I think you make that point and Mr Levy does as well. Did you know each other?</li> </ul>	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Mr Levy as opposed to Mr Perez, although Mr Perez was also a person of standing?  A. There are a number of reasons. The first one is that at the time that we took action in connection with Mr Perez, it was at the same time as taking action with Mr Cornelio and Mr Askis(?) at that time, and so there was a need to take action simultaneously, there was
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Q. As far as Mr Levy is concerned, do you have any recollection of saying something along those lines to Mr Levy?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. The conversation between you and Mr Levy was cordial. I think you make that point and Mr Levy does as well. Did you know each other?</li> <li>A. I've known Mr Levy probably for my</li> </ul>	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Mr Levy as opposed to Mr Perez, although Mr Perez was also a person of standing?  A. There are a number of reasons. The first one is that at the time that we took action in connection with Mr Perez, it was at the same time as taking action with Mr Cornelio and Mr Askis(?) at that time, and so there was a need to take action simultaneously, there was a need to have different teams of people
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. As far as Mr Levy is concerned, do you have any recollection of saying something along those lines to Mr Levy?  A. No.  Q. The conversation between you and Mr Levy was cordial. I think you make that point and Mr Levy does as well. Did you know each other?  A. I've known Mr Levy probably for my whole police career, or most of it anyway.  Q. And your conversation included talk to some extent about your personal lives.	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Mr Levy as opposed to Mr Perez, although Mr Perez was also a person of standing?  A. There are a number of reasons. The first one is that at the time that we took action in connection with Mr Perez, it was at the same time as taking action with Mr Cornelio and Mr Askis(?) at that time, and so there was a need to take action simultaneously, there was a need to have different teams of people searching at the same time. This wasn't the
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. As far as Mr Levy is concerned, do you have any recollection of saying something along those lines to Mr Levy?  A. No.  Q. The conversation between you and Mr Levy was cordial. I think you make that point and Mr Levy does as well. Did you know each other?  A. I've known Mr Levy probably for my whole police career, or most of it anyway.  Q. And your conversation included talk to some extent about your personal lives.  A. There was some chitchat at the end of the	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Mr Levy as opposed to Mr Perez, although Mr Perez was also a person of standing?  A. There are a number of reasons. The first one is that at the time that we took action in connection with Mr Perez, it was at the same time as taking action with Mr Cornelio and Mr Askis(?) at that time, and so there was a need to take action simultaneously, there was a need to have different teams of people searching at the same time. This wasn't the case when we dealt with Mr Levy. There
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. As far as Mr Levy is concerned, do you have any recollection of saying something along those lines to Mr Levy?  A. No.  Q. The conversation between you and Mr Levy was cordial. I think you make that point and Mr Levy does as well. Did you know each other?  A. I've known Mr Levy probably for my whole police career, or most of it anyway.  Q. And your conversation included talk to some extent about your personal lives.	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Mr Levy as opposed to Mr Perez, although Mr Perez was also a person of standing?  A. There are a number of reasons. The first one is that at the time that we took action in connection with Mr Perez, it was at the same time as taking action with Mr Cornelio and Mr Askis(?) at that time, and so there was a need to take action simultaneously, there was a need to have different teams of people searching at the same time. This wasn't the case when we dealt with Mr Levy. There wasn't an opportunity in this case - in the
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. As far as Mr Levy is concerned, do you have any recollection of saying something along those lines to Mr Levy?  A. No.  Q. The conversation between you and Mr Levy was cordial. I think you make that point and Mr Levy does as well. Did you know each other?  A. I've known Mr Levy probably for my whole police career, or most of it anyway.  Q. And your conversation included talk to some extent about your personal lives.  A. There was some chitchat at the end of the	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Mr Levy as opposed to Mr Perez, although Mr Perez was also a person of standing?  A. There are a number of reasons. The first one is that at the time that we took action in connection with Mr Perez, it was at the same time as taking action with Mr Cornelio and Mr Askis(?) at that time, and so there was a need to take action simultaneously, there was a need to have different teams of people searching at the same time. This wasn't the case when we dealt with Mr Levy. There wasn't an opportunity in this case - in the other cases - to ask for an interview, a
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. As far as Mr Levy is concerned, do you have any recollection of saying something along those lines to Mr Levy?  A. No.  Q. The conversation between you and Mr Levy was cordial. I think you make that point and Mr Levy does as well. Did you know each other?  A. I've known Mr Levy probably for my whole police career, or most of it anyway.  Q. And your conversation included talk to some extent about your personal lives.  A. There was some chitchat at the end of the meeting when we'd sorted out the issue of consent.  Q. Do you think that you treated Mr Levy	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Mr Levy as opposed to Mr Perez, although Mr Perez was also a person of standing?  A. There are a number of reasons. The first one is that at the time that we took action in connection with Mr Perez, it was at the same time as taking action with Mr Cornelio and Mr Askis(?) at that time, and so there was a need to take action simultaneously, there was a need to have different teams of people searching at the same time. This wasn't the case when we dealt with Mr Levy. There wasn't an opportunity in this case - in the other cases - to ask for an interview, a voluntary attendance interview, at a later stage. Q. You have already said that you were the
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. As far as Mr Levy is concerned, do you have any recollection of saying something along those lines to Mr Levy?  A. No.  Q. The conversation between you and Mr Levy was cordial. I think you make that point and Mr Levy does as well. Did you know each other?  A. I've known Mr Levy probably for my whole police career, or most of it anyway.  Q. And your conversation included talk to some extent about your personal lives.  A. There was some chitchat at the end of the meeting when we'd sorted out the issue of consent.  Q. Do you think that you treated Mr Levy differently to how you would treat other	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Mr Levy as opposed to Mr Perez, although Mr Perez was also a person of standing?  A. There are a number of reasons. The first one is that at the time that we took action in connection with Mr Perez, it was at the same time as taking action with Mr Cornelio and Mr Askis(?) at that time, and so there was a need to take action simultaneously, there was a need to have different teams of people searching at the same time. This wasn't the case when we dealt with Mr Levy. There wasn't an opportunity in this case - in the other cases - to ask for an interview, a voluntary attendance interview, at a later stage.  Q. You have already said that you were the only person to search his office and, at his
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. As far as Mr Levy is concerned, do you have any recollection of saying something along those lines to Mr Levy?  A. No.  Q. The conversation between you and Mr Levy was cordial. I think you make that point and Mr Levy does as well. Did you know each other?  A. I've known Mr Levy probably for my whole police career, or most of it anyway.  Q. And your conversation included talk to some extent about your personal lives.  A. There was some chitchat at the end of the meeting when we'd sorted out the issue of consent.  Q. Do you think that you treated Mr Levy	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Mr Levy as opposed to Mr Perez, although Mr Perez was also a person of standing?  A. There are a number of reasons. The first one is that at the time that we took action in connection with Mr Perez, it was at the same time as taking action with Mr Cornelio and Mr Askis(?) at that time, and so there was a need to take action simultaneously, there was a need to have different teams of people searching at the same time. This wasn't the case when we dealt with Mr Levy. There wasn't an opportunity in this case - in the other cases - to ask for an interview, a voluntary attendance interview, at a later stage. Q. You have already said that you were the
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. As far as Mr Levy is concerned, do you have any recollection of saying something along those lines to Mr Levy?  A. No.  Q. The conversation between you and Mr Levy was cordial. I think you make that point and Mr Levy does as well. Did you know each other?  A. I've known Mr Levy probably for my whole police career, or most of it anyway.  Q. And your conversation included talk to some extent about your personal lives.  A. There was some chitchat at the end of the meeting when we'd sorted out the issue of consent.  Q. Do you think that you treated Mr Levy differently to how you would treat other suspects?	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Mr Levy as opposed to Mr Perez, although Mr Perez was also a person of standing?  A. There are a number of reasons. The first one is that at the time that we took action in connection with Mr Perez, it was at the same time as taking action with Mr Cornelio and Mr Askis(?) at that time, and so there was a need to take action simultaneously, there was a need to have different teams of people searching at the same time. This wasn't the case when we dealt with Mr Levy. There wasn't an opportunity in this case - in the other cases - to ask for an interview, a voluntary attendance interview, at a later stage.  Q. You have already said that you were the only person to search his office and, at his request, the only person to go to his home.
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. As far as Mr Levy is concerned, do you have any recollection of saying something along those lines to Mr Levy?  A. No.  Q. The conversation between you and Mr Levy was cordial. I think you make that point and Mr Levy does as well. Did you know each other?  A. I've known Mr Levy probably for my whole police career, or most of it anyway.  Q. And your conversation included talk to some extent about your personal lives.  A. There was some chitchat at the end of the meeting when we'd sorted out the issue of consent.  Q. Do you think that you treated Mr Levy differently to how you would treat other	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Mr Levy as opposed to Mr Perez, although Mr Perez was also a person of standing?  A. There are a number of reasons. The first one is that at the time that we took action in connection with Mr Perez, it was at the same time as taking action with Mr Cornelio and Mr Askis(?) at that time, and so there was a need to take action simultaneously, there was a need to have different teams of people searching at the same time. This wasn't the case when we dealt with Mr Levy. There wasn't an opportunity in this case - in the other cases - to ask for an interview, a voluntary attendance interview, at a later stage.  Q. You have already said that you were the only person to search his office and, at his

Was that a normal thing to do, in terms of a 1 A. Yes. 2 2 search warrant? Q. Do you know by "after the meeting" 3 3 when? Immediately after or some time after? A. I had never done it before. 4 4 Q. So why did you agree to depart from your A. I can't be more specific than that, I'm 5 usual course? 5 afraid. 6 6 A. Because the search of his house was a Q. You may as well look at what you say in 7 7 respect of the 15 May meeting 2020. Over little bit of an impossibility from a practical 8 8 the page, the final line, you say: "I was aware perspective. We were looking for, as the 9 9 that Mr McGrail was recording this information says, electronic data, that would 10 10 require accessing databases and we don't meeting." 11 11 have means to be able to seize a server and A. Yes. 12 take it away and close down a business. So 12 Q. I think what you mean by that, but correct 13 we had to rely on the consent of the person to 13 me if I am wrong, is that you were aware 14 14 assist us in that matter. We already had an before the meeting that Mr McGrail, or at the 15 15 agreement that he would hand over, or his IT time of the meeting, that Mr McGrail was 16 16 expert would deal with our IT expert in recording it. 17 17 providing the electronic documents. What A. I can't be precise on that but I certainly 18 was left was principally the communication 18 knew after, some time after the first meeting, 19 19 devices which he had agreed to hand over. I and probably by the second meeting. I may 20 20 have just presumed that he would be wasn't going to be turning his house, or we 21 weren't going to be turning the house upside 21 recording it because he'd told me he had 22 22 down looking behind every single book for recorded the first one. 23 23 evidence. Q. When he told you that, what exactly do 24 24 you remember about what he told you? Q. Now we move to 13 May 2020. If we 25 25 can look at B 168, please. This is a transcript A. I don't remember the words that were Page 137 Page 139 1 of that meeting on 13 May. This was a 1 said. He may have just indicated to his 2 meeting - actually, sorry, I may as well ask 2 phone that I've been recording. I really don't 3 3 you about this. You say in your evidence remember. 4 that Mr McGrail told you after that meeting 4 Q. Did he give you an explanation or 5 5 justification as to why he was recording it? that he had recorded the meeting. Do you 6 remember exactly what he said to you about 6 A. I don't remember that, no. 7 7 Q. What did you think about the fact that he it? 8 8 was recording it? A. No. I'm not a hundred per cent certain 9 9 when I found out that the recordings were A. It was shocking. I'd never come across 10 10 being made. It was certainly not at that first that situation where we'd had to or we felt the 11 11 meeting and it would have been after that need to record a conversation between a 12 first meeting and around the second meeting 12 police officer and a senior lawyer. Looking 13 13 but I don't remember exactly when it was or back on it now, I can understand perhaps 14 what he said. 14 why Mr McGrail did so but at the time I had 15 15 Q. I may as well remind you what you say in no idea. 16 16 your evidence in case it jogs your memory. THE CHAIRMAN: There are presumably 17 17 If we go to A 1288, paragraph 15 of your protocols getting permission covertly to 18 second statement. "In particular, please 18 record meetings. 19 19 provide accounts of the meetings that we A. No, sir, there is no RIPA in Gibraltar. 20 20 THE CHAIRMAN: None at all? believe that you may have attended on the 21 21 following dates", and then there is 13 May A. No, sir. 22 2020 at three o'clock. The last line of the 22 THE CHAIRMAN: Well, that is very 23 23 entry in relation to that meeting says: "After surprising. 24 the meeting I learned that Mr McGrail had 24 MR SANTOS: (To the witness) What was 25 recorded it." 25 your understanding as to the legality of that Page 138 Page 140

1	at the time?	1	the Attorney General asking the first thing
2	A. I had understood that it was perfectly	2	that he said was, "Why have you chosen to
3	legal, that there was no code of conduct or	3	use the most oppressive means of dealing
4	there was no law that regulated this. In fact,	4	with one of the most respected people in
5	I'm aware that we'd been looking at adapting	5	Gibraltar?", and it went downhill very
6	one of the small island's version of RIPA	6	quickly from then. Mr McGrail was very
7	and, in fact, I went over to one of the small	7	defensive of our actions. He felt that his
8	islands on another matter and met a team	8	ethics were being challenged. He said that he
9	from Gibraltar that included Customs officers	9	would stand up (inaudible) but he wouldn't
10	and police that were looking into	10	compromise his position. I didn't know what
11	implementing RIPA, or IPA as we called it,	11	had caused this at that time or why he was so
12	into Gibraltar. I don't know where we are	12	upset. I wasn't aware of the conversations
13	with that. I don't know if it's progressed.	13	that had taken place the day before.
14	Q. Can we just go to what I was just	14	Q. Did you feel subject to any pressure by
15	showing you from your statement, your	15	the Attorney General?
16	second one, A 1288. It is still on screen	16	A. On that meeting - and I'd have to look at
17	actually but you have it in front of you. You	17	the transcript to see where it took place,
18	say in the first paragraph, the fifth line down:	18	during the course of those meetings I felt
19	"I have the impression that he wanted the	19	being put under pressure to adopt a different
20	case against Mr Levy to be stopped, but not	20	procedure with Mr Levy than we would have
21	by him. It was an emotional meeting with	21	done with other people.
22	Mr McGrail asserting that his ethics were	22	Q. Can we move to 15 May 2020. It is B
23	being challenged unfairly." Can you explain	23	269. This was a meeting which you
24	what made you form that impression?	24	attended, and if we go over the page we have
25	A. At the time that I wrote that statement,	25	the transcript there. It says: "The Attorney
	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		ı y
	Page 141		Page 143
1	1.1	,	
1	which was - when was this?	1	General, the DPP, senior Crown counsel and
2	Q. The date of your statement, are you	2	Lloyd DeVincenzi, the Commissioner of
3	saying?	3	Police, you and Detective Inspector Wyan.
4	A. Yes. In June 23.	4 5	We have the transcript of the recording which is more about your impressions. What
5	<ul><li>Q. June last year.</li><li>A. I don't think we had access to the</li></ul>		• •
6		6	in particular in relation to this meeting do
7	transcript of the recordings so my impression	7	you recall about the meeting, and you say
8	of that meeting was exactly that, that there	8	that you were - sorry. What was your
9	was a desire that the matter didn't go any	9	impression of the Attorney General's conduct
10	further, but it wasn't going to be the AG that	10	in that meeting?
11	pulled it. With the benefit of going through	11	A. First of all, the first paragraph, the first
12	the transcripts now I can see that there was	12	cell of that table, records Mr DeVincenzi as
13	discussion of the possible use of Nolle and	13	being present on the 15th. I don't remember
14	the AG saying that there's no need to get to	14	him being present in the second meeting. If
15	41 4 1 4 1 1 1 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	1 17	
	that, but I did not know at the time that I	15	you wanted me to answer accurately we'd
16	wrote my statement whether that was on the	16	have to go through that transcript, and again,
16 17	wrote my statement whether that was on the first, second or third meeting, but my overall	16 17	have to go through that transcript, and again, but during the course of those two meetings
16 17 18	wrote my statement whether that was on the first, second or third meeting, but my overall impression was that there was a desire to stop	16 17 18	have to go through that transcript, and again, but during the course of those two meetings that followed, the 13th, 15th and the 20th, we
16 17 18 19	wrote my statement whether that was on the first, second or third meeting, but my overall impression was that there was a desire to stop the prosecution.	16 17 18 19	have to go through that transcript, and again, but during the course of those two meetings that followed, the 13th, 15th and the 20th, we were changing our position from going from
16 17 18 19 20	wrote my statement whether that was on the first, second or third meeting, but my overall impression was that there was a desire to stop the prosecution.  Q. How did you feel about that about the	16 17 18 19 20	have to go through that transcript, and again, but during the course of those two meetings that followed, the 13th, 15th and the 20th, we were changing our position from going from interviewing Mr Levy, I think it would have
16 17 18 19 20 21	wrote my statement whether that was on the first, second or third meeting, but my overall impression was that there was a desire to stop the prosecution.  Q. How did you feel about that about the Attorney General's conduct at that meeting?	16 17 18 19 20 21	have to go through that transcript, and again, but during the course of those two meetings that followed, the 13th, 15th and the 20th, we were changing our position from going from interviewing Mr Levy, I think it would have been on the Monday after we had been to
16 17 18 19 20 21 22	wrote my statement whether that was on the first, second or third meeting, but my overall impression was that there was a desire to stop the prosecution.  Q. How did you feel about that about the Attorney General's conduct at that meeting?  A. Well, it somewhat puzzled me.	16 17 18 19 20 21 22	have to go through that transcript, and again, but during the course of those two meetings that followed, the 13th, 15th and the 20th, we were changing our position from going from interviewing Mr Levy, I think it would have been on the Monday after we had been to Hassans for an interview with disclosure, to
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	wrote my statement whether that was on the first, second or third meeting, but my overall impression was that there was a desire to stop the prosecution.  Q. How did you feel about that about the Attorney General's conduct at that meeting?  A. Well, it somewhat puzzled me.  Q. Can you expand upon that?	16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	have to go through that transcript, and again, but during the course of those two meetings that followed, the 13th, 15th and the 20th, we were changing our position from going from interviewing Mr Levy, I think it would have been on the Monday after we had been to Hassans for an interview with disclosure, to not going to an interview and to allowing
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	wrote my statement whether that was on the first, second or third meeting, but my overall impression was that there was a desire to stop the prosecution.  Q. How did you feel about that about the Attorney General's conduct at that meeting?  A. Well, it somewhat puzzled me.  Q. Can you expand upon that?  A. It was a very strange meeting. That first	16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	have to go through that transcript, and again, but during the course of those two meetings that followed, the 13th, 15th and the 20th, we were changing our position from going from interviewing Mr Levy, I think it would have been on the Monday after we had been to Hassans for an interview with disclosure, to not going to an interview and to allowing him to produce a written account which he
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	wrote my statement whether that was on the first, second or third meeting, but my overall impression was that there was a desire to stop the prosecution.  Q. How did you feel about that about the Attorney General's conduct at that meeting?  A. Well, it somewhat puzzled me.  Q. Can you expand upon that?	16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	have to go through that transcript, and again, but during the course of those two meetings that followed, the 13th, 15th and the 20th, we were changing our position from going from interviewing Mr Levy, I think it would have been on the Monday after we had been to Hassans for an interview with disclosure, to not going to an interview and to allowing
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	wrote my statement whether that was on the first, second or third meeting, but my overall impression was that there was a desire to stop the prosecution.  Q. How did you feel about that about the Attorney General's conduct at that meeting?  A. Well, it somewhat puzzled me.  Q. Can you expand upon that?  A. It was a very strange meeting. That first	16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	have to go through that transcript, and again, but during the course of those two meetings that followed, the 13th, 15th and the 20th, we were changing our position from going from interviewing Mr Levy, I think it would have been on the Monday after we had been to Hassans for an interview with disclosure, to not going to an interview and to allowing him to produce a written account which he

1	submitted to us and that we would have used	1	say on the Condey on Manday Mamine year
1 2	submitted to us, and that we would have used to determine whether or not we needed to	1 2	say on the Sunday or Monday Morning, you say we wouldn't carry out the interview?"
3	proceed by a voluntary attendance police	3	"Well, we could and we should, but we could
4	interview.	4	delay carrying out any interview until we
5	Q. Just going back to the recording, as I	5	considered the content of that. If it was
6	showed you earlier, on 15 May you say: "I	6	sufficiently robust we could discuss it with
7	was aware that Mr McGrail was recording	7	Chris." It looks there as if you are starting to
8	this meeting." Do you know whether	8	accept the possibility of a voluntary
9	anybody else was aware that he was	9	statement, rather than your plan of an
10	recording the meeting?	10	interview under caution. Is that correct?
11	A. No, I don't know.	11	A. Yes.
12	Q. Can we go to B 237, please. I just want	12	Q. Why were you starting to accept it?
13	to take you here because at one point the	13	A. Again, I'd have to go through every single
14	Attorney General says - it is 8.17 - "Correct.	14	cell there to get the full picture, but there was
15	Christian and I are with you entirely on that.	15	- and I'm not sure if it was in this meeting, or
16	What we think would be helpful for the	16	the previous one, or the one that came
17	management of the whole thing is if that	17	afterwards - there was discussion with the
18	interview would still go ahead, but not have	18	DPP and the AG, that they did not think that
19	it under caution." Is that something that the	19	Mr Levy would answer any questions under
20	Attorney General would typically advise on?	20	caution. In fact they thought that he would
21	A. I've never taken advice from the Attorney	21	not even attend the station, in which case we
22	General on a criminal matter. I've always	22	would not get any evidence in order to be
23	dealt with the DPP.	23	able to take the investigation forward. And
24	Q. It is fair to say, is it not, that you resisted	24	so, it was in our best interests in this way, in
25	that proposal for some time.	25	order to try and get some evidence even if it
	Page 145		Page 147
1	A. That's correct, yes.	1	was not evidence under caution.
2	Q. Can you explain why?	2	Q. Now, you say in your second statement at
2 3	<ul><li>Q. Can you explain why?</li><li>A. Well, because there wouldn't be any</li></ul>	2 3	Q. Now, you say in your second statement at paragraph 15(b) that we were just looking at,
2 3 4	<ul><li>Q. Can you explain why?</li><li>A. Well, because there wouldn't be any value in an interview not under caution. If</li></ul>	2 3 4	Q. Now, you say in your second statement at paragraph 15(b) that we were just looking at, A1288, the penultimate paragraph on that
2 3 4 5	Q. Can you explain why?  A. Well, because there wouldn't be any value in an interview not under caution. If somebody is suspected of committing a	2 3 4 5	Q. Now, you say in your second statement at paragraph 15(b) that we were just looking at, A1288, the penultimate paragraph on that page, "As far as I am aware, this was the first
2 3 4 5 6	Q. Can you explain why?  A. Well, because there wouldn't be any value in an interview not under caution. If somebody is suspected of committing a crime we have an obligation to caution that	2 3 4 5 6	Q. Now, you say in your second statement at paragraph 15(b) that we were just looking at, A1288, the penultimate paragraph on that page, "As far as I am aware, this was the first time we had allowed a suspect to provide a
2 3 4 5 6 7	Q. Can you explain why?  A. Well, because there wouldn't be any value in an interview not under caution. If somebody is suspected of committing a crime we have an obligation to caution that person before putting questions to them.	2 3 4 5 6 7	Q. Now, you say in your second statement at paragraph 15(b) that we were just looking at, A1288, the penultimate paragraph on that page, "As far as I am aware, this was the first time we had allowed a suspect to provide a statement before interview. The statement
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q. Can you explain why?  A. Well, because there wouldn't be any value in an interview not under caution. If somebody is suspected of committing a crime we have an obligation to caution that person before putting questions to them.  Q. If we now can go to 259, please. At the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q. Now, you say in your second statement at paragraph 15(b) that we were just looking at, A1288, the penultimate paragraph on that page, "As far as I am aware, this was the first time we had allowed a suspect to provide a statement before interview. The statement was generally obtained after the interview,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q. Can you explain why?  A. Well, because there wouldn't be any value in an interview not under caution. If somebody is suspected of committing a crime we have an obligation to caution that person before putting questions to them.  Q. If we now can go to 259, please. At the top you say: "What if he, if this weekend he	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q. Now, you say in your second statement at paragraph 15(b) that we were just looking at, A1288, the penultimate paragraph on that page, "As far as I am aware, this was the first time we had allowed a suspect to provide a statement before interview. The statement was generally obtained after the interview, when a suspect had refused to answer
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q. Can you explain why?  A. Well, because there wouldn't be any value in an interview not under caution. If somebody is suspected of committing a crime we have an obligation to caution that person before putting questions to them.  Q. If we now can go to 259, please. At the top you say: "What if he, if this weekend he sends us a witness statement saying, 'I am	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q. Now, you say in your second statement at paragraph 15(b) that we were just looking at, A1288, the penultimate paragraph on that page, "As far as I am aware, this was the first time we had allowed a suspect to provide a statement before interview. The statement was generally obtained after the interview, when a suspect had refused to answer questions." Why did you decide to adopt this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q. Can you explain why?  A. Well, because there wouldn't be any value in an interview not under caution. If somebody is suspected of committing a crime we have an obligation to caution that person before putting questions to them.  Q. If we now can go to 259, please. At the top you say: "What if he, if this weekend he sends us a witness statement saying, 'I am aware that I am under the suspicion and that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q. Now, you say in your second statement at paragraph 15(b) that we were just looking at, A1288, the penultimate paragraph on that page, "As far as I am aware, this was the first time we had allowed a suspect to provide a statement before interview. The statement was generally obtained after the interview, when a suspect had refused to answer questions." Why did you decide to adopt this unusual approach for Mr Levy?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q. Can you explain why?  A. Well, because there wouldn't be any value in an interview not under caution. If somebody is suspected of committing a crime we have an obligation to caution that person before putting questions to them.  Q. If we now can go to 259, please. At the top you say: "What if he, if this weekend he sends us a witness statement saying, 'I am aware that I am under the suspicion and that the police are carrying out an investigation in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q. Now, you say in your second statement at paragraph 15(b) that we were just looking at, A1288, the penultimate paragraph on that page, "As far as I am aware, this was the first time we had allowed a suspect to provide a statement before interview. The statement was generally obtained after the interview, when a suspect had refused to answer questions." Why did you decide to adopt this unusual approach for Mr Levy?  A. Because this - this investigation didn't
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q. Can you explain why?  A. Well, because there wouldn't be any value in an interview not under caution. If somebody is suspected of committing a crime we have an obligation to caution that person before putting questions to them.  Q. If we now can go to 259, please. At the top you say: "What if he, if this weekend he sends us a witness statement saying, 'I am aware that I am under the suspicion and that the police are carrying out an investigation in this matter. Notwithstanding this, I have	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q. Now, you say in your second statement at paragraph 15(b) that we were just looking at, A1288, the penultimate paragraph on that page, "As far as I am aware, this was the first time we had allowed a suspect to provide a statement before interview. The statement was generally obtained after the interview, when a suspect had refused to answer questions." Why did you decide to adopt this unusual approach for Mr Levy?  A. Because this - this investigation didn't just concern Mr Levy, it concerned - it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q. Can you explain why?  A. Well, because there wouldn't be any value in an interview not under caution. If somebody is suspected of committing a crime we have an obligation to caution that person before putting questions to them.  Q. If we now can go to 259, please. At the top you say: "What if he, if this weekend he sends us a witness statement saying, 'I am aware that I am under the suspicion and that the police are carrying out an investigation in this matter. Notwithstanding this, I have chosen to make the statement voluntarily of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q. Now, you say in your second statement at paragraph 15(b) that we were just looking at, A1288, the penultimate paragraph on that page, "As far as I am aware, this was the first time we had allowed a suspect to provide a statement before interview. The statement was generally obtained after the interview, when a suspect had refused to answer questions." Why did you decide to adopt this unusual approach for Mr Levy?  A. Because this - this investigation didn't just concern Mr Levy, it concerned - it concerned other people. And the other
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q. Can you explain why?  A. Well, because there wouldn't be any value in an interview not under caution. If somebody is suspected of committing a crime we have an obligation to caution that person before putting questions to them.  Q. If we now can go to 259, please. At the top you say: "What if he, if this weekend he sends us a witness statement saying, 'I am aware that I am under the suspicion and that the police are carrying out an investigation in this matter. Notwithstanding this, I have chosen to make the statement voluntarily of my own free will'." And he sets out his stall	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q. Now, you say in your second statement at paragraph 15(b) that we were just looking at, A1288, the penultimate paragraph on that page, "As far as I am aware, this was the first time we had allowed a suspect to provide a statement before interview. The statement was generally obtained after the interview, when a suspect had refused to answer questions." Why did you decide to adopt this unusual approach for Mr Levy?  A. Because this - this investigation didn't just concern Mr Levy, it concerned - it concerned other people. And the other people's involvement in - was in a very
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. Can you explain why?  A. Well, because there wouldn't be any value in an interview not under caution. If somebody is suspected of committing a crime we have an obligation to caution that person before putting questions to them.  Q. If we now can go to 259, please. At the top you say: "What if he, if this weekend he sends us a witness statement saying, 'I am aware that I am under the suspicion and that the police are carrying out an investigation in this matter. Notwithstanding this, I have chosen to make the statement voluntarily of my own free will'." And he sets out his stall incriminating Cornelio Perez, to which the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q. Now, you say in your second statement at paragraph 15(b) that we were just looking at, A1288, the penultimate paragraph on that page, "As far as I am aware, this was the first time we had allowed a suspect to provide a statement before interview. The statement was generally obtained after the interview, when a suspect had refused to answer questions." Why did you decide to adopt this unusual approach for Mr Levy?  A. Because this - this investigation didn't just concern Mr Levy, it concerned - it concerned other people. And the other people's involvement in - was in a very serious matter concerning national security
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q. Can you explain why?  A. Well, because there wouldn't be any value in an interview not under caution. If somebody is suspected of committing a crime we have an obligation to caution that person before putting questions to them.  Q. If we now can go to 259, please. At the top you say: "What if he, if this weekend he sends us a witness statement saying, 'I am aware that I am under the suspicion and that the police are carrying out an investigation in this matter. Notwithstanding this, I have chosen to make the statement voluntarily of my own free will'." And he sets out his stall incriminating Cornelio Perez, to which the Attorney General replies: "Or not", and you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. Now, you say in your second statement at paragraph 15(b) that we were just looking at, A1288, the penultimate paragraph on that page, "As far as I am aware, this was the first time we had allowed a suspect to provide a statement before interview. The statement was generally obtained after the interview, when a suspect had refused to answer questions." Why did you decide to adopt this unusual approach for Mr Levy?  A. Because this - this investigation didn't just concern Mr Levy, it concerned - it concerned other people. And the other people's involvement in - was in a very serious matter concerning national security and data breach, and we had only part of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. Can you explain why?  A. Well, because there wouldn't be any value in an interview not under caution. If somebody is suspected of committing a crime we have an obligation to caution that person before putting questions to them.  Q. If we now can go to 259, please. At the top you say: "What if he, if this weekend he sends us a witness statement saying, 'I am aware that I am under the suspicion and that the police are carrying out an investigation in this matter. Notwithstanding this, I have chosen to make the statement voluntarily of my own free will'." And he sets out his stall incriminating Cornelio Perez, to which the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. Now, you say in your second statement at paragraph 15(b) that we were just looking at, A1288, the penultimate paragraph on that page, "As far as I am aware, this was the first time we had allowed a suspect to provide a statement before interview. The statement was generally obtained after the interview, when a suspect had refused to answer questions." Why did you decide to adopt this unusual approach for Mr Levy?  A. Because this - this investigation didn't just concern Mr Levy, it concerned - it concerned other people. And the other people's involvement in - was in a very serious matter concerning national security
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. Can you explain why?  A. Well, because there wouldn't be any value in an interview not under caution. If somebody is suspected of committing a crime we have an obligation to caution that person before putting questions to them.  Q. If we now can go to 259, please. At the top you say: "What if he, if this weekend he sends us a witness statement saying, 'I am aware that I am under the suspicion and that the police are carrying out an investigation in this matter. Notwithstanding this, I have chosen to make the statement voluntarily of my own free will'." And he sets out his stall incriminating Cornelio Perez, to which the Attorney General replies: "Or not", and you say: "Well, he's going to have to do it. How	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. Now, you say in your second statement at paragraph 15(b) that we were just looking at, A1288, the penultimate paragraph on that page, "As far as I am aware, this was the first time we had allowed a suspect to provide a statement before interview. The statement was generally obtained after the interview, when a suspect had refused to answer questions." Why did you decide to adopt this unusual approach for Mr Levy?  A. Because this - this investigation didn't just concern Mr Levy, it concerned - it concerned other people. And the other people's involvement in - was in a very serious matter concerning national security and data breach, and we had only part of the account from Mr Levy. The advice that we -
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. Can you explain why?  A. Well, because there wouldn't be any value in an interview not under caution. If somebody is suspected of committing a crime we have an obligation to caution that person before putting questions to them.  Q. If we now can go to 259, please. At the top you say: "What if he, if this weekend he sends us a witness statement saying, 'I am aware that I am under the suspicion and that the police are carrying out an investigation in this matter. Notwithstanding this, I have chosen to make the statement voluntarily of my own free will'." And he sets out his stall incriminating Cornelio Perez, to which the Attorney General replies: "Or not", and you say: "Well, he's going to have to do it. How can he say he knew what they were doing?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. Now, you say in your second statement at paragraph 15(b) that we were just looking at, A1288, the penultimate paragraph on that page, "As far as I am aware, this was the first time we had allowed a suspect to provide a statement before interview. The statement was generally obtained after the interview, when a suspect had refused to answer questions." Why did you decide to adopt this unusual approach for Mr Levy?  A. Because this - this investigation didn't just concern Mr Levy, it concerned - it concerned other people. And the other people's involvement in - was in a very serious matter concerning national security and data breach, and we had only part of the account from Mr Levy. The advice that we that we were being given was that if we tried
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. Can you explain why?  A. Well, because there wouldn't be any value in an interview not under caution. If somebody is suspected of committing a crime we have an obligation to caution that person before putting questions to them.  Q. If we now can go to 259, please. At the top you say: "What if he, if this weekend he sends us a witness statement saying, 'I am aware that I am under the suspicion and that the police are carrying out an investigation in this matter. Notwithstanding this, I have chosen to make the statement voluntarily of my own free will'." And he sets out his stall incriminating Cornelio Perez, to which the Attorney General replies: "Or not", and you say: "Well, he's going to have to do it. How can he say he knew what they were doing? (14.29)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. Now, you say in your second statement at paragraph 15(b) that we were just looking at, A1288, the penultimate paragraph on that page, "As far as I am aware, this was the first time we had allowed a suspect to provide a statement before interview. The statement was generally obtained after the interview, when a suspect had refused to answer questions." Why did you decide to adopt this unusual approach for Mr Levy?  A. Because this - this investigation didn't just concern Mr Levy, it concerned - it concerned other people. And the other people's involvement in - was in a very serious matter concerning national security and data breach, and we had only part of the account from Mr Levy. The advice that we that we were being given was that if we tried to force the issue with Mr Levy we would not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. Can you explain why?  A. Well, because there wouldn't be any value in an interview not under caution. If somebody is suspected of committing a crime we have an obligation to caution that person before putting questions to them.  Q. If we now can go to 259, please. At the top you say: "What if he, if this weekend he sends us a witness statement saying, 'I am aware that I am under the suspicion and that the police are carrying out an investigation in this matter. Notwithstanding this, I have chosen to make the statement voluntarily of my own free will'." And he sets out his stall incriminating Cornelio Perez, to which the Attorney General replies: "Or not", and you say: "Well, he's going to have to do it. How can he say he knew what they were doing? (14.29)  He can either say 'I knew what they were doing and I was misled' or 'I don't know what they were doing', and the thing is he did	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. Now, you say in your second statement at paragraph 15(b) that we were just looking at, A1288, the penultimate paragraph on that page, "As far as I am aware, this was the first time we had allowed a suspect to provide a statement before interview. The statement was generally obtained after the interview, when a suspect had refused to answer questions." Why did you decide to adopt this unusual approach for Mr Levy?  A. Because this - this investigation didn't just concern Mr Levy, it concerned - it concerned other people. And the other people's involvement in - was in a very serious matter concerning national security and data breach, and we had only part of the account from Mr Levy. The advice that we that we were being given was that if we tried to force the issue with Mr Levy we would not have got anything at all.  Q. And, I have asked you the question in respect of the 13 May meeting, and you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. Can you explain why?  A. Well, because there wouldn't be any value in an interview not under caution. If somebody is suspected of committing a crime we have an obligation to caution that person before putting questions to them.  Q. If we now can go to 259, please. At the top you say: "What if he, if this weekend he sends us a witness statement saying, 'I am aware that I am under the suspicion and that the police are carrying out an investigation in this matter. Notwithstanding this, I have chosen to make the statement voluntarily of my own free will'." And he sets out his stall incriminating Cornelio Perez, to which the Attorney General replies: "Or not", and you say: "Well, he's going to have to do it. How can he say he knew what they were doing? (14.29)  He can either say 'I knew what they were doing and I was misled' or 'I don't know what they were doing', and the thing is he did know, I think, a lot of what they were doing."	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. Now, you say in your second statement at paragraph 15(b) that we were just looking at, A1288, the penultimate paragraph on that page, "As far as I am aware, this was the first time we had allowed a suspect to provide a statement before interview. The statement was generally obtained after the interview, when a suspect had refused to answer questions." Why did you decide to adopt this unusual approach for Mr Levy?  A. Because this - this investigation didn't just concern Mr Levy, it concerned - it concerned other people. And the other people's involvement in - was in a very serious matter concerning national security and data breach, and we had only part of the account from Mr Levy. The advice that we that we were being given was that if we tried to force the issue with Mr Levy we would not have got anything at all.  Q. And, I have asked you the question in respect of the 13 May meeting, and you answered with reference to all three meeting.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. Can you explain why?  A. Well, because there wouldn't be any value in an interview not under caution. If somebody is suspected of committing a crime we have an obligation to caution that person before putting questions to them.  Q. If we now can go to 259, please. At the top you say: "What if he, if this weekend he sends us a witness statement saying, 'I am aware that I am under the suspicion and that the police are carrying out an investigation in this matter. Notwithstanding this, I have chosen to make the statement voluntarily of my own free will'." And he sets out his stall incriminating Cornelio Perez, to which the Attorney General replies: "Or not", and you say: "Well, he's going to have to do it. How can he say he knew what they were doing? (14.29)  He can either say 'I knew what they were doing and I was misled' or 'I don't know what they were doing', and the thing is he did	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. Now, you say in your second statement at paragraph 15(b) that we were just looking at, A1288, the penultimate paragraph on that page, "As far as I am aware, this was the first time we had allowed a suspect to provide a statement before interview. The statement was generally obtained after the interview, when a suspect had refused to answer questions." Why did you decide to adopt this unusual approach for Mr Levy?  A. Because this - this investigation didn't just concern Mr Levy, it concerned - it concerned other people. And the other people's involvement in - was in a very serious matter concerning national security and data breach, and we had only part of the account from Mr Levy. The advice that we that we were being given was that if we tried to force the issue with Mr Levy we would not have got anything at all.  Q. And, I have asked you the question in respect of the 13 May meeting, and you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. Can you explain why?  A. Well, because there wouldn't be any value in an interview not under caution. If somebody is suspected of committing a crime we have an obligation to caution that person before putting questions to them.  Q. If we now can go to 259, please. At the top you say: "What if he, if this weekend he sends us a witness statement saying, 'I am aware that I am under the suspicion and that the police are carrying out an investigation in this matter. Notwithstanding this, I have chosen to make the statement voluntarily of my own free will'." And he sets out his stall incriminating Cornelio Perez, to which the Attorney General replies: "Or not", and you say: "Well, he's going to have to do it. How can he say he knew what they were doing? (14.29)  He can either say 'I knew what they were doing and I was misled' or 'I don't know what they were doing', and the thing is he did know, I think, a lot of what they were doing."	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. Now, you say in your second statement at paragraph 15(b) that we were just looking at, A1288, the penultimate paragraph on that page, "As far as I am aware, this was the first time we had allowed a suspect to provide a statement before interview. The statement was generally obtained after the interview, when a suspect had refused to answer questions." Why did you decide to adopt this unusual approach for Mr Levy?  A. Because this - this investigation didn't just concern Mr Levy, it concerned - it concerned other people. And the other people's involvement in - was in a very serious matter concerning national security and data breach, and we had only part of the account from Mr Levy. The advice that we that we were being given was that if we tried to force the issue with Mr Levy we would not have got anything at all.  Q. And, I have asked you the question in respect of the 13 May meeting, and you answered with reference to all three meeting.

meeting is concerned, to the best of your 1 before, that if - if Mr Levy had attend New 2 2 recollection did you feel under any pressure Mole House Station for a voluntary police 3 from the Attorney General or anyone else? 3 interview, the only way we could compel him 4 4 A. On the 13th? to attend would be by arresting him. And if 5 Q. The 15th. 5 we interviewed him and he refused to say 6 A. On the 15th? On the 15th we were - we 6 nothing, that would take us no further in - in 7 were - we'd started off with a position where 7 the - in our investigation, whether in 8 8 we were going to be dealing with the matter evidence against him or away from him, or 9 9 under caution in a voluntary interview. We towards the defendants in the - the Delhi 10 10 were then moving away from that, and we defendants, or against them. 11 11 continued to be moved away from that Q. And, can we move to the 20 May meeting 12 position throughout the next week or so, with 12 now, B321. This is another meeting; this is 13 communication with Hassans. 13 with Mr McGrail, Mr Wyan, the Attorney 14 14 Q. Do you - you say that: we were moving General and DPP. Again you were aware that this was being recorded, you say in your 15 15 away from it and we were moved away from 16 16 evidence. Is that correct? 17 17 A. I think it was a - I think it was a A. Yes. And by stage I would definitely 18 combination of both. There was advice that 18 have known. 19 19 this is the best way to do it; that we are going Q. And again, do you know whether 20 20 to get evidence this way, if we do not we are anybody else knew that it was being 21 not going to get any evidence. And there was 21 recorded? 22 22 no suggestion that if we forced - and there A. No, I don't think so. 23 23 was also a suggestion that if we did force the Q. If we go to B308, you say at the bottom 24 24 there - sorry, this is the same transcript, but it issue there would be ten QCs coming over 25 25 and all hell would break loose. And there is just that it is not - I don't think it is Page 151 Page 149 1 was no suggestion that, you know: we can 1 different in a material way. Just at the 2 defend this robustly, we could - whatever you 2 bottom there, "They have really turned that 3 3 on its head", this is a reference to Hassans. decide to do, go ahead and do it. This was 4 the advice that was given to us. 4 You say, "They have really turned that on its 5 5 Q. Can we turn to B237, please. The bottom head, from your conversation with him, to 6 of that page, B237. This is an intervention 6 turning round to the Commissioner and 7 7 by Mr Rocca, the DPP. And he says, "And saying now 'the Attorney General has 8 8 this is the point that the AG's going to make informed me that you have agreed to treat 9 9 now, I think. We are led to believe that if we him as a witness'. I mean, that is", and the 10 10 go under caution he's not going to say a Attorney General says, "All I've told them is 11 word, to the extent that he may not even 11 that Ian has agreed - the RGP has agreed to 12 attend. And at the very least, if you do arrest 12 try a written statement. That's all I've told 13 13 him he's not going to give you anything. them." And you say, "And they've really 14 turned that around." That is you raising 14 Entonces then, we're discussing whether that 15 15 is good or bad. I think it leaves us with a concerns in a meeting, that Hassans were 16 16 problem evidentially, and I think it leaves is now saying that the RGP had agreed to treat 17 17 in a position whereby I've had my Mr Levy as a witness. Had you by that point 18 18 agreed to treat Mr Levy as a witness? reservations, you know, about whether we 19 19 have enough on Heine at the moment. I don't A. No, no. 20 think we're quite across the line with Heine 20 O. And if not, why do you think that 21 21 Hassans had formed this view? and we wouldn't proceed, so I would rather 22 22 get information from him that may either A. It... I can't say why Hassans formed that 23 23 incriminate him - if it does, fantastic." What view; what I can say is that we were alive to 24 24 is your reaction to that statement? the possibility that if we took this course of 25 25 A. I think he's referring to what I mentioned action it might be interpreted that we had Page 150 Page 152

changed Mr Levy's suspect as a suspect, and 1 Attorney General --2 2 we were very - very conscious of that fact. A. Uh-huh. 3 3 So, we were very careful in how we worded Q. -- which you recorded at Mr McGrail's 4 4 end. You did not technically record the call, the invitation to give his - his account. When 5 it came through, it went from - again, 5 but you recorded at his end. 6 6 A. That - that's correct. account under caution to an ac-- to his 7 7 Q. Can you just explain to me why you statement, and therefore if he's giving a 8 8 statement we presume now that he is no chose to do that? 9 9 A. This - this was - at the twe-- if I recall longer a suspect, and that was one of the 10 10 things that we had feared when we - when we correct, 22 May was the date that Mr 11 11 thought about that. McGrail had been invited to retire. None of 12 Q. At 309, about a third of the way down the 12 us knew the reasons for this. It was a very 13 Commissioner says, "We've bent over, which 13 emotional morning, and in that meeting when 14 14 we would not have normally done." all of us - all the SMT were there in Mr 15 15 A. Sorry, I can't find that, where... McGrail's office I think that Mr McGrail 16 16 Q. Sorry, it is the second reference -received a call from the Attorney General, 17 17 A. Oh, yes. and I could hear from Mr McGrail's tone that 18 Q. -- to the Commissioner of Police. "We've 18 he was - that he was getting emotional, so I 19 19 bent over, which we would not have started to take - wanted to take a note of it, 20 20 normally done." Did you agree with Mr but then I realised that there's no point in 21 McGrail's assessment of how the 21 taking a note, I can only hear one side of the 22 22 investigation had turned? conversation anyway, and so I recorded it on 23 23 A. With regards to...? my phone. 24 Q. Well, sorry. Did you agree with that 24 Q. And you say that the SMT were there, 25 25 statement? was the SMT there throughout the phone Page 153 Page 155 1 A. Yes, I thought that we had been very 1 call? 2 accommodating with Mr Levy's request on 2 A. I think so. 3 3 Q. Can we just now turn to B1417, please. his law-- through his lawyer, to deal with him 4 other than through an interview at the police 4 This is a message from the Attorney General 5 5 to the Chief Minister, where the Attorney 6 Q. Well, I think there is a difference between 6 General describes a discussion that he had 7 7 "accommodating" and "bent over": I think had with the DPP in the aftermath of that 12 8 8 "bent over" goes a bit further than May meeting. It is the second message 9 9 "accommodating", does it not? down, at 15.41 he says, "Spoken to DPP, he 10 10 A. Maybe bent over - I wouldn't agree with is categorical that whilst he told RGP that an 11 11 interview with JL would likely be necessary bent over backwards. 12 Q. You would not agree with bent over 12 he strongly advised against a search 13 13 backwards? warrant." Does that tally with your 14 14 A. Actually it does not say backwards, it recollection as to what the DPP said to you 15 15 about the search warrant? says "bent over". 16 16 Q. But I mean, I am not asking whether you A. No, it does not. 17 would necessarily agree with the metaphor, 17 Q. How would you distinguish your 18 18 but the underlying meaning of it. Did you recollection with what is said there? 19 19 agree with that assessment of how things had A. My recollection is that the DPP had said, 20 transpired from 12 may to 20 May? 20 at the very end of our videoconference, that 2.1 21 A. Yes. the only thing he would do differently - I 22 22 Q. You would agree with that? think he said the words: we would do 23 23 A. Yes. differently, is: we would prefer a production 24 Q. On 22 May there was a telephone 24 order as opposed to a warrant. He did not 25 25 conversation between Mr McGrail and the categorically state that - he did not strongly Page 154 Page 156

advise against the use of a search warrant. 1 Field was appointed. He was Chief Inspector 2 2 And, he also did not say that the interview at the time, and he was appointed as the 3 3 temporary SIO for that matter, until a - an with JL would likely be necessary; we had 4 4 already agreed that, and the notes in my external force took over from that. But Mr 5 5 Field answered to me, because at that point I daybook reflect that. 6 6 Q. Just going back to 12 May. After the was Superintendent, crime, and he was 7 meeting that Mr McGrail had with the Chief 7 **Detective Chief Inspector, crime.** 8 8 Minister and the Attorney General, I think it Q. You say in your statement, just reading 9 is not in dispute that he then briefed the SMT 9 on, "At 0300 or 0400 on 8 March 2020 I was 10 10 on that meeting. Do you recall being called in to help deal with it. I took notes of 11 11 briefed? the Gold command actions in my daybook, 12 A. I wasn't there. 12 and met with the Attorney General and Mr 13 Q. Oh, you weren't there. So were you --13 McGrail on Sunday 8 March at 0500 in Mr 14 14 A. I was - I was at Hassans when that... McGrail's office. I attended a second 15 15 Q. At any point after that, did Mr McGrail meeting with the Attorney General and Mr 16 16 brief you about that meeting? McGrail the following day. The acting 17 17 A. I thi-- remember whilst I was in Hassans Governor, Nick Pyle, also attended." And, 18 taking a phone call, and I think it was in 18 then you set out your notes. According to 19 19 relation to - to: come back to the station, your recollection, is it accurate that you met 20 20 the Attorney General at 5am in Mr McGrail's we'll have a briefing. I can't remember the -21 the time that I arrived back at the station. 21 22 22 And I think I remember that he briefed the A. No, no, we didn't meet the AG at 5am. 23 SMT, but I am not 100 percent certain on 23 Q. So, at what time did you meet the AG? 24 24 A. It says here, "10.25, meeting with AG, 25 25 Q. Did he brief you about the content of that ML". Page 157 Page 159 1 meeting? 1 Q. Yes, sorry, it is just that you say halfway 2 2 down that paragraph, "I took notes of the A. No. No, I didn't speak to Mr McGrail 3 3 privately about that matter at all. Gold command actions in my daybook, and 4 Q. Can we move now to the collision at sea 4 met with the Attorney General and Mr 5 5 briefly, please. I only have a few questions McGrail on Sunday 8 March at 0500". 6 about that. Firstly, in your second statement, 6 MR GIBBS: Inaudible. 7 paragraph 19(a) is at A1292. You state there, 7 Q. I am extremely grateful to Mr Gibbs. I 8 "I was second senior officer on call when the 8 am looking at the wrong version of the 9 9 incident occurred, which means I was on statement. That has been corrected, I am 10 10 standby to support the senior officer on call, told, on 16 March 2023 to say 10.25. The 11 Superintendent John Field (then Chief 11 signature says 16 March 2023. But anyway, 12 Inspector) who still answered to me at that 12 I think from your note, what your note says is 13 point." What level of involvement did this 13 that a meeting with the Attorney General 14 14 give you, as far as what came to be known as took place at 10.25. 15 Operation Kram is concerned? 15 A. That's correct. 16 A. My principle involvement with Operation 16 Q. And, that is how you recall it? 17 Kram was as a - as an assistant, as a deputy 17 A. Yes. 18 Gold to Mr McGrail during that first golden 18 Q. Can we go to B1680, please. That is an 19 19 hour - golden three hours or four hours email from you to Mr McGrail, copied to Mr 20 20 what it was that was there. I took notes and Ullger and Mr Field, at 10.11 in the morning 21 summarised what had happened for him, 21 on 8 March 2020. 22 22 which I'm sure you have seen the - the A. Yes. 23 correspondence for that. Because of my 23 Q. You can see that it has a brief, then a list 24 24 involvement with Operation Delhi, and other of actions, and then over the page there is a 25 operations that were - that were running, Mr 25 log of events going up to ten past ten, just a Page 158 Page 160

1 minute before this message is sent. The first 1 Commissioner of Police at that time as well? 2 2 entry, "0500, Gold group convened", and it A. I - I don't, and I don't recall Mr Field's 3 looks as though three individuals it's quoting 3 attending the meeting with myself, Attorney 4 4 at that meeting were the Commissioner of General and Mr McGrail. 5 Police, yourself and Chief Inspector Field. Is 5 Q. So when he says at 38, "At 11.05 I 6 that correct? If you go back to the previous 6 briefed", those individuals whom you just 7 page, "Gold meeting convened", just at the 7 named, "concerning the suspected exact 8 top. "Sunday 8 March, 0500" --8 coordinates", that does not accord with your 9 9 A. Yeah. recollection? 10 Q. "Commissioner of Police, Superintendent 10 A. My note is "0940", that's all I can - I can 11 Richardson, CI Field." Then if you go back 11 rely on. 12 to the log, I just want to ask you about the 12 Q. So, just to make this clear. When he 13 penultimate entry in the log. "0940, JF 13 reported them to you, were you with Mr 14 14 advises that collision occurred 36 degrees 9 McGrail? Do you remember whether you 15 15 minutes north, 5 degrees 12 minutes west, were with Mr McGrail? 16 approx 6.54 east of Playa", I think that's 16 A. I don't - I don't think so. 17 17 meant to say --Q. But, it is fair to say that in your email of 8 18 A. Yes 18 March at 10.11, that was sent to Mr McGrail 19 19 and that contained a reference to the Q. -- "de Santa Bárbara". 20 A. Yes. 20 coordinates? 21 O. Now DCI Field in his evidence - if we 21 A. I haven't got the email here to --22 can just go to A801, please. He says at para 22 Q. Sorry, it is the one that we have just 23 36 (it is on screen), "At 0940 hours I received 23 shown, B1680, your Gold actions collision at 24 24 a report from Inspector Paul Chipolina, who sea email. If you just stay there at the top, 25 25 had obtained the coordinates through his 10.11, 8 March 2020. Page 161 Page 163 1 contacts in the Spanish Guardia Civil. These 1 A. Mm-hmm. 2 were", I have just told you what they were, 2 Q. And, on the second page there is the log 3 3 "approximately 6.54 miles east of Playa that says, "JF advises that the collision 4 Santa Bárbara." That tallies with what you 4 occurred", with the coordinates. 5 5 say in your log, and then he says, "I then had A. What - what time does it say that? 6 the coordinates plotted on a map, and 6 Q. 0940. 7 subsequently made my way to the CoP suite. 7 A. Which is the same as what's in my 8 At 1105 hours I briefed CoP, Detective 8 daybook. 9 9 Superintendent Paul Richardson and the Q. Yes. 10 Attorney General Mr Llamas, who was also 10 A. Yes. 11 there, concerning the suspected exact 11 Q. Yes. How did Detective Chief Inspector 12 coordinates. Now, at 37 he says he is 12 Field describe the coordinates at the time, as 13 plotting coordinates on the map, but it looks 13 14 from your log... Well, when was the first 14 A. I don't think - I don't think we knew 15 time that he told you the coordinates? 15 where the coordinates were. So, hence the 16 A. Can I look at my daybook for 2020, 16 reason for plotting it on a map and working 17 because --17 out exactly where it was. 18 O. Yes. 18 Q. Sorry, then let me ask it a different way. 19 19 A. -- this entry was drawn from that. With what sort of certainty did he advance 20 20 Q. Yes, if you are happy -those coordinates, or did he say how certain 21 A. I'm just not sure when (inaudible) it is. In 21 or confirmed those coordinates were? 22 my notes I have "0940, JF", the coordinates 22 A. I'm not - I'm not certain, but from 23 east of Playa de Santa Bárbara, so that must 23 recollection - or, my recollection of this is 24 have been when Mr Field told me. 24 that we'd been given this information from 25 Q. Do you recall whether he told the 25 the Spanish authorities but it was an Page 162 Page 164

1 unofficial basis It's a sout of a nation to	1 illicit purpose, suspect activity, prohibited
1 unofficial basis. It's a sort of a police-to- 2 police basis, it's not inf information that	2 import, Gibraltar and Spain", "Spain and
you can - you can rely on until you've asked	3 Gibraltar". Chase ensued, very sad but as a
4 for it officially.	4 result of criminal action, assuming all was
5 THE CHAIRMAN: I think Mr Field says	5 going well. Need to include 'cooperation'",
6 that he got this from - from Inspector	6 in inverted commas, "AG to review draft of
7 Chipolina, who I think is responsible for	7 next press release." And then at 11.15, this is
8 coordination with the Spanish authorities.	8 a message, it says "Fernando" in the - in the
9 A. That's - that's very likely to be the case,	9 margin, I think was the Spanish police
10 sir.	officer, "agreed to stay in Zona del Este en
11 THE CHAIRMAN: So, it is likely that he	11 caso que la lancha volviera."
12 got the information that -	12 Q. I do not think that that is necessary for
13 A. From Paul Chipolina, yes	13 our purposes. Just over the page we have a
14 THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.	14 reference to, I think - well, can you read
15 A Inspector Paul Chipolina.	15 A. The 12.15 entry?
16 Q. Were you aware that the coordinates had	16 Q. Yes.
17 come from the Guardia Civil?	17 A. "1215, HE arrives", His Excellency, that
18 A. I was looking in - in my daybook. I seem	18 was a reference to Nick Pyle.
19 to remember an entry somewhere here of - of	19 Q. Yes. With the benefit of having read the
20 a com a call between Paul Chipolina and	20 entry, what is your recollection as to what
21 the Commissioner, and it could have been to	21 was said to the Attorney General, first when
do with that, but I haven't been able to find it	he was there on his own (well, not on his
23 in the time that I have available.	23 own but before the Governor arrived), what
Q. Can we go to C4436, please. This is the	24 is your recollection as to what was said to the
25 factual account prepared under section 15 of	25 Attorney General as to location of the
Page 165	Page 167
1 the Police Act by Mr McCroil in recording to	1 collision?
1 the Police Act by Mr McGrail in response to	1 collision?
the Chief Minister's request. And it says here at HH, "At 1010 hours I met with the	2 A. I - I can't remember. I - I can't recall that, 3 I don't have a note of - of discussing that.
3 at HH, "At 1010 hours I met with the 4 Attorney General Michael Llamas in my	3 I don't have a note of - of discussing that. 4 Q. What is the reference to the call from the
5 office, and briefed him fully as to what was	5 Guardia Civil? What is that a reference to?
6 known at that stage." What did that brief to	6 Do you remember?
7 the Attorney General entail, in terms of the	7 A. I think it was that the Commissioner may
8 location of the collision?	8 have received the call from Inspector
9 A. I can only tell you what's in my - in my	9 Fernando, and that - what I'd written there is
10 daybook account.	what he was briefing us at the time, and it
11 Q. With the benefit of your daybook, what	11 describes part of the chase.
did you report to the Attorney General? I do	12 Q. Can we go to B5736, please. This is the
13 not have a reference for the daybook entry.	13 meeting of 9 March 2020, and that is your
14 A. It's	14 note of a meeting between you, Mr McGrail,
15 Q. Does it have a	15 Mr Pyle and the Attorney General. Your note
16 A. It's - be - be 5734.	16 there, if we can just go down a little bit
17 Q. 5734, thank you. So, at 10.25 we have	Yes, the second bullet point there, "Exact
18 your meeting with the Attorney General	18 coordinates of collision still not determined".
19 <b>A. "ML".</b>	What was the state of knowledge at the time,
Q. "ML", and the first entry "Call from	20 in terms of the location of the collision?
21 Guardia Civil".	21 A. I'm not certain what the state was now,
22 A. Yes. Would you like me to read it?	but from reading other people's statements it
Q. Yes, if you don't mind, yes.	23 seemed that the Spanish had to confirm with
24 A. "Call from Guardia Civil. Suspect vessel	24 their technical people, I think there was a
25 description", and I have said "type, fuel,	25 reference to the C-Vay (?), which is like a
Page 166	Page 168
1 450 100	42 (Pages 165 to 168)

1	covert surveillance station. I think that they	1	A. I don't think we would have known it had
2	were telling us that these are the coordinates	2	been switched off if we had a note there to
3	that we think it's happened, but we need to	3	interrogate our devices.
4	confirm this ourselves.	4	Q. If you go to A252, please, this is the
5	(14.59)	5	statement of Mr Pyle and he says, "On 9
6	Q. Do you recall either you or Mr McGrail	6	March, the Attorney General and I met Mr
7	mentioning to the Attorney General that the	7	McGrail at NMH. I again asked Mr McGrail
8	Guardia Civil had provided coordinates?	8	about the location of the incident. Mr
9	A. I am just looking to see whether I've	9	McGrail said he was still not sure. I 'queried'
10	made a note of this here.	10	why the GPS AIS systems could not provide
11	Q. I don't think I mean on 8 or 9 March.	11	this information. Mr McGrail replied that the
12	If you can't remember then I am	12	instruments had been switched off." Do you
13	A. Sorry, I can't help you with that.	13	have any recollection of that exchange?
14	Q. If I ask you the same question as far as	14	A. I know that at some point we found out
15	the interim Governor is concerned, are you	15	that the AIS had been switched off, but it
16	able to assist.	16	does not appear from my notes that we knew
17	A. I think on the first day the interim	17	that in that meeting. He then goes on, "I
18	Governor arrived pretty much towards the	18	asked why the officers would do that. Mr
19	very end of the meeting. There is no notes at	19	McGrail replied 'You know what it is like in
20	all. I think he just popped in. I think he was	20	the heat of the moment'. I said I did not,
21	just walking past the station with his dog and	21	adding that surely standard operating
22	he popped in to say hello. I don't think it was	22	procedures dictated that such equipment
23	by formal agreement. The next day it was.	23	should always be on. I said this was a vitally
24	Q. So just on that then, are you able to say	24	important issue given the state of
25	whether in the time that the interim Governor	25	negotiations with Spain." Do you have any
23	whether in the time that the interim Governor	23	negotiations with Spain. Do you have any
	Page 169		Page 171
1	was at the station, whether the location was	1	recollection of that exchange?
2	discussed?	2	A. Sorry, I have lost track there.
3	A. I can't remember.	3	Q. Sorry, let's just break it down. Mr Pyle
4	Q. You can't remember. Your note of 9	4	says that there was an exchange between him
5	March that we are just looking at, also says	5	and Mr McGrail where Mr Pyle asked Mr
6	I am just looking for the relevant part for you	6	McGrail why the officers would switch the
7	"element of chase within BGTW". It is	7	AIS systems off and that Mr McGrail replied,
8	just over the page, yes, page 5737. Just over	8	"You know what it is like in the heat of the
9	half way down, "element of chase within	9	moment." Do you recall an exchange of that
10	BGTW".	10	nature between Mr Pyle and Mr McGrail?
11	A. Yes.	11	A. No, I don't.
12	Q. Was it discussed that part of the chase	12	Q. At A802, please, I can see the time, I only
13	was outside BGTW?	13	have a handful of questions left. This is DCI
14	A. I think it must have been if I'm saying	14	Field's first statement and at 46 he said, "That
15	that there was an element of chase within	15	same day we instigated the repatriation
16	BGTW. It is implying that the main part of	16	arrangements and also managed to secure the
17	the chase was outside of it.	17	thermal imagery recording which captured
	Q. Was it discussed that the collision was	18	
18 19	Q. was it discussed that the comston was outside GBTW?	19	the actual collision. The recording is not all
		1	that clear because of the time of day and the
20	A. I can't say with any certainty because I	20	distances involved. This was later brought to
21	don't have a note on that.	21	the attention of Superintendent Richardson
22	Q. Your note also states just underneath	22	and Commissioner of Police McGrail." Just
23	"interrogate our own devices, AIS, phones,	23	before I say anything, those redactions are
24	GPS." Did anyone mention in that meeting	24	not to do with the restriction notice. Those
	41-4 41- A 11'44-1111')	1 75	reductions are to do with personal
25	that the AIS system was switched off?	25	redactions are to do with personal
25	Page 170	23	Page 172

1	information. That is not particular relevant.	1	early retirement, can I take you to your
2	DCI Field states that "we managed to obtain	2	second statement, paragraph 15(c), which is
3	thermal imagery of the collision and that this	3	A1289.
4	was later provided to you and Mr McGrail."	4	A. I have it.
5	When did you obtain a copy of the thermal	5	Q. 15(c).
6	imagery, as far as you can recall?	6	A. Yes.
7	A. I do not think I obtained a copy of the	7	Q. You say "After receiving a letter inviting
8	imagery at all. I think Mr Field obtained a	8	him to retire, Mr McGrail called a meeting
9	copy of it.	9	with his senior management team. He
10	Q. Sorry, when did you receive a copy of the	10	explained he had been invited to retire
11	thermal imagery?	11	because the Governor and Chief Minister had
12	A. I didn't. I remember being shown a video	12	lost confidence in him. We were very
13	clip by Mr Field and he had managed to I	13	shocked. I asked whether it was in relation
14	am not sure if it's the right word triangulate	14	to Operation Delhi. He said the concerns
15	where the collision must have taken place	15	related mainly to Operation Kram and the
16	because we knew the position of two tankers	16	serious concerns raised by the HMIC
17	that were berthed, I'm not sure if that's	17	following their inspection. Mr McGrail did
18	anchored in the bay and we knew he was	18	not show us the letter." Why were you
19	saying that if this vessel was here and that	19	shocked?
20	vessel was here, the fact that they've gone	20	A. Because I had had none of us had any
21	through this means that it must have	21	idea that there was anything wrong with the
22	happened over here.	22	relationship with the Commissioner and the
23	Q. When did that take place, do you know?	23	Chief Minister.
24	A. I can't remember.	24	Q. And what is your understanding as to the
25	Q. He says that he obtained the recording on	25	reasons for Mr McGrail ceasing to be
	n		
	Page 173		Page 175
1	12 March.	1	Commissioner of Police by applying for
1 2	12 March.  A. I would imagine as soon as he had	1 2	Commissioner of Police by applying for early retirement?
1 2 3	A. I would imagine as soon as he had	2	early retirement?
2			early retirement?  A. With respect, sir, I think that's what this
2 3	A. I would imagine as soon as he had obtained that recording he would have told me about it.	2 3 4	early retirement?  A. With respect, sir, I think that's what this Inquiry is all about.
2 3 4	A. I would imagine as soon as he had obtained that recording he would have told	2 3	early retirement?  A. With respect, sir, I think that's what this
2 3 4 5	A. I would imagine as soon as he had obtained that recording he would have told me about it.  Q. What was your involvement in Operation Kram after that date?	2 3 4 5	early retirement?  A. With respect, sir, I think that's what this Inquiry is all about.  Q. Yes, but I am asking about your understanding.
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul><li>A. I would imagine as soon as he had obtained that recording he would have told me about it.</li><li>Q. What was your involvement in Operation Kram after that date?</li><li>A. I think that I was asked to liaise with the</li></ul>	2 3 4 5 6	early retirement?  A. With respect, sir, I think that's what this Inquiry is all about.  Q. Yes, but I am asking about your understanding.  A. About my opinions? My view
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>A. I would imagine as soon as he had obtained that recording he would have told me about it.</li> <li>Q. What was your involvement in Operation Kram after that date?</li> <li>A. I think that I was asked to liaise with the Metropolitan Police and I liaised with Chief</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	early retirement?  A. With respect, sir, I think that's what this Inquiry is all about.  Q. Yes, but I am asking about your understanding.  A. About my opinions? My view  Q. No, not your opinion, but your
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. I would imagine as soon as he had obtained that recording he would have told me about it.  Q. What was your involvement in Operation Kram after that date?  A. I think that I was asked to liaise with the Metropolitan Police and I liaised with Chief Inspector Smith, I think, Gary, I forget his	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	early retirement?  A. With respect, sir, I think that's what this Inquiry is all about.  Q. Yes, but I am asking about your understanding.  A. About my opinions? My view  Q. No, not your opinion, but your understanding and if you have no
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A. I would imagine as soon as he had obtained that recording he would have told me about it.  Q. What was your involvement in Operation Kram after that date?  A. I think that I was asked to liaise with the Metropolitan Police and I liaised with Chief Inspector Smith, I think, Gary, I forget his name, Smith.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	early retirement?  A. With respect, sir, I think that's what this Inquiry is all about.  Q. Yes, but I am asking about your understanding.  A. About my opinions? My view Q. No, not your opinion, but your understanding and if you have no understanding
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. I would imagine as soon as he had obtained that recording he would have told me about it.  Q. What was your involvement in Operation Kram after that date?  A. I think that I was asked to liaise with the Metropolitan Police and I liaised with Chief Inspector Smith, I think, Gary, I forget his name, Smith.  Q. Yes, Smith.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	early retirement?  A. With respect, sir, I think that's what this Inquiry is all about.  Q. Yes, but I am asking about your understanding.  A. About my opinions? My view  Q. No, not your opinion, but your understanding and if you have no understanding  A. At the time I had no understanding,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	A. I would imagine as soon as he had obtained that recording he would have told me about it.  Q. What was your involvement in Operation Kram after that date?  A. I think that I was asked to liaise with the Metropolitan Police and I liaised with Chief Inspector Smith, I think, Gary, I forget his name, Smith.  Q. Yes, Smith.  A. I provided a briefing for him, a briefing	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	early retirement?  A. With respect, sir, I think that's what this Inquiry is all about.  Q. Yes, but I am asking about your understanding.  A. About my opinions? My view Q. No, not your opinion, but your understanding and if you have no understanding
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A. I would imagine as soon as he had obtained that recording he would have told me about it.  Q. What was your involvement in Operation Kram after that date?  A. I think that I was asked to liaise with the Metropolitan Police and I liaised with Chief Inspector Smith, I think, Gary, I forget his name, Smith.  Q. Yes, Smith.  A. I provided a briefing for him, a briefing document and sent it over. I was present	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	early retirement?  A. With respect, sir, I think that's what this Inquiry is all about.  Q. Yes, but I am asking about your understanding.  A. About my opinions? My view Q. No, not your opinion, but your understanding and if you have no understanding A. At the time I had no understanding, because I had asked Mr McGrail, we had asked Mr McGrail is this in connection with
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. I would imagine as soon as he had obtained that recording he would have told me about it.  Q. What was your involvement in Operation Kram after that date?  A. I think that I was asked to liaise with the Metropolitan Police and I liaised with Chief Inspector Smith, I think, Gary, I forget his name, Smith.  Q. Yes, Smith.  A. I provided a briefing for him, a briefing document and sent it over. I was present when his team were briefed when they came	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	early retirement?  A. With respect, sir, I think that's what this Inquiry is all about.  Q. Yes, but I am asking about your understanding.  A. About my opinions? My view Q. No, not your opinion, but your understanding and if you have no understanding A. At the time I had no understanding, because I had asked Mr McGrail, we had
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A. I would imagine as soon as he had obtained that recording he would have told me about it.  Q. What was your involvement in Operation Kram after that date?  A. I think that I was asked to liaise with the Metropolitan Police and I liaised with Chief Inspector Smith, I think, Gary, I forget his name, Smith.  Q. Yes, Smith.  A. I provided a briefing for him, a briefing document and sent it over. I was present	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	early retirement?  A. With respect, sir, I think that's what this Inquiry is all about.  Q. Yes, but I am asking about your understanding.  A. About my opinions? My view  Q. No, not your opinion, but your understanding and if you have no understanding  A. At the time I had no understanding, because I had asked Mr McGrail, we had asked Mr McGrail is this in connection with Operation Delhi. Of course, I was concerned
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A. I would imagine as soon as he had obtained that recording he would have told me about it.  Q. What was your involvement in Operation Kram after that date?  A. I think that I was asked to liaise with the Metropolitan Police and I liaised with Chief Inspector Smith, I think, Gary, I forget his name, Smith.  Q. Yes, Smith.  A. I provided a briefing for him, a briefing document and sent it over. I was present when his team were briefed when they came over to Gibraltar and then I had very little involvement from that point onwards.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	early retirement?  A. With respect, sir, I think that's what this Inquiry is all about.  Q. Yes, but I am asking about your understanding.  A. About my opinions? My view Q. No, not your opinion, but your understanding and if you have no understanding A. At the time I had no understanding, because I had asked Mr McGrail, we had asked Mr McGrail is this in connection with Operation Delhi. Of course, I was concerned about that because I was the SIO for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. I would imagine as soon as he had obtained that recording he would have told me about it.  Q. What was your involvement in Operation Kram after that date?  A. I think that I was asked to liaise with the Metropolitan Police and I liaised with Chief Inspector Smith, I think, Gary, I forget his name, Smith.  Q. Yes, Smith.  A. I provided a briefing for him, a briefing document and sent it over. I was present when his team were briefed when they came over to Gibraltar and then I had very little involvement from that point onwards.  Q. Were you in any further contact with Mr	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	early retirement?  A. With respect, sir, I think that's what this Inquiry is all about.  Q. Yes, but I am asking about your understanding.  A. About my opinions? My view Q. No, not your opinion, but your understanding and if you have no understanding A. At the time I had no understanding, because I had asked Mr McGrail, we had asked Mr McGrail is this in connection with Operation Delhi. Of course, I was concerned about that because I was the SIO for Operation Delhi. He had replied that it was not in relation to Operation Delhi but I had
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. I would imagine as soon as he had obtained that recording he would have told me about it.  Q. What was your involvement in Operation Kram after that date?  A. I think that I was asked to liaise with the Metropolitan Police and I liaised with Chief Inspector Smith, I think, Gary, I forget his name, Smith.  Q. Yes, Smith.  A. I provided a briefing for him, a briefing document and sent it over. I was present when his team were briefed when they came over to Gibraltar and then I had very little involvement from that point onwards.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	early retirement?  A. With respect, sir, I think that's what this Inquiry is all about.  Q. Yes, but I am asking about your understanding.  A. About my opinions? My view Q. No, not your opinion, but your understanding and if you have no understanding A. At the time I had no understanding, because I had asked Mr McGrail, we had asked Mr McGrail is this in connection with Operation Delhi. Of course, I was concerned about that because I was the SIO for Operation Delhi. He had replied that it was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. I would imagine as soon as he had obtained that recording he would have told me about it.  Q. What was your involvement in Operation Kram after that date?  A. I think that I was asked to liaise with the Metropolitan Police and I liaised with Chief Inspector Smith, I think, Gary, I forget his name, Smith.  Q. Yes, Smith.  A. I provided a briefing for him, a briefing document and sent it over. I was present when his team were briefed when they came over to Gibraltar and then I had very little involvement from that point onwards.  Q. Were you in any further contact with Mr Pyle, the interim Governor, about Operation	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	early retirement?  A. With respect, sir, I think that's what this Inquiry is all about.  Q. Yes, but I am asking about your understanding.  A. About my opinions? My view Q. No, not your opinion, but your understanding and if you have no understanding A. At the time I had no understanding, because I had asked Mr McGrail, we had asked Mr McGrail is this in connection with Operation Delhi. Of course, I was concerned about that because I was the SIO for Operation Delhi. He had replied that it was not in relation to Operation Delhi but I had not seen any of the papers that he had been
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. I would imagine as soon as he had obtained that recording he would have told me about it.  Q. What was your involvement in Operation Kram after that date?  A. I think that I was asked to liaise with the Metropolitan Police and I liaised with Chief Inspector Smith, I think, Gary, I forget his name, Smith.  Q. Yes, Smith.  A. I provided a briefing for him, a briefing document and sent it over. I was present when his team were briefed when they came over to Gibraltar and then I had very little involvement from that point onwards.  Q. Were you in any further contact with Mr Pyle, the interim Governor, about Operation Kram?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	early retirement?  A. With respect, sir, I think that's what this Inquiry is all about.  Q. Yes, but I am asking about your understanding.  A. About my opinions? My view Q. No, not your opinion, but your understanding and if you have no understanding A. At the time I had no understanding, because I had asked Mr McGrail, we had asked Mr McGrail is this in connection with Operation Delhi. Of course, I was concerned about that because I was the SIO for Operation Delhi. He had replied that it was not in relation to Operation Delhi but I had not seen any of the papers that he had been served. So I was puzzled as to why he was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. I would imagine as soon as he had obtained that recording he would have told me about it.  Q. What was your involvement in Operation Kram after that date?  A. I think that I was asked to liaise with the Metropolitan Police and I liaised with Chief Inspector Smith, I think, Gary, I forget his name, Smith.  Q. Yes, Smith.  A. I provided a briefing for him, a briefing document and sent it over. I was present when his team were briefed when they came over to Gibraltar and then I had very little involvement from that point onwards.  Q. Were you in any further contact with Mr Pyle, the interim Governor, about Operation Kram?  A. Not as far as I remember.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	early retirement?  A. With respect, sir, I think that's what this Inquiry is all about.  Q. Yes, but I am asking about your understanding.  A. About my opinions? My view Q. No, not your opinion, but your understanding and if you have no understanding A. At the time I had no understanding, because I had asked Mr McGrail, we had asked Mr McGrail is this in connection with Operation Delhi. Of course, I was concerned about that because I was the SIO for Operation Delhi. He had replied that it was not in relation to Operation Delhi but I had not seen any of the papers that he had been served. So I was puzzled as to why he was being asked to retire, shocked even.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. I would imagine as soon as he had obtained that recording he would have told me about it.  Q. What was your involvement in Operation Kram after that date?  A. I think that I was asked to liaise with the Metropolitan Police and I liaised with Chief Inspector Smith, I think, Gary, I forget his name, Smith.  Q. Yes, Smith.  A. I provided a briefing for him, a briefing document and sent it over. I was present when his team were briefed when they came over to Gibraltar and then I had very little involvement from that point onwards.  Q. Were you in any further contact with Mr Pyle, the interim Governor, about Operation Kram?  A. Not as far as I remember.  Q. And were you privy to any other	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	early retirement?  A. With respect, sir, I think that's what this Inquiry is all about.  Q. Yes, but I am asking about your understanding.  A. About my opinions? My view Q. No, not your opinion, but your understanding and if you have no understanding A. At the time I had no understanding, because I had asked Mr McGrail, we had asked Mr McGrail is this in connection with Operation Delhi. Of course, I was concerned about that because I was the SIO for Operation Delhi. He had replied that it was not in relation to Operation Delhi but I had not seen any of the papers that he had been served. So I was puzzled as to why he was being asked to retire, shocked even.  MR SANTOS: Thank you. Just bear with
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. I would imagine as soon as he had obtained that recording he would have told me about it.  Q. What was your involvement in Operation Kram after that date?  A. I think that I was asked to liaise with the Metropolitan Police and I liaised with Chief Inspector Smith, I think, Gary, I forget his name, Smith.  Q. Yes, Smith.  A. I provided a briefing for him, a briefing document and sent it over. I was present when his team were briefed when they came over to Gibraltar and then I had very little involvement from that point onwards.  Q. Were you in any further contact with Mr Pyle, the interim Governor, about Operation Kram?  A. Not as far as I remember.  Q. And were you privy to any other meetings or communications between Mr	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	early retirement?  A. With respect, sir, I think that's what this Inquiry is all about.  Q. Yes, but I am asking about your understanding.  A. About my opinions? My view Q. No, not your opinion, but your understanding and if you have no understanding A. At the time I had no understanding, because I had asked Mr McGrail, we had asked Mr McGrail is this in connection with Operation Delhi. Of course, I was concerned about that because I was the SIO for Operation Delhi. He had replied that it was not in relation to Operation Delhi but I had not seen any of the papers that he had been served. So I was puzzled as to why he was being asked to retire, shocked even.  MR SANTOS: Thank you. Just bear with me one second. (Pause) Thank you, if you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. I would imagine as soon as he had obtained that recording he would have told me about it.  Q. What was your involvement in Operation Kram after that date?  A. I think that I was asked to liaise with the Metropolitan Police and I liaised with Chief Inspector Smith, I think, Gary, I forget his name, Smith.  Q. Yes, Smith.  A. I provided a briefing for him, a briefing document and sent it over. I was present when his team were briefed when they came over to Gibraltar and then I had very little involvement from that point onwards.  Q. Were you in any further contact with Mr Pyle, the interim Governor, about Operation Kram?  A. Not as far as I remember.  Q. And were you privy to any other meetings or communications between Mr McGrail and Mr Pyle about Operation Kram?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	early retirement?  A. With respect, sir, I think that's what this Inquiry is all about.  Q. Yes, but I am asking about your understanding.  A. About my opinions? My view Q. No, not your opinion, but your understanding and if you have no understanding A. At the time I had no understanding, because I had asked Mr McGrail, we had asked Mr McGrail is this in connection with Operation Delhi. Of course, I was concerned about that because I was the SIO for Operation Delhi. He had replied that it was not in relation to Operation Delhi but I had not seen any of the papers that he had been served. So I was puzzled as to why he was being asked to retire, shocked even.  MR SANTOS: Thank you. Just bear with me one second. (Pause) Thank you, if you just stay there, I think that Mr Wagner may
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. I would imagine as soon as he had obtained that recording he would have told me about it.  Q. What was your involvement in Operation Kram after that date?  A. I think that I was asked to liaise with the Metropolitan Police and I liaised with Chief Inspector Smith, I think, Gary, I forget his name, Smith.  Q. Yes, Smith.  A. I provided a briefing for him, a briefing document and sent it over. I was present when his team were briefed when they came over to Gibraltar and then I had very little involvement from that point onwards.  Q. Were you in any further contact with Mr Pyle, the interim Governor, about Operation Kram?  A. Not as far as I remember.  Q. And were you privy to any other meetings or communications between Mr McGrail and Mr Pyle about Operation Kram?  A. I don't think so.  Q. Just finally, in relation to Mr McGrail's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	early retirement?  A. With respect, sir, I think that's what this Inquiry is all about.  Q. Yes, but I am asking about your understanding.  A. About my opinions? My view Q. No, not your opinion, but your understanding and if you have no understanding A. At the time I had no understanding, because I had asked Mr McGrail, we had asked Mr McGrail is this in connection with Operation Delhi. Of course, I was concerned about that because I was the SIO for Operation Delhi. He had replied that it was not in relation to Operation Delhi but I had not seen any of the papers that he had been served. So I was puzzled as to why he was being asked to retire, shocked even.  MR SANTOS: Thank you. Just bear with me one second. (Pause) Thank you, if you just stay there, I think that Mr Wagner may have some questions for you.  MR CRUZ: Sir, I have no entitlement to ask
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. I would imagine as soon as he had obtained that recording he would have told me about it.  Q. What was your involvement in Operation Kram after that date?  A. I think that I was asked to liaise with the Metropolitan Police and I liaised with Chief Inspector Smith, I think, Gary, I forget his name, Smith.  Q. Yes, Smith.  A. I provided a briefing for him, a briefing document and sent it over. I was present when his team were briefed when they came over to Gibraltar and then I had very little involvement from that point onwards.  Q. Were you in any further contact with Mr Pyle, the interim Governor, about Operation Kram?  A. Not as far as I remember.  Q. And were you privy to any other meetings or communications between Mr McGrail and Mr Pyle about Operation Kram?  A. I don't think so.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	early retirement?  A. With respect, sir, I think that's what this Inquiry is all about.  Q. Yes, but I am asking about your understanding.  A. About my opinions? My view Q. No, not your opinion, but your understanding and if you have no understanding A. At the time I had no understanding, because I had asked Mr McGrail, we had asked Mr McGrail is this in connection with Operation Delhi. Of course, I was concerned about that because I was the SIO for Operation Delhi. He had replied that it was not in relation to Operation Delhi but I had not seen any of the papers that he had been served. So I was puzzled as to why he was being asked to retire, shocked even.  MR SANTOS: Thank you. Just bear with me one second. (Pause) Thank you, if you just stay there, I think that Mr Wagner may have some questions for you.

1 questions without your permission, and there	1 that you were taken through this morning.
2 was just a couple of documents that go	What I want to find out is who had access to
3 one goes to the issue of the search warrant	3 those documents and I am going to ask you a
4 and the DPP, that I thought it would be	4 few specific questions. So, starting with the
5 helpful if the witness could look at and there	5 national decision model assessment
6 is another, but I do not know whether (a) you	6 document, the NDM, that very detailed
7 would be willing to allow me to ask that	7 document just for everybody else's
8 question, and (b) when you would want me	8 understanding, that were sent to the DPP to
9 to ask it. It may be that others would want	9 assess whether he agreed that Mr Levy could
me to ask it now rather than later. rather than	be treated as a suspect, to your knowledge,
11 later.	between 12 May and 9 June, did the Chief
12 THE CHAIRMAN: We will have our break	12 Minister have access to that document?
shortly. If you just mention to Mr Santos	13 A. Not to my knowledge, no.
what the documents are, that may be the way	Q. Would he have been sent it by you at any
15 forward.	15 point?
16 MR CRUZ: Thank you.	16 A. He would not have been sent it by me.
17 MR SANTOS: I think it is Mr Wagner next	17 Q. Did the Attorney General have access to
18 for Mr McGrail who has some questions for	18 that document?
19 you.	19 A. I didn't send the document to the
20 THE CHAIRMAN: I think maybe it is a	20 Attorney General.
21 good idea to have our break now.	21 Q. No. What about the acting Governor, Mr
22 MR SANTOS: Yes.	22 Pyle?
	23 A. No.
,	
24 (Adjourned for a short time)	Q. Did Dr Britto of the Gibraltar Police
25 (15.20)	25 Authority have access to that document to
Page 177	Page 179
1 THE CHAIRMAN: You have sorted out	1 your knowledge?
2 your position, Mr Cruz?	2 A. No.
3 MR CRUZ: Yes.	3 Q. The application for the warrant, did any
4 MR WAGNER: I did not hear what was	4 of those individuals, as far as you know, have
5 said.	5 access to that document between 12 May and
6 THE CHAIRMAN: The answer was "yes".	6 9 June?
7 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR	7 A. No.
8 WAGNER	8 Q. What about the note that you took of the
9 THE WITNESS: Good afternoon Mr	9 meeting with the DPP where he advised on
10 Wagner.	10 Mr Levy's suspect status. Did any of those
11 MR WAGNER: Good afternoon Mr	individuals have access to those notes?
12 Richardson. You will have to excuse me for	12 A. The DPP will have had access to that note
	13 at some point, yes.
ē , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	1 / 1
14 turn my computer a little bit so I can at least	Q. Sorry, I was not asking about the DPP, I
turn my nose towards you occasionally. I am	15 was asking about the Chief Minister.
16 not being rude, I am just reading from my	16 A. No.
17 screen. As long as it does not concern you or	17 Q. The AG?
18 you cannot hear what I am saying.	18 A. No.
19 A. I can hear what you are saying, and I can	19 Q. Mr Pyle?
do the same and turn.	20 A. No.
Q. Just let me know and if it needs to be	21 Q. Or the GPA?
dealt with, we will deal with it. Mr	22 A. No.
23 Richardson, the first question I wanted to ask	Q. What about the ruling of the Magistrates
you relates to the various documents that	24 granting the warrant? Would the Chief
25 related to Mr Levy and the search warrant	25 Minister have seen that?
Page 178	
	Page 180

45 (Pages 177 to 180)

1	A N	,	O The let 11 steel and the second
1	A. No.	1	Q. The intellectual property, yes.
2	Q. What about the Attorney General?	2	A. Yes, that's correct.
3 4	A. I'm saying no, I've got no idea what the Chief Minister has access to.	3 4	Q. And the fact that he was advising the Government, did that give rise to any
5		5	additional issues that you would have to deal
6	<ul><li>Q. Sorry, to your knowledge?</li><li>A. Not to my knowledge, no.</li></ul>	$\begin{vmatrix} 3 \\ 6 \end{vmatrix}$	with in terms of him being involved and
7	Q. And I assume Mr Pyle and the Dr Britto?	7	seeing the evidence?
8	A. The same.	8	A. Sorry, could you repeat that question.
9	Q. And to your knowledge, during that	9	Q. Wel, if he is advising the Government
10	period of 12 May to 9 June, did anybody in	10	about an issue that is going to be live in the
11	the investigating team, and particularly you,	11	investigation, would you think otherwise
12	share with the Chief Minister the underlying	12	about sharing with him sensitive information
13	evidence that you considered gave you a	13	in the investigation, or does it not make a
14	reasonable suspicion in relation to Mr Levy?	14	difference?
15	A. No.	15	A. I'd never consider that.
16	Q. Was the AG taken through the evidence?	16	Q. No. I just want to ask you now about Op
17	A. No.	17	Delhi and particularly Mr McGrail's
18	Q. Is that unusual that the AG would not be	18	involvement in the investigation. Did Mr
19	taken through the evidence?	19	McGrail have any direct involvement in
20	A. It is not unusual now. Before the	20	running the investigation?
21	constitutional changes, I think in 2006 the	21	A. No.
22	AG held a dual role of being the DPP as well,	22	Q. No. Did he assist in drafting any
23	or having that function and so we would	23	statements?
24	often go down and see the AG, meaning the	24	A. No.
25	AG in his capacity as Gibraltar's version of	25	Q. Did he assist in drafting the NDM
	Page 181		Page 183
	1 100		1 450 100
1	the DPP.	1	documents?
2	Q. Yes. But after 2006?	2	A. No.
2 3	<ul><li>Q. Yes. But after 2006?</li><li>A. No.</li></ul>	2 3	<ul><li>A. No.</li><li>Q. Did he assist in drafting the application</li></ul>
2 3 4	<ul><li>Q. Yes. But after 2006?</li><li>A. No.</li><li>Q. Or whenever it was that the DPP role was</li></ul>	2 3 4	<ul><li>A. No.</li><li>Q. Did he assist in drafting the application for the warrants?</li></ul>
2 3 4 5	<ul><li>Q. Yes. But after 2006?</li><li>A. No.</li><li>Q. Or whenever it was that the DPP role was introduced. I think it may have been 2008?</li></ul>	2 3 4 5	<ul><li>A. No.</li><li>Q. Did he assist in drafting the application for the warrants?</li><li>A. No.</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>Q. Yes. But after 2006?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Or whenever it was that the DPP role was introduced. I think it may have been 2008?</li> <li>A. I don't</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did he assist in drafting the application for the warrants?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did he come along to court that day</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>Q. Yes. But after 2006?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Or whenever it was that the DPP role was introduced. I think it may have been 2008?</li> <li>A. I don't</li> <li>Q. 2015.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did he assist in drafting the application for the warrants?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did he come along to court that day</li> <li>A. No.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>Q. Yes. But after 2006?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Or whenever it was that the DPP role was introduced. I think it may have been 2008?</li> <li>A. I don't</li> <li>Q. 2015.</li> <li>A. It was just before the start of this Inquiry</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did he assist in drafting the application for the warrants?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did he come along to court that day</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q to get the warrant? No. Was he at the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q. Yes. But after 2006?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Or whenever it was that the DPP role was introduced. I think it may have been 2008?</li> <li>A. I don't</li> <li>Q. 2015.</li> <li>A. It was just before the start of this Inquiry I think.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did he assist in drafting the application for the warrants?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did he come along to court that day</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q to get the warrant? No. Was he at the Hassan's offices attempting to execute the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q. Yes. But after 2006?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Or whenever it was that the DPP role was introduced. I think it may have been 2008?</li> <li>A. I don't</li> <li>Q. 2015.</li> <li>A. It was just before the start of this Inquiry I think.</li> <li>Q. All right. So it was not unusual. It would</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did he assist in drafting the application for the warrants?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did he come along to court that day</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q to get the warrant? No. Was he at the Hassan's offices attempting to execute the warrant on 12 May?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>Q. Yes. But after 2006?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Or whenever it was that the DPP role was introduced. I think it may have been 2008?</li> <li>A. I don't</li> <li>Q. 2015.</li> <li>A. It was just before the start of this Inquiry I think.</li> <li>Q. All right. So it was not unusual. It would be unusual if the AG at that time saw the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did he assist in drafting the application for the warrants?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did he come along to court that day</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q to get the warrant? No. Was he at the Hassan's offices attempting to execute the warrant on 12 May?</li> <li>A. No.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Q. Yes. But after 2006?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Or whenever it was that the DPP role was introduced. I think it may have been 2008?</li> <li>A. I don't</li> <li>Q. 2015.</li> <li>A. It was just before the start of this Inquiry I think.</li> <li>Q. All right. So it was not unusual. It would be unusual if the AG at that time saw the evidence in a criminal investigation?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did he assist in drafting the application for the warrants?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did he come along to court that day</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q to get the warrant? No. Was he at the Hassan's offices attempting to execute the warrant on 12 May?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did he come with you to Mr Levy's home</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Q. Yes. But after 2006?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Or whenever it was that the DPP role was introduced. I think it may have been 2008?</li> <li>A. I don't</li> <li>Q. 2015.</li> <li>A. It was just before the start of this Inquiry I think.</li> <li>Q. All right. So it was not unusual. It would be unusual if the AG at that time saw the evidence in a criminal investigation?</li> <li>A. From my perspective as a police officer,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did he assist in drafting the application for the warrants?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did he come along to court that day</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q to get the warrant? No. Was he at the Hassan's offices attempting to execute the warrant on 12 May?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did he come with you to Mr Levy's home on 12 May?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Q. Yes. But after 2006?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Or whenever it was that the DPP role was introduced. I think it may have been 2008?</li> <li>A. I don't</li> <li>Q. 2015.</li> <li>A. It was just before the start of this Inquiry I think.</li> <li>Q. All right. So it was not unusual. It would be unusual if the AG at that time saw the evidence in a criminal investigation?</li> <li>A. From my perspective as a police officer, yes. I don't know if other police officers had</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did he assist in drafting the application for the warrants?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did he come along to court that day</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q to get the warrant? No. Was he at the Hassan's offices attempting to execute the warrant on 12 May?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did he come with you to Mr Levy's home on 12 May?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>A. No.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Q. Yes. But after 2006?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Or whenever it was that the DPP role was introduced. I think it may have been 2008?</li> <li>A. I don't</li> <li>Q. 2015.</li> <li>A. It was just before the start of this Inquiry I think.</li> <li>Q. All right. So it was not unusual. It would be unusual if the AG at that time saw the evidence in a criminal investigation?</li> <li>A. From my perspective as a police officer, yes. I don't know if other police officers had dealt with the AG.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did he assist in drafting the application for the warrants?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did he come along to court that day</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q to get the warrant? No. Was he at the Hassan's offices attempting to execute the warrant on 12 May?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did he come with you to Mr Levy's home on 12 May?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. How often did you update Mr McGrail in</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Q. Yes. But after 2006?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Or whenever it was that the DPP role was introduced. I think it may have been 2008?</li> <li>A. I don't</li> <li>Q. 2015.</li> <li>A. It was just before the start of this Inquiry I think.</li> <li>Q. All right. So it was not unusual. It would be unusual if the AG at that time saw the evidence in a criminal investigation?</li> <li>A. From my perspective as a police officer, yes. I don't know if other police officers had dealt with the AG.</li> <li>Q. And the AG in this investigation, he had</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did he assist in drafting the application for the warrants?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did he come along to court that day</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q to get the warrant? No. Was he at the Hassan's offices attempting to execute the warrant on 12 May?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did he come with you to Mr Levy's home on 12 May?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. How often did you update Mr McGrail in relation to the investigation?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Q. Yes. But after 2006?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Or whenever it was that the DPP role was introduced. I think it may have been 2008?</li> <li>A. I don't</li> <li>Q. 2015.</li> <li>A. It was just before the start of this Inquiry I think.</li> <li>Q. All right. So it was not unusual. It would be unusual if the AG at that time saw the evidence in a criminal investigation?</li> <li>A. From my perspective as a police officer, yes. I don't know if other police officers had dealt with the AG.</li> <li>Q. And the AG in this investigation, he had informed you, I think it is right to say, that he</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did he assist in drafting the application for the warrants?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did he come along to court that day</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q to get the warrant? No. Was he at the Hassan's offices attempting to execute the warrant on 12 May?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did he come with you to Mr Levy's home on 12 May?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. How often did you update Mr McGrail in relation to the investigation?</li> <li>A. That is hard to say because I think I</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Q. Yes. But after 2006?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Or whenever it was that the DPP role was introduced. I think it may have been 2008?</li> <li>A. I don't</li> <li>Q. 2015.</li> <li>A. It was just before the start of this Inquiry I think.</li> <li>Q. All right. So it was not unusual. It would be unusual if the AG at that time saw the evidence in a criminal investigation?</li> <li>A. From my perspective as a police officer, yes. I don't know if other police officers had dealt with the AG.</li> <li>Q. And the AG in this investigation, he had informed you, I think it is right to say, that he was advising on the ownership issue. Is that</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did he assist in drafting the application for the warrants?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did he come along to court that day</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q to get the warrant? No. Was he at the Hassan's offices attempting to execute the warrant on 12 May?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did he come with you to Mr Levy's home on 12 May?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. How often did you update Mr McGrail in relation to the investigation?</li> <li>A. That is hard to say because I think I mentioned in one of my statements that our</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q. Yes. But after 2006?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Or whenever it was that the DPP role was introduced. I think it may have been 2008?</li> <li>A. I don't</li> <li>Q. 2015.</li> <li>A. It was just before the start of this Inquiry I think.</li> <li>Q. All right. So it was not unusual. It would be unusual if the AG at that time saw the evidence in a criminal investigation?</li> <li>A. From my perspective as a police officer, yes. I don't know if other police officers had dealt with the AG.</li> <li>Q. And the AG in this investigation, he had informed you, I think it is right to say, that he was advising on the ownership issue. Is that right?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did he assist in drafting the application for the warrants?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did he come along to court that day</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q to get the warrant? No. Was he at the Hassan's offices attempting to execute the warrant on 12 May?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did he come with you to Mr Levy's home on 12 May?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. How often did you update Mr McGrail in relation to the investigation?</li> <li>A. That is hard to say because I think I mentioned in one of my statements that our offices were collocated on purpose so that he</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q. Yes. But after 2006?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Or whenever it was that the DPP role was introduced. I think it may have been 2008?</li> <li>A. I don't</li> <li>Q. 2015.</li> <li>A. It was just before the start of this Inquiry I think.</li> <li>Q. All right. So it was not unusual. It would be unusual if the AG at that time saw the evidence in a criminal investigation?</li> <li>A. From my perspective as a police officer, yes. I don't know if other police officers had dealt with the AG.</li> <li>Q. And the AG in this investigation, he had informed you, I think it is right to say, that he was advising on the ownership issue. Is that</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did he assist in drafting the application for the warrants?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did he come along to court that day</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q to get the warrant? No. Was he at the Hassan's offices attempting to execute the warrant on 12 May?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did he come with you to Mr Levy's home on 12 May?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. How often did you update Mr McGrail in relation to the investigation?</li> <li>A. That is hard to say because I think I mentioned in one of my statements that our offices were collocated on purpose so that he could pop in and he did pop in several times</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Q. Yes. But after 2006?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Or whenever it was that the DPP role was introduced. I think it may have been 2008?</li> <li>A. I don't</li> <li>Q. 2015.</li> <li>A. It was just before the start of this Inquiry I think.</li> <li>Q. All right. So it was not unusual. It would be unusual if the AG at that time saw the evidence in a criminal investigation?</li> <li>A. From my perspective as a police officer, yes. I don't know if other police officers had dealt with the AG.</li> <li>Q. And the AG in this investigation, he had informed you, I think it is right to say, that he was advising on the ownership issue. Is that right?</li> <li>A. That is my recollection.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did he assist in drafting the application for the warrants?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did he come along to court that day</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q to get the warrant? No. Was he at the Hassan's offices attempting to execute the warrant on 12 May?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did he come with you to Mr Levy's home on 12 May?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. How often did you update Mr McGrail in relation to the investigation?</li> <li>A. That is hard to say because I think I mentioned in one of my statements that our offices were collocated on purpose so that he</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q. Yes. But after 2006?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Or whenever it was that the DPP role was introduced. I think it may have been 2008?</li> <li>A. I don't</li> <li>Q. 2015.</li> <li>A. It was just before the start of this Inquiry I think.</li> <li>Q. All right. So it was not unusual. It would be unusual if the AG at that time saw the evidence in a criminal investigation?</li> <li>A. From my perspective as a police officer, yes. I don't know if other police officers had dealt with the AG.</li> <li>Q. And the AG in this investigation, he had informed you, I think it is right to say, that he was advising on the ownership issue. Is that right?</li> <li>A. That is my recollection.</li> <li>Q. So that was the ownership issue, correct</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did he assist in drafting the application for the warrants?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did he come along to court that day</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q to get the warrant? No. Was he at the Hassan's offices attempting to execute the warrant on 12 May?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did he come with you to Mr Levy's home on 12 May?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. How often did you update Mr McGrail in relation to the investigation?</li> <li>A. That is hard to say because I think I mentioned in one of my statements that our offices were collocated on purpose so that he could pop in and he did pop in several times during the course of the day. Discussions</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q. Yes. But after 2006?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Or whenever it was that the DPP role was introduced. I think it may have been 2008?</li> <li>A. I don't</li> <li>Q. 2015.</li> <li>A. It was just before the start of this Inquiry I think.</li> <li>Q. All right. So it was not unusual. It would be unusual if the AG at that time saw the evidence in a criminal investigation?</li> <li>A. From my perspective as a police officer, yes. I don't know if other police officers had dealt with the AG.</li> <li>Q. And the AG in this investigation, he had informed you, I think it is right to say, that he was advising on the ownership issue. Is that right?</li> <li>A. That is my recollection.</li> <li>Q. So that was the ownership issue, correct me if I am wrong, was whether it was the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did he assist in drafting the application for the warrants?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did he come along to court that day</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q to get the warrant? No. Was he at the Hassan's offices attempting to execute the warrant on 12 May?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did he come with you to Mr Levy's home on 12 May?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. How often did you update Mr McGrail in relation to the investigation?</li> <li>A. That is hard to say because I think I mentioned in one of my statements that our offices were collocated on purpose so that he could pop in and he did pop in several times during the course of the day. Discussions will have been had on an ad hoc basis. So, it</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. Yes. But after 2006?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Or whenever it was that the DPP role was introduced. I think it may have been 2008?</li> <li>A. I don't</li> <li>Q. 2015.</li> <li>A. It was just before the start of this Inquiry I think.</li> <li>Q. All right. So it was not unusual. It would be unusual if the AG at that time saw the evidence in a criminal investigation?</li> <li>A. From my perspective as a police officer, yes. I don't know if other police officers had dealt with the AG.</li> <li>Q. And the AG in this investigation, he had informed you, I think it is right to say, that he was advising on the ownership issue. Is that right?</li> <li>A. That is my recollection.</li> <li>Q. So that was the ownership issue, correct me if I am wrong, was whether it was the Government or Bland that owned the NCSIS.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. No. Q. Did he assist in drafting the application for the warrants? A. No. Q. Did he come along to court that day A. No. Q to get the warrant? No. Was he at the Hassan's offices attempting to execute the warrant on 12 May? A. No. Q. Did he come with you to Mr Levy's home on 12 May? A. No. Q. Did he come with you update Mr McGrail in relation to the investigation? A. That is hard to say because I think I mentioned in one of my statements that our offices were collocated on purpose so that he could pop in and he did pop in several times during the course of the day. Discussions will have been had on an ad hoc basis. So, it is impossible for me to say exactly how
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Q. Yes. But after 2006?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Or whenever it was that the DPP role was introduced. I think it may have been 2008?</li> <li>A. I don't</li> <li>Q. 2015.</li> <li>A. It was just before the start of this Inquiry I think.</li> <li>Q. All right. So it was not unusual. It would be unusual if the AG at that time saw the evidence in a criminal investigation?</li> <li>A. From my perspective as a police officer, yes. I don't know if other police officers had dealt with the AG.</li> <li>Q. And the AG in this investigation, he had informed you, I think it is right to say, that he was advising on the ownership issue. Is that right?</li> <li>A. That is my recollection.</li> <li>Q. So that was the ownership issue, correct me if I am wrong, was whether it was the Government or Bland that owned the NCSIS.</li> <li>A. The intellectual property behind the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. No. Q. Did he assist in drafting the application for the warrants? A. No. Q. Did he come along to court that day A. No. Q to get the warrant? No. Was he at the Hassan's offices attempting to execute the warrant on 12 May? A. No. Q. Did he come with you to Mr Levy's home on 12 May? A. No. Q. Did he come with you update Mr McGrail in relation to the investigation? A. That is hard to say because I think I mentioned in one of my statements that our offices were collocated on purpose so that he could pop in and he did pop in several times during the course of the day. Discussions will have been had on an ad hoc basis. So, it is impossible for me to say exactly how many times I would have updated him.

46 (Pages 181 to 184)

1 A W.II 4 day and day on between	1 4
1 A. Well, it depended on what was	1 the crimes?
2 happening. For example, in the case of the NDM that we had taken advice from the DPP	A. It became apparent very soon on that we didn't have the technical expertise to be able
4 and what that advice was, where we were in	didn't have the technical expertise to be able to investigate the computer misuse offences,
5 relation to things. Mr McGrail had been	5 not just within the police, but within
6 instrumental in helping us secure the	6 Gibraltar and we also didn't have the
7 assistance of the National Crime Agency that	7 technical expertise to be able to interview
8 came over to assist with the investigation.	_
9 Q. I will come back in a moment to the	8 somebody at the level that was required to 9 investigate the crimes that were under
10 National Crime Agency. Just two other	investigate the crimes that were under 10 investigation. It was for that reason that we
11 questions about Mr McGrail's involvement	11 engaged with the National Crime Unit's
12 and one that's not. During the investigation,	12 Cyber Crime Unit to assist.
13 were you or any of the other investigating	13 Q. And when they arrived, the National
14 officers to your knowledge what you might	14 Crime Agency Cyber Unit, did they say,
	15 "This isn't very serious. Why have you
15 call being directed by James Gaggero? 16 A. No.	16 called us in?"
17 Q. And to your knowledge, was Mr McGrail	
	, 1
18 being directed by James Gaggero? 19 A. No.	
	19 A. This was the level of investigation that
20 Q. Just coming back to the NCA, the 21 National Crime Agency, is it normal for the	20 they got involved in nationally in the United
l	21 <b>Kingdom.</b>
22 National Crime Agency to come in and assist	<ul> <li>Q. What do you mean by "level"?</li> <li>A. Well, in forces in the UK, obviously most</li> </ul>
23 with an investigation in Gibraltar?	, , ,
24 <b>A. No, it isn't.</b> 25 O. And I think you mentioned in your earlier	of the forces are much, much bigger than
25 Q. And I think you mentioned in your earlier	25 ours. They will have their own cyber crime
Page 185	Page 187
1 evidence, you spoke about the seriousness of	1 units. They may have their own specialist
2 the consequences of what you considered to	2 technicians, but if it gets beyond a certain
3 be the alleged criminal conduct.	3 size, they will have to use a national resource
4 A. Yes.	4 and they have to bid to use that national
5 Q. Now, I am not going to ask you about the	5 resource. There isn't several National Crime
6 detail of those consequences and you know	6 Agencies that can be drawn upon.
7 that some of it is subject to a restriction	7 Q. Yes. So they were saying to you, in
8 notice, but just talking about seriousness, and	8 effect, this was an investigation that was so
9 just to give this a bit of context, all these	9 serious that even in a country of 60 million
documents and the actions that were being	10 people, as compared to a jurisdiction of
taken and the meetings and the discussions	11 30,000, it would be serious enough for them
and all of that, in your experience as a police	12 to get involved?
officer, how long were you a police officer	13 A. That's correct.
14 for?	Q. Would you agree that there was another
15 A. 36 years.	15 aspect of it was serious is that it was the
16 Q. In your 36 years as a police officer, how	people that you suspected of being involved
17 serious was this investigation compared to	and their position in society?
18 others you had been involved in?	18 A. Yes.
19 A. I think it was the most serious	19 Q. Can you just elaborate on that and how it
20 investigation that I had been involved in.	20 impacted on the investigation.
Q. You say it was the most serious	21 A. There are sensitivities in every
investigation you had been involved in, the	22 investigation but this particular one involved
23 level of criminality that you suspected and	23 the ex-commanding officer of the Gibraltar
the seriousness of the consequences, how did	24 Regiment, a person that was held in high
=	25 esteem. A senior civil servant and also an
25 that impact on the way that you investigated	25 esteem. A senior civil servant and also an
25 that impact on the way that you investigated Page 186	Page 188

1	esteemed barrister within Gibraltar.	1	2020?
1 2	Q. Yes, and not just a senior civil servant, it	1 2	A. I think it was 2018, yes.
3			Q. You think it was 2018, yes.
	was the Principal Private Secretary to the	3	Q. You think it was 2018 specifically, or could it have been 2019 as well?
4	Deputy Chief Minister?	4	
5	A. That is correct.	5	A. It could have been 2019. I am not 100
6	Q. So one of the most senior civil servants?	6	per cent certain.
7	A. I am not sure how that relates in the UK	7	Q. I am going to just show you a part from
8	context. I know his grade was a higher	8	Mr McGrail's first affidavit. If we could
9	executive officer, which isn't one of the most	9	show A4 please and paragraph 12. Just go a
10	senior in the civil service in Gibraltar.	10	little bit further down, it says there, "Because
11	Q. Right. But certainly he would have	11	of the complexities of the case, I was aware
12	access to high levels of information and	12	the investigative officers were consulting
13	control?	13	with the Office of Criminal Prosecution and
14	A. I would imagine working with the Deputy	14	Litigation, particularly with the DPP. I also
15	Chief Minister he would.	15	discussed the investigation with the AG on a
16	Q. So you had a senior military man, a	16	few occasions when he brought it up and
17	senior civil servant and a very senior law	17	very briefly verbally went over the evidence
18	officer, all potentially involved?	18	and progress made. I would normally
19	A. That's correct.	19	provide these briefings on the back of other
20	Q. And did that lead you to dealing with the	20	subject matters that I had met the AG on.
21	matters in a different way than you would	21	The AG was initially enquiring about what
22	normally?	22	evidence we were coming across and I was
23	A. We had to deal with the matter	23	content to disclose this verbally to him, albeit
24	sensitively, particularly with regards to Mr	24	in a brief fashion."
25	Levy, and I have talked about that quite a bit	25	Now, earlier you gave evidence that you only
	Page 189		Page 191
1	this morning, and if you would like me to go	1	recalled being in one meeting that was
1	uns morning, and it you would like me to go	. 1	CONTRACTOR AND ADDRESS OF A STREET AND ADDRESS OF A ST
2			<u> </u>
2 3	through it again?	2	specifically about Op Delhi with both the AG
3	through it again?  Q. No, there is no need for you to go through	2 3	specifically about Op Delhi with both the AG and Mr McGrail. That's right, isn't it?
3 4	through it again?  Q. No, there is no need for you to go through it again. I want to move in to some of the	2 3 4	specifically about Op Delhi with both the AG and Mr McGrail. That's right, isn't it?  A. With the AG, yes, that's correct.
3 4 5	through it again?  Q. No, there is no need for you to go through it again. I want to move in to some of the specifics now, please. I am going to start	2 3 4 5	specifically about Op Delhi with both the AG and Mr McGrail. That's right, isn't it?  A. With the AG, yes, that's correct.  Q. Before 12 May. Of course I mean before
3 4 5 6	through it again?  Q. No, there is no need for you to go through it again. I want to move in to some of the specifics now, please. I am going to start with the meetings and conversations with the	2 3 4 5 6	specifically about Op Delhi with both the AG and Mr McGrail. That's right, isn't it?  A. With the AG, yes, that's correct.  Q. Before 12 May. Of course I mean before 12 May. Is it possible you were if Mr
3 4 5 6 7	through it again?  Q. No, there is no need for you to go through it again. I want to move in to some of the specifics now, please. I am going to start with the meetings and conversations with the Attorney General. Thue first question is:	2 3 4 5 6 7	specifically about Op Delhi with both the AG and Mr McGrail. That's right, isn't it?  A. With the AG, yes, that's correct.  Q. Before 12 May. Of course I mean before 12 May. Is it possible you were if Mr McGrail is right in his recollection and the
3 4 5 6 7 8	through it again?  Q. No, there is no need for you to go through it again. I want to move in to some of the specifics now, please. I am going to start with the meetings and conversations with the Attorney General. Thue first question is: while Mr McGrail was Commissioner and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	specifically about Op Delhi with both the AG and Mr McGrail. That's right, isn't it?  A. With the AG, yes, that's correct.  Q. Before 12 May. Of course I mean before 12 May. Is it possible you were if Mr McGrail is right in his recollection and the AG sometimes brought up Op Delhi in other
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	through it again?  Q. No, there is no need for you to go through it again. I want to move in to some of the specifics now, please. I am going to start with the meetings and conversations with the Attorney General. Thue first question is: while Mr McGrail was Commissioner and you were an officer, would you have been	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	specifically about Op Delhi with both the AG and Mr McGrail. That's right, isn't it?  A. With the AG, yes, that's correct.  Q. Before 12 May. Of course I mean before 12 May. Is it possible you were if Mr McGrail is right in his recollection and the AG sometimes brought up Op Delhi in other meetings that were not about Op Delhi, is it
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	through it again?  Q. No, there is no need for you to go through it again. I want to move in to some of the specifics now, please. I am going to start with the meetings and conversations with the Attorney General. Thue first question is: while Mr McGrail was Commissioner and you were an officer, would you have been involved in any meetings with Mr McGrail	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	specifically about Op Delhi with both the AG and Mr McGrail. That's right, isn't it?  A. With the AG, yes, that's correct.  Q. Before 12 May. Of course I mean before 12 May. Is it possible you were if Mr McGrail is right in his recollection and the AG sometimes brought up Op Delhi in other meetings that were not about Op Delhi, is it possible that you might have been in those
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	through it again?  Q. No, there is no need for you to go through it again. I want to move in to some of the specifics now, please. I am going to start with the meetings and conversations with the Attorney General. Thue first question is: while Mr McGrail was Commissioner and you were an officer, would you have been involved in any meetings with Mr McGrail that were not about Operation Delhi?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	specifically about Op Delhi with both the AG and Mr McGrail. That's right, isn't it?  A. With the AG, yes, that's correct.  Q. Before 12 May. Of course I mean before 12 May. Is it possible you were if Mr McGrail is right in his recollection and the AG sometimes brought up Op Delhi in other meetings that were not about Op Delhi, is it possible that you might have been in those meetings?
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	through it again?  Q. No, there is no need for you to go through it again. I want to move in to some of the specifics now, please. I am going to start with the meetings and conversations with the Attorney General. Thue first question is: while Mr McGrail was Commissioner and you were an officer, would you have been involved in any meetings with Mr McGrail that were not about Operation Delhi?  A. Sorry, are you asking have I been in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	specifically about Op Delhi with both the AG and Mr McGrail. That's right, isn't it?  A. With the AG, yes, that's correct.  Q. Before 12 May. Of course I mean before 12 May. Is it possible you were if Mr McGrail is right in his recollection and the AG sometimes brought up Op Delhi in other meetings that were not about Op Delhi, is it possible that you might have been in those meetings?  A. No, I don't think so, no.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	through it again?  Q. No, there is no need for you to go through it again. I want to move in to some of the specifics now, please. I am going to start with the meetings and conversations with the Attorney General. Thue first question is: while Mr McGrail was Commissioner and you were an officer, would you have been involved in any meetings with Mr McGrail that were not about Operation Delhi?  A. Sorry, are you asking have I been in meetings?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	specifically about Op Delhi with both the AG and Mr McGrail. That's right, isn't it?  A. With the AG, yes, that's correct.  Q. Before 12 May. Of course I mean before 12 May. Is it possible you were if Mr McGrail is right in his recollection and the AG sometimes brought up Op Delhi in other meetings that were not about Op Delhi, is it possible that you might have been in those meetings?  A. No, I don't think so, no.  Q. Why don't you think so?
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	through it again?  Q. No, there is no need for you to go through it again. I want to move in to some of the specifics now, please. I am going to start with the meetings and conversations with the Attorney General. Thue first question is: while Mr McGrail was Commissioner and you were an officer, would you have been involved in any meetings with Mr McGrail that were not about Operation Delhi?  A. Sorry, are you asking have I been in meetings?  Q. In, say, 2018/19/20, were you ever in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	specifically about Op Delhi with both the AG and Mr McGrail. That's right, isn't it?  A. With the AG, yes, that's correct.  Q. Before 12 May. Of course I mean before 12 May. Is it possible you were if Mr McGrail is right in his recollection and the AG sometimes brought up Op Delhi in other meetings that were not about Op Delhi, is it possible that you might have been in those meetings?  A. No, I don't think so, no.  Q. Why don't you think so?  A. Because I would have remembered being
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	through it again?  Q. No, there is no need for you to go through it again. I want to move in to some of the specifics now, please. I am going to start with the meetings and conversations with the Attorney General. Thue first question is: while Mr McGrail was Commissioner and you were an officer, would you have been involved in any meetings with Mr McGrail that were not about Operation Delhi?  A. Sorry, are you asking have I been in meetings?  Q. In, say, 2018/19/20, were you ever in meetings with Mr McGrail that were not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	specifically about Op Delhi with both the AG and Mr McGrail. That's right, isn't it?  A. With the AG, yes, that's correct.  Q. Before 12 May. Of course I mean before 12 May. Is it possible you were — if Mr McGrail is right in his recollection and the AG sometimes brought up Op Delhi in other meetings that were not about Op Delhi, is it possible that you might have been in those meetings?  A. No, I don't think so, no.  Q. Why don't you think so?  A. Because I would have remembered being present when Operation Delhi was raised
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	through it again?  Q. No, there is no need for you to go through it again. I want to move in to some of the specifics now, please. I am going to start with the meetings and conversations with the Attorney General. Thue first question is: while Mr McGrail was Commissioner and you were an officer, would you have been involved in any meetings with Mr McGrail that were not about Operation Delhi?  A. Sorry, are you asking have I been in meetings?  Q. In, say, 2018/19/20, were you ever in meetings with Mr McGrail that were not about Operation Delhi?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	specifically about Op Delhi with both the AG and Mr McGrail. That's right, isn't it?  A. With the AG, yes, that's correct.  Q. Before 12 May. Of course I mean before 12 May. Is it possible you were if Mr McGrail is right in his recollection and the AG sometimes brought up Op Delhi in other meetings that were not about Op Delhi, is it possible that you might have been in those meetings?  A. No, I don't think so, no.  Q. Why don't you think so?  A. Because I would have remembered being present when Operation Delhi was raised with the Attorney General.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	through it again?  Q. No, there is no need for you to go through it again. I want to move in to some of the specifics now, please. I am going to start with the meetings and conversations with the Attorney General. Thue first question is: while Mr McGrail was Commissioner and you were an officer, would you have been involved in any meetings with Mr McGrail that were not about Operation Delhi?  A. Sorry, are you asking have I been in meetings?  Q. In, say, 2018/19/20, were you ever in meetings with Mr McGrail that were not about Operation Delhi?  A. Many meetings.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	specifically about Op Delhi with both the AG and Mr McGrail. That's right, isn't it?  A. With the AG, yes, that's correct.  Q. Before 12 May. Of course I mean before 12 May. Is it possible you were if Mr McGrail is right in his recollection and the AG sometimes brought up Op Delhi in other meetings that were not about Op Delhi, is it possible that you might have been in those meetings?  A. No, I don't think so, no.  Q. Why don't you think so?  A. Because I would have remembered being present when Operation Delhi was raised with the Attorney General.  Q. Sorry, Mr McGrail is saying it was raised
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	through it again?  Q. No, there is no need for you to go through it again. I want to move in to some of the specifics now, please. I am going to start with the meetings and conversations with the Attorney General. Thue first question is: while Mr McGrail was Commissioner and you were an officer, would you have been involved in any meetings with Mr McGrail that were not about Operation Delhi?  A. Sorry, are you asking have I been in meetings?  Q. In, say, 2018/19/20, were you ever in meetings with Mr McGrail that were not about Operation Delhi?  A. Many meetings.  Q. Yes. And would you ever have been in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	specifically about Op Delhi with both the AG and Mr McGrail. That's right, isn't it?  A. With the AG, yes, that's correct.  Q. Before 12 May. Of course I mean before 12 May. Is it possible you were if Mr McGrail is right in his recollection and the AG sometimes brought up Op Delhi in other meetings that were not about Op Delhi, is it possible that you might have been in those meetings?  A. No, I don't think so, no.  Q. Why don't you think so?  A. Because I would have remembered being present when Operation Delhi was raised with the Attorney General.  Q. Sorry, Mr McGrail is saying it was raised by the Attorney General rather than with the
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	through it again?  Q. No, there is no need for you to go through it again. I want to move in to some of the specifics now, please. I am going to start with the meetings and conversations with the Attorney General. Thue first question is: while Mr McGrail was Commissioner and you were an officer, would you have been involved in any meetings with Mr McGrail that were not about Operation Delhi?  A. Sorry, are you asking have I been in meetings?  Q. In, say, 2018/19/20, were you ever in meetings with Mr McGrail that were not about Operation Delhi?  A. Many meetings.  Q. Yes. And would you ever have been in any meetings with the Attorney General that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	specifically about Op Delhi with both the AG and Mr McGrail. That's right, isn't it?  A. With the AG, yes, that's correct.  Q. Before 12 May. Of course I mean before 12 May. Is it possible you were if Mr McGrail is right in his recollection and the AG sometimes brought up Op Delhi in other meetings that were not about Op Delhi, is it possible that you might have been in those meetings?  A. No, I don't think so, no.  Q. Why don't you think so?  A. Because I would have remembered being present when Operation Delhi was raised with the Attorney General.  Q. Sorry, Mr McGrail is saying it was raised by the Attorney General rather than with the Attorney General.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	through it again?  Q. No, there is no need for you to go through it again. I want to move in to some of the specifics now, please. I am going to start with the meetings and conversations with the Attorney General. Thue first question is: while Mr McGrail was Commissioner and you were an officer, would you have been involved in any meetings with Mr McGrail that were not about Operation Delhi?  A. Sorry, are you asking have I been in meetings?  Q. In, say, 2018/19/20, were you ever in meetings with Mr McGrail that were not about Operation Delhi?  A. Many meetings.  Q. Yes. And would you ever have been in any meetings with the Attorney General that were not about Operation Delhi?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	specifically about Op Delhi with both the AG and Mr McGrail. That's right, isn't it?  A. With the AG, yes, that's correct.  Q. Before 12 May. Of course I mean before 12 May. Is it possible you were if Mr McGrail is right in his recollection and the AG sometimes brought up Op Delhi in other meetings that were not about Op Delhi, is it possible that you might have been in those meetings?  A. No, I don't think so, no.  Q. Why don't you think so?  A. Because I would have remembered being present when Operation Delhi was raised with the Attorney General.  Q. Sorry, Mr McGrail is saying it was raised by the Attorney General rather than with the Attorney General.  A. Well, in a meeting with I don't
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	through it again?  Q. No, there is no need for you to go through it again. I want to move in to some of the specifics now, please. I am going to start with the meetings and conversations with the Attorney General. Thue first question is: while Mr McGrail was Commissioner and you were an officer, would you have been involved in any meetings with Mr McGrail that were not about Operation Delhi?  A. Sorry, are you asking have I been in meetings?  Q. In, say, 2018/19/20, were you ever in meetings with Mr McGrail that were not about Operation Delhi?  A. Many meetings.  Q. Yes. And would you ever have been in any meetings with the Attorney General that were not about Operation Delhi?  A. Yes, I was in relation to one particular	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	specifically about Op Delhi with both the AG and Mr McGrail. That's right, isn't it?  A. With the AG, yes, that's correct.  Q. Before 12 May. Of course I mean before 12 May. Is it possible you were if Mr McGrail is right in his recollection and the AG sometimes brought up Op Delhi in other meetings that were not about Op Delhi, is it possible that you might have been in those meetings?  A. No, I don't think so, no.  Q. Why don't you think so?  A. Because I would have remembered being present when Operation Delhi was raised with the Attorney General.  Q. Sorry, Mr McGrail is saying it was raised by the Attorney General rather than with the Attorney General.  A. Well, in a meeting with I don't remember going to any other meetings with
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	through it again?  Q. No, there is no need for you to go through it again. I want to move in to some of the specifics now, please. I am going to start with the meetings and conversations with the Attorney General. Thue first question is: while Mr McGrail was Commissioner and you were an officer, would you have been involved in any meetings with Mr McGrail that were not about Operation Delhi?  A. Sorry, are you asking have I been in meetings?  Q. In, say, 2018/19/20, were you ever in meetings with Mr McGrail that were not about Operation Delhi?  A. Many meetings.  Q. Yes. And would you ever have been in any meetings with the Attorney General that were not about Operation Delhi?  A. Yes, I was in relation to one particular operation for which I was the SIO as well,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	specifically about Op Delhi with both the AG and Mr McGrail. That's right, isn't it?  A. With the AG, yes, that's correct.  Q. Before 12 May. Of course I mean before 12 May. Is it possible you were if Mr McGrail is right in his recollection and the AG sometimes brought up Op Delhi in other meetings that were not about Op Delhi, is it possible that you might have been in those meetings?  A. No, I don't think so, no.  Q. Why don't you think so?  A. Because I would have remembered being present when Operation Delhi was raised with the Attorney General.  Q. Sorry, Mr McGrail is saying it was raised by the Attorney General rather than with the Attorney General.  A. Well, in a meeting with I don't remember going to any other meetings with the Commissioner and the Attorney General
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	through it again?  Q. No, there is no need for you to go through it again. I want to move in to some of the specifics now, please. I am going to start with the meetings and conversations with the Attorney General. Thue first question is: while Mr McGrail was Commissioner and you were an officer, would you have been involved in any meetings with Mr McGrail that were not about Operation Delhi?  A. Sorry, are you asking have I been in meetings?  Q. In, say, 2018/19/20, were you ever in meetings with Mr McGrail that were not about Operation Delhi?  A. Many meetings.  Q. Yes. And would you ever have been in any meetings with the Attorney General that were not about Operation Delhi?  A. Yes, I was in relation to one particular operation for which I was the SIO as well, yes, I met on a number of occasions with the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	specifically about Op Delhi with both the AG and Mr McGrail. That's right, isn't it?  A. With the AG, yes, that's correct.  Q. Before 12 May. Of course I mean before 12 May. Is it possible you were if Mr McGrail is right in his recollection and the AG sometimes brought up Op Delhi in other meetings that were not about Op Delhi, is it possible that you might have been in those meetings?  A. No, I don't think so, no.  Q. Why don't you think so?  A. Because I would have remembered being present when Operation Delhi was raised with the Attorney General.  Q. Sorry, Mr McGrail is saying it was raised by the Attorney General rather than with the Attorney General.  A. Well, in a meeting with I don't remember going to any other meetings with the Commissioner and the Attorney General other than the Operation it was called
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	through it again?  Q. No, there is no need for you to go through it again. I want to move in to some of the specifics now, please. I am going to start with the meetings and conversations with the Attorney General. Thue first question is: while Mr McGrail was Commissioner and you were an officer, would you have been involved in any meetings with Mr McGrail that were not about Operation Delhi?  A. Sorry, are you asking have I been in meetings?  Q. In, say, 2018/19/20, were you ever in meetings with Mr McGrail that were not about Operation Delhi?  A. Many meetings.  Q. Yes. And would you ever have been in any meetings with the Attorney General that were not about Operation Delhi?  A. Yes, I was in relation to one particular operation for which I was the SIO as well,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	specifically about Op Delhi with both the AG and Mr McGrail. That's right, isn't it?  A. With the AG, yes, that's correct.  Q. Before 12 May. Of course I mean before 12 May. Is it possible you were if Mr McGrail is right in his recollection and the AG sometimes brought up Op Delhi in other meetings that were not about Op Delhi, is it possible that you might have been in those meetings?  A. No, I don't think so, no.  Q. Why don't you think so?  A. Because I would have remembered being present when Operation Delhi was raised with the Attorney General.  Q. Sorry, Mr McGrail is saying it was raised by the Attorney General rather than with the Attorney General.  A. Well, in a meeting with I don't remember going to any other meetings with the Commissioner and the Attorney General
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	through it again?  Q. No, there is no need for you to go through it again. I want to move in to some of the specifics now, please. I am going to start with the meetings and conversations with the Attorney General. Thue first question is: while Mr McGrail was Commissioner and you were an officer, would you have been involved in any meetings with Mr McGrail that were not about Operation Delhi?  A. Sorry, are you asking have I been in meetings?  Q. In, say, 2018/19/20, were you ever in meetings with Mr McGrail that were not about Operation Delhi?  A. Many meetings.  Q. Yes. And would you ever have been in any meetings with the Attorney General that were not about Operation Delhi?  A. Yes, I was in relation to one particular operation for which I was the SIO as well, yes, I met on a number of occasions with the Commissioner and the Attorney General.  Q. And is that in that period 2018, 2019,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	specifically about Op Delhi with both the AG and Mr McGrail. That's right, isn't it?  A. With the AG, yes, that's correct.  Q. Before 12 May. Of course I mean before 12 May. Is it possible you were if Mr McGrail is right in his recollection and the AG sometimes brought up Op Delhi in other meetings that were not about Op Delhi, is it possible that you might have been in those meetings?  A. No, I don't think so, no.  Q. Why don't you think so?  A. Because I would have remembered being present when Operation Delhi was raised with the Attorney General.  Q. Sorry, Mr McGrail is saying it was raised by the Attorney General rather than with the Attorney General.  A. Well, in a meeting with I don't remember going to any other meetings with the Commissioner and the Attorney General other than the Operation it was called Operation Florence and that was to do with the Iranian super tanker.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	through it again?  Q. No, there is no need for you to go through it again. I want to move in to some of the specifics now, please. I am going to start with the meetings and conversations with the Attorney General. Thue first question is: while Mr McGrail was Commissioner and you were an officer, would you have been involved in any meetings with Mr McGrail that were not about Operation Delhi?  A. Sorry, are you asking have I been in meetings?  Q. In, say, 2018/19/20, were you ever in meetings with Mr McGrail that were not about Operation Delhi?  A. Many meetings.  Q. Yes. And would you ever have been in any meetings with the Attorney General that were not about Operation Delhi?  A. Yes, I was in relation to one particular operation for which I was the SIO as well, yes, I met on a number of occasions with the Commissioner and the Attorney General.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	specifically about Op Delhi with both the AG and Mr McGrail. That's right, isn't it?  A. With the AG, yes, that's correct.  Q. Before 12 May. Of course I mean before 12 May. Is it possible you were if Mr McGrail is right in his recollection and the AG sometimes brought up Op Delhi in other meetings that were not about Op Delhi, is it possible that you might have been in those meetings?  A. No, I don't think so, no.  Q. Why don't you think so?  A. Because I would have remembered being present when Operation Delhi was raised with the Attorney General.  Q. Sorry, Mr McGrail is saying it was raised by the Attorney General rather than with the Attorney General.  A. Well, in a meeting with I don't remember going to any other meetings with the Commissioner and the Attorney General other than the Operation it was called Operation Florence and that was to do with

1	O. Vez	,	mathemathem dervise the emissional marriage
1	Q. Yes.	1	rather than down the criminal routes?  A. Yes, I do.
2	A. And that was before Operation Delhi.	$\begin{vmatrix} 2\\3 \end{vmatrix}$	
3	Q. Right. So you don't remember that	4	<ul><li>Q. How did you respond to that?</li><li>A. It was - to me it was shocking to hear</li></ul>
4 5	happening. A. No, I don't.	5	that.
6	THE CHAIRMAN: No, he does not say he	6	Q. Why was it shocking?
7	does not remember, he said he did not know.	7	A. I said as much to the AG at the time, I
8	MR WAGNER: Sorry?	8	said: "Sir, from what we have seen the man is
9	THE CHAIRMAN: He did not say he did	9	corrupt," and then I must have noted a
10	not remember any such meetings, he said	10	reaction and I apologised for being frank and
11	there weren't any such meetings.	11	he said: "That's fine," or "That's okay, Paul,"
12	(15.36)	12	or whatever it was, and we didn't discuss it
13	MR WAGNER: Yes.	13	any further.
14	THE CHAIRMAN: That is different.	14	Q. Do you think your shock was connected
15	MR WAGNER: Understood. I want to talk	15	to what you were saying at the outset of my
16	about the meeting of 7 April. If you could	16	questions about the seriousness of the
17	please turn up A1437. This is about whether	17	investigation?
18	you recall any agreement being reached that	18	A. Yes. I didn't think it was appropriate for
19	the RGP would not take any further action	19	a senior civil servant that was involved in
20	until we had clarified the question of	20	criminality of the level that we were
21	ownership and rationalised the number of	21	investigating, I don't think that a disciplinary
22	charges.	22	route was an appropriate route for that matter
23	"Furthermore, I do not remember agreeing	23	to be resolved.
24	nothing would happen until we met again."	24	Q. Do you remember the Attorney General
25	You were not taken through earlier the	25	proposing a scenario whereby the
25	-		
	Page 193		Page 195
		1	
1	factors at paragraph 72, where you say:	1	government had allowed the platform to be
1 2	factors at paragraph 72, where you say: "Had such an agreement been reached I	1 2	government had allowed the platform to be accessed? The NSCIS platform?
2	"Had such an agreement been reached I	1 2 3	accessed? The NSCIS platform?
2 3	"Had such an agreement been reached I would have made a record of it either at the	2	accessed? The NSCIS platform?  A. Sorry, could you repeat that?
2 3 4	"Had such an agreement been reached I would have made a record of it either at the time of when you returned to the office,	2 3	accessed? The NSCIS platform?  A. Sorry, could you repeat that?  Q. Do you remember the Attorney General
2 3 4 5	"Had such an agreement been reached I would have made a record of it either at the time of when you returned to the office, discussed it with Mr McGrail and planned a	2 3 4	accessed? The NSCIS platform?  A. Sorry, could you repeat that?  Q. Do you remember the Attorney General at any point proposing a scenario, in that
2 3 4	"Had such an agreement been reached I would have made a record of it either at the time of when you returned to the office, discussed it with Mr McGrail and planned a strategy given the other suspects were on	2 3 4 5	accessed? The NSCIS platform?  A. Sorry, could you repeat that?  Q. Do you remember the Attorney General
2 3 4 5 6 7	"Had such an agreement been reached I would have made a record of it either at the time of when you returned to the office, discussed it with Mr McGrail and planned a strategy given the other suspects were on police bail, discussed it with Mr Wyan	2 3 4 5 6	accessed? The NSCIS platform?  A. Sorry, could you repeat that?  Q. Do you remember the Attorney General at any point proposing a scenario, in that meeting or otherwise, that what if the
2 3 4 5 6	"Had such an agreement been reached I would have made a record of it either at the time of when you returned to the office, discussed it with Mr McGrail and planned a strategy given the other suspects were on	2 3 4 5 6 7	accessed? The NSCIS platform?  A. Sorry, could you repeat that?  Q. Do you remember the Attorney General at any point proposing a scenario, in that meeting or otherwise, that what if the Government had actually allowed access to the NSCIS platform by suspects?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	"Had such an agreement been reached I would have made a record of it either at the time of when you returned to the office, discussed it with Mr McGrail and planned a strategy given the other suspects were on police bail, discussed it with Mr Wyan particularly as the Op Delhi defendants were	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	accessed? The NSCIS platform?  A. Sorry, could you repeat that?  Q. Do you remember the Attorney General at any point proposing a scenario, in that meeting or otherwise, that what if the Government had actually allowed access to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	"Had such an agreement been reached I would have made a record of it either at the time of when you returned to the office, discussed it with Mr McGrail and planned a strategy given the other suspects were on police bail, discussed it with Mr Wyan particularly as the Op Delhi defendants were due to surrender to their bail in two weeks'	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	accessed? The NSCIS platform?  A. Sorry, could you repeat that?  Q. Do you remember the Attorney General at any point proposing a scenario, in that meeting or otherwise, that what if the Government had actually allowed access to the NSCIS platform by suspects?  A. I have a vague recollection of that but I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	"Had such an agreement been reached I would have made a record of it either at the time of when you returned to the office, discussed it with Mr McGrail and planned a strategy given the other suspects were on police bail, discussed it with Mr Wyan particularly as the Op Delhi defendants were due to surrender to their bail in two weeks' time on 15 April, discussed it with the DPP	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	accessed? The NSCIS platform?  A. Sorry, could you repeat that?  Q. Do you remember the Attorney General at any point proposing a scenario, in that meeting or otherwise, that what if the Government had actually allowed access to the NSCIS platform by suspects?  A. I have a vague recollection of that but I don't know if it's something that I remember
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	"Had such an agreement been reached I would have made a record of it either at the time of when you returned to the office, discussed it with Mr McGrail and planned a strategy given the other suspects were on police bail, discussed it with Mr Wyan particularly as the Op Delhi defendants were due to surrender to their bail in two weeks' time on 15 April, discussed it with the DPP whom I had consulted and from whom I was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	accessed? The NSCIS platform?  A. Sorry, could you repeat that?  Q. Do you remember the Attorney General at any point proposing a scenario, in that meeting or otherwise, that what if the Government had actually allowed access to the NSCIS platform by suspects?  A. I have a vague recollection of that but I don't know if it's something that I remember from that meeting or whether it's something
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	"Had such an agreement been reached I would have made a record of it either at the time of when you returned to the office, discussed it with Mr McGrail and planned a strategy given the other suspects were on police bail, discussed it with Mr Wyan particularly as the Op Delhi defendants were due to surrender to their bail in two weeks' time on 15 April, discussed it with the DPP whom I had consulted and from whom I was still waiting for a response, not proceeded to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	accessed? The NSCIS platform?  A. Sorry, could you repeat that?  Q. Do you remember the Attorney General at any point proposing a scenario, in that meeting or otherwise, that what if the Government had actually allowed access to the NSCIS platform by suspects?  A. I have a vague recollection of that but I don't know if it's something that I remember from that meeting or whether it's something that I have heard since then.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	"Had such an agreement been reached I would have made a record of it either at the time of when you returned to the office, discussed it with Mr McGrail and planned a strategy given the other suspects were on police bail, discussed it with Mr Wyan particularly as the Op Delhi defendants were due to surrender to their bail in two weeks' time on 15 April, discussed it with the DPP whom I had consulted and from whom I was still waiting for a response, not proceeded to obtain the search warrant."	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	accessed? The NSCIS platform?  A. Sorry, could you repeat that?  Q. Do you remember the Attorney General at any point proposing a scenario, in that meeting or otherwise, that what if the Government had actually allowed access to the NSCIS platform by suspects?  A. I have a vague recollection of that but I don't know if it's something that I remember from that meeting or whether it's something that I have heard since then.  Q. Okay. We have already mentioned it in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	"Had such an agreement been reached I would have made a record of it either at the time of when you returned to the office, discussed it with Mr McGrail and planned a strategy given the other suspects were on police bail, discussed it with Mr Wyan particularly as the Op Delhi defendants were due to surrender to their bail in two weeks' time on 15 April, discussed it with the DPP whom I had consulted and from whom I was still waiting for a response, not proceeded to obtain the search warrant."  I just want to clarify. You say there that you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	accessed? The NSCIS platform?  A. Sorry, could you repeat that?  Q. Do you remember the Attorney General at any point proposing a scenario, in that meeting or otherwise, that what if the Government had actually allowed access to the NSCIS platform by suspects?  A. I have a vague recollection of that but I don't know if it's something that I remember from that meeting or whether it's something that I have heard since then.  Q. Okay. We have already mentioned it in parts, but do you recall the Attorney General
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	"Had such an agreement been reached I would have made a record of it either at the time of when you returned to the office, discussed it with Mr McGrail and planned a strategy given the other suspects were on police bail, discussed it with Mr Wyan particularly as the Op Delhi defendants were due to surrender to their bail in two weeks' time on 15 April, discussed it with the DPP whom I had consulted and from whom I was still waiting for a response, not proceeded to obtain the search warrant."  I just want to clarify. You say there that you do not recall any agreement happening but	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	accessed? The NSCIS platform?  A. Sorry, could you repeat that?  Q. Do you remember the Attorney General at any point proposing a scenario, in that meeting or otherwise, that what if the Government had actually allowed access to the NSCIS platform by suspects?  A. I have a vague recollection of that but I don't know if it's something that I remember from that meeting or whether it's something that I have heard since then.  Q. Okay. We have already mentioned it in parts, but do you recall the Attorney General saying that he was now advising on the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	"Had such an agreement been reached I would have made a record of it either at the time of when you returned to the office, discussed it with Mr McGrail and planned a strategy given the other suspects were on police bail, discussed it with Mr Wyan particularly as the Op Delhi defendants were due to surrender to their bail in two weeks' time on 15 April, discussed it with the DPP whom I had consulted and from whom I was still waiting for a response, not proceeded to obtain the search warrant."  I just want to clarify. You say there that you do not recall any agreement happening but then you give a number of actions that you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	accessed? The NSCIS platform?  A. Sorry, could you repeat that?  Q. Do you remember the Attorney General at any point proposing a scenario, in that meeting or otherwise, that what if the Government had actually allowed access to the NSCIS platform by suspects?  A. I have a vague recollection of that but I don't know if it's something that I remember from that meeting or whether it's something that I have heard since then.  Q. Okay. We have already mentioned it in parts, but do you recall the Attorney General saying that he was now advising on the intellectual property aspect of the picture
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	"Had such an agreement been reached I would have made a record of it either at the time of when you returned to the office, discussed it with Mr McGrail and planned a strategy given the other suspects were on police bail, discussed it with Mr Wyan particularly as the Op Delhi defendants were due to surrender to their bail in two weeks' time on 15 April, discussed it with the DPP whom I had consulted and from whom I was still waiting for a response, not proceeded to obtain the search warrant."  I just want to clarify. You say there that you do not recall any agreement happening but then you give a number of actions that you think you would have taken if there had been such an agreement. Looking back at it now, do you think there was any agreement of that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	accessed? The NSCIS platform?  A. Sorry, could you repeat that?  Q. Do you remember the Attorney General at any point proposing a scenario, in that meeting or otherwise, that what if the Government had actually allowed access to the NSCIS platform by suspects?  A. I have a vague recollection of that but I don't know if it's something that I remember from that meeting or whether it's something that I have heard since then.  Q. Okay. We have already mentioned it in parts, but do you recall the Attorney General saying that he was now advising on the intellectual property aspect of the picture  A. Of the ownership of the  Q. Of the ownership of the intellectual property, and that he would be stepping back
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	"Had such an agreement been reached I would have made a record of it either at the time of when you returned to the office, discussed it with Mr McGrail and planned a strategy given the other suspects were on police bail, discussed it with Mr Wyan particularly as the Op Delhi defendants were due to surrender to their bail in two weeks' time on 15 April, discussed it with the DPP whom I had consulted and from whom I was still waiting for a response, not proceeded to obtain the search warrant."  I just want to clarify. You say there that you do not recall any agreement happening but then you give a number of actions that you think you would have taken if there had been such an agreement. Looking back at it now,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. Sorry, could you repeat that?  Q. Do you remember the Attorney General at any point proposing a scenario, in that meeting or otherwise, that what if the Government had actually allowed access to the NSCIS platform by suspects?  A. I have a vague recollection of that but I don't know if it's something that I remember from that meeting or whether it's something that I have heard since then.  Q. Okay. We have already mentioned it in parts, but do you recall the Attorney General saying that he was now advising on the intellectual property aspect of the picture  A. Of the ownership of the  Q. Of the ownership of the intellectual property, and that he would be stepping back as a result?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	"Had such an agreement been reached I would have made a record of it either at the time of when you returned to the office, discussed it with Mr McGrail and planned a strategy given the other suspects were on police bail, discussed it with Mr Wyan particularly as the Op Delhi defendants were due to surrender to their bail in two weeks' time on 15 April, discussed it with the DPP whom I had consulted and from whom I was still waiting for a response, not proceeded to obtain the search warrant."  I just want to clarify. You say there that you do not recall any agreement happening but then you give a number of actions that you think you would have taken if there had been such an agreement. Looking back at it now, do you think there was any agreement of that kind?  A. No.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. Sorry, could you repeat that?  Q. Do you remember the Attorney General at any point proposing a scenario, in that meeting or otherwise, that what if the Government had actually allowed access to the NSCIS platform by suspects?  A. I have a vague recollection of that but I don't know if it's something that I remember from that meeting or whether it's something that I have heard since then.  Q. Okay. We have already mentioned it in parts, but do you recall the Attorney General saying that he was now advising on the intellectual property aspect of the picture  A. Of the ownership of the  Q. Of the ownership of the intellectual property, and that he would be stepping back as a result?  A. That does sound familiar.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	"Had such an agreement been reached I would have made a record of it either at the time of when you returned to the office, discussed it with Mr McGrail and planned a strategy given the other suspects were on police bail, discussed it with Mr Wyan particularly as the Op Delhi defendants were due to surrender to their bail in two weeks' time on 15 April, discussed it with the DPP whom I had consulted and from whom I was still waiting for a response, not proceeded to obtain the search warrant."  I just want to clarify. You say there that you do not recall any agreement happening but then you give a number of actions that you think you would have taken if there had been such an agreement. Looking back at it now, do you think there was any agreement of that kind?  A. No.  Q. Do you recall at that meeting or	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	accessed? The NSCIS platform?  A. Sorry, could you repeat that?  Q. Do you remember the Attorney General at any point proposing a scenario, in that meeting or otherwise, that what if the Government had actually allowed access to the NSCIS platform by suspects?  A. I have a vague recollection of that but I don't know if it's something that I remember from that meeting or whether it's something that I have heard since then.  Q. Okay. We have already mentioned it in parts, but do you recall the Attorney General saying that he was now advising on the intellectual property aspect of the picture  A. Of the ownership of the  Q. Of the ownership of the intellectual property, and that he would be stepping back as a result?  A. That does sound familiar.  Q. What did you take him to mean, if you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	"Had such an agreement been reached I would have made a record of it either at the time of when you returned to the office, discussed it with Mr McGrail and planned a strategy given the other suspects were on police bail, discussed it with Mr Wyan particularly as the Op Delhi defendants were due to surrender to their bail in two weeks' time on 15 April, discussed it with the DPP whom I had consulted and from whom I was still waiting for a response, not proceeded to obtain the search warrant."  I just want to clarify. You say there that you do not recall any agreement happening but then you give a number of actions that you think you would have taken if there had been such an agreement. Looking back at it now, do you think there was any agreement of that kind?  A. No.  Q. Do you recall at that meeting or otherwise the Attorney General suggesting	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	accessed? The NSCIS platform?  A. Sorry, could you repeat that?  Q. Do you remember the Attorney General at any point proposing a scenario, in that meeting or otherwise, that what if the Government had actually allowed access to the NSCIS platform by suspects?  A. I have a vague recollection of that but I don't know if it's something that I remember from that meeting or whether it's something that I have heard since then.  Q. Okay. We have already mentioned it in parts, but do you recall the Attorney General saying that he was now advising on the intellectual property aspect of the picture  A. Of the ownership of the  Q. Of the ownership of the intellectual property, and that he would be stepping back as a result?  A. That does sound familiar.  Q. What did you take him to mean, if you can remember your reaction?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	"Had such an agreement been reached I would have made a record of it either at the time of when you returned to the office, discussed it with Mr McGrail and planned a strategy given the other suspects were on police bail, discussed it with Mr Wyan particularly as the Op Delhi defendants were due to surrender to their bail in two weeks' time on 15 April, discussed it with the DPP whom I had consulted and from whom I was still waiting for a response, not proceeded to obtain the search warrant."  I just want to clarify. You say there that you do not recall any agreement happening but then you give a number of actions that you think you would have taken if there had been such an agreement. Looking back at it now, do you think there was any agreement of that kind?  A. No.  Q. Do you recall at that meeting or otherwise the Attorney General suggesting that Caine Sanchez, who was the senior civil	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	accessed? The NSCIS platform?  A. Sorry, could you repeat that?  Q. Do you remember the Attorney General at any point proposing a scenario, in that meeting or otherwise, that what if the Government had actually allowed access to the NSCIS platform by suspects?  A. I have a vague recollection of that but I don't know if it's something that I remember from that meeting or whether it's something that I have heard since then.  Q. Okay. We have already mentioned it in parts, but do you recall the Attorney General saying that he was now advising on the intellectual property aspect of the picture  A. Of the ownership of the  Q. Of the ownership of the intellectual property, and that he would be stepping back as a result?  A. That does sound familiar.  Q. What did you take him to mean, if you can remember your reaction?  A. I'm sorry, I can't remember anything
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	"Had such an agreement been reached I would have made a record of it either at the time of when you returned to the office, discussed it with Mr McGrail and planned a strategy given the other suspects were on police bail, discussed it with Mr Wyan particularly as the Op Delhi defendants were due to surrender to their bail in two weeks' time on 15 April, discussed it with the DPP whom I had consulted and from whom I was still waiting for a response, not proceeded to obtain the search warrant."  I just want to clarify. You say there that you do not recall any agreement happening but then you give a number of actions that you think you would have taken if there had been such an agreement. Looking back at it now, do you think there was any agreement of that kind?  A. No.  Q. Do you recall at that meeting or otherwise the Attorney General suggesting	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	accessed? The NSCIS platform?  A. Sorry, could you repeat that?  Q. Do you remember the Attorney General at any point proposing a scenario, in that meeting or otherwise, that what if the Government had actually allowed access to the NSCIS platform by suspects?  A. I have a vague recollection of that but I don't know if it's something that I remember from that meeting or whether it's something that I have heard since then.  Q. Okay. We have already mentioned it in parts, but do you recall the Attorney General saying that he was now advising on the intellectual property aspect of the picture  A. Of the ownership of the  Q. Of the ownership of the intellectual property, and that he would be stepping back as a result?  A. That does sound familiar.  Q. What did you take him to mean, if you can remember your reaction?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	"Had such an agreement been reached I would have made a record of it either at the time of when you returned to the office, discussed it with Mr McGrail and planned a strategy given the other suspects were on police bail, discussed it with Mr Wyan particularly as the Op Delhi defendants were due to surrender to their bail in two weeks' time on 15 April, discussed it with the DPP whom I had consulted and from whom I was still waiting for a response, not proceeded to obtain the search warrant."  I just want to clarify. You say there that you do not recall any agreement happening but then you give a number of actions that you think you would have taken if there had been such an agreement. Looking back at it now, do you think there was any agreement of that kind?  A. No.  Q. Do you recall at that meeting or otherwise the Attorney General suggesting that Caine Sanchez, who was the senior civil	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. Sorry, could you repeat that?  Q. Do you remember the Attorney General at any point proposing a scenario, in that meeting or otherwise, that what if the Government had actually allowed access to the NSCIS platform by suspects?  A. I have a vague recollection of that but I don't know if it's something that I remember from that meeting or whether it's something that I have heard since then.  Q. Okay. We have already mentioned it in parts, but do you recall the Attorney General saying that he was now advising on the intellectual property aspect of the picture  A. Of the ownership of the  Q. Of the ownership of the intellectual property, and that he would be stepping back as a result?  A. That does sound familiar.  Q. What did you take him to mean, if you can remember your reaction?  A. I'm sorry, I can't remember anything

O. No. Just in relation to the number of 1 point where the charges would be narrowed 2 2 charges, if we could just turn please to down? 3 B3666. You should be able to see there this 3 A. Yes. 4 4 is the proposed charges. In actual fact it Q. Do you happen to know how many 5 looks like the significant majority of the 5 charges were brought against Tommy 6 charges are against the person who was 6 Cornelio in the end? 7 thought to have or suspected to have hacked 7 A. No, sorry, I don't. 8 into the system. Is that right? 8 Q. If I were to say it was 14, does that sound 9 A. That is correct. 9 about right, or do you not recall? 10 10 Q. Yes. You mentioned in your evidence A. It sounds about right but I really could 11 earlier that part of the reason for that might 11 not sav. 12 have been the fact that there was not just one 12 Q. I want to ask you now about the 13 instance, there were multiple instances. 13 ownership issue in Op Delhi. In your view, 14 14 was it necessary at any point in the A. Yes, that's correct. 15 Q. How would that impact on the number of 15 investigation to pause the investigation so 16 16 that the ownership issue could be resolved. 17 17 A. My understanding with computer misuse A. No. 18 offences is that on each instance that there 18 Q. No. Can you explain your reasoning? 19 19 has been a hacking or an accessing or a A. From the beginning we understood from 20 20 the complainant Mr Gaggero that Blands diversion, it creates a separate offence. It 21 wasn't an area of law that I was particularly 21 retained the intellectual property ownership 22 22 of the platform. This position was disputed familiar with. In fact I don't think we had 23 23 ever dealt with it before, certainly not at this strongly by the Government. Mr Gaggero 24 24 was able to put an argument forward with his level. 25 25 Q. In an investigation like this, which you evidence in support of that and unfortunately Page 199 Page 197 1 said is serious and I think you would agree it 1 we couldn't obtain that same amount of 2 is complex as well as serious ... 2 evidence from the Government, and so we 3 3 A. Yes. considered how --4 Q. Would it be unusual at that stage of the 4 Q. Just pause there a second - sorry to 5 5 interrupt, but you said: "Unfortunately we investigation, so while the investigation is 6 afoot, is ongoing, to have more charges being 6 could not take that kind of evidence from the 7 7 Government, or level of evidence from the proposed than you expect to eventually proffer? 8 8 Government." What do you mean by that? 9 9 A. Yes. A. Because when we attended a meeting 10 10 Q. Is it right to say that in this jurisdiction with the Chief Secretary specifically with the police actually bring the charges directly, 11 regards to what the Government's position 11 12 it is not the DPP who brings the charges? 12 was on ownership, he had no documents 13 A. That's correct. I think there may be a 13 supporting the Government's view that they 14 small number of offences that require a fiat 14 owned the platform. 15 15 Q. What kind of documents would you have in order to proceed but by and large the 16 16 offences are decided by the police. wanted to see or hoped to see? 17 17 Q. At the point where they are decided by A. A contract, an agreement, an exchange of 18 18 the police, will the DPP be consulted? emails, memorandum of understanding. 19 19 A. It depends on the level of the crime. If it Q. Was it your view that the Government 20 20 was cooperative in relation to the ownership is a traffic offence, the answer is no. In a 21 21 more complex case, usually yes. issue? Q. So in this case was the DPP ultimately 22 22 A. It was difficult to get a concerted 23 23 consulted on the offences? response from the Chief Secretary and other 24 24 people involved in this investigation within a 25 Q. Would it be right to say that is usually the 25 meaningful period of time. Page 198 Page 200

1	Q. Within a what period of time, sorry?	1	Gaggero has brought in a forensic team of six
2	A. Within a meaningful period of time. So	2	to look at anything John and I may have done
3	we were asking for statements, we were	3	to tamper with the system, etc. Gaggero is
4	asking for clarification, and it took a long	4	going all out, it seems."
5	time for that information to come back.	5	A. Sorry, sir, you say this was the national
6	Q. Do you remember roughly how long?	6	decision making document? I don't think it
7	Was it days, weeks, months?	7	is, sir.
8	A. It was more than days. Weeks, perhaps	8	Q. Have I got that wrong? It is the
9	even months.	9	A. It looks like the charging advice. Or the
10	Q. But in the meantime you did not think it	10	information. One of the two.
11	was necessary to stop investigating.	11	Q. Okay. In a text to Perez the same day,
12	A. No.	12	Cornelio stated that he had spoken to Levy
13	Q. I want to ask you now about Mr Levy's	13	and was told not to worry. Then the third bit
14	status as a suspect. You gave evidence	14	is the evidence indicates Levy discussed the
15	earlier about something you called	15	forensic team with Cornelio and that he had
16	reasonable suspicion. Just for those, and of	16	given him advice about the situation.
17	course not the lawyers in the room but for	17	A. Yes.
18	others who are watching your evidence, can	18	Q. Why did that make you, in your opinion,
19	you explain what you mean by reasonable	19	suspect that Mr Levy was involved in their
20	suspicion?	20	criminal offences?
21	A. It's a long time since I have looked this	21	A. Because Cornelio appears to have found
22	up, Mr Wagner, but reasonable suspicion,	22	out that the national - sorry, the
23	from what I remember now four years down	23	PricewaterhouseCoopers forensic
24	the line, is when you can form an objective	24	investigators had come to Gibraltar and were
25	view that a set of circumstances indicates that	25	interrogating the system that he had
23	view that a set of circumstances indicates that	23	meer ogating the system that he had
	Page 201		Page 203
1	something happened, but you can also form a	1	previously had control over, and that he was
1 2	something happened, but you can also form a subjective view that you agree that that	1 2	previously had control over, and that he was explaining to Mr Levy, a lawyer, that he was
2	subjective view that you agree that that	2	explaining to Mr Levy, a lawyer, that he was
2 3	subjective view that you agree that that happened, and that if you relayed those	2 3	explaining to Mr Levy, a lawyer, that he was worried that - I will read what it says:
2 3 4	subjective view that you agree that that happened, and that if you relayed those suspicions to a third party they would be able	2 3 4	explaining to Mr Levy, a lawyer, that he was worried that - I will read what it says: "Morning, James. Very confidential. Note
2 3 4 5	subjective view that you agree that that happened, and that if you relayed those suspicions to a third party they would be able to draw that same conclusion. I am sure that	2 3 4 5	explaining to Mr Levy, a lawyer, that he was worried that - I will read what it says: "Morning, James. Very confidential. Note Gaggero has brought in a forensic team of six
2 3 4 5 6	subjective view that you agree that that happened, and that if you relayed those suspicions to a third party they would be able to draw that same conclusion. I am sure that is not the technical description of it, but that's	2 3 4 5 6	explaining to Mr Levy, a lawyer, that he was worried that - I will read what it says: "Morning, James. Very confidential. Note Gaggero has brought in a forensic team of six to look at anything John and I may have done
2 3 4 5 6 7	subjective view that you agree that that happened, and that if you relayed those suspicions to a third party they would be able to draw that same conclusion. I am sure that is not the technical description of it, but that's what my recollection is.	2 3 4 5 6 7	explaining to Mr Levy, a lawyer, that he was worried that - I will read what it says: "Morning, James. Very confidential. Note Gaggero has brought in a forensic team of six to look at anything John and I may have done to tamper with the system, etc. Gaggero is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	subjective view that you agree that that happened, and that if you relayed those suspicions to a third party they would be able to draw that same conclusion. I am sure that is not the technical description of it, but that's what my recollection is.  Q. Is that the same as the level of certainty	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	explaining to Mr Levy, a lawyer, that he was worried that - I will read what it says: "Morning, James. Very confidential. Note Gaggero has brought in a forensic team of six to look at anything John and I may have done to tamper with the system, etc. Gaggero is going all out, it seems."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	subjective view that you agree that that happened, and that if you relayed those suspicions to a third party they would be able to draw that same conclusion. I am sure that is not the technical description of it, but that's what my recollection is.  Q. Is that the same as the level of certainty you need to bring a charge? Can you bring a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	explaining to Mr Levy, a lawyer, that he was worried that - I will read what it says: "Morning, James. Very confidential. Note Gaggero has brought in a forensic team of six to look at anything John and I may have done to tamper with the system, etc. Gaggero is going all out, it seems."  So we had a suspect in a major hacking
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	subjective view that you agree that that happened, and that if you relayed those suspicions to a third party they would be able to draw that same conclusion. I am sure that is not the technical description of it, but that's what my recollection is.  Q. Is that the same as the level of certainty you need to bring a charge? Can you bring a charge just on reasonable suspicion?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	explaining to Mr Levy, a lawyer, that he was worried that - I will read what it says: "Morning, James. Very confidential. Note Gaggero has brought in a forensic team of six to look at anything John and I may have done to tamper with the system, etc. Gaggero is going all out, it seems."  So we had a suspect in a major hacking allegation and data breach allegation that was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	subjective view that you agree that that happened, and that if you relayed those suspicions to a third party they would be able to draw that same conclusion. I am sure that is not the technical description of it, but that's what my recollection is.  Q. Is that the same as the level of certainty you need to bring a charge? Can you bring a charge just on reasonable suspicion?  A. No.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	explaining to Mr Levy, a lawyer, that he was worried that - I will read what it says: "Morning, James. Very confidential. Note Gaggero has brought in a forensic team of six to look at anything John and I may have done to tamper with the system, etc. Gaggero is going all out, it seems."  So we had a suspect in a major hacking allegation and data breach allegation that was sending a message to a lawyer advising him
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	subjective view that you agree that that happened, and that if you relayed those suspicions to a third party they would be able to draw that same conclusion. I am sure that is not the technical description of it, but that's what my recollection is.  Q. Is that the same as the level of certainty you need to bring a charge? Can you bring a charge just on reasonable suspicion?  A. No.  Q. No. Is reasonable suspicion lower than	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	explaining to Mr Levy, a lawyer, that he was worried that - I will read what it says: "Morning, James. Very confidential. Note Gaggero has brought in a forensic team of six to look at anything John and I may have done to tamper with the system, etc. Gaggero is going all out, it seems."  So we had a suspect in a major hacking allegation and data breach allegation that was sending a message to a lawyer advising him that his actions were being investigated by
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	subjective view that you agree that that happened, and that if you relayed those suspicions to a third party they would be able to draw that same conclusion. I am sure that is not the technical description of it, but that's what my recollection is.  Q. Is that the same as the level of certainty you need to bring a charge? Can you bring a charge just on reasonable suspicion?  A. No.  Q. No. Is reasonable suspicion lower than the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	explaining to Mr Levy, a lawyer, that he was worried that - I will read what it says: "Morning, James. Very confidential. Note Gaggero has brought in a forensic team of six to look at anything John and I may have done to tamper with the system, etc. Gaggero is going all out, it seems."  So we had a suspect in a major hacking allegation and data breach allegation that was sending a message to a lawyer advising him that his actions were being investigated by forensic investigators and that he was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	subjective view that you agree that that happened, and that if you relayed those suspicions to a third party they would be able to draw that same conclusion. I am sure that is not the technical description of it, but that's what my recollection is.  Q. Is that the same as the level of certainty you need to bring a charge? Can you bring a charge just on reasonable suspicion?  A. No.  Q. No. Is reasonable suspicion lower than the  A. It is, yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	explaining to Mr Levy, a lawyer, that he was worried that - I will read what it says: "Morning, James. Very confidential. Note Gaggero has brought in a forensic team of six to look at anything John and I may have done to tamper with the system, etc. Gaggero is going all out, it seems."  So we had a suspect in a major hacking allegation and data breach allegation that was sending a message to a lawyer advising him that his actions were being investigated by forensic investigators and that he was worried that they would find out that he had
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	subjective view that you agree that that happened, and that if you relayed those suspicions to a third party they would be able to draw that same conclusion. I am sure that is not the technical description of it, but that's what my recollection is.  Q. Is that the same as the level of certainty you need to bring a charge? Can you bring a charge just on reasonable suspicion?  A. No.  Q. No. Is reasonable suspicion lower than the  A. It is, yes.  Q level you need? Is it quite a bit lower?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	explaining to Mr Levy, a lawyer, that he was worried that - I will read what it says: "Morning, James. Very confidential. Note Gaggero has brought in a forensic team of six to look at anything John and I may have done to tamper with the system, etc. Gaggero is going all out, it seems."  So we had a suspect in a major hacking allegation and data breach allegation that was sending a message to a lawyer advising him that his actions were being investigated by forensic investigators and that he was worried that they would find out that he had done something to tamper with the system.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	subjective view that you agree that that happened, and that if you relayed those suspicions to a third party they would be able to draw that same conclusion. I am sure that is not the technical description of it, but that's what my recollection is.  Q. Is that the same as the level of certainty you need to bring a charge? Can you bring a charge just on reasonable suspicion?  A. No.  Q. No. Is reasonable suspicion lower than the  A. It is, yes.  Q level you need? Is it quite a bit lower?  A. Well, there is suspicion and belief.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	explaining to Mr Levy, a lawyer, that he was worried that - I will read what it says: "Morning, James. Very confidential. Note Gaggero has brought in a forensic team of six to look at anything John and I may have done to tamper with the system, etc. Gaggero is going all out, it seems."  So we had a suspect in a major hacking allegation and data breach allegation that was sending a message to a lawyer advising him that his actions were being investigated by forensic investigators and that he was worried that they would find out that he had done something to tamper with the system.  Q. Sorry, I should - before someone else
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	subjective view that you agree that that happened, and that if you relayed those suspicions to a third party they would be able to draw that same conclusion. I am sure that is not the technical description of it, but that's what my recollection is.  Q. Is that the same as the level of certainty you need to bring a charge? Can you bring a charge just on reasonable suspicion?  A. No.  Q. No. Is reasonable suspicion lower than the  A. It is, yes.  Q level you need? Is it quite a bit lower?  A. Well, there is suspicion and belief.  Q. Yes. I just want to turn, please, to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	explaining to Mr Levy, a lawyer, that he was worried that - I will read what it says: "Morning, James. Very confidential. Note Gaggero has brought in a forensic team of six to look at anything John and I may have done to tamper with the system, etc. Gaggero is going all out, it seems."  So we had a suspect in a major hacking allegation and data breach allegation that was sending a message to a lawyer advising him that his actions were being investigated by forensic investigators and that he was worried that they would find out that he had done something to tamper with the system.  Q. Sorry, I should - before someone else jumps up, he says:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	subjective view that you agree that that happened, and that if you relayed those suspicions to a third party they would be able to draw that same conclusion. I am sure that is not the technical description of it, but that's what my recollection is.  Q. Is that the same as the level of certainty you need to bring a charge? Can you bring a charge just on reasonable suspicion?  A. No.  Q. No. Is reasonable suspicion lower than the  A. It is, yes.  Q level you need? Is it quite a bit lower?  A. Well, there is suspicion and belief.  Q. Yes. I just want to turn, please, to  B3630. So this is the knowledge of computer	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	explaining to Mr Levy, a lawyer, that he was worried that - I will read what it says:  "Morning, James. Very confidential. Note Gaggero has brought in a forensic team of six to look at anything John and I may have done to tamper with the system, etc. Gaggero is going all out, it seems."  So we had a suspect in a major hacking allegation and data breach allegation that was sending a message to a lawyer advising him that his actions were being investigated by forensic investigators and that he was worried that they would find out that he had done something to tamper with the system.  Q. Sorry, I should - before someone else jumps up, he says:  "To look at anything John and I may have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	subjective view that you agree that that happened, and that if you relayed those suspicions to a third party they would be able to draw that same conclusion. I am sure that is not the technical description of it, but that's what my recollection is.  Q. Is that the same as the level of certainty you need to bring a charge? Can you bring a charge just on reasonable suspicion?  A. No.  Q. No. Is reasonable suspicion lower than the  A. It is, yes.  Q level you need? Is it quite a bit lower?  A. Well, there is suspicion and belief.  Q. Yes. I just want to turn, please, to  B3630. So this is the knowledge of computer misuse offences Levy section in the national	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	explaining to Mr Levy, a lawyer, that he was worried that - I will read what it says:  "Morning, James. Very confidential. Note Gaggero has brought in a forensic team of six to look at anything John and I may have done to tamper with the system, etc. Gaggero is going all out, it seems."  So we had a suspect in a major hacking allegation and data breach allegation that was sending a message to a lawyer advising him that his actions were being investigated by forensic investigators and that he was worried that they would find out that he had done something to tamper with the system.  Q. Sorry, I should - before someone else jumps up, he says:  "To look at anything John and I may have done to tamper with the system."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	subjective view that you agree that that happened, and that if you relayed those suspicions to a third party they would be able to draw that same conclusion. I am sure that is not the technical description of it, but that's what my recollection is.  Q. Is that the same as the level of certainty you need to bring a charge? Can you bring a charge just on reasonable suspicion?  A. No.  Q. No. Is reasonable suspicion lower than the  A. It is, yes.  Q level you need? Is it quite a bit lower?  A. Well, there is suspicion and belief.  Q. Yes. I just want to turn, please, to B3630. So this is the knowledge of computer misuse offences Levy section in the national decision model document. It says there - we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	explaining to Mr Levy, a lawyer, that he was worried that - I will read what it says:  "Morning, James. Very confidential. Note Gaggero has brought in a forensic team of six to look at anything John and I may have done to tamper with the system, etc. Gaggero is going all out, it seems."  So we had a suspect in a major hacking allegation and data breach allegation that was sending a message to a lawyer advising him that his actions were being investigated by forensic investigators and that he was worried that they would find out that he had done something to tamper with the system.  Q. Sorry, I should - before someone else jumps up, he says:  "To look at anything John and I may have done to tamper with the system."  A. Yes, that's correct, yes.  Q. Sorry, I interrupted you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	subjective view that you agree that that happened, and that if you relayed those suspicions to a third party they would be able to draw that same conclusion. I am sure that is not the technical description of it, but that's what my recollection is.  Q. Is that the same as the level of certainty you need to bring a charge? Can you bring a charge just on reasonable suspicion?  A. No.  Q. No. Is reasonable suspicion lower than the  A. It is, yes.  Q level you need? Is it quite a bit lower?  A. Well, there is suspicion and belief.  Q. Yes. I just want to turn, please, to B3630. So this is the knowledge of computer misuse offences Levy section in the national decision model document. It says there - we have been these messages before - 19 October, Cornelio, who is the person	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	explaining to Mr Levy, a lawyer, that he was worried that - I will read what it says: "Morning, James. Very confidential. Note Gaggero has brought in a forensic team of six to look at anything John and I may have done to tamper with the system, etc. Gaggero is going all out, it seems."  So we had a suspect in a major hacking allegation and data breach allegation that was sending a message to a lawyer advising him that his actions were being investigated by forensic investigators and that he was worried that they would find out that he had done something to tamper with the system.  Q. Sorry, I should - before someone else jumps up, he says: "To look at anything John and I may have done to tamper with the system."  A. Yes, that's correct, yes.  Q. Sorry, I interrupted you.  A. I have lost my flow.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	subjective view that you agree that that happened, and that if you relayed those suspicions to a third party they would be able to draw that same conclusion. I am sure that is not the technical description of it, but that's what my recollection is.  Q. Is that the same as the level of certainty you need to bring a charge? Can you bring a charge just on reasonable suspicion?  A. No.  Q. No. Is reasonable suspicion lower than the  A. It is, yes.  Q level you need? Is it quite a bit lower?  A. Well, there is suspicion and belief.  Q. Yes. I just want to turn, please, to B3630. So this is the knowledge of computer misuse offences Levy section in the national decision model document. It says there - we have been these messages before - 19	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	explaining to Mr Levy, a lawyer, that he was worried that - I will read what it says:  "Morning, James. Very confidential. Note Gaggero has brought in a forensic team of six to look at anything John and I may have done to tamper with the system, etc. Gaggero is going all out, it seems."  So we had a suspect in a major hacking allegation and data breach allegation that was sending a message to a lawyer advising him that his actions were being investigated by forensic investigators and that he was worried that they would find out that he had done something to tamper with the system.  Q. Sorry, I should - before someone else jumps up, he says:  "To look at anything John and I may have done to tamper with the system."  A. Yes, that's correct, yes.  Q. Sorry, I interrupted you.  A. I have lost my flow.  Q. That was my fault. He sent this message
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	subjective view that you agree that that happened, and that if you relayed those suspicions to a third party they would be able to draw that same conclusion. I am sure that is not the technical description of it, but that's what my recollection is.  Q. Is that the same as the level of certainty you need to bring a charge? Can you bring a charge just on reasonable suspicion?  A. No.  Q. No. Is reasonable suspicion lower than the  A. It is, yes.  Q level you need? Is it quite a bit lower?  A. Well, there is suspicion and belief.  Q. Yes. I just want to turn, please, to B3630. So this is the knowledge of computer misuse offences Levy section in the national decision model document. It says there - we have been these messages before - 19  October, Cornelio, who is the person suspected of accessing and hacking into the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	explaining to Mr Levy, a lawyer, that he was worried that - I will read what it says: "Morning, James. Very confidential. Note Gaggero has brought in a forensic team of six to look at anything John and I may have done to tamper with the system, etc. Gaggero is going all out, it seems."  So we had a suspect in a major hacking allegation and data breach allegation that was sending a message to a lawyer advising him that his actions were being investigated by forensic investigators and that he was worried that they would find out that he had done something to tamper with the system.  Q. Sorry, I should - before someone else jumps up, he says: "To look at anything John and I may have done to tamper with the system."  A. Yes, that's correct, yes.  Q. Sorry, I interrupted you.  A. I have lost my flow.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	subjective view that you agree that that happened, and that if you relayed those suspicions to a third party they would be able to draw that same conclusion. I am sure that is not the technical description of it, but that's what my recollection is.  Q. Is that the same as the level of certainty you need to bring a charge? Can you bring a charge just on reasonable suspicion?  A. No.  Q. No. Is reasonable suspicion lower than the  A. It is, yes.  Q level you need? Is it quite a bit lower?  A. Well, there is suspicion and belief.  Q. Yes. I just want to turn, please, to B3630. So this is the knowledge of computer misuse offences Levy section in the national decision model document. It says there - we have been these messages before - 19  October, Cornelio, who is the person suspected of accessing and hacking into the system:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	explaining to Mr Levy, a lawyer, that he was worried that - I will read what it says:  "Morning, James. Very confidential. Note Gaggero has brought in a forensic team of six to look at anything John and I may have done to tamper with the system, etc. Gaggero is going all out, it seems."  So we had a suspect in a major hacking allegation and data breach allegation that was sending a message to a lawyer advising him that his actions were being investigated by forensic investigators and that he was worried that they would find out that he had done something to tamper with the system.  Q. Sorry, I should - before someone else jumps up, he says:  "To look at anything John and I may have done to tamper with the system."  A. Yes, that's correct, yes.  Q. Sorry, I interrupted you.  A. I have lost my flow.  Q. That was my fault. He sent this message and in your mind what was the suspicion that

1	A. That he was confident in speaking to a	1	detail in the warrant application.
2	lawyer about this tampering and that the	2	Q. Yes, okay. Just in relation to Mr Levy
3	lawyer had reassured him not to worry about	3	being a lawyer, I am going to ask you a
4	it.	4	question which may sound a bit simplistic
5	Q. Just to pause there on - you have used	5	but can you help me with this. Is it your
6	two expressions. You talked about a lawyer	6	experience that lawyers sometimes commit
7	and his lawyer. Now, to your understanding,	7	crimes?
8	was Mr Levy acting as 36 North	8	A. Yes.
9	A. No, I am sorry, it is a lawyer, you are	9	Q. Do not name any names but do you know
10	right. Mr Levy in his statement says that he	10	any other lawyers who have been
11	had a business relationship with Mr Cornelio	11	investigated or even convicted of crimes?
12	and Mr Perez but he also offered high level	12	A. Several.
13	legal advice. I don't know to what extent he	13	Q. I just want to ask you about the Chief
14	was acting as a lawyer and what extent he	14	Minister's involvement. Was there anything
15	was acting as a business partner. Either way,	15	in the documents that you uncovered that
16	the conclusion I would draw will be the	16	attracted your interest as the senior
17	same.	17	investigating officer to the Chief Minister
18	Q. That is what you thought at the time.	18	himself in relation to this investigation?
19	You have been taken through in a lot of	19	A. Yes.
20	detail the evidence and the application for the	20	Q. Can you just summarise?
21	warrant and asked some questions about it	21	A. It has been a while since I have seen them
22	this morning. Looking back now, do you	22	but there were some messages between the
23	remain of the view that that suspicion was	23	Chief Minister and John Perez about the
24	well founded based on that evidence there, or	24	setting up of the company before the
25	would you change your mind now?	25	company had been set up.
	Page 205		Page 207
1	A. If this is the information for the warrant -	1	Q. Right. Can we just go to A223, please.
2	I don't know if it is - I think that we should	2	(Background noise) I am used to being
3	have added far more information, far more	3	heckled in court but that is new for me. Have
4	detail about what our suspicion was.	4	you got A223, paragraph 5? This is from the
5	MR SANTOS: It is the charging advice.	5	Chief Minister's statement. He says:
6	MR WAGNER: The charging advice, I am	6	"I recall that I discussed with Mr James Levy
7	sorry about that. So is that information that	7	KC on a very large number of occasions the
8	you had at the time of the warrant, that you	8	fact that the RGP had suggested he might be
9	would have added, or is it information you	9	a person of interest in the investigation. He
10	find out afterwards?	10	raised it with me constantly when I spoke to
11	A. I am sorry, I have lost your thread, Mr	11	him on other matters."
12	Q. Is the information that you are saying you	12	First I am going to ask you this: when you
13	would have added when you applied for the	13	were applying for the warrant were you or to
14	warrant	14	your knowledge any of the other
15	A. Yes, yes, that is correct.	15	investigating team, did you think that Mr
16	Q is that information you knew at the	16	Levy knew he was a person of interest?
17	time?	17	A. I think it was very likely that he would
18	A. Yes.	18	have known that his name would have
19	Q. Yes. What kind of information would	19	featured in the investigation.
20	you have added, looking back?	20	Q. Is that different though?
21	A. More content about the exchange of	21	A. It depends on what he had heard from the
22	messages between Mr Levy and the other	22	people that had already been arrested.
23	persons, which was included and the	23	Q. If you had known by 12 May that the
24 25	appendix to the NDM that was not	24 25	Chief Minister and Mr Levy had been in very
23	specifically - we didn't go into that much	23	regular discussions about Mr Levy's status as
	Page 206		Page 208

1	a person of interest, would that have caused	1	about but I know that there is an entry in Mr
2	you any concern or made you deal with the	2	Wyan's investigation log that deals with this.
3	investigation in a different way?	3	Q. Yes, there it is. If we could turn to
4	A. I don't know if it would have made me	4	B2957, please. This is an email, or it may be
5	deal with the investigation in a different way,	5	a text, on 27 July 2018 from two of the
6	but it would have caused me concern, yes.	6	alleged co-conspirators, Vasquez to Cornelio:
7	Q. What would the concern have been?	7	"Tommy, Wavetecz email accounts have
8	A. A Chief Minister obviously has a very	8	been closed but if someone opens them with
9	special role in Gibraltar. In this case he was	9	our names they can get emails sent to us. We
10	also a partner in the same business that Mr	10	need to inform all our contacts that we no
11	Levy was, and as a result of that he was a	11	longer have these emails. I could be
12	shareholder in the same venture that Mr Levy	12	challenged as to why I cancelled mine. I'm
13	was, which was a company that we were	13	okay if you delete everything and no-one can
14	investigating for conspiracy to defraud.	14	recover any previous emails sent to me."
15	Q. It is right to say, is it not, that the	15	Cornelio replied:
16	Attorney General is the legal adviser to the	16	"No-one can recover."
17	Chief Minister.	17	Vasquez then states:
18	A. I think so, yes.	18	"SO no probs, mate. Recovering my emails
19	Q. If you had known that the Chief Minister	19	would be,"
20	had been in very regular discussions with Mr	20	sad face, a sort of crying and smiling and a
21	Levy, who was a person of interest, might	21	mixture of emojis. Cornelio replied:
22	that have led you to deal with the Attorney	22	"You were using the account?"
23	General in a different way?	23	Vasquez replied:
24	A. I don't think so.	24	"Yes, I used the accounts a bit for STP,
25	Q. Would you have asked the question of the	25	(Tambien?) as well."
	D 400		70.00
	Page 209		Page 211
1	Attorney General whether he had been	1	Was your understanding that some of the
2	advising the Chief Minister, or is that not	2	emails had been deleted by some of the
3	something you would have	3	suspects?
4	A. On this same matter?	4	A. Yes, it was.
5	Q. Yes.	5	Q. Were some of those emails actually
6	A. Oh, because he was advising on the	6	recovered in the end?
7	ownership issue?	7	A. Yes, they were.
8	Q. Yes.	8	Q. They were. So was it known to you at
9	A. Yes.	9	the point where you applied for the warrant
10	Q. Just in relation to the application for the	10	against Mr Levy that one of the suspects had
11	search warrant, you were already asked, I	11	potentially deleted some relevant messages,
12	think, or you spoke about the fact that when	12	and two of the suspects had deleted their
13	Mr Sanchez was arrested and his phone was	13	email accounts?
14	examined - correct me if I am wrong - you	14	A. That is correct.
15	found that a lot of the relevant	15	Q. Would that in any way impact on whether
16	communications had been deleted. Is that	16	you go for a search warrant or not?
17	right?	17	A. It adds to the risk of losing evidence by
18	A. I don't know if I used the word "a lot".	18	attempting to obtain it without notice. Both
19	There had been deletions in the Whatsapp	19	Mr Sanchez and the other people that are
20	records of Mr Sanchez.	20	mentioned in that paragraph had deleted
21	Q. Yes. Did it seem to you that they were	21	information, and in this instance I recall that
22	potentially deletions that were relevant to the	22	one of the emails had been recovered. If I
23	investigation, or would have been relevant to	23	am not mistaken, that was the email that
24	the investigation?	24	indicated that Mr Levy was involved.
25	A. I can't remember exactly what they were	25	Q. Right, so your memory is that one of the
_			
	Page 210		Page 212
			52 (D 200 + 212)

1 emails which had been deleted and the RGP 1 48. This is Mr Llamas's statement. 2 2 recovered ... A. Sorry, whose statement. Q. Mr Llamas's statement. He says: 3 A. Mm-hm. 3 4 Q. ... was one of the emails that related to 4 "On the day of 12 May I received two missed 5 5 voice calls from Mr Levy in which, since Mr Levy. 6 6 they were just a few minutes after the search A. That's my memory of it, yes. 7 Q. Right. In answer to Mr Santos earlier 7 warrants had been executed, I assumed they 8 you mentioned a concern in relation to a 8 were in relation to this matter. I recall I did 9 production order was that in Gibraltar a 9 speak to him either later that day or the 10 production order would have to be on notice. 10 following day and that whilst being 11 11 respectful he complained to me about the It may sound obvious to you as a former 12 police officer, but can you assist us with 12 way he had been treated by the RGP. He felt 13 explaining the concern? 13 very aggrieved. I listened to what he had to 14 14 A. If we had applied for a production order say and told him the DPP was handling this 15 15 there would have had to have been, as I matter and that he should speak to him, 16 16 understand it - I admit that I am far more which I believe he did." 17 17 aware of the law behind this now than I was Were you aware that Mr Llamas had spoken 18 at the time, but the application would have 18 to Mr Levy on 12 or 13 May? 19 had to be on notice, which means that the 19 A. No. 20 20 Q. At the time? other party would have had to have been 21 present to put their views forward. 21 A. No. 22 Q. What would them being present, what 22 Q. No. Were you aware, and this has to be 23 impact would that have on your investigative 23 explored with the DPP but just on the basis 24 24 of what Mr Llamas says there, were you aims? 25 25 A. It would have meant that the other party aware the DPP spoke to Mr Levy? Page 213 Page 215 1 would have known what it is that we were 1 A. No. 2 looking for before we went to try and seize it. 2 Q. There is a text message exchange - I will 3 3 not go to it, but it indicates that on 13 May at Q. So it is not just that it alerts them to fact 4 that you are coming in, it tells them what you 4 around about 12.30 to 12.45 Mr Llamas met 5 5 are coming in for. with Mr Levy's son, Moshe Levy, a partner at 6 6 A. Yes. Hassans, and Lewis Baglietto who was acting 7 7 Q. Would that apply in any way to a search for Mr Levy. Now, I think it is right to say 8 8 that the meeting that you had on 13 May with warrant? 9 9 A. Not an ex parte search warrant. him and others happened in the mid-10 10 Q. What does ex parte mean? afternoon, is that right? 11 A. It means that only the party that is 11 A. I can check my record, I will have a note 12 applying for it is present in court. 12 of the time. 13 Q. Yes. So to put it simply, when you turn 13 (16.06)14 up at the door that is the first they know 14 Q. I don't think let's do that now. But take it 15 about it. 15 from me, it happened in the mid-afternoon. 16 16 A. That is correct. Do you remember Mr Llamas saying that he 17 17 Q. If everything has gone to plan. had met with Moshe Levy, Mr Levy's and 18 A. That is correct. 18 Mr Baglietto? 19 19 Q. Yes. I want to talk now about the 13 A. No, not at all. 20 May meeting. So there were three meetings 20 Q. No. I am sorry, I just need to find 2.1 21 that took place. You have already talked a reference. If we could just go to A/289, 22 about them quite a bit. The first one between 22 please. Just a little bit further down, there is 23 23 you and the AG and the Commissioner and a text message here. I am sorry, just go 24 others, I just want to put that in mind, and I 24 a little bit further up. There is a text message want to take you, please, to A282, paragraph 25 25 there between Mr Levy and Mr Llamas on Page 214 Page 216

1	the 13th. So this is the evening of the	1	worry.
2	meeting. Mr Levy said: "On the other matter	2	Q. B/126, please. It is the third entry from
3	I felt I had been hang out to dry, certainly not	3	the bottom, please. This is the 13th May
4	by you." Mr Llamas responds "Don't worry".	4	meeting. I don't know whether you
5	Did you know about that text message	5	remember this or not, but this is Mr Llamas
6	exchange at the time?	6	said this:
7	A. No.	7	"In my view, it's just a view, completely
8	Q. No. If you had known that Mr Llamas	8	unjust, unjustifiable to me that this man
9	had texted Mr Levy, who was the criminal	9	should even be appearing in a formal
10	suspect, "don't worry", would that have	10	document. And I will not, if it is not
11	caused you any concern?	11	legitimate, I want that to disappear
12	A. Yes, it would have done.	12	immediately. My concern here is the
13	Q. Why?	13	reputation of this jurisdiction and that passes
14	A. Because the Attorney General is	14	to the reputation of our Chief Minister,
15	reassuring a suspect of a live police	15	especially in this moment in time, and for
16	investigation that he shouldn't worry about it.	16	that I shall fight until I die."
17	Q. If you had known that the	17	Do you remember that being said?
18	Attorney General met just before he met with	18	A. I think so.
19	you with Moshe with Mr Levy's son and	19	Q. Do you remember how you felt about the
20	his lawyer	20	statement? I think he says twice words to the
21	THE CHAIRMAN: You've asked that	21	effect of "I'll fight to defend the Chief
22	already.	22	Minister's reputation to the death", or "until
23	MR WAGNER: Sorry, sir, I had not finished	23	I die." Do you remember how that made you
24	the question yet.	24	feel as the investigating officer?
25	Would that have concerned you?	25	A. I can't say with any certainty that I can
	D 445		
	Page 217		Page 219
1	A. It would have raised concerns. I would	1	recall how I felt hearing that. It does seem
1 2	A. It would have raised concerns. I would have been curious as to what the AG was	1 2	recall how I felt hearing that. It does seem strange and it's not words that I would use
2	have been curious as to what the AG was	2	strange and it's not words that I would use
	have been curious as to what the AG was meeting because if it isn't just Mr Levy's	2 3	strange and it's not words that I would use myself, but I can't tell you now how I felt at
2 3	have been curious as to what the AG was meeting because if it isn't just Mr Levy's son, it's another partner of the same firm that	2 3 4	strange and it's not words that I would use myself, but I can't tell you now how I felt at the time.
2 3 4	have been curious as to what the AG was meeting because if it isn't just Mr Levy's	2 3	strange and it's not words that I would use myself, but I can't tell you now how I felt at
2 3 4 5	have been curious as to what the AG was meeting because if it isn't just Mr Levy's son, it's another partner of the same firm that was under investigation.	2 3 4 5	strange and it's not words that I would use myself, but I can't tell you now how I felt at the time.  Q. B/276, please, at the bottom of the page. I am picking up at the bottom of the longer
2 3 4 5 6	have been curious as to what the AG was meeting because if it isn't just Mr Levy's son, it's another partner of the same firm that was under investigation.  Q. Yes. Well, the firm wasn't under	2 3 4 5 6	strange and it's not words that I would use myself, but I can't tell you now how I felt at the time.  Q. B/276, please, at the bottom of the page. I am picking up at the bottom of the longer paragraph that records what you say. I think
2 3 4 5 6 7	have been curious as to what the AG was meeting because if it isn't just Mr Levy's son, it's another partner of the same firm that was under investigation.  Q. Yes. Well, the firm wasn't under investigation, was it?	2 3 4 5 6 7	strange and it's not words that I would use myself, but I can't tell you now how I felt at the time.  Q. B/276, please, at the bottom of the page. I am picking up at the bottom of the longer
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	have been curious as to what the AG was meeting because if it isn't just Mr Levy's son, it's another partner of the same firm that was under investigation.  Q. Yes. Well, the firm wasn't under investigation, was it?  A. No, sorry, the partners of Hassans at that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	strange and it's not words that I would use myself, but I can't tell you now how I felt at the time.  Q. B/276, please, at the bottom of the page. I am picking up at the bottom of the longer paragraph that records what you say. I think this is your reading from the Hassans letter
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	have been curious as to what the AG was meeting because if it isn't just Mr Levy's son, it's another partner of the same firm that was under investigation.  Q. Yes. Well, the firm wasn't under investigation, was it?  A. No, sorry, the partners of Hassans at that time were beneficial owners of Astelon.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	strange and it's not words that I would use myself, but I can't tell you now how I felt at the time.  Q. B/276, please, at the bottom of the page. I am picking up at the bottom of the longer paragraph that records what you say. I think this is your reading from the Hassans letter that's been received in relation to the search
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	have been curious as to what the AG was meeting because if it isn't just Mr Levy's son, it's another partner of the same firm that was under investigation.  Q. Yes. Well, the firm wasn't under investigation, was it?  A. No, sorry, the partners of Hassans at that time were beneficial owners of Astelon.  I don't know if Mr Moshe Levy was a partner	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	strange and it's not words that I would use myself, but I can't tell you now how I felt at the time.  Q. B/276, please, at the bottom of the page. I am picking up at the bottom of the longer paragraph that records what you say. I think this is your reading from the Hassans letter that's been received in relation to the search warrant. You say: "There is even
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	have been curious as to what the AG was meeting because if it isn't just Mr Levy's son, it's another partner of the same firm that was under investigation.  Q. Yes. Well, the firm wasn't under investigation, was it?  A. No, sorry, the partners of Hassans at that time were beneficial owners of Astelon.  I don't know if Mr Moshe Levy was a partner at that time.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	strange and it's not words that I would use myself, but I can't tell you now how I felt at the time.  Q. B/276, please, at the bottom of the page. I am picking up at the bottom of the longer paragraph that records what you say. I think this is your reading from the Hassans letter that's been received in relation to the search warrant. You say: "There is even a suggestion here that you [being Mr Rocca]
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	have been curious as to what the AG was meeting because if it isn't just Mr Levy's son, it's another partner of the same firm that was under investigation.  Q. Yes. Well, the firm wasn't under investigation, was it?  A. No, sorry, the partners of Hassans at that time were beneficial owners of Astelon.  I don't know if Mr Moshe Levy was a partner at that time.  Q. Right. But Mr Baglietto was partner at	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	strange and it's not words that I would use myself, but I can't tell you now how I felt at the time.  Q. B/276, please, at the bottom of the page. I am picking up at the bottom of the longer paragraph that records what you say. I think this is your reading from the Hassans letter that's been received in relation to the search warrant. You say: "There is even a suggestion here that you [being Mr Rocca] advised us not to obtain a warrant."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	have been curious as to what the AG was meeting because if it isn't just Mr Levy's son, it's another partner of the same firm that was under investigation.  Q. Yes. Well, the firm wasn't under investigation, was it?  A. No, sorry, the partners of Hassans at that time were beneficial owners of Astelon.  I don't know if Mr Moshe Levy was a partner at that time.  Q. Right. But Mr Baglietto was partner at that time?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	strange and it's not words that I would use myself, but I can't tell you now how I felt at the time.  Q. B/276, please, at the bottom of the page. I am picking up at the bottom of the longer paragraph that records what you say. I think this is your reading from the Hassans letter that's been received in relation to the search warrant. You say: "There is even a suggestion here that you [being Mr Rocca] advised us not to obtain a warrant."  A. Sorry, I can't see this on this page.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	have been curious as to what the AG was meeting because if it isn't just Mr Levy's son, it's another partner of the same firm that was under investigation.  Q. Yes. Well, the firm wasn't under investigation, was it?  A. No, sorry, the partners of Hassans at that time were beneficial owners of Astelon.  I don't know if Mr Moshe Levy was a partner at that time.  Q. Right. But Mr Baglietto was partner at that time?  A. Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	strange and it's not words that I would use myself, but I can't tell you now how I felt at the time.  Q. B/276, please, at the bottom of the page. I am picking up at the bottom of the longer paragraph that records what you say. I think this is your reading from the Hassans letter that's been received in relation to the search warrant. You say: "There is even a suggestion here that you [being Mr Rocca] advised us not to obtain a warrant."  A. Sorry, I can't see this on this page.  Q. Right at the bottom of the big
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	have been curious as to what the AG was meeting because if it isn't just Mr Levy's son, it's another partner of the same firm that was under investigation.  Q. Yes. Well, the firm wasn't under investigation, was it?  A. No, sorry, the partners of Hassans at that time were beneficial owners of Astelon.  I don't know if Mr Moshe Levy was a partner at that time.  Q. Right. But Mr Baglietto was partner at that time?  A. Yes.  Q. Yes. If you had known that the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	strange and it's not words that I would use myself, but I can't tell you now how I felt at the time.  Q. B/276, please, at the bottom of the page. I am picking up at the bottom of the longer paragraph that records what you say. I think this is your reading from the Hassans letter that's been received in relation to the search warrant. You say: "There is even a suggestion here that you [being Mr Rocca] advised us not to obtain a warrant."  A. Sorry, I can't see this on this page.  Q. Right at the bottom of the big paragraph
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	have been curious as to what the AG was meeting because if it isn't just Mr Levy's son, it's another partner of the same firm that was under investigation.  Q. Yes. Well, the firm wasn't under investigation, was it?  A. No, sorry, the partners of Hassans at that time were beneficial owners of Astelon.  I don't know if Mr Moshe Levy was a partner at that time.  Q. Right. But Mr Baglietto was partner at that time?  A. Yes.  Q. Yes. If you had known that the Attorney General had texted Mr Levy, "Don't	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	strange and it's not words that I would use myself, but I can't tell you now how I felt at the time.  Q. B/276, please, at the bottom of the page. I am picking up at the bottom of the longer paragraph that records what you say. I think this is your reading from the Hassans letter that's been received in relation to the search warrant. You say: "There is even a suggestion here that you [being Mr Rocca] advised us not to obtain a warrant."  A. Sorry, I can't see this on this page.  Q. Right at the bottom of the big paragraph  A. I can see it now.  Q. That is attributed to you. It says: "There is even a suggestion here that he advises us
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	have been curious as to what the AG was meeting because if it isn't just Mr Levy's son, it's another partner of the same firm that was under investigation.  Q. Yes. Well, the firm wasn't under investigation, was it?  A. No, sorry, the partners of Hassans at that time were beneficial owners of Astelon.  I don't know if Mr Moshe Levy was a partner at that time.  Q. Right. But Mr Baglietto was partner at that time?  A. Yes.  Q. Yes. If you had known that the Attorney General had texted Mr Levy, "Don't worry", and had met with Mr Baglietto and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	strange and it's not words that I would use myself, but I can't tell you now how I felt at the time.  Q. B/276, please, at the bottom of the page. I am picking up at the bottom of the longer paragraph that records what you say. I think this is your reading from the Hassans letter that's been received in relation to the search warrant. You say: "There is even a suggestion here that you [being Mr Rocca] advised us not to obtain a warrant."  A. Sorry, I can't see this on this page.  Q. Right at the bottom of the big paragraph  A. I can see it now.  Q. That is attributed to you. It says: "There
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	have been curious as to what the AG was meeting because if it isn't just Mr Levy's son, it's another partner of the same firm that was under investigation.  Q. Yes. Well, the firm wasn't under investigation, was it?  A. No, sorry, the partners of Hassans at that time were beneficial owners of Astelon.  I don't know if Mr Moshe Levy was a partner at that time.  Q. Right. But Mr Baglietto was partner at that time?  A. Yes.  Q. Yes. If you had known that the Attorney General had texted Mr Levy, "Don't worry", and had met with Mr Baglietto and Mr Levy, would you have dealt with the meetings any differently that you had with him?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	strange and it's not words that I would use myself, but I can't tell you now how I felt at the time.  Q. B/276, please, at the bottom of the page. I am picking up at the bottom of the longer paragraph that records what you say. I think this is your reading from the Hassans letter that's been received in relation to the search warrant. You say: "There is even a suggestion here that you [being Mr Rocca] advised us not to obtain a warrant."  A. Sorry, I can't see this on this page.  Q. Right at the bottom of the big paragraph  A. I can see it now.  Q. That is attributed to you. It says: "There is even a suggestion here that he advises us not to obtain a warrant." Mr Rocca said: "I read that, Superintendent Richardson. We
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	have been curious as to what the AG was meeting because if it isn't just Mr Levy's son, it's another partner of the same firm that was under investigation.  Q. Yes. Well, the firm wasn't under investigation, was it?  A. No, sorry, the partners of Hassans at that time were beneficial owners of Astelon.  I don't know if Mr Moshe Levy was a partner at that time.  Q. Right. But Mr Baglietto was partner at that time?  A. Yes.  Q. Yes. If you had known that the Attorney General had texted Mr Levy, "Don't worry", and had met with Mr Baglietto and Mr Levy, would you have dealt with the meetings any differently that you had with him?  A. I think I would have had to discuss it with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	strange and it's not words that I would use myself, but I can't tell you now how I felt at the time.  Q. B/276, please, at the bottom of the page. I am picking up at the bottom of the longer paragraph that records what you say. I think this is your reading from the Hassans letter that's been received in relation to the search warrant. You say: "There is even a suggestion here that you [being Mr Rocca] advised us not to obtain a warrant."  A. Sorry, I can't see this on this page.  Q. Right at the bottom of the big paragraph  A. I can see it now.  Q. That is attributed to you. It says: "There is even a suggestion here that he advises us not to obtain a warrant." Mr Rocca said: "I read that, Superintendent Richardson. We didn't say that. We didn't agree with that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	have been curious as to what the AG was meeting because if it isn't just Mr Levy's son, it's another partner of the same firm that was under investigation.  Q. Yes. Well, the firm wasn't under investigation, was it?  A. No, sorry, the partners of Hassans at that time were beneficial owners of Astelon.  I don't know if Mr Moshe Levy was a partner at that time.  Q. Right. But Mr Baglietto was partner at that time?  A. Yes.  Q. Yes. If you had known that the Attorney General had texted Mr Levy, "Don't worry", and had met with Mr Baglietto and Mr Levy, would you have dealt with the meetings any differently that you had with him?  A. I think I would have had to discuss it with the Commissioners whether we would be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	strange and it's not words that I would use myself, but I can't tell you now how I felt at the time.  Q. B/276, please, at the bottom of the page. I am picking up at the bottom of the longer paragraph that records what you say. I think this is your reading from the Hassans letter that's been received in relation to the search warrant. You say: "There is even a suggestion here that you [being Mr Rocca] advised us not to obtain a warrant."  A. Sorry, I can't see this on this page.  Q. Right at the bottom of the big paragraph  A. I can see it now.  Q. That is attributed to you. It says: "There is even a suggestion here that he advises us not to obtain a warrant." Mr Rocca said: "I read that, Superintendent Richardson. We didn't say that. We didn't agree with that. Now where has that come from, who has told
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	have been curious as to what the AG was meeting because if it isn't just Mr Levy's son, it's another partner of the same firm that was under investigation.  Q. Yes. Well, the firm wasn't under investigation, was it?  A. No, sorry, the partners of Hassans at that time were beneficial owners of Astelon.  I don't know if Mr Moshe Levy was a partner at that time.  Q. Right. But Mr Baglietto was partner at that time?  A. Yes.  Q. Yes. If you had known that the Attorney General had texted Mr Levy, "Don't worry", and had met with Mr Baglietto and Mr Levy, would you have dealt with the meetings any differently that you had with him?  A. I think I would have had to discuss it with the Commissioners whether we would be comfortable going through any evidence with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	strange and it's not words that I would use myself, but I can't tell you now how I felt at the time.  Q. B/276, please, at the bottom of the page. I am picking up at the bottom of the longer paragraph that records what you say. I think this is your reading from the Hassans letter that's been received in relation to the search warrant. You say: "There is even a suggestion here that you [being Mr Rocca] advised us not to obtain a warrant."  A. Sorry, I can't see this on this page.  Q. Right at the bottom of the big paragraph  A. I can see it now.  Q. That is attributed to you. It says: "There is even a suggestion here that he advises us not to obtain a warrant." Mr Rocca said: "I read that, Superintendent Richardson. We didn't say that. We didn't agree with that. Now where has that come from, who has told"
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	have been curious as to what the AG was meeting because if it isn't just Mr Levy's son, it's another partner of the same firm that was under investigation.  Q. Yes. Well, the firm wasn't under investigation, was it?  A. No, sorry, the partners of Hassans at that time were beneficial owners of Astelon.  I don't know if Mr Moshe Levy was a partner at that time.  Q. Right. But Mr Baglietto was partner at that time?  A. Yes.  Q. Yes. If you had known that the Attorney General had texted Mr Levy, "Don't worry", and had met with Mr Baglietto and Mr Levy, would you have dealt with the meetings any differently that you had with him?  A. I think I would have had to discuss it with the Commissioners whether we would be comfortable going through any evidence with the Attorney General at the same time that he	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	strange and it's not words that I would use myself, but I can't tell you now how I felt at the time.  Q. B/276, please, at the bottom of the page. I am picking up at the bottom of the longer paragraph that records what you say. I think this is your reading from the Hassans letter that's been received in relation to the search warrant. You say: "There is even a suggestion here that you [being Mr Rocca] advised us not to obtain a warrant."  A. Sorry, I can't see this on this page.  Q. Right at the bottom of the big paragraph  A. I can see it now.  Q. That is attributed to you. It says: "There is even a suggestion here that he advises us not to obtain a warrant." Mr Rocca said: "I read that, Superintendent Richardson. We didn't say that. We didn't agree with that. Now where has that come from, who has told"  Just pausing there, do you remember any of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	have been curious as to what the AG was meeting because if it isn't just Mr Levy's son, it's another partner of the same firm that was under investigation.  Q. Yes. Well, the firm wasn't under investigation, was it?  A. No, sorry, the partners of Hassans at that time were beneficial owners of Astelon.  I don't know if Mr Moshe Levy was a partner at that time.  Q. Right. But Mr Baglietto was partner at that time?  A. Yes.  Q. Yes. If you had known that the Attorney General had texted Mr Levy, "Don't worry", and had met with Mr Baglietto and Mr Levy, would you have dealt with the meetings any differently that you had with him?  A. I think I would have had to discuss it with the Commissioners whether we would be comfortable going through any evidence with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	strange and it's not words that I would use myself, but I can't tell you now how I felt at the time.  Q. B/276, please, at the bottom of the page. I am picking up at the bottom of the longer paragraph that records what you say. I think this is your reading from the Hassans letter that's been received in relation to the search warrant. You say: "There is even a suggestion here that you [being Mr Rocca] advised us not to obtain a warrant."  A. Sorry, I can't see this on this page.  Q. Right at the bottom of the big paragraph  A. I can see it now.  Q. That is attributed to you. It says: "There is even a suggestion here that he advises us not to obtain a warrant." Mr Rocca said: "I read that, Superintendent Richardson. We didn't say that. We didn't agree with that. Now where has that come from, who has told"
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	have been curious as to what the AG was meeting because if it isn't just Mr Levy's son, it's another partner of the same firm that was under investigation.  Q. Yes. Well, the firm wasn't under investigation, was it?  A. No, sorry, the partners of Hassans at that time were beneficial owners of Astelon.  I don't know if Mr Moshe Levy was a partner at that time.  Q. Right. But Mr Baglietto was partner at that time?  A. Yes.  Q. Yes. If you had known that the Attorney General had texted Mr Levy, "Don't worry", and had met with Mr Baglietto and Mr Levy, would you have dealt with the meetings any differently that you had with him?  A. I think I would have had to discuss it with the Commissioners whether we would be comfortable going through any evidence with the Attorney General at the same time that he	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	strange and it's not words that I would use myself, but I can't tell you now how I felt at the time.  Q. B/276, please, at the bottom of the page. I am picking up at the bottom of the longer paragraph that records what you say. I think this is your reading from the Hassans letter that's been received in relation to the search warrant. You say: "There is even a suggestion here that you [being Mr Rocca] advised us not to obtain a warrant."  A. Sorry, I can't see this on this page.  Q. Right at the bottom of the big paragraph  A. I can see it now.  Q. That is attributed to you. It says: "There is even a suggestion here that he advises us not to obtain a warrant." Mr Rocca said: "I read that, Superintendent Richardson. We didn't say that. We didn't agree with that. Now where has that come from, who has told"  Just pausing there, do you remember any of

1	A. Yes.	1	where has it come from? It wasn't aired in
2	Q. Can you just contextualise it?	2	court."
3	A. This was let me refresh my memory of	3	Mr Llamas: "It must come from the
4	it, please.	4	conversation with Ian and the Chief
5	Q. Of course.	5	Minister."
6	A. This was in relation to one of the	6	Do you remember Mr Llamas saying that?
7	letters one of the many letters that we	7	A. Yes.
8	received from Hassans. Which date is this	8	Q. And what did you think about that?
9	meeting?	9	A. It was it was a little bit shocking but,
10	Q. The 13th?	10	one, that Hassans had access to advice that
11	A. This is on 13th May excuse me	11	the DPP claims to have or that they say
12	Q. It is 15th, I am sorry.	12	that the DPP advice that the DPP had given
13	A. Well, there had been a number of letters	13	to the police. And then to quote it to the
14	that we had received from Hassans. And one	14	Attorney General I am assuming that the
15	of them mentions I think it was Louis	15	Attorney General had been copied into this,
16	Baglietto that was writing, said that or	16	or the Commissioner of Police to quote
17	words to the effect that it was plainly clear	17	advice that we had been given, and advice
18	that the DPP had advised against obtaining	18	that was wrong because the DPP had not
19	a warrant and that was not the case. So	19	expressly advised against the obtaining of
20	I have raised it with the DPP and said there is	20	a search warrant.
21	even a suggestion the words I used were	21	Q. And what about that bit about it must
22	there is even a suggestion here that you	22	have come from the meeting between the
23	advised us not to obtain a warrant; as if to	23	Commissioner and the Chief Minister?
24	say, you didn't advise that.	24	A. At that time I wouldn't have given that
25	Q. Yes. And Mr Rocca said, "I read that".	25	that much thought because I didn't know
			_
	Page 221		Page 223
1	Vou said: "We didn't say that we didn't agree	1	what the meeting was between the
1	You said: "We didn't say that, we didn't agree	1 2	what the meeting was between the
2	to that. Now where has that come from, who	2	Commissioner and the Chief Minister.
2 3	to that. Now where has that come from, who has told?"	2 3	Commissioner and the Chief Minister. Q. Looking back now, does that concern
2 3 4	to that. Now where has that come from, who has told?" Mr Llamas said: "I think they've had a lot of	2 3 4	Commissioner and the Chief Minister.  Q. Looking back now, does that concern you, if it was the case that the Chief Minister
2 3 4 5	to that. Now where has that come from, who has told?"  Mr Llamas said: "I think they've had a lot of confusion over that from the beginning." If	2 3 4 5	Commissioner and the Chief Minister.  Q. Looking back now, does that concern you, if it was the case that the Chief Minister provided that information to
2 3 4 5 6	to that. Now where has that come from, who has told?"  Mr Llamas said: "I think they've had a lot of confusion over that from the beginning." If we go further down please you are right, it	2 3 4 5 6	Commissioner and the Chief Minister.  Q. Looking back now, does that concern you, if it was the case that the Chief Minister provided that information to  A. If it leads to that the Chief Minister
2 3 4 5 6 7	to that. Now where has that come from, who has told?"  Mr Llamas said: "I think they've had a lot of confusion over that from the beginning." If we go further down please you are right, it is the 15th, sorry about that.	2 3 4 5 6 7	Commissioner and the Chief Minister.  Q. Looking back now, does that concern you, if it was the case that the Chief Minister provided that information to  A. If it leads to that the Chief Minister provided that information, yes, it is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	to that. Now where has that come from, who has told?"  Mr Llamas said: "I think they've had a lot of confusion over that from the beginning." If we go further down please you are right, it is the 15th, sorry about that.  You say: "That clearly might be the case, but	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Commissioner and the Chief Minister. Q. Looking back now, does that concern you, if it was the case that the Chief Minister provided that information to A. If it leads to that the Chief Minister provided that information, yes, it is concerning.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	to that. Now where has that come from, who has told?"  Mr Llamas said: "I think they've had a lot of confusion over that from the beginning." If we go further down please you are right, it is the 15th, sorry about that.  You say: "That clearly might be the case, but this is a QC [Mr Baglietto, I presume]	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Commissioner and the Chief Minister.  Q. Looking back now, does that concern you, if it was the case that the Chief Minister provided that information to  A. If it leads to that the Chief Minister provided that information, yes, it is concerning.  Q. Why?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	to that. Now where has that come from, who has told?"  Mr Llamas said: "I think they've had a lot of confusion over that from the beginning." If we go further down please you are right, it is the 15th, sorry about that.  You say: "That clearly might be the case, but this is a QC [Mr Baglietto, I presume] accusing the Commissioner of Police of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Commissioner and the Chief Minister.  Q. Looking back now, does that concern you, if it was the case that the Chief Minister provided that information to  A. If it leads to that the Chief Minister provided that information, yes, it is concerning.  Q. Why?  A. For the same reason it is concerning that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	to that. Now where has that come from, who has told?"  Mr Llamas said: "I think they've had a lot of confusion over that from the beginning." If we go further down please you are right, it is the 15th, sorry about that.  You say: "That clearly might be the case, but this is a QC [Mr Baglietto, I presume] accusing the Commissioner of Police of acting unlawfully because he's gone against	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Commissioner and the Chief Minister.  Q. Looking back now, does that concern you, if it was the case that the Chief Minister provided that information to  A. If it leads to that the Chief Minister provided that information, yes, it is concerning.  Q. Why?  A. For the same reason it is concerning that Mr Baglietto had access to advice that the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	to that. Now where has that come from, who has told?"  Mr Llamas said: "I think they've had a lot of confusion over that from the beginning." If we go further down please you are right, it is the 15th, sorry about that.  You say: "That clearly might be the case, but this is a QC [Mr Baglietto, I presume] accusing the Commissioner of Police of acting unlawfully because he's gone against the advice of the DPP."	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Commissioner and the Chief Minister.  Q. Looking back now, does that concern you, if it was the case that the Chief Minister provided that information to  A. If it leads to that the Chief Minister provided that information, yes, it is concerning.  Q. Why?  A. For the same reason it is concerning that Mr Baglietto had access to advice that the DPP had given the police. It's not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	to that. Now where has that come from, who has told?"  Mr Llamas said: "I think they've had a lot of confusion over that from the beginning." If we go further down please you are right, it is the 15th, sorry about that.  You say: "That clearly might be the case, but this is a QC [Mr Baglietto, I presume] accusing the Commissioner of Police of acting unlawfully because he's gone against the advice of the DPP."  Mr Rocca said, "I picked that up."	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Commissioner and the Chief Minister.  Q. Looking back now, does that concern you, if it was the case that the Chief Minister provided that information to  A. If it leads to that the Chief Minister provided that information, yes, it is concerning.  Q. Why?  A. For the same reason it is concerning that Mr Baglietto had access to advice that the DPP had given the police. It's not appropriate. Particularly in a in a live
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	to that. Now where has that come from, who has told?"  Mr Llamas said: "I think they've had a lot of confusion over that from the beginning." If we go further down please you are right, it is the 15th, sorry about that.  You say: "That clearly might be the case, but this is a QC [Mr Baglietto, I presume] accusing the Commissioner of Police of acting unlawfully because he's gone against the advice of the DPP."  Mr Rocca said, "I picked that up."  Chief of police: "Can we go back to a couple	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Commissioner and the Chief Minister.  Q. Looking back now, does that concern you, if it was the case that the Chief Minister provided that information to  A. If it leads to that the Chief Minister provided that information, yes, it is concerning.  Q. Why?  A. For the same reason it is concerning that Mr Baglietto had access to advice that the DPP had given the police. It's not appropriate. Particularly in a in a live police investigation.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	to that. Now where has that come from, who has told?"  Mr Llamas said: "I think they've had a lot of confusion over that from the beginning." If we go further down please you are right, it is the 15th, sorry about that.  You say: "That clearly might be the case, but this is a QC [Mr Baglietto, I presume] accusing the Commissioner of Police of acting unlawfully because he's gone against the advice of the DPP."  Mr Rocca said, "I picked that up."  Chief of police: "Can we go back to a couple of instances"	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Commissioner and the Chief Minister.  Q. Looking back now, does that concern you, if it was the case that the Chief Minister provided that information to  A. If it leads to that the Chief Minister provided that information, yes, it is concerning.  Q. Why?  A. For the same reason it is concerning that Mr Baglietto had access to advice that the DPP had given the police. It's not appropriate. Particularly in a in a live police investigation.  Q. I am sorry, just to ask you to spell it out,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	to that. Now where has that come from, who has told?"  Mr Llamas said: "I think they've had a lot of confusion over that from the beginning." If we go further down please you are right, it is the 15th, sorry about that.  You say: "That clearly might be the case, but this is a QC [Mr Baglietto, I presume] accusing the Commissioner of Police of acting unlawfully because he's gone against the advice of the DPP."  Mr Rocca said, "I picked that up."  Chief of police: "Can we go back to a couple of instances"  And Mr Llamas says: "That's an assumption	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Commissioner and the Chief Minister.  Q. Looking back now, does that concern you, if it was the case that the Chief Minister provided that information to  A. If it leads to that the Chief Minister provided that information, yes, it is concerning.  Q. Why?  A. For the same reason it is concerning that Mr Baglietto had access to advice that the DPP had given the police. It's not appropriate. Particularly in a in a live police investigation.  Q. I am sorry, just to ask you to spell it out, but why do you think it's not appropriate?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	to that. Now where has that come from, who has told?"  Mr Llamas said: "I think they've had a lot of confusion over that from the beginning." If we go further down please you are right, it is the 15th, sorry about that.  You say: "That clearly might be the case, but this is a QC [Mr Baglietto, I presume] accusing the Commissioner of Police of acting unlawfully because he's gone against the advice of the DPP."  Mr Rocca said, "I picked that up."  Chief of police: "Can we go back to a couple of instances"  And Mr Llamas says: "That's an assumption that they're making."	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Commissioner and the Chief Minister.  Q. Looking back now, does that concern you, if it was the case that the Chief Minister provided that information to  A. If it leads to that the Chief Minister provided that information, yes, it is concerning.  Q. Why?  A. For the same reason it is concerning that Mr Baglietto had access to advice that the DPP had given the police. It's not appropriate. Particularly in a in a live police investigation.  Q. I am sorry, just to ask you to spell it out, but why do you think it's not appropriate?  A. Well, the Chief Minister was a partner in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	to that. Now where has that come from, who has told?"  Mr Llamas said: "I think they've had a lot of confusion over that from the beginning." If we go further down please you are right, it is the 15th, sorry about that.  You say: "That clearly might be the case, but this is a QC [Mr Baglietto, I presume] accusing the Commissioner of Police of acting unlawfully because he's gone against the advice of the DPP."  Mr Rocca said, "I picked that up."  Chief of police: "Can we go back to a couple of instances"  And Mr Llamas says: "That's an assumption that they're making."  You say: "How can a QC just throw that out,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Commissioner and the Chief Minister.  Q. Looking back now, does that concern you, if it was the case that the Chief Minister provided that information to  A. If it leads to that the Chief Minister provided that information, yes, it is concerning.  Q. Why?  A. For the same reason it is concerning that Mr Baglietto had access to advice that the DPP had given the police. It's not appropriate. Particularly in a in a live police investigation.  Q. I am sorry, just to ask you to spell it out, but why do you think it's not appropriate?  A. Well, the Chief Minister was a partner in the same firm that had a share in the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	to that. Now where has that come from, who has told?"  Mr Llamas said: "I think they've had a lot of confusion over that from the beginning." If we go further down please you are right, it is the 15th, sorry about that.  You say: "That clearly might be the case, but this is a QC [Mr Baglietto, I presume] accusing the Commissioner of Police of acting unlawfully because he's gone against the advice of the DPP."  Mr Rocca said, "I picked that up."  Chief of police: "Can we go back to a couple of instances"  And Mr Llamas says: "That's an assumption that they're making."  You say: "How can a QC just throw that out, saying that the Commissioner of Police is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Commissioner and the Chief Minister.  Q. Looking back now, does that concern you, if it was the case that the Chief Minister provided that information to  A. If it leads to that the Chief Minister provided that information, yes, it is concerning.  Q. Why?  A. For the same reason it is concerning that Mr Baglietto had access to advice that the DPP had given the police. It's not appropriate. Particularly in a in a live police investigation.  Q. I am sorry, just to ask you to spell it out, but why do you think it's not appropriate?  A. Well, the Chief Minister was a partner in the same firm that had a share in the ownership of the firm that we were
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	to that. Now where has that come from, who has told?"  Mr Llamas said: "I think they've had a lot of confusion over that from the beginning." If we go further down please you are right, it is the 15th, sorry about that.  You say: "That clearly might be the case, but this is a QC [Mr Baglietto, I presume] accusing the Commissioner of Police of acting unlawfully because he's gone against the advice of the DPP."  Mr Rocca said, "I picked that up."  Chief of police: "Can we go back to a couple of instances"  And Mr Llamas says: "That's an assumption that they're making."  You say: "How can a QC just throw that out, saying that the Commissioner of Police is acting unlawfully?"	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Commissioner and the Chief Minister.  Q. Looking back now, does that concern you, if it was the case that the Chief Minister provided that information to  A. If it leads to that the Chief Minister provided that information, yes, it is concerning.  Q. Why?  A. For the same reason it is concerning that Mr Baglietto had access to advice that the DPP had given the police. It's not appropriate. Particularly in a in a live police investigation.  Q. I am sorry, just to ask you to spell it out, but why do you think it's not appropriate?  A. Well, the Chief Minister was a partner in the same firm that had a share in the ownership of the firm that we were investigating, as well as being
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	to that. Now where has that come from, who has told?"  Mr Llamas said: "I think they've had a lot of confusion over that from the beginning." If we go further down please you are right, it is the 15th, sorry about that.  You say: "That clearly might be the case, but this is a QC [Mr Baglietto, I presume] accusing the Commissioner of Police of acting unlawfully because he's gone against the advice of the DPP."  Mr Rocca said, "I picked that up."  Chief of police: "Can we go back to a couple of instances"  And Mr Llamas says: "That's an assumption that they're making."  You say: "How can a QC just throw that out, saying that the Commissioner of Police is acting unlawfully?"  Mr Rocca says: "It's almost worse than that.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Commissioner and the Chief Minister.  Q. Looking back now, does that concern you, if it was the case that the Chief Minister provided that information to  A. If it leads to that the Chief Minister provided that information, yes, it is concerning.  Q. Why?  A. For the same reason it is concerning that Mr Baglietto had access to advice that the DPP had given the police. It's not appropriate. Particularly in a in a live police investigation.  Q. I am sorry, just to ask you to spell it out, but why do you think it's not appropriate?  A. Well, the Chief Minister was a partner in the same firm that had a share in the ownership of the firm that we were investigating, as well as being  Q. And why does that make it inappropriate?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	to that. Now where has that come from, who has told?"  Mr Llamas said: "I think they've had a lot of confusion over that from the beginning." If we go further down please you are right, it is the 15th, sorry about that.  You say: "That clearly might be the case, but this is a QC [Mr Baglietto, I presume] accusing the Commissioner of Police of acting unlawfully because he's gone against the advice of the DPP."  Mr Rocca said, "I picked that up."  Chief of police: "Can we go back to a couple of instances"  And Mr Llamas says: "That's an assumption that they're making."  You say: "How can a QC just throw that out, saying that the Commissioner of Police is acting unlawfully?"  Mr Rocca says: "It's almost worse than that. It's kind of possibly suggests that I've spoken	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Commissioner and the Chief Minister.  Q. Looking back now, does that concern you, if it was the case that the Chief Minister provided that information to  A. If it leads to that the Chief Minister provided that information, yes, it is concerning.  Q. Why?  A. For the same reason it is concerning that Mr Baglietto had access to advice that the DPP had given the police. It's not appropriate. Particularly in a in a live police investigation.  Q. I am sorry, just to ask you to spell it out, but why do you think it's not appropriate?  A. Well, the Chief Minister was a partner in the same firm that had a share in the ownership of the firm that we were investigating, as well as being  Q. And why does that make it inappropriate?  A. Because he had an interest in the outcome
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	to that. Now where has that come from, who has told?"  Mr Llamas said: "I think they've had a lot of confusion over that from the beginning." If we go further down please you are right, it is the 15th, sorry about that.  You say: "That clearly might be the case, but this is a QC [Mr Baglietto, I presume] accusing the Commissioner of Police of acting unlawfully because he's gone against the advice of the DPP."  Mr Rocca said, "I picked that up."  Chief of police: "Can we go back to a couple of instances"  And Mr Llamas says: "That's an assumption that they're making."  You say: "How can a QC just throw that out, saying that the Commissioner of Police is acting unlawfully?"  Mr Rocca says: "It's almost worse than that. It's kind of possibly suggests that I've spoken to Louis Baglietto which I haven't."	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Commissioner and the Chief Minister.  Q. Looking back now, does that concern you, if it was the case that the Chief Minister provided that information to  A. If it leads to that the Chief Minister provided that information, yes, it is concerning.  Q. Why?  A. For the same reason it is concerning that Mr Baglietto had access to advice that the DPP had given the police. It's not appropriate. Particularly in a in a live police investigation.  Q. I am sorry, just to ask you to spell it out, but why do you think it's not appropriate?  A. Well, the Chief Minister was a partner in the same firm that had a share in the ownership of the firm that we were investigating, as well as being  Q. And why does that make it inappropriate?  A. Because he had an interest in the outcome of this matter.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	to that. Now where has that come from, who has told?"  Mr Llamas said: "I think they've had a lot of confusion over that from the beginning." If we go further down please you are right, it is the 15th, sorry about that.  You say: "That clearly might be the case, but this is a QC [Mr Baglietto, I presume] accusing the Commissioner of Police of acting unlawfully because he's gone against the advice of the DPP."  Mr Rocca said, "I picked that up."  Chief of police: "Can we go back to a couple of instances"  And Mr Llamas says: "That's an assumption that they're making."  You say: "How can a QC just throw that out, saying that the Commissioner of Police is acting unlawfully?"  Mr Rocca says: "It's almost worse than that. It's kind of possibly suggests that I've spoken to Louis Baglietto which I haven't."  Chief of police: "That's my question. My	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Commissioner and the Chief Minister.  Q. Looking back now, does that concern you, if it was the case that the Chief Minister provided that information to  A. If it leads to that the Chief Minister provided that information, yes, it is concerning.  Q. Why?  A. For the same reason it is concerning that Mr Baglietto had access to advice that the DPP had given the police. It's not appropriate. Particularly in a in a live police investigation.  Q. I am sorry, just to ask you to spell it out, but why do you think it's not appropriate?  A. Well, the Chief Minister was a partner in the same firm that had a share in the ownership of the firm that we were investigating, as well as being  Q. And why does that make it inappropriate?  A. Because he had an interest in the outcome of this matter.  Q. I want to ask you just about something
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	to that. Now where has that come from, who has told?"  Mr Llamas said: "I think they've had a lot of confusion over that from the beginning." If we go further down please you are right, it is the 15th, sorry about that.  You say: "That clearly might be the case, but this is a QC [Mr Baglietto, I presume] accusing the Commissioner of Police of acting unlawfully because he's gone against the advice of the DPP."  Mr Rocca said, "I picked that up."  Chief of police: "Can we go back to a couple of instances"  And Mr Llamas says: "That's an assumption that they're making."  You say: "How can a QC just throw that out, saying that the Commissioner of Police is acting unlawfully?"  Mr Rocca says: "It's almost worse than that. It's kind of possibly suggests that I've spoken to Louis Baglietto which I haven't."	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Commissioner and the Chief Minister.  Q. Looking back now, does that concern you, if it was the case that the Chief Minister provided that information to  A. If it leads to that the Chief Minister provided that information, yes, it is concerning.  Q. Why?  A. For the same reason it is concerning that Mr Baglietto had access to advice that the DPP had given the police. It's not appropriate. Particularly in a in a live police investigation.  Q. I am sorry, just to ask you to spell it out, but why do you think it's not appropriate?  A. Well, the Chief Minister was a partner in the same firm that had a share in the ownership of the firm that we were investigating, as well as being  Q. And why does that make it inappropriate?  A. Because he had an interest in the outcome of this matter.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	to that. Now where has that come from, who has told?"  Mr Llamas said: "I think they've had a lot of confusion over that from the beginning." If we go further down please you are right, it is the 15th, sorry about that.  You say: "That clearly might be the case, but this is a QC [Mr Baglietto, I presume] accusing the Commissioner of Police of acting unlawfully because he's gone against the advice of the DPP."  Mr Rocca said, "I picked that up."  Chief of police: "Can we go back to a couple of instances"  And Mr Llamas says: "That's an assumption that they're making."  You say: "How can a QC just throw that out, saying that the Commissioner of Police is acting unlawfully?"  Mr Rocca says: "It's almost worse than that. It's kind of possibly suggests that I've spoken to Louis Baglietto which I haven't."  Chief of police: "That's my question. My	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Commissioner and the Chief Minister.  Q. Looking back now, does that concern you, if it was the case that the Chief Minister provided that information to  A. If it leads to that the Chief Minister provided that information, yes, it is concerning.  Q. Why?  A. For the same reason it is concerning that Mr Baglietto had access to advice that the DPP had given the police. It's not appropriate. Particularly in a in a live police investigation.  Q. I am sorry, just to ask you to spell it out, but why do you think it's not appropriate?  A. Well, the Chief Minister was a partner in the same firm that had a share in the ownership of the firm that we were investigating, as well as being  Q. And why does that make it inappropriate?  A. Because he had an interest in the outcome of this matter.  Q. I want to ask you just about something

1	a small thing you talked about the AG's	1	A. It would have been myself, from
2	chambers. What would a police	2	memory, Mr Yeats, Cathal Yeats,
3	officer before the DPP role came to be,	3	Superintendent Tunbridge. I think that
4	what would a police officer have meant if	4	would have been it.
5	they said they were going to the AG's	5	Q. Mr Aldren?
6	chambers?	6	A. And Mr Aldren, of course, yes.
7	A. It would have meant that they were going	7	Q. Why were you all together?
8	down to see the prosecutors. The AG's	8	A. I think, if I remember correctly, that we
9	chambers from a police perspective was	9	had been asked to attend a meeting
10	where the Crown counsels lived, and we took	10	because sorry, we are talking about the
11	advice regarding criminal matters from	11	22nd, aren't we?
12	Crown counsels that were located at the	12	A. Yes.
13	Attorney General's chambers.	13	Q. Yes?
14	Q. So it wouldn't necessarily mean "I am	14	A. Because the Commissioner had been
15	going to see the Attorney General"?	15	asked to retire.
16	A. You would only see the Attorney General	16	Q. Could I ask, would it make sense, since
17	if it was a very serious matter. Most cases	17	you translated it and you transcribed it,
18	would have been dealt with by the by the	18	would you read out the call?
19	Crown counsels.	19	A. I am not too happy about reading out the
20	Q. Was that a phrase that in your experience	20	Spanish.
21	may have lived on a bit beyond when the	21	Q. I will read it out and I won't read
22	DPP took over the post?	22	out yes, it's the second page of the
23	A. Certainly with older officers.	23	translation. Sorry, I was actually looking at
24	Q. I want to ask you about the call that you	24	the second page which is why I was asking.
25	recorded one end of on 22 May. You were	25	I am just going to read it and then I am going
23	recorded one end of on 22 iviay. Tod were	23	Turn just going to read it and then I am going
	Page 225		Page 227
1	asked about it before now. There is an audio	1	to ask about your reaction to it. Obviously
2	recording obviously that you recorded.	2	this only Mr McGrail's end of the
3		_	this only wir wedian's end of the
5	I understand that your legal team have	3	convergation:
4	I understand that your legal team have	3	conversation:
4	transcribed the call. I wonder if it is possible	4	"I will say a bit well, I feel completely,
5	transcribed the call. I wonder if it is possible to have that put up on the screen. They have	4 5	"I will say a bit well, I feel completely, well, let down. I don't deserve this. I don't
5 6	transcribed the call. I wonder if it is possible to have that put up on the screen. They have not just transcribed it, they have actually	4 5 6	"I will say a bit well, I feel completely, well, let down. I don't deserve this. I don't deserve this at all, Michael. At all. I am
5 6 7	transcribed the call. I wonder if it is possible to have that put up on the screen. They have not just transcribed it, they have actually translated it as well.	4 5 6 7	"I will say a bit well, I feel completely, well, let down. I don't deserve this. I don't deserve this at all, Michael. At all. I am [something something] weekend. Michael,
5 6 7 8	transcribed the call. I wonder if it is possible to have that put up on the screen. They have not just transcribed it, they have actually translated it as well.  A. It was me that translated it.	4 5 6 7 8	"I will say a bit well, I feel completely, well, let down. I don't deserve this. I don't deserve this at all, Michael. At all. I am [something something] weekend. Michael, I don't know what to do, I'm at a loss. I've
5 6 7 8 9	transcribed the call. I wonder if it is possible to have that put up on the screen. They have not just transcribed it, they have actually translated it as well.  A. It was me that translated it.  Q. It was you that translated it?	4 5 6 7 8 9	"I will say a bit well, I feel completely, well, let down. I don't deserve this. I don't deserve this at all, Michael. At all. I am [something something] weekend. Michael, I don't know what to do, I'm at a loss. I've been attacked. My options are either think
5 6 7 8 9 10	transcribed the call. I wonder if it is possible to have that put up on the screen. They have not just transcribed it, they have actually translated it as well.  A. It was me that translated it.  Q. It was you that translated it?  A. Yes.	4 5 6 7 8 9 10	"I will say a bit well, I feel completely, well, let down. I don't deserve this. I don't deserve this at all, Michael. At all. I am [something something] weekend. Michael, I don't know what to do, I'm at a loss. I've been attacked. My options are either think about Gibraltar or save my skin and think
5 6 7 8 9 10 11	transcribed the call. I wonder if it is possible to have that put up on the screen. They have not just transcribed it, they have actually translated it as well.  A. It was me that translated it. Q. It was you that translated it? A. Yes. Q. Well, that's even	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	"I will say a bit well, I feel completely, well, let down. I don't deserve this. I don't deserve this at all, Michael. At all. I am [something something] weekend. Michael, I don't know what to do, I'm at a loss. I've been attacked. My options are either think about Gibraltar or save my skin and think about Gibraltar or create a constitutional
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	transcribed the call. I wonder if it is possible to have that put up on the screen. They have not just transcribed it, they have actually translated it as well.  A. It was me that translated it. Q. It was you that translated it? A. Yes. Q. Well, that's even A. It might not be 100 per cent accurate.	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	"I will say a bit well, I feel completely, well, let down. I don't deserve this. I don't deserve this at all, Michael. At all. I am [something something] weekend. Michael, I don't know what to do, I'm at a loss. I've been attacked. My options are either think about Gibraltar or save my skin and think about Gibraltar or create a constitutional crisis. That's where I am, Michael. That's
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	transcribed the call. I wonder if it is possible to have that put up on the screen. They have not just transcribed it, they have actually translated it as well.  A. It was me that translated it. Q. It was you that translated it? A. Yes. Q. Well, that's even A. It might not be 100 per cent accurate. Q. Well, it is your fault if it is not.	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	"I will say a bit well, I feel completely, well, let down. I don't deserve this. I don't deserve this at all, Michael. At all. I am [something something] weekend. Michael, I don't know what to do, I'm at a loss. I've been attacked. My options are either think about Gibraltar or save my skin and think about Gibraltar or create a constitutional crisis. That's where I am, Michael. That's where I am. What do I do now? Either
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	transcribed the call. I wonder if it is possible to have that put up on the screen. They have not just transcribed it, they have actually translated it as well.  A. It was me that translated it. Q. It was you that translated it? A. Yes. Q. Well, that's even A. It might not be 100 per cent accurate. Q. Well, it is your fault if it is not. A. Yes.	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	"I will say a bit well, I feel completely, well, let down. I don't deserve this. I don't deserve this at all, Michael. At all. I am [something something] weekend. Michael, I don't know what to do, I'm at a loss. I've been attacked. My options are either think about Gibraltar or save my skin and think about Gibraltar or create a constitutional crisis. That's where I am, Michael. That's where I am. What do I do now? Either I keep quiet and I leave and that is it, and this
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	transcribed the call. I wonder if it is possible to have that put up on the screen. They have not just transcribed it, they have actually translated it as well.  A. It was me that translated it. Q. It was you that translated it? A. Yes. Q. Well, that's even A. It might not be 100 per cent accurate. Q. Well, it is your fault if it is not. A. Yes. A. Thank you. Just to contextualise here,	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	"I will say a bit well, I feel completely, well, let down. I don't deserve this. I don't deserve this at all, Michael. At all. I am [something something] weekend. Michael, I don't know what to do, I'm at a loss. I've been attacked. My options are either think about Gibraltar or save my skin and think about Gibraltar or create a constitutional crisis. That's where I am, Michael. That's where I am. What do I do now? Either I keep quiet and I leave and that is it, and this won't change because those I leave behind
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	transcribed the call. I wonder if it is possible to have that put up on the screen. They have not just transcribed it, they have actually translated it as well.  A. It was me that translated it. Q. It was you that translated it? A. Yes. Q. Well, that's even A. It might not be 100 per cent accurate. Q. Well, it is your fault if it is not. A. Yes. A. Thank you. Just to contextualise here, you said that the senior management were all	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	"I will say a bit well, I feel completely, well, let down. I don't deserve this. I don't deserve this at all, Michael. At all. I am [something something] weekend. Michael, I don't know what to do, I'm at a loss. I've been attacked. My options are either think about Gibraltar or save my skin and think about Gibraltar or create a constitutional crisis. That's where I am, Michael. That's where I am. What do I do now? Either I keep quiet and I leave and that is it, and this won't change because those I leave behind I think the same about. I think the same
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	transcribed the call. I wonder if it is possible to have that put up on the screen. They have not just transcribed it, they have actually translated it as well.  A. It was me that translated it. Q. It was you that translated it? A. Yes. Q. Well, that's even A. It might not be 100 per cent accurate. Q. Well, it is your fault if it is not. A. Yes. A. Thank you. Just to contextualise here, you said that the senior management were all in the room. What room was it in that this	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	"I will say a bit well, I feel completely, well, let down. I don't deserve this. I don't deserve this at all, Michael. At all. I am [something something] weekend. Michael, I don't know what to do, I'm at a loss. I've been attacked. My options are either think about Gibraltar or save my skin and think about Gibraltar or create a constitutional crisis. That's where I am, Michael. That's where I am. What do I do now? Either I keep quiet and I leave and that is it, and this won't change because those I leave behind I think the same about. I think the same about it. If I were the only one, if I if
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	transcribed the call. I wonder if it is possible to have that put up on the screen. They have not just transcribed it, they have actually translated it as well.  A. It was me that translated it. Q. It was you that translated it? A. Yes. Q. Well, that's even A. It might not be 100 per cent accurate. Q. Well, it is your fault if it is not. A. Yes. A. Thank you. Just to contextualise here, you said that the senior management were all in the room. What room was it in that this call was made from?	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	"I will say a bit well, I feel completely, well, let down. I don't deserve this. I don't deserve this at all, Michael. At all. I am [something something] weekend. Michael, I don't know what to do, I'm at a loss. I've been attacked. My options are either think about Gibraltar or save my skin and think about Gibraltar or create a constitutional crisis. That's where I am, Michael. That's where I am. What do I do now? Either I keep quiet and I leave and that is it, and this won't change because those I leave behind I think the same about it. If I were the only one, if I if I those behind me are all with the same
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	transcribed the call. I wonder if it is possible to have that put up on the screen. They have not just transcribed it, they have actually translated it as well.  A. It was me that translated it. Q. It was you that translated it? A. Yes. Q. Well, that's even A. It might not be 100 per cent accurate. Q. Well, it is your fault if it is not. A. Yes. A. Thank you. Just to contextualise here, you said that the senior management were all in the room. What room was it in that this call was made from? A. This was the Commissioner's office. The	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	"I will say a bit well, I feel completely, well, let down. I don't deserve this. I don't deserve this at all, Michael. At all. I am [something something] weekend. Michael, I don't know what to do, I'm at a loss. I've been attacked. My options are either think about Gibraltar or save my skin and think about Gibraltar or create a constitutional crisis. That's where I am, Michael. That's where I am. What do I do now? Either I keep quiet and I leave and that is it, and this won't change because those I leave behind I think the same about. I think the same about it. If I were the only one, if I if I those behind me are all with the same mindset about this investigation. It's not that
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	transcribed the call. I wonder if it is possible to have that put up on the screen. They have not just transcribed it, they have actually translated it as well.  A. It was me that translated it. Q. It was you that translated it? A. Yes. Q. Well, that's even A. It might not be 100 per cent accurate. Q. Well, it is your fault if it is not. A. Yes. A. Thank you. Just to contextualise here, you said that the senior management were all in the room. What room was it in that this call was made from? A. This was the Commissioner's office. The Commissioner's suite as it is called.	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	"I will say a bit well, I feel completely, well, let down. I don't deserve this. I don't deserve this at all, Michael. At all. I am [something something] weekend. Michael, I don't know what to do, I'm at a loss. I've been attacked. My options are either think about Gibraltar or save my skin and think about Gibraltar or create a constitutional crisis. That's where I am, Michael. That's where I am. What do I do now? Either I keep quiet and I leave and that is it, and this won't change because those I leave behind I think the same about. I think the same about it. If I were the only one, if I if I those behind me are all with the same mindset about this investigation. It's not that we it's not just me, therefore I don't know
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	transcribed the call. I wonder if it is possible to have that put up on the screen. They have not just transcribed it, they have actually translated it as well.  A. It was me that translated it. Q. It was you that translated it? A. Yes. Q. Well, that's even A. It might not be 100 per cent accurate. Q. Well, it is your fault if it is not. A. Yes. A. Thank you. Just to contextualise here, you said that the senior management were all in the room. What room was it in that this call was made from? A. This was the Commissioner's office. The Commissioner's suite as it is called. Q. Yes. Is it a big room?	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	"I will say a bit well, I feel completely, well, let down. I don't deserve this. I don't deserve this at all, Michael. At all. I am [something something] weekend. Michael, I don't know what to do, I'm at a loss. I've been attacked. My options are either think about Gibraltar or save my skin and think about Gibraltar or create a constitutional crisis. That's where I am, Michael. That's where I am. What do I do now? Either I keep quiet and I leave and that is it, and this won't change because those I leave behind I think the same about. I think the same about it. If I were the only one, if I if I those behind me are all with the same mindset about this investigation. It's not that we it's not just me, therefore I don't know how this is going to be fixed. I'll leave. I'll
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	transcribed the call. I wonder if it is possible to have that put up on the screen. They have not just transcribed it, they have actually translated it as well.  A. It was me that translated it. Q. It was you that translated it? A. Yes. Q. Well, that's even A. It might not be 100 per cent accurate. Q. Well, it is your fault if it is not. A. Yes. A. Thank you. Just to contextualise here, you said that the senior management were all in the room. What room was it in that this call was made from? A. This was the Commissioner's office. The Commissioner's suite as it is called. Q. Yes. Is it a big room? A. It's the biggest in the station.	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	"I will say a bit well, I feel completely, well, let down. I don't deserve this. I don't deserve this at all, Michael. At all. I am [something something] weekend. Michael, I don't know what to do, I'm at a loss. I've been attacked. My options are either think about Gibraltar or save my skin and think about Gibraltar or create a constitutional crisis. That's where I am, Michael. That's where I am. What do I do now? Either I keep quiet and I leave and that is it, and this won't change because those I leave behind I think the same about. I think the same about it. If I were the only one, if I if I those behind me are all with the same mindset about this investigation. It's not that we it's not just me, therefore I don't know how this is going to be fixed. I'll leave. I'll leave or I'll stir things up and we all stand to
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	transcribed the call. I wonder if it is possible to have that put up on the screen. They have not just transcribed it, they have actually translated it as well.  A. It was me that translated it.  Q. It was you that translated it?  A. Yes.  Q. Well, that's even  A. It might not be 100 per cent accurate.  Q. Well, it is your fault if it is not.  A. Yes.  A. Thank you. Just to contextualise here, you said that the senior management were all in the room. What room was it in that this call was made from?  A. This was the Commissioner's office. The Commissioner's suite as it is called.  Q. Yes. Is it a big room?  A. It's the biggest in the station.  Q. When you said the senior management	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	"I will say a bit well, I feel completely, well, let down. I don't deserve this. I don't deserve this at all, Michael. At all. I am [something something] weekend. Michael, I don't know what to do, I'm at a loss. I've been attacked. My options are either think about Gibraltar or save my skin and think about Gibraltar or create a constitutional crisis. That's where I am, Michael. That's where I am. What do I do now? Either I keep quiet and I leave and that is it, and this won't change because those I leave behind I think the same about. I think the same about it. If I were the only one, if I if I those behind me are all with the same mindset about this investigation. It's not that we it's not just me, therefore I don't know how this is going to be fixed. I'll leave. I'll leave or I'll stir things up and we all stand to lose, me and Gibraltar. They have jumped
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	transcribed the call. I wonder if it is possible to have that put up on the screen. They have not just transcribed it, they have actually translated it as well.  A. It was me that translated it.  Q. It was you that translated it?  A. Yes.  Q. Well, that's even  A. It might not be 100 per cent accurate.  Q. Well, it is your fault if it is not.  A. Yes.  A. Thank you. Just to contextualise here, you said that the senior management were all in the room. What room was it in that this call was made from?  A. This was the Commissioner's office. The Commissioner's suite as it is called.  Q. Yes. Is it a big room?  A. It's the biggest in the station.  Q. When you said the senior management team were there, who would have been there	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	"I will say a bit well, I feel completely, well, let down. I don't deserve this. I don't deserve this at all, Michael. At all. I am [something something] weekend. Michael, I don't know what to do, I'm at a loss. I've been attacked. My options are either think about Gibraltar or save my skin and think about Gibraltar or create a constitutional crisis. That's where I am, Michael. That's where I am. What do I do now? Either I keep quiet and I leave and that is it, and this won't change because those I leave behind I think the same about. I think the same about it. If I were the only one, if I if I those behind me are all with the same mindset about this investigation. It's not that we it's not just me, therefore I don't know how this is going to be fixed. I'll leave. I'll leave or I'll stir things up and we all stand to lose, me and Gibraltar. They have jumped the gun with here this a very
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	transcribed the call. I wonder if it is possible to have that put up on the screen. They have not just transcribed it, they have actually translated it as well.  A. It was me that translated it.  Q. It was you that translated it?  A. Yes.  Q. Well, that's even  A. It might not be 100 per cent accurate.  Q. Well, it is your fault if it is not.  A. Yes.  A. Thank you. Just to contextualise here, you said that the senior management were all in the room. What room was it in that this call was made from?  A. This was the Commissioner's office. The Commissioner's suite as it is called.  Q. Yes. Is it a big room?  A. It's the biggest in the station.  Q. When you said the senior management	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	"I will say a bit well, I feel completely, well, let down. I don't deserve this. I don't deserve this at all, Michael. At all. I am [something something] weekend. Michael, I don't know what to do, I'm at a loss. I've been attacked. My options are either think about Gibraltar or save my skin and think about Gibraltar or create a constitutional crisis. That's where I am, Michael. That's where I am. What do I do now? Either I keep quiet and I leave and that is it, and this won't change because those I leave behind I think the same about. I think the same about it. If I were the only one, if I if I those behind me are all with the same mindset about this investigation. It's not that we it's not just me, therefore I don't know how this is going to be fixed. I'll leave. I'll leave or I'll stir things up and we all stand to lose, me and Gibraltar. They have jumped
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	transcribed the call. I wonder if it is possible to have that put up on the screen. They have not just transcribed it, they have actually translated it as well.  A. It was me that translated it.  Q. It was you that translated it?  A. Yes.  Q. Well, that's even  A. It might not be 100 per cent accurate.  Q. Well, it is your fault if it is not.  A. Yes.  A. Thank you. Just to contextualise here, you said that the senior management were all in the room. What room was it in that this call was made from?  A. This was the Commissioner's office. The Commissioner's suite as it is called.  Q. Yes. Is it a big room?  A. It's the biggest in the station.  Q. When you said the senior management team were there, who would have been there	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	"I will say a bit well, I feel completely, well, let down. I don't deserve this. I don't deserve this at all, Michael. At all. I am [something something] weekend. Michael, I don't know what to do, I'm at a loss. I've been attacked. My options are either think about Gibraltar or save my skin and think about Gibraltar or create a constitutional crisis. That's where I am, Michael. That's where I am. What do I do now? Either I keep quiet and I leave and that is it, and this won't change because those I leave behind I think the same about. I think the same about it. If I were the only one, if I if I those behind me are all with the same mindset about this investigation. It's not that we it's not just me, therefore I don't know how this is going to be fixed. I'll leave. I'll leave or I'll stir things up and we all stand to lose, me and Gibraltar. They have jumped the gun with here this a very

4	TI 119 ( 1 1 1 3 1 0 )		
1	I'd like to do is clear this up for everyone's	1	with crime in Gibraltar. We didn't think that
2	benefit and I'm being pinned against the wall.	2	we had done anything wrong. We thought
3	Anyhow, I vented what I have to vent with	3	that applying for a search warrant was the
4 5	you. I don't know. I don't know whether we'll be able to talk about this matter. If you	4 5	correct thing to do.  Q. Why would it impact on how you dealt
6	offer it if you offer to meet I I'll be glad,	6	with other crime in Gibraltar?
7	but I don't know in what capacity you'll be	7	A. Well, if there was any other crime in
8	talking to me. I'm no, I'm already I'm	8	Gibraltar that involved the need to obtain
9	suspected of everything, Michael. Suspect of	9	a search warrant, and that search warrant
10	everything. Of everything. I don't even trust	10	involved a lawyer, we would find ourselves
11	my shadow."	11	back in exactly the same position.
12	Just to pause there, do you remember how	12	Q. And so what would that mean for
13	you and any other members of the senior	13	decisions you might make or not make?
14	management team reacted to hearing this	14	A. Knowing now what I know but I didn't
15	call?	15	know at the time about the warrant process,
16	A. It was sad. It was sad to hear the	16	I don't know how we would have addressed
17	Commissioner being emotional and	17	that, that situation, because if the only routes
18	being speaking to it was clear that he	18	to obtain that evidence is by production order
19	was speaking to the Attorney General.	19	and we suspected that a lawyer as we had
20	I don't know what the Attorney General was	20	in a number of occasions previously, and as
21	saying, but it was an emotional thing to see	21	far as I am aware perhaps still now how
22	the Commissioner being put in that position.	22	would you go about obtaining that evidence
23	Q. Was there any concern about the	23	if you had to obtain that evidence on notice?
24	Commissioner being put in that position?	24	There is no way to covert covertly obtain
25	A. I think we were all concerned. All the	25	that information as you would in the
	Page 229		Page 231
	SMT were concerned at that stage.	1	United Kingdom through RIPA.
1 2	SMT were concerned at that stage.  Q. Did you remained concerned after he	$\begin{bmatrix} 1\\2 \end{bmatrix}$	United Kingdom through RIPA. O. In your experience of Mr McGrail, was
	Q. Did you remained concerned after he left?	2	Q. In your experience of Mr McGrail, was
2	Q. Did you remained concerned after he		
2 3	Q. Did you remained concerned after he left?	2 3	Q. In your experience of Mr McGrail, was he in your view an honest police officer?
2 3 4	<ul><li>Q. Did you remained concerned after he left?</li><li>A. Yes.</li></ul>	2 3 4	<ul><li>Q. In your experience of Mr McGrail, was he in your view an honest police officer?</li><li>A. Yes.</li></ul>
2 3 4 5	<ul><li>Q. Did you remained concerned after he left?</li><li>A. Yes.</li><li>Q. Why?</li></ul>	2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>Q. In your experience of Mr McGrail, was he in your view an honest police officer?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And in your experience of Mr McGrail,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6	<ul><li>Q. Did you remained concerned after he left?</li><li>A. Yes.</li><li>Q. Why?</li><li>A. Because at that stage we had been told</li></ul>	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>Q. In your experience of Mr McGrail, was he in your view an honest police officer?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And in your experience of Mr McGrail, in your view, is he a man of integrity?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>Q. Did you remained concerned after he left?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Why?</li> <li>A. Because at that stage we had been told that his — the reason that he had been asked to retire wasn't to do with Operation Delhi, but all the evidence that we'd seen suggested</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>Q. In your experience of Mr McGrail, was he in your view an honest police officer?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And in your experience of Mr McGrail, in your view, is he a man of integrity?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. I just want to ask you one more area which is Op Kram, so the incident at sea.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q. Did you remained concerned after he left?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Why?</li> <li>A. Because at that stage we had been told that his the reason that he had been asked to retire wasn't to do with Operation Delhi, but all the evidence that we'd seen suggested that it was. And it was we weren't clear</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>Q. In your experience of Mr McGrail, was he in your view an honest police officer?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And in your experience of Mr McGrail, in your view, is he a man of integrity?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. I just want to ask you one more area which is Op Kram, so the incident at sea.</li> <li>You were involved in a number of the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q. Did you remained concerned after he left?  A. Yes. Q. Why? A. Because at that stage we had been told that his the reason that he had been asked to retire wasn't to do with Operation Delhi, but all the evidence that we'd seen suggested that it was. And it was we weren't clear about why the Commissioner had been asked	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>Q. In your experience of Mr McGrail, was he in your view an honest police officer?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And in your experience of Mr McGrail, in your view, is he a man of integrity?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. I just want to ask you one more area which is Op Kram, so the incident at sea. You were involved in a number of the meetings about Op Kram. We went through</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q. Did you remained concerned after he left?  A. Yes. Q. Why? A. Because at that stage we had been told that his the reason that he had been asked to retire wasn't to do with Operation Delhi, but all the evidence that we'd seen suggested that it was. And it was we weren't clear about why the Commissioner had been asked to retire and not clear about whether it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Q. In your experience of Mr McGrail, was he in your view an honest police officer?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And in your experience of Mr McGrail, in your view, is he a man of integrity?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. I just want to ask you one more area which is Op Kram, so the incident at sea. You were involved in a number of the meetings about Op Kram. We went through them before, is that right?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q. Did you remained concerned after he left?  A. Yes. Q. Why?  A. Because at that stage we had been told that his — the reason that he had been asked to retire wasn't to do with Operation Delhi, but all the evidence that we'd seen suggested that it was. And it was — we weren't clear about why the Commissioner had been asked to retire and not clear about whether it involved Operation Delhi or not.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Q. In your experience of Mr McGrail, was he in your view an honest police officer?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And in your experience of Mr McGrail, in your view, is he a man of integrity?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. I just want to ask you one more area which is Op Kram, so the incident at sea. You were involved in a number of the meetings about Op Kram. We went through them before, is that right?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q. Did you remained concerned after he left?  A. Yes. Q. Why?  A. Because at that stage we had been told that his the reason that he had been asked to retire wasn't to do with Operation Delhi, but all the evidence that we'd seen suggested that it was. And it was we weren't clear about why the Commissioner had been asked to retire and not clear about whether it involved Operation Delhi or not.  Q. Would it have made a difference if it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Q. In your experience of Mr McGrail, was he in your view an honest police officer?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And in your experience of Mr McGrail, in your view, is he a man of integrity?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. I just want to ask you one more area which is Op Kram, so the incident at sea. You were involved in a number of the meetings about Op Kram. We went through them before, is that right?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. And in some of those meetings the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q. Did you remained concerned after he left?  A. Yes. Q. Why? A. Because at that stage we had been told that his — the reason that he had been asked to retire wasn't to do with Operation Delhi, but all the evidence that we'd seen suggested that it was. And it was — we weren't clear about why the Commissioner had been asked to retire and not clear about whether it involved Operation Delhi or not.  Q. Would it have made a difference if it involved Operation Delhi?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Q. In your experience of Mr McGrail, was he in your view an honest police officer?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And in your experience of Mr McGrail, in your view, is he a man of integrity?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. I just want to ask you one more area which is Op Kram, so the incident at sea. You were involved in a number of the meetings about Op Kram. We went through them before, is that right?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. And in some of those meetings the Commissioner was there, is that right, or the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. Did you remained concerned after he left?  A. Yes. Q. Why? A. Because at that stage we had been told that his the reason that he had been asked to retire wasn't to do with Operation Delhi, but all the evidence that we'd seen suggested that it was. And it was we weren't clear about why the Commissioner had been asked to retire and not clear about whether it involved Operation Delhi or not. Q. Would it have made a difference if it involved Operation Delhi? A. Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Q. In your experience of Mr McGrail, was he in your view an honest police officer?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And in your experience of Mr McGrail, in your view, is he a man of integrity?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. I just want to ask you one more area which is Op Kram, so the incident at sea. You were involved in a number of the meetings about Op Kram. We went through them before, is that right?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. And in some of those meetings the Commissioner was there, is that right, or the ex-Commissioner?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. Did you remained concerned after he left?  A. Yes. Q. Why?  A. Because at that stage we had been told that his — the reason that he had been asked to retire wasn't to do with Operation Delhi, but all the evidence that we'd seen suggested that it was. And it was — we weren't clear about why the Commissioner had been asked to retire and not clear about whether it involved Operation Delhi or not. Q. Would it have made a difference if it involved Operation Delhi?  A. Yes. Q. Why?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Q. In your experience of Mr McGrail, was he in your view an honest police officer?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And in your experience of Mr McGrail, in your view, is he a man of integrity?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. I just want to ask you one more area which is Op Kram, so the incident at sea. You were involved in a number of the meetings about Op Kram. We went through them before, is that right?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. And in some of those meetings the Commissioner was there, is that right, or the ex-Commissioner?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. Did you remained concerned after he left?  A. Yes. Q. Why?  A. Because at that stage we had been told that his the reason that he had been asked to retire wasn't to do with Operation Delhi, but all the evidence that we'd seen suggested that it was. And it was we weren't clear about why the Commissioner had been asked to retire and not clear about whether it involved Operation Delhi or not. Q. Would it have made a difference if it involved Operation Delhi?  A. Yes. Q. Why?  A. Well, because the Commissioner had	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q. In your experience of Mr McGrail, was he in your view an honest police officer?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And in your experience of Mr McGrail, in your view, is he a man of integrity?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. I just want to ask you one more area which is Op Kram, so the incident at sea. You were involved in a number of the meetings about Op Kram. We went through them before, is that right?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. And in some of those meetings the Commissioner was there, is that right, or the ex-Commissioner?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Was it your impression at any stage in</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. Did you remained concerned after he left?  A. Yes. Q. Why?  A. Because at that stage we had been told that his — the reason that he had been asked to retire wasn't to do with Operation Delhi, but all the evidence that we'd seen suggested that it was. And it was — we weren't clear about why the Commissioner had been asked to retire and not clear about whether it involved Operation Delhi or not. Q. Would it have made a difference if it involved Operation Delhi?  A. Yes. Q. Why?  A. Well, because the Commissioner had been — if that was the case, that at that stage	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q. In your experience of Mr McGrail, was he in your view an honest police officer?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And in your experience of Mr McGrail, in your view, is he a man of integrity?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. I just want to ask you one more area which is Op Kram, so the incident at sea. You were involved in a number of the meetings about Op Kram. We went through them before, is that right?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. And in some of those meetings the Commissioner was there, is that right, or the ex-Commissioner?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Was it your impression at any stage in those meetings or otherwise that Mr McGrail</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. Did you remained concerned after he left?  A. Yes. Q. Why? A. Because at that stage we had been told that his the reason that he had been asked to retire wasn't to do with Operation Delhi, but all the evidence that we'd seen suggested that it was. And it was we weren't clear about why the Commissioner had been asked to retire and not clear about whether it involved Operation Delhi or not. Q. Would it have made a difference if it involved Operation Delhi? A. Yes. Q. Why? A. Well, because the Commissioner had been if that was the case, that at that stage we'd known that the Commissioner had been	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Q. In your experience of Mr McGrail, was he in your view an honest police officer?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And in your experience of Mr McGrail, in your view, is he a man of integrity?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. I just want to ask you one more area which is Op Kram, so the incident at sea. You were involved in a number of the meetings about Op Kram. We went through them before, is that right?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. And in some of those meetings the Commissioner was there, is that right, or the ex-Commissioner?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Was it your impression at any stage in those meetings or otherwise that Mr McGrail was deliberately keeping any information</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. Did you remained concerned after he left?  A. Yes. Q. Why? A. Because at that stage we had been told that his the reason that he had been asked to retire wasn't to do with Operation Delhi, but all the evidence that we'd seen suggested that it was. And it was we weren't clear about why the Commissioner had been asked to retire and not clear about whether it involved Operation Delhi or not. Q. Would it have made a difference if it involved Operation Delhi?  A. Yes. Q. Why? A. Well, because the Commissioner had been if that was the case, that at that stage we'd known that the Commissioner had been removed because of Operation Delhi and it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q. In your experience of Mr McGrail, was he in your view an honest police officer?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And in your experience of Mr McGrail, in your view, is he a man of integrity?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. I just want to ask you one more area which is Op Kram, so the incident at sea. You were involved in a number of the meetings about Op Kram. We went through them before, is that right?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. And in some of those meetings the Commissioner was there, is that right, or the ex-Commissioner?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Was it your impression at any stage in those meetings or otherwise that Mr McGrail was deliberately keeping any information from the acting Governor?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. Did you remained concerned after he left?  A. Yes. Q. Why?  A. Because at that stage we had been told that his — the reason that he had been asked to retire wasn't to do with Operation Delhi, but all the evidence that we'd seen suggested that it was. And it was — we weren't clear about why the Commissioner had been asked to retire and not clear about whether it involved Operation Delhi or not. Q. Would it have made a difference if it involved Operation Delhi?  A. Yes. Q. Why?  A. Well, because the Commissioner had been — if that was the case, that at that stage we'd known that the Commissioner had been removed because of Operation Delhi and it was because of the warrant that we had	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q. In your experience of Mr McGrail, was he in your view an honest police officer?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And in your experience of Mr McGrail, in your view, is he a man of integrity?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. I just want to ask you one more area which is Op Kram, so the incident at sea. You were involved in a number of the meetings about Op Kram. We went through them before, is that right?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. And in some of those meetings the Commissioner was there, is that right, or the ex-Commissioner?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Was it your impression at any stage in those meetings or otherwise that Mr McGrail was deliberately keeping any information from the acting Governor?</li> <li>A. No.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. Did you remained concerned after he left?  A. Yes. Q. Why?  A. Because at that stage we had been told that his the reason that he had been asked to retire wasn't to do with Operation Delhi, but all the evidence that we'd seen suggested that it was. And it was we weren't clear about why the Commissioner had been asked to retire and not clear about whether it involved Operation Delhi or not. Q. Would it have made a difference if it involved Operation Delhi?  A. Yes. Q. Why?  A. Well, because the Commissioner had been if that was the case, that at that stage we'd known that the Commissioner had been removed because of Operation Delhi and it was because of the warrant that we had executed with Mr Levy, it would it would	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. In your experience of Mr McGrail, was he in your view an honest police officer?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And in your experience of Mr McGrail, in your view, is he a man of integrity?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. I just want to ask you one more area which is Op Kram, so the incident at sea. You were involved in a number of the meetings about Op Kram. We went through them before, is that right?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. And in some of those meetings the Commissioner was there, is that right, or the ex-Commissioner?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Was it your impression at any stage in those meetings or otherwise that Mr McGrail was deliberately keeping any information from the acting Governor?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did you know of any reason Mr McGrail</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. Did you remained concerned after he left?  A. Yes. Q. Why?  A. Because at that stage we had been told that his — the reason that he had been asked to retire wasn't to do with Operation Delhi, but all the evidence that we'd seen suggested that it was. And it was — we weren't clear about why the Commissioner had been asked to retire and not clear about whether it involved Operation Delhi or not. Q. Would it have made a difference if it involved Operation Delhi?  A. Yes. Q. Why?  A. Well, because the Commissioner had been — if that was the case, that at that stage we'd known that the Commissioner had been removed because of Operation Delhi and it was because of the warrant that we had executed with Mr Levy, it would — it would affect how we would deal with other	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Q. In your experience of Mr McGrail, was he in your view an honest police officer?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And in your experience of Mr McGrail, in your view, is he a man of integrity?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. I just want to ask you one more area which is Op Kram, so the incident at sea. You were involved in a number of the meetings about Op Kram. We went through them before, is that right?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. And in some of those meetings the Commissioner was there, is that right, or the ex-Commissioner?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Was it your impression at any stage in those meetings or otherwise that Mr McGrail was deliberately keeping any information from the acting Governor?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did you know of any reason Mr McGrail would have to hold any information back</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. Did you remained concerned after he left?  A. Yes. Q. Why?  A. Because at that stage we had been told that his the reason that he had been asked to retire wasn't to do with Operation Delhi, but all the evidence that we'd seen suggested that it was. And it was we weren't clear about why the Commissioner had been asked to retire and not clear about whether it involved Operation Delhi or not. Q. Would it have made a difference if it involved Operation Delhi?  A. Yes. Q. Why?  A. Well, because the Commissioner had been if that was the case, that at that stage we'd known that the Commissioner had been removed because of Operation Delhi and it was because of the warrant that we had executed with Mr Levy, it would it would	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. In your experience of Mr McGrail, was he in your view an honest police officer?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And in your experience of Mr McGrail, in your view, is he a man of integrity?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. I just want to ask you one more area which is Op Kram, so the incident at sea. You were involved in a number of the meetings about Op Kram. We went through them before, is that right?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. And in some of those meetings the Commissioner was there, is that right, or the ex-Commissioner?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Was it your impression at any stage in those meetings or otherwise that Mr McGrail was deliberately keeping any information from the acting Governor?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did you know of any reason Mr McGrail</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. Did you remained concerned after he left?  A. Yes. Q. Why?  A. Because at that stage we had been told that his — the reason that he had been asked to retire wasn't to do with Operation Delhi, but all the evidence that we'd seen suggested that it was. And it was — we weren't clear about why the Commissioner had been asked to retire and not clear about whether it involved Operation Delhi or not. Q. Would it have made a difference if it involved Operation Delhi?  A. Yes. Q. Why?  A. Well, because the Commissioner had been — if that was the case, that at that stage we'd known that the Commissioner had been removed because of Operation Delhi and it was because of the warrant that we had executed with Mr Levy, it would — it would affect how we would deal with other	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Q. In your experience of Mr McGrail, was he in your view an honest police officer?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And in your experience of Mr McGrail, in your view, is he a man of integrity?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. I just want to ask you one more area which is Op Kram, so the incident at sea. You were involved in a number of the meetings about Op Kram. We went through them before, is that right?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. And in some of those meetings the Commissioner was there, is that right, or the ex-Commissioner?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Was it your impression at any stage in those meetings or otherwise that Mr McGrail was deliberately keeping any information from the acting Governor?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did you know of any reason Mr McGrail would have to hold any information back</li> </ul>

1	A. No.	1	(3.29 pm)
2	MR WAGNER: I've no further questions,	2	(A short break)
3	thank you.	3	(3.36 pm)
4	A. Thank you.	4	THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.
5	THE CHAIRMAN: Sir Peter, how long do	5	Cross-examination by SIR PETER
6	you think you will be?	6	CARUANA KC
7	SIR PETER CARUANA: At least an hour	7	SIR PETER CARUANA: Good afternoon to
8	and a half and it might be a bit longer I had	8	you, Mr Richardson.
9	scheduled an hour and a half, but as a result	9	A. Good afternoon, Sir Peter.
10	of some of the evidence that Mr Richardson	10	Q. I will just start with one or two short
11	has given today it might be a bit longer even.	11	points about Operation Kram. You were
12	MR SANTOS: In that case is it worth	12	asked this afternoon about the coordinates
13	perhaps doing 15 minutes now so that we can	13	and then the visit by the Governor. You said
14	make sure that we are done in an hour and	14	that he had just passed walking his dog.
15	a half tomorrow?	15	I think the meeting with Mr Llamas started
16	THE CHAIRMAN: We must	16	earlier on the morning of the 8th, at about 10,
17	finish Mr Wyan tomorrow, mustn't we?	17	and the governor turned up at about 12.15; is
18	MR SANTOS: Yes, I think the aim would	18	that correct?
19	be to finish, at least subject to the private	19	A. Mr Caruana, I can't remember unless
20	aspect, by, well, mid-morning. I don't think	20	I look back at my notes. It's one of many
21	mid-morning is going to be possible.	21	things that we've discussed today.
22	THE CHAIRMAN: No.	22	Q. I see. Well, leaving aside the question of
23	MR SANTOS: So I do think we should try	23	coordinates, where is Santa Barbara beach?
24	to make some progress this evening.	24	A. It's, as far as I am aware, past the runway
25	15/20 minutes now, I think might make us	25	in the area that we call La PinadA.
23	15/20 minutes now, I timik might make us		in the area that we can but made.
	Page 233		Page 235
1	a hit more comfortable tomorrow if Sir Peter	1	O So it's adjacent to the neighbouring
1 2	a bit more comfortable tomorrow, if Sir Peter is happy	1 2	Q. So it's adjacent to the neighbouring Spanish town of La Linea?
2	is happy.	2	Spanish town of La Linea?
2 3	is happy. SIR PETER CARUANA: I am very happy if	2 3	Spanish town of La Linea?  A. Yes.
2 3 4	is happy. SIR PETER CARUANA: I am very happy if you are.	2 3 4	Spanish town of La Linea?  A. Yes.  Q. Is there any part of the waters off of that
2 3 4 5	is happy. SIR PETER CARUANA: I am very happy if you are. THE CHAIRMAN: I know this question	2 3 4 5	Spanish town of La Linea?  A. Yes.  Q. Is there any part of the waters off of that beach that are other than in Spanish territorial
2 3 4 5 6	is happy. SIR PETER CARUANA: I am very happy if you are. THE CHAIRMAN: I know this question can't readily be answered but how long do	2 3 4 5 6	Spanish town of La Linea?  A. Yes.  Q. Is there any part of the waters off of that beach that are other than in Spanish territorial waters?
2 3 4 5 6 7	is happy. SIR PETER CARUANA: I am very happy if you are. THE CHAIRMAN: I know this question can't readily be answered but how long do you think you are likely to be?	2 3 4 5 6 7	Spanish town of La Linea?  A. Yes.  Q. Is there any part of the waters off of that beach that are other than in Spanish territorial waters?  A. Well, they abut Spanish territorial waters.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	is happy. SIR PETER CARUANA: I am very happy if you are. THE CHAIRMAN: I know this question can't readily be answered but how long do you think you are likely to be? MR GIBBS: I would hope about half an	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Spanish town of La Linea?  A. Yes.  Q. Is there any part of the waters off of that beach that are other than in Spanish territorial waters?  A. Well, they abut Spanish territorial waters.  Q. Yes. Is there any part of the waters
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	is happy. SIR PETER CARUANA: I am very happy if you are. THE CHAIRMAN: I know this question can't readily be answered but how long do you think you are likely to be? MR GIBBS: I would hope about half an hour. I tend not to be very long.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Spanish town of La Linea?  A. Yes.  Q. Is there any part of the waters off of that beach that are other than in Spanish territorial waters?  A. Well, they abut Spanish territorial waters.  Q. Yes. Is there any part of the waters adjacent to that beach that could conceivably
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	is happy. SIR PETER CARUANA: I am very happy if you are. THE CHAIRMAN: I know this question can't readily be answered but how long do you think you are likely to be? MR GIBBS: I would hope about half an hour. I tend not to be very long. THE CHAIRMAN: No, that is correct.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Spanish town of La Linea?  A. Yes.  Q. Is there any part of the waters off of that beach that are other than in Spanish territorial waters?  A. Well, they abut Spanish territorial waters.  Q. Yes. Is there any part of the waters adjacent to that beach that could conceivably be thought to be in British territorial waters?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	is happy. SIR PETER CARUANA: I am very happy if you are. THE CHAIRMAN: I know this question can't readily be answered but how long do you think you are likely to be? MR GIBBS: I would hope about half an hour. I tend not to be very long. THE CHAIRMAN: No, that is correct. Some people get carried away, but I would	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Spanish town of La Linea?  A. Yes.  Q. Is there any part of the waters off of that beach that are other than in Spanish territorial waters?  A. Well, they abut Spanish territorial waters.  Q. Yes. Is there any part of the waters adjacent to that beach that could conceivably be thought to be in British territorial waters?  A. I have to think about what you are saying.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	is happy.  SIR PETER CARUANA: I am very happy if you are.  THE CHAIRMAN: I know this question can't readily be answered but how long do you think you are likely to be?  MR GIBBS: I would hope about half an hour. I tend not to be very long.  THE CHAIRMAN: No, that is correct.  Some people get carried away, but I would not level that allegation against you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Spanish town of La Linea?  A. Yes.  Q. Is there any part of the waters off of that beach that are other than in Spanish territorial waters?  A. Well, they abut Spanish territorial waters.  Q. Yes. Is there any part of the waters adjacent to that beach that could conceivably be thought to be in British territorial waters?  A. I have to think about what you are saying. Is there any part of the waters —
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	is happy.  SIR PETER CARUANA: I am very happy if you are.  THE CHAIRMAN: I know this question can't readily be answered but how long do you think you are likely to be?  MR GIBBS: I would hope about half an hour. I tend not to be very long.  THE CHAIRMAN: No, that is correct.  Some people get carried away, but I would not level that allegation against you.  MR GIBBS: I will take that as	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Spanish town of La Linea?  A. Yes.  Q. Is there any part of the waters off of that beach that are other than in Spanish territorial waters?  A. Well, they abut Spanish territorial waters.  Q. Yes. Is there any part of the waters adjacent to that beach that could conceivably be thought to be in British territorial waters?  A. I have to think about what you are saying. Is there any part of the waters  Q. Sorry, I will ask you more simply.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	is happy.  SIR PETER CARUANA: I am very happy if you are.  THE CHAIRMAN: I know this question can't readily be answered but how long do you think you are likely to be?  MR GIBBS: I would hope about half an hour. I tend not to be very long.  THE CHAIRMAN: No, that is correct.  Some people get carried away, but I would not level that allegation against you.  MR GIBBS: I will take that as a compliment, thank you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Spanish town of La Linea?  A. Yes.  Q. Is there any part of the waters off of that beach that are other than in Spanish territorial waters?  A. Well, they abut Spanish territorial waters.  Q. Yes. Is there any part of the waters adjacent to that beach that could conceivably be thought to be in British territorial waters?  A. I have to think about what you are saying. Is there any part of the waters  Q. Sorry, I will ask you more simply.  A. Thank you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	is happy. SIR PETER CARUANA: I am very happy if you are. THE CHAIRMAN: I know this question can't readily be answered but how long do you think you are likely to be? MR GIBBS: I would hope about half an hour. I tend not to be very long. THE CHAIRMAN: No, that is correct. Some people get carried away, but I would not level that allegation against you. MR GIBBS: I will take that as a compliment, thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Right.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A. Yes. Q. Is there any part of the waters off of that beach that are other than in Spanish territorial waters? A. Well, they abut Spanish territorial waters. Q. Yes. Is there any part of the waters adjacent to that beach that could conceivably be thought to be in British territorial waters? A. I have to think about what you are saying. Is there any part of the waters Q. Sorry, I will ask you more simply. A. Thank you. Q. Are the waters off Santa Barbara not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	is happy.  SIR PETER CARUANA: I am very happy if you are.  THE CHAIRMAN: I know this question can't readily be answered but how long do you think you are likely to be?  MR GIBBS: I would hope about half an hour. I tend not to be very long.  THE CHAIRMAN: No, that is correct.  Some people get carried away, but I would not level that allegation against you.  MR GIBBS: I will take that as a compliment, thank you.  THE CHAIRMAN: Right.  MR SANTOS: May I just ask for some	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. Yes. Q. Is there any part of the waters off of that beach that are other than in Spanish territorial waters? A. Well, they abut Spanish territorial waters. Q. Yes. Is there any part of the waters adjacent to that beach that could conceivably be thought to be in British territorial waters? A. I have to think about what you are saying. Is there any part of the waters Q. Sorry, I will ask you more simply. A. Thank you. Q. Are the waters off Santa Barbara not necessarily outside British Gibraltar
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	is happy.  SIR PETER CARUANA: I am very happy if you are.  THE CHAIRMAN: I know this question can't readily be answered but how long do you think you are likely to be?  MR GIBBS: I would hope about half an hour. I tend not to be very long.  THE CHAIRMAN: No, that is correct.  Some people get carried away, but I would not level that allegation against you.  MR GIBBS: I will take that as a compliment, thank you.  THE CHAIRMAN: Right.  MR SANTOS: May I just ask for some consideration just from the timing for the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. Yes. Q. Is there any part of the waters off of that beach that are other than in Spanish territorial waters? A. Well, they abut Spanish territorial waters. Q. Yes. Is there any part of the waters adjacent to that beach that could conceivably be thought to be in British territorial waters? A. I have to think about what you are saying. Is there any part of the waters Q. Sorry, I will ask you more simply. A. Thank you. Q. Are the waters off Santa Barbara not necessarily outside British Gibraltar territorial waters as a matter of geometry
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	is happy.  SIR PETER CARUANA: I am very happy if you are.  THE CHAIRMAN: I know this question can't readily be answered but how long do you think you are likely to be?  MR GIBBS: I would hope about half an hour. I tend not to be very long.  THE CHAIRMAN: No, that is correct.  Some people get carried away, but I would not level that allegation against you.  MR GIBBS: I will take that as a compliment, thank you.  THE CHAIRMAN: Right.  MR SANTOS: May I just ask for some consideration just from the timing for the witness briefly, perhaps he could be allowed	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. Yes.  Q. Is there any part of the waters off of that beach that are other than in Spanish territorial waters?  A. Well, they abut Spanish territorial waters. Q. Yes. Is there any part of the waters adjacent to that beach that could conceivably be thought to be in British territorial waters?  A. I have to think about what you are saying. Is there any part of the waters Q. Sorry, I will ask you more simply.  A. Thank you. Q. Are the waters off Santa Barbara not necessarily outside British Gibraltar territorial waters as a matter of geometry A. Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	is happy.  SIR PETER CARUANA: I am very happy if you are.  THE CHAIRMAN: I know this question can't readily be answered but how long do you think you are likely to be?  MR GIBBS: I would hope about half an hour. I tend not to be very long.  THE CHAIRMAN: No, that is correct.  Some people get carried away, but I would not level that allegation against you.  MR GIBBS: I will take that as a compliment, thank you.  THE CHAIRMAN: Right.  MR SANTOS: May I just ask for some consideration just from the timing for the witness briefly, perhaps he could be allowed just a couple of minutes?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Spanish town of La Linea?  A. Yes.  Q. Is there any part of the waters off of that beach that are other than in Spanish territorial waters?  A. Well, they abut Spanish territorial waters.  Q. Yes. Is there any part of the waters adjacent to that beach that could conceivably be thought to be in British territorial waters?  A. I have to think about what you are saying. Is there any part of the waters  Q. Sorry, I will ask you more simply.  A. Thank you.  Q. Are the waters off Santa Barbara not necessarily outside British Gibraltar territorial waters as a matter of geometry  A. Yes.  Q. So the question of the exact coordinates
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	is happy.  SIR PETER CARUANA: I am very happy if you are.  THE CHAIRMAN: I know this question can't readily be answered but how long do you think you are likely to be?  MR GIBBS: I would hope about half an hour. I tend not to be very long.  THE CHAIRMAN: No, that is correct.  Some people get carried away, but I would not level that allegation against you.  MR GIBBS: I will take that as a compliment, thank you.  THE CHAIRMAN: Right.  MR SANTOS: May I just ask for some consideration just from the timing for the witness briefly, perhaps he could be allowed just a couple of minutes?  THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. I think that's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. Yes.  Q. Is there any part of the waters off of that beach that are other than in Spanish territorial waters?  A. Well, they abut Spanish territorial waters. Q. Yes. Is there any part of the waters adjacent to that beach that could conceivably be thought to be in British territorial waters?  A. I have to think about what you are saying. Is there any part of the waters Q. Sorry, I will ask you more simply.  A. Thank you. Q. Are the waters off Santa Barbara not necessarily outside British Gibraltar territorial waters as a matter of geometry A. Yes. Q. So the question of the exact coordinates is relevant to what? At what stage was it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	is happy.  SIR PETER CARUANA: I am very happy if you are.  THE CHAIRMAN: I know this question can't readily be answered but how long do you think you are likely to be?  MR GIBBS: I would hope about half an hour. I tend not to be very long.  THE CHAIRMAN: No, that is correct.  Some people get carried away, but I would not level that allegation against you.  MR GIBBS: I will take that as a compliment, thank you.  THE CHAIRMAN: Right.  MR SANTOS: May I just ask for some consideration just from the timing for the witness briefly, perhaps he could be allowed just a couple of minutes?  THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. I think that's a good idea. We will have a short, short	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. Yes.  Q. Is there any part of the waters off of that beach that are other than in Spanish territorial waters?  A. Well, they abut Spanish territorial waters. Q. Yes. Is there any part of the waters adjacent to that beach that could conceivably be thought to be in British territorial waters?  A. I have to think about what you are saying. Is there any part of the waters Q. Sorry, I will ask you more simply.  A. Thank you. Q. Are the waters off Santa Barbara not necessarily outside British Gibraltar territorial waters as a matter of geometry A. Yes. Q. So the question of the exact coordinates is relevant to what? At what stage was it clear in your mind that wherever precisely it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	is happy.  SIR PETER CARUANA: I am very happy if you are.  THE CHAIRMAN: I know this question can't readily be answered but how long do you think you are likely to be?  MR GIBBS: I would hope about half an hour. I tend not to be very long.  THE CHAIRMAN: No, that is correct.  Some people get carried away, but I would not level that allegation against you.  MR GIBBS: I will take that as a compliment, thank you.  THE CHAIRMAN: Right.  MR SANTOS: May I just ask for some consideration just from the timing for the witness briefly, perhaps he could be allowed just a couple of minutes?  THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. I think that's a good idea. We will have a short, short break. Then quarter of an hour or so and you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Spanish town of La Linea?  A. Yes.  Q. Is there any part of the waters off of that beach that are other than in Spanish territorial waters?  A. Well, they abut Spanish territorial waters. Q. Yes. Is there any part of the waters adjacent to that beach that could conceivably be thought to be in British territorial waters?  A. I have to think about what you are saying. Is there any part of the waters Q. Sorry, I will ask you more simply.  A. Thank you. Q. Are the waters off Santa Barbara not necessarily outside British Gibraltar territorial waters as a matter of geometry A. Yes. Q. So the question of the exact coordinates is relevant to what? At what stage was it clear in your mind that wherever precisely it might have happened as a matter of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	is happy.  SIR PETER CARUANA: I am very happy if you are.  THE CHAIRMAN: I know this question can't readily be answered but how long do you think you are likely to be?  MR GIBBS: I would hope about half an hour. I tend not to be very long.  THE CHAIRMAN: No, that is correct.  Some people get carried away, but I would not level that allegation against you.  MR GIBBS: I will take that as a compliment, thank you.  THE CHAIRMAN: Right.  MR SANTOS: May I just ask for some consideration just from the timing for the witness briefly, perhaps he could be allowed just a couple of minutes?  THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. I think that's a good idea. We will have a short, short break. Then quarter of an hour or so and you break at some convenient point. Okay?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Spanish town of La Linea?  A. Yes.  Q. Is there any part of the waters off of that beach that are other than in Spanish territorial waters?  A. Well, they abut Spanish territorial waters. Q. Yes. Is there any part of the waters adjacent to that beach that could conceivably be thought to be in British territorial waters?  A. I have to think about what you are saying. Is there any part of the waters Q. Sorry, I will ask you more simply.  A. Thank you. Q. Are the waters off Santa Barbara not necessarily outside British Gibraltar territorial waters as a matter of geometry A. Yes. Q. So the question of the exact coordinates is relevant to what? At what stage was it clear in your mind that wherever precisely it might have happened as a matter of coordinates, that this collision did not take
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	is happy.  SIR PETER CARUANA: I am very happy if you are.  THE CHAIRMAN: I know this question can't readily be answered but how long do you think you are likely to be?  MR GIBBS: I would hope about half an hour. I tend not to be very long.  THE CHAIRMAN: No, that is correct.  Some people get carried away, but I would not level that allegation against you.  MR GIBBS: I will take that as a compliment, thank you.  THE CHAIRMAN: Right.  MR SANTOS: May I just ask for some consideration just from the timing for the witness briefly, perhaps he could be allowed just a couple of minutes?  THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. I think that's a good idea. We will have a short, short break. Then quarter of an hour or so and you break at some convenient point. Okay?  SIR PETER CARUANA: Yes, sir.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. Yes.  Q. Is there any part of the waters off of that beach that are other than in Spanish territorial waters?  A. Well, they abut Spanish territorial waters. Q. Yes. Is there any part of the waters adjacent to that beach that could conceivably be thought to be in British territorial waters?  A. I have to think about what you are saying. Is there any part of the waters Q. Sorry, I will ask you more simply.  A. Thank you. Q. Are the waters off Santa Barbara not necessarily outside British Gibraltar territorial waters as a matter of geometry A. Yes. Q. So the question of the exact coordinates is relevant to what? At what stage was it clear in your mind that wherever precisely it might have happened as a matter of coordinates, that this collision did not take place in British Gibraltar territorial waters?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	is happy.  SIR PETER CARUANA: I am very happy if you are.  THE CHAIRMAN: I know this question can't readily be answered but how long do you think you are likely to be?  MR GIBBS: I would hope about half an hour. I tend not to be very long.  THE CHAIRMAN: No, that is correct.  Some people get carried away, but I would not level that allegation against you.  MR GIBBS: I will take that as a compliment, thank you.  THE CHAIRMAN: Right.  MR SANTOS: May I just ask for some consideration just from the timing for the witness briefly, perhaps he could be allowed just a couple of minutes?  THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. I think that's a good idea. We will have a short, short break. Then quarter of an hour or so and you break at some convenient point. Okay?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Spanish town of La Linea?  A. Yes.  Q. Is there any part of the waters off of that beach that are other than in Spanish territorial waters?  A. Well, they abut Spanish territorial waters. Q. Yes. Is there any part of the waters adjacent to that beach that could conceivably be thought to be in British territorial waters?  A. I have to think about what you are saying. Is there any part of the waters Q. Sorry, I will ask you more simply.  A. Thank you. Q. Are the waters off Santa Barbara not necessarily outside British Gibraltar territorial waters as a matter of geometry A. Yes. Q. So the question of the exact coordinates is relevant to what? At what stage was it clear in your mind that wherever precisely it might have happened as a matter of coordinates, that this collision did not take
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	is happy.  SIR PETER CARUANA: I am very happy if you are.  THE CHAIRMAN: I know this question can't readily be answered but how long do you think you are likely to be?  MR GIBBS: I would hope about half an hour. I tend not to be very long.  THE CHAIRMAN: No, that is correct.  Some people get carried away, but I would not level that allegation against you.  MR GIBBS: I will take that as a compliment, thank you.  THE CHAIRMAN: Right.  MR SANTOS: May I just ask for some consideration just from the timing for the witness briefly, perhaps he could be allowed just a couple of minutes?  THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. I think that's a good idea. We will have a short, short break. Then quarter of an hour or so and you break at some convenient point. Okay?  SIR PETER CARUANA: Yes, sir.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. Yes.  Q. Is there any part of the waters off of that beach that are other than in Spanish territorial waters?  A. Well, they abut Spanish territorial waters. Q. Yes. Is there any part of the waters adjacent to that beach that could conceivably be thought to be in British territorial waters?  A. I have to think about what you are saying. Is there any part of the waters Q. Sorry, I will ask you more simply.  A. Thank you. Q. Are the waters off Santa Barbara not necessarily outside British Gibraltar territorial waters as a matter of geometry A. Yes. Q. So the question of the exact coordinates is relevant to what? At what stage was it clear in your mind that wherever precisely it might have happened as a matter of coordinates, that this collision did not take place in British Gibraltar territorial waters?

1	in your mind about that?	1	to say that.
2	A. I don't think that I had any doubt in my	2	THE WITNESS: I can't remember what the
3	mind that the collision had happened other	3	question was.
4	than outside the Gibraltar territorial waters.	4	SIR PETER CARUANA: Which question?
5	What the issue in my mind was what part,	5	The one that led to the answer that the
6	if any, had the chase happened in Gibraltar	6	Chairman has just read out to you?
7	territorial waters.	7	A. The question that you are waiting for an
8	Q. So Gold Command had no doubt at all	8	answer from me, sir.
9	that it had happened in Spanish territorial	9	Q. I have asked you two questions. One,
10	waters?	10	whether the waters of the Santa Barbara
11	A. No, sir, I didn't say that. I said in my	11	beach are capable of being in British waters,
12	mind, I believed that it would have happened	12	and then I have asked you at what time you
13	outside of Gibraltar British Gibraltar	13	became clear in your mind that the incident
14	territorial waters.	14	had not happened in British waters, to which
15	Q. Your mind being what was your status	15	you gave the answer that the Chairman has
16	in that group?	16	just
17	A. I was the the title was Deputy Gold.	17	A. The first question is no, the waters
18	I was assisting Mr McGrail.	18	outside the beach can't be BGTW, and with
19	Q. Yes. So you were the second most senior	19	regard to what time was I clear in my mind
20	officer in charge of the incident response for	20	that it had happened, I have to rephrase what
21	the RGP and you were absolutely clear in	21	I said before. I'm not certain at what time I
22	your mind that the collision had happened in	22	knew that it was clear that it happened
23	Spanish territorial waters?	23	outside of Gibraltar territorial waters.
24	THE CHAIRMAN: He didn't say that. He	24	It was a very murky picture during those first
25	didn't say that. He said it was outside	25	few hours. We hadn't had any information
	•		·
	Page 237		Page 239
1	D(4) -1.	1	6 4h 66
1	British	1	from the officers themselves as to where it
2	SIR PETER CARUANA: I beg your pardon.	2	happened, and we didn't know at that time
2 3	SIR PETER CARUANA: I beg your pardon. To be clear, outside of British Gibraltar	2 3	happened, and we didn't know at that time that the AIS had been switched off.
2 3 4	SIR PETER CARUANA: I beg your pardon. To be clear, outside of British Gibraltar territorial waters?	2 3 4	happened, and we didn't know at that time that the AIS had been switched off.  Q. I see. So your evidence now is that even
2 3 4 5	SIR PETER CARUANA: I beg your pardon. To be clear, outside of British Gibraltar territorial waters?  A. I wouldn't say absolutely clear in my	2 3 4 5	happened, and we didn't know at that time that the AIS had been switched off.  Q. I see. So your evidence now is that even in respect of the collision you are clear that it
2 3 4 5 6	SIR PETER CARUANA: I beg your pardon. To be clear, outside of British Gibraltar territorial waters? A. I wouldn't say absolutely clear in my mind because we didn't know the coordinates	2 3 4 5 6	happened, and we didn't know at that time that the AIS had been switched off.  Q. I see. So your evidence now is that even in respect of the collision you are clear that it happened outside of British waters but you
2 3 4 5 6 7	SIR PETER CARUANA: I beg your pardon. To be clear, outside of British Gibraltar territorial waters?  A. I wouldn't say absolutely clear in my mind because we didn't know the coordinates until later.	2 3 4 5 6 7	happened, and we didn't know at that time that the AIS had been switched off.  Q. I see. So your evidence now is that even in respect of the collision you are clear that it happened outside of British waters but you are no longer clear about the time that you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	SIR PETER CARUANA: I beg your pardon. To be clear, outside of British Gibraltar territorial waters?  A. I wouldn't say absolutely clear in my mind because we didn't know the coordinates until later. (16.39)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	happened, and we didn't know at that time that the AIS had been switched off.  Q. I see. So your evidence now is that even in respect of the collision you are clear that it happened outside of British waters but you are no longer clear about the time that you discovered it. Is that the clarification that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	SIR PETER CARUANA: I beg your pardon. To be clear, outside of British Gibraltar territorial waters?  A. I wouldn't say absolutely clear in my mind because we didn't know the coordinates until later. (16.39) Q. Well, you have said you had no doubt.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	happened, and we didn't know at that time that the AIS had been switched off.  Q. I see. So your evidence now is that even in respect of the collision you are clear that it happened outside of British waters but you are no longer clear about the time that you discovered it. Is that the clarification that you are making?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	SIR PETER CARUANA: I beg your pardon. To be clear, outside of British Gibraltar territorial waters?  A. I wouldn't say absolutely clear in my mind because we didn't know the coordinates until later. (16.39) Q. Well, you have said you had no doubt. About what did you say a few moments ago	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	happened, and we didn't know at that time that the AIS had been switched off.  Q. I see. So your evidence now is that even in respect of the collision you are clear that it happened outside of British waters but you are no longer clear about the time that you discovered it. Is that the clarification that you are making?  A. Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	SIR PETER CARUANA: I beg your pardon. To be clear, outside of British Gibraltar territorial waters?  A. I wouldn't say absolutely clear in my mind because we didn't know the coordinates until later. (16.39) Q. Well, you have said you had no doubt. About what did you say a few moments ago you had no doubt?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	happened, and we didn't know at that time that the AIS had been switched off.  Q. I see. So your evidence now is that even in respect of the collision you are clear that it happened outside of British waters but you are no longer clear about the time that you discovered it. Is that the clarification that you are making?  A. Yes.  Q. So what you are saying is that it has not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	SIR PETER CARUANA: I beg your pardon. To be clear, outside of British Gibraltar territorial waters?  A. I wouldn't say absolutely clear in my mind because we didn't know the coordinates until later. (16.39) Q. Well, you have said you had no doubt. About what did you say a few moments ago you had no doubt?  A. I can't remember what the question was.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	happened, and we didn't know at that time that the AIS had been switched off.  Q. I see. So your evidence now is that even in respect of the collision you are clear that it happened outside of British waters but you are no longer clear about the time that you discovered it. Is that the clarification that you are making?  A. Yes.  Q. So what you are saying is that it has not always been clear to you from the very first
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	SIR PETER CARUANA: I beg your pardon. To be clear, outside of British Gibraltar territorial waters?  A. I wouldn't say absolutely clear in my mind because we didn't know the coordinates until later. (16.39) Q. Well, you have said you had no doubt. About what did you say a few moments ago you had no doubt?  A. I can't remember what the question was. THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I remember	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	happened, and we didn't know at that time that the AIS had been switched off.  Q. I see. So your evidence now is that even in respect of the collision you are clear that it happened outside of British waters but you are no longer clear about the time that you discovered it. Is that the clarification that you are making?  A. Yes.  Q. So what you are saying is that it has not always been clear to you from the very first moment you discovered the incident.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	SIR PETER CARUANA: I beg your pardon. To be clear, outside of British Gibraltar territorial waters?  A. I wouldn't say absolutely clear in my mind because we didn't know the coordinates until later. (16.39) Q. Well, you have said you had no doubt. About what did you say a few moments ago you had no doubt?  A. I can't remember what the question was. THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I remember exactly what you said. My note of what you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	happened, and we didn't know at that time that the AIS had been switched off.  Q. I see. So your evidence now is that even in respect of the collision you are clear that it happened outside of British waters but you are no longer clear about the time that you discovered it. Is that the clarification that you are making?  A. Yes.  Q. So what you are saying is that it has not always been clear to you from the very first moment you discovered the incident.  A. No, I think my notes, sir, say that we
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	SIR PETER CARUANA: I beg your pardon. To be clear, outside of British Gibraltar territorial waters?  A. I wouldn't say absolutely clear in my mind because we didn't know the coordinates until later. (16.39) Q. Well, you have said you had no doubt. About what did you say a few moments ago you had no doubt?  A. I can't remember what the question was. THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I remember exactly what you said. My note of what you said is: "I was clear in my mind that the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	happened, and we didn't know at that time that the AIS had been switched off.  Q. I see. So your evidence now is that even in respect of the collision you are clear that it happened outside of British waters but you are no longer clear about the time that you discovered it. Is that the clarification that you are making?  A. Yes.  Q. So what you are saying is that it has not always been clear to you from the very first moment you discovered the incident.  A. No, I think my notes, sir, say that we believed at the beginning that it happened
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	SIR PETER CARUANA: I beg your pardon. To be clear, outside of British Gibraltar territorial waters?  A. I wouldn't say absolutely clear in my mind because we didn't know the coordinates until later. (16.39) Q. Well, you have said you had no doubt. About what did you say a few moments ago you had no doubt?  A. I can't remember what the question was. THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I remember exactly what you said. My note of what you said is: "I was clear in my mind that the collision had occurred outside British	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	happened, and we didn't know at that time that the AIS had been switched off.  Q. I see. So your evidence now is that even in respect of the collision you are clear that it happened outside of British waters but you are no longer clear about the time that you discovered it. Is that the clarification that you are making?  A. Yes.  Q. So what you are saying is that it has not always been clear to you from the very first moment you discovered the incident.  A. No, I think my notes, sir, say that we believed at the beginning that it happened within Gibraltar territorial waters.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	SIR PETER CARUANA: I beg your pardon. To be clear, outside of British Gibraltar territorial waters?  A. I wouldn't say absolutely clear in my mind because we didn't know the coordinates until later. (16.39) Q. Well, you have said you had no doubt. About what did you say a few moments ago you had no doubt?  A. I can't remember what the question was. THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I remember exactly what you said. My note of what you said is: "I was clear in my mind that the collision had occurred outside British Gibraltar territorial waters." You drew a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	happened, and we didn't know at that time that the AIS had been switched off.  Q. I see. So your evidence now is that even in respect of the collision you are clear that it happened outside of British waters but you are no longer clear about the time that you discovered it. Is that the clarification that you are making?  A. Yes.  Q. So what you are saying is that it has not always been clear to you from the very first moment you discovered the incident.  A. No, I think my notes, sir, say that we believed at the beginning that it happened within Gibraltar territorial waters.  Q. As to the presence or not of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	SIR PETER CARUANA: I beg your pardon. To be clear, outside of British Gibraltar territorial waters?  A. I wouldn't say absolutely clear in my mind because we didn't know the coordinates until later. (16.39) Q. Well, you have said you had no doubt. About what did you say a few moments ago you had no doubt?  A. I can't remember what the question was. THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I remember exactly what you said. My note of what you said is: "I was clear in my mind that the collision had occurred outside British Gibraltar territorial waters." You drew a distinction between being certain about the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	happened, and we didn't know at that time that the AIS had been switched off.  Q. I see. So your evidence now is that even in respect of the collision you are clear that it happened outside of British waters but you are no longer clear about the time that you discovered it. Is that the clarification that you are making?  A. Yes.  Q. So what you are saying is that it has not always been clear to you from the very first moment you discovered the incident.  A. No, I think my notes, sir, say that we believed at the beginning that it happened within Gibraltar territorial waters.  Q. As to the presence or not of the Governor, I think your evidence was that you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	SIR PETER CARUANA: I beg your pardon. To be clear, outside of British Gibraltar territorial waters?  A. I wouldn't say absolutely clear in my mind because we didn't know the coordinates until later. (16.39) Q. Well, you have said you had no doubt. About what did you say a few moments ago you had no doubt?  A. I can't remember what the question was. THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I remember exactly what you said. My note of what you said is: "I was clear in my mind that the collision had occurred outside British Gibraltar territorial waters." You drew a distinction between being certain about the position of the collision but not being certain	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	happened, and we didn't know at that time that the AIS had been switched off.  Q. I see. So your evidence now is that even in respect of the collision you are clear that it happened outside of British waters but you are no longer clear about the time that you discovered it. Is that the clarification that you are making?  A. Yes.  Q. So what you are saying is that it has not always been clear to you from the very first moment you discovered the incident.  A. No, I think my notes, sir, say that we believed at the beginning that it happened within Gibraltar territorial waters.  Q. As to the presence or not of the Governor, I think your evidence was that you could not remember at what time, at what
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	SIR PETER CARUANA: I beg your pardon. To be clear, outside of British Gibraltar territorial waters?  A. I wouldn't say absolutely clear in my mind because we didn't know the coordinates until later. (16.39) Q. Well, you have said you had no doubt. About what did you say a few moments ago you had no doubt?  A. I can't remember what the question was. THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I remember exactly what you said. My note of what you said is: "I was clear in my mind that the collision had occurred outside British Gibraltar territorial waters." You drew a distinction between being certain about the position of the collision but not being certain in your mind about where the chase had	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	happened, and we didn't know at that time that the AIS had been switched off.  Q. I see. So your evidence now is that even in respect of the collision you are clear that it happened outside of British waters but you are no longer clear about the time that you discovered it. Is that the clarification that you are making?  A. Yes.  Q. So what you are saying is that it has not always been clear to you from the very first moment you discovered the incident.  A. No, I think my notes, sir, say that we believed at the beginning that it happened within Gibraltar territorial waters.  Q. As to the presence or not of the Governor, I think your evidence was that you could not remember at what time, at what stage of the proceedings, the Governor had
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	SIR PETER CARUANA: I beg your pardon. To be clear, outside of British Gibraltar territorial waters?  A. I wouldn't say absolutely clear in my mind because we didn't know the coordinates until later. (16.39) Q. Well, you have said you had no doubt. About what did you say a few moments ago you had no doubt?  A. I can't remember what the question was. THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I remember exactly what you said. My note of what you said is: "I was clear in my mind that the collision had occurred outside British Gibraltar territorial waters." You drew a distinction between being certain about the position of the collision but not being certain in your mind about where the chase had A. Exactly, sir, that is my recollection.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	happened, and we didn't know at that time that the AIS had been switched off.  Q. I see. So your evidence now is that even in respect of the collision you are clear that it happened outside of British waters but you are no longer clear about the time that you discovered it. Is that the clarification that you are making?  A. Yes.  Q. So what you are saying is that it has not always been clear to you from the very first moment you discovered the incident.  A. No, I think my notes, sir, say that we believed at the beginning that it happened within Gibraltar territorial waters.  Q. As to the presence or not of the Governor, I think your evidence was that you could not remember at what time, at what stage of the proceedings, the Governor had come. Can you be shown A 801, please.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	SIR PETER CARUANA: I beg your pardon. To be clear, outside of British Gibraltar territorial waters?  A. I wouldn't say absolutely clear in my mind because we didn't know the coordinates until later. (16.39) Q. Well, you have said you had no doubt. About what did you say a few moments ago you had no doubt?  A. I can't remember what the question was. THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I remember exactly what you said. My note of what you said is: "I was clear in my mind that the collision had occurred outside British Gibraltar territorial waters." You drew a distinction between being certain about the position of the collision but not being certain in your mind about where the chase had A. Exactly, sir, that is my recollection. SIR PETER CARUANA: That is my	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	happened, and we didn't know at that time that the AIS had been switched off.  Q. I see. So your evidence now is that even in respect of the collision you are clear that it happened outside of British waters but you are no longer clear about the time that you discovered it. Is that the clarification that you are making?  A. Yes.  Q. So what you are saying is that it has not always been clear to you from the very first moment you discovered the incident.  A. No, I think my notes, sir, say that we believed at the beginning that it happened within Gibraltar territorial waters.  Q. As to the presence or not of the Governor, I think your evidence was that you could not remember at what time, at what stage of the proceedings, the Governor had come. Can you be shown A 801, please.  This is the witness statement of Mr Field.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	SIR PETER CARUANA: I beg your pardon. To be clear, outside of British Gibraltar territorial waters?  A. I wouldn't say absolutely clear in my mind because we didn't know the coordinates until later. (16.39)  Q. Well, you have said you had no doubt. About what did you say a few moments ago you had no doubt?  A. I can't remember what the question was. THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I remember exactly what you said. My note of what you said is: "I was clear in my mind that the collision had occurred outside British Gibraltar territorial waters." You drew a distinction between being certain about the position of the collision but not being certain in your mind about where the chase had A. Exactly, sir, that is my recollection.  SIR PETER CARUANA: That is my recollection too, sir.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	happened, and we didn't know at that time that the AIS had been switched off.  Q. I see. So your evidence now is that even in respect of the collision you are clear that it happened outside of British waters but you are no longer clear about the time that you discovered it. Is that the clarification that you are making?  A. Yes.  Q. So what you are saying is that it has not always been clear to you from the very first moment you discovered the incident.  A. No, I think my notes, sir, say that we believed at the beginning that it happened within Gibraltar territorial waters.  Q. As to the presence or not of the Governor, I think your evidence was that you could not remember at what time, at what stage of the proceedings, the Governor had come. Can you be shown A 801, please.  This is the witness statement of Mr Field. Paragraph 38. Do you see what he says
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	SIR PETER CARUANA: I beg your pardon. To be clear, outside of British Gibraltar territorial waters?  A. I wouldn't say absolutely clear in my mind because we didn't know the coordinates until later. (16.39)  Q. Well, you have said you had no doubt. About what did you say a few moments ago you had no doubt?  A. I can't remember what the question was. THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I remember exactly what you said. My note of what you said is: "I was clear in my mind that the collision had occurred outside British Gibraltar territorial waters." You drew a distinction between being certain about the position of the collision but not being certain in your mind about where the chase had A. Exactly, sir, that is my recollection.  SIR PETER CARUANA: That is my recollection too, sir. THE CHAIRMAN: I might have	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	happened, and we didn't know at that time that the AIS had been switched off.  Q. I see. So your evidence now is that even in respect of the collision you are clear that it happened outside of British waters but you are no longer clear about the time that you discovered it. Is that the clarification that you are making?  A. Yes.  Q. So what you are saying is that it has not always been clear to you from the very first moment you discovered the incident.  A. No, I think my notes, sir, say that we believed at the beginning that it happened within Gibraltar territorial waters.  Q. As to the presence or not of the Governor, I think your evidence was that you could not remember at what time, at what stage of the proceedings, the Governor had come. Can you be shown A 801, please.  This is the witness statement of Mr Field.  Paragraph 38. Do you see what he says there: "At 11.05 I [that is to say Mr Field]
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	SIR PETER CARUANA: I beg your pardon. To be clear, outside of British Gibraltar territorial waters?  A. I wouldn't say absolutely clear in my mind because we didn't know the coordinates until later. (16.39)  Q. Well, you have said you had no doubt. About what did you say a few moments ago you had no doubt?  A. I can't remember what the question was. THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I remember exactly what you said. My note of what you said is: "I was clear in my mind that the collision had occurred outside British Gibraltar territorial waters." You drew a distinction between being certain about the position of the collision but not being certain in your mind about where the chase had A. Exactly, sir, that is my recollection.  SIR PETER CARUANA: That is my recollection too, sir.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	happened, and we didn't know at that time that the AIS had been switched off.  Q. I see. So your evidence now is that even in respect of the collision you are clear that it happened outside of British waters but you are no longer clear about the time that you discovered it. Is that the clarification that you are making?  A. Yes.  Q. So what you are saying is that it has not always been clear to you from the very first moment you discovered the incident.  A. No, I think my notes, sir, say that we believed at the beginning that it happened within Gibraltar territorial waters.  Q. As to the presence or not of the Governor, I think your evidence was that you could not remember at what time, at what stage of the proceedings, the Governor had come. Can you be shown A 801, please.  This is the witness statement of Mr Field. Paragraph 38. Do you see what he says
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	SIR PETER CARUANA: I beg your pardon. To be clear, outside of British Gibraltar territorial waters?  A. I wouldn't say absolutely clear in my mind because we didn't know the coordinates until later. (16.39)  Q. Well, you have said you had no doubt. About what did you say a few moments ago you had no doubt?  A. I can't remember what the question was. THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I remember exactly what you said. My note of what you said is: "I was clear in my mind that the collision had occurred outside British Gibraltar territorial waters." You drew a distinction between being certain about the position of the collision but not being certain in your mind about where the chase had A. Exactly, sir, that is my recollection.  SIR PETER CARUANA: That is my recollection too, sir. THE CHAIRMAN: I might have	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	happened, and we didn't know at that time that the AIS had been switched off.  Q. I see. So your evidence now is that even in respect of the collision you are clear that it happened outside of British waters but you are no longer clear about the time that you discovered it. Is that the clarification that you are making?  A. Yes.  Q. So what you are saying is that it has not always been clear to you from the very first moment you discovered the incident.  A. No, I think my notes, sir, say that we believed at the beginning that it happened within Gibraltar territorial waters.  Q. As to the presence or not of the Governor, I think your evidence was that you could not remember at what time, at what stage of the proceedings, the Governor had come. Can you be shown A 801, please.  This is the witness statement of Mr Field.  Paragraph 38. Do you see what he says there: "At 11.05 I [that is to say Mr Field]

1	Superintendent Paul Richardson, and the	1	which you were present with the Governor.
2	Attorney General Mr Llamas who was also	2	How many meetings was that?
3	there, concerning the suspected exact	3	MR GIBBS: That might have been five
4	coordinates." Do you see that?	4	questions.
5	A. Yes, I do.	5	SIR PETER CARUANA: I beg your pardon.
6	Q. Does it help you, given that His	6	(To the witness) I just want to clarify what
7	Excellency the Governor is not mentioned in	7	you meant by your answer
8	that list, would you accept on the basis of Mr	8	THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Wagner's question
9	Field's sworn evidence that the Governor was	9	was rather loosely drafted and the witness -
10	not present when the exact coordinates	10	SIR PETER CARUANA: I am just trying to
11	briefing was being given to Mr Llamas.	11	narrow the scope of the answer.
12	A. It would appear so but I don't recall Mr	12	THE CHAIRMAN: The witness did not pick
13	Field briefing us either.	13	that up.
14	Q. You do not recall that either. I am just	14	SIR PETER CARUANA: I see. That is all I
		15	
15	asking you whether you accept, you have any reason to doubt Mr Field's evidence about	16	am trying to achieve, to just narrow the
16	this.	1	question.
17		17	THE CHAIRMAN: I have the point.
18	A. No.	18	SIR PETER CARUANA: You have the
19	Q. And you said in answer to my learned	19	point, okay. (To the witness) Mr
20	friend Mr Wagner that you did not think that	20	Richardson, do you think that everything that
21	the Commissioner of Police was deliberately	21	is not illegal is proper?
22	keeping information from the Governor. Do	22	A. Sorry, do I think that everything that is
23	you remember saying that?	23	not illegal is not proper?
24	A. Yes, I do.	24	Q. Is proper.
25	Q. How do you know whether whatever Mr	25	A. Do I think that everything that is not
	Page 241		Page 243
		1	
	N. G. 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11		
1	McGrail did or did not do was deliberate or	1	illegal is proper? No.
2	not?	2	Q. So things can be improper then even if
2 3	not? A. Well, I wouldn't know if he was	2 3	Q. So things can be improper then even if they are not illegal.
2 3 4	not? A. Well, I wouldn't know if he was deliberately keeping, in terms of he knew	2 3 4	<ul><li>Q. So things can be improper then even if they are not illegal.</li><li>A. Yes.</li></ul>
2 3 4 5	not? A. Well, I wouldn't know if he was deliberately keeping, in terms of he knew some information that he was withholding.	2 3 4 5	<ul><li>Q. So things can be improper then even if they are not illegal.</li><li>A. Yes.</li><li>Q. And do you think that covertly recording</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6	not? A. Well, I wouldn't know if he was deliberately keeping, in terms of he knew some information that he was withholding. I'm saying that I didn't think that there was	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>Q. So things can be improper then even if they are not illegal.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And do you think that covertly recording senior officers of the Government in</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	not? A. Well, I wouldn't know if he was deliberately keeping, in terms of he knew some information that he was withholding. I'm saying that I didn't think that there was anything that we knew that was being held	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>Q. So things can be improper then even if they are not illegal.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And do you think that covertly recording senior officers of the Government in meetings affecting the conduct of</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	not? A. Well, I wouldn't know if he was deliberately keeping, in terms of he knew some information that he was withholding. I'm saying that I didn't think that there was anything that we knew that was being held from the Governor.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>Q. So things can be improper then even if they are not illegal.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And do you think that covertly recording senior officers of the Government in meetings affecting the conduct of confidential business of this kind is proper or</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	not? A. Well, I wouldn't know if he was deliberately keeping, in terms of he knew some information that he was withholding. I'm saying that I didn't think that there was anything that we knew that was being held from the Governor.  Q. That you are aware.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q. So things can be improper then even if they are not illegal.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And do you think that covertly recording senior officers of the Government in meetings affecting the conduct of confidential business of this kind is proper or improper?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	not? A. Well, I wouldn't know if he was deliberately keeping, in terms of he knew some information that he was withholding. I'm saying that I didn't think that there was anything that we knew that was being held from the Governor.  Q. That you are aware.  A. That I'm aware, yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q. So things can be improper then even if they are not illegal.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And do you think that covertly recording senior officers of the Government in meetings affecting the conduct of confidential business of this kind is proper or improper?</li> <li>A. It is irregular. I think whether it's proper</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	not? A. Well, I wouldn't know if he was deliberately keeping, in terms of he knew some information that he was withholding. I'm saying that I didn't think that there was anything that we knew that was being held from the Governor. Q. That you are aware. A. That I'm aware, yes. Q. But are you aware of what he was saying	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>Q. So things can be improper then even if they are not illegal.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And do you think that covertly recording senior officers of the Government in meetings affecting the conduct of confidential business of this kind is proper or improper?</li> <li>A. It is irregular. I think whether it's proper or not depends on the circumstances.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	not? A. Well, I wouldn't know if he was deliberately keeping, in terms of he knew some information that he was withholding. I'm saying that I didn't think that there was anything that we knew that was being held from the Governor. Q. That you are aware. A. That I'm aware, yes. Q. But are you aware of what he was saying to the Governor?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Q. So things can be improper then even if they are not illegal.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And do you think that covertly recording senior officers of the Government in meetings affecting the conduct of confidential business of this kind is proper or improper?</li> <li>A. It is irregular. I think whether it's proper or not depends on the circumstances.</li> <li>Q. What circumstances do you think render</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	not? A. Well, I wouldn't know if he was deliberately keeping, in terms of he knew some information that he was withholding. I'm saying that I didn't think that there was anything that we knew that was being held from the Governor. Q. That you are aware. A. That I'm aware, yes. Q. But are you aware of what he was saying to the Governor? A. I think I was present during all the time	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Q. So things can be improper then even if they are not illegal.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And do you think that covertly recording senior officers of the Government in meetings affecting the conduct of confidential business of this kind is proper or improper?</li> <li>A. It is irregular. I think whether it's proper or not depends on the circumstances.</li> <li>Q. What circumstances do you think render it proper?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	not? A. Well, I wouldn't know if he was deliberately keeping, in terms of he knew some information that he was withholding. I'm saying that I didn't think that there was anything that we knew that was being held from the Governor. Q. That you are aware. A. That I'm aware, yes. Q. But are you aware of what he was saying to the Governor? A. I think I was present during all the time that the Governor was there.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Q. So things can be improper then even if they are not illegal.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And do you think that covertly recording senior officers of the Government in meetings affecting the conduct of confidential business of this kind is proper or improper?</li> <li>A. It is irregular. I think whether it's proper or not depends on the circumstances.</li> <li>Q. What circumstances do you think render it proper?</li> <li>A. For example, as I assume in this case the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A. Well, I wouldn't know if he was deliberately keeping, in terms of he knew some information that he was withholding. I'm saying that I didn't think that there was anything that we knew that was being held from the Governor.  Q. That you are aware.  A. That I'm aware, yes.  Q. But are you aware of what he was saying to the Governor?  A. I think I was present during all the time that the Governor was there.  Q. So your answer - let us be clear - applies	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Q. So things can be improper then even if they are not illegal.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And do you think that covertly recording senior officers of the Government in meetings affecting the conduct of confidential business of this kind is proper or improper?</li> <li>A. It is irregular. I think whether it's proper or not depends on the circumstances.</li> <li>Q. What circumstances do you think render it proper?</li> <li>A. For example, as I assume in this case the Commissioner believed that he needed to</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. Well, I wouldn't know if he was deliberately keeping, in terms of he knew some information that he was withholding. I'm saying that I didn't think that there was anything that we knew that was being held from the Governor.  Q. That you are aware.  A. That I'm aware, yes.  Q. But are you aware of what he was saying to the Governor?  A. I think I was present during all the time that the Governor was there.  Q. So your answer - let us be clear - applies only to what you witnessed personally in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Q. So things can be improper then even if they are not illegal.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And do you think that covertly recording senior officers of the Government in meetings affecting the conduct of confidential business of this kind is proper or improper?</li> <li>A. It is irregular. I think whether it's proper or not depends on the circumstances.</li> <li>Q. What circumstances do you think render it proper?</li> <li>A. For example, as I assume in this case the Commissioner believed that he needed to keep an accurate record because he believed,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. Well, I wouldn't know if he was deliberately keeping, in terms of he knew some information that he was withholding. I'm saying that I didn't think that there was anything that we knew that was being held from the Governor.  Q. That you are aware.  A. That I'm aware, yes.  Q. But are you aware of what he was saying to the Governor?  A. I think I was present during all the time that the Governor was there.  Q. So your answer - let us be clear - applies only to what you witnessed personally in meetings.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Q. So things can be improper then even if they are not illegal.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And do you think that covertly recording senior officers of the Government in meetings affecting the conduct of confidential business of this kind is proper or improper?</li> <li>A. It is irregular. I think whether it's proper or not depends on the circumstances.</li> <li>Q. What circumstances do you think render it proper?</li> <li>A. For example, as I assume in this case the Commissioner believed that he needed to keep an accurate record because he believed, for whatever reasons, that if in the absence of</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. Well, I wouldn't know if he was deliberately keeping, in terms of he knew some information that he was withholding. I'm saying that I didn't think that there was anything that we knew that was being held from the Governor.  Q. That you are aware.  A. That I'm aware, yes.  Q. But are you aware of what he was saying to the Governor?  A. I think I was present during all the time that the Governor was there.  Q. So your answer - let us be clear - applies only to what you witnessed personally in meetings.  A. Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q. So things can be improper then even if they are not illegal.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And do you think that covertly recording senior officers of the Government in meetings affecting the conduct of confidential business of this kind is proper or improper?</li> <li>A. It is irregular. I think whether it's proper or not depends on the circumstances.</li> <li>Q. What circumstances do you think render it proper?</li> <li>A. For example, as I assume in this case the Commissioner believed that he needed to keep an accurate record because he believed, for whatever reasons, that if in the absence of an accurate record he wouldn't be able to</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. Well, I wouldn't know if he was deliberately keeping, in terms of he knew some information that he was withholding. I'm saying that I didn't think that there was anything that we knew that was being held from the Governor.  Q. That you are aware.  A. That I'm aware, yes.  Q. But are you aware of what he was saying to the Governor?  A. I think I was present during all the time that the Governor was there.  Q. So your answer - let us be clear - applies only to what you witnessed personally in meetings.  A. Yes.  Q. So we must not get carried away by you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q. So things can be improper then even if they are not illegal.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And do you think that covertly recording senior officers of the Government in meetings affecting the conduct of confidential business of this kind is proper or improper?</li> <li>A. It is irregular. I think whether it's proper or not depends on the circumstances.</li> <li>Q. What circumstances do you think render it proper?</li> <li>A. For example, as I assume in this case the Commissioner believed that he needed to keep an accurate record because he believed, for whatever reasons, that if in the absence of an accurate record he wouldn't be able to recreate or would not be able to have an</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. Well, I wouldn't know if he was deliberately keeping, in terms of he knew some information that he was withholding. I'm saying that I didn't think that there was anything that we knew that was being held from the Governor.  Q. That you are aware.  A. That I'm aware, yes.  Q. But are you aware of what he was saying to the Governor?  A. I think I was present during all the time that the Governor was there.  Q. So your answer - let us be clear - applies only to what you witnessed personally in meetings.  A. Yes.  Q. So we must not get carried away by you suggesting that you were validating in any	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. So things can be improper then even if they are not illegal.  A. Yes.  Q. And do you think that covertly recording senior officers of the Government in meetings affecting the conduct of confidential business of this kind is proper or improper?  A. It is irregular. I think whether it's proper or not depends on the circumstances.  Q. What circumstances do you think render it proper?  A. For example, as I assume in this case the Commissioner believed that he needed to keep an accurate record because he believed, for whatever reasons, that if in the absence of an accurate record he wouldn't be able to recreate or would not be able to have an accurate record of what had been said. For
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. Well, I wouldn't know if he was deliberately keeping, in terms of he knew some information that he was withholding. I'm saying that I didn't think that there was anything that we knew that was being held from the Governor.  Q. That you are aware.  A. That I'm aware, yes.  Q. But are you aware of what he was saying to the Governor?  A. I think I was present during all the time that the Governor was there.  Q. So your answer - let us be clear - applies only to what you witnessed personally in meetings.  A. Yes.  Q. So we must not get carried away by you suggesting that you were validating in any respect the view that Mr McGrail did not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q. So things can be improper then even if they are not illegal.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And do you think that covertly recording senior officers of the Government in meetings affecting the conduct of confidential business of this kind is proper or improper?</li> <li>A. It is irregular. I think whether it's proper or not depends on the circumstances.</li> <li>Q. What circumstances do you think render it proper?</li> <li>A. For example, as I assume in this case the Commissioner believed that he needed to keep an accurate record because he believed, for whatever reasons, that if in the absence of an accurate record he wouldn't be able to recreate or would not be able to have an</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. Well, I wouldn't know if he was deliberately keeping, in terms of he knew some information that he was withholding. I'm saying that I didn't think that there was anything that we knew that was being held from the Governor.  Q. That you are aware.  A. That I'm aware, yes.  Q. But are you aware of what he was saying to the Governor?  A. I think I was present during all the time that the Governor was there.  Q. So your answer - let us be clear - applies only to what you witnessed personally in meetings.  A. Yes.  Q. So we must not get carried away by you suggesting that you were validating in any respect the view that Mr McGrail did not deliberately withhold information from the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. So things can be improper then even if they are not illegal.  A. Yes.  Q. And do you think that covertly recording senior officers of the Government in meetings affecting the conduct of confidential business of this kind is proper or improper?  A. It is irregular. I think whether it's proper or not depends on the circumstances.  Q. What circumstances do you think render it proper?  A. For example, as I assume in this case the Commissioner believed that he needed to keep an accurate record because he believed, for whatever reasons, that if in the absence of an accurate record he wouldn't be able to recreate or would not be able to have an accurate record of what had been said. For example, in this case if there was no transcripts available of the meetings, I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. Well, I wouldn't know if he was deliberately keeping, in terms of he knew some information that he was withholding. I'm saying that I didn't think that there was anything that we knew that was being held from the Governor.  Q. That you are aware.  A. That I'm aware, yes.  Q. But are you aware of what he was saying to the Governor?  A. I think I was present during all the time that the Governor was there.  Q. So your answer - let us be clear - applies only to what you witnessed personally in meetings.  A. Yes.  Q. So we must not get carried away by you suggesting that you were validating in any respect the view that Mr McGrail did not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. So things can be improper then even if they are not illegal.  A. Yes.  Q. And do you think that covertly recording senior officers of the Government in meetings affecting the conduct of confidential business of this kind is proper or improper?  A. It is irregular. I think whether it's proper or not depends on the circumstances.  Q. What circumstances do you think render it proper?  A. For example, as I assume in this case the Commissioner believed that he needed to keep an accurate record because he believed, for whatever reasons, that if in the absence of an accurate record he wouldn't be able to recreate or would not be able to have an accurate record of what had been said. For example, in this case if there was no
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. Well, I wouldn't know if he was deliberately keeping, in terms of he knew some information that he was withholding. I'm saying that I didn't think that there was anything that we knew that was being held from the Governor.  Q. That you are aware.  A. That I'm aware, yes.  Q. But are you aware of what he was saying to the Governor?  A. I think I was present during all the time that the Governor was there.  Q. So your answer - let us be clear - applies only to what you witnessed personally in meetings.  A. Yes.  Q. So we must not get carried away by you suggesting that you were validating in any respect the view that Mr McGrail did not deliberately withhold information from the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. So things can be improper then even if they are not illegal.  A. Yes.  Q. And do you think that covertly recording senior officers of the Government in meetings affecting the conduct of confidential business of this kind is proper or improper?  A. It is irregular. I think whether it's proper or not depends on the circumstances.  Q. What circumstances do you think render it proper?  A. For example, as I assume in this case the Commissioner believed that he needed to keep an accurate record because he believed, for whatever reasons, that if in the absence of an accurate record he wouldn't be able to recreate or would not be able to have an accurate record of what had been said. For example, in this case if there was no transcripts available of the meetings, I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. Well, I wouldn't know if he was deliberately keeping, in terms of he knew some information that he was withholding. I'm saying that I didn't think that there was anything that we knew that was being held from the Governor.  Q. That you are aware.  A. That I'm aware, yes.  Q. But are you aware of what he was saying to the Governor?  A. I think I was present during all the time that the Governor was there.  Q. So your answer - let us be clear - applies only to what you witnessed personally in meetings.  A. Yes.  Q. So we must not get carried away by you suggesting that you were validating in any respect the view that Mr McGrail did not deliberately withhold information from the Governor other than in your presence. He	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. So things can be improper then even if they are not illegal.  A. Yes. Q. And do you think that covertly recording senior officers of the Government in meetings affecting the conduct of confidential business of this kind is proper or improper?  A. It is irregular. I think whether it's proper or not depends on the circumstances. Q. What circumstances do you think render it proper?  A. For example, as I assume in this case the Commissioner believed that he needed to keep an accurate record because he believed, for whatever reasons, that if in the absence of an accurate record he wouldn't be able to recreate or would not be able to have an accurate record of what had been said. For example, in this case if there was no transcripts available of the meetings, I wouldn't be able to recall a lot of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. Well, I wouldn't know if he was deliberately keeping, in terms of he knew some information that he was withholding. I'm saying that I didn't think that there was anything that we knew that was being held from the Governor.  Q. That you are aware.  A. That I'm aware, yes.  Q. But are you aware of what he was saying to the Governor?  A. I think I was present during all the time that the Governor was there.  Q. So your answer - let us be clear - applies only to what you witnessed personally in meetings.  A. Yes.  Q. So we must not get carried away by you suggesting that you were validating in any respect the view that Mr McGrail did not deliberately withhold information from the Governor other than in your presence. He might have done it in your absence. You are	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. So things can be improper then even if they are not illegal.  A. Yes.  Q. And do you think that covertly recording senior officers of the Government in meetings affecting the conduct of confidential business of this kind is proper or improper?  A. It is irregular. I think whether it's proper or not depends on the circumstances.  Q. What circumstances do you think render it proper?  A. For example, as I assume in this case the Commissioner believed that he needed to keep an accurate record because he believed, for whatever reasons, that if in the absence of an accurate record he wouldn't be able to recreate or would not be able to have an accurate record of what had been said. For example, in this case if there was no transcripts available of the meetings, I wouldn't be able to recall a lot of the communication that was had.

1		,	
1	every un-minuted meeting.	1 2	would sense the emotion. It was palpable. It
2 3	<ul><li>A. It depends on the circumstances, I think.</li><li>Q. You thought there was nothing unethical</li></ul>	3	was the Commissioner of Police saying to the Attorney General: "I am not corrupt. I will
4	about it.	4	do this, I will do that." It was a very highly
5	A. I didn't say that, Sir Peter.	5	charged meeting and although I didn't know
6	Q. Well, let me ask you. Do you think it	6	what had happened, I sensed that there was
7	was ethical or unethical?	7	something seriously wrong with what was
8	A. I think that's a decision that the person	8	happening.
9	that's made the recording has to answer. I	9	Q. And the presence of Mr DeVincenzi, Mr
10	wasn't in possession of the same information	10	Rocca and Mr Wyan were not sufficient
11	that Mr McGrail had when he made that	11	witnesses to make the recording unnecessary
12	decision.	12	in the event of impropriety.
13	Q. That answer may be applicable to the first	13	A. I don't know whether they would have an
14	meeting on the 13th that you did not know	14	accurate record of it. I can say that Mr
15	was being recorded, but then you attended	15	DeVincenzi and I have different recollections
16	two meetings yourself with some of the most	16	of the content of two meetings.
17	senior officials in Government, and in the	17	Q. So you think the fact that there are later
18	knowledge that the meeting was being	18	different recollections about what happened
19	recorded. Were you entirely comfortable	19	at a meeting is of itself justification for
20	about that?	20	having recorded it at the time.
21	A. I think if you'd asked me that question in	21	A. No, I'm not saying that.
22	relation to the first meeting, I would have	22	Q. No, not that you recorded it; I should not
23	said no. But after what happened in the first	23	have suggested that either. Being more
24	meeting I was more comfort - I felt not as	24	comfortable about it being recorded.
25	shocked at the prospect that the meeting was	25	A. I was more comfortable with the fact that
	Page 245		Page 247
1		١,	diamanda de Partir de La la Caración de
1	recorded at the second meeting.	1	there was a secret recording being made
2	Q. So you did not know that the first	2	because of the way that I had felt after the
2 3	Q. So you did not know that the first meeting of the 13th was being recorded, and	2 3	because of the way that I had felt after the first meeting when I wasn't aware that the
2 3 4	Q. So you did not know that the first meeting of the 13th was being recorded, and as I understand your answer now, what you	2 3 4	because of the way that I had felt after the first meeting when I wasn't aware that the recording had been made.
2 3 4 5	Q. So you did not know that the first meeting of the 13th was being recorded, and as I understand your answer now, what you are saying is what happened at the first	2 3 4 5	because of the way that I had felt after the first meeting when I wasn't aware that the recording had been made.  Q. Given that you thought there was proper
2 3 4 5 6	Q. So you did not know that the first meeting of the 13th was being recorded, and as I understand your answer now, what you are saying is what happened at the first meeting that you did not know was being	2 3 4 5 6	because of the way that I had felt after the first meeting when I wasn't aware that the recording had been made.  Q. Given that you thought there was proper reason in your mind to feel more comfortable
2 3 4 5 6 7	Q. So you did not know that the first meeting of the 13th was being recorded, and as I understand your answer now, what you are saying is what happened at the first meeting that you did not know was being recorded made you feel comfortable about	2 3 4 5 6 7	because of the way that I had felt after the first meeting when I wasn't aware that the recording had been made.  Q. Given that you thought there was proper reason in your mind to feel more comfortable about it, and these were very important
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q. So you did not know that the first meeting of the 13th was being recorded, and as I understand your answer now, what you are saying is what happened at the first meeting that you did not know was being recorded made you feel comfortable about the 15th and the 20th being recorded.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	because of the way that I had felt after the first meeting when I wasn't aware that the recording had been made.  Q. Given that you thought there was proper reason in your mind to feel more comfortable about it, and these were very important matters being discussed, did it occur to you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q. So you did not know that the first meeting of the 13th was being recorded, and as I understand your answer now, what you are saying is what happened at the first meeting that you did not know was being recorded made you feel comfortable about the 15th and the 20th being recorded.  THE CHAIRMAN: More comfortable.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	because of the way that I had felt after the first meeting when I wasn't aware that the recording had been made.  Q. Given that you thought there was proper reason in your mind to feel more comfortable about it, and these were very important matters being discussed, did it occur to you to suggest to the participants "Can we record"
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q. So you did not know that the first meeting of the 13th was being recorded, and as I understand your answer now, what you are saying is what happened at the first meeting that you did not know was being recorded made you feel comfortable about the 15th and the 20th being recorded.  THE CHAIRMAN: More comfortable.  SIR PETER CARUANA: More	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	because of the way that I had felt after the first meeting when I wasn't aware that the recording had been made.  Q. Given that you thought there was proper reason in your mind to feel more comfortable about it, and these were very important matters being discussed, did it occur to you to suggest to the participants "Can we record these meetings?"
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q. So you did not know that the first meeting of the 13th was being recorded, and as I understand your answer now, what you are saying is what happened at the first meeting that you did not know was being recorded made you feel comfortable about the 15th and the 20th being recorded.  THE CHAIRMAN: More comfortable.  SIR PETER CARUANA: More comfortable.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	because of the way that I had felt after the first meeting when I wasn't aware that the recording had been made.  Q. Given that you thought there was proper reason in your mind to feel more comfortable about it, and these were very important matters being discussed, did it occur to you to suggest to the participants "Can we record these meetings?"  A. No, it did not.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q. So you did not know that the first meeting of the 13th was being recorded, and as I understand your answer now, what you are saying is what happened at the first meeting that you did not know was being recorded made you feel comfortable about the 15th and the 20th being recorded. THE CHAIRMAN: More comfortable. SIR PETER CARUANA: More comfortable.  A. Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	because of the way that I had felt after the first meeting when I wasn't aware that the recording had been made.  Q. Given that you thought there was proper reason in your mind to feel more comfortable about it, and these were very important matters being discussed, did it occur to you to suggest to the participants "Can we record these meetings?"  A. No, it did not.  Q. Why was that?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q. So you did not know that the first meeting of the 13th was being recorded, and as I understand your answer now, what you are saying is what happened at the first meeting that you did not know was being recorded made you feel comfortable about the 15th and the 20th being recorded.  THE CHAIRMAN: More comfortable.  SIR PETER CARUANA: More comfortable.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	because of the way that I had felt after the first meeting when I wasn't aware that the recording had been made.  Q. Given that you thought there was proper reason in your mind to feel more comfortable about it, and these were very important matters being discussed, did it occur to you to suggest to the participants "Can we record these meetings?"  A. No, it did not.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q. So you did not know that the first meeting of the 13th was being recorded, and as I understand your answer now, what you are saying is what happened at the first meeting that you did not know was being recorded made you feel comfortable about the 15th and the 20th being recorded.  THE CHAIRMAN: More comfortable.  SIR PETER CARUANA: More comfortable.  A. Yes.  Q. Because? That is a subjective thing.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	because of the way that I had felt after the first meeting when I wasn't aware that the recording had been made.  Q. Given that you thought there was proper reason in your mind to feel more comfortable about it, and these were very important matters being discussed, did it occur to you to suggest to the participants "Can we record these meetings?"  A. No, it did not.  Q. Why was that?  A. Because the Commissioner was leading
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q. So you did not know that the first meeting of the 13th was being recorded, and as I understand your answer now, what you are saying is what happened at the first meeting that you did not know was being recorded made you feel comfortable about the 15th and the 20th being recorded.  THE CHAIRMAN: More comfortable.  SIR PETER CARUANA: More comfortable.  A. Yes.  Q. Because? That is a subjective thing.  That no longer relies on any reason that Mr	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	because of the way that I had felt after the first meeting when I wasn't aware that the recording had been made.  Q. Given that you thought there was proper reason in your mind to feel more comfortable about it, and these were very important matters being discussed, did it occur to you to suggest to the participants "Can we record these meetings?"  A. No, it did not.  Q. Why was that?  A. Because the Commissioner was leading those meetings and that would have been his
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q. So you did not know that the first meeting of the 13th was being recorded, and as I understand your answer now, what you are saying is what happened at the first meeting that you did not know was being recorded made you feel comfortable about the 15th and the 20th being recorded.  THE CHAIRMAN: More comfortable.  SIR PETER CARUANA: More comfortable.  A. Yes.  Q. Because? That is a subjective thing.  That no longer relies on any reason that Mr McGrail might have had. This is your	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	because of the way that I had felt after the first meeting when I wasn't aware that the recording had been made.  Q. Given that you thought there was proper reason in your mind to feel more comfortable about it, and these were very important matters being discussed, did it occur to you to suggest to the participants "Can we record these meetings?"  A. No, it did not.  Q. Why was that?  A. Because the Commissioner was leading those meetings and that would have been his decision, and he had already made the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. So you did not know that the first meeting of the 13th was being recorded, and as I understand your answer now, what you are saying is what happened at the first meeting that you did not know was being recorded made you feel comfortable about the 15th and the 20th being recorded. THE CHAIRMAN: More comfortable. SIR PETER CARUANA: More comfortable.  A. Yes.  Q. Because? That is a subjective thing. That no longer relies on any reason that Mr McGrail might have had. This is your assessment of your level of comfiture	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	because of the way that I had felt after the first meeting when I wasn't aware that the recording had been made.  Q. Given that you thought there was proper reason in your mind to feel more comfortable about it, and these were very important matters being discussed, did it occur to you to suggest to the participants "Can we record these meetings?"  A. No, it did not.  Q. Why was that?  A. Because the Commissioner was leading those meetings and that would have been his decision, and he had already made the decision to record the meetings.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. So you did not know that the first meeting of the 13th was being recorded, and as I understand your answer now, what you are saying is what happened at the first meeting that you did not know was being recorded made you feel comfortable about the 15th and the 20th being recorded.  THE CHAIRMAN: More comfortable.  SIR PETER CARUANA: More comfortable.  A. Yes.  Q. Because? That is a subjective thing.  That no longer relies on any reason that Mr McGrail might have had. This is your assessment of your level of comfiture because of what you had experienced in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	because of the way that I had felt after the first meeting when I wasn't aware that the recording had been made.  Q. Given that you thought there was proper reason in your mind to feel more comfortable about it, and these were very important matters being discussed, did it occur to you to suggest to the participants "Can we record these meetings?"  A. No, it did not.  Q. Why was that?  A. Because the Commissioner was leading those meetings and that would have been his decision, and he had already made the decision to record the meetings.  Q. Yes, but I am asking you about your
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. So you did not know that the first meeting of the 13th was being recorded, and as I understand your answer now, what you are saying is what happened at the first meeting that you did not know was being recorded made you feel comfortable about the 15th and the 20th being recorded.  THE CHAIRMAN: More comfortable.  SIR PETER CARUANA: More comfortable.  A. Yes.  Q. Because? That is a subjective thing.  That no longer relies on any reason that Mr McGrail might have had. This is your assessment of your level of comfiture because of what you had experienced in the meeting of the 13th. Can you convey sense of what had happened at the meeting at the 13th that made you feel that participating in a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	because of the way that I had felt after the first meeting when I wasn't aware that the recording had been made.  Q. Given that you thought there was proper reason in your mind to feel more comfortable about it, and these were very important matters being discussed, did it occur to you to suggest to the participants "Can we record these meetings?"  A. No, it did not.  Q. Why was that?  A. Because the Commissioner was leading those meetings and that would have been his decision, and he had already made the decision to record the meetings.  Q. Yes, but I am asking you about your behaviour, not the Commissioner's. Your behaviour in participating in meetings that you knew were being recorded, which, if you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. So you did not know that the first meeting of the 13th was being recorded, and as I understand your answer now, what you are saying is what happened at the first meeting that you did not know was being recorded made you feel comfortable about the 15th and the 20th being recorded.  THE CHAIRMAN: More comfortable.  SIR PETER CARUANA: More comfortable.  A. Yes.  Q. Because? That is a subjective thing.  That no longer relies on any reason that Mr McGrail might have had. This is your assessment of your level of comfiture because of what you had experienced in the meeting of the 13th. Can you convey sense of what had happened at the meeting at the 13th that made you feel that participating in a recording meeting you were more	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	because of the way that I had felt after the first meeting when I wasn't aware that the recording had been made.  Q. Given that you thought there was proper reason in your mind to feel more comfortable about it, and these were very important matters being discussed, did it occur to you to suggest to the participants "Can we record these meetings?"  A. No, it did not.  Q. Why was that?  A. Because the Commissioner was leading those meetings and that would have been his decision, and he had already made the decision to record the meetings.  Q. Yes, but I am asking you about your behaviour, not the Commissioner's. Your behaviour in participating in meetings that you knew were being recorded, which, if you thought that there was a proper reason for,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. So you did not know that the first meeting of the 13th was being recorded, and as I understand your answer now, what you are saying is what happened at the first meeting that you did not know was being recorded made you feel comfortable about the 15th and the 20th being recorded.  THE CHAIRMAN: More comfortable.  SIR PETER CARUANA: More comfortable.  A. Yes.  Q. Because? That is a subjective thing.  That no longer relies on any reason that Mr McGrail might have had. This is your assessment of your level of comfiture because of what you had experienced in the meeting of the 13th. Can you convey sense of what had happened at the meeting at the 13th that made you feel that participating in a recording meeting you were more comfortable about?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	because of the way that I had felt after the first meeting when I wasn't aware that the recording had been made.  Q. Given that you thought there was proper reason in your mind to feel more comfortable about it, and these were very important matters being discussed, did it occur to you to suggest to the participants "Can we record these meetings?"  A. No, it did not.  Q. Why was that?  A. Because the Commissioner was leading those meetings and that would have been his decision, and he had already made the decision to record the meetings.  Q. Yes, but I am asking you about your behaviour, not the Commissioner's. Your behaviour in participating in meetings that you knew were being recorded, which, if you thought that there was a proper reason for, could have been resolved by simply saying to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. So you did not know that the first meeting of the 13th was being recorded, and as I understand your answer now, what you are saying is what happened at the first meeting that you did not know was being recorded made you feel comfortable about the 15th and the 20th being recorded.  THE CHAIRMAN: More comfortable.  SIR PETER CARUANA: More comfortable.  A. Yes.  Q. Because? That is a subjective thing.  That no longer relies on any reason that Mr McGrail might have had. This is your assessment of your level of comfiture because of what you had experienced in the meeting of the 13th. Can you convey sense of what had happened at the meeting at the 13th that made you feel that participating in a recording meeting you were more comfortable about?  A. I think you get a sense or proportion of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	because of the way that I had felt after the first meeting when I wasn't aware that the recording had been made.  Q. Given that you thought there was proper reason in your mind to feel more comfortable about it, and these were very important matters being discussed, did it occur to you to suggest to the participants "Can we record these meetings?"  A. No, it did not.  Q. Why was that?  A. Because the Commissioner was leading those meetings and that would have been his decision, and he had already made the decision to record the meetings.  Q. Yes, but I am asking you about your behaviour, not the Commissioner's. Your behaviour in participating in meetings that you knew were being recorded, which, if you thought that there was a proper reason for, could have been resolved by simply saying to the people: "Look, given the situation that is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. So you did not know that the first meeting of the 13th was being recorded, and as I understand your answer now, what you are saying is what happened at the first meeting that you did not know was being recorded made you feel comfortable about the 15th and the 20th being recorded.  THE CHAIRMAN: More comfortable.  SIR PETER CARUANA: More comfortable.  A. Yes.  Q. Because? That is a subjective thing.  That no longer relies on any reason that Mr McGrail might have had. This is your assessment of your level of comfiture because of what you had experienced in the meeting of the 13th. Can you convey sense of what had happened at the meeting at the 13th that made you feel that participating in a recording meeting you were more comfortable about?  A. I think you get a sense or proportion of the emotion that was in that meeting from the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	because of the way that I had felt after the first meeting when I wasn't aware that the recording had been made.  Q. Given that you thought there was proper reason in your mind to feel more comfortable about it, and these were very important matters being discussed, did it occur to you to suggest to the participants "Can we record these meetings?"  A. No, it did not.  Q. Why was that?  A. Because the Commissioner was leading those meetings and that would have been his decision, and he had already made the decision to record the meetings.  Q. Yes, but I am asking you about your behaviour, not the Commissioner's. Your behaviour in participating in meetings that you knew were being recorded, which, if you thought that there was a proper reason for, could have been resolved by simply saying to the people: "Look, given the situation that is happening, can we record these meetings?"
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. So you did not know that the first meeting of the 13th was being recorded, and as I understand your answer now, what you are saying is what happened at the first meeting that you did not know was being recorded made you feel comfortable about the 15th and the 20th being recorded.  THE CHAIRMAN: More comfortable.  SIR PETER CARUANA: More comfortable.  A. Yes.  Q. Because? That is a subjective thing.  That no longer relies on any reason that Mr McGrail might have had. This is your assessment of your level of comfiture because of what you had experienced in the meeting of the 13th. Can you convey sense of what had happened at the meeting at the 13th that made you feel that participating in a recording meeting you were more comfortable about?  A. I think you get a sense or proportion of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	because of the way that I had felt after the first meeting when I wasn't aware that the recording had been made.  Q. Given that you thought there was proper reason in your mind to feel more comfortable about it, and these were very important matters being discussed, did it occur to you to suggest to the participants "Can we record these meetings?"  A. No, it did not.  Q. Why was that?  A. Because the Commissioner was leading those meetings and that would have been his decision, and he had already made the decision to record the meetings.  Q. Yes, but I am asking you about your behaviour, not the Commissioner's. Your behaviour in participating in meetings that you knew were being recorded, which, if you thought that there was a proper reason for, could have been resolved by simply saying to the people: "Look, given the situation that is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. So you did not know that the first meeting of the 13th was being recorded, and as I understand your answer now, what you are saying is what happened at the first meeting that you did not know was being recorded made you feel comfortable about the 15th and the 20th being recorded.  THE CHAIRMAN: More comfortable.  SIR PETER CARUANA: More comfortable.  A. Yes.  Q. Because? That is a subjective thing.  That no longer relies on any reason that Mr McGrail might have had. This is your assessment of your level of comfiture because of what you had experienced in the meeting of the 13th. Can you convey sense of what had happened at the meeting at the 13th that made you feel that participating in a recording meeting you were more comfortable about?  A. I think you get a sense or proportion of the emotion that was in that meeting from the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	because of the way that I had felt after the first meeting when I wasn't aware that the recording had been made.  Q. Given that you thought there was proper reason in your mind to feel more comfortable about it, and these were very important matters being discussed, did it occur to you to suggest to the participants "Can we record these meetings?"  A. No, it did not.  Q. Why was that?  A. Because the Commissioner was leading those meetings and that would have been his decision, and he had already made the decision to record the meetings.  Q. Yes, but I am asking you about your behaviour, not the Commissioner's. Your behaviour in participating in meetings that you knew were being recorded, which, if you thought that there was a proper reason for, could have been resolved by simply saying to the people: "Look, given the situation that is happening, can we record these meetings?"

1	Q. Are you aware that the RGP has a code of	1	no.
2	ethics?	2	Q. No. And under the heading "Conduct" it
3	A. Yes.	3	says: "I will behave in a manner, whether on
4	Q. And do you recall that they say under the	4	or off duty, which does not bring discredit on
5	heading "Fairness" you should treat people	5	the police." Do you think that the covert
6	fairly?	6	recording of meetings of this nature are
7	A. I remember that heading.	7	capable of not bringing the police into
8	Q. And under "Honesty", you are truthful	8	discredit?
9	and trustworthy.	9	A. Sorry, could you repeat the question?
10	A. Yes.	10	Q. Yes. Do you think - could you be sure -
11	Q. And under "Integrity", you always do the	11	that feeling comfortable or more
12	right thing.	12	comfortable, whatever that may add to the
13	A. Yes.	13	question, about recording meetings with
14	Q. And do you think that covert recording	14	these officials would not bring discredit on
15	by a police officer of meetings with the two	15	the police?
16	most senior law officers in the land and the	16	A. No, I think in the circumstances, in these
17	Solicitor General and indeed another	17	particular circumstances, I think that on
18	colleague, Mr Wyan - was Mr Wyan aware	18	balance it was better that there was an
19	that the meetings were being recorded?	19	accurate record of what was said.
20	A. I don't know if he was aware or not.	20	Q. It may well be, and indeed we are very
21	Q. Do you think that that is doing the right	21	grateful for the fact that these records exist,
22	thing, which your code of ethics required you	22	as I hope to take you through tomorrow. But
23	always to do?	23	that is not the issue. The issue is not whether
24	A. At that time I thought that it was the right	24	it is useful. If you want an accurate record of
25	thing, yes.	25	a meeting which is a salutary thing to want,
	Page 249		Page 251
1	O You thought that it was the right thing to	1	you ask the neonle in the meetings: "Can we
1 2	Q. You thought that it was the right thing to	1 2	you ask the people in the meetings: "Can we
2	do. Okay. And under the heading	2	record it so that we all have an accurate
2 3	do. Okay. And under the heading "Openness", it required you to be open and	2 3	record it so that we all have an accurate record of them?" It does not have to be
2 3 4	do. Okay. And under the heading "Openness", it required you to be open and transparent in your actions. Do you think	2 3 4	record it so that we all have an accurate record of them?" It does not have to be covert, does it?
2 3 4 5	do. Okay. And under the heading "Openness", it required you to be open and transparent in your actions. Do you think covert recording of such meetings fit under	2 3 4 5	record it so that we all have an accurate record of them?" It does not have to be covert, does it?  A. No.
2 3 4 5 6	do. Okay. And under the heading "Openness", it required you to be open and transparent in your actions. Do you think covert recording of such meetings fit under an obligation to be open and transparent in	2 3 4 5 6	record it so that we all have an accurate record of them?" It does not have to be covert, does it?  A. No.  Q. We have heard something already about
2 3 4 5 6 7	do. Okay. And under the heading "Openness", it required you to be open and transparent in your actions. Do you think covert recording of such meetings fit under an obligation to be open and transparent in your actions?	2 3 4 5 6 7	record it so that we all have an accurate record of them?" It does not have to be covert, does it?  A. No.  Q. We have heard something already about the Nolan Principles. Do you know what the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	do. Okay. And under the heading "Openness", it required you to be open and transparent in your actions. Do you think covert recording of such meetings fit under an obligation to be open and transparent in your actions?  A. I think if the police were open and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	record it so that we all have an accurate record of them?" It does not have to be covert, does it?  A. No.  Q. We have heard something already about the Nolan Principles. Do you know what the Nolan Principles are?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	do. Okay. And under the heading "Openness", it required you to be open and transparent in your actions. Do you think covert recording of such meetings fit under an obligation to be open and transparent in your actions?  A. I think if the police were open and transparent in all their actions, they wouldn't	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	record it so that we all have an accurate record of them?" It does not have to be covert, does it?  A. No.  Q. We have heard something already about the Nolan Principles. Do you know what the Nolan Principles are?  A. No, I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	do. Okay. And under the heading "Openness", it required you to be open and transparent in your actions. Do you think covert recording of such meetings fit under an obligation to be open and transparent in your actions?  A. I think if the police were open and transparent in all their actions, they wouldn't be able to prosecute much crime.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	record it so that we all have an accurate record of them?" It does not have to be covert, does it?  A. No.  Q. We have heard something already about the Nolan Principles. Do you know what the Nolan Principles are?  A. No, I  Q. You just heard Mr Cruz speaking about
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	do. Okay. And under the heading "Openness", it required you to be open and transparent in your actions. Do you think covert recording of such meetings fit under an obligation to be open and transparent in your actions?  A. I think if the police were open and transparent in all their actions, they wouldn't be able to prosecute much crime.  Q. It is not my code of ethics, it is the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	record it so that we all have an accurate record of them?" It does not have to be covert, does it?  A. No.  Q. We have heard something already about the Nolan Principles. Do you know what the Nolan Principles are?  A. No, I  Q. You just heard Mr Cruz speaking about them.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	do. Okay. And under the heading "Openness", it required you to be open and transparent in your actions. Do you think covert recording of such meetings fit under an obligation to be open and transparent in your actions?  A. I think if the police were open and transparent in all their actions, they wouldn't be able to prosecute much crime. Q. It is not my code of ethics, it is the RGP's.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	record it so that we all have an accurate record of them?" It does not have to be covert, does it?  A. No.  Q. We have heard something already about the Nolan Principles. Do you know what the Nolan Principles are?  A. No, I  Q. You just heard Mr Cruz speaking about them.  A. Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	do. Okay. And under the heading "Openness", it required you to be open and transparent in your actions. Do you think covert recording of such meetings fit under an obligation to be open and transparent in your actions?  A. I think if the police were open and transparent in all their actions, they wouldn't be able to prosecute much crime. Q. It is not my code of ethics, it is the RGP's.  A. I think it depends on the situation that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	record it so that we all have an accurate record of them?" It does not have to be covert, does it?  A. No.  Q. We have heard something already about the Nolan Principles. Do you know what the Nolan Principles are?  A. No, I  Q. You just heard Mr Cruz speaking about them.  A. Yes.  Q. And is it something you have done, the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	do. Okay. And under the heading "Openness", it required you to be open and transparent in your actions. Do you think covert recording of such meetings fit under an obligation to be open and transparent in your actions?  A. I think if the police were open and transparent in all their actions, they wouldn't be able to prosecute much crime. Q. It is not my code of ethics, it is the RGP's.  A. I think it depends on the situation that you are talking about.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	record it so that we all have an accurate record of them?" It does not have to be covert, does it?  A. No.  Q. We have heard something already about the Nolan Principles. Do you know what the Nolan Principles are?  A. No, I  Q. You just heard Mr Cruz speaking about them.  A. Yes.  Q. And is it something you have done, the recording of meetings? Can we see B122. B
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	do. Okay. And under the heading "Openness", it required you to be open and transparent in your actions. Do you think covert recording of such meetings fit under an obligation to be open and transparent in your actions?  A. I think if the police were open and transparent in all their actions, they wouldn't be able to prosecute much crime. Q. It is not my code of ethics, it is the RGP's.  A. I think it depends on the situation that you are talking about. Q. And it requires you to treat everyone with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	record it so that we all have an accurate record of them?" It does not have to be covert, does it?  A. No.  Q. We have heard something already about the Nolan Principles. Do you know what the Nolan Principles are?  A. No, I  Q. You just heard Mr Cruz speaking about them.  A. Yes.  Q. And is it something you have done, the recording of meetings? Can we see B122. B 122 at the top there, six lines down, you are
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	do. Okay. And under the heading "Openness", it required you to be open and transparent in your actions. Do you think covert recording of such meetings fit under an obligation to be open and transparent in your actions?  A. I think if the police were open and transparent in all their actions, they wouldn't be able to prosecute much crime. Q. It is not my code of ethics, it is the RGP's.  A. I think it depends on the situation that you are talking about. Q. And it requires you to treat everyone with respect, under the heading "Respect".	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	record it so that we all have an accurate record of them?" It does not have to be covert, does it?  A. No.  Q. We have heard something already about the Nolan Principles. Do you know what the Nolan Principles are?  A. No, I  Q. You just heard Mr Cruz speaking about them.  A. Yes.  Q. And is it something you have done, the recording of meetings? Can we see B122. B 122 at the top there, six lines down, you are talking there about: "I think in front of a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	do. Okay. And under the heading "Openness", it required you to be open and transparent in your actions. Do you think covert recording of such meetings fit under an obligation to be open and transparent in your actions?  A. I think if the police were open and transparent in all their actions, they wouldn't be able to prosecute much crime. Q. It is not my code of ethics, it is the RGP's.  A. I think it depends on the situation that you are talking about. Q. And it requires you to treat everyone with respect, under the heading "Respect". A. Yes, that's true.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	record it so that we all have an accurate record of them?" It does not have to be covert, does it?  A. No.  Q. We have heard something already about the Nolan Principles. Do you know what the Nolan Principles are?  A. No, I  Q. You just heard Mr Cruz speaking about them.  A. Yes.  Q. And is it something you have done, the recording of meetings? Can we see B122. B 122 at the top there, six lines down, you are talking there about: "I think in front of a Special Branch, now Heine is suggesting that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	do. Okay. And under the heading "Openness", it required you to be open and transparent in your actions. Do you think covert recording of such meetings fit under an obligation to be open and transparent in your actions?  A. I think if the police were open and transparent in all their actions, they wouldn't be able to prosecute much crime. Q. It is not my code of ethics, it is the RGP's.  A. I think it depends on the situation that you are talking about. Q. And it requires you to treat everyone with respect, under the heading "Respect". A. Yes, that's true. Q. And do you think that covert recordings	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	record it so that we all have an accurate record of them?" It does not have to be covert, does it?  A. No.  Q. We have heard something already about the Nolan Principles. Do you know what the Nolan Principles are?  A. No, I  Q. You just heard Mr Cruz speaking about them.  A. Yes.  Q. And is it something you have done, the recording of meetings? Can we see B122. B 122 at the top there, six lines down, you are talking there about: "I think in front of a Special Branch, now Heine is suggesting that because of that I am colluding, we are
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	do. Okay. And under the heading "Openness", it required you to be open and transparent in your actions. Do you think covert recording of such meetings fit under an obligation to be open and transparent in your actions?  A. I think if the police were open and transparent in all their actions, they wouldn't be able to prosecute much crime. Q. It is not my code of ethics, it is the RGP's.  A. I think it depends on the situation that you are talking about. Q. And it requires you to treat everyone with respect, under the heading "Respect".  A. Yes, that's true. Q. And do you think that covert recordings of these meetings was treating the Director of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	record it so that we all have an accurate record of them?" It does not have to be covert, does it?  A. No.  Q. We have heard something already about the Nolan Principles. Do you know what the Nolan Principles are?  A. No, I  Q. You just heard Mr Cruz speaking about them.  A. Yes.  Q. And is it something you have done, the recording of meetings? Can we see B122. B 122 at the top there, six lines down, you are talking there about: "I think in front of a Special Branch, now Heine is suggesting that because of that I am colluding, we are colluding with James Gaggero, and I have a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	do. Okay. And under the heading "Openness", it required you to be open and transparent in your actions. Do you think covert recording of such meetings fit under an obligation to be open and transparent in your actions?  A. I think if the police were open and transparent in all their actions, they wouldn't be able to prosecute much crime. Q. It is not my code of ethics, it is the RGP's.  A. I think it depends on the situation that you are talking about. Q. And it requires you to treat everyone with respect, under the heading "Respect".  A. Yes, that's true. Q. And do you think that covert recordings of these meetings was treating the Director of Was the Director of Public Prosecution	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	record it so that we all have an accurate record of them?" It does not have to be covert, does it?  A. No.  Q. We have heard something already about the Nolan Principles. Do you know what the Nolan Principles are?  A. No, I  Q. You just heard Mr Cruz speaking about them.  A. Yes.  Q. And is it something you have done, the recording of meetings? Can we see B122. B 122 at the top there, six lines down, you are talking there about: "I think in front of a Special Branch, now Heine is suggesting that because of that I am colluding, we are colluding with James Gaggero, and I have a recording of everything. I have a recording
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	do. Okay. And under the heading "Openness", it required you to be open and transparent in your actions. Do you think covert recording of such meetings fit under an obligation to be open and transparent in your actions?  A. I think if the police were open and transparent in all their actions, they wouldn't be able to prosecute much crime. Q. It is not my code of ethics, it is the RGP's.  A. I think it depends on the situation that you are talking about. Q. And it requires you to treat everyone with respect, under the heading "Respect". A. Yes, that's true. Q. And do you think that covert recordings of these meetings was treating the Director of Was the Director of Public Prosecution under suspicion of any impropriety? Do you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	record it so that we all have an accurate record of them?" It does not have to be covert, does it?  A. No.  Q. We have heard something already about the Nolan Principles. Do you know what the Nolan Principles are?  A. No, I  Q. You just heard Mr Cruz speaking about them.  A. Yes.  Q. And is it something you have done, the recording of meetings? Can we see B122. B 122 at the top there, six lines down, you are talking there about: "I think in front of a Special Branch, now Heine is suggesting that because of that I am colluding, we are colluding with James Gaggero, and I have a recording of everything. I have a recording and a note of every conversation that I've had
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	do. Okay. And under the heading "Openness", it required you to be open and transparent in your actions. Do you think covert recording of such meetings fit under an obligation to be open and transparent in your actions?  A. I think if the police were open and transparent in all their actions, they wouldn't be able to prosecute much crime. Q. It is not my code of ethics, it is the RGP's.  A. I think it depends on the situation that you are talking about. Q. And it requires you to treat everyone with respect, under the heading "Respect". A. Yes, that's true. Q. And do you think that covert recordings of these meetings was treating the Director of Was the Director of Public Prosecution under suspicion of any impropriety? Do you think you were treating him with respect?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	record it so that we all have an accurate record of them?" It does not have to be covert, does it?  A. No.  Q. We have heard something already about the Nolan Principles. Do you know what the Nolan Principles are?  A. No, I  Q. You just heard Mr Cruz speaking about them.  A. Yes.  Q. And is it something you have done, the recording of meetings? Can we see B122. B 122 at the top there, six lines down, you are talking there about: "I think in front of a Special Branch, now Heine is suggesting that because of that I am colluding, we are colluding with James Gaggero, and I have a recording of everything. I have a recording and a note of every conversation that I've had with Gaggero." This is you, sorry. Can we
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	do. Okay. And under the heading "Openness", it required you to be open and transparent in your actions. Do you think covert recording of such meetings fit under an obligation to be open and transparent in your actions?  A. I think if the police were open and transparent in all their actions, they wouldn't be able to prosecute much crime. Q. It is not my code of ethics, it is the RGP's.  A. I think it depends on the situation that you are talking about. Q. And it requires you to treat everyone with respect, under the heading "Respect". A. Yes, that's true. Q. And do you think that covert recordings of these meetings was treating the Director of Was the Director of Public Prosecution under suspicion of any impropriety? Do you think you were treating him with respect? A. No, he wasn't.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	record it so that we all have an accurate record of them?" It does not have to be covert, does it?  A. No.  Q. We have heard something already about the Nolan Principles. Do you know what the Nolan Principles are?  A. No, I  Q. You just heard Mr Cruz speaking about them.  A. Yes.  Q. And is it something you have done, the recording of meetings? Can we see B122. B 122 at the top there, six lines down, you are talking there about: "I think in front of a Special Branch, now Heine is suggesting that because of that I am colluding, we are colluding with James Gaggero, and I have a recording of everything. I have a recording and a note of every conversation that I've had with Gaggero." This is you, sorry. Can we go back to the previous page just to see. That
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	do. Okay. And under the heading "Openness", it required you to be open and transparent in your actions. Do you think covert recording of such meetings fit under an obligation to be open and transparent in your actions?  A. I think if the police were open and transparent in all their actions, they wouldn't be able to prosecute much crime. Q. It is not my code of ethics, it is the RGP's.  A. I think it depends on the situation that you are talking about. Q. And it requires you to treat everyone with respect, under the heading "Respect".  A. Yes, that's true. Q. And do you think that covert recordings of these meetings was treating the Director of Was the Director of Public Prosecution under suspicion of any impropriety? Do you think you were treating him with respect?  A. No, he wasn't. Q. So were you treating him with respect?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	record it so that we all have an accurate record of them?" It does not have to be covert, does it?  A. No.  Q. We have heard something already about the Nolan Principles. Do you know what the Nolan Principles are?  A. No, I  Q. You just heard Mr Cruz speaking about them.  A. Yes.  Q. And is it something you have done, the recording of meetings? Can we see B122. B 122 at the top there, six lines down, you are talking there about: "I think in front of a Special Branch, now Heine is suggesting that because of that I am colluding, we are colluding with James Gaggero, and I have a recording of everything. I have a recording and a note of every conversation that I've had with Gaggero." This is you, sorry. Can we
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	do. Okay. And under the heading "Openness", it required you to be open and transparent in your actions. Do you think covert recording of such meetings fit under an obligation to be open and transparent in your actions?  A. I think if the police were open and transparent in all their actions, they wouldn't be able to prosecute much crime. Q. It is not my code of ethics, it is the RGP's.  A. I think it depends on the situation that you are talking about. Q. And it requires you to treat everyone with respect, under the heading "Respect". A. Yes, that's true. Q. And do you think that covert recordings of these meetings was treating the Director of Was the Director of Public Prosecution under suspicion of any impropriety? Do you think you were treating him with respect? A. No, he wasn't.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	record it so that we all have an accurate record of them?" It does not have to be covert, does it?  A. No.  Q. We have heard something already about the Nolan Principles. Do you know what the Nolan Principles are?  A. No, I  Q. You just heard Mr Cruz speaking about them.  A. Yes.  Q. And is it something you have done, the recording of meetings? Can we see B122. B 122 at the top there, six lines down, you are talking there about: "I think in front of a Special Branch, now Heine is suggesting that because of that I am colluding, we are colluding with James Gaggero, and I have a recording of everything. I have a recording and a note of every conversation that I've had with Gaggero." This is you, sorry. Can we go back to the previous page just to see. That is the end of the box. Superintendent
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	do. Okay. And under the heading "Openness", it required you to be open and transparent in your actions. Do you think covert recording of such meetings fit under an obligation to be open and transparent in your actions?  A. I think if the police were open and transparent in all their actions, they wouldn't be able to prosecute much crime. Q. It is not my code of ethics, it is the RGP's.  A. I think it depends on the situation that you are talking about. Q. And it requires you to treat everyone with respect, under the heading "Respect".  A. Yes, that's true. Q. And do you think that covert recordings of these meetings was treating the Director of Was the Director of Public Prosecution under suspicion of any impropriety? Do you think you were treating him with respect?  A. No, he wasn't. Q. So were you treating him with respect?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	record it so that we all have an accurate record of them?" It does not have to be covert, does it?  A. No.  Q. We have heard something already about the Nolan Principles. Do you know what the Nolan Principles are?  A. No, I  Q. You just heard Mr Cruz speaking about them.  A. Yes.  Q. And is it something you have done, the recording of meetings? Can we see B122. B 122 at the top there, six lines down, you are talking there about: "I think in front of a Special Branch, now Heine is suggesting that because of that I am colluding, we are colluding with James Gaggero, and I have a recording of everything. I have a recording and a note of every conversation that I've had with Gaggero." This is you, sorry. Can we go back to the previous page just to see. That is the end of the box. Superintendent

1	A. Which meeting is this, sir?	1	long I am allowed, sir.
2	Q. This is the meeting of 13 May. Did you	2	THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.
3	make a recording of all your conversations	3	MR SANTOS: I think the initial indication
4	with Mr Gaggero, the complainant in the	4	was at least an hour and a half. Sir Peter has
5	case?	5	had about 20 minutes, 25 minutes now. If he
6	A. It is not referring to an audio recording.	6	can stick to an hour and 15 tomorrow, and
7	It's recording a note.	7	then we have the half hour and then we have
8	Q. Well, it has to be something other than a	8	the session, the private session. I think really
9	note because it says: "I have a recording and	9	we would have to start with Superintendent
10	a note." So if you have a note, what do you	10	Wyan at the very latest by 12.00 midday to
11	think the word "recording" might mean, or	11	ensure that we get through Mr Wyan. If that
12	just answer my question. Did you record	12	works for everybody, I think that would be
13	your meetings with Mr Gaggero?	13	ideal.
14	A. I did not make an audio recording of my	14	SIR PETER CARUANA: I am entirely in
15	meetings with Mr Gaggero.	15	your hands, sir.
16	Q. So what recording did you make?	16	THE CHAIRMAN: I am asking this
17	A. I made a recording, or a record, of the	17	question, hoping and expecting for the
18	notes in my daybook or on a piece of paper if	18	answer yes, but can you live with an hour
19	I didn't have my daybook with me.	19	and a quarter?
20	Q. So when you say you have a recording	20	SIR PETER CARUANA: I will live with
21	and a note, a recording and note, the	21	whatever is convenient for the Tribunal. An
22	recording of it adds nothing to the note then.	22	hour and a quarter it is.
23	A. In this conversation, in normal	23	THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, if your juniors
24	conversations, people are not as precise with	24	can monitor progress, that would be very
25	their language as you might need to be for,	25	helpful.
	Daga 252		Daga 255
	Page 253		Page 255
1	for example, now giving evidence.	1	SIR PETER CARUANA: They are very
2	Q. And how would the fact that you had a	2	good at that. Constantly doing it.
3	written note only serve the purpose that you	3	THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.
4	were announcing, that would allow you to	4	MR WAGNER: I am just concerned that
5	prove that you were not colluding with him?	5	tomorrow is a very acute situation because of
6	A. Because every time I had a contact with	6	Mr Wyan's availability. That is it.
7	Mr Gaggero I made a record of that.	7	THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.
8	Q. A verbatim record?	8	MR WAGNER: I am just wondering
9	A. No, it can't be a verbatim record.	9	whether, not as a matter of course but
10	Q. Exactly, understandably so. So it would	10	tomorrow, we might consider starting a bit
11	not disprove collusion, which is what you	11	early, just to try and avoid the bad scenario.
12	were holding this up as enabling you to	12	MR SANTOS: We discussed this earlier.
13	disprove. Okay, that is okay; it is not for me	13	The suggestion that we mooted, I hope the
14	to assess your evidence. Your evidence is	14	Chairman will not mind me sharing, is rather
15	that you did not make an audio recording of	15	than starting early perhaps, if necessary, at
1.6	that you are not make an address recording of		
16	the conversations. Is that a convenient	16	lunchtime shortening the lunch break by half
17	the conversations. Is that a convenient moment?	17	an hour, rather than starting at half nine.
17 18	the conversations. Is that a convenient moment? THE CHAIRMAN: It is five o'clock. That	17 18	an hour, rather than starting at half nine. THE CHAIRMAN: My experience of
17 18 19	the conversations. Is that a convenient moment?  THE CHAIRMAN: It is five o'clock. That is long enough. Okay. Again, I am going to	17 18 19	an hour, rather than starting at half nine. THE CHAIRMAN: My experience of starting early is that things that people
17 18 19 20	the conversations. Is that a convenient moment?  THE CHAIRMAN: It is five o'clock. That is long enough. Okay. Again, I am going to ask you how long you are likely to be?	17 18 19 20	an hour, rather than starting at half nine. THE CHAIRMAN: My experience of starting early is that things that people usually sort out before we start do not get
17 18 19 20 21	the conversations. Is that a convenient moment? THE CHAIRMAN: It is five o'clock. That is long enough. Okay. Again, I am going to ask you how long you are likely to be? SIR PETER CARUANA: We have got quite	17 18 19 20 21	an hour, rather than starting at half nine. THE CHAIRMAN: My experience of starting early is that things that people usually sort out before we start do not get sorted out, and it ends up taking longer. So I
17 18 19 20 21 22	the conversations. Is that a convenient moment?  THE CHAIRMAN: It is five o'clock. That is long enough. Okay. Again, I am going to ask you how long you are likely to be?  SIR PETER CARUANA: We have got quite a lot of ground to cover, sir.	17 18 19 20 21 22	an hour, rather than starting at half nine.  THE CHAIRMAN: My experience of starting early is that things that people usually sort out before we start do not get sorted out, and it ends up taking longer. So I am not personally very keen on early starts.
17 18 19 20 21 22 23	the conversations. Is that a convenient moment?  THE CHAIRMAN: It is five o'clock. That is long enough. Okay. Again, I am going to ask you how long you are likely to be?  SIR PETER CARUANA: We have got quite a lot of ground to cover, sir.  THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, but we have not	17 18 19 20 21 22 23	an hour, rather than starting at half nine. THE CHAIRMAN: My experience of starting early is that things that people usually sort out before we start do not get sorted out, and it ends up taking longer. So I am not personally very keen on early starts. Ten o'clock is
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	the conversations. Is that a convenient moment?  THE CHAIRMAN: It is five o'clock. That is long enough. Okay. Again, I am going to ask you how long you are likely to be?  SIR PETER CARUANA: We have got quite a lot of ground to cover, sir.  THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, but we have not got much time to cover it in.	17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	an hour, rather than starting at half nine. THE CHAIRMAN: My experience of starting early is that things that people usually sort out before we start do not get sorted out, and it ends up taking longer. So I am not personally very keen on early starts. Ten o'clock is MR SANTOS: I think we review at one
17 18 19 20 21 22 23	the conversations. Is that a convenient moment?  THE CHAIRMAN: It is five o'clock. That is long enough. Okay. Again, I am going to ask you how long you are likely to be?  SIR PETER CARUANA: We have got quite a lot of ground to cover, sir.  THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, but we have not	17 18 19 20 21 22 23	an hour, rather than starting at half nine. THE CHAIRMAN: My experience of starting early is that things that people usually sort out before we start do not get sorted out, and it ends up taking longer. So I am not personally very keen on early starts. Ten o'clock is
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	the conversations. Is that a convenient moment?  THE CHAIRMAN: It is five o'clock. That is long enough. Okay. Again, I am going to ask you how long you are likely to be?  SIR PETER CARUANA: We have got quite a lot of ground to cover, sir.  THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, but we have not got much time to cover it in.	17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	an hour, rather than starting at half nine. THE CHAIRMAN: My experience of starting early is that things that people usually sort out before we start do not get sorted out, and it ends up taking longer. So I am not personally very keen on early starts. Ten o'clock is MR SANTOS: I think we review at one

1	THE CHAIDMAN. That is what: 11
1 2	THE CHAIRMAN: That is what we will do.  MR SANTOS: (inaudible) half an hour.
3	THE CHAIRMAN: We will start at ten, we
4	will review the position at one, and if we
5	have to have a short lunch so be it, because
6	we must finish Wyan tomorrow afternoon.
	MR SANTOS: The other thing is I think you
7	
8	would want me to say that the extra time that
9	is being added today and tomorrow, to the
10	extent it is added tomorrow, is just to
11	accommodate Wyan
12	THE CHAIRMAN: Correct.
13	MR SANTOS: because of particular
14	circumstances that apply.
15	THE CHAIRMAN: Correct, it is.
16	MR SANTOS: This cannot become the
17	norm.
18	THE CHAIRMAN: Correct. Okay, thank
19	you very much indeed, see you tomorrow.
20	(The Inquiry adjourned until 10.00 am on
21	Friday, 12 April 2024)
22	(17.03)
	Page 257

		-		
<b>A</b>	107:11 111:24	65:12 66:2,14,24	advice 11:25 32:3	aforementioned
$\frac{A}{A/1374}$ 14:21	142:6 179:2,12	67:7 68:3 72:13	32:7 33:22 34:3	105:14
A/1426 23:22	179:17,25 180:5	83:20 85:9	35:5 36:6,9,13,22	afraid 139:5
A/1436 18:15	180:11,12 181:4	116:12 136:11,13	37:1,14 38:17,18	aftermath 156:7
A/289 216:21	189:12 196:7	136:15 152:25	40:18,22,22	afternoon 92:1
A/3 4:15	223:10 224:11	167:4 193:19	41:19 42:3 43:7	178:9,11 216:10
A1063 117:15	accessed 196:2	actions 8:15 15:15	43:21 47:16 48:3	235:7,9,12 257:6
A1288 148:4	accessing 44:2	49:13 53:1 83:23	48:7 49:22,25	<b>AG</b> 19:15,19,19
A1289 175:3	46:22 47:1	143:7 159:11	50:1,3,5,16,23	20:2 55:10 59:20
<b>A1290</b> 95:4 99:13	137:10 197:19	160:3,24 163:23	51:5,11,12,19,20	59:23 60:18,23
119:2	202:23	186:10 194:16	52:5,9,11,16,20	60:25 61:3,8,10
A1292 158:7	accommodate	204:12 250:4,7,9	53:1,5,8,12 58:20	61:18 62:9,14,25
<b>A1427</b> 34:15	257:11	activity 33:4,14,16	60:17 64:4,22	63:21,25 64:6
A1430 95:24	accommodating	33:17 36:24 83:9	68:25 69:3,5,7	69:5 73:13 75:2
<b>A1431</b> 94:12	154:2,7,9	167:1	74:2,8,10,23 75:4	77:24 78:4,4,25
109:23	accompanied	actual 6:8 116:3	77:3 81:17 99:4	79:11 142:10,14
<b>A1437</b> 193:17	55:11	172:18 197:4	99:15 102:23	147:18 159:22,23
<b>A223</b> 208:1,4	accord 163:8	acute 256:5	108:5 112:23	159:24 167:6
<b>A252</b> 171:4	account 15:18	ad 78:4 184:22	113:23 132:12,19	180:17 181:16,18
<b>A282</b> 214:25	70:21 144:24	adapt 135:6	133:3,12,14,16	181:22,24,25
<b>A4</b> 191:9	148:18 153:4,6	adapting 141:5	133:23 145:21	182:11,15,16
<b>A801</b> 161:22	165:25 166:10	add 251:12	148:18 149:18	191:15,20,21
<b>A802</b> 172:12	211:22	added 46:7,15	150:4 185:3,4	192:2,4,8 195:7
able 6:16 9:8 62:21	accounts 96:14	82:19 206:3,9,13	203:9,16 205:13	214:23 218:2
73:8 83:25	138:19 211:7,24	206:20 257:9,10	206:5,6 222:12	<b>AG's</b> 19:24 150:8
109:20 137:11	212:13	adding 171:21	223:10,12,17,17	225:1,5,8
147:23 165:22	accuracy 80:17	addition 47:15	224:11 225:11	Agencies 188:6
169:16,24 187:3	81:5,6,11	52:15 117:21	advise 14:10 83:19	<b>Agency</b> 185:7,10
187:7 197:3	accurate 76:7	additional 61:22	145:20 157:1	185:21,22 187:14
199:24 202:4	96:13 159:19	62:1 183:5	221:24	aggrieved 215:13
229:5 244:18,19	226:12 244:16,18	address 66:18,18	advised 11:23 15:1	ago 41:12 238:10
244:23 250:10	244:20 247:14	79:16 83:9 99:23	15:17 19:1 27:16	agree 12:10 17:6
abroad 30:25	251:19,24 252:2	addressed 40:20	27:21 59:17	48:16 66:14,15
absence 19:24	accurately 144:15	40:23 41:8,13	69:16 94:21	67:25 72:16
242:24 244:17	accusing 222:10	86:13 231:16	132:5 156:12	73:25 82:13 88:2
absolutely 237:21	aches 77:12	adds 212:17	180:9 220:12	89:17,21 100:16
238:5	achieve 32:22	253:22	221:18,23 223:19	103:2 111:6
abut 236:7	243:15	adjacent 236:1,9	adviser 209:16	137:4 153:20,24
ac 153:6	act 135:11 166:1	adjourned 56:12	advises 161:14	154:10,12,17,19
accept 49:25 51:10	acted 28:6 102:15	177:24 257:20	164:3 220:18	154:22 188:14 198:1 202:2
57:2 66:10 84:4	acting 159:16 179:21 205:8,14	adjournment 124:17	advising 60:19,25 104:11 182:18	220:21 222:1
84:5 104:6	205:15 216:6	admit 213:16	183:3,9 196:15	agreed 30:23
105:23 106:9	222:11,20 232:21	admit 213:16 adopt 29:16	204:11 210:2,6	44:12 50:6 63:15
112:19 114:3,4	232:25	143:19 148:10	affect 230:24,25	65:3 66:11 67:9
123:18 147:8,12	action 12:18,19	adopted 43:13	affidavit 19:14	68:2 77:21 88:24
241:8,15	14:9 16:5 32:13	adopted 43.13 advance 19:3	65:24 132:1	89:19 91:20,22
access 12:22 30:21	32:21 34:6 36:14	164:19	191:8	94:6 126:11
40:4 42:14 47:6	50:11 52:7 53:13	advantage 101:7	<b>afoot</b> 198:6	131:17,18 137:19
62:18 88:8 97:6	50.11 52.7 55.15	"" "" "" "" " " " " " " " " " " " " "	41000170.0	131.17,10 137.17
	l		l	l

				1 age 237
152:8,11,11,16	117:11	45:6 84:15 90:17	approving 96:1	arrival 88:6
152:18 157:4	amicable 131:18	203:21	97:12	130:12
167:10 179:9	amount 35:1 72:25	appended 95:16	approx 161:16	arrive 6:9 88:17
agreeing 65:15	89:14 200:1	appendix 206:24	approximately	arrived 109:12
66:7 67:11 73:23	amounted 42:15	applicable 245:13	3:25 162:3	157:21 167:23
193:23	amounts 37:15	application 73:11	April 1:1 35:16	169:18 187:13
agreement 28:10	analysis 89:8	94:21 95:17,22	38:9 44:3 51:17	arrives 167:17
65:11,18 66:1,6	anchored 173:18	96:2,11 97:13,20	53:17 54:1,3	aside 235:22
66:23 67:1,2,4,15	and/or 47:20	97:22 98:2,6,9,14	55:20,25 56:9,15	asked 23:5 35:8
67:17 68:4,13	69:17 105:12,13	100:8,19 110:5	56:24 57:2,4,10	43:8 81:16,18
69:21 78:25	105:21 117:23	112:24 113:17	57:10,12 58:5,13	83:13 89:7 115:6
79:12 137:15	119:15	115:3,14 117:2	58:19 59:12	118:18 119:22,25
169:23 193:18	announcing 254:4	117:16,20 132:6	63:15 64:22 69:1	128:22 129:1
194:2,15,18,19	answer 40:6 44:11	180:3 184:3	69:7,8,8 70:7	131:14 132:18
200:17	45:18,25,25 46:5	205:20 207:1	71:3,7 73:14	148:22 165:3
<b>Agrees</b> 78:23	57:1 61:15 77:15	210:10 213:18	80:18 81:6,7,8,12	171:7,18 172:5
ahead 13:4 58:17	103:7 114:2	applications 48:22	81:21 84:15	174:7,16 172.3
69:19 145:18	144:15 147:19	94:11 95:6 99:4	90:13 92:2,17,19	176:12,13,20
150:3	148:9 178:6	113:24 116:24	96:6 101:22	205:21 209:25
aim 233:18	198:20 213:7	117:4	193:16 194:10	210:11 217:21
aimed 51:3	239:5,8,15	applied 31:10	257:21	226:1 227:9,15
aims 213:24	241:19 242:15	206:13 212:9	area 1:13 197:21	230:7,11 235:12
aired 223:1	243:7,11 245:9	213:14	232:8 235:25	239:9,12 245:21
AIS 170:23,25	245:13 246:4	applies 242:15	argue 61:6 89:13	asking 105:3 128:4
171:10,15 172:7	253:12 255:18	apply 33:23 34:1	argument 89:17	143:1 154:16
240:3	answered 119:20	95:9 111:7 214:7	90:5 113:2	176:5 180:14,15
albeit 191:23	148:24 158:12	257:14	199:24	190:12 201:3,4
<b>Aldren</b> 227:5,6	159:5 234:6	applying 176:1	arm's 14:14	227:24 241:15
alerts 214:3	answers 56:19	208:13 214:12	armed 88:18	248:17 255:16
alive 65:1 152:23	anybody 18:10	231:3	arranged 18:23	Askis 24:5 136:14
all-out 44:24	107:2 145:9	appointed 6:2	125:7	asks 61:3 63:21,25
allegation 12:16	151:20 181:10	107:10 159:1,2	arrangements	aspect 188:15
72:3 132:1,23	anyway 48:8 66:13	appointment 99:7	30:18 107:14,16	196:16 233:20
204:10,10 234:12	134:17 155:22	99:9	107:23 172:16	asserted 64:11
allegations 131:24	160:11	approach 12:7	arranging 110:7	asserting 141:22
alleged 52:18	<b>apart</b> 9:17	13:1 29:16 83:13	arrest 15:25 23:16	assertion 108:19
87:16 103:6	apologies 58:2	90:1,4 136:7	29:13 49:16	assertions 65:18
108:23 121:19	65:21	148:11	80:10 150:12	assess 179:9
186:3 211:6	apologised 16:20	approached 122:8	arrested 13:10	254:14
<b>alleging</b> 6:14 36:1	62:8 195:10	appropriate 27:3	15:25 16:3 20:15	assessment 27:6
allow 92:14 177:7	<b>apology</b> 126:24	50:12 52:25	29:9,18 72:8	32:12 37:24 38:1
254:4	apparent 187:2	112:17 195:18,22	116:15 136:4	52:2 53:9 68:25
allowed 103:16	apparently 50:15	224:13,16	208:22 210:13	83:8,15 88:2
148:6 196:1,7	<b>appear</b> 4:16 14:22	approval 32:2,5	arresting 20:24	153:21 154:19
234:18 255:1	25:15 130:11	approve 90:19	151:4	179:5 246:16
allowing 144:23	171:16 241:12	96:14	arrests 13:21	assessments
<b>alter</b> 108:16 111:4	appeared 108:10	<b>approved</b> 95:13,18	14:11 15:1,4,7,17	123:19
alternative 31:25	appearing 219:9	97:4 98:6,14	89:15 110:4	assist 6:16 52:5
amendment 117:9	appears 44:19	132:14,21	122:25 135:3	137:14 169:16

				1 agc 200
183:22,25 184:3	54:9,14 55:18	106:17 109:24	110:22 114:14	125:14 142:25
185:8,22 187:12	56:17,23 63:3	110:1 111:21,23	115:11 129:12,13	beginning 5:17 7:6
213:12	64:2 65:17,24,25	113:8,14 139:8	135:19 140:13	26:24 199:19
assistance 5:24	67:8 68:1,12	139:13 141:5	145:5 157:6,19	222:5 240:15
185:7	69:12,16 78:16	143:12 145:7,9	157:21 161:6,11	behalf 12:18 22:14
assistant 158:17	142:21 143:1,15	146:11 148:5	185:9,20 191:19	25:11 121:17
assisting 237:18	143:25 144:9	151:14 165:16	194:18 196:19	behave 251:3
assume 181:7	145:14,20,21	191:11 213:17	201:5 205:22	behaviour 248:18
244:14	146:17 149:3	215:17,22,25	201.3 203.22 206:20 222:14	248:19
assumed 215:7	151:13 152:7,10	231:21 235:24	224:3 231:11	belief 2:6,21 58:7
assuming 55:15	155:1,16 156:4,5	242:9,10,11	232:24 235:20	202:16
79:19 167:4	157:8 159:12,15	248:3 249:1,18	252:23	<b>believe</b> 13:9 24:16
223:14	159:20 160:4,13	249:20	Background 208:2	37:2 56:23 57:17
<b>assumption</b> 29:19	162:10 163:3	249.20	backwards 154:11	58:4 62:12 95:12
222:16	166:4,7,12,18	В		96:22 97:3
<b>Astelon</b> 117:23	160:4,7,12,18	<b>b</b> 25:14 26:15,16	154:13,14 <b>bad</b> 150:15 256:11	124:25 130:8
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	37:11 47:14,20		
218:9	169:7 171:6	51:15 54:19	<b>Baglietto</b> 132:4	138:20 150:9
at 29:22 attach 32:18	179:17,20 181:2 190:7,19,24	101:2 130:7	216:6,18 218:12 218:17 221:16	215:16
attach 32:18 attached 29:2	190:7,19,24	137:25 143:22	218:17 221:16 222:9,23 224:11	<b>believed</b> 56:24 237:12 240:15
		145:12 177:8	•	
32:11 83:6 86:7	194:23 195:24	252:14	bail 24:17 85:5,5	244:15,16
attachments 41:25	196:4,14 209:16	<b>B/126</b> 219:2	194:7,9	believing 28:6 beneficial 218:9
attacked 228:9	209:22 210:1	B/276 220:5	<b>bailed</b> 14:16	
attempting 184:9	217:14,18 218:16	<b>B122</b> 252:14	balance 251:18	benefit 28:14
212:18	218:24 223:14,15	<b>B1417</b> 156:3	Barbara 235:23	45:15,16 51:10
attend 62:7 89:4,6	225:13,15,16	<b>B1680</b> 160:18	236:15 239:10 Párk 161:10	54:23 66:9
117:25 128:18	229:19,20 241:2	163:23	<b>Bárbara</b> 161:19	112:23 124:23
134:1,3 147:21	247:3	<b>B237</b> 150:5,6	162:4,23	125:22 142:11
150:12 151:1,4	attracted 207:16	<b>B2957</b> 211:4	<b>barrister</b> 189:1	166:11 167:19
227:9	attributed 220:17	<b>B308</b> 151:23	based 28:13 47:17	229:2
attendance 29:15	audio 226:1 253:6	<b>B321</b> 151:12	83:11 96:4 97:15	benefited 51:11
29:23 80:12	253:14 254:15	<b>B3243</b> 100:11	116:15 205:24	108:4
136:21 145:3 attended 20:6 31:1	authorities 164:25	<b>B3244</b> 103:22	basis 28:5 32:18	benefitted 116:25
	165:8	<b>B3245</b> 110:23	44:14 52:4 77:22	bent 153:13,19
53:24 59:24	Authority 179:25	<b>B3272</b> 31:16	87:12 90:18	154:7,8,10,11,12
92:13 119:17	availability 256:6 available 12:23	<b>B3277</b> 86:3	95:14 100:20	154:15
124:21 125:4		<b>B3452</b> 27:4	108:19 165:1,2	berthed 173:17
138:20 143:24	87:3 165:23	B3612 40:20	184:22 215:23	best 2:5,20 45:18
159:14,17 200:9	244:22	<b>B3630</b> 202:18	241:8	49:4 54:3 71:8
245:15	avoid 77:12	<b>B3666</b> 197:3	bay 173:18	77:14 123:12
attendee 18:5	129:19 256:11	<b>B3681</b> 80:14	beach 235:23	147:24 149:1,19
attending 125:6	aware 12:15 19:18	<b>B5506</b> 77:9	236:5,9 239:11	betrayed 122:9,17
133:20 163:3	23:13 24:1 38:12	<b>B5736</b> 168:12	239:18	122:18,20 123:2
attention 9:24	41:16 45:7 47:4	back 21:1 23:5	bear 101:19	better 3:14,15
40:24 41:15	53:17 54:7,22	28:14 40:6 43:15	176:21	76:19 127:3
128:17 172:21	55:25 56:20	47:8 56:8 60:10	bearing 69:3	251:18
Atter 126:20	63:11,13 89:15	61:9 65:2 73:21	becoming 127:3	beyond 63:12
Attorney 19:9,13	98:24 100:7,9	81:24 82:2,8	beg 238:2 243:5	68:16 188:2
53:18,22,25 54:5	101:14 105:16	83:1 99:11 107:6	began 3:2 6:12	196:25 225:21
		03.1 99.11 10/:0		

				Page 201
<b>BF</b> 10:10	220:5,6,14	102:5 172:20	227:18 229:15	88:21 108:14
<b>BGTW</b> 170:7,10	<b>bound</b> 108:11	191:16 192:8	235:25	111:2 112:12
170:13,16 239:18	boundaries 35:14	199:5 203:1	called 14:16,18	123:4 136:18,19
bid 188:4	box 252:24	204:5	17:8,9,9 58:14	138:16 141:20
big 220:14 226:21	Branch 252:17	<b>building</b> 126:14	60:19,25 129:1	147:21 165:9
bigger 187:24	breach 148:17	bullet 13:20 24:15	129:13,13,14,14	185:2 191:11
biggest 226:22	204:10	24:19,21 26:17	141:11 159:10	198:21,22 209:9
bin 40:16	break 56:5,7 61:15	61:18,24 122:2	175:8 187:16	221:19 222:8
bit 13:2 28:7 92:19	66:10 124:4	168:17	192:23 201:15	224:4 230:19
128:25 137:7	149:25 172:3	<b>bundle</b> 1:19 4:15	226:20	233:12 244:14,21
154:8 168:16	177:12,21 234:22	4:16 18:14 25:14	calling 61:12,14	253:5
178:14 186:9	234:23 235:2	26:15,16 37:11	calls 127:7,25	cases 50:21 52:22
189:25 191:10	256:16	83:4 84:12	215:5	69:6 136:20
202:15 203:13	<b>Brian</b> 5:19 10:10	business 8:14 24:6	camera 94:9	225:17
207:4 211:24	brief 4:3 7:11	27:12 35:12 36:2	123:24 124:1,24	caso 167:11
214:22 216:22,24	18:24 20:21	36:24 39:9 58:18	125:13,17 130:4	categorical 156:10
223:9,21 225:21	157:16,25 160:23	137:12 205:11,15	131:13,21	categorically
228:4 233:8,11	166:6 191:24	209:10 244:8	cancelled 211:12	156:25
234:1 256:10	briefed 31:24		Canessa 46:25	<b>Cathal</b> 227:2
Bland 17:3 28:10	35:11 157:9,11	C	capable 105:10,14	caught 128:24
100:15,24 182:23	157:22 162:8	c 21:3 57:13 70:7	105:20 239:11	caused 45:1
Bland's 12:18	163:6 166:5	84:12 101:6	251:7	127:13 143:11
24:25	174:14 240:25	126:2	capacity 181:25	209:1,6 217:11
<b>Blands</b> 45:2	briefer 76:1	C-Vay 168:25	229:7	caution 48:1 70:14
101:10 199:20	briefest 38:23	<b>C/1657</b> 10:8	capture 106:22	71:17 136:5
<b>block</b> 61:13	<b>briefing</b> 10:9,13	<b>C/1733</b> 13:3	captured 172:17	145:19 146:4,6
blue 2:9	10:15,16 11:5,6	<b>C/1735</b> 17:13	car 15:11,11	147:10,20 148:1
board 6:1	19:3 22:19,22	<b>C/1760</b> 24:11	career 69:20	149:9 150:10
boardroom 125:1	81:14 82:4	C1764 25:24	134:17	153:6
126:20 127:21	157:20 168:10	<b>C1789</b> 120:6	careful 153:3	ceasing 175:25
130:13	174:12,12 241:11	<b>C4436</b> 165:24	carried 58:18	cell 144:12 147:14
<b>body</b> 94:9,19	241:13	Cabinet 55:2	234:11 242:19	cent 128:10 138:8
<b>body-</b> 123:25	briefings 8:18,19	Caine 19:1 20:19	carry 147:2	191:6 226:12
body-worn 123:21	191:19	22:22 23:16 60:6	carrying 45:5	Centralised
123:22,23 124:24	briefly 158:5	194:24	146:12 147:4	108:24
125:13 130:4	191:17 234:18	calendar 37:10	<b>Caruana</b> 1:9 12:9	certain 3:23 41:23
book 8:10 10:5	<b>bright</b> 50:18	call 7:7,10 9:9	233:7 234:3,24	81:14 82:11 98:4
37:7 57:15 58:25	<b>bring</b> 65:5 89:8	13:14 14:4 15:5	235:6,7,19 238:2	109:12 115:4
77:17 80:20,21	198:11 202:9,9	16:14 17:17	238:22 239:4	116:18 128:10
82:5 87:7 92:7	251:4,14	40:18,18,21	243:5,10,14,18	138:8 157:23
137:22	bringing 251:7	61:13,16 71:7	246:10 254:21,25	164:20,22 168:21
borderline 72:20	<b>brings</b> 198:12	73:14 84:14	255:14,20 256:1	188:2 191:6
72:21 73:7	<b>British</b> 236:10,16	120:8,17 121:14	case 2:16 16:4,5,8	238:18,19 239:21
bottom 11:19,22	236:24 237:13	127:13 129:12	20:17 27:15	certainly 13:24
13:25 24:22	238:1,3,16	130:23 155:4,16	28:13 36:23 42:7	56:10 59:4,25
32:10 78:20	239:11,14 240:6	156:1 157:18	42:11,12 50:10	124:10 138:10
84:20 126:14	Britto 179:24	158:8,10 165:20	50:22 52:21 61:6	139:17 189:11
150:5 151:23	181:7	166:20,24 168:4	75:6 77:22 78:8	197:23 217:3
152:2 219:3	<b>brought</b> 6:1 44:21	168:8 185:15	78:9 81:4 83:7	225:23
		225:24 226:4,18		

				Page 202
certainty 99:2	202:9,10 237:20	209:19 210:2	clarity's 39:25	collusion 254:11
164:19 170:20	charged 78:22	219:14,21 222:14	Clarke 25:20	com 165:20
202:8 219:25	79:14 247:5	222:24 223:4,23	95:18 96:9 97:18	combination
chain 40:25	charges 26:17,18	224:2,4,6,17	115:19 118:7	149:18
chairman 3:9,15	42:4,9,10,25 43:3	Chincotta 125:8	119:19 130:15	come 40:8,10 50:6
3:17,18 26:4	47:16 52:10	125:19 126:15,17	Clarke's 117:14	56:8 77:1 78:25
46:17 56:5,10	56:18 57:6 60:1	126:21 127:13	clear 5:22 12:6	79:13 110:22
57:22,25 59:12	61:4 63:22 64:7	128:8 129:23	26:23 30:6 50:21	125:12 126:9,11
105:25 106:3	65:5,14 66:4,11	130:13,17,24	67:24 68:16 79:4	127:20 128:22
111:16 112:4,10	68:14 71:22 72:2	131:2 133:5	125:17 126:24	129:1,2,5,5,18
114:1,19,22	193:22 197:2,4,6	<b>Chipolina</b> 161:24	163:12 172:19	140:9 157:19
115:20,23 118:24	197:16 198:6,11	165:7,13,15,20	221:17 229:1,18	165:17 184:6,12
124:2,7,12,15	198:12 199:1,5	chitchat 134:20	230:10,12 236:21	185:9,22 201:5
140:16,20,22	charging 36:9	choice 73:21	236:25 237:21	203:24 220:22
165:5,11,14	40:17,18,19,21	choice 73.21 choose 27:2,14	238:3,5,15	222:2 223:1,3,22
177:12,20 178:1	41:2,19 42:8	30:24 82:22	239:13,19,22	240:21
178:6 193:6,9,14	43:6 51:18,20	114:12	240:5,7,12	comes 49:7 111:17
217:21 233:5,16	64:22 68:25 74:7	choosing 76:17,22	240:3,7,12	111:20,22 112:6
233:22 234:5,10	95:14 203:9	chose 73:20 84:10	clearer 65:21	comfiture 246:16
234:15,20,25	206:5,6	115:11 155:8	clearing 13:1	comfort 245:24
235:4 237:24	chase 167:3	chosen 99:25	clearly 109:2	comfortable 3:19
238:13,24 239:6	168:11 170:7,9	143:2 146:14	222:8	47:9 77:21 78:7
239:15 243:8,12	170:12,15,17	Chris 147:7	clients 106:1	218:23 234:1
243:17 246:9	237:6 238:20	Christian 145:15	clip 173:13	245:19 246:7,9
254:18,23 255:2	chaser 93:2,19	chunk 109:13	close 137:12	246:11,22 247:24
255:16,23 256:3	chat 77:20	CI 161:11	closed 211:8	247:25 248:6
256:7,14,18	check 2:11 80:17	circumstances	clothes 126:13	251:11,12
257:1,3,12,15,18	81:6,11,18 84:22	112:11 114:8	CM 21:13 63:9	coming 149:24
Chairman's	216:11	201:25 244:11,12	<b>co</b> 30:6	185:20 191:22
111:19	Chief 5:18 15:10	245:2 251:16,17	co-conspirators	214:4,5
challenge 129:24	16:19,21 17:11	257:14	211:6	command 159:11
challenged 141:23	17:25 20:21	civil 12:18 16:5	code 43:1 60:7	160:3 237:8
143:8 211:12	21:16,25,25	18:25 20:19	141:3 249:1,22	commanding
chambers 225:2,6	22:15 31:7,11,14	162:1 165:17	250:11	136:2
225:9,13	46:23 54:25	166:21,24 168:5	coincided 4:6	commas 167:6
chance 34:16	61:21,24 62:4	169:8 188:25	collar 63:11	commenced 4:19
46:11 68:11 91:2	72:16,24 80:3	189:2,6,10,17	colleague 249:18	4:22 5:5 58:25
120:14	94:25 98:18	194:24 195:19	collected 110:2	commences 125:1
Chances 105:19	101:7 132:7	claims 30:15	collision 158:4	commencing 4:21
change 205:25	156:5 157:7	223:11	161:14 163:23	comment 16:21
228:15	158:11 159:1,7	clarification 23:4	164:3 166:8	21:21 22:1,8
changed 100:5	161:5 164:11	93:18 201:4	168:1,18,20	74:14 76:10 81:1
153:1	166:2 174:8	240:8	170:18 172:18	commission 10:15
changes 181:21	175:11,23 179:11	clarified 65:13	173:3,15 236:23	48:4
changing 144:19	180:15,24 181:4	66:3 193:20	237:3,22 238:16	Commissioner 3:7
characterisation	181:12 189:4,15	clarify 7:18 8:3	238:19 240:5	6:25 7:10 8:20
64:16	200:10,23 207:13	21:10 22:13 57:8	collocated 184:19	10:16 11:6,8
charge 6:3 42:18	207:17,23 208:5	68:10 194:14	colluding 252:18	19:18,23 21:24
85:7,16,22,23	208:24 209:8,17	243:6	252:19 254:5	22:20 31:18,24
,,,				
	<u> </u>		<u> </u>	I

				1 480 200
40:23 41:9,13	compared 186:17	12:22 44:18 50:2	102:12	71:13 75:19 76:5
53:19,25 54:5,10	188:10	50:20 58:8 59:25	confirm 2:4,11,15	78:5 96:5 104:9
54:13 55:1,19	compatible 110:15	65:19 102:14	2:18 15:21 20:1	109:5 147:5
67:7 69:17 78:17	135:23	106:14 119:10	62:20 132:24	181:13 186:2
81:15,16 82:15	compel 151:3	134:8 148:13,14	168:23 169:4	200:3
86:13,15 120:9	complain 62:2	149:1 158:15	confirmed 16:21	considering 58:20
120:12,23 144:2	complainant 7:8	169:15 176:14	23:2 49:24 71:6	60:6 66:21
152:6 153:13,18	14:7 16:18	217:25 229:25	79:5 83:17	133:16,25
161:4,10 163:1	121:17 199:20	230:1,2 256:4	164:21	conspiracy 24:25
165:21 168:7	253:4	concerning 24:4	confirming 73:15	28:3,18 47:19
172:22 175:22	complainants 16:2	64:10 148:16	confirms 96:8	48:5 71:22 72:2
176:1 190:8,24	complained	162:11 163:7	97:17	209:14
192:22 214:23	215:11	224:8,10 241:3	confused 15:24	Constable 96:9
222:10,19 223:16	complaint 5:6 6:7	concerns 4:23	18:20	97:17
223:23 224:2	6:8,13 61:20	19:17 68:23	confusion 222:5	constantly 208:10
227:14 229:17,22	complaints 12:14	73:12 152:15	connected 108:25	256:2
229:24 230:11,18	completely 3:11	175:14,16 218:1	195:14	constituted 28:16
230:20 232:15	78:23 119:7	concert 71:18	connection 23:13	constitutional
240:25 241:21	219:7 228:4	concerted 200:22	136:12 176:13	181:21 228:11
244:15 247:2	completeness'	concludes 28:1	conscious 110:12	<b>consult</b> 33:3,13
248:13	148:25	conclusion 27:25	135:15,20 153:2	34:21 52:25 94:7
commissioner's	complex 32:25	39:14 40:8,10	consent 49:3	107:15 129:23
22:22 226:19,20	42:7 198:2,21	44:4,12 50:7	107:25 134:22	consulted 35:17
248:18	complexities	71:2 100:17	137:13	51:2 59:23 69:4
Commissioners	191:11	103:4 202:5	consents 29:14	116:11 194:11
218:22	complicated 30:15	205:16	consequences	198:18,23
commit 207:6	compliment	conclusions 28:5	128:2,3,4,17	consulting 191:12
committed 28:3	234:14	34:4 39:5 75:7	129:7 186:2,6,24	<b>contact</b> 16:2 53:18
37:18 47:19,23	comprehensive	75:13	consider 28:16	53:21 92:24
50:17 52:18 73:2	28:20 29:3 39:1	concurred 83:12	30:3,10 32:1	93:15 94:2
84:1 87:19	39:2	conduct 30:22	46:6,14 47:24	104:13 174:17
101:15 121:20	compromise 12:25	35:15,25 47:25	48:13 59:9 76:18	254:6
committing 16:8	143:10	48:13 141:3	87:2 91:17 93:4	contacting 93:16
50:9 146:5	computer 26:19	142:21 144:9	93:20 95:2 98:7	101:8
communicate	26:25 42:12,14	186:3 244:7	104:14 106:20,24	contacts 162:1
83:17	42:17 44:6	251:2	112:16 132:8	211:10
communication	101:15 116:4	conducting 27:11	183:15 256:10	contain 104:2,23
46:7 47:7 80:2	178:14 187:4	conference 7:7,10	considerable 35:1	104:23
100:23 137:18	197:17 202:18	60:12 71:7 73:14	66:19 72:25	contained 32:19
149:13 244:24	computers 105:10	74:25 120:7	considerably	106:11 163:19
communications	conceal 108:17	conferring 29:10	85:19	containing 104:17
101:14 105:15	111:5	30:4,7	consideration	104:17
106:6,23 109:10	conceivably 236:9	confidence 175:12	32:24 37:17	contemporaneous
109:13 110:3	concern 148:13	confident 205:1	49:19 76:22	80:22
174:22 210:16	178:17 209:2,6,7	confidential 5:14	234:17	contemporaneo
community 51:1	213:8,13 217:11	33:9 44:20 102:4	considerations	8:25
135:13	219:12 224:3	202:25 204:4	108:21	content 30:14
company 207:24	229:23	244:8	considered 43:1,4	121:6 147:5
207:25 209:13	concerned 5:16	confidentially 45:8	50:11 64:23 71:3	157:25 191:23
	<u> </u>		<u> </u>	<u> </u>

				1 agc 204
206:21 247:16	200:20	121:11,12 127:5	176:14 184:21	crisis 85:20 228:12
contents 2:4,19	coordinates	129:9 130:6	192:5 201:17	critical 78:22
59:11 82:3	161:25 162:6,12	136:6 139:12	221:5 227:6	Cross-examinati
context 93:11	162:13,15,22	145:14 146:1	256:9	178:7 235:5
186:9 189:8	163:8,20 164:4	147:10 151:16	court 84:19 94:22	Crown 78:6 99:14
contextualise	164:12,15,20,21	155:6,10 160:15	96:3 97:14 98:3	99:22 144:1
221:2 226:15	165:16 168:18	161:6 182:21	98:8 99:10,23	225:10,12,19
continued 69:10	169:2,8 235:12	183:2 188:13	119:14 184:6	Cruz 176:25
149:11	235:23 236:19,23	189:5,19 192:4	208:3 214:12	177:16 178:2,3
contract 25:1	238:6 241:4,10	197:9,14 198:13	223:2	252:10
28:11 100:15,24	coordination	204:20 206:15	courts 12:21	crying 211:20
200:17	165:8	210:14 212:14	cover 254:22,24	CS 62:2 110:5
contracted 43:25	<b>CoP</b> 10:9,14 11:24	214:16,18 231:4	covered 39:25	CTI 1:7
45:3	12:6 14:3,4	232:13 234:10	125:16	curious 218:2
contrary 89:12	77:24 116:10	235:18 257:12,15	covering 74:7	Customs 141:9
187:17	122:5 162:7,8	257:18	covert 169:1	cyber 187:12,14
contributed 46:15	copied 160:19	corrected 160:9	231:24 249:14	187:25
control 189:13	223:15	correction 113:14	250:5,18 251:5	
204:1	copies 8:1	correctly 84:23	252:4	D
controversial 12:7	copy 8:6 14:2,23	227:8	covertly 140:17	<b>d</b> 101:8
convened 161:2,7	19:4 37:25 62:19	correspondence	231:24 244:5	<b>D2900</b> 115:15,25
convenient 234:23	173:5,7,9,10	41:12 95:7	Covid 62:8 74:24	daily 87:11
254:16 255:21	cordial 134:13	158:23	84:18 85:16,20	data 137:9 148:17
convent 15:8	Corne 102:13	corroborate 83:25	Craig 95:19	204:10
conversation	Cornelio 13:9	corrupt 62:3 195:9	create 228:11	databases 137:10
14:19 17:6,20	43:17,20,24 44:2	247:3	created 62:16	date 16:23 24:12
20:7 63:8 74:15	44:19 46:21 47:3	Costa 18:1	creates 197:20	25:19 54:22
76:4 82:20 84:17	47:5,8 101:9,16	counsel 78:6 99:14	creation 101:2	56:22 57:8 62:21
85:4 131:2,6	101:22 102:3,10	99:22,22 100:1	crime 3:6 4:24,24	92:8 142:2
133:5 134:12,18	102:22 136:13	133:11 144:1	4:25,25 5:1,2,21	155:10 174:6
140:11 152:5	146:16 199:6	counsel's 99:14	16:8 63:11 146:6	221:8
154:25 155:22	202:22 203:12,15	<b>counsels</b> 225:10,12	159:6,7 185:7,10	dated 55:22 58:8
223:4 228:3	203:21 205:11	225:19	185:21,22 187:11	65:24 81:7,8
252:21 253:23	211:6,15,21	counter-113:1	187:12,14,25	96:7
conversations	Cornelio's 103:6	counter-argument	188:5 198:19	dates 138:21
63:18 87:11	121:11	90:7	231:1,6,7 250:10	day 9:19,21 13:8
109:14 143:12	cornered 122:22	country 188:9	crimes 187:1,9	14:17 15:2,7,15
190:6 253:3,24	correct 2:17 10:12	<b>couple</b> 2:23 17:15	207:7,11	15:18,24 16:16
254:16	11:14 12:11	77:16,18 177:2	criminal 35:15	37:7 54:24 57:15
<b>convey</b> 246:18	13:11,12,15,16	222:14 234:19	36:1,24 37:15,18	58:17,18,19 69:7
convicted 207:11	24:15 48:2,10,18	course 18:11 32:13	39:10 47:20 48:6	70:3 75:3 77:17
conviction 52:12	62:6,16 69:25	32:13,21 34:6	83:8 84:2 111:25	80:20,21,24 82:5
71:24 78:12	70:5 81:22,23	36:14 50:25 52:7	145:22 167:4	87:7 92:2,7
convinced 64:15	83:15 84:15 85:1	53:13 61:14	182:12 186:3	95:22 98:2
64:18	95:1 97:7 105:18	66:14 83:20	191:13 195:1	101:23 102:10
cooperation 88:11	105:24 106:8,13	105:16 113:8,14	203:20 217:9	107:24 108:2
88:19	106:19 107:18,19	116:11 134:5	225:11	109:12 123:17
cooperation' 167:5	114:21 118:11	137:5 143:18	criminality 186:23	124:20,24 143:13
cooperative	120:10,13 121:8	144:17 152:24	195:20	159:16 169:17,23
				172:15,19 184:6
	•	•	•	•

Г				Page 203
184:21 203:11	<b>decided</b> 26:22 71:4	<b>Delhi</b> 4:18 5:8 6:5	destroy 108:16	132:18 134:5
215:4,9,10	92:3,5,12 115:9	6:8,17 7:3,17,23	111:4 120:3	136:7,16 143:19
day-to-day 8:14	198:16,17	7:25 8:4,7 9:21	destroyed 109:7	150:7,10 143:17
daybook 7:16,16	deciding 115:1	9:22 15:24 18:24	110:12	189:21 193:14
7:19,19,22,25 8:4	129:24	20:17 34:19	destroying 30:11	208:20 209:3,5
8:5,7,12,13,17	decision 27:13	53:15,20 54:6,14	destruction 113:6	209:23 247:15,18
9:11,14,17 10:7	31:13 33:23	54:18 57:14 85:5	detail 32:22 33:7	differently 134:24
10:20 17:14 18:9	35:22 42:16	87:4 123:1,4	87:13 96:6	136:5 156:21,23
21:2 23:19 24:10	48:17,19 51:12	151:9 158:24	100:19 186:6	218:19
36:18 37:1 57:14	73:18 82:25	175:14 176:14,16	205:20 206:4	<b>difficult</b> 103:14
58:16 70:2,8	92:15 94:24	176:17 183:17	207:1	200:22
71:11 74:17	114:15,17 179:5	190:11,16,20	detailed 117:20	difficulty 25:8
120:7 126:1	202:20 203:6	190:11,10,20	179:6	digital 45:3 87:17
157:5 159:11	245:8,12 248:15	193:2 194:8	details 63:12	104:4 107:5,9
160:3 162:16	248:16	199:13 230:8,13	Detective 86:5	110:4
164:8 165:18	<b>Decision-</b> 27:9	230:15,21	95:19 96:9 97:17	digitally 117:24
166:10,11,13	decisions 231:13	deliberate 242:1	116:10 144:3	direct 7:13 78:22
253:18,19	deface 108:16	deliberately	159:7 162:8	183:19
daybooks 9:6	111:4	232:20 241:21	164:11 240:25	directed 185:15,18
days 9:3,19 16:1	defaced 109:7	242:4,22	determine 78:11	direction 64:2
201:7,8	defend 83:22	demonstrate	145:2	directly 60:4
<b>DCI</b> 161:21	150:2 219:21	100:13	determined	198:11
172:13 173:2	defendant 218:25	<b>DEP</b> 11:24	123:20 168:18	<b>Director</b> 250:19
de 161:19 162:23	defendants 12:19	depart 137:4	developed 4:14	250:20
de 101.19 102.23 deal 25:7 49:5	12:21 15:25	depend 61:5 63:23	5:21 44:9	disagree 17:4
70:25 91:18	49:16 79:14 85:5	depended 185:1	device 104:16,23	disagreement
103:1 137:16	123:4 151:9,10	depends 16:4	105:13,19 109:18	56:21 63:14
154:3 159:10	194:8	42:11 52:21	devices 20:18	disappear 219:11
178:22 183:5	defensible 114:18	198:19 208:21	23:17 87:18 88:8	disciplinary 60:7
189:23 209:2,5	defensive 143:7	244:11 245:2	88:13 89:8 104:4	194:25 195:21
209:22 230:24	defining 106:20	250:13	105:9 106:9	disclose 191:23
dealing 59:21 60:3	definitely 124:9	deprive 24:25	107:5,9 108:1	disclosure 97:20
85:8 87:3 127:22	151:17	28:10	110:4,7 116:13	97:21,23,25
135:8,8,9 143:3	definition 49:14	deputed 37:3	137:19 170:23	144:22
149:8 189:20	defraud 28:4,18	deputy 158:17	171:3	discovered 240:8
dealings 131:10	47:20 48:5 71:22	189:4,14 237:17	DeVincenzi 56:17	240:13
deals 211:2	72:2 209:14	describe 4:8	56:23 60:24	discredit 251:4,8
dealt 49:3 84:2	degrees 161:14,15	164:12	64:12 144:2,12	251:14
89:12 136:18	del 167:10	described 8:24	247:9,15	discreet 126:25
145:23 178:22	delay 10:4 147:4	112:15	<b>DI</b> 126:22	127:11 131:16
182:15 194:25	delayed 85:18,19	describes 156:6	dictated 171:22	discuss 32:14
197:23 218:18	delete 111:10,13	168:11	did 113:22	34:18 56:17 57:6
225:18 230:25	211:13	description 40:20	die 219:16,23	68:5 86:24 87:5
231:5	deleted 109:9,14	116:5 166:25	difference 96:17	91:12 92:1
death 219:22	110:3 210:16	202:6	130:2 154:6	102:13 103:17,18
December 5:9	212:2,11,12,20	deserve 228:5,6	183:14 230:14	121:16 129:16
6:10,18	213:1	deserved 250:25	different 8:5,9	147:6 195:12
decide 83:22 90:24	deletions 110:9	desire 142:9,18	29:16 36:5 77:2	218:21
148:10 150:3	210:19,22	<b>Despite</b> 44:1	82:22 105:4	discussed 25:21
1.0.10 120.3	210.17,22	- ospice i iii	32.22 100.1	
	l		l	

				1 450 200
26:9 30:20 43:19	180:5 202:20	144:1 145:23	<u> </u>	160:19 163:17,21
61:8 63:2,4	203:6 219:10	147:18 150:7	e 100:20 101:14	163:24 211:4,7
64:20 67:6,19	documentation	151:14 156:7,9	EA 29:8	212:13,23
76:8 94:6 102:18	117:22	156:14,19 177:4	earlier 49:21	emailed 38:8
102:21 114:24	documents 95:6	179:8 180:9,12	51:17 56:19 57:1	emails 35:10 92:10
115:8,13 122:24	95:16 97:24	180:14 181:22	98:16 110:4	92:17 200:18
170:2,12,18	106:22 117:3	182:1,4 185:3	117:18 145:6	211:9,11,14,18
191:15 194:5,7	137:17 177:2,14	191:14 194:10	185:25 191:25	212:2,5,22 213:1
194:10 203:14	178:24 179:3	198:12,18,22	193:25 197:11	213:4
208:6 235:21	184:1 186:10	215:14,23,25	201:15 213:7	embark 53:2
248:8 256:12	200:12,15 207:15	221:18,20 222:12	235:16 256:12	emojis 211:21
discussing 78:19	dog 169:21 235:14	223:11,12,12,18	early 10:7 56:4	<b>emotion</b> 246:24
92:4,6 94:13	doing 43:13 89:7	224:12 225:3,22	100:24 175:1	247:1
100:23 132:16	118:8 146:19,22	<b>DPP's</b> 35:5 36:22	176:2 256:11,15	emotional 141:21
133:7 150:14	146:24 233:13	38:17,18 48:7	256:19,22	142:25 155:13,18
168:3	249:21 256:2	50:1 69:2,6	east 161:16 162:3	229:17,21
discussion 87:8	doing' 146:23	74:18 76:9 82:8	162:23	employed 101:10
130:17 142:13	door 214:14	84:4 113:9,15,18	Eddie 24:5	employee 13:22
147:17 156:6	doubt 43:24 70:12	114:7,10 115:7	effect 17:7 85:14	15:20
discussions 125:18	70:17,23 71:16	<b>Dr</b> 179:24 181:7	188:8 219:21	en 167:10
184:21 186:11	83:24 108:6	draft 27:14 90:15	221:17	enabling 254:12
208:25 209:20	237:2,8 238:9,11	91:5 167:6	effecting 33:10	ended 10:1 69:20
dishonestly 28:6	241:16	<b>drafted</b> 37:16,19	effectively 40:16	ends 131:7 256:21
dishonesty 28:8,12	downhill 143:5	48:24 95:12	87:25	engage 83:14
28:18 35:14	downstairs 130:14	96:22 97:3,5	either 56:15 69:23	engaged 135:1
disposal 32:14	<b>DPP</b> 17:25 30:20	112:2,5 243:9	73:13 146:21	187:11
disprove 254:11	33:3,13,22 34:2	drafter 108:3	150:22 169:6	England 19:24
254:13	34:10,12,21,25	drafting 91:7	194:3 205:15	enquiries 85:12
dispute 157:9	35:8,17 36:10	112:23 113:23	215:9 228:9,13	enquiring 191:21
disputed 199:22	37:13,25 39:18	183:22,25 184:3	241:13,14 247:23	enquiry 121:23
dissipation 8:20	40:3,7,9 41:20	draw 34:3 39:13	elaborate 188:19	enshrined 84:2
distances 172:20	42:4 48:25 49:23	75:7 202:5	elderly 61:12	ensued 167:3
distancing 85:21	49:24 51:2,6,18	205:16	elect 114:12	ensure 33:3,13
distinction 238:18	52:20 58:20	<b>drawing</b> 39:5 64:8	elected 31:1	83:14 255:11
distinguish 156:17	59:22 60:4,12	drawn 50:15 75:12	electronic 23:17	entail 166:7
diversion 197:20	64:21 68:22 69:5	162:19 188:6	105:8,12,19,21	entails 5:11
diverted 9:24	70:7,15,16 71:6,9	dressing 63:8	115:16 116:1	entering 9:16
docket 49:18	72:20 73:5,13,15	drew 238:17	137:9,17	entirely 145:15
<b>document</b> 2:1 27:5	73:23 74:3,11,13	drill 78:23	element 170:7,9,15	245:19 255:14
28:1 29:3 32:17	75:7,12,20 77:5	driver 15:11	else's 9:10 179:7	entitled 43:6 47:5
32:20 41:19 43:6	77:20 78:4 79:9	driving 15:10	<b>email</b> 24:4 31:17	entitlement 176:25
43:10,14 52:4	82:15,21 83:14	drove 112:16	32:8,10,18 38:7	Entonces 150:14
61:9 86:16 87:8	83:17 84:14	dry 217:3	38:11 40:25	entries 10:6 77:16
89:23 96:10	86:22 92:24	<b>DS</b> 60:12 115:18	41:21 51:16,18	entry 8:9 9:14
99:18 108:4	93:16,24 94:2,4	119:18 130:14	51:22 54:20 55:2	24:10 26:6,7
115:16,17,18	96:6 100:8	DSI 16:14	55:22,24 56:2	28:19 33:11 39:1
116:6,16,18	104:14 114:16,24 115:10 116:10	dual 181:22 due 194:9	74:7 80:15 81:8	39:2 58:10 59:4
174:13 179:6,7 179:12,18,19,25	132:5 134:5	duty 4:6 251:4	83:13 86:4,10,19	80:20,21 87:7 92:7,8 125:7
1/9.14,10,19,43	154.5 154.5	uuiy 4.0 231.4	90:13 93:5,21	74.1,0 143.1

				Page 26/
126 10 127 60	06 4 07 15 10	105 2 244 14 21	(0.12.74.16.70.1	117 12 122 14
126:19 127:6,8	96:4 97:15,19	185:2 244:14,21	69:13 74:16 78:1	117:13 123:14
129:8,21 130:4	98:25 100:16	254:1	79:3 85:2 103:14	133:7 134:4,6
138:23 161:2,13	102:18,21 103:3	Excellency 167:17	116:15 125:2	140:7 141:4,7
162:19 165:19	109:6 110:10	241:7	127:9 141:23	147:20 153:2
166:13,20 167:15	112:15 113:6	exception 8:7	146:2 155:7	173:20 183:3
167:20 211:1	114:5 116:25	exchange 19:6,7	199:18 201:19	197:4,12,22
219:2	120:3 137:23	19:22 31:17	explained 58:4	208:8 210:12
equipment 171:22	138:3,16 147:22	73:25 74:3 92:10	68:22 76:12 78:7	214:3 247:17,25
escorted 126:16	147:25 148:1	131:17 171:13	82:6,6,18 84:7	251:21 254:2
especially 219:15	149:20,21 151:8	172:1,4,9 200:17	126:18,23 128:21	factors 194:1
established 99:16	151:16 161:21	206:21 216:2	129:4 175:10	factual 165:25
113:9	181:13,16,19	217:6 220:25	explaining 27:11	<b>fail</b> 108:11
Este 167:10	182:12 183:7	exchanges 29:4	61:22 62:1 204:2	fair 13:2 48:11
<b>esteem</b> 188:25	186:1 191:17,22	30:8 43:17 63:3	213:13	64:16 89:24 90:3
esteemed 189:1	191:25 197:10	<b>excuse</b> 178:12	explanation 90:23	92:16 98:5 111:6
ethical 245:7	199:25 200:2,6,7	221:11	111:7 140:4	115:2 127:7
ethics 141:22	201:14,18 203:14	execute 33:24	Explore 130:20	145:24 163:17
143:8 249:2,22	205:20,24 212:17	88:21 116:12	explored 215:23	<b>fairly</b> 249:6
250:11	218:23 230:9	184:9	exposed 27:1	fairness 97:5
evening 54:21	231:18,22,23	executed 123:18	express 69:11	109:21 249:5
217:1 233:24	233:10 240:4,18	215:7 230:23	expressed 77:6	<b>fall</b> 49:13 61:7
event 14:16 29:14	241:9,16 254:1	executing 20:23	expresses 82:15	fallback 24:24
30:16 47:22	254:14,14	31:22	expression 74:18	25:5
58:10,11 75:25	evidentially	execution 49:1	expressions 205:6	familiar 196:21
132:2 247:12	150:16	88:10 94:13,15	expressly 46:22	197:22
events 4:14 58:22	ex 113:16 214:9,10	executive 14:9	223:19	family 129:16,17
59:1 160:25	ex-commanding	17:2 189:9	extended 85:6	129:18
eventually 198:7	188:23	exercise 26:23	extensively 59:21	<b>fan</b> 81:4
everybody 54:24	ex-Commissioner	27:19 30:22,25	<b>extent</b> 22:6 134:19	fantastic 150:23
179:7 255:12	232:16	64:14 129:17	150:11 205:13,14	far 25:13 35:23
everybody's 45:15	exact 127:15	exhibits 95:7	257:10	38:12 39:19 40:5
everyone's 229:1	162:11 163:7	exist 30:2 251:21	external 99:22	44:17 50:2,19
evidence 14:21	168:17 236:19	<b>expand</b> 142:23	159:4	57:3 58:7 65:18
18:12 20:1 21:9	241:3,10	<b>expect</b> 87:9 198:7	extra 257:8	75:8 94:16 100:7
23:25 24:2 27:20	exactly 4:20 6:10	expected 54:15	extraordinary	100:9 106:14,17
29:12 30:11	71:8 78:3 82:2	128:23	9:18	108:18 110:1,15
33:19 35:1,6,16	138:6,13 139:23	expecting 255:17	extremely 160:7	117:25 118:3
35:22,24 36:4,7	142:8 164:17	experience 186:12		119:10 122:18
36:10,12 38:21	184:23 210:25	207:6 225:20	<u>F</u>	134:7,8 148:5,25
39:6,7,11,15,19	231:11 238:14,21	232:2,5 256:18	face 211:20	158:14 164:13
40:2,5 42:24	254:10	experienced	face-to-face 75:1	169:14 173:6
43:9,19 44:5,7	examination 20:17	246:17	facilitated 7:7	174:20 180:4
46:3 47:1,11,17	30:14	<b>expert</b> 137:16,16	fact 14:13 15:19	206:3,3 213:16
49:17 56:21	Examination-in	expertise 187:3,7	19:21 23:3 34:11	231:21 235:24
64:12 65:22 66:9	1:15	<b>explain</b> 4:20 5:10	36:1 37:4 44:1	fashion 191:24
68:7,13 71:5,23	examine 108:1	6:20,22 8:11	48:11 60:18 77:5	faster 21:5
72:23,25 77:22	examined 210:14	18:22 20:14 27:8	83:16 86:12	fault 131:12
85:18 87:20,21	<b>example</b> 9:8 49:15	38:23 44:14 49:8	88:22 94:8 97:9	204:23 226:13
89:11 91:2 95:3	125:19 136:1	57:16 58:6 59:8	101:4 104:12	<b>feared</b> 91:1 108:14
			109:1,15 114:15	
L				

				1 486 200
111:2 153:10	finish 233:17,19	11:23 14:17 15:6	130:24 131:1	203:3 204:5,7
feature 75:21,23	257:6	28:13 29:6 69:7	132:2 158:19	252:19,22 253:4
112:18	finished 35:18	89:5 95:25	201:23	253:13,15 254:7
featured 208:19	217:23	100:12 101:11	fourth 19:9 24:15	Gaggero's 14:20
February 23:20	<b>Finlayson</b> 5:19 7:9	108:12 121:22	frank 62:9 195:10	17:5
71:4	10:11 11:18	138:21 159:16	fraud 12:16 109:1	<b>Gary</b> 174:9
feel 52:6 102:25	firm 218:4,6	175:17 215:10	free 146:15	gathered 35:17,23
103:18 122:6,17	224:18,19	follows 14:25	Friday 257:21	<b>GBTW</b> 170:19
142:20 143:14	first 1:5,7,18,21	16:13 32:17	friend 241:20	general 19:10
149:2 219:24	7:9 10:8 13:17	47:15 71:2	friends 4:13	28:23 53:18,22
228:4 246:7,20	13:18,20 15:16	<b>footage</b> 94:9,19	friendship 4:13	54:1,5,10,14
248:6	29:18 30:17 32:9	123:21,23 124:23	<b>front</b> 1:19 141:17	55:18 56:17,23
<b>feeling</b> 251:11	38:11 53:3 55:4	124:25 125:14	252:16	63:3 64:2 67:8
feels 122:8,16	59:16 68:19	126:3 131:5,7,7,9	fuel 166:25	68:1 69:12,16
felt 122:19 123:2	77:19 87:1 88:7	force 7:2 148:20	full 37:15,19 78:25	78:16 135:5,6
140:10 143:7,18	104:13 108:21	149:23 159:4	147:14	143:1,15 144:1
215:12 217:3	117:18 118:2,3	forced 149:22	fuller 45:24	145:14,20,22
219:19 220:1,3	118:24 136:10	forces 187:23,24	fullest 90:23	146:17 149:3
245:24 248:2	138:10,12 139:18	foremost 75:14	<b>fully</b> 166:5	151:14 152:7,10
Fernando 167:8	139:22 141:18	forensic 20:17	function 49:11	155:1,16 156:4,6
168:9	142:17,24 143:1	43:20 44:21 45:3	181:23	157:8 159:12,15
fiat 198:14	144:11,11,11	47:2,10 102:5,11	functions 78:10	159:20 160:4,13
field 25:20 101:23	148:5 158:18	102:19,22 203:1	funding 5:24	162:10 163:4
158:11 159:1,5	161:1 162:14	203:15,23 204:5	further 11:15,16	166:4,7,12,18
160:20 161:5,11	166:20 167:21	204:13	28:7 32:23 35:20	167:21,25 168:15
161:21 162:24	169:17 172:14	forensically 24:5	44:9 47:25 48:14	169:7 171:6
164:12 165:5	178:23 190:7	110:11	65:12 66:2,24	179:17,20 181:2
173:2,8,13	191:8 208:12	forget 174:9	67:7 68:3,16	190:7,19,24
240:22,24 241:13	214:14,22 239:17	form 36:14 44:8	89:22 142:10	192:16,18,19,22
Field's 163:2	239:24 240:12	47:25 48:14	151:6 154:8	194:23 195:24
172:14 241:9,16	245:13,22,23	141:24 201:24	174:17 191:10	196:4,14 209:16
fifth 132:1 141:18	246:2,5 248:3	202:1	193:19 195:13	209:23 210:1
Fifty-seven 18:21	Firstly 158:6	formal 64:4 169:23 219:9	216:22,24 222:6 233:2	217:14,18 218:16
fight 219:16,21	Fischel 121:10,19		Furthermore	218:24 223:14,15
file 42:19 116:1,4 filmed 131:11	<b>fit</b> 250:5 <b>five</b> 117:15 243:3	formally 136:4 formed 60:13	65:15 83:19	225:15,16 229:19 229:20 241:2
final 1:25 2:14	254:18	152:21,22	193:23	247:3 249:17
21:6 33:12 80:5	fixed 228:21	former 5:18	future 8:17 68:1	General's 19:13
97:16 107:7	Floor 126:20	213:11		65:18,24,25
116:8 139:8	Florence 192:24	forms 112:2	G	68:12 142:21
finally 1:10 174:25	flow 204:22	forward 12:3 13:3	Gaggero 6:9,13	144:9 225:13
find 26:14 32:11	focus 39:12 55:7	89:3 147:23	7:7 13:15 14:7	generally 53:14
40:24 68:9	77:18	177:15 199:24	14:11,14 15:23	148:8
103:23 111:9	follow 52:7 130:17	213:21	16:12 17:18	geometry 236:17
153:15 165:22	<b>follow-up</b> 64:5	<b>found</b> 45:9 125:10	44:20,23 45:7	getting 39:12 47:7
179:2 204:14	<b>followed</b> 1:8 50:10	138:9 171:14	102:5,8 120:8	140:17 155:18
206:10 216:20	68:24 114:16	203:21 210:15	121:14,19 122:13	Gibbs 1:10 10:20
231:10	144:18	<b>founded</b> 205:24	122:21 123:9,10	10:22 11:2,3
fine 116:21 195:11	following 8:16	four 84:19 117:15	123:13 185:15,18	26:1 160:6,7
	8		199:20,23 203:1	<u> </u>
	ı	ı	1	1

				1 age 207
234:8,13 243:3	glad 229:6	191:7 192:21	122:23 123:6,7	193:24 199:4
Gibraltar 30:25	<b>go</b> 1:6 9:16 13:25	203:4 204:8	123:11	happened 6:11,15
45:2,5 76:24	14:20 16:6 21:1	207:3 208:12	ground 44:8 73:6	9:7 14:12 15:7
110:13 135:21	27:24 28:7 31:8	218:23 225:5,7	73:7 254:22	15:10 28:15
136:3 140:19	31:13 34:14	225:15 227:25,25	grounds 28:2,12	58:12 67:22,23
141:9,12 143:5	43:15 46:2 51:15	228:21 233:21	28:17 46:7,16	88:23 107:24
167:2,3 174:15	57:7,13 77:9	254:19	47:18,22 48:4	109:8 114:6
179:24 185:23	84:12 89:2 90:11	<b>Gold</b> 158:18	50:8,17 52:17	158:21 169:3
187:6 188:23	94:11,24 97:10	159:11 160:3	70:11 71:15 73:1	173:22 202:1,3
189:1,10 203:24	99:10,11 100:18	161:2,7 163:23	73:8 77:23 78:9	216:9,15 236:22
209:9 213:9	103:21 116:8	237:8,17	78:14 79:10	237:3,6,9,12,22
228:10,11,23	118:23 120:6,22	<b>golden</b> 158:18,19	103:5,10	239:14,20,22
231:1,6,8 236:16	127:21 128:5	Goldwin 95:19	group 161:2	240:2,6,15
236:24 237:4,6	131:15,22 135:2	good 1:3 124:3	237:16	245:23 246:5,19
237:13,13 238:3	135:3 136:25	150:15 177:21	guard 128:25	247:6,18
238:17 239:23	138:17 141:14	178:9,11 234:21	Guardia 162:1	happening 125:9
240:16	142:9 143:24	235:7,9 256:2	165:17 166:21,24	185:2 193:4
Gibraltar's 181:25	144:16 145:12,18	government 1:10	168:5 169:8	194:15 247:8
give 8:19 23:25	146:8 147:13	60:20 61:1,19	guess 129:11	248:24
34:16 37:25 38:5	150:3,10 151:23	64:10 122:7	gun 228:24	happens 4:22
45:24,25 46:4	160:18 161:6,11	182:23 183:4,9		happy 10:25 40:19
52:23 59:9 62:21	161:22 165:24	196:1,7 199:23	H	92:1 117:13
68:11 90:22,22	168:12,16 171:4	200:2,7,8,19	hacked 197:7	162:20 227:19
90:23 115:20	177:2 181:24	244:6 245:17	hacking 12:15	234:2,3
116:22 120:14	190:1,3 191:9	Government's	108:24 197:19	hard 14:2,23
129:20 140:4	206:25 208:1	200:11,13	202:23 204:9	184:17
150:13 153:4	212:16 216:3,21	governor 61:2	half 8:8 118:5,13	Hassan 31:6
158:14 183:4	216:23 222:6,14	159:17 167:23	121:24 170:9	Hassan's 184:9
186:9 194:16	231:22 252:23	169:15,18,25	233:8,9,15 234:8	Hassans 21:8,14
given 11:25 31:3	goes 154:8 171:17	174:18 175:11	255:4,7 256:16	31:23 33:20
32:25 36:3,22	177:3	179:21 232:21,25	256:17 257:2	92:13 94:14,20
43:21 46:10	going 7:12 9:1	235:13,17 240:18	half-hour 124:11	124:21 125:12,13
52:12 53:1 58:15	14:24 16:11 23:5	240:20 241:7,9	halfway 12:5 13:5	126:23 127:18
59:16 64:5 75:5	29:20 38:10 40:6	241:22 242:8,12	17:16 84:13	133:20 134:1
87:18 89:14 90:5	44:24 45:13	242:14,23 243:1	103:24 160:1	144:22 149:13
102:23 107:11	59:19 60:17 75:7	governor's 15:9	hand 88:20 137:15	152:3,15,21,22
108:2,14 111:2	77:4 92:20 98:3	<b>GPA</b> 180:21	137:19	157:14,17 216:6
113:10,16 132:4	98:6,21,25	GPS 170:24	handed 7:23	218:8 220:8
133:15 148:19	101:23 102:8	171:10	<b>handful</b> 172:13	221:8,14 223:10
150:4 164:24	107:6,15 110:22	<b>grade</b> 189:8	handling 215:14	Hassans' 125:5
171:24 194:6	112:13 137:20,21	grant 115:2	handover 88:13	head 152:3,5
203:16 223:12,17	142:10,11 144:19	granted 88:8	hands 255:15	headed 27:5 43:22
223:24 224:12	144:23 145:5	granting 180:24	handwriting 127:3	65:23
233:11 241:6,11	146:18 149:8,19	grateful 93:4,20	handwritten 98:1	heading 10:9 28:8
248:5,23	149:21 150:8,10	160:7 251:21	98:4 130:8	108:7 116:3
giving 35:25 50:23	150:13 157:6	great 119:13	hang 103:24 112:4	249:5,7 250:2,16
66:9 77:14 78:13	160:25 167:5	Grech 18:2	217:3	251:2
87:22 153:7	179:3 183:10	grey 122:3,5,7,8	<b>happen</b> 16:23	hear 155:17,21
254:1	186:5 190:5	122:11,12,16,19	30:18 65:16 66:8	178:4,18,19
		, , -, -	67:10,12 74:10	, , -
L	I	1	I	ı

				1 age 270
195:4 229:16	hoped 200:16	141:11	including 95:6	206:9,12,16,19
heard 13:21 15:13	hopefully 39:13	implicated 35:2	105:9 130:14,22	212:21 224:5,7
196:12 208:21	40:7,9 124:10	110:2	incriminate	231:25 232:20,24
246:25 252:6,10	hoping 255:17	implications 5:15	150:23	239:25 241:22
hearing 1:4 119:18	hour 118:5 119:21	53:1	incriminating	242:5,22 245:10
119:21 220:1	158:19 233:7,9	implied 44:11	146:16	informed 15:3
229:14	233:14 234:9,22	implies 5:3	independent 51:12	99:8 152:8
hearings 117:25	255:4,6,7,18,22	implies 3.3	107:10	182:17
heat 171:20 172:8	256:17 257:2	import 167:2	Independently	inherent 52:13
heckled 208:3	hours 38:22 60:24	import 107.2	68:2	initial 117:16
Heine 27:7 87:4	118:6,14 126:18	important 16:9	indicated 20:18	255:3
105:13 127:25	158:19,19 161:23	36:25 43:5 74:3	57:15 140:1	initially 56:24
150:19,20 252:17	162:8 166:3	76:5 82:14,18	212:24	117:1 191:21
held 7:10 108:13	239:25	93:10 114:23	indicates 43:19	initials 130:18
111:1 117:24	house 127:19	171:24 248:7	91:22 102:18,21	injected 101:5
181:22 188:24	130:15,16 131:14		201:25 203:14	innocent 16:22
242:7	137:6,20,21	impossibility 137:7	201:23 203:14	inquiries 35:19
hell 149:25	151:2	impossible 184:23	indication 114:7	inquiries 33:19 inquiry 1:23 2:10
		_		
hello 3:13 15:12 169:22	hundred 128:10 138:8	impression 64:13 141:19,24 142:7	125:5 255:3 individual 13:10	7:15 8:4,10 15:23 27:12
	138:8	*		
help 55:22 159:10	T	142:18 144:9	individuals 35:20	35:19 95:5
169:13 207:5	Ian 152:11 223:4	232:18	161:3 163:6	124:23 176:4
241:6	ICODE 117:23	impressions 144:5	180:4,11	182:8 257:20
helpful 18:19	idea 25:5,6 29:20	improper 132:8	inf 165:2	insofar 135:22
145:16 177:5	63:10 140:15	244:2,9	influence 101:6	inspection 175:17
255:25	175:21 177:21	impropriety	inform 116:13	Inspector 5:18
helping 185:6	181:3 234:21	247:12 250:21	211:10	16:16 86:5 95:19
HH 166:3	ideal 255:13	inappropriate	information 2:6	144:3 158:12
Hiene 127:7	ideally 87:21	224:21	2:21 7:20 12:20	159:1,7 161:5,24
high 5:20 133:12	identified 26:18	inasmuch 29:1	12:23 16:17,24	164:11 165:6,15
188:24 189:12	42:8	inaudible 10:22	16:25 32:6,19	168:8 174:9
205:12		26:1,2 143:9	45:19,21 46:1,5	inspectors 4:5
higher 189:8	identify 42:9	160:6 162:21	47:9 49:11 83:11	instance 42:13
highest 132:12,14	illegal 243:21,23	257:2	90:8 95:2,11,15	88:7 197:13,18
133:3,23	244:1,3	incident 158:9	95:17 96:10,15	212:21
highly 247:4	illicit 167:1	171:8 232:9	96:21 97:2,18,21	instances 42:17
hindsight 28:15	IM 60:23 62:7	237:20 239:13	98:9,20 99:15	197:13 222:15
51:10	imagery 172:17	240:13	100:3,7,10,11,17	instant 105:11,21
HMIC 175:16	173:3,6,8,11	incidental 75:16	103:11,22 107:4	instigated 172:15
hoc 184:22	imagine 82:3 87:6	include 74:17	110:2,23 111:11	instruct 91:21
hold 232:24	88:1 112:22	85:25 117:11	111:13 113:18	instructed 99:23
holding 74:25	174:2 189:14	167:5	114:9 118:8	99:24 100:1
254:12	immediately 139:3	included 7:20	119:19 120:2	107:17
home 9:9 131:8	219:12	31:22 40:25	132:7 137:9	instructing 91:13
136:25 184:12	impact 84:18	41:23 52:1 59:3	150:22 164:24	93:16,25
honest 232:3	103:15 186:25	72:3 83:7 90:6	165:2,12 171:11	instructing/cont
Honesty 249:8	197:15 212:15	105:22 113:18	173:1 183:12	92:25
hope 52:5 234:8	213:23 231:5	134:18 141:9	189:12 201:5	instructions 69:12
251:22 256:13	impacted 188:20	206:23	203:10 206:1,3,7	130:16
	implementing			
	•	•	•	•

				1 agc 2/1
instrumental	23:16 49:17	investigation 4:23	188:22 189:18	127:10,25 128:12
101:2 185:6	interrupt 61:11	5:13,14,20,21,25	190:10 195:19	128:25 129:14
instruments	200:5	6:3,24 7:14	200:24 203:19	133:7,10 134:6
171:12	interrupted	12:25 15:14	212:24 230:13,15	<b>JF</b> 161:13 162:22
integrity 232:6	204:21	20:23 22:14 25:7	231:8,10 232:10	164:3
249:11	intervene 16:7	27:1 29:17 33:1	involvement 6:12	<b>JG</b> 11:23 13:17,21
intellectual 182:24	72:15	43:11 52:13	6:18 7:13 18:25	JL 22:3,25 23:3
183:1 196:16,18	intervening 29:21	69:11 72:1,10,12	20:18 22:5,6,23	28:2 29:13 30:14
199:21	70:20	79:25 89:16	24:9 27:6 32:12	35:5 36:15 37:13
Intelligence	intervention 29:24	94:18 95:20	34:19 35:5 37:14	37:17 39:19 52:2
108:25	79:23 133:15,18	109:20,25 111:15	39:8 61:8 70:24	58:21 70:11 71:2
intend 26:21 32:22	133:24 150:6	113:4 146:12	122:7 148:15	73:23 78:19,21
43:3	interview 29:15	147:23 148:12	158:13,16,24	79:20,23 83:18
<b>intended</b> 21:18,19	34:22 44:10 48:1	151:7 153:22	174:5,16 183:18	84:24 85:17,25
33:4,13,15 34:6	49:21,23,25 50:2	182:12,16 183:11	183:19 185:11	96:5 109:25
41:14 52:4 53:13	50:5,11 52:2	183:13,18,20	207:14	110:19 126:21
80:13 83:9,20	53:10 70:13	184:16 185:8,12	<b>IPA</b> 141:11	129:12 130:24
107:19 128:16	71:17 80:11,12	185:23 186:17,20	Iranian 192:25	135:16,25 136:5
<b>intent</b> 87:23	85:17 89:9	186:22 187:10,19	irregular 244:10	156:11 157:3
130:22	116:14 126:21	188:8,20,22	<b>is-</b> 92:18	<b>JL's</b> 34:19 60:14
intention 42:23	130:23 134:3	191:15 195:17	island's 141:6	61:7 83:8 110:12
87:2 116:14	136:20,21 144:22	197:25 198:5,5	islands 141:8	135:20
134:2	144:23 145:4,18	199:15,15 200:24	issue 31:5 60:1	jogs 138:16
intentions 89:10	146:4 147:2,4,10	207:18 208:9,19	64:9 66:16 68:15	<b>John</b> 11:7 44:22
intents 31:21,22	148:7,8 149:9	209:3,5 210:23	74:12 75:14	102:6 158:11
interaction 17:11	151:3 154:4	210:24 211:2	93:24 134:21	203:2 204:6,18
intercede 111:10	156:11 157:2	217:16 218:5,7	148:20 149:24	207:23
interceded 109:8	187:7	224:14 228:19	171:24 177:3	joined 6:21
interest 22:17 23:7	interviewed 34:20	investigations	182:18,21 183:10	joint 122:5
34:22 52:14 71:3	72:9 136:4 151:5	47:25 48:14	199:13,16 200:21	<b>JP</b> 29:8 31:5 136:2
77:25 78:10,13	interviewing 20:25	230:25	210:7 237:5	JR 114:18
78:17,24 79:10	49:16 70:20 86:8	investigative 65:6	251:23,23	Judah 27:7
104:19,25 207:16	144:20	191:12 213:23	issues 24:22 93:5	judge 99:5
208:9,16 209:1	introduced 182:5	investigators 45:4	93:21 183:5	July 211:5
209:21 224:22	inverted 167:6	203:24 204:13	items 88:20	jumped 228:23
interested 106:23	investigate 63:10	invitation 153:4	- J	jumps 204:17
interests 147:24	187:4,9	invited 62:25	$\frac{\mathbf{J}}{\mathbf{J}32:12\ 130:12,17}$	June 4:3,14 65:24
interim 169:15,17	investigated 5:2	155:11 175:10	130:23	142:4,5 179:11
169:25 174:18	186:25 204:12	inviting 134:2	James 13:14 17:18	180:6 181:10
international	207:11	175:7	23:3 52:15 57:20	junior 133:11
85:13	investigating 5:8	involved 5:4,19	102:4,11 120:8	juniors 255:23
interpret 48:2	5:11 6:4,22	7:4 12:15,20	185:15,18 202:25	jurisdiction
53:7 64:1	40:13 42:12 83:7	20:23 42:12 51:7	204:4 208:6	188:10 198:10
interpreted 152:25	108:23 111:12	52:22 72:4	252:19	219:13
interrogate 45:4	121:22 181:11	100:14 108:23	January 10:7	jury 71:23
170:23 171:3	185:13 195:21	109:4 111:15	11:19 25:18 26:1	Justice 18:1 31:7
interrogating 203:25	201:11 207:17	172:20 183:6	26:5	31:11,14 94:25 98:18
interrogation	208:15 209:14 219:24 224:20	186:18,20,22 187:20 188:12,16	Javier 125:8 126:6	justification 140:5
interrogation	217.24 224.2U	107.20 100:12,10	126:21,22 127:6	Justincation 140:3
i	<u> </u>	l		

				1 486 272
247:19	141:12,13 142:15	236:2	150:15,16	44:17,20 45:8
	143:10 145:8,11	labelled 62:19	leaving 21:23	46:8,16 47:4,18
K	146:22,24 150:1	lancha 167:11	129:22 235:22	47:23 50:5 52:15
<b>KC</b> 1:9,10 12:9	150:18 151:19	land 249:16	led 134:1 150:9	70:21 71:10,14
121:10 208:7	171:14,19 172:8	language 253:25	209:22 239:5	71:25 72:4,6,13
235:6	173:23 177:6	large 101:5 109:13	left 4:2 42:19	72:19 73:2 79:1
keen 256:22	178:21 180:4	198:15 208:7	137:18 172:13	80:3,6,7,10 85:8
keep 8:17 14:14	182:14 186:6	largest 107:7	230:3	85:11 86:9 87:4
228:14 244:16	189:8 193:7	lasted 38:22 75:10	legal 12:6 13:1	87:22 88:19 89:4
keeping 33:9	196:10 199:4	119:21	17:3 30:15 50:15	89:6,10 90:1,16
232:20 241:22	205:13 206:2	late 5:9 6:9	50:23 51:11,12	92:14 93:6,22
242:4	207:9 209:4	latest 255:10	52:5,16 53:5	94:7 100:13,22
keeps 61:14	210:18 211:1	Laundering 95:20	77:3 104:2	101:2,22 102:3
kept 5:14 94:16	214:14 217:5	law 31:6,23 32:4	107:10,20 108:5	102:18,21 103:5
kind 86:9 187:18	218:10 219:4	141:4 189:17	110:13 112:23	104:9 105:13,16
194:20 200:6,15	223:25 228:8,20	197:21 213:17	113:23 132:3,9	107:15,24 109:1
206:19 222:22	229:4,4,7,20	249:16	135:20 141:3	109:4,15 112:17
244:8	231:14,15,16	law 154:3	205:13 209:16	113:3 115:17
kindly 62:18	232:23 234:5	lawful 104:16,22	226:3	116:1,5,13,14
Kingdom 187:21	238:6 240:2	104:24 106:15	legality 140:25	120:3 122:14,23
232:1	241:25 242:3	lawyer 30:17,21	legally 33:4,14	123:1 125:10
knew 96:3 97:14	245:14 246:2,6	30:24 31:1,2	91:19 104:3	127:14,17,20
103:5 109:17	247:5,13 249:20	50:22,22 91:12	legitimate 219:11	128:7,13 131:11
139:18 146:19,21	252:7	91:14,21 92:3,5	length 14:14	132:13,23 133:1
151:20 155:12	<b>Knowing</b> 231:14	92:22,25 93:10	let's 78:23 172:3	133:17,25 134:7
164:14 171:16	knowledge 2:6,21	93:14,17,25	216:14	134:8,10,13,14
173:16,18 206:16	24:7 44:6,16	104:6 105:17	letter 6:13 85:13	134:16,23 136:8
208:16 239:22	50:14 58:7 59:23	107:16 109:2	120:24 121:6,9	136:18 141:20
242:4,7 248:20	103:9 116:16	121:11 140:12	121:13 175:7,18	143:20 144:20
know 11:24 16:9	168:19 179:10,13	154:3 204:2,11	220:8	147:19 148:11,13
17:4 22:5 23:2	180:1 181:5,6,9	205:2,3,6,7,9,14	letters 221:7,7,13	148:18,20 151:1
25:13 26:10	185:14,17 202:18	207:3 217:20	letting 45:8	152:17,18 178:25
32:21 34:5 41:2	208:14 245:18	231:10,19	level 70:23 132:15	179:9 181:14
41:4,18 45:8,9	known 3:4 4:11	lawyer/client	133:11,12,13,23	189:25 202:19
53:14 54:8 55:12	17:10 22:3 47:5	104:11	158:13 186:23	203:12,14,19
63:17 69:2 73:12	113:3 134:16	lawyers 48:24	187:8,19,22	204:2 205:8,10
74:13 75:6,22	151:18 158:14	76:16 82:24	195:20 197:24	206:22 207:2
86:15,21,23	166:6 171:1	201:17 207:6,10	198:19 200:7	208:6,16,24
89:21 90:6 94:4	208:18,23 209:19	laying 12:20	202:8,15 205:12	209:11,12,21
94:24 98:13,16	212:8 214:1	lead 71:23 189:20	234:12 246:16	212:10,24 213:5
99:1,2,6,6 100:4	217:8,17 218:15	leading 58:22	level' 132:12 133:3	215:5,18,25
103:19 107:2,25	230:20	248:13	levels 189:12	216:5,7,17,25
109:9 110:1	knows 114:20	leads 224:6	Levy 22:3,4,16	217:2,9 218:10
111:11 112:8,21	Kram 9:22 158:15	learned 15:19	23:1,3,6,13 24:2	218:16,18 230:23
112:25 113:7,17	158:17 174:6,19	138:24 241:19	24:6 27:7 28:6	Levy's 24:8 29:24
113:25 115:1	174:23 175:15	leave 18:10 92:13	28:17 29:5,16	32:12 44:5 50:25
116:6,19,21	232:9,11 235:11	95:21 228:14,15	30:4,6,7,11,24	68:23 131:8,14
122:19 123:10	т	228:21,22	33:19 34:4 35:2	131:22 135:12
126:15 130:9,10	L L 167 11 225 25	leaves 62:7 92:21	39:8 43:17,19,24	153:1 154:2
134:15 139:2	la 167:11 235:25			
	-	-	•	-

				1 age 273
180:10 184:12	215:17,24 216:4	205:22 206:20	64:6 76:3,4	matter 14:8 22:5,7
201:13 208:25	216:16,25 217:4	214:2 224:3	94:21 108:19	34:11 49:2,12
216:5,17 217:19	217:8 219:5	227:23	132:5 203:6	50:24 60:4 74:2
218:3	222:4,16 223:3,6	looks 111:17,20	222:17 240:9	78:5 83:21
Lewis 216:6	235:15 241:2,11	112:6 147:7	MALE 93:8	104:14 115:10
liaise 174:7	Llamas's 215:1,3	161:3 162:13	132:17	126:9 127:1
liaised 174:8	Lloyd 60:24 144:2	197:5 203:9	man 122:3,5,7,8	137:14 141:8
life 75:2	local 93:9,17,25	loose 10:4 149:25	122:11,12,16,19	142:9 145:22
lifetime 63:9	located 225:12	loosely 243:9	122:23 123:6,7	146:13 148:16
lift 126:16,17	location 166:8	lose 228:23	123:11 189:16	149:8 158:3
133:6	167:25 168:20	losing 91:2 212:17	195:8 219:8	159:3 189:23
light 42:24 123:15	170:1 171:8	loss 29:11 89:11	232:6	195:22 210:4
likelihood 106:10	log 160:25 161:12	228:8	managed 109:10	215:8,15 217:2
limb 117:12	161:13 162:5,14	loss/destruction	172:16 173:2,13	224:23 225:17
limited 27:7 28:10	164:2 211:2	87:20	management	229:5 236:17,22
105:9 117:22,23	London 19:10	lost 40:15 109:7,18	145:17 175:9	256:9
117:23	long 3:8,24 77:20	172:2 175:12	226:16,23 229:14	matters 8:23 49:6
line 13:17,18,20,25	104:18 113:4	204:22 206:11	managing 126:22	49:9,14 50:19
15:16 21:6 27:12	118:3 119:17	lot 35:16 79:6	manner 251:3	51:5,8,8 75:19,20
27:12 33:12	178:17 186:13	146:24 205:19	map 162:6,13	106:12 112:14
48:12 50:14,18	201:4,6,21 233:5	210:15,18 222:4	164:16	189:21 191:20
64:8 80:5 84:21	234:6,9 254:19	244:23 254:22	March 34:13	208:11 225:11
87:1 89:21	254:20 255:1	Louis 221:15	38:15 68:22	248:8
138:22 139:8	longer 47:5 153:9	222:23	159:9,13 160:5	McGrail 1:8 2:25
141:18 150:20	211:11 220:6	lower 202:12,15	160:10,11,21	3:1,3 4:2,11,18
201:24	233:8,11 240:7	lunch 256:16	161:8 163:18,25	5:13 6:25 7:4
Linea 236:2	246:14 256:21	257:5	168:13 169:11	11:18 14:10
lines 78:2 79:4	longest 9:15	luncheon 124:17	170:5 171:6	18:23 19:8,16
84:20 97:16	look 1:20 25:22	lunchtime 256:16	174:1	20:20 22:13 23:6
121:22 126:10	39:3 44:21 65:8		margin 167:9	23:9 31:18,20
134:10 252:15	68:19 73:9 77:16	M	Mark 24:23,24	32:8,11,16 33:7
lingering 70:12,17	102:6 108:7	magistrate 31:13	25:5,9 78:5,6	35:8 40:25 41:3
70:23 71:16	109:21 137:25	90:9 94:25 98:18	86:9 92:1 126:22	41:6,18,22 54:20
list 19:21 160:23	139:6 143:16	98:21 99:5,8	marked 1:19	54:25 55:2,14
241:8	162:16 177:5	114:19 115:5	40:24	56:16 58:13
listen 32:7	203:2 204:6,18	116:24 117:5	marks 122:1	59:17 62:11,15
listened 215:13	235:20 248:23	118:18 119:21	mate 211:18	62:17,25 63:2,5
Litigation 191:14	<b>looked</b> 117:3	magistrates	material 30:16	64:13 66:15
little 16:24 28:7	201:21	119:23 180:23	42:14 91:19	67:25 81:22
128:25 137:7	looking 17:16	Magistrates' 84:19	92:23 93:15 94:1	84:10 86:17
168:16 174:15	28:14 45:10	96:3 97:14	103:23 104:1,2,4	94:15 98:13
178:14 191:10	47:11 70:9 78:21	mail 105:12,22	104:8,18,18,24	131:25,25 138:4
216:22,24 223:9	92:7 117:1	main 75:17 76:22	104:25 105:23	138:24 139:9,14
live 183:10 217:15	121:20 127:21	170:16	106:1,5,11,16	139:15 140:14
224:13 255:18,20	137:8,22 140:12	maintain 43:25	107:12,21 108:9	141:22 143:6
lived 225:10,21	141:5,10 148:3	maintenance 25:1	108:13,15,17	145:7 151:13
lives 134:19	160:8 165:18	28:11	111:1,3,5 117:17	154:25 155:11,15
<b>Llamas</b> 59:25	169:9 170:5,6	<b>major</b> 9:25 204:9	117:19,21 152:1	157:7,15 158:2
162:10 166:4	178:13 194:18	majority 197:5	materially 77:17	158:18 159:13,16
		making 10:1 27:10		
		1	1	1

				Page 2/4
160.5 10 162.4	225.47 229.25	102.1 20 102.16	106.12 107.10	75.14 17 101.10
160:5,19 163:4	225:4,7 238:25 243:7	192:1,20 193:16 194:22 196:6,11	196:13 197:10 212:20 213:8	75:14,17 101:19 103:12 166:23
163:14,15,18 166:1 168:14	meet 67:9,25 68:4	200:9 214:20	241:7	204:24 205:25
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	216:8 217:2	•	
169:6 171:7,7,9	68:15 159:22,23		mentioning 169:7	214:24 236:21
171:11,19 172:5	229:6	218:3 219:4	mentions 221:15	237:1,3,5,12,15
172:6,7,10,22	meeting 8:25 9:2	221:9 223:22	merit 121:21	237:22 238:6,15
173:4 174:23	11:11,12,17 12:4	224:1 227:9	message 19:9,22	238:20 239:13,19
175:8,17,25	12:6,12 17:24	235:15 245:1,14	44:15 46:15,18	248:6 256:14
176:12,13 177:18	18:4,7,23 19:2,20	245:18,22,24,25	46:24 128:9	minds 109:3
183:19 184:15	20:3,6,12 21:2,22	246:1,3,6,18,19	156:4,8 161:1	mindset 228:19
185:5,17 190:8	25:17,18,21	246:21,24 247:5	167:8 204:11,23	mine 36:21 76:1
190:10,15 192:3	34:18,25 36:17	247:19 248:3	216:2,23,24	125:8 126:7
192:7,17 194:5	37:9,12,13 38:1,2	251:25 253:1,2	217:5	211:12
232:2,5,19,23	38:6,15,22 53:16	meetings 8:20,23	messages 22:24	Minister 15:10
237:18 242:1,21	53:24 54:16,17	9:6 54:4,9 55:10	45:16 100:22	16:20,22 17:11
245:11 246:15	54:24 55:20,24	55:13,15,17 56:1	105:11,12,21,21	17:25 18:1 20:21
McGrail's 6:20,23	56:9,16,22 57:5,7	62:13,24 114:15	106:6 202:21	21:17,25 22:1,15
58:22 83:3	57:9,10,18 58:12	138:19 140:18	206:22 207:22	46:23 54:25
153:21 155:3,15	58:14,17 59:2,7	143:18 144:17	212:11	72:24 80:3 101:7
155:17 159:14,20	59:11,12,13,17	174:22 186:11	met 19:18 29:13	132:8 156:5
174:25 183:17	59:20,24,24 60:9	190:6,10,13,15	54:13 65:16 66:8	157:8 175:11,23
185:11 191:8	60:16,19,22,25	190:17,19 192:9	67:10,12 68:21	179:12 180:15,25
228:2	62:7,8 63:15	192:11,21 193:10	75:2 126:17,21	181:4,12 189:4
mean 9:17 10:14	64:4 68:3 70:3,6	193:11 214:20	141:8 159:12,19	189:15 207:17,23
14:6 33:7,15	71:1 74:17 75:1	218:19 232:11,14	160:4 166:3	208:24 209:8,17
52:21 70:17	75:9,22 76:3	232:19 242:17,25	171:6 190:23	209:19 210:2
71:14 80:7 85:24	81:18,21,22,25	243:2 244:7,22	191:20 193:24	219:14 223:5,23
86:14 88:12	94:9 120:19	245:16 247:16	216:4,17 217:18	224:2,4,6,17
105:25 128:6	122:5 126:15,25	248:10,14,16,19	217:18 218:17	Minister's 72:17
133:19 139:12	130:9 131:9	248:24 249:15,19	metaphor 154:17	166:2 207:14
152:9 154:16	134:21 138:1,2,4	250:5,19 251:6	methods 108:9	208:5 219:22
169:11 187:22	138:5,11,12,12	251:13 252:1,14	Metropolitan	minute 94:17
192:5 196:22	138:23,24 139:2	253:13,15	174:8	161:1
200:8 201:19	139:7,10,14,15	<b>members</b> 229:13	Michael 166:4	minuted 76:2
214:10 225:14	139:18,19 141:21	memorandum	228:6,7,12 229:9	minutes 59:18,18
231:12 253:11	142:8,17,21,24	200:18	microphone 3:11	75:10 130:24
meaning 48:2	142:25 143:16,23	memory 22:19	mid- 216:9	131:1 161:15,15
154:18 181:24	144:6,7,10,14	30:22 138:16	mid-afternoon	215:6 233:13,25
meaningful 200:25	145:8,10 147:15	212:25 213:6	216:15	234:19 255:5,5
201:2	148:23,24 149:1	221:3 227:2	mid-morning 56:5	misled' 146:22
means 27:10 85:3	151:11,12 152:15	<b>Mena</b> 18:2	56:7 233:20,21	missed 18:4 93:9
125:24 137:11	155:13 156:8	mention 23:6	midday 15:9	215:4
143:3 158:9	157:7,10,16	113:1 134:4	255:10	mistaken 15:23
173:21 213:19	158:1 159:15,24	170:24 177:13	miles 162:3	212:23
214:11	160:13 161:4,7	mentioned 10:11	military 189:16	misunderstandi
meant 4:20 21:11	163:3 166:18	15:13 17:21	mill 133:9	94:20
21:17 49:9 79:3	168:13,14 169:19	22:17 23:8,11	million 188:9	misunderstood
110:8 135:4	170:24 171:17	60:5 150:25	mind 24:20 28:22	238:25
161:17 213:25	175:8 180:9	184:18 185:25	66:13 68:9 69:3	misuse 26:19,25
	1	1	1	1

				1 486 278
42:13,18 44:6	100:23 124:2	87:10 111:9	new 151:1 208:3	22:21,22 23:19
101:15 187:4	149:10,14	154:17 225:14	Nick 159:17	25:16,22 36:21
197:17 202:19	<b>multiple</b> 197:13	236:16	167:18	38:4,24 54:8
mixture 211:21	murky 239:24	necessary 29:22	nine 256:17	55:20 58:24
ML 159:25 166:19	mustn't 233:17	47:24 48:13 52:7	NMH 89:4 171:7	59:10 60:18 64:6
166:20	mutual 49:3	64:15,19 65:4	no-one 211:13,16	71:20 75:22,23
Mm 23:24	MW 24:22	68:10 91:23	noise 208:2	75:24,25 76:3
Mm-hm 213:3	MZ 77:20	116:12 156:11	Nolan 252:7,8	79:6 81:19,20
Mm-hmm 164:1		157:3 167:12	Nolle 142:13	98:1,4 115:17
mobile 105:9	N	199:14 201:11	norm 257:17	116:2,5 120:12
<b>Mod</b> 27:10	N 32:12	256:15,25	normal 7:25 41:5	120:21 125:21,22
model 179:5	name 79:22	necessity 29:13	69:6 137:1	125:24,25 130:8
202:20	174:10 207:9	80:10 116:9	185:21 253:23	157:4 158:20
module 27:10	208:18	neck 77:12	normally 9:18,20	159:10,18 160:2
102:1	<b>named</b> 116:1	need 1:22 8:15,15	18:10 36:11,12	162:22 169:19
Mole 151:2	119:7 163:7	8:16 21:7,13	98:10 153:14,20	171:16 180:11
moment 79:11	names 78:25 79:12	27:2 30:21 32:5	189:22 191:18	235:20 240:14
91:11 150:19	79:15,16,17,18	50:4 52:2 53:9	north 23:14 27:7	253:18
172:9 185:9	79:21,24 80:1	61:20 64:23 65:1	43:25 101:3,7,9	notice 45:22 58:15
219:15 240:13	207:9 211:9	66:14 71:18 72:5	104:12 106:7	58:15 59:16
254:17	naming 119:4	72:14 79:1 80:6	117:22 161:15	76:25 87:22 91:3
moment' 171:20	narrow 243:11,15	85:20 88:21	205:8	108:14 109:19
moments 238:10	narrowed 199:1	91:17 98:10	nose 178:15	110:5 111:2
<b>Monday</b> 144:21	narrowly 106:21	102:25 103:19	note 9:13 10:13	172:24 186:8
147:1	national 5:16 27:9	126:25 129:19	11:7,23 13:5,13	212:18 213:10,19
money 95:20	101:24 108:24	136:15,16 140:11	14:18 19:3,4	231:23
101:5	148:16 179:5	142:14 167:5	21:1,6,6,12 22:11	noticed 15:22
monitor 255:24	185:7,10,21,22	169:3 190:3	22:19,25 24:3	132:17
months 201:7,9	187:11,13 188:3	202:9,15 211:10	25:4 26:14 37:3	notify 89:10
mooted 256:13	188:4,5 202:19	216:20 231:8	37:12,18 38:16	notwithstanding
morning 1:3 7:23	203:5,22	253:25	44:20 45:15	46:25 146:13
56:19 102:4	nationally 187:20	needed 32:1 33:22	60:21 61:8 62:11	November 24:11
126:5 128:24	natural 56:6	83:23 85:18	62:22 63:6,16,21	24:13 96:8
147:1 155:13	nature 33:1 52:13	99:10 126:8	64:7 70:1,2	<b>NSCIS</b> 12:16
160:20 179:1	98:10 172:10	127:11,17 145:2	73:25 74:16	28:11 43:22 44:1
190:1 202:25	251:6	244:15	80:18 81:12,14	45:1 46:23
204:4 205:22	NCA 185:20	needs 4:25 78:21	82:4 102:5	100:15 103:16
235:16 236:25	NCSIS 182:23,25	178:21	128:20 155:19,21	196:2,8
<b>Moshe</b> 216:5,17	<b>NDM</b> 27:5,8,9,14	negotiations	160:12,12 163:10	<b>number</b> 60:23
217:19 218:10	27:25 31:17,19	171:25	168:3,14,15	62:8 64:9 65:5
mother 61:12	31:21 33:18	neighbouring	169:10 170:4,21	65:14 66:4
<b>mouth</b> 11:10 41:18	37:23,25 38:13	236:1	170:22 171:2	108:20 126:20
move 12:3 24:10	41:22 51:22 52:1	neither 20:8	180:8,12 202:25	136:10 190:23
27:4 40:16 47:13	53:6,9 68:24	never 27:17 59:23	204:4 216:11	193:21 194:16
123:16 137:24	80:8 83:5 123:20	68:9 69:4 137:3	238:14 252:21	197:1,15 198:14
143:22 151:11	179:6 183:25	140:9 145:21	253:7,9,10,10,21	208:7 221:13
158:4 190:4	185:3 206:24	183:15	253:21,22 254:3	231:20 232:10
moved 149:11,15	nearly 132:2	nevertheless 74:2	<b>noted</b> 34:9 195:9	
moving 1:4 68:10	nec 29:22	74:11 106:15	<b>notes</b> 8:18 9:6 10:1	0
	necessarily 86:14			o'clock 124:9,13
	1	1	1	•

				1480270
127:2 138:22	52:18 73:3 84:2	<b>OIC</b> 75:12 107:11	operational 32:25	outages 45:1
254:18 256:23,25	87:19 108:22	108:16 111:4	49:2,6,9,12,14	outcome 224:22
objective 201:24	197:20 198:20	okay 3:20 46:12	50:19 51:5,7	outcomes 85:15
objectives 32:23	offences 26:24,25	119:13 120:15	73:18 75:19	outlined 33:17
obligation 70:13	42:13 44:6 47:21	124:15 195:11	82:25 83:21	Outlook 37:10
71:16 146:6	48:6 87:16	196:13 203:11	94:17 115:10	outset 195:15
250:6	101:15 121:20	207:2 211:13	operations 9:25	outside 170:13,17
<b>obtain</b> 33:18 34:6	187:4 197:18	234:23 243:19	158:25	170:19 236:16
69:10 104:16	198:14,16,23	250:2 254:13,13	<b>opined</b> 114:16	237:4,13,25
114:17 173:2,5	202:19 203:20	254:19 255:23	opinion 35:12,25	238:3,16 239:18
194:13 200:1	offensive 135:11	256:3 257:18	39:7 52:23 73:5	239:23 240:6
212:18 220:12,19	offer 229:6,6	older 225:23	78:14 114:11	overall 142:17
221:23 231:8,18	offered 39:18	omitted 28:22,25	176:8 203:18	overlooked 60:16
231:23,24	74:13 88:11	29:1	opinions 176:7	overstretched
obtained 48:9	129:16 205:12	once 6:21 69:23	opportunity 12:24	35:13
148:8 161:25	office 9:10 69:24	125:1	40:4 59:10 90:22	owned 105:12
173:7,8,25 174:3	120:9 128:22,23	one.' 102:1	109:18 116:22	182:23 200:14
obtaining 49:1	129:2,18 131:14	ones 27:3 42:19	136:19	owner 61:19
108:9 221:18	132:10 133:2	54:11 55:11	opposed 25:1	owners 218:9
223:19 231:22	136:24 155:15	ongoing 198:6	31:14 74:25	ownership 24:22
<b>obvious</b> 18:8 37:5	159:14,21 166:5	onwards 174:16	76:20,23 97:19	60:20 61:1,3,5,7
213:11	191:13 194:4	<b>Op</b> 183:16 192:2,8	98:18,22 114:13	63:24 64:10,11
obviously 29:19	226:19	192:9 194:8	136:8 156:24	65:13 66:3,16
45:24 63:17 79:8	officer 5:3,8,11,21	199:13 232:9,11	oppressive 143:3	68:15 78:21
104:6 116:2	6:2,4,22 69:18,19	open 64:14 250:3,6	opted 73:19 76:10	101:4 182:18,21
123:17 125:23	76:15 136:3	250:8	<b>option</b> 76:19 93:1	193:21 196:17,18
135:6 187:23	140:12 158:8,10	opened 15:12	93:17	199:13,16,21
209:8 226:2	167:10 182:13	Openness 250:3	<b>options</b> 86:8,24,25	200:12,20 210:7
228:1	186:13,13,16	opens 211:8	87:3 89:3 113:3	224:19
occasion 50:1 51:9	188:23 189:9,18	operating 130:5	228:9	
occasionally	190:9 207:17	171:21	opts 90:3	<u> </u>
178:15	213:12 219:24	operation 4:18,21	oral 119:16	page 2:1,14 4:16
occasions 9:7,12	225:3,4 232:3	4:22,23 5:1,3,5,8	orally 119:15	11:22 12:5 13:6
9:18 109:16	237:20 249:15	5:17 6:5,8,17,21	<b>order</b> 18:23 29:10	17:15,16,23 29:6
190:23 191:16	officers 5:25 8:13	7:3,5,17,18,21,22	30:21 73:17,19	34:8 37:11 57:13
208:7 231:20	8:18 76:14 82:24	7:22,25 8:3,7	73:22 74:4,19	57:24,25 65:10
occur 98:20 248:8	130:13,14,15,16	9:21,22,22 18:24	75:15 76:11,20	77:12,19 78:18
occurred 126:3	130:16 141:9	20:16 33:9 34:19	76:23,24 77:5	83:4 84:12 86:11
158:9 161:14	171:18 172:6	53:15,20 54:14	81:2 82:9,16,23	90:12 96:10
164:4 238:16	182:14 185:14	54:18 57:14 87:4	87:20 91:18	105:7 110:24,25
OCPL 91:14	191:12 225:23	122:25 123:4	110:6 113:12,16	111:7 116:3,9
October 4:19 6:11	240:1 244:6	158:15,16,24	114:14,25 147:22	117:19 120:23
44:24 102:3	249:16	174:5,18,23	147:25 156:24	121:3,25,25
202:22	offices 184:9,19	175:14,15 176:14	198:15 213:9,10	126:1 139:8
odd 22:2	officially 165:4	176:16,17 190:11	213:14 231:18	143:24 148:5
offence 28:3 37:15	officials 245:17	190:16,20,22	orders 48:23	150:6 160:24
37:18 40:13	251:14	192:15,23,24	original 10:25	161:7 164:2
42:15 47:19,23	Oh 42:2 153:17	193:2 230:8,13	originally 125:4	167:13 170:8,8
48:5 50:9,16	157:13 210:6	230:15,21 235:11	ought 115:1	220:5,13 227:22 227:24 252:23
				221.24 232.23

				1 480 277
pages 8:8 11:15,16	73:12 75:11	76:18 84:16	208:9,16 209:1	143:17 160:14
12:3 13:4,4	109:14 148:17	176:22 199:15	209:21 245:8	173:15,23 214:21
17:15	168:11 170:6,12	200:4 205:5	personal 7:19	236:24
palpable 247:1	170:16 191:7	229:12	46:24 134:19	<b>plain</b> 126:12
paper 9:13 10:2,5	197:11 236:4,8	pausing 220:24	172:25	plainly 221:17
253:18	236:12 237:5	pending 16:5 85:9	personally 242:16	<b>plan</b> 100:14 147:9
papers 97:6 117:1	parte 113:16 214:9	penultimate 55:7	256:22	214:17
176:18	214:10	148:4 161:13	persons 83:25	planned 32:13
para 161:22	participants 248:9	people 12:24 16:7	206:23	194:5
paragraph 4:17	participating 20:9	18:7 21:23 22:24	perspective 69:4	planning 31:9
14:22 15:6 16:11	246:20 248:19	29:18,23 30:9	137:8 182:13	platform 12:16
16:12 18:14,20	particular 16:4	72:8 79:7 85:8	225:9	25:2 44:1 46:23
19:11,15,24	28:22 59:2 83:7	104:12 109:15	perused 32:17	47:8 61:2,19
21:10,12 28:4	112:11 138:18	111:10,13 122:25	perusing 38:3	64:11 182:25
29:2,7 30:13	144:6 173:1	136:16 143:4,21	Peter 1:9 12:6,8,9	196:1,2,8 199:22
31:3 34:15,15,24	188:22 190:21	148:14 168:24	12:13,17 233:5,7	200:14
39:16,21 42:5,21	251:17 257:13	188:10,16 200:24	234:1,3,24 235:5	<b>Playa</b> 161:16
42:23 43:23	particularly 16:9	208:22 212:19	235:7,9 238:2,22	162:3,23
47:14,21 48:11	18:25 41:7 55:10	234:11 248:23	239:4 243:5,10	please 2:15 4:15
51:24 53:3,7,8,11	181:11 183:17	249:5 252:1	243:14,18 245:5	10:18,19 14:21
55:8 65:9,10,22	189:24 191:14	253:24 256:19	246:10 254:21,25	14:22 17:13
71:1,19 73:9	194:8 197:21	people's 148:15	255:4,14,20	18:14 27:4,8,24
83:4 87:14 88:5	224:13	168:22	256:1	31:16 32:11
89:24 94:12	parties 1:10	peradventure	phase 1:4,5	41:10 42:1,20
95:23 96:7,18,24	partner 21:7,14	68:17,20	phone 102:12	44:14 46:13
97:10 100:12	126:23 205:15	<b>percent</b> 157:23	120:17 127:7,14	47:14 51:15
101:12,18 103:25	209:10 216:5	<b>Perez</b> 11:8,12 13:9	127:25 128:8,13	54:19 55:5 57:17
106:21 107:6,8	218:4,10,12	43:18 101:9	140:2 155:23,25	58:6 59:8 65:9
108:7 109:22	224:17	102:10 121:10	157:18 210:13	70:8 73:10 74:16
110:23,24 112:18	partners 218:8	136:8,9,12	<b>phones</b> 170:23	77:9,12 80:14,17
113:1 116:9	parts 45:16 131:10	146:16 203:11	phrase 225:20	81:11 84:13,15
117:18 118:21	196:14	205:12 207:23	phrases 33:5	85:2 86:3,7
135:15,18 138:17	party 202:4	perfectly 16:22	physically 20:5,8	90:11 93:4,20
141:18 144:11	213:20,25 214:11	141:2	pick 243:12	99:13 102:24
148:3,4 158:7	passed 16:19	period 3:23 4:4	<b>picked</b> 222:13	109:22 115:15
160:2 175:2	235:14	9:15 53:15	<b>picking</b> 3:12 220:6	116:8 118:20
191:9 194:1	passes 219:13	181:10 190:25	picture 147:14	120:6,21 131:23
208:4 212:20	patiently 14:9	200:25 201:1,2	196:16 239:24	133:10 137:25
214:25 220:7,15	<b>Paul</b> 1:6,12,14	periodically 7:12	piece 9:13 253:18	138:18 145:12
240:23	15:1,17 16:14	periods 24:17	<b>pieces</b> 10:1,5	146:8 150:5
paragraphs 14:25	32:17 95:18	permission 34:1	piecing 58:23	156:3 158:5
23:22 43:16	119:18 146:25	93:7,23 140:17	<b>PIN</b> 129:20,20	160:18 161:22
45:12 55:4 89:2	161:24 162:9	177:1	PinadA 235:25	165:24 168:12
100:13,25 101:16	165:13,15,20	person 5:4 22:16	<b>pinned</b> 229:2	171:4 172:12
101:17 117:15	195:11 241:1	23:7 34:22 71:3	place 1:12 17:6	190:5 191:9
pardon 238:2	pause 2:12 10:19	91:7 135:7 136:9	25:19 37:9 57:18	193:17 197:2
243:5	11:4 14:23 23:23	136:24,25 137:13	58:5 59:15 87:16	202:17 208:1
part 9:5 12:19	24:13 45:14	146:7 188:24	91:18 120:9	211:4 214:25
22:19 44:17 65:6	46:11 55:5 56:6	197:6 202:22	131:6,8 143:13	216:22 219:2,3
L				

				1 age 270
220:5 221:4	141:10 144:3	226:4 233:21	prepare 40:1	Principles 252:7,8
222:6 240:21	145:3 146:12	possibly 16:15	prepared 19:2	prior 6:17 22:15
plotted 162:6	151:2 153:18	222:22	22:20 51:21	38:1 58:15 63:5
plotting 162:13	154:4 161:5,10	post 20:20 58:10	62:10,22 77:11	63:16 87:22
164:16	163:1 165:2	225:22	77:14 97:8	100:8 107:11
pm 235:1,3	166:1 167:9	postdate 55:24	115:18 116:6	priority 39:3
point 10:4 24:15	172:22 174:8	postdates 59:4	165:25	private 46:2
24:19,21 26:17	176:1 179:24	potential 29:11	preparing 43:11	103:18 189:3
41:23 42:16 43:5	182:13,14 186:12	31:4 90:7	63:5,16	233:19 255:8
51:22 53:22	186:13,16 187:5	potentially 104:17	presence 240:17	privately 129:23
59:22 61:18,24	194:7 198:11,16	189:18 210:22	242:23 247:9	158:3
69:2 70:1 72:3	198:18 213:12	212:11	present 18:3,7	privilege 30:16
72:10,11,12	217:15 222:10,14	PR 60:23	19:21 20:2,4	privileged 91:19
73:21 86:6 91:20	222:19,24 223:13	PR33 62:19	54:15 55:17	92:23 93:14,25
122:2 124:3	223:16 224:12,14	PR34 62:19	60:23 104:4	104:2,3,8,18,19
125:3 127:24	225:2,4,9 232:3	practical 137:7	120:11 144:13,14	104:24 105:1,22
128:12 132:22	240:25 241:21	practice 31:6,23	174:13 192:15	105:25 106:7,11
134:14 145:13	247:2 249:15	35:12 36:2,24	213:21,22 214:12	106:18,25
150:8 152:17	250:8 251:5,7,15	39:9 41:5 42:6	241:10 242:13	privy 174:21
155:20 157:15	Police's 120:9	48:21 74:9 99:17	243:1	probably 13:3
158:13 159:5	police-to- 165:1	100:2 113:23	presented 36:9	58:11 86:19 98:2
168:17 171:14	policy 51:4	114:6	press 167:7	98:7 118:11,12
174:16 179:15	political 31:4	preceding 84:21	pressure 143:14	124:5 131:19
180:13 196:5	52:13	90:12 91:15	143:19 149:2	134:16 139:19
198:17 199:1,14	pop 184:20,20	120:23	presumably 10:10	problem 150:16
212:9 234:23	popped 169:20,22	precipitated	88:24 122:24	problems 92:22
243:17,19	position 15:21	228:25	123:2 140:16	probs 211:18
pointed 27:18	20:1 24:24 25:5	precise 139:17	presume 58:13	procedure 1:7
36:20 53:12	53:4 57:9 64:16	253:24	153:8 222:9	111:25 143:20
96:20	65:3,25 68:12,17	precisely 236:21	presumed 139:20	procedures 84:19
pointing 76:1	85:7,10,15 100:5	predominantly	pretty 77:20 82:4	171:22
points 13:20	106:4 107:13	26:19	169:18	proceed 32:2 43:3
235:11	120:1,2 143:10	prefer 3:21 76:12	prevent 29:10	51:13 52:14
police 7:1 10:15,17	144:19 149:7,12	156:23	87:20 94:20	78:13 80:11
11:9 15:14 16:6	150:17 173:16	preference 74:4,19	previous 11:11	90:25 145:3
29:15 31:18,24	178:2 188:17	77:6 81:2 82:8	35:10 93:5,21	150:21 198:15
40:23 41:9,13	199:22 200:11	82:16 84:4,9	105:7 147:16	proceeded 69:10
47:24 48:12,17	229:22,24 231:11	94:7 113:9,11,15	161:6 211:14	70:22 91:3
48:20,24 49:2,11	238:19 257:4	113:19 114:8,10	252:23	194:12
51:8 53:19,25	possession 124:22	114:25 115:8	previously 204:1	proceeding 79:11
54:6,10,13 55:1	245:10	preferential	231:20	90:18
55:19 69:17,18	possibility 20:5	110:20 135:25	Pricewaterhous	proceedings
69:18 73:18	60:6 147:8	preferred 42:4	203:23	240:20
76:14,15 78:17	152:24	76:11 134:5	principal 20:16	process 65:6 70:20
80:12 82:15,24	possible 5:15	preferring 73:16	189:3	90:15 91:5
82:25 86:13,15	26:18 33:10 42:9	premises 33:11	principally 27:16	231:15
89:7,15 111:12	94:16 115:7	88:6,18 125:5,11	50:25 137:18	processed 84:24
120:12,23 134:3	127:1,23 131:16	preparation 15:22	principle 32:20	85:11,14
134:17 140:12	142:13 192:6,10	119:6	158:16	produce 43:9
15 1.17 1 10.12	1 12.13 172.0,10	117.0	150.10	produce 13.7
			l	l

81:16 144:24	proposing 25:11	214:13,24 226:5	120:4 146:7	42:23 46:9 53:3
produced 81:17	195:25 196:5	229:22,24	147:19 148:10	55:4,6,9 63:21
96:9 97:18	prosecute 250:10	<b>putting</b> 10:4 91:17	158:5 172:13	71:18 84:16,22
144:25	prosecution 51:6	146:7	176:24 177:1,18	91:15 100:21
production 48:23	77:24 78:15	puzzled 59:19 60:3	179:4 185:11	117:17 118:7
49:18 73:17,19	142:19 191:13	68:20 142:22	195:16 205:21	120:14 122:2
73:22 74:4,19	250:20	176:19	233:2 239:9	125:21 129:10
75:15 76:11,20	prosecutors 36:11	<b>Pyle</b> 159:17	243:4	132:22 166:22
76:23,24 77:5	43:2 225:8	167:18 168:15	quickly 143:6	167:14,19 204:3
81:2 82:9,16,22	prospect 52:12	171:5 172:3,5,10	quiet 228:14	220:20 221:25
110:6 113:12,15	71:24 78:12	174:18,23 179:22	quite 58:11 66:19	227:18,21,21,25
114:13,25 156:23	245:25	180:19 181:7	82:13 93:10	239:6
213:9,10,14	protect 45:21		114:1 150:20	readily 234:6
231:18	94:17	Q	187:17 189:25	reading 24:20
profession 110:13	protocols 140:17	<b>QC</b> 222:9,18	202:15 214:22	89:20 127:3
135:21	prove 102:15	QCs 149:24	254:21	159:8 168:22
professional 4:10	254:5	qualified 114:11	quote 223:13,16	178:16 220:8
professionally	provide 18:24	qualifies 89:22	quoting 161:3	227:19
110:7	38:11 39:18	quarter 234:22		reads 13:21 24:16
proffer 198:8	61:21,25 108:15	255:19,22	R	47:14,21
proffered 42:24	111:3 138:19	que 167:11	raise 34:9	ready 16:6 85:16
profusely 16:20	148:6 171:10	queried' 171:9	raised 19:16 34:11	85:23 92:21
progress 5:24	191:19	querying 98:4	60:1 90:5 93:5	real 75:2 109:6
15:14 109:20	provided 16:18	<b>question</b> 18:8 23:5	93:21 119:20	realise 131:20
124:8 191:18	38:13,14 62:18	26:8 28:9 36:3	121:13 175:16	realised 59:1
233:24 255:24	77:23 83:11	37:6 41:17 44:2	192:15,17 208:10	155:20
progressed 141:13	169:8 173:4	45:14 46:12 51:3	218:1 221:20	realistic 71:24
progressing 20:22	174:12 224:5,7	65:13 66:2 70:12	raising 152:14	78:11
prohibited 46:22	providing 137:17	71:15 72:18 77:2	rationale 27:11	really 3:5,22 51:20
167:1	<b>public</b> 52:14 77:25	77:4 92:14 95:4	52:3 73:16 76:14	99:6 140:2 152:2
promoted 4:2	78:9,13,17,24	99:16 103:8	76:16	152:4,13 199:10
prompted 21:16	79:10 250:20	111:16 112:14	rationalise 61:3	255:8
proper 31:23	<b>pull</b> 77:23 78:9,14	114:2 122:1	63:22,25 64:23	reason 22:18 35:7
243:21,23,24	79:1 80:6,7	123:12 132:18	66:11 68:14	35:21 37:6 38:18
244:1,8,10,13,25	<b>pulled</b> 142:11	148:22 169:14	rationalised 65:14	38:20 50:25 51:4
248:5,21	pulling 78:24	177:8 178:23	66:4 193:21	80:25 101:21
properties 29:9	purely 83:21	183:8 190:7	rationalising 60:1	126:19 129:4
property 72:9	purpose 20:11	193:20 207:4	re-read 53:6 93:12	130:20,22 164:16
182:24 183:1	43:7 120:16,19	209:25 217:24	reached 65:11	187:10 197:11
196:16,19 199:21	131:3 167:1	222:24,25 234:5	66:6 67:15,17	224:10 230:7
proportion 246:23	184:19,25 254:3	235:22 236:19	69:22 193:18 194:2	232:23 241:16
proposal 25:7,9	purposes 8:17	238:12 239:3,4,7		246:14 248:6,21
88:25 145:25	167:13	239:17 243:8,16	reacted 229:14 reaction 76:9	reasonable 28:2
propose 52:10	pushed 85:6	245:21 251:9,13 253:12 255:17	150:24 195:10	28:17 44:8 47:18
proposed 29:7	put 11:9 36:4	questioning 1:5	196:23 228:1	47:22 48:4 50:8
36:13 42:25	41:17 58:1 89:3	questions 2:24	read 10:18 13:18	52:11,17 70:11
47:15 52:8 56:18	90:8 92:13 105:4	44:9 45:17 52:19	14:2 15:21 19:14	71:15 73:1,6
64:7 197:4 198:7	111:16 143:19	115:6 118:18	23:9,10 26:6,7	91:2 103:4,10
proposes 24:24	199:24 213:21	119:20,22 120:1	34:16 35:2 39:20	181:14 201:16,19
		117.20,22 120.1	J=1.10 JJ.2 JJ.20	

				1 age 200
201:22 202:10,12	94:5 99:3 122:21	250:5 251:6,13	44:15 46:19	relation 7:24 24:6
reasoning 199:18	132:25 134:9	252:14,20,20	49:20 53:6 54:12	50:24 53:19
reasons 67:19	149:2 156:14,18	253:3,6,7,9,11,14	55:13 56:1 59:14	57:20 86:1,8
136:10 155:12	156:19 159:19	253:16,17,20,21	71:12 77:10,13	95:3 100:3 101:9
175:25 244:17	163:9 164:23,23	253:10,17,20,21	79:17,19 90:21	122:25 131:24
reassured 205:3	167:20,24 171:13	recordings 138:9	103:13 122:15,23	133:23 138:23
reassuring 217:15	172:1 182:20	142:7 246:25	103.13 122.13,23	144:6 157:19
218:25	192:7 196:9	250:18	referring 19:19	174:25 175:13
recall 12:1 15:2	202:7 238:21,23	records 25:18	33:25 51:16 59:7	176:17 181:14
16:14 20:11	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		79:20 86:12	184:16 185:5
21:16 22:10	recollections	57:15,18 61:2 144:12 210:20	87:24 91:9 93:9	190:21 197:1
	247:15,18	220:7 251:21		
25:20 26:8,10,22	recommend		96:24 100:25	200:20 207:2,18
34:10 54:23	116:11	recover 105:8	101:11 122:10,12	210:10 213:8
65:11 66:6,22,25	record 8:13,22,24	211:14,16	122:13 123:13	215:8 220:9
118:1,4,8,10	9:5 17:17 19:20	recovered 24:5	150:25 253:6	221:6 245:22
119:22,25 120:16	36:17,25 37:7	110:11 212:6,22	refers 12:2 13:1	relationship 2:24
121:13 122:18	38:16 41:24 60:9	213:2	15:16 19:23	4:9,11 24:7
132:3 133:4,5	69:22 74:22 76:5	Recovering 211:18	37:19,23 83:5	104:11 175:22
134:7 144:7	76:7 81:16,17	recreate 244:19	89:18	205:11
155:9 157:10	84:13 115:12	red 50:14 92:19	refined 26:20	relayed 202:3
160:16 162:25	140:11,18 155:4	redacted 8:8 45:16	refining 26:21	relaying 47:9
163:2 168:2	194:3 216:11	45:20 101:20	reflect 100:2 157:5	release 167:7
169:6 172:9	244:16,18,20,25	102:25	reflected 103:11	Relevance 37:17
173:6 193:18	247:14 248:9,16	redactions 45:20	114:9 116:3	relevant 8:2 23:9
194:15,22 196:14	248:24 251:19,24	172:23,25	refresh 221:3	88:8 110:10
199:9 208:6	252:2,3 253:12	redo 43:12	refused 148:9	170:6 173:1
212:21 215:8	253:17 254:7,8,9	ref 102:11	151:5	210:15,22,23
220:1 241:12,14	recorded 4:25	refer 51:21 55:24	regard 60:14 61:1	212:11 236:20
244:23 249:4	18:9 21:11 36:20	84:8 86:24	85:4 239:19	relied 43:10 95:8
recalled 109:11	37:8 38:19 55:21	112:10 123:7	regarding 24:3	<b>relief</b> 75:11
117:3 192:1	71:11 94:8	reference 10:10	27:6 37:13	relies 246:14
receive 110:19	120:18 128:20	11:11 12:5,9	133:14 225:11	relieved 60:13
135:25 173:10	138:5,25 139:22	17:20,24 19:8	regards 50:4 72:13	reluctance 31:5
received 5:6 6:12	151:15,21 155:3	22:25 26:14,16	86:9 153:23	rely 137:13 163:11
7:15 9:9 60:11	155:5,22 225:25	33:8 37:21 45:19	189:24 200:11	165:3
75:4 114:7	226:2 245:15,19	46:1,5 49:22	Regiment 136:3	remain 205:23
155:16 161:23	246:1,3,7,8	62:4 65:17 68:9	188:24	remained 64:9
168:8 215:4	247:20,22,24	71:25 72:1,6	regular 208:25	230:2
220:9 221:8,14	248:20 249:19	74:18 78:19 80:8	209:20	remains 61:6
receiving 16:14	recording 8:16	84:3,5 103:24	regularly 101:8	63:24
105:11,20 175:7	11:13 78:2 79:7	115:21,24 121:6	regulated 141:4	remember 20:7,8
recharging 40:22	139:9,16,21	121:9 128:3	related 77:1	23:11 38:25 64:6
recognise 98:19	140:2,5,8 144:4	129:22 148:24	175:15 178:25	65:15 66:7 67:3
116:2	145:5,7,10	152:3 153:16	213:4	67:5,11,16,18
recollection 13:23	172:17,18 173:25	163:19 166:13	relates 178:24	73:15 74:22 92:9
17:5 18:6 20:2,4	174:3 226:2	167:14,18 168:4	189:7	94:13 95:15 96:1
30:19 38:3 54:3	244:5 245:9	168:5,25 216:21	relating 7:17 96:5	97:12 115:5
57:5 67:14 71:8	246:21 247:11	referred 7:16 35:9	106:1,6,12	118:15,16 120:4
79:9 92:9,12	248:1,4 249:14	37:22 38:15	117:22	120:19 125:23
	,,			
	I	l	l	I

				Page 281
127:15 128:12,14	95:14 101:24	139:7 148:23	167:6 256:24	222:6 232:12,15
132:16 138:6,13	113:3 161:24	176:3 240:5	257:4	234:15,25 249:12
139:24,25 140:3	166:12	242:21 250:16,16	reviewed 30:17	249:21,24 250:1
140:6 144:13	reported 4:24	250:22,24,25	107:9	RIPA 140:19
157:17,20,22	163:13	respected 143:4	reviewing 101:25	141:6,11 232:1
163:14 165:19	representations	respectful 215:11	107:21	rise 183:4 204:25
168:2,6 169:12	121:16	respond 68:11	<b>RF</b> 120:24 121:9	risk 30:3,11 45:2
170:3,4 173:12	representative	69:1 195:3	<b>RGP</b> 3:2 6:12 7:24	89:11 109:5,6
173:24 174:20	107:10,20 132:3	responded 115:7	16:25 17:1 26:21	113:6 212:17
192:21 193:3,7	132:9	responds 217:4	28:1 43:2 48:21	risks 33:2
193:10,23 195:24	reputation 219:13	responds 217.4	62:18 65:12	<b>Robert</b> 121:9
196:4,10,23,24	219:14,22	32:16 34:9 65:23	66:23 83:21	robust 147:6
201:6,23 210:25	reputational 33:2	66:5 68:13,18	90:18 95:20	robustly 150:2
216:16 219:5,17	request 58:22	91:25 95:4	97:23 99:17	Rocca 35:11,22
219:19,23 220:24	85:13 89:4	109:16 166:1	100:2 112:1,5	39:6,10,12 43:10
223:6 227:8	125:11 136:25	194:12 200:23	132:10 133:1	150:7 220:11,19
229:12 235:19	154:2 166:2	237:20	152:11,16 156:10	221:25 222:13,21
238:12,13 239:2	requested 31:7	responses 121:7	193:19 208:8	247:10
240:19 241:23	37:14 42:25 86:7	responses 121.7	213:1 215:12	role 5:10 6:20,23
249:7	89:6 97:25	7:2	237:21 249:1	10:8 181:22
remembered	requests 42:3	responsible 165:7	RGP's 120:1	182:4 209:9
21:20 192:14	require 88:10	restricted 63:7	250:12	225:3
remembering	137:10 198:14	restriction 45:22	Richardson 1:6,11	roles 5:23
63:19	required 5:23	172:24 186:7	1:12,14,16 15:2	room 55:2 129:22
remind 138:15	187:8 249:22	restrictions 84:18	15:18 16:15,16	201:17 226:17,17
reminded 8:15	250:3	result 42:18 167:4	21:9 37:16,20	226:21
remove 100:14	requirement 87:17	196:20 209:11	55:12 56:14	rotate 77:11
removed 230:21	requirements 30:1	233:9	83:12,16,24	rough 62:21
render 244:12	requires 250:15	resulted 79:24	99:12 161:11	roughly 2:25 3:24
repatriation	requiring 128:18	110:6	162:9 172:21	201:6
172:15	reservations	retained 199:21	178:12,23 220:20	round 152:6
repeat 46:12 65:20		retire 58:23 63:1	222:25 233:10	route 31:8 83:1
104:20 183:8	reserve 48:19	155:11 175:8,10	235:8 241:1	115:11 194:25
196:3 251:9	reserving 48:16	176:20 227:15	243:20 252:25	195:22,22
repeats 132:1	residence 15:9	230:8,12	right 11:10 39:5	routes 195:1
rephrase 239:20	resignation 101:11	retired 62:11,15	40:21 42:22	231:17
replied 171:11,19	resisted 14:12	62:18	65:22 70:1	rude 178:16
172:7 176:16	145:24	retirement 175:1	104:10 112:7	<b>Rules</b> 111:25
211:15,21,23	resisting 135:10	176:2	115:20,24 124:25	ruling 180:23
replies 32:8 62:9	resolve 66:15	retrospect 37:2	130:3 173:14	run 77:21 133:8
146:17,25	68:14	74:6 100:18	182:10,17,19	running 9:23,25
reply 34:9	resolved 195:23	108:3	189:11 192:3,7	78:8 158:25
report 37:15,19,21	199:16 248:22	return 83:13	193:3 197:8	183:20
39:12 40:19 41:2	resource 188:3,5	returned 69:23	198:10,25 199:9	runway 235:24
42:2,8 43:22	resources 5:22	194:4	199:10 205:10	rush 62:7
44:4 51:21 68:25	respect 52:15	revert 80:17 81:11	208:1 209:15	
74:7 81:24 82:2	85:24 87:4 90:16	reverted 67:8	210:17 212:25	S
82:8,14 86:7,25	93:6,22 110:15	review 47:3 71:5	213:7 216:7,10	sabotage 44:16
87:2,5 88:15	112:17 135:13,22	92:22 93:14	218:12 220:14	102:15 103:6,6
				sad 109:3 167:3
				•

				1 age 202
211:20 229:16,16	130:3 132:25	215:3,24 219:20	second 1:23 2:8	225:15,16 229:21
safe 16:10	134:9 142:3,14	220:17 222:16,21	18:13,16 48:12	235:22 240:4,23
safeguard 32:24	146:10 152:7,16	240:23 251:3	55:3,8 96:12	241:4 243:14
safeguards 91:18	170:14 173:19	253:9	99:12 117:12,20	252:14,23 257:19
sake 40:1 148:25	178:18,19 181:3	scanned 8:6	118:16,21,23	seeing 36:6 96:1
salutary 251:25	188:7 192:17	scenario 195:25	119:4,8,9 131:22	97:12 126:24
Sanchez 16:1 19:1	195:15 196:15	196:5 256:11	138:12,18 139:19	183:7
20:19,25 23:16	206:12 216:16	schedule 90:16	141:16 142:17	seek 5:23 33:22,23
60:6 62:4 100:22	222:19 223:6	91:6	144:14 148:2	34:3 49:24 52:19
109:9 194:24	229:21 236:11	scheduled 233:9	153:16 156:8	73:8 74:8,9 88:7
210:13,20 212:19	240:11 241:23	school 4:12,13	158:6,8 159:14	88:19 90:19
Sanchez's 22:23	242:6,11 246:5	schoolfriend 125:7	164:2 168:17	105:6,8 106:15
Sanchez/Levy	247:2,21 248:22	126:7	175:2 176:22	113:23
43:23	says 11:7 13:20	scope 243:11	200:4 227:22,24	seeking 32:2 35:4
Sands 126:20	14:4,25 15:6,16	screen 4:17 14:1	237:19 246:1	36:5,13 48:3,7
Santa 161:19	16:12 19:12 21:6	14:22 25:15,25	secondary 73:23	49:22 50:15 51:4
162:4,23 235:23	24:21 32:16	141:16 161:23	secret 94:16 248:1	51:20 52:5,9,16
236:15 239:10	33:12 37:13	178:17 226:5	secretary 46:24	53:5,8,12 70:21
Santos 1:3,15,16	43:18,23 48:12	scroll 32:9,9,15	61:21,25 62:5	99:23 100:3
3:10,16,20 10:21	53:11 55:3,9	sea 158:4 163:24	189:3 200:10,23	117:12 119:15
10:24 11:3 26:3	60:22 61:18	232:9	secrets 129:17	seems.' 102:8
47:13 56:4,14	64:12 70:10 78:3	search 20:24 33:18	section 43:22	seen 34:25 35:6
57:24 58:2 59:13	79:21 83:5 84:14	33:23,24 34:1,6	45:12 65:23	36:4 39:11 40:5
61:11 62:13 76:2	84:23 86:25	45:6 48:1,8,14	72:14 165:25	62:3 72:24,24
78:3 93:8,12	87:14 88:5 89:4	49:1 51:13 73:8	202:19	75:24 80:21
103:7 106:2,4	89:25 90:14	74:5,20 75:16	sections 8:2 23:9	81:19 86:16
111:19 112:13	91:10 100:12	76:12 77:4 81:3	secure 29:22 87:21	98:14 158:22
113:11 115:22	101:19 102:13	82:9,17,23 87:24	172:16 185:6	176:18 180:25
124:5,8,14,19	107:4 108:12	88:14,22 93:6,22	security 5:16	195:8 207:21
132:21 140:24	116:9,16,17	94:14 95:9 99:24	32:25 94:17	230:9
176:21 177:13,17	117:16,20 118:7	104:16,22 105:5	101:24 108:24	seize 33:19 87:17
177:22 206:5	120:24 122:16	106:15 112:16	126:13 148:16	109:19 116:13
213:7 233:12,18	126:19 127:4,6	113:10 114:13,17	see 11:8 15:10	137:11 214:2
233:23 234:16	127:10 129:5	116:12 119:15	19:24 25:22	seized 30:14 49:18
255:3 256:12,24	130:12 131:25	124:22 127:18,18	36:12 38:10	104:5
257:2,7,13,16	133:1 137:9	129:15,20,24	45:10 46:20	seizing 49:10
sat 58:23	138:23 143:25	130:22 132:13	49:21 61:5 63:24	send 31:17,19
save 228:10	145:14 150:7	133:14,20 134:2	64:21 75:9 86:7	35:22 179:19
saw 41:19 97:24	152:10 153:13	136:24 137:2,6	90:12 91:24	sending 51:18 81:9
98:2,19 182:11	154:15 156:9	156:12,15 157:1	92:24 93:16 94:7	105:10,20 204:11
242:25	159:24 160:11,12	177:3 178:25	99:14 101:25	sends 146:10
saying 8:5 11:10	161:22 162:5,12	194:13 210:11	105:4 109:10	senior 5:7,10 6:4
21:18 22:15 23:1	163:5 164:3	212:16 214:7,9	118:19 121:1,2	6:22 8:13 17:2
28:23 31:12 34:2	165:5 166:2	215:6 220:9	126:9 131:5,25	18:25 20:19 21:7
67:1,5,13,15,18	167:8 170:5	223:20 231:3,9,9	142:12 143:17	21:14 69:17
79:7,8,9 80:16	171:5 172:4	searched 29:9	160:23 169:9	109:2 140:12
86:5 102:4,11	173:25 191:10	72:10	172:12 181:24	144:1 158:8,10
122:21 123:1	202:20 204:3,17	searching 49:10	197:3 200:16,16	175:9 188:25
124:25 128:16	205:10 208:5	136:17	220:13,16 225:8	189:2,6,10,16,17

				1 age 203
189:17 194:24	served 176:19	shown 41:3,4	102:23 133:9	118:22 119:1,10
195:19 207:16	server 137:11	163:23 173:12	140:10 203:16	119:24 120:5
226:16,23 229:13	service 51:7	240:21	231:17 248:23	123:8,25 132:16
237:19 244:6	189:10	shows 11:8 116:4	250:13 256:5	133:22 135:4,18
245:17 249:16	session 255:8,8	SIA 10:8	six 44:21 102:6	138:2 144:8
sense 28:24 227:16	set 19:6 28:5 31:21	SIC 45:7	117:15 203:1	151:24 153:15,16
246:18,23 247:1	32:22 60:21	side 21:24 119:5	204:5 252:15	153:24 160:1
sensed 56:25 247:6	67:19 75:5 81:12	155:21	sixth 61:24	163:22 164:18
senseless 85:21	100:16,20 111:24	signature 2:2,15	size 188:3	169:13 172:2,3
sensible 124:6	159:18 201:25	160:11	skin 228:10	173:10 180:14
sensitive 61:9	207:25	signed 95:18 98:10	slightly 56:4 77:2	181:5 183:8
126:8 127:1,12	sets 52:3 84:8	significance 54:22	small 80:4 141:6,7	190:12 192:17
183:12	101:4 146:15	significant 45:2	198:14 225:1	193:8 196:3,24
sensitively 127:23	setting 6:14 85:9	197:5	smiling 211:20	199:7 200:4
189:24	207:24	signposting 48:15	Smith 174:9,10,11	201:1 203:5,22
sensitivities 31:4	shadow 229:11	signposting 48.13	SMT 155:14,24,25	204:16,21 205:9
83:6 188:21	shadows 123:14	132:12,15 133:4	157:9,23 230:1	204:10,21 203.9
sensitivity 110:14	share 181:12	simplistic 207:4	snapshot 80:4	216:20,23 217:23
135:22	224:18	simplistic 207.4 simply 214:13	social 85:20	218:8 220:13
sent 41:20,22	shared 9:24 16:24	236:13 248:22	society 188:17	221:12 222:7
54:20 64:22 81:5	17:1,1 19:4	simultaneously	Solicitor 249:17	224:15 227:10,23
86:21 100:7	shareholder	9:23 29:10	somebody 9:10	236:13 243:22
161:1 163:18	209:12	136:15	25:12 76:6 135:9	251:9 252:22
174:13 179:8,14	shares 61:10	single 95:11 96:21	135:12 146:5	sort 9:15 125:16
179:16 204:23	sharing 183:12	97:2 101:25	187:8	164:19 165:1
211:9,14	256:14	137:22 147:13	somewhat 142:22	211:20 256:20
sentence 55:8	sharp 35:12 36:1	SIO 11:24 75:11	son 216:5 217:19	sorted 134:21
84:20 91:16	36:23 39:9	98:11 159:3	218:4	178:1 256:21
107:7 111:17	shift 4:4	176:15 190:22	soon 174:2 187:2	sought 36:8 42:3
separate 72:6	shock 195:14	sir 1:3,9 12:6,8,9	sooner 124:10	47:16 50:2,4,5
197:20	shocked 60:8	12:12,17 86:7	sorry 3:8,21 6:19	64:5 74:1 103:23
Sergeant 95:18	175:13,19 176:20	90:15 112:8	8:3 10:21 12:1	104:1,8 106:10
117:14 118:7	245:25	114:21 115:4	14:6 18:16,18,18	108:13,17 111:1
serious 5:1 12:15	shocking 140:9	140:19,21 165:10	24:12 26:6 29:1	111:5 117:17,19
45:1 133:8	195:4,6 223:9	176:3,25 195:8	31:12 37:5 40:6	sound 196:21
148:16 175:16	short 56:12 58:14	203:5,7 217:23	42:2,21 46:10	199:8 207:4
186:17,19,21	177:24 234:21,21	233:5,7 234:1,3	57:20,21 58:2	213:11
187:15 188:9,11	235:2,10 257:5	234:24,24 235:5	61:23 65:20 68:8	sounds 199:10
188:15 198:1,2	shortening 256:16	235:7,9 237:11	69:8 77:11 79:15	<b>Spain</b> 14:17 167:2
225:17	shortly 16:15	238:2,21,22,23	81:8 88:16 90:11	167:2 171:25
seriously 247:7	62:11,17 70:3	239:4,8 240:14	91:15 92:4 95:24	Spanish 162:1
seriousness 103:15	177:13	243:5,10,14,18	96:16,18,19,23	164:25 165:8
108:22 186:1,8	show 41:6 44:16	245:5 246:10	96:25 99:18,19	167:9 168:23
186:24 195:16	92:18 100:23	253:1 254:21,22	99:21 100:6	227:20 236:2,5,7
servant 19:1 20:20	101:14 175:18	254:25 255:1,4	102:20,20 103:7	237:9,23
188:25 189:2,17	191:7,9	255:14,15,20	103:20 104:20,21	speak 3:16,18,20
194:25 195:19	showed 47:1 145:6	256:1	105:2 107:6	3:21 12:24 14:15
servants 189:6	showing 38:8	situ 87:21	112:8 113:13,13	21:7,14 34:2
serve 254:3	141:15	situation 43:21	115:22,23 117:15	35:7 77:24 78:16
	I	I	I	I

				1 age 204
126:8 127:17	230:1,6,19	118:25 119:4,5	<b>STP</b> 211:24	suggesting 129:14
128:1 129:3,6	232:18 236:20	131:23 132:19	straight 60:10	194:23 242:20
158:2 215:9,15	240:20	135:14,19 138:18	111:17,21,22	252:17
<b>SPEAKER</b> 93:8	stages 7:6	141:15,25 142:2	112:6	suggestion 64:1,3
132:17	stake 33:2	142:16 146:10,14	strange 22:12	72:17 149:22,23
speakerphone	stall 146:15	147:9 148:2,7,7	74:23 142:24	150:1 220:11,18
128:11,14	stand 61:7 143:9	150:24 152:12	220:2	221:21,22 256:13
speaking 3:10	228:22	153:7,8,25 158:6	strategy 194:6	suggests 222:22
21:25 121:4	standard 171:21	159:8 160:9	stray 102:24	suite 162:7 226:20
134:6 205:1	244:25	171:5 172:14	110:21	sum 101:5
229:18,19 242:25	<b>standby</b> 158:10	175:2 205:10	strong 35:11 39:7	summarise 207:20
252:10	standing 110:13	208:5 215:1,2,3	strongly 156:12,25	summarised
special 209:9	135:12,20 136:2	219:20 240:22	199:23	158:21
252:17	136:9	statements 1:20	struck 22:11	summary 23:8
specialist 188:1	stands 27:9	95:7 168:22	struggling 135:10	35:23 39:18 40:2
specific 26:12	start 2:23 107:20	183:23 184:18	stuck 75:17	40:4 43:9 77:22
72:14 139:4	182:8 190:5	201:3	style 135:7	96:4 97:15
179:4	235:10 255:9	states 4:18 19:15	subject 32:23	Sunday 147:1
specifically 7:24	256:20 257:3	21:6 61:10,18	45:21 63:18	159:13 160:5
20:9 54:17 63:13	started 3:3 23:18	63:21 85:12 91:4	79:24 92:11	161:8
72:7 74:1 79:16	35:19 53:16	103:22 170:22	108:13,15,16	super 192:25
112:18 118:10	58:23 149:7	173:2 211:17	111:1,3,4 143:14	superintendence
131:15 133:6,13	155:19 235:15	station 80:13 89:7	186:7 191:20	5:12
191:3 192:2	starting 90:15	126:13 147:21	233:19	superintendent
200:10 206:25	91:5 147:7,12	151:2 154:5	subjective 202:2	3:6 27:22 37:16
specifics 190:5	179:4 256:10,15	157:19,21 169:1	246:13	37:20 55:12
specify 79:18	256:17,19	169:21 170:1	submission 119:14	80:15 83:12,16
spell 224:15	starts 14:3 84:21	226:22	submissions 95:8	83:24 86:4
spoke 7:8 102:11	101:18 122:3	status 51:1 60:15	119:16	116:10 158:11
102:12 128:13	256:22	68:23 180:10	submit 89:9	159:6 161:10
186:1 208:10	state 13:17 29:8	201:14 208:25	submitted 96:2	162:9 172:21
210:12 215:25	30:13 31:3 34:18	237:15	97:13 145:1	220:20 222:25
<b>spoken</b> 107:23 156:9 203:12	34:24 39:17 156:25 158:7	stay 163:24 167:10 176:23	subsequent 92:17	227:3 241:1
215:17 222:22			<b>subsequently</b> 63:4 72:18 162:7	252:24 255:9 support 32:20
spread 35:20	168:19,21 171:24 stated 203:12	step 1:11 stepping 196:19	substance 80:19	96:10 158:10
springs 103:12	stated 203:12 statement 1:23 2:5	stepping 190:19 steps 6:17 29:7	127:10	199:25
springs 103:12 st 35:10	2:10,19,20 16:12	53:5 68:8,16	substantial 87:15	supported 33:4,14
stage 11:25 23:3	18:13,17,18	stick 255:6	substantial 67.13	100:17
24:8 29:17,21	19:11 21:10	sticking 81:21	substantive 31.23 sufficient 44:5,7	supporting 200:13
30:5 35:18 36:10	23:22 34:15	stipendiary 31:13	71:23 103:3	supporting 200.13 suppose 52:21
39:11 41:7 42:22	39:17 54:12	98:17,21 119:20	247:10	76:21 131:12
43:2,4 48:7	60:22 61:22 62:1	stipulated 117:16	sufficiently 147:6	Supreme 94:22
56:15 68:5,21	65:8 70:25 73:10	stir 228:22	suggest 22:16 45:6	sure 3:11 6:10
77:23 78:9,15	83:4 94:12 95:24	stood 21:23	92:23 93:15	17:8 25:6 39:4
79:1,13 81:20	96:7,13 97:8,10	stop 142:18 201:11	248:9	41:21 42:21 50:3
91:17 113:24	99:12 109:22	stopped 15:11	suggested 32:20	63:19 64:24
136:22 151:17	111:19,20 117:14	141:20	73:1 94:18 208:8	72:23 89:19
166:6 198:4	118:17,22,22,23	storing 105:14	230:9 247:23	125:16 126:10
	, , ,,_	9	5	
	I	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	l

				Page 285
129:12 130:1	250:21	taken 6:17 15:15	187:3,7 202:6	119:13 120:15,16
147:15 158:22	suspicions 202:4	25:17 59:14 68:8	technically 155:4	124:15 126:2
162:21 171:9	swayed 120:24	94:19,24 118:13	technicians 188:2	130:3 166:17
173:14,17 189:7	switch 172:6	120:2 124:23	telephone 13:13	176:21,22 177:16
202:5 233:14	switched 125:3,17	131:21 132:11	15:5 20:6,10	226:15 233:3,4
251:10	126:4 170:25	133:3,11,12,12	154:24	234:14,25 236:14
surely 171:21	171:2,12,15	133:3,11,12,12	telephones 105:10	257:18
surprising 140:23	240:3	143:13 145:21	tell 12:12 21:19,20	thanks 126:23
surrender 194:9	sworn 1:14 241:9	173:15 179:1	31:9 41:8 52:24	thermal 172:17
surveillance 169:1	system 5:16 44:2	181:16,19 185:3	89:20 103:8	173:3,5,11
suspect 16:3 23:1	44:23 45:4,11	186:11 193:25	114:20,23 126:2	thi 157:17
28:2,12,17 34:5	47:2,6,12 102:7	194:17 205:19	132:13 166:9	thing 26:12 59:16
36:16 46:8,16	102:15 108:25	takes 131:6	220:3 254:25	75:17 82:14,21
47:18,23 48:4	170:25 197:8	talk 125:18 134:18	telling 44:19 88:17	137:1 143:1
50:18,22 52:17	202:24 203:3,25	193:15 214:19	169:2	145:17 146:23
58:21 60:15 71:5	202:24 203:3,23	229:5	tells 214:4	156:21 225:1
71:6,10,14 72:19	systems 171:10	talked 60:5 189:25	template 111:18	229:21 231:4
73:2,24 83:18	172:7	205:6 214:21	111:21,22 112:4	246:13 249:12,22
87:18 103:5,10	1 / 4. /	224:25 225:1	111:21,22 112:4	249:13 249:12,22
104:10 111:8,14	T	talking 53:16	templates 111:24	251:25 257:7
121:17 133:17,25	tab 1:21,21 2:9,9	186:8 227:10	temporary 159:3	things 8:14,16,22
136:1 148:6,9	119:11	229:8 250:14	ten 59:18 149:24	66:24 77:18 98:5
153:1,1,9 166:24	table 21:22 29:3	252:16	160:25,25 256:23	110:21 153:10
167:1 179:10	144:12	tallies 162:4	257:3	154:19 185:5
180:10 201:14	tactical 32:21 33:7	tally 156:13	tend 234:9	187:18 228:22
203:19 204:9	take 1:12,18,21	<b>Tambien</b> 211:25	term 49:6	235:21 244:2
217:10,15 229:9	10:6 11:15 14:9	tamper 44:23	terms 92:3,5	256:19
suspected 16:7	14:24 18:12	102:7 203:3	116:23 124:8	think 1:11,21 3:2,9
22:4 83:8 84:1	19:11 23:21 25:4	204:7,15,19	127:9 137:1	3:14,21 4:2,16
104:12 146:5	26:12,15,23	tampered 45:10	166:7 168:20	6:7 7:9 10:22,24
162:11 163:7	31:16 37:3 50:11	47:12	183:6 242:4	12:4,7 13:4 14:1
186:23 188:16	56:7 58:16 60:17	tampering 205:2	territorial 236:5,7	14:2 15:23 17:9
197:7 202:23	61:15 65:12 66:2	tanker 192:25	236:10,17,24	17:14,23 18:19
229:9 231:19	66:23 67:6 68:3	tanker 172:25	237:4,7,9,14,23	23:19 27:20
241:3	74:23 77:3 83:2	taught 41:11	238:4,17 239:23	29:25 33:8,25
suspecting 50:8	92:16 96:12	TC 29:8	240:16	34:2,13 36:25
suspects 20:16	101:17 105:6	team 17:2,3 22:14	text 14:13 23:10	37:8,23 38:7,8,20
29:5 85:24 86:2	114:15 117:13,14	43:20 44:21 45:3	30:8 44:15	38:21 39:2,15,24
89:13 110:17	119:17 120:21	47:10 73:4 91:9	105:11,20 203:11	40:17,21 43:5
134:25 135:2,4	121:24 123:23,25	102:5,11,19,22	211:5 216:2,23	44:7,11 50:21
135:24 194:6	130:7 132:21	103:9 141:8	216:24 217:5	51:10 53:11,22
196:8 212:3,10	136:7,15 137:12	174:14 175:9	texted 126:6 217:9	54:1 56:6 57:3
212:12	145:13 147:23	181:11 203:1,15	218:16	57:22 59:17
suspicion 24:8	151:6 155:19,19	204:5 208:15	thank 1:17 2:8,23	60:10,18 62:3,16
44:8 146:11	173:23 175:1	226:3,24 229:14	8:11 11:2,3,7	62:20 63:7,7,17
181:14 201:16,20	193:19 196:22	team's 83:8,14,20	23:4 27:24 32:15	64:3,24 76:21
201:22 202:10,12	200:6 214:25	teams 136:16	57:7 61:17 77:12	77:3,11,16 80:8
202:16 204:24	216:14 234:13	tech 5:20	78:18 93:12,18	84:23 89:24 90:3
205:23 206:4	236:23 251:22	technical 168:24	106:20 113:13	90:21 91:9 92:12
	256:25			
	I	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	I

				1 age 200
93:2,8,10 95:13	234:7,20 235:15	4:4,5 5:12 6:2	title 10:13 115:17	250:6,9
97:5 98:15 99:15	234:7,20 233:13	7:9 9:21 10:1	237:17	transpired 154:20
103:20 107:13	240:14,18 241:20	19:23 22:2,6,11	today 24:2 57:1	treat 110:14
103.20 107.13	242:6,13 243:20	27:23 29:24	82:7 113:25	134:24 135:21
114:22 116:24	243:22,25 244:5	38:12 39:3 43:8	233:11 235:21	152:8,16,18
120:8,24 121:5	244:10,12 245:2	44:25 46:4,21	257:9	249:5 250:15
123:12,13,20	245:6,8,21	47:2 48:21 56:12	told 17:12 21:13	treated 73:24
123:12,13,20	246:23 247:17	58:11 66:19	25:24 125:9	83:18 134:23
124:5 125:15,16	248:25 249:14,21	69:23 70:4 73:4	126:7,14 127:16	136:5 179:10
127:24 129:2,13	250:4,8,13,18,22	73:11 74:21	131:1 132:9,11	215:12
130:2,21 133:10	251:5,10,16,17	75:18 76:6,22	133:2 138:4	treating 110:16
134:13,23 139:12	252:16 253:11	85:22 87:15	139:21,23,24	135:23 250:19,22
140:7 142:6	255:3,8,12	89:14,20 98:7	152:10,12 156:10	250:24
144:20 145:16	256:24 257:7	99:8 100:4,6	160:10 162:2,15	treatment 110:20
146:24 147:18	thinking 65:23	107:1 109:12	162:24,25 174:3	135:25
149:17,17 150:9	third 2:9 18:13,16	113:4 121:11	203:13 215:14	triangulate 173:14
150:15,16,20,25	18:18 21:9 23:21	128:24 130:4	220:22 222:3	Triay 21:5
151:22,25 152:20	24:19,21 26:17	131:17 136:11,13	230:6	Tribunal 255:21
154:6,7 155:15	34:14 39:17	136:14,17 139:3	<b>Tommy</b> 199:5	tried 108:10
156:2,22 157:8	51:23 60:21 65:8	139:15,18 140:14	211:7	110:14 135:21
157:18,22 160:12	73:10 94:11	141:1,25 142:15	tomorrow 128:1	148:19
161:16 163:16	95:23 97:8,10	143:11 145:25	129:6,6 233:15	true 2:5,20 250:17
164:14,14 165:5	103:25 109:22	148:6 157:21	233:17 234:1	trust 229:10
165:7 167:9,12	118:22 119:9	159:2,23 162:15	251:22 255:6	trustworthy 249:9
167:14 168:7,24	135:14,18 142:17	163:1 164:5,12	256:5,10 257:6,9	truthful 249:8
169:1,3,11,17,20	153:12 202:4	165:23 168:10,19	257:10,19	try 102:14 129:11
169:20,22 170:14	203:13 219:2	169:25 172:12,19	tone 155:17	147:25 152:12
171:1 173:7,8	thorn 119:5	176:11 177:24	top 17:23 34:8	214:2 233:23
174:7,9,24 176:3	thought 32:4 49:4	178:13 182:11	92:18 110:24	256:11
176:23 177:17,20	68:24 74:21	194:4,10 195:7	146:9 161:8	trying 18:19 61:12
181:21 182:5,9	147:20 153:11	200:25 201:1,2,5	163:24 252:15	66:17,18 68:8
182:17 183:11	154:1 177:4	201:21 205:18	town 236:2	243:10,15
184:17 185:25	197:7 205:18	206:8,17 213:18	trace 86:20	<b>Tuesday</b> 58:3,8
186:19 191:2,3	223:25 231:2	215:20 216:12	track 172:2	Tunbridge 227:3
192:12,13 194:17	236:10 245:3	217:6 218:9,11	traffic 198:20	turn 1:25 4:15
194:19 195:14,18	248:5,21 249:24	218:13,24 219:15	trail 38:8	13:2 17:13 25:14
195:21 197:22	250:1	220:4 223:24	transcribed 9:14	37:11 38:10
198:1,13 201:10	thread 206:11	226:25 231:15	226:4,6 227:17	39:16 40:17 42:1
203:6 206:2	three 15:24 20:16	236:25 239:12,19	transcribing 10:2	42:20 54:19 56:8
208:15,17 209:18	29:18,23 35:20	239:21 240:2,7	transcript 137:25	70:6 80:14 83:3
209:24 210:12	42:5 43:16 79:4	240:19 242:13	142:7 143:17,25	86:3 94:10
216:7,14 218:21	118:17 124:9	247:20 249:24	144:4,16 151:24	100:10 115:15
219:18,20 220:7	130:14,15 138:22	254:6,24 257:8	246:25	125:25 150:5
221:15 222:4	148:24 158:19	timeline 59:1	transcripts 142:12	156:3 178:14,15
223:8 224:16	161:3 214:20	77:10,13	244:22	178:20 193:17
227:3,8 228:9,10	throw 222:18	timelines 62:17	translated 226:7,8	197:2 202:17
228:16,16 229:25	<b>Thue</b> 190:7	times 79:6 184:20	226:9 227:17	211:3 214:13
231:1 233:6,18	Thursday 1:1	184:24	translation 227:23	turned 152:2,4,14
233:20,23,25	time 1:22 3:4,23	timing 234:17	transparent 250:4	153:22 235:17
	•	-	•	•

				1 480 207
turning 11:12	181:12	unnecessary	156:20	183:16 190:4
87:13 95:2	underneath	247:11	view 36:15,22	193:15 194:14
124:19 137:20,21	108:12 170:22	unofficial 165:1	48:25 52:25	199:12 201:13
152:6	understand 12:8	unscrupulous 39:9	60:14 73:5 90:1	202:17 207:13
twe 155:9	33:6,15,21 37:21	unthinkable 69:13	152:21,23 176:7	214:19,24,25
twice 219:20	44:3 70:16 83:15	69:15	199:13 200:13,19	219:11 224:24
two 11:16 12:3	96:16 108:18	unusual 75:3,4	201:25 202:2	225:24 232:8
14:25 35:19	114:4 115:18	111:13 121:18	205:23 219:7,7	243:6 251:24,25
38:22,24 55:4	119:7 123:3	148:11 181:18,20	232:3,6 242:21	257:8
62:17 66:24 78:1	132:4 140:13	182:10,11 198:4	views 31:25 74:11	wanted 5:13 14:4
92:21 96:13	213:16 226:3	update 184:15	213:21	14:10 20:21 40:3
97:16 117:4,25	246:4	updated 184:24	visit 126:19 130:21	57:8 79:22 84:22
118:6,13 122:1	understandably	updates 184:25	131:3 235:13	116:22 141:19
124:12 126:21	3:10 254:10	upset 16:17 143:12	vitally 171:23	144:15 155:19
144:17 173:16	understanding	<b>upside</b> 137:21	voice 215:5	178:23 200:16
185:10 194:9	12:17 49:8 50:13	use 8:17 40:19	voluntarily 88:20	warrant 31:5,6,22
203:10 205:6	50:20 52:6 73:3	72:19 75:15 88:9	146:14	33:18,24,24 34:1
211:5 212:12	73:4 104:7,15,21	91:13 111:25	voluntary 29:14	34:7 48:8 51:13
215:4 235:10	105:5 112:1	112:2 142:13	80:11,12 88:13	69:10 73:8,17,20
239:9 245:16	115:25 140:25	143:3 157:1	88:14 134:3	73:22 74:5,8,10
247:16 249:15	175:24 176:6,9	188:3,4 220:2	136:21 145:3	74:20 75:16
two-thirds 70:10	176:10,11 179:8	useful 251:24	147:8 149:9	76:13,19,23 77:4
type 166:25	197:17 200:18	uses 33:6	151:2	81:3 82:10,17,23
<b>typed</b> 61:9	205:7 212:1	usual 49:24 121:16	volviera 167:11	87:25 88:9,9,18
typed-out 25:16	understood 22:23	137:5		88:22 90:19,25
<b>typical</b> 16:2 42:5,9	73:16 76:13,16	usually 75:25	<u>W</u>	93:6,22 94:10,14
52:24 99:17	104:3 105:2	198:21,25 256:20	<b>w</b> 35:13	95:17 97:22
100:2	114:12 128:6	<b>T</b> 7	Wagner 1:8	99:24 100:3
typically 34:21	141:2 193:15	<u>V</u>	176:23 177:17	104:16,22 105:6
52:19 145:20	199:19	vague 99:3 196:9	178:4,8,10,11	106:16 107:25
	undertaking 64:14	validating 242:20	193:8,13,15	112:16 113:10
<u>U</u>	unethical 245:3,7	value 27:18 146:4	201:22 206:6	114:13,17 115:17
Uh-huh 97:1 155:2	unfairly 141:23	various 178:24	217:23 233:2	116:1,5 117:13
UK 31:2,2 109:11	unfolded 43:12	Vasquez 211:6,17	241:20 256:4,8	124:22 127:18,19
111:23 187:23	unfortunately	211:23	Wagner's 243:8	128:5 129:25
189:7	115:12 199:25	vent 229:3	wait 101:24	132:14 133:15,21
Ullger 160:20	200:5	vented 229:3	130:12,14,20	134:2 137:2
ultimately 31:8	Unit 95:20 187:12	venture 209:12	waiting 14:8 16:6 69:5 84:24 85:11	156:13,15,24
90:3,8,24 123:18 198:22	187:14	verbally 191:17,23 verbatim 254:8,9		157:1 177:3
um 12:14 14:9	Unit's 187:11	version 25:16 81:5	194:12 239:7	178:25 180:3,24
23:18 24:4	United 85:12	141:6 160:8	walking 15:8 169:21 235:14	184:8,10 194:13
un-minuted 245:1	187:20 232:1	181:25	wall 229:2	205:21 206:1,8
unable 45:25	units 188:1	vessel 166:24	want 11:9 14:15	206:14 207:1
uncertain 85:15	unjust 219:8	173:19,20	14:24 15:20 55:7	208:13 210:11
uncomfortable	unjustifiable	viable 92:25 93:17	58:1 66:10 67:24	212:9,16 214:8,9
122:6	219:8	video 60:11 71:7	77:16 79:5 90:23	220:10,12,19
uncovered 207:15	unlawful 42:14	73:14 74:25	118:18 129:2,15	221:19,23 223:20
uncovering 47:10	unlawfully 222:11	173:12	145:12 161:12	230:22 231:3,9,9
underlying 154:18	222:20	videoconference	177:8,9 179:2	231:15
and Tyme 157.10	l	, racocomici ciicc	177.0,5 175.2	l

				1 480 200
warranted 52:10	we'll 129:6 157:20	withhold 242:22	218:17 219:1	<b>Wyan's</b> 25:5,9
warrants 20:24	229:5	withholding 242:5	worse 222:21	36:21 37:12 44:4
48:1,15,23 49:1	we're 150:14,20	witness 1:6,13,20	worth 76:1 233:12	75:21,24 88:15
90:16 91:6,8	we've 133:10	1:23 2:5,10,18,19	<b>wouldn't</b> 17:10	96:4 97:15 130:8
95:9,22 116:13	153:13,18 235:21	10:23 18:13,17	67:6 72:21	211:2 256:6
119:16 123:17	wear 123:21,22	18:18 21:10	133:13 143:9	
130:22 132:6,11	week 34:10 92:21	23:21 34:14 58:3	146:3 147:2	X
133:2 135:2	149:12	60:21 73:10	150:21 154:10	<b>T</b> 7
184:4 215:7	weekend 97:24	94:11 95:7 119:5	223:24 225:14	<u>Y</u>
wasn't 31:15 40:13	146:9 228:7	131:22 132:22	238:5 242:3	Yeah 161:9
58:21 59:16	weeks 201:7,8	135:14,18 140:24	244:18,23 250:9	year 3:3 8:1 29:25
60:16 63:11 64:4	weeks' 194:9	146:10 152:17,18	write 84:11 93:23	72:11 109:25
73:7 75:3,17	Wel 183:9	177:5 178:9	writing 23:18 59:1	142:5
76:15 122:12	welcome 1:16	234:18 239:2	75:5 119:14	year's 40:15
125:8,10 128:11	62:10	240:22 243:6,9	221:16	years 2:25 41:12
133:8 135:1	went 35:7 58:17	243:12,19	written 26:10 75:5	132:2 186:15,16
136:17,19 137:20	75:8 86:14 98:8	witness' 152:9	81:1 95:8 116:20	201:23
142:10 143:12	98:17 119:19	witnessed 242:16	132:19 144:24	Yeats 27:22 227:2
157:12 197:21	126:13,16 131:13	witnesses 247:11	152:12 168:9	227:2
218:6 223:1	131:19 141:7	wonder 226:4	254:3	yellow 1:21 119:11
230:8 245:10	143:5 153:5	wondering 115:23	wrong 8:10 24:16	yesterday 14:5
248:3 250:23	191:17 214:2	256:8	26:6 57:23,24,25	$\overline{\mathbf{z}}$
wasted 40:14,14	232:11	word 64:24,25	139:13 160:8	
watching 201:18	weren't 4:13 36:8	68:19 72:20 93:9	175:21 182:22	Zammit 78:6,6
waters 236:4,6,7,8	66:20 76:15	150:11 173:14	203:8 210:14	<b>Zona</b> 167:10
236:10,12,15,17	137:21 157:13	210:18 253:11	223:18 231:2	0
236:24 237:4,7	193:11 230:10	worded 153:3	247:7	<b>0300</b> 159:9
237:10,14,23	west 161:15	words 11:9 14:13	wrongly 59:14	<b>0400</b> 159:9
238:4,17 239:10	WhatsApp 19:2,5	41:17 84:11	wrote 94:4 101:22	<b>0500</b> 159:13 160:5
239:11,14,17,23	19:5,7 210:19	127:15,22 132:13	102:3,10 116:18	161:2,8
240:6,16	Whereabouts	132:15 133:4	141:25 142:16	<b>09.45</b> 60:24
Wavetecz 211:7	120:25	139:25 156:22	Wyan 6:1 24:23,24	<b>09.43</b> 00.24 <b>0940</b> 161:13,23
way 36:5 49:4,5,14	whichever 83:1	219:20 220:2	25:17,19 26:17	162:22 163:10
65:2 70:10 74:23	114:14	221:17,21	37:3,23 40:1	164:6
82:19 83:25	<b>whilst</b> 9:9,10,11	work 3:1 10:25	41:1 42:3 43:8	107.0
84:11 89:12	87:15 101:10	40:15 43:12 75:8	51:21 75:12	1
105:5 110:16	132:10 133:1	90:2	80:15 81:5,10,18	<b>1</b> 38:9 51:17 64:22
121:24 133:6	156:10 157:17	worked 3:5,22	86:4,22 87:5,9,11	69:1 90:16 91:6
135:11,24 147:24	215:10	29:19	87:24 88:3 90:13	92:22 93:13
149:19,20 151:3	<b>white</b> 63:10	Workflows 24:17	90:24 91:4 92:11	105:8 106:21
152:1 153:12	<b>whittle</b> 61:4 63:23	working 2:24 4:9	94:2 95:12,21	10 235:16
162:7 164:18	64:24 65:4	164:16 189:14	96:8 97:3,17	<b>10.00</b> 1:2 257:20
170:9 177:14	wholly 64:15	works 255:12	113:2 119:18	<b>10.01</b> 13:14
186:25 189:21	will' 146:15	worn 94:9,19	124:21 126:12,22	<b>10.11</b> 160:20
205:15 209:3,5	willing 177:7	124:1	144:3 151:13	163:18,25
209:23 212:15	<b>window</b> 15:12	worried 204:3,14	194:7 233:17	<b>10.12</b> 13:14
214:7 215:12	wiped 110:8	worry 102:14	247:10 249:18,18	<b>10.25</b> 159:24
231:24 248:2	wish 32:14	203:13 205:3	255:10,11 257:6	160:10,14 166:17
way,' 102:16	withdrawn 108:1	217:4,10,16	257:11	10.31 25:3
L	1		1	

				1 age 207
<b>100</b> 101:16 102:9	<b>13.04</b> 129:8	<b>17.03</b> 257:22	81:9,13 84:15	<b>3245</b> 110:25
157:23 191:5	<b>13.56</b> 129:21	<b>1764</b> 25:25	96:6 123:16	<b>3283</b> 90:11
226:12	<b>132</b> 43:16 44:15	<b>1783</b> 70:7	124:20 137:24	<b>3285</b> 92:17
<b>101</b> 102:17	46:18,20	<b>1784</b> 84:12	138:22 139:7	<b>33</b> 30:13
<b>1010</b> 166:3	<b>133</b> 44:16	<b>1788</b> 57:13 58:2	143:22 159:9	<b>337</b> 42:21
<b>11</b> 1:1 13:5,8,13	<b>134</b> 43:16,18	<b>1790</b> 120:22	160:21 162:16	<b>338</b> 47:14
101:22	<b>135</b> 45:13	121:25	163:25 168:13	<b>339</b> 48:11
11.01 45:23	<b>136</b> 46:7	<b>1794</b> 126:2	191:1	<b>34</b> 94:12
<b>11.05</b> 163:5 240:24	<b>137</b> 45:13	<b>18</b> 39:16,21 89:24	<b>2022</b> 65:25 96:8	<b>3455</b> 27:24
<b>11.15</b> 167:7	13th 55:23 62:14	119:11	<b>2023</b> 160:10,11	<b>3456</b> 29:6
<b>11.16</b> 56:11	62:24 144:18	<b>18(b)</b> 95:4 96:18	<b>2024</b> 1:1 257:21	<b>3497</b> 130:7
<b>11.28</b> 56:13	149:4 217:1	96:25 99:11,19	<b>20th</b> 55:23 62:14	<b>35</b> 31:3
<b>11.55</b> 77:8	219:3 221:10,11	<b>18(c)</b> 99:21	62:24 144:18	<b>36</b> 23:14 27:7
<b>1105</b> 162:8	245:14 246:3,18	<b>18(d)</b> 118:21	246:8	32:12 43:25
11th 126:20	246:19	119:13	<b>21</b> 25:17 26:1,5	101:3,7,9 104:12
<b>12</b> 54:21 55:22	<b>14</b> 17:16 34:15,16	<b>19</b> 102:3 202:21	81:6,6,8 96:7	106:6 161:14,23
59:4 63:3 123:16	199:8	19(a) 158:7	<b>21April</b> 81:9	186:15,16 205:8
124:3,19 127:2	<b>14.01</b> 124:18	<b>1985</b> 3:2	21st 26:4	<b>3610</b> 51:15
130:13 154:20	<b>14.29</b> 146:20		<b>22</b> 63:1 77:15	<b>3612</b> 42:1,1
156:7 157:6	<b>14.59</b> 169:5	2	154:24 155:10	<b>3630</b> 43:15
161:15 174:1	<b>1429</b> 71:1	<b>20</b> 35:16 55:16	225:25	<b>3635</b> 42:20
179:11 180:5	<b>143</b> 126:1	75:10 84:14	<b>22nd</b> 26:3 227:11	<b>3666</b> 42:22 47:14
181:10 184:10,13	<b>1431</b> 135:15	151:11 154:20	<b>23</b> 28:4 83:5 84:8	<b>37</b> 162:12
191:9 192:5,6	<b>1436</b> 19:12 60:22	255:5	90:13 92:2 142:4	<b>3717</b> 25:14
208:23 215:4,18	<b>15</b> 4:19 24:11,13	<b>2000</b> 4:1	<b>237</b> 145:12	<b>38</b> 96:9 109:22
257:21	34:24 35:2 55:16	<b>2006</b> 181:21 182:2	<b>24</b> 65:24 71:1	163:5 240:23
<b>12.00</b> 126:18	59:18 89:2	<b>2008</b> 182:5	<b>25</b> 19:15 255:5	<b>39</b> 135:15,18
255:10	138:17 139:7	<b>2015</b> 182:7	<b>259</b> 146:8	
<b>12.15</b> 167:15	143:22 145:6	<b>2018</b> 4:1,19 5:9	<b>26</b> 95:23,25 97:10	4
235:17	165:25 194:10	6:11,18 44:25	<b>269</b> 143:23	<b>4</b> 55:21 56:25 57:4
<b>12.30</b> 127:4,5	233:13 255:6	100:24 102:3	<b>27</b> 211:5	57:11 58:3,8
130:12,13 216:4	<b>15(b)</b> 148:3	190:25 191:2,3	<b>28</b> 29:8	59:15 60:24
<b>12.40</b> 113:20	<b>15(c)</b> 175:2,5	211:5	<b>2905</b> 116:8	87:14 93:2
<b>12.45</b> 216:4	<b>15.09</b> 177:23	<b>2018/19/20</b> 190:14		41 73:9
<b>12.46</b> 130:17,25	<b>15.20</b> 177:25	<b>2019</b> 10:7 11:19	3	<b>44</b> 96:7
<b>12.50</b> 127:6 130:23	<b>15.36</b> 193:12	13:5,8 17:17	<b>3</b> 4:16 23:22 34:13	<b>45</b> 100:25
130:25	<b>15.41</b> 156:9	19:17,19,20 20:3	38:15 68:22	<b>46</b> 172:14
<b>12.56</b> 124:16	<b>15/20</b> 233:25	24:11,13 43:24	<b>3.29</b> 235:1	47 100:25
<b>1215</b> 167:17	<b>1514</b> 131:23	44:3 53:16 54:2	<b>3.36</b> 235:3	<b>48</b> 215:1
<b>122</b> 252:15	<b>15th</b> 55:23 62:14	71:4 101:22	<b>30</b> 29:12 92:17,18	5
<b>1288</b> 138:17	62:24 144:13,18	190:25 191:4,5	117:22	<b>5</b> 88:5 161:15
141:16	149:5,6,6 221:12	<b>2020</b> 4:3,14 23:20	<b>30,000</b> 188:11	208:4
<b>1290</b> 96:19	222:7 246:8	25:18 26:5 34:13	<b>309</b> 153:12	<b>5.29</b> 92:19
<b>13</b> 17:24 19:20	<b>16</b> 89:2 160:10,11	51:17 53:17	<b>319</b> 100:12	<b>50</b> 26:18
20:3 55:16	<b>16.06</b> 216:13	54:21 55:20,23 56:9,15,24,25	<b>3197</b> 37:11 <b>32</b> 65:10	<b>55</b> 130:1
137:24 138:1,21	<b>16.39</b> 238:8	57:16 58:3,6,9	<b>32</b> 63:10 <b>320</b> 105:7 106:21	<b>56</b> 130:1
148:23 214:19	<b>1659</b> 11:16	59:5 60:24 63:16	<b>3218</b> 101:18	<b>57</b> 18:14,20
215:18 216:3,8	1661 12:4	70:7 71:4,7	<b>3216</b> 101:18 <b>322</b> 103:21 107:7	<b>5734</b> 166:16,17
253:2	<b>168</b> 137:25	73:14 80:18 81:8	<b>324</b> 108:7 110:23	<b>5737</b> 170:8
		/3.17 00.10 01.0	<b>347</b> 100./ 110.23	

		Page 290
50 10 25		l l
<b>59</b> 19:25		
<b>5am</b> 159:20,22		
6		
<b>6</b> 62:8		
<b>6.54</b> 161:16 162:3		
<b>60</b> 21:10,12 188:9		
<b>61</b> 101:12		
<b>65</b> 62:16		
7		
<b>7</b> 4:17 23:22 54:1,2		
55:20,25 56:9,24		
57:2,3,9,10,12,16		
57:18 58:5,13,19		
59:12 63:15 69:8		
83:4 120:7		
193:16		
<b>70</b> 13:3 19:11,14		
<b>70-plus</b> 61:4 63:23		
<b>71</b> 65:9,22 66:5		
<b>72</b> 13:4 194:1		
<b>74</b> 54:19		
<b>76</b> 42:8,25 64:8		
<b>78</b> 14:22 15:16		
0		
8		
<b>8</b> 11:18 69:7,8 70:7		
71:7 73:14 80:18		
81:7,12,21 96:6		
159:9,13 160:5		
160:21 161:8		
163:17,25 169:11		
<b>8.17</b> 145:14		
<b>80</b> 16:12		
<b>801</b> 240:21		
<b>89</b> 101:12		
8th 235:16		
oth 233.10		
9		
9 161:14 168:13		
169:11 170:4		
171:5 179:11		
180:6 181:10		
<b>9.4</b> 131:24		
<b>98</b> 101:18,18		
<b>99</b> 101:16 102:2		