1	(Monday, 15 April 2024)	1	A. Yes, it is my signature.
2	(10.01)	2	Q. It is your signature and your fourth
3	THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Santos, just before	3	witness statement.
4	we start with Mr McGrail, there is something	4	A. Yes.
5	that I would like to say. This, of course, is a	5	Q. And do you confirm that that is true to
6	public inquiry, there is a keen public interest	6	the best of your knowledge, information and
7	in the hearings which have so far been live	7	belief
8	streamed by the GBC. However, so far there	8	A. I do.
9	has been no catch-up facility so that those	9	Q. Your fifth now, please.
10	who have been at work during the daytime	10	A. I also confirm that that is my signature.
11	have been unable to watch. I have now	11	Q. And do you confirm that that affidavit is
12	changed the rules to permit catch-up, which	12	true to the best of your knowledge,
13	will allow everyone to follow the	13	information and belief?
14	proceedings, even if they cannot watch the	14	A. I do.
15	live stream.	15	Q. And your sixth, please.
16	MR SANTOS: Thank you, sir.	16	A. I also confirm that that is my signature.
17	THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr McGrail.	17	Q. And do you confirm that that affidavit is
18	Mr IAN McGRAIL, Sworn	18	true to the best of your knowledge,
19	Examination-in-chief by Mr SANTOS	19	information and belief?
20	Q. I believe you have a bundle in front of	20	A. I do.
21	you that is marked "Witness statements".	21	Q. The seventh statement is not in front of
22	Can you please turn behind the first tab. That	22	you physically but it should be appearing on
23	should hopefully be your first witness	23	the screen. Can you please confirm that that
24	statement. Can you please check that it is	24	is your seventh affidavit and that your
25	and confirm that it has your signature at the	25	signature is on the final page, please?
	und commit that is mad y can engineers as the	-0	erginionie in en une immi puge, premier
	Page 1		Page 3
1	end	1	A It is actually a statement this one rather
1 2	end.	1 2	A. It is actually a statement, this one, rather
2	A. I confirm.	2	than an affidavit.
2 3	A. I confirm.Q. Is that witness statement true to the best	2 3	than an affidavit. Q. A statement.
2 3 4	A. I confirm.Q. Is that witness statement true to the best of your knowledge, information and belief?	2 3 4	than an affidavit. Q. A statement. A. If I can just go to the signature page.
2 3 4 5	A. I confirm.Q. Is that witness statement true to the best of your knowledge, information and belief?A. It is.	2 3 4 5	than an affidavit. Q. A statement. A. If I can just go to the signature page. Yes, that is my signature.
2 3 4 5 6	 A. I confirm. Q. Is that witness statement true to the best of your knowledge, information and belief? A. It is. Q. Can we do the same for your second 	2 3 4 5 6	than an affidavit. Q. A statement. A. If I can just go to the signature page. Yes, that is my signature. Q. And can you confirm that witness
2 3 4 5 6 7	 A. I confirm. Q. Is that witness statement true to the best of your knowledge, information and belief? A. It is. Q. Can we do the same for your second witness statement, please. 	2 3 4 5 6 7	than an affidavit. Q. A statement. A. If I can just go to the signature page. Yes, that is my signature. Q. And can you confirm that witness statement is true to the best of your
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 A. I confirm. Q. Is that witness statement true to the best of your knowledge, information and belief? A. It is. Q. Can we do the same for your second witness statement, please. A. I also confirm that this is my second 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	than an affidavit. Q. A statement. A. If I can just go to the signature page. Yes, that is my signature. Q. And can you confirm that witness statement is true to the best of your knowledge, information and belief?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 A. I confirm. Q. Is that witness statement true to the best of your knowledge, information and belief? A. It is. Q. Can we do the same for your second witness statement, please. A. I also confirm that this is my second affidavit. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	than an affidavit. Q. A statement. A. If I can just go to the signature page. Yes, that is my signature. Q. And can you confirm that witness statement is true to the best of your knowledge, information and belief? A. I do.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 A. I confirm. Q. Is that witness statement true to the best of your knowledge, information and belief? A. It is. Q. Can we do the same for your second witness statement, please. A. I also confirm that this is my second affidavit. Q. And is that your signature on the final 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	than an affidavit. Q. A statement. A. If I can just go to the signature page. Yes, that is my signature. Q. And can you confirm that witness statement is true to the best of your knowledge, information and belief? A. I do. Q. Thank you. How long were you an
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 A. I confirm. Q. Is that witness statement true to the best of your knowledge, information and belief? A. It is. Q. Can we do the same for your second witness statement, please. A. I also confirm that this is my second affidavit. Q. And is that your signature on the final page? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	than an affidavit. Q. A statement. A. If I can just go to the signature page. Yes, that is my signature. Q. And can you confirm that witness statement is true to the best of your knowledge, information and belief? A. I do. Q. Thank you. How long were you an officer with the RGP, Mr McGrail?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 A. I confirm. Q. Is that witness statement true to the best of your knowledge, information and belief? A. It is. Q. Can we do the same for your second witness statement, please. A. I also confirm that this is my second affidavit. Q. And is that your signature on the final page? A. It is. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	than an affidavit. Q. A statement. A. If I can just go to the signature page. Yes, that is my signature. Q. And can you confirm that witness statement is true to the best of your knowledge, information and belief? A. I do. Q. Thank you. How long were you an officer with the RGP, Mr McGrail? A. I joined the service in October 1984, so
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 A. I confirm. Q. Is that witness statement true to the best of your knowledge, information and belief? A. It is. Q. Can we do the same for your second witness statement, please. A. I also confirm that this is my second affidavit. Q. And is that your signature on the final page? A. It is. Q. And do you confirm that that is true to 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	than an affidavit. Q. A statement. A. If I can just go to the signature page. Yes, that is my signature. Q. And can you confirm that witness statement is true to the best of your knowledge, information and belief? A. I do. Q. Thank you. How long were you an officer with the RGP, Mr McGrail? A. I joined the service in October 1984, so by the time I retired in June 2020 I would
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 A. I confirm. Q. Is that witness statement true to the best of your knowledge, information and belief? A. It is. Q. Can we do the same for your second witness statement, please. A. I also confirm that this is my second affidavit. Q. And is that your signature on the final page? A. It is. Q. And do you confirm that that is true to the best of your knowledge, information and 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	than an affidavit. Q. A statement. A. If I can just go to the signature page. Yes, that is my signature. Q. And can you confirm that witness statement is true to the best of your knowledge, information and belief? A. I do. Q. Thank you. How long were you an officer with the RGP, Mr McGrail? A. I joined the service in October 1984, so by the time I retired in June 2020 I would have completed 35 years and nine months.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 A. I confirm. Q. Is that witness statement true to the best of your knowledge, information and belief? A. It is. Q. Can we do the same for your second witness statement, please. A. I also confirm that this is my second affidavit. Q. And is that your signature on the final page? A. It is. Q. And do you confirm that that is true to the best of your knowledge, information and belief? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	than an affidavit. Q. A statement. A. If I can just go to the signature page. Yes, that is my signature. Q. And can you confirm that witness statement is true to the best of your knowledge, information and belief? A. I do. Q. Thank you. How long were you an officer with the RGP, Mr McGrail? A. I joined the service in October 1984, so by the time I retired in June 2020 I would have completed 35 years and nine months. Q. We have seen over the course of last
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 A. I confirm. Q. Is that witness statement true to the best of your knowledge, information and belief? A. It is. Q. Can we do the same for your second witness statement, please. A. I also confirm that this is my second affidavit. Q. And is that your signature on the final page? A. It is. Q. And do you confirm that that is true to the best of your knowledge, information and belief? A. I do. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	than an affidavit. Q. A statement. A. If I can just go to the signature page. Yes, that is my signature. Q. And can you confirm that witness statement is true to the best of your knowledge, information and belief? A. I do. Q. Thank you. How long were you an officer with the RGP, Mr McGrail? A. I joined the service in October 1984, so by the time I retired in June 2020 I would have completed 35 years and nine months. Q. We have seen over the course of last week the evidence of Superintendent
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 A. I confirm. Q. Is that witness statement true to the best of your knowledge, information and belief? A. It is. Q. Can we do the same for your second witness statement, please. A. I also confirm that this is my second affidavit. Q. And is that your signature on the final page? A. It is. Q. And do you confirm that that is true to the best of your knowledge, information and belief? A. I do. Q. And for the third, please? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	than an affidavit. Q. A statement. A. If I can just go to the signature page. Yes, that is my signature. Q. And can you confirm that witness statement is true to the best of your knowledge, information and belief? A. I do. Q. Thank you. How long were you an officer with the RGP, Mr McGrail? A. I joined the service in October 1984, so by the time I retired in June 2020 I would have completed 35 years and nine months. Q. We have seen over the course of last week the evidence of Superintendent Richardson, and he was one of your
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 A. I confirm. Q. Is that witness statement true to the best of your knowledge, information and belief? A. It is. Q. Can we do the same for your second witness statement, please. A. I also confirm that this is my second affidavit. Q. And is that your signature on the final page? A. It is. Q. And do you confirm that that is true to the best of your knowledge, information and belief? A. I do. Q. And for the third, please? A. Yes. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	than an affidavit. Q. A statement. A. If I can just go to the signature page. Yes, that is my signature. Q. And can you confirm that witness statement is true to the best of your knowledge, information and belief? A. I do. Q. Thank you. How long were you an officer with the RGP, Mr McGrail? A. I joined the service in October 1984, so by the time I retired in June 2020 I would have completed 35 years and nine months. Q. We have seen over the course of last week the evidence of Superintendent Richardson, and he was one of your superintendents at the time. Can I ask you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 A. I confirm. Q. Is that witness statement true to the best of your knowledge, information and belief? A. It is. Q. Can we do the same for your second witness statement, please. A. I also confirm that this is my second affidavit. Q. And is that your signature on the final page? A. It is. Q. And do you confirm that that is true to the best of your knowledge, information and belief? A. I do. Q. And for the third, please? A. Yes. Q. Do you confirm that that is your signature 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	than an affidavit. Q. A statement. A. If I can just go to the signature page. Yes, that is my signature. Q. And can you confirm that witness statement is true to the best of your knowledge, information and belief? A. I do. Q. Thank you. How long were you an officer with the RGP, Mr McGrail? A. I joined the service in October 1984, so by the time I retired in June 2020 I would have completed 35 years and nine months. Q. We have seen over the course of last week the evidence of Superintendent Richardson, and he was one of your superintendents at the time. Can I ask you what your relationship was like with your
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 A. I confirm. Q. Is that witness statement true to the best of your knowledge, information and belief? A. It is. Q. Can we do the same for your second witness statement, please. A. I also confirm that this is my second affidavit. Q. And is that your signature on the final page? A. It is. Q. And do you confirm that that is true to the best of your knowledge, information and belief? A. I do. Q. And for the third, please? A. Yes. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	than an affidavit. Q. A statement. A. If I can just go to the signature page. Yes, that is my signature. Q. And can you confirm that witness statement is true to the best of your knowledge, information and belief? A. I do. Q. Thank you. How long were you an officer with the RGP, Mr McGrail? A. I joined the service in October 1984, so by the time I retired in June 2020 I would have completed 35 years and nine months. Q. We have seen over the course of last week the evidence of Superintendent Richardson, and he was one of your superintendents at the time. Can I ask you what your relationship was like with your senior management team in 2019/2020?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 A. I confirm. Q. Is that witness statement true to the best of your knowledge, information and belief? A. It is. Q. Can we do the same for your second witness statement, please. A. I also confirm that this is my second affidavit. Q. And is that your signature on the final page? A. It is. Q. And do you confirm that that is true to the best of your knowledge, information and belief? A. I do. Q. And for the third, please? A. Yes. Q. Do you confirm that that is your signature on the final page? A. It is. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	than an affidavit. Q. A statement. A. If I can just go to the signature page. Yes, that is my signature. Q. And can you confirm that witness statement is true to the best of your knowledge, information and belief? A. I do. Q. Thank you. How long were you an officer with the RGP, Mr McGrail? A. I joined the service in October 1984, so by the time I retired in June 2020 I would have completed 35 years and nine months. Q. We have seen over the course of last week the evidence of Superintendent Richardson, and he was one of your superintendents at the time. Can I ask you what your relationship was like with your
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. I confirm. Q. Is that witness statement true to the best of your knowledge, information and belief? A. It is. Q. Can we do the same for your second witness statement, please. A. I also confirm that this is my second affidavit. Q. And is that your signature on the final page? A. It is. Q. And do you confirm that that is true to the best of your knowledge, information and belief? A. I do. Q. And for the third, please? A. Yes. Q. Do you confirm that that is your signature on the final page? A. It is. Q. And is that 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 21	than an affidavit. Q. A statement. A. If I can just go to the signature page. Yes, that is my signature. Q. And can you confirm that witness statement is true to the best of your knowledge, information and belief? A. I do. Q. Thank you. How long were you an officer with the RGP, Mr McGrail? A. I joined the service in October 1984, so by the time I retired in June 2020 I would have completed 35 years and nine months. Q. We have seen over the course of last week the evidence of Superintendent Richardson, and he was one of your superintendents at the time. Can I ask you what your relationship was like with your senior management team in 2019/2020? A. Yes, sir. You're right, Mr Richardson was a member of the Command Team. The
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 A. I confirm. Q. Is that witness statement true to the best of your knowledge, information and belief? A. It is. Q. Can we do the same for your second witness statement, please. A. I also confirm that this is my second affidavit. Q. And is that your signature on the final page? A. It is. Q. And do you confirm that that is true to the best of your knowledge, information and belief? A. I do. Q. And for the third, please? A. Yes. Q. Do you confirm that that is your signature on the final page? A. It is. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	than an affidavit. Q. A statement. A. If I can just go to the signature page. Yes, that is my signature. Q. And can you confirm that witness statement is true to the best of your knowledge, information and belief? A. I do. Q. Thank you. How long were you an officer with the RGP, Mr McGrail? A. I joined the service in October 1984, so by the time I retired in June 2020 I would have completed 35 years and nine months. Q. We have seen over the course of last week the evidence of Superintendent Richardson, and he was one of your superintendents at the time. Can I ask you what your relationship was like with your senior management team in 2019/2020? A. Yes, sir. You're right, Mr Richardson was a member of the Command Team. The Command Team comprised of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 A. I confirm. Q. Is that witness statement true to the best of your knowledge, information and belief? A. It is. Q. Can we do the same for your second witness statement, please. A. I also confirm that this is my second affidavit. Q. And is that your signature on the final page? A. It is. Q. And do you confirm that that is true to the best of your knowledge, information and belief? A. I do. Q. And for the third, please? A. Yes. Q. Do you confirm that that is your signature on the final page? A. It is. Q. And is that 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 22 23	than an affidavit. Q. A statement. A. If I can just go to the signature page. Yes, that is my signature. Q. And can you confirm that witness statement is true to the best of your knowledge, information and belief? A. I do. Q. Thank you. How long were you an officer with the RGP, Mr McGrail? A. I joined the service in October 1984, so by the time I retired in June 2020 I would have completed 35 years and nine months. Q. We have seen over the course of last week the evidence of Superintendent Richardson, and he was one of your superintendents at the time. Can I ask you what your relationship was like with your senior management team in 2019/2020? A. Yes, sir. You're right, Mr Richardson was a member of the Command Team. 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. I confirm. Q. Is that witness statement true to the best of your knowledge, information and belief? A. It is. Q. Can we do the same for your second witness statement, please. A. I also confirm that this is my second affidavit. Q. And is that your signature on the final page? A. It is. Q. And do you confirm that that is true to the best of your knowledge, information and belief? A. I do. Q. And for the third, please? A. Yes. Q. Do you confirm that that is your signature on the final page? A. It is. Q. And is that true to the best of your knowledge, information and belief? A. It is. Q. And is that true to the best of your knowledge, information and belief? A. 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	than an affidavit. Q. A statement. A. If I can just go to the signature page. Yes, that is my signature. Q. And can you confirm that witness statement is true to the best of your knowledge, information and belief? A. I do. Q. Thank you. How long were you an officer with the RGP, Mr McGrail? A. I joined the service in October 1984, so by the time I retired in June 2020 I would have completed 35 years and nine months. Q. We have seen over the course of last week the evidence of Superintendent Richardson, and he was one of your superintendents at the time. Can I ask you what your relationship was like with your senior management team in 2019/2020? A. Yes, sir. You're right, Mr Richardson was a member of the Command Team. The Command Team comprised of the

1 (Pages 1 to 4)

1 deputy, and there were three or four	1 Governor, Chief Minister, Commander
2 superintendents. Three? Let me just get this	2 British Forces, Gibraltar Defence Police,
3 right. Three superintendents. My	3 Chief Police Officer and the GPF. Then can
4 relationship: I'd worked with a few of them,	4 we please turn to paragraph 51, two pages
5 not so much with others, but it was a good	5 on, at 68. You say: "Despite not having a
6 relationship as far as I was concerned. They	6 clear picture of how the collision had
7 provided a lot of input into my work,	7 occurred and given it was the early hours of
8 provided advice, counsel, and I think I got on	8 the morning, I decided to inform MP and CM
9 very well with them. I got challenged by	9 of the incident by WhatsApp message. This
10 them when the need arose, and with some of	10 has been a common method of
11 them I had friendships. With others I didn't	11 communicating with these officials involved
12 but with some of them I had friendships	in the past. My chat logs with them can
because of the amount of years that I'd served	13 confirm this. My initial message to them at
14 with them.	14 06.05 hours was as follows" and you say
15 Q. We are going to turn to issue three first of	15 that you sent the same content but by
16 all, Operation Kram. On Sunday 8 March	separate message. "We are dealing with a
17 2020 your evidence is that you were called	17 critical incident. One of our boats has been
by the senior office on call, DCI John Field,	involved in a collision with a smuggling rib
19 at approximately 25 past four in the morning.	19 with four on board. Two on the smuggling
20 Is that correct?	20 rib are fatalities. Our crew are uninjured but
21 A. Yes.	21 clearly shaken and shocked. I am invoking
Q. The Command Team met at five in the	22 post-incident procedures and planning for
23 morning. Am I right in thinking that that was	23 consequence management. Once I have
you, DCI Field and Superintendent	24 further updates I will let you know. Regards,
25 Richardson?	25 Ian." That, if I am not mistaken, is how you
D 5	D 7
Page 5	Page 7
1 A. I directed DCI Field to call out the	1 notified the Interim Governor at the time and
2 Command Team down to meet in my office	2 the Chief Minister. Is that correct?
3 to set up a gold group to deal with the	3 A. Yes, given the early hours that it was in
4 incident.	4 the morning, I did not feel it appropriate to
5 Q. I may as well take you to B 1680, the	5 call up and provide this level of briefing at
6 document we have seen a few times already.	6 that early hour.
7 This is an email sent by Superintendent	7 Q. If we can look at the preceding
8 Richardson on 8 March 2020 at 11 past ten	8 paragraph, paragraph 50, you say: "I was
9 and it refers to the gold meeting being	9 therefore dealing with a situation whereby it
10 convened at your office at five in the	was believed that as a result of a collision
11 morning, as you say, and it has you,	between an RGP vessel and a suspect
12 Superintendent Richardson and CI Field	smuggling vessel, two persons on board the
13 identified as attending. Was it just you three	latter had died. I had no confirmation of
at five o'clock in the morning.	where the collision had taken place or the
15 A. It would seem from there that there was	15 circumstances surrounding it. This in itself is
16 no CS but we were subsequently joined in by	not unusual as information of an unfolding
17 others.	17 serious incident can be received in dribs and
18 Q. Can we go to your third witness	drabs and it is not uncommon to receive
statement, please, at A66. You say at	19 inaccurate or conflicting reports. This was
20 paragraph 47 that a verbal briefing of what	20 actually the case in this incident when initial
21 was known at the time was provided by DCI	21 reports suggested the collision to have
John Field as a result of which several fast	occurred three miles off Europa Point and to
23 track actions were initiated including, but not	23 my understanding within BGCW when this
24 limited to, and then at (vi) towards the	24 was subsequently found not to be the case."
, , ,	_ ·
25 bottom of the page you refer to notifying the	25 Are you able to say where those initial
. ,	_ ·

1	reports came from that the incident had	1	would like to highlight we can turn to that.
2	occurred three miles off Europa Point?	2	We will be turning to that. Can I just ask you
3	A. At the time I didn't know. This was just	3	to look towards the top of the page. These
4	coming in verbally and there was nothing	4	are the responses that you are receiving from
5	that I could see that was written before me.	5	the Chief Minister, having informed him at
6	However, since I've read the papers that have	6	6.05 in the morning of the incident, and there
7	been submitted I believe that there was a	7	is an exchange. Then I just want to highlight
8	command and despatch log which was then	8	07.41 hours. "Also, what time did it occur
9	subsequently transposed onto a timeline that	9	and was it firmly within BGTW or
10	I used to provide information requested by	10	questionable?" is the question from the Chief
11	the Chief Minister.	11	Minister. Further down at 07.43 hours you
12	Q. That was the section 15	12	respond: "Collision occurred at approx. 03.40
13	A. That's right, and also I believe that it's	13	hours. Location still to be confirmed." Then
14	contained in the statement of Inspector John	14	if we can go over the page to B 134, please.
15	Lutkin, who was the inspector on duty,	15	At 9.27 hours there is a message from the
16	having been told by the station officer, the	16	Governor: "Ian, thanks for letting me know.
17	senior sergeant on duty, that the information	17	Sorry to hear this." He also sends a further
18	suggested that the collision had occurred	18	message: "And of course if TY need
19	three miles off Europa Point.	19	anything from us, HMG, just ask. Hope your
20	Q. So you say that that came from the	20	guys are okay." And you reply: "Thanks,
21	sergeant, but are you aware of where that	21	Nick" at 09.41 hours. You say at paragraph
22	information, the source of that information	22	58 of your third affidavit that you received a
23	A. I don't know. I can't.	23	report of an incident in Alcaidesa just north
24	Q. If we can now go to B 1344, this is a	24	of La Linea's eastern coastline. Then if we
25	timeline of communications between you as	25	can go to
	on communications convent you us	23	cuit go to
	Page 9		Page 11
1	Commissioner of Police and officials in	1	A Sorry I didn't receive that report
1	Commissioner of Police and officials in	1	A. Sorry, I didn't receive that report.
2	relation to Operation Kram. Are you aware	2	Q. Thanks for that clarification. The RGP
2 3	relation to Operation Kram. Are you aware who prepared this timeline?	2 3	Q. Thanks for that clarification. The RGP received a report. Let us go to
2 3 4	relation to Operation Kram. Are you aware who prepared this timeline? A. That was prepared by my staff at the time	2 3 4	Q. Thanks for that clarification. The RGP received a report. Let us go toA. Well, yes, through the port department,
2 3 4 5	relation to Operation Kram. Are you aware who prepared this timeline? A. That was prepared by my staff at the time of the section 15 request. However, I	2 3 4 5	 Q. Thanks for that clarification. The RGP received a report. Let us go to A. Well, yes, through the port department, yes.
2 3 4 5 6	relation to Operation Kram. Are you aware who prepared this timeline? A. That was prepared by my staff at the time of the section 15 request. However, I elaborated on it because by the time I was	2 3 4 5 6	 Q. Thanks for that clarification. The RGP received a report. Let us go to A. Well, yes, through the port department, yes. Q. Thank you for that clarification. If we
2 3 4 5 6 7	relation to Operation Kram. Are you aware who prepared this timeline? A. That was prepared by my staff at the time of the section 15 request. However, I elaborated on it because by the time I was preparing my evidence to produce to the	2 3 4 5 6 7	 Q. Thanks for that clarification. The RGP received a report. Let us go to A. Well, yes, through the port department, yes. Q. Thank you for that clarification. If we just go to paragraph 58, the duty VTS officer
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	relation to Operation Kram. Are you aware who prepared this timeline? A. That was prepared by my staff at the time of the section 15 request. However, I elaborated on it because by the time I was preparing my evidence to produce to the Inquiry there was information which had not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 Q. Thanks for that clarification. The RGP received a report. Let us go to A. Well, yes, through the port department, yes. Q. Thank you for that clarification. If we just go to paragraph 58, the duty VTS officer of the port authority had reported that he had
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	relation to Operation Kram. Are you aware who prepared this timeline? A. That was prepared by my staff at the time of the section 15 request. However, I elaborated on it because by the time I was preparing my evidence to produce to the Inquiry there was information which had not been included there because I had missed it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 Q. Thanks for that clarification. The RGP received a report. Let us go to A. Well, yes, through the port department, yes. Q. Thank you for that clarification. If we just go to paragraph 58, the duty VTS officer of the port authority had reported that he had been advised of an incident in Alcaidesa that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	relation to Operation Kram. Are you aware who prepared this timeline? A. That was prepared by my staff at the time of the section 15 request. However, I elaborated on it because by the time I was preparing my evidence to produce to the Inquiry there was information which had not been included there because I had missed it at the time of - and I'll tell you in particular	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 Q. Thanks for that clarification. The RGP received a report. Let us go to A. Well, yes, through the port department, yes. Q. Thank you for that clarification. If we just go to paragraph 58, the duty VTS officer of the port authority had reported that he had been advised of an incident in Alcaidesa that he had been advised of an incident by Tarifa
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	relation to Operation Kram. Are you aware who prepared this timeline? A. That was prepared by my staff at the time of the section 15 request. However, I elaborated on it because by the time I was preparing my evidence to produce to the Inquiry there was information which had not been included there because I had missed it at the time of - and I'll tell you in particular what it was. It was a WhatsApp incident.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 Q. Thanks for that clarification. The RGP received a report. Let us go to A. Well, yes, through the port department, yes. Q. Thank you for that clarification. If we just go to paragraph 58, the duty VTS officer of the port authority had reported that he had been advised of an incident in Alcaidesa that he had been advised of an incident by Tarifa marine traffic control but was uncertain
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	relation to Operation Kram. Are you aware who prepared this timeline? A. That was prepared by my staff at the time of the section 15 request. However, I elaborated on it because by the time I was preparing my evidence to produce to the Inquiry there was information which had not been included there because I had missed it at the time of - and I'll tell you in particular what it was. It was a WhatsApp incident. The Maritime Incident Group that the Chief	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q. Thanks for that clarification. The RGP received a report. Let us go to A. Well, yes, through the port department, yes. Q. Thank you for that clarification. If we just go to paragraph 58, the duty VTS officer of the port authority had reported that he had been advised of an incident in Alcaidesa that he had been advised of an incident by Tarifa marine traffic control but was uncertain whether this was the same incident we were
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	relation to Operation Kram. Are you aware who prepared this timeline? A. That was prepared by my staff at the time of the section 15 request. However, I elaborated on it because by the time I was preparing my evidence to produce to the Inquiry there was information which had not been included there because I had missed it at the time of - and I'll tell you in particular what it was. It was a WhatsApp incident. The Maritime Incident Group that the Chief Minister opened with a couple of members	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q. Thanks for that clarification. The RGP received a report. Let us go to A. Well, yes, through the port department, yes. Q. Thank you for that clarification. If we just go to paragraph 58, the duty VTS officer of the port authority had reported that he had been advised of an incident in Alcaidesa that he had been advised of an incident by Tarifa marine traffic control but was uncertain whether this was the same incident we were dealing with. You explain that Alcaidesa is a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	relation to Operation Kram. Are you aware who prepared this timeline? A. That was prepared by my staff at the time of the section 15 request. However, I elaborated on it because by the time I was preparing my evidence to produce to the Inquiry there was information which had not been included there because I had missed it at the time of - and I'll tell you in particular what it was. It was a WhatsApp incident. The Maritime Incident Group that the Chief Minister opened with a couple of members involved. So at the time of providing that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q. Thanks for that clarification. The RGP received a report. Let us go to A. Well, yes, through the port department, yes. Q. Thank you for that clarification. If we just go to paragraph 58, the duty VTS officer of the port authority had reported that he had been advised of an incident in Alcaidesa that he had been advised of an incident by Tarifa marine traffic control but was uncertain whether this was the same incident we were dealing with. You explain that Alcaidesa is a large housing complex area to the north of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	relation to Operation Kram. Are you aware who prepared this timeline? A. That was prepared by my staff at the time of the section 15 request. However, I elaborated on it because by the time I was preparing my evidence to produce to the Inquiry there was information which had not been included there because I had missed it at the time of - and I'll tell you in particular what it was. It was a WhatsApp incident. The Maritime Incident Group that the Chief Minister opened with a couple of members involved. So at the time of providing that initial timeline, for some reason that slipped	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q. Thanks for that clarification. The RGP received a report. Let us go to A. Well, yes, through the port department, yes. Q. Thank you for that clarification. If we just go to paragraph 58, the duty VTS officer of the port authority had reported that he had been advised of an incident in Alcaidesa that he had been advised of an incident by Tarifa marine traffic control but was uncertain whether this was the same incident we were dealing with. You explain that Alcaidesa is a large housing complex area to the north of Gibraltar's neighbouring town, La Linea de la
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	relation to Operation Kram. Are you aware who prepared this timeline? A. That was prepared by my staff at the time of the section 15 request. However, I elaborated on it because by the time I was preparing my evidence to produce to the Inquiry there was information which had not been included there because I had missed it at the time of - and I'll tell you in particular what it was. It was a WhatsApp incident. The Maritime Incident Group that the Chief Minister opened with a couple of members involved. So at the time of providing that initial timeline, for some reason that slipped and it wasn't, but I added it subsequently	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. Thanks for that clarification. The RGP received a report. Let us go to A. Well, yes, through the port department, yes. Q. Thank you for that clarification. If we just go to paragraph 58, the duty VTS officer of the port authority had reported that he had been advised of an incident in Alcaidesa that he had been advised of an incident by Tarifa marine traffic control but was uncertain whether this was the same incident we were dealing with. You explain that Alcaidesa is a large housing complex area to the north of Gibraltar's neighbouring town, La Linea de la Concepcion. If we can then turn to 60,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	relation to Operation Kram. Are you aware who prepared this timeline? A. That was prepared by my staff at the time of the section 15 request. However, I elaborated on it because by the time I was preparing my evidence to produce to the Inquiry there was information which had not been included there because I had missed it at the time of - and I'll tell you in particular what it was. It was a WhatsApp incident. The Maritime Incident Group that the Chief Minister opened with a couple of members involved. So at the time of providing that initial timeline, for some reason that slipped and it wasn't, but I added it subsequently using the same information originally. I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. Thanks for that clarification. The RGP received a report. Let us go to A. Well, yes, through the port department, yes. Q. Thank you for that clarification. If we just go to paragraph 58, the duty VTS officer of the port authority had reported that he had been advised of an incident in Alcaidesa that he had been advised of an incident by Tarifa marine traffic control but was uncertain whether this was the same incident we were dealing with. You explain that Alcaidesa is a large housing complex area to the north of Gibraltar's neighbouring town, La Linea de la Concepcion. If we can then turn to 60, please, just lower down on the same page,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	relation to Operation Kram. Are you aware who prepared this timeline? A. That was prepared by my staff at the time of the section 15 request. However, I elaborated on it because by the time I was preparing my evidence to produce to the Inquiry there was information which had not been included there because I had missed it at the time of - and I'll tell you in particular what it was. It was a WhatsApp incident. The Maritime Incident Group that the Chief Minister opened with a couple of members involved. So at the time of providing that initial timeline, for some reason that slipped and it wasn't, but I added it subsequently using the same information originally. I added on to it to produce for the Inquiry.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. Thanks for that clarification. The RGP received a report. Let us go to A. Well, yes, through the port department, yes. Q. Thank you for that clarification. If we just go to paragraph 58, the duty VTS officer of the port authority had reported that he had been advised of an incident in Alcaidesa that he had been advised of an incident by Tarifa marine traffic control but was uncertain whether this was the same incident we were dealing with. You explain that Alcaidesa is a large housing complex area to the north of Gibraltar's neighbouring town, La Linea de la Concepcion. If we can then turn to 60, please, just lower down on the same page, you say: "At 94Ohrs I received information
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	relation to Operation Kram. Are you aware who prepared this timeline? A. That was prepared by my staff at the time of the section 15 request. However, I elaborated on it because by the time I was preparing my evidence to produce to the Inquiry there was information which had not been included there because I had missed it at the time of - and I'll tell you in particular what it was. It was a WhatsApp incident. The Maritime Incident Group that the Chief Minister opened with a couple of members involved. So at the time of providing that initial timeline, for some reason that slipped and it wasn't, but I added it subsequently using the same information originally. I added on to it to produce for the Inquiry. Q. This one, if I am not mistaken, does not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. Thanks for that clarification. The RGP received a report. Let us go to A. Well, yes, through the port department, yes. Q. Thank you for that clarification. If we just go to paragraph 58, the duty VTS officer of the port authority had reported that he had been advised of an incident in Alcaidesa that he had been advised of an incident by Tarifa marine traffic control but was uncertain whether this was the same incident we were dealing with. You explain that Alcaidesa is a large housing complex area to the north of Gibraltar's neighbouring town, La Linea de la Concepcion. If we can then turn to 60, please, just lower down on the same page, you say: "At 94Ohrs I received information from DCI John Field who in turn relayed
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	relation to Operation Kram. Are you aware who prepared this timeline? A. That was prepared by my staff at the time of the section 15 request. However, I elaborated on it because by the time I was preparing my evidence to produce to the Inquiry there was information which had not been included there because I had missed it at the time of - and I'll tell you in particular what it was. It was a WhatsApp incident. The Maritime Incident Group that the Chief Minister opened with a couple of members involved. So at the time of providing that initial timeline, for some reason that slipped and it wasn't, but I added it subsequently using the same information originally. I added on to it to produce for the Inquiry. Q. This one, if I am not mistaken, does not contain the Maritime Incident WhatsApps	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. Thanks for that clarification. The RGP received a report. Let us go to A. Well, yes, through the port department, yes. Q. Thank you for that clarification. If we just go to paragraph 58, the duty VTS officer of the port authority had reported that he had been advised of an incident in Alcaidesa that he had been advised of an incident by Tarifa marine traffic control but was uncertain whether this was the same incident we were dealing with. You explain that Alcaidesa is a large housing complex area to the north of Gibraltar's neighbouring town, La Linea de la Concepcion. If we can then turn to 60, please, just lower down on the same page, you say: "At 94Ohrs I received information from DCI John Field who in turn relayed information provided by the Guardia Civil
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	relation to Operation Kram. Are you aware who prepared this timeline? A. That was prepared by my staff at the time of the section 15 request. However, I elaborated on it because by the time I was preparing my evidence to produce to the Inquiry there was information which had not been included there because I had missed it at the time of - and I'll tell you in particular what it was. It was a WhatsApp incident. The Maritime Incident Group that the Chief Minister opened with a couple of members involved. So at the time of providing that initial timeline, for some reason that slipped and it wasn't, but I added it subsequently using the same information originally. I added on to it to produce for the Inquiry. Q. This one, if I am not mistaken, does not contain the Maritime Incident WhatsApps but there is another version that has, and I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. Thanks for that clarification. The RGP received a report. Let us go to A. Well, yes, through the port department, yes. Q. Thank you for that clarification. If we just go to paragraph 58, the duty VTS officer of the port authority had reported that he had been advised of an incident in Alcaidesa that he had been advised of an incident by Tarifa marine traffic control but was uncertain whether this was the same incident we were dealing with. You explain that Alcaidesa is a large housing complex area to the north of Gibraltar's neighbouring town, La Linea de la Concepcion. If we can then turn to 60, please, just lower down on the same page, you say: "At 94Ohrs I received information from DCI John Field who in turn relayed information provided by the Guardia Civil suggesting the collision had occurred in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	relation to Operation Kram. Are you aware who prepared this timeline? A. That was prepared by my staff at the time of the section 15 request. However, I elaborated on it because by the time I was preparing my evidence to produce to the Inquiry there was information which had not been included there because I had missed it at the time of - and I'll tell you in particular what it was. It was a WhatsApp incident. The Maritime Incident Group that the Chief Minister opened with a couple of members involved. So at the time of providing that initial timeline, for some reason that slipped and it wasn't, but I added it subsequently using the same information originally. I added on to it to produce for the Inquiry. Q. This one, if I am not mistaken, does not contain the Maritime Incident WhatsApps but there is another version that has, and I will take you to that.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. Thanks for that clarification. The RGP received a report. Let us go to A. Well, yes, through the port department, yes. Q. Thank you for that clarification. If we just go to paragraph 58, the duty VTS officer of the port authority had reported that he had been advised of an incident in Alcaidesa that he had been advised of an incident by Tarifa marine traffic control but was uncertain whether this was the same incident we were dealing with. You explain that Alcaidesa is a large housing complex area to the north of Gibraltar's neighbouring town, La Linea de la Concepcion. If we can then turn to 60, please, just lower down on the same page, you say: "At 94Ohrs I received information from DCI John Field who in turn relayed information provided by the Guardia Civil suggesting the collision had occurred in Spanish territorial waters though this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	relation to Operation Kram. Are you aware who prepared this timeline? A. That was prepared by my staff at the time of the section 15 request. However, I elaborated on it because by the time I was preparing my evidence to produce to the Inquiry there was information which had not been included there because I had missed it at the time of - and I'll tell you in particular what it was. It was a WhatsApp incident. The Maritime Incident Group that the Chief Minister opened with a couple of members involved. So at the time of providing that initial timeline, for some reason that slipped and it wasn't, but I added it subsequently using the same information originally. I added on to it to produce for the Inquiry. Q. This one, if I am not mistaken, does not contain the Maritime Incident WhatsApps but there is another version that has, and I will take you to that. A. Okay.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. Thanks for that clarification. The RGP received a report. Let us go to A. Well, yes, through the port department, yes. Q. Thank you for that clarification. If we just go to paragraph 58, the duty VTS officer of the port authority had reported that he had been advised of an incident in Alcaidesa that he had been advised of an incident by Tarifa marine traffic control but was uncertain whether this was the same incident we were dealing with. You explain that Alcaidesa is a large housing complex area to the north of Gibraltar's neighbouring town, La Linea de la Concepcion. If we can then turn to 60, please, just lower down on the same page, you say: "At 94Ohrs I received information from DCI John Field who in turn relayed information provided by the Guardia Civil suggesting the collision had occurred in Spanish territorial waters though this required confirmation by them." Do you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	relation to Operation Kram. Are you aware who prepared this timeline? A. That was prepared by my staff at the time of the section 15 request. However, I elaborated on it because by the time I was preparing my evidence to produce to the Inquiry there was information which had not been included there because I had missed it at the time of - and I'll tell you in particular what it was. It was a WhatsApp incident. The Maritime Incident Group that the Chief Minister opened with a couple of members involved. So at the time of providing that initial timeline, for some reason that slipped and it wasn't, but I added it subsequently using the same information originally. I added on to it to produce for the Inquiry. Q. This one, if I am not mistaken, does not contain the Maritime Incident WhatsApps but there is another version that has, and I will take you to that. A. Okay. Q. At the moment we are not concerned with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. Thanks for that clarification. The RGP received a report. Let us go to A. Well, yes, through the port department, yes. Q. Thank you for that clarification. If we just go to paragraph 58, the duty VTS officer of the port authority had reported that he had been advised of an incident in Alcaidesa that he had been advised of an incident by Tarifa marine traffic control but was uncertain whether this was the same incident we were dealing with. You explain that Alcaidesa is a large housing complex area to the north of Gibraltar's neighbouring town, La Linea de la Concepcion. If we can then turn to 60, please, just lower down on the same page, you say: "At 94Ohrs I received information from DCI John Field who in turn relayed information provided by the Guardia Civil suggesting the collision had occurred in Spanish territorial waters though this required confirmation by them." Do you recall that coordinates were provided as part
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	relation to Operation Kram. Are you aware who prepared this timeline? A. That was prepared by my staff at the time of the section 15 request. However, I elaborated on it because by the time I was preparing my evidence to produce to the Inquiry there was information which had not been included there because I had missed it at the time of - and I'll tell you in particular what it was. It was a WhatsApp incident. The Maritime Incident Group that the Chief Minister opened with a couple of members involved. So at the time of providing that initial timeline, for some reason that slipped and it wasn't, but I added it subsequently using the same information originally. I added on to it to produce for the Inquiry. Q. This one, if I am not mistaken, does not contain the Maritime Incident WhatsApps but there is another version that has, and I will take you to that. A. Okay.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. Thanks for that clarification. The RGP received a report. Let us go to A. Well, yes, through the port department, yes. Q. Thank you for that clarification. If we just go to paragraph 58, the duty VTS officer of the port authority had reported that he had been advised of an incident in Alcaidesa that he had been advised of an incident by Tarifa marine traffic control but was uncertain whether this was the same incident we were dealing with. You explain that Alcaidesa is a large housing complex area to the north of Gibraltar's neighbouring town, La Linea de la Concepcion. If we can then turn to 60, please, just lower down on the same page, you say: "At 94Ohrs I received information from DCI John Field who in turn relayed information provided by the Guardia Civil suggesting the collision had occurred in Spanish territorial waters though this required confirmation by them." Do you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	relation to Operation Kram. Are you aware who prepared this timeline? A. That was prepared by my staff at the time of the section 15 request. However, I elaborated on it because by the time I was preparing my evidence to produce to the Inquiry there was information which had not been included there because I had missed it at the time of - and I'll tell you in particular what it was. It was a WhatsApp incident. The Maritime Incident Group that the Chief Minister opened with a couple of members involved. So at the time of providing that initial timeline, for some reason that slipped and it wasn't, but I added it subsequently using the same information originally. I added on to it to produce for the Inquiry. Q. This one, if I am not mistaken, does not contain the Maritime Incident WhatsApps but there is another version that has, and I will take you to that. A. Okay. Q. At the moment we are not concerned with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. Thanks for that clarification. The RGP received a report. Let us go to A. Well, yes, through the port department, yes. Q. Thank you for that clarification. If we just go to paragraph 58, the duty VTS officer of the port authority had reported that he had been advised of an incident in Alcaidesa that he had been advised of an incident by Tarifa marine traffic control but was uncertain whether this was the same incident we were dealing with. You explain that Alcaidesa is a large housing complex area to the north of Gibraltar's neighbouring town, La Linea de la Concepcion. If we can then turn to 60, please, just lower down on the same page, you say: "At 94Ohrs I received information from DCI John Field who in turn relayed information provided by the Guardia Civil suggesting the collision had occurred in Spanish territorial waters though this required confirmation by them." Do you recall that coordinates were provided as part

1	A. I do not specifically recall but taking	1	saying that I'm doubting the statement. It's
2	reference from the notes that have been	2	just that this was a very dynamic and fast
3	produced, which are, as far as I'm concerned,	3	pacing incident and it was actually in the
4	quite accurate or at least contemporaneous in	4	very early stages of it, so the dust hadn't
5	that regard, yes, they were discussed.	5	settled, everything was fast actions, fast
6	Q. I think what you are referring to probably	6	briefings, and therefore I can't with certainty
7	is B 1319. There is an entry at 09.35 hours	7	recall it but I'm not doubting Mr Field's
8	which says: "Call received by DI Chipolina	8	word, by no means, to, in fact, just before
9	from Comandante Pacheco Polo GC	9	coming up today I was trying to see, to
10	Alquisiras stating that according to COS	10	answer your question, to see how far away
11	radar tracing of the incident the approximate	11	was it from Gibraltar waters and international
12	coordinates of the collision were 36 degrees	12	waters and I couldn't grapple with that.
13	nine minutes north, five degrees 12 minutes	13	Q. So have you never plotted or has nobody
14	west, which was approximately 6.54 miles	14	ever plotted for you those coordinates and
15	east of Santa Barbara Beach. GC stated this	15	shown you where they fall within Spanish
16	data was subject to confirmation by technical	16	waters?
17	extraction from their SIV system. DCI Field	17	A. I think they are contained in the Solis
18	contacted and informed of this." Then the	18	reports but that report came afterwards, after
19	entry at 09.40 is DCI Field reporting that	19	my retirement. Actually, the draft report
20	data. Is it fair to say that this placed the	20	came before.
21	collision comfortably within Spanish waters?	21	Q. Not the final report.
22	A. I can't say that with 100 per cent certainty	22	A. Not the final report.
23	because I don't know what distance. The	23	Q. Can we look at B 1681, please, which is
24	distance of 6.54 miles is from the coastline	24	the second page of the email I showed you
25	eastwards, but I do not know in relation to	25	earlier from Superintendent Richardson.
	Page 13		Page 15
	1 age 15		1 agc 13
1	international waters laterally as opposed to	1	This is, as I say, sent at 10.11 in the morning.
2	just the vertical. It's a two dimensional sort	2	If one looks at a log, the penultimate entry
2 3	just the vertical. It's a two dimensional sort of focus and if we focus it with the one	2 3	If one looks at a log, the penultimate entry there is the Field briefing as to location. The
2 3 4	just the vertical. It's a two dimensional sort of focus and if we focus it with the one dimension, it's only 6.5 miles out. It could be	2 3 4	If one looks at a log, the penultimate entry there is the Field briefing as to location. The wording is: "JF advises that collision
2 3 4 5	just the vertical. It's a two dimensional sort of focus and if we focus it with the one dimension, it's only 6.5 miles out. It could be anywhere within one kilometre beach. Santa	2 3 4 5	If one looks at a log, the penultimate entry there is the Field briefing as to location. The wording is: "JF advises that collision occurred", and then provides the detail.
2 3 4 5 6	just the vertical. It's a two dimensional sort of focus and if we focus it with the one dimension, it's only 6.5 miles out. It could be anywhere within one kilometre beach. Santa Barbara could be one kilometre beach, or it	2 3 4 5 6	If one looks at a log, the penultimate entry there is the Field briefing as to location. The wording is: "JF advises that collision occurred", and then provides the detail. There is no suggestion there that there is any
2 3 4 5 6 7	just the vertical. It's a two dimensional sort of focus and if we focus it with the one dimension, it's only 6.5 miles out. It could be anywhere within one kilometre beach. Santa Barbara could be one kilometre beach, or it could be at the - its northern aspect which is	2 3 4 5 6 7	If one looks at a log, the penultimate entry there is the Field briefing as to location. The wording is: "JF advises that collision occurred", and then provides the detail. There is no suggestion there that there is any great doubt about the location. Is that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	just the vertical. It's a two dimensional sort of focus and if we focus it with the one dimension, it's only 6.5 miles out. It could be anywhere within one kilometre beach. Santa Barbara could be one kilometre beach, or it could be at the - its northern aspect which is borderline with our own runway, or it could	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	If one looks at a log, the penultimate entry there is the Field briefing as to location. The wording is: "JF advises that collision occurred", and then provides the detail. There is no suggestion there that there is any great doubt about the location. Is that correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	just the vertical. It's a two dimensional sort of focus and if we focus it with the one dimension, it's only 6.5 miles out. It could be anywhere within one kilometre beach. Santa Barbara could be one kilometre beach, or it could be at the - its northern aspect which is borderline with our own runway, or it could be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	If one looks at a log, the penultimate entry there is the Field briefing as to location. The wording is: "JF advises that collision occurred", and then provides the detail. There is no suggestion there that there is any great doubt about the location. Is that correct? A. Well, I can't see. It plotted and in relation
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	just the vertical. It's a two dimensional sort of focus and if we focus it with the one dimension, it's only 6.5 miles out. It could be anywhere within one kilometre beach. Santa Barbara could be one kilometre beach, or it could be at the - its northern aspect which is borderline with our own runway, or it could be Q. Southern, the most southern.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	If one looks at a log, the penultimate entry there is the Field briefing as to location. The wording is: "JF advises that collision occurred", and then provides the detail. There is no suggestion there that there is any great doubt about the location. Is that correct? A. Well, I can't see. It plotted and in relation to a chart, a navigational chart or a map that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	just the vertical. It's a two dimensional sort of focus and if we focus it with the one dimension, it's only 6.5 miles out. It could be anywhere within one kilometre beach. Santa Barbara could be one kilometre beach, or it could be at the - its northern aspect which is borderline with our own runway, or it could be Q. Southern, the most southern. A. Southern, sorry, yes, I beg your pardon.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	If one looks at a log, the penultimate entry there is the Field briefing as to location. The wording is: "JF advises that collision occurred", and then provides the detail. There is no suggestion there that there is any great doubt about the location. Is that correct? A. Well, I can't see. It plotted and in relation to a chart, a navigational chart or a map that would give me that indication, which is what
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	just the vertical. It's a two dimensional sort of focus and if we focus it with the one dimension, it's only 6.5 miles out. It could be anywhere within one kilometre beach. Santa Barbara could be one kilometre beach, or it could be at the - its northern aspect which is borderline with our own runway, or it could be Q. Southern, the most southern. A. Southern, sorry, yes, I beg your pardon. The most southern end of the beach, which is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	If one looks at a log, the penultimate entry there is the Field briefing as to location. The wording is: "JF advises that collision occurred", and then provides the detail. There is no suggestion there that there is any great doubt about the location. Is that correct? A. Well, I can't see. It plotted and in relation to a chart, a navigational chart or a map that would give me that indication, which is what I can't remember from happening at - it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	just the vertical. It's a two dimensional sort of focus and if we focus it with the one dimension, it's only 6.5 miles out. It could be anywhere within one kilometre beach. Santa Barbara could be one kilometre beach, or it could be at the - its northern aspect which is borderline with our own runway, or it could be Q. Southern, the most southern. A. Southern, sorry, yes, I beg your pardon. The most southern end of the beach, which is practically joining up with our runway, or it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	If one looks at a log, the penultimate entry there is the Field briefing as to location. The wording is: "JF advises that collision occurred", and then provides the detail. There is no suggestion there that there is any great doubt about the location. Is that correct? A. Well, I can't see. It plotted and in relation to a chart, a navigational chart or a map that would give me that indication, which is what I can't remember from happening at - it happening.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	just the vertical. It's a two dimensional sort of focus and if we focus it with the one dimension, it's only 6.5 miles out. It could be anywhere within one kilometre beach. Santa Barbara could be one kilometre beach, or it could be at the - its northern aspect which is borderline with our own runway, or it could be Q. Southern, the most southern. A. Southern, sorry, yes, I beg your pardon. The most southern end of the beach, which is practically joining up with our runway, or it could have been its northern aspect which	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	If one looks at a log, the penultimate entry there is the Field briefing as to location. The wording is: "JF advises that collision occurred", and then provides the detail. There is no suggestion there that there is any great doubt about the location. Is that correct? A. Well, I can't see. It plotted and in relation to a chart, a navigational chart or a map that would give me that indication, which is what I can't remember from happening at - it happening. Q. Do you remember there being a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	just the vertical. It's a two dimensional sort of focus and if we focus it with the one dimension, it's only 6.5 miles out. It could be anywhere within one kilometre beach. Santa Barbara could be one kilometre beach, or it could be at the - its northern aspect which is borderline with our own runway, or it could be Q. Southern, the most southern. A. Southern, sorry, yes, I beg your pardon. The most southern end of the beach, which is practically joining up with our runway, or it could have been its northern aspect which would have taken it closer to the fishing	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	If one looks at a log, the penultimate entry there is the Field briefing as to location. The wording is: "JF advises that collision occurred", and then provides the detail. There is no suggestion there that there is any great doubt about the location. Is that correct? A. Well, I can't see. It plotted and in relation to a chart, a navigational chart or a map that would give me that indication, which is what I can't remember from happening at - it happening. Q. Do you remember there being a conversation as to whether it was within
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	just the vertical. It's a two dimensional sort of focus and if we focus it with the one dimension, it's only 6.5 miles out. It could be anywhere within one kilometre beach. Santa Barbara could be one kilometre beach, or it could be at the - its northern aspect which is borderline with our own runway, or it could be Q. Southern, the most southern. A. Southern, sorry, yes, I beg your pardon. The most southern end of the beach, which is practically joining up with our runway, or it could have been its northern aspect which would have taken it closer to the fishing village commonly known as La Tournada(?).	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	If one looks at a log, the penultimate entry there is the Field briefing as to location. The wording is: "JF advises that collision occurred", and then provides the detail. There is no suggestion there that there is any great doubt about the location. Is that correct? A. Well, I can't see. It plotted and in relation to a chart, a navigational chart or a map that would give me that indication, which is what I can't remember from happening at - it happening. Q. Do you remember there being a conversation as to whether it was within Spanish waters or
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	just the vertical. It's a two dimensional sort of focus and if we focus it with the one dimension, it's only 6.5 miles out. It could be anywhere within one kilometre beach. Santa Barbara could be one kilometre beach, or it could be at the - its northern aspect which is borderline with our own runway, or it could be Q. Southern, the most southern. A. Southern, sorry, yes, I beg your pardon. The most southern end of the beach, which is practically joining up with our runway, or it could have been its northern aspect which would have taken it closer to the fishing village commonly known as La Tournada(?). Q. That is correct about 6.54 miles off Santa	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	If one looks at a log, the penultimate entry there is the Field briefing as to location. The wording is: "JF advises that collision occurred", and then provides the detail. There is no suggestion there that there is any great doubt about the location. Is that correct? A. Well, I can't see. It plotted and in relation to a chart, a navigational chart or a map that would give me that indication, which is what I can't remember from happening at - it happening. Q. Do you remember there being a conversation as to whether it was within Spanish waters or A. Yes. That was a consideration that was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	just the vertical. It's a two dimensional sort of focus and if we focus it with the one dimension, it's only 6.5 miles out. It could be anywhere within one kilometre beach. Santa Barbara could be one kilometre beach, or it could be at the - its northern aspect which is borderline with our own runway, or it could be Q. Southern, the most southern. A. Southern, sorry, yes, I beg your pardon. The most southern end of the beach, which is practically joining up with our runway, or it could have been its northern aspect which would have taken it closer to the fishing village commonly known as La Tournada(?). Q. That is correct about 6.54 miles off Santa Barbara, but in terms of the coordinates,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	If one looks at a log, the penultimate entry there is the Field briefing as to location. The wording is: "JF advises that collision occurred", and then provides the detail. There is no suggestion there that there is any great doubt about the location. Is that correct? A. Well, I can't see. It plotted and in relation to a chart, a navigational chart or a map that would give me that indication, which is what I can't remember from happening at - it happening. Q. Do you remember there being a conversation as to whether it was within Spanish waters or A. Yes. That was a consideration that was toyed with form early on, as soon as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	just the vertical. It's a two dimensional sort of focus and if we focus it with the one dimension, it's only 6.5 miles out. It could be anywhere within one kilometre beach. Santa Barbara could be one kilometre beach, or it could be at the - its northern aspect which is borderline with our own runway, or it could be Q. Southern, the most southern. A. Southern, sorry, yes, I beg your pardon. The most southern end of the beach, which is practically joining up with our runway, or it could have been its northern aspect which would have taken it closer to the fishing village commonly known as La Tournada(?). Q. That is correct about 6.54 miles off Santa Barbara, but in terms of the coordinates, where did the coordinates place it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	If one looks at a log, the penultimate entry there is the Field briefing as to location. The wording is: "JF advises that collision occurred", and then provides the detail. There is no suggestion there that there is any great doubt about the location. Is that correct? A. Well, I can't see. It plotted and in relation to a chart, a navigational chart or a map that would give me that indication, which is what I can't remember from happening at - it happening. Q. Do you remember there being a conversation as to whether it was within Spanish waters or A. Yes. That was a consideration that was toyed with form early on, as soon as coordinates were provided to us. However,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	just the vertical. It's a two dimensional sort of focus and if we focus it with the one dimension, it's only 6.5 miles out. It could be anywhere within one kilometre beach. Santa Barbara could be one kilometre beach, or it could be at the - its northern aspect which is borderline with our own runway, or it could be Q. Southern, the most southern. A. Southern, sorry, yes, I beg your pardon. The most southern end of the beach, which is practically joining up with our runway, or it could have been its northern aspect which would have taken it closer to the fishing village commonly known as La Tournada(?). Q. That is correct about 6.54 miles off Santa Barbara, but in terms of the coordinates, where did the coordinates place it comfortably within	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	If one looks at a log, the penultimate entry there is the Field briefing as to location. The wording is: "JF advises that collision occurred", and then provides the detail. There is no suggestion there that there is any great doubt about the location. Is that correct? A. Well, I can't see. It plotted and in relation to a chart, a navigational chart or a map that would give me that indication, which is what I can't remember from happening at - it happening. Q. Do you remember there being a conversation as to whether it was within Spanish waters or A. Yes. That was a consideration that was toyed with form early on, as soon as coordinates were provided to us. However, we were working on the hypothesis that there
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	just the vertical. It's a two dimensional sort of focus and if we focus it with the one dimension, it's only 6.5 miles out. It could be anywhere within one kilometre beach. Santa Barbara could be one kilometre beach, or it could be at the - its northern aspect which is borderline with our own runway, or it could be Q. Southern, the most southern. A. Southern, sorry, yes, I beg your pardon. The most southern end of the beach, which is practically joining up with our runway, or it could have been its northern aspect which would have taken it closer to the fishing village commonly known as La Tournada(?). Q. That is correct about 6.54 miles off Santa Barbara, but in terms of the coordinates, where did the coordinates place it comfortably within A. I wouldn't know because I'd seen	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	If one looks at a log, the penultimate entry there is the Field briefing as to location. The wording is: "JF advises that collision occurred", and then provides the detail. There is no suggestion there that there is any great doubt about the location. Is that correct? A. Well, I can't see. It plotted and in relation to a chart, a navigational chart or a map that would give me that indication, which is what I can't remember from happening at - it happening. Q. Do you remember there being a conversation as to whether it was within Spanish waters or A. Yes. That was a consideration that was toyed with form early on, as soon as coordinates were provided to us. However, we were working on the hypothesis that there had been a pursuit that had taken place in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	just the vertical. It's a two dimensional sort of focus and if we focus it with the one dimension, it's only 6.5 miles out. It could be anywhere within one kilometre beach. Santa Barbara could be one kilometre beach, or it could be at the - its northern aspect which is borderline with our own runway, or it could be Q. Southern, the most southern. A. Southern, sorry, yes, I beg your pardon. The most southern end of the beach, which is practically joining up with our runway, or it could have been its northern aspect which would have taken it closer to the fishing village commonly known as La Tournada(?). Q. That is correct about 6.54 miles off Santa Barbara, but in terms of the coordinates, where did the coordinates place it comfortably within A. I wouldn't know because I'd seen reference to a chart being brought up and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	If one looks at a log, the penultimate entry there is the Field briefing as to location. The wording is: "JF advises that collision occurred", and then provides the detail. There is no suggestion there that there is any great doubt about the location. Is that correct? A. Well, I can't see. It plotted and in relation to a chart, a navigational chart or a map that would give me that indication, which is what I can't remember from happening at - it happening. Q. Do you remember there being a conversation as to whether it was within Spanish waters or A. Yes. That was a consideration that was toyed with form early on, as soon as coordinates were provided to us. However, we were working on the hypothesis that there had been a pursuit that had taken place in British Gibraltar territorial waters and/or
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	just the vertical. It's a two dimensional sort of focus and if we focus it with the one dimension, it's only 6.5 miles out. It could be anywhere within one kilometre beach. Santa Barbara could be one kilometre beach, or it could be at the - its northern aspect which is borderline with our own runway, or it could be Q. Southern, the most southern. A. Southern, sorry, yes, I beg your pardon. The most southern end of the beach, which is practically joining up with our runway, or it could have been its northern aspect which would have taken it closer to the fishing village commonly known as La Tournada(?). Q. That is correct about 6.54 miles off Santa Barbara, but in terms of the coordinates, where did the coordinates place it comfortably within A. I wouldn't know because I'd seen reference to a chart being brought up and those coordinates being plotted, and as much	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	If one looks at a log, the penultimate entry there is the Field briefing as to location. The wording is: "JF advises that collision occurred", and then provides the detail. There is no suggestion there that there is any great doubt about the location. Is that correct? A. Well, I can't see. It plotted and in relation to a chart, a navigational chart or a map that would give me that indication, which is what I can't remember from happening at - it happening. Q. Do you remember there being a conversation as to whether it was within Spanish waters or A. Yes. That was a consideration that was toyed with form early on, as soon as coordinates were provided to us. However, we were working on the hypothesis that there had been a pursuit that had taken place in British Gibraltar territorial waters and/or straddled into Spanish waters or international
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	just the vertical. It's a two dimensional sort of focus and if we focus it with the one dimension, it's only 6.5 miles out. It could be anywhere within one kilometre beach. Santa Barbara could be one kilometre beach, or it could be at the - its northern aspect which is borderline with our own runway, or it could be Q. Southern, the most southern. A. Southern, sorry, yes, I beg your pardon. The most southern end of the beach, which is practically joining up with our runway, or it could have been its northern aspect which would have taken it closer to the fishing village commonly known as La Tournada(?). Q. That is correct about 6.54 miles off Santa Barbara, but in terms of the coordinates, where did the coordinates place it comfortably within A. I wouldn't know because I'd seen reference to a chart being brought up and those coordinates being plotted, and as much as I tried to rack my brain, I cannot with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	If one looks at a log, the penultimate entry there is the Field briefing as to location. The wording is: "JF advises that collision occurred", and then provides the detail. There is no suggestion there that there is any great doubt about the location. Is that correct? A. Well, I can't see. It plotted and in relation to a chart, a navigational chart or a map that would give me that indication, which is what I can't remember from happening at - it happening. Q. Do you remember there being a conversation as to whether it was within Spanish waters or A. Yes. That was a consideration that was toyed with form early on, as soon as coordinates were provided to us. However, we were working on the hypothesis that there had been a pursuit that had taken place in British Gibraltar territorial waters and/or straddled into Spanish waters or international waters, but certainly that something had
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	just the vertical. It's a two dimensional sort of focus and if we focus it with the one dimension, it's only 6.5 miles out. It could be anywhere within one kilometre beach. Santa Barbara could be one kilometre beach, or it could be at the - its northern aspect which is borderline with our own runway, or it could be Q. Southern, the most southern. A. Southern, sorry, yes, I beg your pardon. The most southern end of the beach, which is practically joining up with our runway, or it could have been its northern aspect which would have taken it closer to the fishing village commonly known as La Tournada(?). Q. That is correct about 6.54 miles off Santa Barbara, but in terms of the coordinates, where did the coordinates place it comfortably within A. I wouldn't know because I'd seen reference to a chart being brought up and those coordinates being plotted, and as much	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	If one looks at a log, the penultimate entry there is the Field briefing as to location. The wording is: "JF advises that collision occurred", and then provides the detail. There is no suggestion there that there is any great doubt about the location. Is that correct? A. Well, I can't see. It plotted and in relation to a chart, a navigational chart or a map that would give me that indication, which is what I can't remember from happening at - it happening. Q. Do you remember there being a conversation as to whether it was within Spanish waters or A. Yes. That was a consideration that was toyed with form early on, as soon as coordinates were provided to us. However, we were working on the hypothesis that there had been a pursuit that had taken place in British Gibraltar territorial waters and/or straddled into Spanish waters or international

1	collision seemed to have occurred in Spanish	1	"Yes, agreed. Any necessary additional
2	waters.	2	expenditure will be approved Many
3	Q. Just to follow up on that, you say you	3	thanks." In your witness statement you say
4	were working on a provisional hypothesis	4	this was only information which needed
5	that the pursuit had taken place in BGTW but	5	verification. Why did you send that message
6	in terms of the collision were you not by that	6	to the Chief Minister?
7	point fairly certain that the collision had	7	A. It was in response to a question that he'd
8	occurred in Spanish waters?	8	asked me.
9	A. There was no certainty, there was no	9	Q. You obviously considered it meaning
10	certainty, and the mere fact that the	10	information for a Chief Minister and the
11	wireless(?) said we were not able to commit	11	Chief Minister had said that you needed to be
12	to that and I wanted to work on that	12	transparent, so why did you not send at the
13	confirmation and best information, best	13	same time that information to the Governor?
14	evidence. I was expectant that the data that	14	A. Like I say, I was engaged in a form of
15	would confirm all these things that we were	15	conversation with the Chief Minister and I
16	enquiring about would be available to us	16	was responding to questions from him in the
17	from our own assets, the maritime assets I	17	same way as I was responding to questions
18	mean, and/or port authority or Windmill Hill	18	from the Interim Governor, from Mr Pyle.
19	Signal Station.	19	There is absolutely no doubt whatsoever that
20	Q. When you understood that the	20	this information would have been shared
21	coordinates needed technical confirmation,	21	with Mr Pyle at the next point of
	did you understand that to mean that they	22	communication with him. That I didn't do it
22	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	22 23	
23	could be wildly wrong, or was that a	1	at the time I've got no explanation for other
24	suggestion that actually there was a slight	24	than saying that this was a dynamic moving
25	margin for error in the coordinates?	25	matter and it's not that I was focused solely
	Page 17		Page 19
1	A. I thought that it needed verification in the	1	on responding to WhatsApp messages.
2	sense that they may not have had the full	2	There were things that I was doing and
3	picture themselves, and these things are	3	getting information briefed up to me, and so
4	complicated, they're scientific and technical	4	forth, so it's not that as soon as I stopped
5	and computer-related, and to be certain you	5	chatting with the CM, as per what's on the
6	have to be 100 per cent certain that that is	6	screen, that it kept in my head I've got to tell
7	where it's happened. If I correlate with any	7	the Governor this. It didn't flow like that.
8	other major incidents, you don't want to be	8	However, it's transpired - well, sorry.
9	announcing mass casualties when there are	9	Q. Thank you. At 09.41 hours when we see
10	not, you don't want to provide inaccurate	10	above, you do send a message to the
11	information that could cause knock-on	11	Governor: "Thanks, Nick." Would that not
12	effects.	12	have been after the briefing that DCI Field
13	Q. Can we go to 1345, please. This is your	13	had given you as to location?
14	message of 09.49 hours. I think it is the sixth	14	A. Sorry, where was that?
15	box from the top. Your WhatsApp message	15	Q. 09.41 hours. It is just above the message
16	says: "CM, the information suggests that the	16	that we were just looking at in terms of
17	collision took place outside BGTW approx.	17	location, just where the cursor is. You send a
	combion took place outside BG1 w approx.		
18	*	18	message to the Governor at 09.41 hours.
18 19	six nautical miles east of the runway Santa Barbara Beach." Then you say: "When a	1	message to the Governor at 09.41 hours. Was that not just after DCI Field had briefed
	six nautical miles east of the runway Santa	18	=
19	six nautical miles east of the runway Santa Barbara Beach." Then you say: "When a	18 19	Was that not just after DCI Field had briefed you as to the location?
19 20	six nautical miles east of the runway Santa Barbara Beach." Then you say: "When a death arises from police contact it's best practice to engage with an independent	18 19 20	Was that not just after DCI Field had briefed
19 20 21	six nautical miles east of the runway Santa Barbara Beach." Then you say: "When a death arises from police contact it's best	18 19 20 21	Was that not just after DCI Field had briefed you as to the location? A. The time of the briefing of the location
19 20 21 22	six nautical miles east of the runway Santa Barbara Beach." Then you say: "When a death arises from police contact it's best practice to engage with an independent investigating team and I am studying how to	18 19 20 21 22	Was that not just after DCI Field had briefed you as to the location? A. The time of the briefing of the location was what? Q. 09.40 hours.
19 20 21 22 23	six nautical miles east of the runway Santa Barbara Beach." Then you say: "When a death arises from police contact it's best practice to engage with an independent investigating team and I am studying how to achieve this." "Okay, we need to liaise with AG on this and ensure we are transparent on	18 19 20 21 22 23	Was that not just after DCI Field had briefed you as to the location? A. The time of the briefing of the location was what? Q. 09.40 hours. A. I mean, we could even say it's
19 20 21 22 23 24	six nautical miles east of the runway Santa Barbara Beach." Then you say: "When a death arises from police contact it's best practice to engage with an independent investigating team and I am studying how to achieve this." "Okay, we need to liaise with	18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Was that not just after DCI Field had briefed you as to the location? A. The time of the briefing of the location was what? Q. 09.40 hours.

1	off the ouff user once and as I'm dealing	1	summised that the AIC on board the notice
1	off the cuff responses, and as I'm dealing	1	surprised that the AIS on board the police
2	with other things, so I've got no explanation	2	vessel was either switched off or faulty. I did
3	as to whether it was before, because they	3	not know at the time what the case was. So
4	have told me about the one minute margin	4	yes, I was surprised that Gibraltar sources
5	here, whether it was before or after, but I	5	could not provide that information.
6	reinforce that there is absolutely no doubt in	6	Q. Can we now turn to the briefing with the
7	my mind then, now, and it will be shown,	7	Attorney General. If we look at A 73, two
8	that I was not going to withhold anything	8	pages on from here, you say at paragraph 63:
9	from the Governor.	9	"At 1010hrs, I briefed the AG, Mr Michael
10	Q. Did you recognise the importance to the	10	Llamas, in my office. Present were Supt
11	Governor of knowing as soon as possible	11	Richardson and possibly DCI Field and other
12	whether the collision took place in Spanish or	12	members of the command team. I explained
13	BGTW given his constitutional	13	to the AG what we knew at the time
14	responsibilities for external affairs and for	14	including the uncertainty of where the
15	the police?	15	collision had occurred." Can I take you to
16	A. Absolutely. It's evident that I'm telling	16	the Attorney General's evidence as far as this
17	the Chief Minister, the head of the	17	is concerned. It is at A 294. The Attorney
18	Government, the head of Government at	18	General says the following: "Mr McGrail in
19	number 6. There was absolutely no reason or	19	the presence of other RGP officers briefed
20	motive to not brief up to Mr Pyle with the	20	me on what he knew at that stage. Other than
21	same information. It's nonsensical, as far as	21	the basic facts of what had happened, I do
22	I'm concerned.	22	not have a precise recollection of what he
23	Q. It may not have been confirmed	23	told me in relation to the location of the
24	information but do you accept the Governor	24	collision and whether it had occurred in
25	was entitled to the best available information	25	BGTW or in Spanish territorial waters. To
			BOT W of in Spanion territorial waters. To
	Page 21		Page 23
1	at the time?	1	the best of my recollection I believe he
2	A. That's right, and he was. He was	2	referred to the fact that there had been a
3	provided with the best information.	3	chase that straddled BGTW and Spanish
4	Q. Can we turn to A 71, please, paragraph	4	waters, that there had been some element of
5	57. This is further details of the briefing by	5	contact between the RGP and the Spanish
6	DCI Field. I just want to take you to the final	6	Guardia Civil and that it seemed highly likely
7	four lines of that, that neither Windmill Hill	7	that the collision had occurred in Spanish
8	Signal Station nor Gibraltar Port Authority	8	waters but that he was waiting for formal
9	had any coordinates plotted for the police	9	technical confirmation of this. My
10	vessel, this potentially meaning the vessel's	10	recollection is that, considering the gravity of
11	automatic identification system, AIS, was	11	the consequences, political and otherwise, of
12	either switched off or faulty. What was your	12	the collision having occurred in Spanish
13	thought or reaction when you first learned	13	waters, Mr McGrail wanted to be absolutely
14	this information?	14	certain of this and was not assisted by the
15	A. It was regrettable that we couldn't extract	15	fact that the RGP's AIS appeared not to have
16	data from either of these three sources. That	16	been switched on at the time of the
17	set us back somewhat in establishing with	17	collision." Do you agree that you said that it
18	certainty from our own sources where this	18	seemed highly likely that the collision had
19	would have happened, where the incident	19	occurred in Spanish waters to the Attorney
20	would happened.	20	General?
21	Q. Were you surprised to learn that	20	
22	information?	21 22	A. I think that that was a working theory that
23	A. I was surprised that Windmill Hill	1	we developed based in concert there as these
23	couldn't plot it, I was surprised that the Port	23	things were being brought to us. So when we
25	Department couldn't plot it, and I was	24	break it down to that level of detail, it was
23	Department contain a plot it, and I was	25	mentioned that it was highly likely that it was
	Page 22		Page 24
•			

1	going to happen - would have happened - in	1	from anywhere else.
2	Spanish waters.	2	Q. He sent that message to you. Did you
3	THE CHAIRMAN: When you say "it was	3	agree or disagree with his use of that phrase
4	mentioned", you mean you thought that it	4	"virtually certain"?
5	was highly likely that it occurred in Spanish	5	A. I did not consider it inappropriate. As far
6	waters, and said so.	6	as I was concerned, he briefed, he was
7	A. Yes, yes, with the proviso that part of the	7	following up with the Chief Minister, and I
8	chase or under - I mean, these were working	8	was satisfied with that.
9	theories to complement the information that	9	Q. At around 12.15 the Governor arrived
10	we had, the coordinates and the information	10	and you deal with this at 65 of your
11	that we had, that it would seem that it had	11	statement. "At 12.15 hours NP, the interim
12	happened, but we were working on the	12	Governor, attended my office and joined the
13	hypothesis that part of the chase had either	13	AG and my team in the briefing where all the
14	commenced or had involved British Gibraltar	14	actions that had been carried out and those
15	territorial waters.	15	that remained outstanding were discussed. I
16	MR SANTOS: Then if you go back to A73,	16	explained what my intentions were in respect
17	please, which is your statement again, you	17	of best practices to follow when faced with a
18	say: "During the course of this briefing, at	18	death as a result of contact with the police.
19	1140hrs, the AG sent a message to the CM	19	That I would be exploring means of securing
20	which he then also sent to me and which read	20	an independent team to take over the
21	as follows: 'Been in New Mole for the last	21	investigation. Both the AG and NP were in
22	hour or so. Cooperation RGP/Spanish LEAs	22	agreement. NP did not raise any particular
23	very good. New RGP Press Release today	23	query." You say he did not raise any
24	will say good cooperation with ES (Spain),	24	particular query. Did he not even ask you
25	drug related activity, 2 deaths are Spanish	25	where the collision had occurred?
	Page 25		Page 27
1	nationals of North African descent.	1	A. It is possible that he asked, yes.
2	Investigation continues. PR [which is, you	2	Q. It is possible that he asked.
3	helpfully point out, an abbreviation for press	3	A. Yes. Or the other way round, that what I
4	release] will not say where incident occurred	4	believe happened is that I briefed him to the
5	bitt it is virtually certain it was outside	5	same level that I briefed the Attorney
6	BGTW eastern side opposite runway. It also	6	General.
7	seems that part of the chase was within	7	Q. Why do you not say that in paragraph 65
8	BGTW'." That is a message that the	8	of your witness statement, that you briefed
9	Attorney General actually sent to you. It	9	him as to the location?
10	does not appear that he actually, as it	10	A. Well, it says that the AG and my team -
11	happens, sent the message to the Chief	11	that: "The Interim Governor attended my
12	Minister, although it is not a hundred per cent	12	office and joined the AG and my team in the
	ataon and reservant on the attenue. Districts magazined	13	briefing where all the actions [and the
13	clear one way or the other. But you received	1	-
14	that message, did you not?	14	actions, as you can see, include the question
14 15	that message, did you not? A. Yes. He sent it there in my presence. He	14 15	actions, as you can see, include the question of where the location happened] that had
14 15 16	that message, did you not? A. Yes. He sent it there in my presence. He says: "I've just forwarded this to the - I've	14 15 16	actions, as you can see, include the question of where the location happened] that had been carried out and those that remained
14 15 16 17	that message, did you not? A. Yes. He sent it there in my presence. He says: "I've just forwarded this to the - I've just sent this to the Chief Minister. I'm going	14 15 16 17	actions, as you can see, include the question of where the location happened] that had been carried out and those that remained outstanding were discussed." Again, that
14 15 16 17 18	that message, did you not? A. Yes. He sent it there in my presence. He says: "I've just forwarded this to the - I've just sent this to the Chief Minister. I'm going to forward it to you." It seems that it's a	14 15 16 17 18	actions, as you can see, include the question of where the location happened] that had been carried out and those that remained outstanding were discussed." Again, that includes establishing where the incident had
14 15 16 17 18 19	that message, did you not? A. Yes. He sent it there in my presence. He says: "I've just forwarded this to the - I've just sent this to the Chief Minister. I'm going to forward it to you." It seems that it's a common thing that the Attorney General	14 15 16 17 18 19	actions, as you can see, include the question of where the location happened] that had been carried out and those that remained outstanding were discussed." Again, that includes establishing where the incident had occurred. So there is reference to that and
14 15 16 17 18 19 20	that message, did you not? A. Yes. He sent it there in my presence. He says: "I've just forwarded this to the - I've just sent this to the Chief Minister. I'm going to forward it to you." It seems that it's a common thing that the Attorney General does, as we follow through from the	14 15 16 17 18 19 20	actions, as you can see, include the question of where the location happened] that had been carried out and those that remained outstanding were discussed." Again, that includes establishing where the incident had occurred. So there is reference to that and that's my interpretation of what I wanted to
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	that message, did you not? A. Yes. He sent it there in my presence. He says: "I've just forwarded this to the - I've just sent this to the Chief Minister. I'm going to forward it to you." It seems that it's a common thing that the Attorney General does, as we follow through from the evidence. He does forward messages that	14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	actions, as you can see, include the question of where the location happened] that had been carried out and those that remained outstanding were discussed." Again, that includes establishing where the incident had occurred. So there is reference to that and that's my interpretation of what I wanted to convey.
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	that message, did you not? A. Yes. He sent it there in my presence. He says: "I've just forwarded this to the - I've just sent this to the Chief Minister. I'm going to forward it to you." It seems that it's a common thing that the Attorney General does, as we follow through from the evidence. He does forward messages that he's received, and forwards them on.	14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	actions, as you can see, include the question of where the location happened] that had been carried out and those that remained outstanding were discussed." Again, that includes establishing where the incident had occurred. So there is reference to that and that's my interpretation of what I wanted to convey. Q. If we go to Mr Pyle's evidence as to this
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	that message, did you not? A. Yes. He sent it there in my presence. He says: "I've just forwarded this to the - I've just sent this to the Chief Minister. I'm going to forward it to you." It seems that it's a common thing that the Attorney General does, as we follow through from the evidence. He does forward messages that he's received, and forwards them on. Q. Did he give that information virtually	14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	actions, as you can see, include the question of where the location happened] that had been carried out and those that remained outstanding were discussed." Again, that includes establishing where the incident had occurred. So there is reference to that and that's my interpretation of what I wanted to convey. Q. If we go to Mr Pyle's evidence as to this briefing, 251, at paragraph 25.3, his account
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	that message, did you not? A. Yes. He sent it there in my presence. He says: "I've just forwarded this to the - I've just sent this to the Chief Minister. I'm going to forward it to you." It seems that it's a common thing that the Attorney General does, as we follow through from the evidence. He does forward messages that he's received, and forwards them on. Q. Did he give that information virtually certain from your briefing?	14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	actions, as you can see, include the question of where the location happened] that had been carried out and those that remained outstanding were discussed." Again, that includes establishing where the incident had occurred. So there is reference to that and that's my interpretation of what I wanted to convey. Q. If we go to Mr Pyle's evidence as to this briefing, 251, at paragraph 25.3, his account is as follows: "Whilst walking my dog past
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	that message, did you not? A. Yes. He sent it there in my presence. He says: "I've just forwarded this to the - I've just sent this to the Chief Minister. I'm going to forward it to you." It seems that it's a common thing that the Attorney General does, as we follow through from the evidence. He does forward messages that he's received, and forwards them on. Q. Did he give that information virtually	14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	actions, as you can see, include the question of where the location happened] that had been carried out and those that remained outstanding were discussed." Again, that includes establishing where the incident had occurred. So there is reference to that and that's my interpretation of what I wanted to convey. Q. If we go to Mr Pyle's evidence as to this briefing, 251, at paragraph 25.3, his account
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	that message, did you not? A. Yes. He sent it there in my presence. He says: "I've just forwarded this to the - I've just sent this to the Chief Minister. I'm going to forward it to you." It seems that it's a common thing that the Attorney General does, as we follow through from the evidence. He does forward messages that he's received, and forwards them on. Q. Did he give that information virtually certain from your briefing?	14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	actions, as you can see, include the question of where the location happened] that had been carried out and those that remained outstanding were discussed." Again, that includes establishing where the incident had occurred. So there is reference to that and that's my interpretation of what I wanted to convey. Q. If we go to Mr Pyle's evidence as to this briefing, 251, at paragraph 25.3, his account is as follows: "Whilst walking my dog past

1 4 04- M1- 1 4 1-4 11 1	1 41-4
1 on the 8th March I decided to call in and	1 that paragraph says: "My recollection is that
2 asked to see Mr McGrail. He was there and	2 Mr McGrail told the then Governor that he
agreed to see me. Given the possibility of a	3 was still not certain where the collision had
4 diplomatic and political situation with Spain	4 occurred." Is that something that you
5 about this incident, which (being external	5 remember saying?
6 affairs) would be the responsibility of the	6 A. No. I remember saying that it was highly
7 Governor and HMGOG, my primary concern	7 probable that it had happened, probably
8 was to establish the location of the incident,	8 reinforcing that we needed confirmation of
9 and whether it had occurred in Spanish	9 that and we needed certainty on that. So that
10 territorial waters. I therefore asked Mr	10 it was not certain where the collision had
11 McGrail about the location and whether it	11 occurred and not necessarily that it had not
was inside or outside BGTW. He replied	12 happened in Spanish waters. The certainty,
with a slightly flippant waving of his hands,	as far as I interpreted it, was confirmation of
14 'could be in, and could be out, it's difficult to	14 it.
15 tell at night'." Did you say something to that	15 Q. Can we turn to B 1346 now, please. The
16 effect?	16 first new box on that page is from Mr Pyle to
17 A. Certainly there was no flippancy, not	you at 13.33 hours, and he says: "Thanks for
18 even slightly, as Mr Pyle describes.	the briefing. I'll do a quick note for London
19 Certainly that was not. I always adopt a	19 for when it hits the press. Line will be
20 respectful approach to persons who hold high	20 'Investigation ongoing, Spanish nationals
office. Secondly, I think there has been, sort	from Ceuta. Did you say one person was
of the comment "Could be in and could be	22 Portuguese? Not sure in whose waters
23 out" has been somewhat warped, because the	23 incident took place. RGP seeking assistance
essence of what we were discussing was that	24 from UK police authorities. No assistance
25 we were working on the hypothesis that part	25 needed from FCO at this stage'." And you
Page 29	Page 31
1 of the chase could have happened in	1 replied: "Yes, all correct. indeed one was
2 Gibraltar waters or could have happened out.	2 Portuguese. Trying to clarify exact position
3 There are two distinct - I'm working on so	of the collision. Okay, thanks." Now, given
4 from the stance that there's the collision is the	4 that you had already told the Chief Minister
5 end product and the pursuit is the beginning	5 the coordinates and you had seen that the
6 of that product. So I was considering both	6 Attorney General was reporting to the Chief
7 issues, not necessarily one as a one package.	7 Minister that it was virtually certain that the
8 THE CHAIRMAN: The Interim Governor	8 incident took place in Spanish waters, why
9 asked you where the collision had taken	9 did you agree with Mr Pyle's proposed line?
10 place. Is that right?	10 A. Again, this is a fluid conversation and
11 A. I cannot recall him asking me	when he's talking about - I'm talking about
12 specifically. What I can recall is that I	12 the - he's talking about the incident. Now,
13 briefed him to the same degree that I had	when I refer to the incident, he's talking
14 briefed the	14 about - I'm looking at dissecting that into
15 THE CHAIRMAN: What precisely did you	15 collision and pursuit. It's not solely the
16 tell him?	culmination of the incident which is the
17 A. I cannot tell you with certainty other than	collision. So by me responding to him the
18 say that the matter - that the collision was	exact position of the collision sort of infers
19 highly probable that it happened in Spain	19 that I'm not talking only about the collision
with part of the chase happening in Gibraltar	20 itself. It's talking about the - I'm referring to
21 waters.	21 the pursuit being part of the issue.
22 MR SANTOS: If we go to A 295, this is the	Q. If we go now to 1746, please, there is an
23 Attorney General's statement, and at	email from Mr Pyle to the FCDO, and I just
24 paragraph 84 he says that Mr Nick Pyle	want to read out the first two paragraphs.
25 arrived at NMH. Then the final sentence of	25 "I've just met with the Commissioner of
D 20	D 22
Page 30	Page 32

1	Police who kindly gave me a briefing on the	1	can only hope that it was at the invitation of
2	incident. The facts have yet to be determined	2	the Spanish, but this may be why GOG have
3	and the investigation is ongoing but initial	3	kept details very close and have asked for no
4	headlines are as follows: the incident	4	social media speculation." Then jumping to
5	happened at 0400 hours though it is not yet	5	the next line, "Let's hope this is all resolved
6	known whether it took place in BGTW or	6	quickly between the agencies and there is no
7	just outside." Again, given what you had	7	negative impact on Thursday's talks with the
8	reported to the Chief Minister and to the	8	Spanish." I think you have already answered
9	Attorney General about it being virtually	9	this question, but I will just ask it so that you
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	10	can answer as clearly as you like. What
10	certain - well, given the coordinates you had	1	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
11	provided to the Chief Minister and what the	11	information do you think led to Mr Pyle
12	Attorney General had said to the Chief	12	sending that email?
13	Minister about it being virtually certain that	13	A. My briefing. However Mr Pyle's sole
14	the collision had taken place outside BGTW,	14	focus there, and I respect it because of the
15	are you concerned by the fact that Mr Pyle	15	role he discharges, but I want to also explain
16	was reporting to the FCO that it is not yet	16	my - my action that - the day, and everything
17	known whether the incident took place in	17	that I was dealing with. This was the most
18	BGTW waters or just outside?	18	tragic and unfortunate of incidents; this was
19	(10.47)	19	not something - this was an abnormal,
20	A. Certainly I am. I am, because	20	uncommon incident that has - that has come
21	unbeknown to me Mr Pyle had also	21	to our attention, and that we had to deal with.
22	communicated to the FCDO hours after this	22	Not only was I dealing with the loss of life
23	email that things could get complicated	23	(which was extremely regrettable), the shock
24	because the collision happened six nautical	24	that that had caused amongst our - the
25	miles into Spanish waters, the same figure	25	service, and no doubt the families and the
	D 22		D 25
	Page 33		Page 35
1	that I had provided the Chief Minister with.	1	community. I was also dealing with the
2	So at the time, obviously I never had sight of	2	potential of serious public disorder, given
3	this until it was provided to me now, so it	3	that only a few months earlier there had been
4	just confirms in my mind that what I told	4	a similar incident involving a HM Customs
5	him, what the briefing provided. I don't un	5	vessel, with a - another smuggling vessel,
6	I don't understand why Mr Pyle has not	6	and where there had been one fatality. And,
7	included it in this particular email, but he	7	the wake that that brought was serious public
8	certainly does it.	8	disorder in the streets, albeit in the
9	Q. Well, I will show you the other email I	9	neighbouring town. But I had serious
10	think you are referring to, 1748. Correct me	10	9
	<u> </u>		concerns for that happening in Gibraltar,
11	if I am wrong, but this is an email sent the	11	given that we were dealing with organised
	next morning at 7.57	1 2	animinal naturalis And was lesses been the
12	next morning at 7.57	12	criminal networks. And, we know how they
12 13	A. Yes, but	13	operate and how they can go into retribution.
12 13 14	A. Yes, but Q. Then	13 14	operate and how they can go into retribution. So those are only a sample of the issues that I
12 13 14 15	A. Yes, butQ. ThenA. I - I - I don't think that anybody briefed	13 14 15	operate and how they can go into retribution. So those are only a sample of the issues that I was dealing with, whilst it seems Mr Pyle
12 13 14 15 16	 A. Yes, but Q. Then A. I - I - I don't think that anybody briefed Mr Pyle at seven o'clock in the morning on 	13 14 15 16	operate and how they can go into retribution. So those are only a sample of the issues that I was dealing with, whilst it seems Mr Pyle was only focused on (and - and probably
12 13 14 15 16 17	A. Yes, but Q. Then A. I - I - I don't think that anybody briefed Mr Pyle at seven o'clock in the morning on the day, on the 9th. That information he's	13 14 15 16 17	operate and how they can go into retribution. So those are only a sample of the issues that I was dealing with, whilst it seems Mr Pyle was only focused on (and - and probably rightly so) on the - on the diplomatic issues.
12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. Yes, but Q. Then A. I - I - I don't think that anybody briefed Mr Pyle at seven o'clock in the morning on the day, on the 9th. That information he's referring to, he had received the previous	13 14 15 16 17 18	operate and how they can go into retribution. So those are only a sample of the issues that I was dealing with, whilst it seems Mr Pyle was only focused on (and - and probably rightly so) on the - on the diplomatic issues. I had that, also - that also featured in my
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	A. Yes, but Q. Then A. I - I - I don't think that anybody briefed Mr Pyle at seven o'clock in the morning on the day, on the 9th. That information he's referring to, he had received the previous day.	13 14 15 16 17 18 19	operate and how they can go into retribution. So those are only a sample of the issues that I was dealing with, whilst it seems Mr Pyle was only focused on (and - and probably rightly so) on the - on the diplomatic issues. I had that, also - that also featured in my considerations, but I had all these others that
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. Yes, but Q. Then A. I - I - I don't think that anybody briefed Mr Pyle at seven o'clock in the morning on the day, on the 9th. That information he's referring to, he had received the previous day. Q. He says "There may be complications	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	operate and how they can go into retribution. So those are only a sample of the issues that I was dealing with, whilst it seems Mr Pyle was only focused on (and - and probably rightly so) on the - on the diplomatic issues. I had that, also - that also featured in my considerations, but I had all these others that - the col the colonial inquiry, professional
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. Yes, but Q. Then A. I - I - I don't think that anybody briefed Mr Pyle at seven o'clock in the morning on the day, on the 9th. That information he's referring to, he had received the previous day. Q. He says "There may be complications around yesterday's incident, in that it might	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	operate and how they can go into retribution. So those are only a sample of the issues that I was dealing with, whilst it seems Mr Pyle was only focused on (and - and probably rightly so) on the - on the diplomatic issues. I had that, also - that also featured in my considerations, but I had all these others that - the col the colonial inquiry, professional standards inquiry, cr potential criminal
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. Yes, but Q. Then A. I - I - I don't think that anybody briefed Mr Pyle at seven o'clock in the morning on the day, on the 9th. That information he's referring to, he had received the previous day. Q. He says "There may be complications around yesterday's incident, in that it might have happened as much as six miles inside	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	operate and how they can go into retribution. So those are only a sample of the issues that I was dealing with, whilst it seems Mr Pyle was only focused on (and - and probably rightly so) on the - on the diplomatic issues. I had that, also - that also featured in my considerations, but I had all these others that - the col the colonial inquiry, professional standards inquiry, cr potential criminal liabilities and so forth.
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. Yes, but Q. Then A. I - I - I don't think that anybody briefed Mr Pyle at seven o'clock in the morning on the day, on the 9th. That information he's referring to, he had received the previous day. Q. He says "There may be complications around yesterday's incident, in that it might have happened as much as six miles inside Spanish waters. If true, it's hard to fathom	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	operate and how they can go into retribution. So those are only a sample of the issues that I was dealing with, whilst it seems Mr Pyle was only focused on (and - and probably rightly so) on the - on the diplomatic issues. I had that, also - that also featured in my considerations, but I had all these others that - the col the colonial inquiry, professional standards inquiry, cr potential criminal liabilities and so forth. Q. Can we turn to A160 please, paragraph
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. Yes, but Q. Then A. I - I - I don't think that anybody briefed Mr Pyle at seven o'clock in the morning on the day, on the 9th. That information he's referring to, he had received the previous day. Q. He says "There may be complications around yesterday's incident, in that it might have happened as much as six miles inside Spanish waters. If true, it's hard to fathom quite what the RGP were doing chasing a	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	operate and how they can go into retribution. So those are only a sample of the issues that I was dealing with, whilst it seems Mr Pyle was only focused on (and - and probably rightly so) on the - on the diplomatic issues. I had that, also - that also featured in my considerations, but I had all these others that - the col the colonial inquiry, professional standards inquiry, cr potential criminal liabilities and so forth. Q. Can we turn to A160 please, paragraph 81. This is your fifth witness statement.
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. Yes, but Q. Then A. I - I - I don't think that anybody briefed Mr Pyle at seven o'clock in the morning on the day, on the 9th. That information he's referring to, he had received the previous day. Q. He says "There may be complications around yesterday's incident, in that it might have happened as much as six miles inside Spanish waters. If true, it's hard to fathom	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	operate and how they can go into retribution. So those are only a sample of the issues that I was dealing with, whilst it seems Mr Pyle was only focused on (and - and probably rightly so) on the - on the diplomatic issues. I had that, also - that also featured in my considerations, but I had all these others that - the col the colonial inquiry, professional standards inquiry, cr potential criminal liabilities and so forth. Q. Can we turn to A160 please, paragraph
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. Yes, but Q. Then A. I - I - I don't think that anybody briefed Mr Pyle at seven o'clock in the morning on the day, on the 9th. That information he's referring to, he had received the previous day. Q. He says "There may be complications around yesterday's incident, in that it might have happened as much as six miles inside Spanish waters. If true, it's hard to fathom quite what the RGP were doing chasing a vessel so deep into Spanish waters, and one	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	operate and how they can go into retribution. So those are only a sample of the issues that I was dealing with, whilst it seems Mr Pyle was only focused on (and - and probably rightly so) on the - on the diplomatic issues. I had that, also - that also featured in my considerations, but I had all these others that - the col the colonial inquiry, professional standards inquiry, cr potential criminal liabilities and so forth. Q. Can we turn to A160 please, paragraph 81. This is your fifth witness statement. A. Sorry, fifth?
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. Yes, but Q. Then A. I - I - I don't think that anybody briefed Mr Pyle at seven o'clock in the morning on the day, on the 9th. That information he's referring to, he had received the previous day. Q. He says "There may be complications around yesterday's incident, in that it might have happened as much as six miles inside Spanish waters. If true, it's hard to fathom quite what the RGP were doing chasing a	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	operate and how they can go into retribution. So those are only a sample of the issues that I was dealing with, whilst it seems Mr Pyle was only focused on (and - and probably rightly so) on the - on the diplomatic issues. I had that, also - that also featured in my considerations, but I had all these others that - the col the colonial inquiry, professional standards inquiry, cr potential criminal liabilities and so forth. Q. Can we turn to A160 please, paragraph 81. This is your fifth witness statement.

1 Q. Your fifth witness statement. Sorry, yes, I 1 information on to Mr Pyle? 2 2 should give you the cue for your physical --A. Sorry, I - want to refer to the - which one 3 3 A. Which reference, sorry? was this? 4 4 Q. I am sorry about that. Third statement, Q. Fifth statement, paragraph 81. 5 A. 81. 5 paragraph 67. It is the final three lines. 6 6 A. And the question was, sorry? Q. It is on page 19. You say here, "The AG 7 states in paragraph 86 of his affidavit that on 7 Q. Did you pass that information on to Mr 8 9 March, the day after the incident, Mr 8 Pyle? 9 9 McGrail briefed and explained that he was A. The relations - the relations I had with -10 10 not in a position to formally confirm where with him in respect of this was not a live-feed 11 the collision had taken place." And then you 11 relation, as is evident. It's not that I was 12 say, "I was aware that the AG and NP had 12 constantly feeding him - this is coming in on 13 been together the night before, because NP 13 a - on a live-feed basis, so I cannot be certain 14 14 informed me so at 1015 hours on 9 March that I did. 15 15 2020. NP asked me to meet again with the Q. In his email that we just saw a moment 16 16 AG for a further update. In his message to ago, he refers to talks that week in London. 17 17 Did you appreciate, given the Governor's role me NP wrote, 'I was with the AG last night, 18 and we wondered whether it would be worth 18 and given those talks, that it was imperative 19 19 for the Governor to have the best information having an update at some stage later this 20 20 morning. We are keen to reach out to Spain available as to location? 21 given his talks this week in London.' From 21 A. Yes, absolutely. He knew that I'd sent 22 22 this, I understood that the AG and NP were two police officers - two senior officers to 23 23 actively in communication with each other, Algeciras very early on, because I think he 24 24 quotes it that - he quotes that to - to his and therefore it is inconceivable that I would 25 25 have told the AG key information which he bosses in London. That can only show him Page 37 Page 39 1 would have failed to pass on to NP, given 1 the ca-- why would I send two officers to 2 that they were both in close contact 2 Algeciras? That can only indicate that we're 3 3 throughout and very much focused on the linking up with our counterparts because the 4 accident. This shows that NP was aware by 4 incident happened in Spain. Otherwise, there 5 5 that stage of the possibility that the collision would be no sense of us sending two police 6 occurred in Spanish waters, and that that is 6 officers there. And, he quotes that. 7 7 why it was a matter for high-level diplomatic Q. Then you meet at five minutes past 8 8 discussions planned for the following week." midday, which is the same statement that you 9 9 Are you suggesting there, in your statement, have open, paragraph 69. And you say, "The 10 10 following update was provided", in the that Mr Pyle may have been informed by the second line, "That following engagement"... Attorney General on the evening of 8 March 11 11 12 2020 as to the collision taking place in 12 It is paragraph 69 in front of you, I think. 13 13 "That following engagement with GC and Spanish waters? 14 A. That is a possibility. I do not know, 14 Algeciras we have been able to establish that 15 15 the GC had opened an investigation due to because I wasn't obviously privy to the 16 16 conversation, but that is the... If not the incident involving deaths of Spanish 17 17 nationals. According to my information, this informed, certainly reminded of. 18 18 Q. Can we now turn to A74, please. In was regardless of whether the incident 19 19 paragraph 67 (the last three lines) you say, occurred in Spanish waters or disputed 20 "During the course of the morning of 9 20 waters (as the GC called them), that the GC 21 21 sought to be kept informed irrespective. March 2020 I was informed that the GC were 22 Then, (i), you say that "The exact coordinates 22 still of the view that the collision had 23 23 occurred in Spanish waters, but that they of the collision have still not been 24 24 determined. I cannot recall whether the needed this interpretation to be confirmed by 25 their technicians." Did you pass that 25 provisional coordinates provided by the GC Page 38 Page 40

1 were discussed in specific detail but given 1 impression whatsoever that the mindset that 2 2 the note prepared by Superintendent he developed (or at least, that he's described 3 3 Richardson (which made reference to the in his statements) had been created at all. 4 4 exact coordinates not being determined, Quite the contrary. You can see his exchange 5 5 with me, post to - to the incident happening, suggesting the provisional coordinates were 6 6 mentioned) it seems that location was and engaging with him to facilitate the 7 discussed, albeit with a caveat that this still 7 engagement of a - an independent team from 8 needed verification. The notion that NP was 8 the UK, as I had requested practically within 9 9 kept out of the loop, as he claims in his letter hours - or at least explored, within hours of 10 10 to the GPA dates 3 June 2020, is absurd. the incident. I mean, there's no sign 11 11 Both the AG and Superintendent Richardson whatsoever there that that man, Mr Pyle, was 12 were present, and if I was evasive (which I 12 - was perceiving me to be evasive in any s--13 strenuously deny) then so would the AG and 13 in any - in any way, shape or form. And like, 14 14 the Superintendent have been evasive." Do I come to the - the - reinforcing the 15 15 you have any recollection of providing the point that he could not have been eva-- he 16 16 provisional coordinates to Mr Pyle? cou-- he wasn't behaving the way he alleges, 17 17 A. No. because he was fully aware of the 18 Q. If --18 information that I was pro-- imparting. And, 19 19 A. However -that is supported by the fact that he, within 20 20 Q. Sorry. 19 hours of meeting with me, the following 21 A. - the fact that we were discussing the 21 morning when he woke up he imparted to his 22 22 coordinates, and that we couldn't - and that bosses in London that they - there were -23 23 we were working to determine the exact there could be complications, that the 24 24 coordinates - as I say in my statement, there incident happened at six nautical miles into 25 25 Spanish waters, which is actually not correct. was a discussion all about coordinates. And Page 41 Page 43 1 now, the only coordinates that we had at the 1 That is not the correct --2 2 O. That is a reference to the distance off time were those that you've repeatedly 3 3 mentioned, and they when plotted ma--Santa Bárbara beach. 4 4 comes out to - to Spanish waters, those -A. Into Spanish waters, not necessarily from 5 5 those that have been referred to. So, what Gibraltar waters, it's not. 6 I'm trying to say there is that Mr Pyle was in 6 Q. No, no, no. Sorry, I --7 7 that conversation, and if I was at any point A. But, what - it's important to highlight, 8 8 flippant (as is being (?) alleged), evasive, not because the - the - the key thing here is: had 9 9 imparting correct information or - or being he said ten miles, twenty miles, fifty (?) 10 10 misleading, I was doing that in the presence miles, that would have been suggesting that 11 11 of the Attorney General and my colleague. there was some miscommunication. But, he 12 But (?) you've seen my colleague Mr 12 called six nautical miles, albeit that he is 13 13 Richardson, an exemplary officer. As indeed, quoting it for the wrong - under the wrong 14 14 Mr Wyan. And, the office of the Attorney pretexts, but he's quoting six nautical miles, 15 15 which is the same information that I imparted General - it just does not make sense that I'm 16 16 going to address the Governor with to the Chief Minister. Six nautical miles east 17 misleading information, or inaccurate 17 of Santa Bárbara, making no reference to the 18 18 information, or with disrespect, as is being Chief Minister as to whether that was close 19 19 alleged. He had more than ample to international waters, close to - to British 20 20 opportunity to do - to challenge me and ask Gibraltar Territorial Waters. It was what I 21 21 had, so - and - and that's - and that is what I questions of me at that meeting, and if he 22 22 didn't feel it appropriate he could have called imparted to him. 23 me up, and called me to order and probed me 23 Q. Can we turn to his statement, it is at 24 24 for any clarity. That - that - that did not A254, please. Paragraph 25.6. He says, "I 25 25 had in fact learned on either 18 or 19 March happen at any stage, and I was left with no Page 42 Page 44

1	from a delai-florestina Detection	1	in whose these was a west insident was advus
1	from a debrief by acting Detective	1	in place - there was a post-incident procedure that is - that kicks in when a situation of this
2	Superintendent Gary Smith of the	2	
3	Metropolitan Police that all indications were	3	sorts take place, and there are post-incident
4	that the incident had happened in Spanish	4	managers - post-incident procedure managers
5	waters, possibly up to three miles out of	5	that deal with that, to facilitate the - the
6	BGTW." Sorry, I think I have got the	6	eliciting of evidence from those involved.
7	wrong we will come back to that. Sorry, I	7	THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Pyle says that you
8	think I have read out the wrong part. Let us	8	sought to excuse that, by saying that it had
9	just move on to one other Yes, 256, sorry,	9	been switched off in the heat of the moment.
10	page 256. He says, "I told him that I thought	10	Do you recall saying that?
11	that Mr" We will just move on from this	11	A. Oh, certainly not, sir. I would never have
12	question, and come back.	12	said that. And I don't think anybody present
13	THE CHAIRMAN: This is the same	13	at that meeting will - I am absol a hundred,
14	meeting, is it not? Top of the page. That -	14	two hundred percent certain that nobody in
15	stop, it is that paragraph there, is it not?	15	that meeting will say that.
16	26.4.	16	THE CHAIRMAN: Well, you are quite right
17	MR SANTOS: But, that is I think there is	17	that Superintendent Richardson does not
18	an earlier reference to this.	18	remember that being said.
19	THE CHAIRMAN: Well look, let me ask	19	A. It wasn't said, sir. What I'd said, if
20	something of Mr McGrail	20	anything, it was that it may have been
21	MR SANTOS: We will come - sorry, go on.	21	switched off or it could have been faulty.
22	THE CHAIRMAN: The confusion as to	22	THE CHAIRMAN: No, but you found out
23	where the collision occurred was entirely	23	eventually that it was not faulty, did you not?
24	caused because the RGP launch did not have	24	A. Yes, yes.
25	its satellite navigation systems turned on. Do	25	THE CHAIRMAN: It just had not been
	D 45		D 47
	Page 45		Page 47
1	you agree with that?	1	switched on.
1 2	A. That contributed to it. Yes, certainly, sir.	2	A. That's right.
	A. That contributed to it. Yes, certainly, sir. THE CHAIRMAN: Well, it caused it, did it	2 3	A. That's right. THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, (inaudible).
2	A. That contributed to it. Yes, certainly, sir. THE CHAIRMAN: Well, it caused it, did it not? If the systems had been on, everyone	2 3 4	A. That's right.THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, (inaudible).A. And it was switched on afterwards
2 3	A. That contributed to it. Yes, certainly, sir. THE CHAIRMAN: Well, it caused it, did it	2 3 4 5	A. That's right.THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, (inaudible).A. And it was switched on afterwards apparently, once they were back into waters,
2 3 4	A. That contributed to it. Yes, certainly, sir. THE CHAIRMAN: Well, it caused it, did it not? If the systems had been on, everyone	2 3 4	 A. That's right. THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, (inaudible). A. And it was switched on afterwards apparently, once they were back into waters, and as they were towing in the - the crashed
2 3 4 5	A. That contributed to it. Yes, certainly, sir. THE CHAIRMAN: Well, it caused it, did it not? If the systems had been on, everyone would know exactly where the chase started A. Yes.	2 3 4 5	 A. That's right. THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, (inaudible). A. And it was switched on afterwards apparently, once they were back into waters, and as they were towing in the - the crashed vessel. That's what I understand.
2 3 4 5 6	A. That contributed to it. Yes, certainly, sir. THE CHAIRMAN: Well, it caused it, did it not? If the systems had been on, everyone would know exactly where the chase started -	2 3 4 5 6	 A. That's right. THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, (inaudible). A. And it was switched on afterwards apparently, once they were back into waters, and as they were towing in the - the crashed
2 3 4 5 6 7	A. That contributed to it. Yes, certainly, sir. THE CHAIRMAN: Well, it caused it, did it not? If the systems had been on, everyone would know exactly where the chase started A. Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: and where the collision had taken place. What was your	2 3 4 5 6 7	A. That's right. THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, (inaudible). A. And it was switched on afterwards apparently, once they were back into waters, and as they were towing in the - the crashed vessel. That's what I understand. THE CHAIRMAN: Did that not strike you as rather strange.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A. That contributed to it. Yes, certainly, sir. THE CHAIRMAN: Well, it caused it, did it not? If the systems had been on, everyone would know exactly where the chase started A. Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: and where the collision had taken place. What was your reaction, when you found out that the crew of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A. That's right. THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, (inaudible). A. And it was switched on afterwards apparently, once they were back into waters, and as they were towing in the - the crashed vessel. That's what I understand. THE CHAIRMAN: Did that not strike you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	A. That contributed to it. Yes, certainly, sir. THE CHAIRMAN: Well, it caused it, did it not? If the systems had been on, everyone would know exactly where the chase started A. Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: and where the collision had taken place. What was your	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	A. That's right. THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, (inaudible). A. And it was switched on afterwards apparently, once they were back into waters, and as they were towing in the - the crashed vessel. That's what I understand. THE CHAIRMAN: Did that not strike you as rather strange. A. Yes. Q. Why do you think it was switched off on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. That contributed to it. Yes, certainly, sir. THE CHAIRMAN: Well, it caused it, did it not? If the systems had been on, everyone would know exactly where the chase started A. Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: and where the collision had taken place. What was your reaction, when you found out that the crew of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. That's right. THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, (inaudible). A. And it was switched on afterwards apparently, once they were back into waters, and as they were towing in the - the crashed vessel. That's what I understand. THE CHAIRMAN: Did that not strike you as rather strange. A. Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	A. That contributed to it. Yes, certainly, sir. THE CHAIRMAN: Well, it caused it, did it not? If the systems had been on, everyone would know exactly where the chase started A. Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: and where the collision had taken place. What was your reaction, when you found out that the crew of your launch had not turned their systems on?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. That's right. THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, (inaudible). A. And it was switched on afterwards apparently, once they were back into waters, and as they were towing in the - the crashed vessel. That's what I understand. THE CHAIRMAN: Did that not strike you as rather strange. A. Yes. Q. Why do you think it was switched off on this occasion? A. I can't answer that question.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A. That contributed to it. Yes, certainly, sir. THE CHAIRMAN: Well, it caused it, did it not? If the systems had been on, everyone would know exactly where the chase started A. Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: and where the collision had taken place. What was your reaction, when you found out that the crew of your launch had not turned their systems on? A. I was not pleased at all, sir. THE CHAIRMAN: No. MR SANTOS: This sorry.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A. That's right. THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, (inaudible). A. And it was switched on afterwards apparently, once they were back into waters, and as they were towing in the - the crashed vessel. That's what I understand. THE CHAIRMAN: Did that not strike you as rather strange. A. Yes. Q. Why do you think it was switched off on this occasion? A. I can't answer that question. Q. Why do you think that officer felt
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. That contributed to it. Yes, certainly, sir. THE CHAIRMAN: Well, it caused it, did it not? If the systems had been on, everyone would know exactly where the chase started A. Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: and where the collision had taken place. What was your reaction, when you found out that the crew of your launch had not turned their systems on? A. I was not pleased at all, sir. THE CHAIRMAN: No. MR SANTOS: This sorry. THE CHAIRMAN: I think (?) someone has	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A. That's right. THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, (inaudible). A. And it was switched on afterwards apparently, once they were back into waters, and as they were towing in the - the crashed vessel. That's what I understand. THE CHAIRMAN: Did that not strike you as rather strange. A. Yes. Q. Why do you think it was switched off on this occasion? A. I can't answer that question.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A. That contributed to it. Yes, certainly, sir. THE CHAIRMAN: Well, it caused it, did it not? If the systems had been on, everyone would know exactly where the chase started A. Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: and where the collision had taken place. What was your reaction, when you found out that the crew of your launch had not turned their systems on? A. I was not pleased at all, sir. THE CHAIRMAN: No. MR SANTOS: This sorry.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A. That's right. THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, (inaudible). A. And it was switched on afterwards apparently, once they were back into waters, and as they were towing in the - the crashed vessel. That's what I understand. THE CHAIRMAN: Did that not strike you as rather strange. A. Yes. Q. Why do you think it was switched off on this occasion? A. I can't answer that question. Q. Why do you think that officer felt
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A. That contributed to it. Yes, certainly, sir. THE CHAIRMAN: Well, it caused it, did it not? If the systems had been on, everyone would know exactly where the chase started A. Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: and where the collision had taken place. What was your reaction, when you found out that the crew of your launch had not turned their systems on? A. I was not pleased at all, sir. THE CHAIRMAN: No. MR SANTOS: This sorry. THE CHAIRMAN: I think (?) someone has	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. That's right. THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, (inaudible). A. And it was switched on afterwards apparently, once they were back into waters, and as they were towing in the - the crashed vessel. That's what I understand. THE CHAIRMAN: Did that not strike you as rather strange. A. Yes. Q. Why do you think it was switched off on this occasion? A. I can't answer that question. Q. Why do you think that that officer felt that he was entitled to switch it off?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. That contributed to it. Yes, certainly, sir. THE CHAIRMAN: Well, it caused it, did it not? If the systems had been on, everyone would know exactly where the chase started A. Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: and where the collision had taken place. What was your reaction, when you found out that the crew of your launch had not turned their systems on? A. I was not pleased at all, sir. THE CHAIRMAN: No. MR SANTOS: This sorry. THE CHAIRMAN: I think (?) someone has suggested that there was a practice that that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. That's right. THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, (inaudible). A. And it was switched on afterwards apparently, once they were back into waters, and as they were towing in the - the crashed vessel. That's what I understand. THE CHAIRMAN: Did that not strike you as rather strange. A. Yes. Q. Why do you think it was switched off on this occasion? A. I can't answer that question. Q. Why do you think that that officer felt that he was entitled to switch it off? A. I can't - I can jump to some theory, but
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. That contributed to it. Yes, certainly, sir. THE CHAIRMAN: Well, it caused it, did it not? If the systems had been on, everyone would know exactly where the chase started A. Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: and where the collision had taken place. What was your reaction, when you found out that the crew of your launch had not turned their systems on? A. I was not pleased at all, sir. THE CHAIRMAN: No. MR SANTOS: This sorry. THE CHAIRMAN: I think (?) someone has suggested that there was a practice that that happened. Did you know of that practice?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. That's right. THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, (inaudible). A. And it was switched on afterwards apparently, once they were back into waters, and as they were towing in the - the crashed vessel. That's what I understand. THE CHAIRMAN: Did that not strike you as rather strange. A. Yes. Q. Why do you think it was switched off on this occasion? A. I can't answer that question. Q. Why do you think that that officer felt that he was entitled to switch it off? A. I can't - I can jump to some theory, but that would be - I don't know whether you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. That contributed to it. Yes, certainly, sir. THE CHAIRMAN: Well, it caused it, did it not? If the systems had been on, everyone would know exactly where the chase started A. Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: and where the collision had taken place. What was your reaction, when you found out that the crew of your launch had not turned their systems on? A. I was not pleased at all, sir. THE CHAIRMAN: No. MR SANTOS: This sorry. THE CHAIRMAN: I think (?) someone has suggested that there was a practice that that happened. Did you know of that practice? A. Not at all. I believe that there were	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. That's right. THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, (inaudible). A. And it was switched on afterwards apparently, once they were back into waters, and as they were towing in the - the crashed vessel. That's what I understand. THE CHAIRMAN: Did that not strike you as rather strange. A. Yes. Q. Why do you think it was switched off on this occasion? A. I can't answer that question. Q. Why do you think that that officer felt that he was entitled to switch it off? A. I can't - I can jump to some theory, but that would be - I don't know whether you want me to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. That contributed to it. Yes, certainly, sir. THE CHAIRMAN: Well, it caused it, did it not? If the systems had been on, everyone would know exactly where the chase started A. Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: and where the collision had taken place. What was your reaction, when you found out that the crew of your launch had not turned their systems on? A. I was not pleased at all, sir. THE CHAIRMAN: No. MR SANTOS: This sorry. THE CHAIRMAN: I think (?) someone has suggested that there was a practice that that happened. Did you know of that practice? A. Not at all. I believe that there were specific instructions that the AIS and those	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. That's right. THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, (inaudible). A. And it was switched on afterwards apparently, once they were back into waters, and as they were towing in the - the crashed vessel. That's what I understand. THE CHAIRMAN: Did that not strike you as rather strange. A. Yes. Q. Why do you think it was switched off on this occasion? A. I can't answer that question. Q. Why do you think that that officer felt that he was entitled to switch it off? A. I can't - I can jump to some theory, but that would be - I don't know whether you want me to THE CHAIRMAN: Well, never mind
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. That contributed to it. Yes, certainly, sir. THE CHAIRMAN: Well, it caused it, did it not? If the systems had been on, everyone would know exactly where the chase started A. Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: and where the collision had taken place. What was your reaction, when you found out that the crew of your launch had not turned their systems on? A. I was not pleased at all, sir. THE CHAIRMAN: No. MR SANTOS: This sorry. THE CHAIRMAN: I think (?) someone has suggested that there was a practice that that happened. Did you know of that practice? A. Not at all. I believe that there were specific instructions that the AIS and those satellite navigational aides had to be kept on.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. That's right. THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, (inaudible). A. And it was switched on afterwards apparently, once they were back into waters, and as they were towing in the - the crashed vessel. That's what I understand. THE CHAIRMAN: Did that not strike you as rather strange. A. Yes. Q. Why do you think it was switched off on this occasion? A. I can't answer that question. Q. Why do you think that that officer felt that he was entitled to switch it off? A. I can't - I can jump to some theory, but that would be - I don't know whether you want me to THE CHAIRMAN: Well, never mind jumping to a theory, one obvious explanation
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. That contributed to it. Yes, certainly, sir. THE CHAIRMAN: Well, it caused it, did it not? If the systems had been on, everyone would know exactly where the chase started A. Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: and where the collision had taken place. What was your reaction, when you found out that the crew of your launch had not turned their systems on? A. I was not pleased at all, sir. THE CHAIRMAN: No. MR SANTOS: This sorry. THE CHAIRMAN: I think (?) someone has suggested that there was a practice that that happened. Did you know of that practice? A. Not at all. I believe that there were specific instructions that the AIS and those satellite navigational aides had to be kept on. THE CHAIRMAN: And what steps did you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. That's right. THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, (inaudible). A. And it was switched on afterwards apparently, once they were back into waters, and as they were towing in the - the crashed vessel. That's what I understand. THE CHAIRMAN: Did that not strike you as rather strange. A. Yes. Q. Why do you think it was switched off on this occasion? A. I can't answer that question. Q. Why do you think that that officer felt that he was entitled to switch it off? A. I can't - I can jump to some theory, but that would be - I don't know whether you want me to THE CHAIRMAN: Well, never mind jumping to a theory, one obvious explanation is that he did not want anybody to find out
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. That contributed to it. Yes, certainly, sir. THE CHAIRMAN: Well, it caused it, did it not? If the systems had been on, everyone would know exactly where the chase started A. Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: and where the collision had taken place. What was your reaction, when you found out that the crew of your launch had not turned their systems on? A. I was not pleased at all, sir. THE CHAIRMAN: No. MR SANTOS: This sorry. THE CHAIRMAN: I think (?) someone has suggested that there was a practice that that happened. Did you know of that practice? A. Not at all. I believe that there were specific instructions that the AIS and those satellite navigational aides had to be kept on. THE CHAIRMAN: And what steps did you take towards the crew, when you found out	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. That's right. THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, (inaudible). A. And it was switched on afterwards apparently, once they were back into waters, and as they were towing in the - the crashed vessel. That's what I understand. THE CHAIRMAN: Did that not strike you as rather strange. A. Yes. Q. Why do you think it was switched off on this occasion? A. I can't answer that question. Q. Why do you think that that officer felt that he was entitled to switch it off? A. I can't - I can jump to some theory, but that would be - I don't know whether you want me to THE CHAIRMAN: Well, never mind jumping to a theory, one obvious explanation is that he did not want anybody to find out that he was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. That contributed to it. Yes, certainly, sir. THE CHAIRMAN: Well, it caused it, did it not? If the systems had been on, everyone would know exactly where the chase started A. Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: and where the collision had taken place. What was your reaction, when you found out that the crew of your launch had not turned their systems on? A. I was not pleased at all, sir. THE CHAIRMAN: No. MR SANTOS: This sorry. THE CHAIRMAN: I think (?) someone has suggested that there was a practice that that happened. Did you know of that practice? A. Not at all. I believe that there were specific instructions that the AIS and those satellite navigational aides had to be kept on. THE CHAIRMAN: And what steps did you take towards the crew, when you found out that they had not turned the systems on?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. That's right. THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, (inaudible). A. And it was switched on afterwards apparently, once they were back into waters, and as they were towing in the - the crashed vessel. That's what I understand. THE CHAIRMAN: Did that not strike you as rather strange. A. Yes. Q. Why do you think it was switched off on this occasion? A. I can't answer that question. Q. Why do you think that that officer felt that he was entitled to switch it off? A. I can't - I can jump to some theory, but that would be - I don't know whether you want me to THE CHAIRMAN: Well, never mind jumping to a theory, one obvious explanation is that he did not want anybody to find out that he was A. 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	A. That contributed to it. Yes, certainly, sir. THE CHAIRMAN: Well, it caused it, did it not? If the systems had been on, everyone would know exactly where the chase started A. Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: and where the collision had taken place. What was your reaction, when you found out that the crew of your launch had not turned their systems on? A. I was not pleased at all, sir. THE CHAIRMAN: No. MR SANTOS: This sorry. THE CHAIRMAN: I think (?) someone has suggested that there was a practice that that happened. Did you know of that practice? A. Not at all. I believe that there were specific instructions that the AIS and those satellite navigational aides had to be kept on. THE CHAIRMAN: And what steps did you take towards the crew, when you found out that they had not turned the systems on? A. I can't remember when I got to know,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. That's right. THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, (inaudible). A. And it was switched on afterwards apparently, once they were back into waters, and as they were towing in the - the crashed vessel. That's what I understand. THE CHAIRMAN: Did that not strike you as rather strange. A. Yes. Q. Why do you think it was switched off on this occasion? A. I can't answer that question. Q. Why do you think that that officer felt that he was entitled to switch it off? A. I can't - I can jump to some theory, but that would be - I don't know whether you want me to THE CHAIRMAN: Well, never mind jumping to a theory, one obvious explanation is that he did not want anybody to find out that he was A. That is THE CHAIRMAN: straying into Spanish

		1	1 : C D5724 W 1 1 1 1 14 1
1	A. That is my theory sir, but I cannot be	$\begin{vmatrix} 1\\2 \end{vmatrix}$	briefing, B5736. We have dealt with the
2	certain because I have not investigated that		coordinates question, sorry. B1757. This is
3	aspect of it. I - so I do not know what the	3	another email from Mr Pyle briefing the FCO
4	officers said in response. Although I know	4	and he says, "The AG and I received a further
5	now, but at the time, whether there was any	5	briefing from the Commissioner of Police
6	particular reason. But you can - if you want	6	this morning, and my request headlines are as
7	to look at it sinisterly, I - I agree with the	7	follows." And he says at the bottom of the
8	Chair Mr Chairman, that it could be	8	fourth paragraph, the largest one, "CoP
9	deemed to - to be a question of intentional	9	confirmed that the exact location has still to
10	switching off to cover your tracks.	10	be determined as were details of the chase,
11	Q. Has there been any analysis as to how	11	which lasted ten minutes." Why do you think
12	regularly AIS was switched off, up until that	12	that Mr Pyle was still briefing to that effect?
13	moment, on patrolling boats?	13	A. Because he's reffer he's referring to the
14	A. That featured part of the investigation,	14	exact location, and not a - previous
15	which was not completed by the time I	15	information that suggested that it was highly
16	finished service. I believe there is an	16	probable. He's now moved to briefing up in
17	analysis, which I've read, from the Solis	17	London that it was - the exact location was
18	report, and from the poss potentially from	18	still do be determined, and that is accurate.
19	the misconduct report, that capt captured	19	What he'd reported up to London was
20	the instances where there had been pursuits.	20	accurate.
21	I think it was in the region of 59 pursuits, if	21	Q. Now jumping to your third witness
22	I'm not mistaken. And, out of the 59 pursuits	22	statement, which you have in front of you,
23	57 occurred within Gibraltar territorial	23	paragraph 73, which is on page 77. In the
24	waters, with two (including the one in	24	preceding paragraph you refer to the
25	question) not occurring within British	25	"Maritime Incident" group, and at 73 you say
	Page 49		Page 51
1	Gibraltar Territorial Waters. Now, in those	1	that the Chief Minister messaged the group
2	figures, if I analyse those figures I see that,	2	saying, "Today I spoke to the British
3	by and large, the marine crews were	3	Ambassador in Madrid. He was having
4	compliant with the instructions, by - in vast	4	Interior Minister Grande Marlaska in for
5	sort of - in the vast amount of instances they	5	lunch today." Skip a sentence. "Anything I
6	were	6	can report on progress through that channel
7	Q. There was something I wanted to ask you	7	will be helpful, although, from what I
8	about that, we may as well turn to C5633,	8	understand, we have Spanish law
9	which I think is where we have the stats that	9	enforcement on side." And you say, " It
10	you referred to. And it is a credit to your	10	would be safe to assume that NP, as a
11	recollection, 3.17.6 is exactly that: 59 entries	11	Foreign Office Official was also in the same
12	involved a chase, two (including this case)	12	loop with the British Ambassador in Madrid
13	A. My recollection is because I read it very	13	or that at least the CM was in
14	recent very recently.	14	communications with NP - that was a safe
15	Q. It still has credit. My question to you is	15	assumption for me to make given NP's and
16	this: if there was a practice of switching off	16	the CM's messages to me regarding the
17	AIS, then would any patrols which had	17	talks/meetings in London and Madrid and
18	involved a switching-off of AIS show up	18	moreover that the AG, as legal advisor to
19	within those stats as having strayed into	19	both of them, was in communication with
20	Spanish waters?	20	them." I think it is obvious from that that Mr
21	A. I don't think they would. I mean, I'm not	21	Pyle was not in the "Maritime "Incident"
22	the technical expert here, but it makes -	22	WhatsApp group, is that correct?
23	seems to be that that would not show up.	23	A. That group - WhatsApp group - was
24	Q. Can you go to B1757, please. Sorry,	24	opened by Mr Picardo, after he
25	actually we were about to deal with your	25	communicated with Mr Britto, the Chairman
	_		_
	Page 50		Page 52
			13 (Pages 40 to 52)

1	of the Police Authority. I had no control of	1	to have occurred, rather.
2	who was given membership of that group.	2	Q. Do you have any clear recollection of
3	Q. I was just asking whether he was in there	3	informing him of that information verbally
4		4	before that point?
5	A. No, he wasn't.	5	A. Other than at the initial briefing, no,
6	Q just so that we know whether he	6	because I did not brief him face to face again.
7	received that message.	7	Q. Now, immediately after that you message
8	A. He wasn he wasn't.	8	the Attorney General. And let me just read
9	Q. You say that it is safe to assume that he	9	those, which are below. "HE Nick is asking
10	was in the loop, due to his contact with the	10	for confirmation of where collision took
11	Chief Minister and the Attorney General.	11	place, as London as keen to know. I have
12	But, do you think that it might have been	12	informed him along the same lines that you
13	better for you to make sure that he was up to	13	advised CM, ie that it is highly probably that
14	speed on all the best available information?	14	it happened outside BGTW." And the
15	A. Well, as far as I was concerned he was up	15	Attorney General responds, "Ian, that seems
16	to speed, as far as I'm concerned. That he	16	fine to me, factual whilst being amenable to
17	should have been member of that group,	17	further precision once you obtain further
18	absolutely. I would have - with hindsight, it	18	details." And you reply, "Ok".
19	would have saved me having to be	19	A. The word - the word "precision" there is -
20	communicating to both different sources.	20	is the key word, here. Because it suggests
21	Q. On 10 March, your only communications	21	that there was information which was not
22	with Mr Pyle appear to have been in relation	22	precise, but now what we were wanting was
23 24	to instructing the investigation team from the UK, I do not think we have to go to that. I	23 24	precision. And, the fact is that there was no further information or evidence to enhance
25	am going to move to 11 March 2020, if we	25	the - the picture, than what we had already
23	ani going to move to 11 March 2020, if we	23	the - the picture, than what we had an eady
	Page 53		Page 55
1	go to B1351 please. B1351. This is an	1	provided the high office holders of the
1 2	exchange between you and Mr Pyle on 11	1 2	Governor and the Chief Minister. There was
_	exchange between you and Mr Pyle on 11 March, and Mr Pyle says, "Ian, good to hear	2 3	Governor and the Chief Minister. There was no further - I could not add anything further
2 3 4	exchange between you and Mr Pyle on 11 March, and Mr Pyle says, "Ian, good to hear about progress re Met help. Are we clearer	2 3 4	Governor and the Chief Minister. There was no further - I could not add anything further to that, because I did not have anything
2 3 4 5	exchange between you and Mr Pyle on 11 March, and Mr Pyle says, "Ian, good to hear about progress re Met help. Are we clearer as to where the collision took place? London	2 3 4 5	Governor and the Chief Minister. There was no further - I could not add anything further to that, because I did not have anything further to share.
2 3 4 5 6	exchange between you and Mr Pyle on 11 March, and Mr Pyle says, "Ian, good to hear about progress re Met help. Are we clearer as to where the collision took place? London are keen to know whether it was inside or	2 3 4 5 6	Governor and the Chief Minister. There was no further - I could not add anything further to that, because I did not have anything further to share. (11.15)
2 3 4 5 6 7	exchange between you and Mr Pyle on 11 March, and Mr Pyle says, "Ian, good to hear about progress re Met help. Are we clearer as to where the collision took place? London are keen to know whether it was inside or outside the BGTW, and if the latter	2 3 4 5 6 7	Governor and the Chief Minister. There was no further - I could not add anything further to that, because I did not have anything further to share. (11.15) Q. Then if we can go to B100, please. This
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	exchange between you and Mr Pyle on 11 March, and Mr Pyle says, "Ian, good to hear about progress re Met help. Are we clearer as to where the collision took place? London are keen to know whether it was inside or outside the BGTW, and if the latter approximately by how far. Regards, Nick."	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Governor and the Chief Minister. There was no further - I could not add anything further to that, because I did not have anything further to share. (11.15) Q. Then if we can go to B100, please. This is the "Maritime Incident" group, and at the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	exchange between you and Mr Pyle on 11 March, and Mr Pyle says, "Ian, good to hear about progress re Met help. Are we clearer as to where the collision took place? London are keen to know whether it was inside or outside the BGTW, and if the latter approximately by how far. Regards, Nick." And you respond, "Nick, we are getting there	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Governor and the Chief Minister. There was no further - I could not add anything further to that, because I did not have anything further to share. (11.15) Q. Then if we can go to B100, please. This is the "Maritime Incident" group, and at the bottom of the page, 12 March, you say "All,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	exchange between you and Mr Pyle on 11 March, and Mr Pyle says, "Ian, good to hear about progress re Met help. Are we clearer as to where the collision took place? London are keen to know whether it was inside or outside the BGTW, and if the latter approximately by how far. Regards, Nick." And you respond, "Nick, we are getting there on establishing exact coordinates of where	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Governor and the Chief Minister. There was no further - I could not add anything further to that, because I did not have anything further to share. (11.15) Q. Then if we can go to B100, please. This is the "Maritime Incident" group, and at the bottom of the page, 12 March, you say "All, an update for your info." And if we go to the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	exchange between you and Mr Pyle on 11 March, and Mr Pyle says, "Ian, good to hear about progress re Met help. Are we clearer as to where the collision took place? London are keen to know whether it was inside or outside the BGTW, and if the latter approximately by how far. Regards, Nick." And you respond, "Nick, we are getting there on establishing exact coordinates of where the collision took place. We are tying up	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Governor and the Chief Minister. There was no further - I could not add anything further to that, because I did not have anything further to share. (11.15) Q. Then if we can go to B100, please. This is the "Maritime Incident" group, and at the bottom of the page, 12 March, you say "All, an update for your info." And if we go to the bottom of the page, "In terms of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	exchange between you and Mr Pyle on 11 March, and Mr Pyle says, "Ian, good to hear about progress re Met help. Are we clearer as to where the collision took place? London are keen to know whether it was inside or outside the BGTW, and if the latter approximately by how far. Regards, Nick." And you respond, "Nick, we are getting there on establishing exact coordinates of where the collision took place. We are tying up some loose ends and probing further from	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Governor and the Chief Minister. There was no further - I could not add anything further to that, because I did not have anything further to share. (11.15) Q. Then if we can go to B100, please. This is the "Maritime Incident" group, and at the bottom of the page, 12 March, you say "All, an update for your info." And if we go to the bottom of the page, "In terms of the investigation proper, the evidence means that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	exchange between you and Mr Pyle on 11 March, and Mr Pyle says, "Ian, good to hear about progress re Met help. Are we clearer as to where the collision took place? London are keen to know whether it was inside or outside the BGTW, and if the latter approximately by how far. Regards, Nick." And you respond, "Nick, we are getting there on establishing exact coordinates of where the collision took place. We are tying up some loose ends and probing further from WHSS, and should be able to confirm soon.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Governor and the Chief Minister. There was no further - I could not add anything further to that, because I did not have anything further to share. (11.15) Q. Then if we can go to B100, please. This is the "Maritime Incident" group, and at the bottom of the page, 12 March, you say "All, an update for your info." And if we go to the bottom of the page, "In terms of the investigation proper, the evidence means that pursuit and collision occurring outside
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	exchange between you and Mr Pyle on 11 March, and Mr Pyle says, "Ian, good to hear about progress re Met help. Are we clearer as to where the collision took place? London are keen to know whether it was inside or outside the BGTW, and if the latter approximately by how far. Regards, Nick." And you respond, "Nick, we are getting there on establishing exact coordinates of where the collision took place. We are tying up some loose ends and probing further from WHSS, and should be able to confirm soon. It is highly probable it did occur out BGTW.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Governor and the Chief Minister. There was no further - I could not add anything further to that, because I did not have anything further to share. (11.15) Q. Then if we can go to B100, please. This is the "Maritime Incident" group, and at the bottom of the page, 12 March, you say "All, an update for your info." And if we go to the bottom of the page, "In terms of the investigation proper, the evidence means that pursuit and collision occurring outside BTGW not the best news we wanted to hear."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	exchange between you and Mr Pyle on 11 March, and Mr Pyle says, "Ian, good to hear about progress re Met help. Are we clearer as to where the collision took place? London are keen to know whether it was inside or outside the BGTW, and if the latter approximately by how far. Regards, Nick." And you respond, "Nick, we are getting there on establishing exact coordinates of where the collision took place. We are tying up some loose ends and probing further from WHSS, and should be able to confirm soon. It is highly probable it did occur out BGTW. We are getting plotted, which will provide as	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Governor and the Chief Minister. There was no further - I could not add anything further to that, because I did not have anything further to share. (11.15) Q. Then if we can go to B100, please. This is the "Maritime Incident" group, and at the bottom of the page, 12 March, you say "All, an update for your info." And if we go to the bottom of the page, "In terms of the investigation proper, the evidence means that pursuit and collision occurring outside BTGW not the best news we wanted to hear." What new evidence prompted you to say
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	exchange between you and Mr Pyle on 11 March, and Mr Pyle says, "Ian, good to hear about progress re Met help. Are we clearer as to where the collision took place? London are keen to know whether it was inside or outside the BGTW, and if the latter approximately by how far. Regards, Nick." And you respond, "Nick, we are getting there on establishing exact coordinates of where the collision took place. We are tying up some loose ends and probing further from WHSS, and should be able to confirm soon. It is highly probable it did occur out BGTW. We are getting plotted, which will provide as better understanding in terms of distance	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Governor and the Chief Minister. There was no further - I could not add anything further to that, because I did not have anything further to share. (11.15) Q. Then if we can go to B100, please. This is the "Maritime Incident" group, and at the bottom of the page, 12 March, you say "All, an update for your info." And if we go to the bottom of the page, "In terms of the investigation proper, the evidence means that pursuit and collision occurring outside BTGW not the best news we wanted to hear." What new evidence prompted you to say that?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	exchange between you and Mr Pyle on 11 March, and Mr Pyle says, "Ian, good to hear about progress re Met help. Are we clearer as to where the collision took place? London are keen to know whether it was inside or outside the BGTW, and if the latter approximately by how far. Regards, Nick." And you respond, "Nick, we are getting there on establishing exact coordinates of where the collision took place. We are tying up some loose ends and probing further from WHSS, and should be able to confirm soon. It is highly probable it did occur out BGTW. We are getting plotted, which will provide as better understanding in terms of distance from BGTW. Best regards, Ian." Mr Pyle	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Governor and the Chief Minister. There was no further - I could not add anything further to that, because I did not have anything further to share. (11.15) Q. Then if we can go to B100, please. This is the "Maritime Incident" group, and at the bottom of the page, 12 March, you say "All, an update for your info." And if we go to the bottom of the page, "In terms of the investigation proper, the evidence means that pursuit and collision occurring outside BTGW not the best news we wanted to hear." What new evidence prompted you to say that? A. We still had no confirmation from the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	exchange between you and Mr Pyle on 11 March, and Mr Pyle says, "Ian, good to hear about progress re Met help. Are we clearer as to where the collision took place? London are keen to know whether it was inside or outside the BGTW, and if the latter approximately by how far. Regards, Nick." And you respond, "Nick, we are getting there on establishing exact coordinates of where the collision took place. We are tying up some loose ends and probing further from WHSS, and should be able to confirm soon. It is highly probable it did occur out BGTW. We are getting plotted, which will provide as better understanding in terms of distance from BGTW. Best regards, Ian." Mr Pyle says that this was the first time, nearly three	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Governor and the Chief Minister. There was no further - I could not add anything further to that, because I did not have anything further to share. (11.15) Q. Then if we can go to B100, please. This is the "Maritime Incident" group, and at the bottom of the page, 12 March, you say "All, an update for your info." And if we go to the bottom of the page, "In terms of the investigation proper, the evidence means that pursuit and collision occurring outside BTGW not the best news we wanted to hear." What new evidence prompted you to say that? A. We still had no confirmation from the Guardia Civil and, like I say, it was very
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	exchange between you and Mr Pyle on 11 March, and Mr Pyle says, "Ian, good to hear about progress re Met help. Are we clearer as to where the collision took place? London are keen to know whether it was inside or outside the BGTW, and if the latter approximately by how far. Regards, Nick." And you respond, "Nick, we are getting there on establishing exact coordinates of where the collision took place. We are tying up some loose ends and probing further from WHSS, and should be able to confirm soon. It is highly probable it did occur out BGTW. We are getting plotted, which will provide as better understanding in terms of distance from BGTW. Best regards, Ian." Mr Pyle	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Governor and the Chief Minister. There was no further - I could not add anything further to that, because I did not have anything further to share. (11.15) Q. Then if we can go to B100, please. This is the "Maritime Incident" group, and at the bottom of the page, 12 March, you say "All, an update for your info." And if we go to the bottom of the page, "In terms of the investigation proper, the evidence means that pursuit and collision occurring outside BTGW not the best news we wanted to hear." What new evidence prompted you to say that? A. We still had no confirmation from the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	exchange between you and Mr Pyle on 11 March, and Mr Pyle says, "Ian, good to hear about progress re Met help. Are we clearer as to where the collision took place? London are keen to know whether it was inside or outside the BGTW, and if the latter approximately by how far. Regards, Nick." And you respond, "Nick, we are getting there on establishing exact coordinates of where the collision took place. We are tying up some loose ends and probing further from WHSS, and should be able to confirm soon. It is highly probable it did occur out BGTW. We are getting plotted, which will provide as better understanding in terms of distance from BGTW. Best regards, Ian." Mr Pyle says that this was the first time, nearly three full days later, that you had disclosed to him	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Governor and the Chief Minister. There was no further - I could not add anything further to that, because I did not have anything further to share. (11.15) Q. Then if we can go to B100, please. This is the "Maritime Incident" group, and at the bottom of the page, 12 March, you say "All, an update for your info." And if we go to the bottom of the page, "In terms of the investigation proper, the evidence means that pursuit and collision occurring outside BTGW not the best news we wanted to hear." What new evidence prompted you to say that? A. We still had no confirmation from the Guardia Civil and, like I say, it was very regrettable that the AIS of the police boat had
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	exchange between you and Mr Pyle on 11 March, and Mr Pyle says, "Ian, good to hear about progress re Met help. Are we clearer as to where the collision took place? London are keen to know whether it was inside or outside the BGTW, and if the latter approximately by how far. Regards, Nick." And you respond, "Nick, we are getting there on establishing exact coordinates of where the collision took place. We are tying up some loose ends and probing further from WHSS, and should be able to confirm soon. It is highly probable it did occur out BGTW. We are getting plotted, which will provide as better understanding in terms of distance from BGTW. Best regards, Ian." Mr Pyle says that this was the first time, nearly three full days later, that you had disclosed to him information that you had since 0914 hours on	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Governor and the Chief Minister. There was no further - I could not add anything further to that, because I did not have anything further to share. (11.15) Q. Then if we can go to B100, please. This is the "Maritime Incident" group, and at the bottom of the page, 12 March, you say "All, an update for your info." And if we go to the bottom of the page, "In terms of the investigation proper, the evidence means that pursuit and collision occurring outside BTGW not the best news we wanted to hear." What new evidence prompted you to say that? A. We still had no confirmation from the Guardia Civil and, like I say, it was very regrettable that the AIS of the police boat had not been functioning for whatever the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	exchange between you and Mr Pyle on 11 March, and Mr Pyle says, "Ian, good to hear about progress re Met help. Are we clearer as to where the collision took place? London are keen to know whether it was inside or outside the BGTW, and if the latter approximately by how far. Regards, Nick." And you respond, "Nick, we are getting there on establishing exact coordinates of where the collision took place. We are tying up some loose ends and probing further from WHSS, and should be able to confirm soon. It is highly probable it did occur out BGTW. We are getting plotted, which will provide as better understanding in terms of distance from BGTW. Best regards, Ian." Mr Pyle says that this was the first time, nearly three full days later, that you had disclosed to him information that you had since 0914 hours on 8 March. Do you accept that? A. No, because he has already reported up to the Foreign Office on the 9th, at just before	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Governor and the Chief Minister. There was no further - I could not add anything further to that, because I did not have anything further to share. (11.15) Q. Then if we can go to B100, please. This is the "Maritime Incident" group, and at the bottom of the page, 12 March, you say "All, an update for your info." And if we go to the bottom of the page, "In terms of the investigation proper, the evidence means that pursuit and collision occurring outside BTGW not the best news we wanted to hear." What new evidence prompted you to say that? A. We still had no confirmation from the Guardia Civil and, like I say, it was very regrettable that the AIS of the police boat had not been functioning for whatever the reasons and we know now that it was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	exchange between you and Mr Pyle on 11 March, and Mr Pyle says, "Ian, good to hear about progress re Met help. Are we clearer as to where the collision took place? London are keen to know whether it was inside or outside the BGTW, and if the latter approximately by how far. Regards, Nick." And you respond, "Nick, we are getting there on establishing exact coordinates of where the collision took place. We are tying up some loose ends and probing further from WHSS, and should be able to confirm soon. It is highly probable it did occur out BGTW. We are getting plotted, which will provide as better understanding in terms of distance from BGTW. Best regards, Ian." Mr Pyle says that this was the first time, nearly three full days later, that you had disclosed to him information that you had since 0914 hours on 8 March. Do you accept that? A. No, because he has already reported up to the Foreign Office on the 9th, at just before eight o'clock in the morning, that the matter	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Governor and the Chief Minister. There was no further - I could not add anything further to that, because I did not have anything further to share. (11.15) Q. Then if we can go to B100, please. This is the "Maritime Incident" group, and at the bottom of the page, 12 March, you say "All, an update for your info." And if we go to the bottom of the page, "In terms of the investigation proper, the evidence means that pursuit and collision occurring outside BTGW not the best news we wanted to hear." What new evidence prompted you to say that? A. We still had no confirmation from the Guardia Civil and, like I say, it was very regrettable that the AIS of the police boat had not been functioning for whatever the reasons and we know now that it was purposely switched off, when the signals when the (Inaudible) signal station nicknamed Wendy (?) couldn't provide it and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	exchange between you and Mr Pyle on 11 March, and Mr Pyle says, "Ian, good to hear about progress re Met help. Are we clearer as to where the collision took place? London are keen to know whether it was inside or outside the BGTW, and if the latter approximately by how far. Regards, Nick." And you respond, "Nick, we are getting there on establishing exact coordinates of where the collision took place. We are tying up some loose ends and probing further from WHSS, and should be able to confirm soon. It is highly probable it did occur out BGTW. We are getting plotted, which will provide as better understanding in terms of distance from BGTW. Best regards, Ian." Mr Pyle says that this was the first time, nearly three full days later, that you had disclosed to him information that you had since 0914 hours on 8 March. Do you accept that? A. No, because he has already reported up to the Foreign Office on the 9th, at just before	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Governor and the Chief Minister. There was no further - I could not add anything further to that, because I did not have anything further to share. (11.15) Q. Then if we can go to B100, please. This is the "Maritime Incident" group, and at the bottom of the page, 12 March, you say "All, an update for your info." And if we go to the bottom of the page, "In terms of the investigation proper, the evidence means that pursuit and collision occurring outside BTGW not the best news we wanted to hear." What new evidence prompted you to say that? A. We still had no confirmation from the Guardia Civil and, like I say, it was very regrettable that the AIS of the police boat had not been functioning for whatever the reasons and we know now that it was purposely switched off, when the signals when the (Inaudible) signal station

1	assigned to this particular task of establishing	1	I only I qualify not only the collision
2	the or confirming the exact location,	2	occurred but also the chase, so our
3	because that was a key action and it is	3	hypothesis that there could have been
4	highlighted specifically by me that we	4	criminality in Gibraltar was done away with
5	wanted to determine the exact location as	5	and that had the consequence of releasing the
6	soon as possible, so I believe that the SIO	6	people that we had the two persons that
7	the provisional SIO, the senior investigating	7	we had under arrest, so it was not only
8	officer, assigned this particular task to a	8	confirmation of the collision
9	couple of officers, a detective sergeant I	9	Q. The collision
10	think it was Detective Sergeant Cotton or	10	A but the fact that the whole incident as
11	Garrett and they engaged with the police	11	a package has occurred outside.
12	with the port authority and through non-	12	Q. Can we now turn to A134, please, where
13	technical I suppose there is a technical	13	you set out your concluding points and it is
14	method but not relying on any plotting	14	paragraph 170 of your statement in front of
15	equipment, they used coastal commerce (?)	15	you and at 170A you say "The reasons for
16	with anchors off anchors on the eastern	16	Mr Pyle and the Chief Minister claiming that
17	anchorage to be able to try and relate and	17	I did not provide timely and accurate updates
18	come up and plot the more or less where the	18	to them on the collision at sea do not stack
19	collision occurred and that took its time and I	19	up. I provided information when this became
20	think I represented the efforts in this regard	20	available and was in very regular contact
21	by sharing the statement for the purpose of	21	with the AG who I knew was feeding
22	the inquiry of the port official I think it is	22	information up, though I now realise that I do
23	Mr Mandelberg, and I recall having been	23	not know the extent of the detail he passed
24	shown how they found out and it was quite	24	on. Attorneys General have always given the
25	good detective work in terms of because	25	incumbent governor legal advice. I
	Page 57		Page 59
1	the pictures are obviously on night vision	1	understand that this has been the case since
2	images but they were able to with the help	2	the office of the AG was first established
3	of the port authority and in conjunction with	3	when Gibraltar became a colony in 1830. If
4	the port authority the officers were able to	4	the current AG considers his loyalty is to the
5	confirm where and that was now hard	5	CM so that he may have withheld
6	evidence. The information had moved from	6	information from MP, then it is the AG and
7	the information stage to evidence and that is	7	not me who should have been brought to
8	important. In serious investigation like this,	8	task." Then at B, three lines from the bottom
9	whether it's a murder enquiry or whether it's -	9	of the page, "Again the AG who knew the
10	any major investigation you work on	10	level of information that I had was present
11	evidence and that is crucial in these things	11	during the times I met with MP to discuss the
12	because then working on information can	12	case. It is, therefore, incomprehensible that I
13	take you off the focus.	13	would act evasively towards MP with the AG
14	Q. So that is the evidence that prompted you	14	and others present. In any event, I was
15	to send that message?	15	totally oblivious of MP believing that I was
16	A. Yes.	16	disrespecting his post and this is simply
17	Q. And you say as well, just for clarity say,	17	because he gave me no indication that he was
18	in your evidence at paragraph 92 that you	18	unhappy with the way I was dealing with the
19	then spoke to Mr Pyle to update him in the	19	incident. I just wish he would have
20	same vein as you had the group?	20	challenged me on any of the issues of
21	A. That is correct and I think he accepts that.	21	concerns he now articulates at the time they
22	Q. Can we go to your third statement, right	22	occurred. I am convinced that I would not be
23	at the end, paragraph 170, A134 please.	23	in the position I am now had he done so."
24	A. I am sorry, Mr Santos, it is important to	24 25	Mr Pyle responds to this at A264 where he
25	highlight, because there's a distinction in that	23	says, "I note that the general theme running
	Page 58		Page 60

1 throughout Mr McGrail 3 is that Mr Llamas, 1 the expression that I am making there. 2 2 the AG, was my legal adviser and that IM Q. Can we go to B101 ----3 3 A. And in fact that is the case because had, therefore, assumed that the AG was 4 4 apparently there had been a meeting before relying to me all the information that IM was 5 passing to the AG, including information 5 and they waned a further briefing together 6 6 about the location of the collision on a timely one evening -----7 7 Q. Do you mean on 8 March? basis," and that his comments are, firstly at 8 8 A. Yes, they wanted further, so they were 19.1, "As the evidence shows I asked IM 9 directly on numerous occasions if he was 9 clearly discussing the matters and that is 10 10 able to confirm whether the incident had good. Don't get me wrong, I'm very, very 11 11 pleased that there was that interest expressed taken place in Spanish waters. On 11 March 12 2020, three days after the incident he was 12 for obvious reasons but it just cannot be 13 still telling that he was getting there. The 13 twisted to then say three months later ---14 14 simple fact is that I repeatedly asked IM a remember that this is three months later when 15 15 simple and direct question to which he did this is brought to my attention. 16 Q. Can we look at --- we will get to June but 16 not reply candidly with the best information 17 17 available to him. He withheld highly can we get to 101, please. This is the 18 relevant information from me." Then at 19.4 18 response by the Chief Minister to your 19 19 message that we looked at earlier on the he makes the point that the Attorney General 20 20 strength of the information at you have had is not the governor's lawyer in a normal 21 solicitor/client relationship and, therefore, it 21 from an analysis of the footage, you say that 22 22 it looks like the pursuit and collision is not safe to assume that the AG will pass 23 23 every --- all information up to him. What is occurred outside BTGW, or the evidence 24 24 points at the pursuit and collision occurring your response to that evidence of Mr Pyle? 25 25 A. Can we go to 19.1? outside BTGW, the response from the Chief Page 63 Page 61 1 Q. Yes, just after 19.1, please. 1 Minister is, "Thank you, Ian, location does 2 A. The numerous occasions are the 2 not worry me so much, helps us in a way, 3 3 occasions that I have --- that the Inquiry has will discuss directly with you." The Chief 4 before it, so the Inquiry will determine 4 Minister explained --- the Inquiry asked the 5 5 whether that is numerous or not. The Chief Minister to explain that and he does so 6 question that Mr Pyle is referring to is 6 at A230, paragraph 20 of his second witness 7 7 statement, and he says, "The reason I said the whether the incident had happened in 8 8 Spanish waters when Mr Pyle's aim is to ask location could help us was two-fold; first, in 9 9 for confirmation of where the incident has demonstrating to the general public in 10 10 occurred and the minister said in Spanish Gibraltar that in some instances police 11 waters, so I wanted to draw that distinction. 11 cooperation involves cross-border activity 12 The questions relating to the same 12 and that our own police may stray into 13 13 paragraphs there, all I can say is what I have Spanish waters in the same way [I believe he 14 already said that there was no evasiveness on 14 means to say] as Spanish officers often stray 15 my part and it's truly and deeply regrettable 15 into British Gibraltar territorial waters. 16 that Mr Pyle has felt like that and not brought 16 Secondly, I thought that although it would 17 17 it to my notice and the opportunity was cause huge diplomatic issues in the 18 clearly there. The question of the Attorney 18 negotiations on foot with Spain at the time, it 19 19 General feeding up, it's because at the point would be helpful in showing our Spanish 20 of writing the statement I am comfortable 20 counterparts that our police officers were 2.1 21 with what I have said there and then but in seeking out illicit activity." Do you agree 22 22 the meeting I am making the assumption that with the Chief Minister's explanation as to 23 --- and they are talking about the matter and I 23 why it helps in a way? 24 24 am making the assumption that they are A. I have got mixed views with that on the 25 talking about what I have briefed and that is 25 basis that at the time when I received it, it Page 62 Page 64

1	was reassuring that the Chief Minister was	1	responding to a situation described in the
2	supporting the police and the activities that	2	following paragraph, participating in a search
3	had been carried out and that gave me some	3	and rescue operation at the invitation of
4	peace of mind but, on the other hand, it was	4	Spanish authorities. As far as you are aware,
5	evident that this was a serious matter and that	5	were those instructions followed at all times?
6	there was reputational risk for the RGP and	6	A. The instructions are there and I expected
7	reputational risk for Gibraltar and serious	7	them to be followed all the time and I would
8	consequence for those involved. So, on the	8	have expected, if there were any breaches of
9	one hand, I was pleased that the Chief	9	them, depending on their gravity, to be
10	Minister was seemingly not too concerned, as	10	reported up.
11	he says, but, on the other hand, I knew that	11	Q. As far as you were aware, were they
12	this was going to have its consequences.	12	followed at all times?
13	Q. Can we now go to C4432 and the final	13	A. Yes.
14	paragraph, this is from the Solis report, and	14	Q. The draft Solis report made some
15	the final paragraph says it gives the	15	findings about high speed pursuits and about
16	coordinates, it says the coordinates are in	16	management oversight; for example, it found
17	Spanish waters, "At the relevant time, this	17	that there was no proper training in pursuit of
18	information was not available to the	18	suspect vessels, that pursuit methods were
19	command team as the police interceptors AIS	19	developed and understood by the coxswain's
20	had not been activated. That is contrary to	20	boat without RGP marine section
21	standing orders. It was assumed that the	21	management standards or proper established
22	collision was likely to have taken place	22	oversight in place and that the marine section
23	outside of BTGW as the radar screen and the	23	managers did not apply effective oversight
24	suspect vessel displayed coordinates	24	into how the patrols were being carried out.
25	indicating this but this required technical	25	In the final report that was changed to they
			1 8 7
	Page 65		Page 67
1	confirmation." How did how was the	1	aculd have more affective evereight into have
1		1	could have more effective oversight into how
2	radar screen of the suspect vessel obtained?	2	the patrols were being carried out. Do you
3	A. I do not know. What I do know is that the vessel was declared a crime scene as is	3	accept any responsibility for those failures? A. When there's audits carried out or
4		4 5	
5 6	standard practice and, therefore, nobody	6	investigations carried out, inevitably they are going to highlight and bring out areas for
7	touched anything there until the crime scene investigators took their time to process it. I	7	improvement or shortfalls that they have
8	do not know when that extraction of data		come across. Until such incident occurred,
9	took place and who did it. I do not know.	8 9	the marine section was ably functioning.
10	Q. I think that is	10	They were competent, capable, they were
11	A. Or when it happened. I do not know	11	pulling in many good results. The regrettable
12	when it happened.	12	and tragic circumstances of the collision
13	MR SANTOS: Thank you. I think that is	13	caused an audit to be carried out and I
14	probably a convenient moment to take our	1	
15	mid-morning break, sir.	14 15	wholeheartedly I was the person
16	THE CHAIRMAN: Very well, thank you.	16	requesting this audit to be carried out as part of an accident investigation but expecting
	(Short adjournment) 11.30 - 11.40	1	
17 18	IAN MCGRAIL (Continued):	17 18	fully expecting that there was going to be
19	Cross-examined by MR SANTOS	18	routine branch examination of the functions.
20	(Continued):	1	So I was anticipating that there was going to
21	Q. Can we turn to C5251, please, these are	20 21	be recommendations to tighten up in one area
22	the marine section instructions of 8 July 2016	21 22	or improve in another and, therefore, I have
23	which refer at 4 to officers not being	1	to agree that and accept that there are rooms -
23	authorised to operate outside BTGW and	23	that there is always room for improvement.
25	inside Spanish waters unless when	24	I stress that until such time as those until
23	mode opamon waters unless when	25	such time as the incident had occurred, the
	Page 66		Page 68
	<u> </u>		<u> </u>

1	section was weathing as for as I was	1	General would speak to the CM about
2	section was working as far as I was concerned in an effective and an efficient	1 2	whether he was content for the Met Police to
3		3	liaise with the YVSVU (?). Is that your
4	manner. Q. My question was whether you accept	4	evidence?
5	responsibility for those failings that had been	5	A. Yes, and I remember that because I
6	identified?	6	don't think that that deals with the claim,
7	A. I accept responsibility I am not going	7	does it? You can correct me if I am wrong.
8	to strike off responsibilities but if I didn't	8	Does it deal with the claim?
9	know that that was their shortfalls then I can't	9	Q. That does not deal with the claim, I am
10	I could not have been responsible for that.	10	going to come to that, but I just want to set
11	It is once you understand where the	11	out the
12	improvement can be made, whether you	12	A. Sorry, yes, yes.
13	accept them or not, but I will put it this way,	13	Q background.
14	I was not consciously allowing any	14	A. Indeed, that is correct. I met with him in
15	inefficiency or ineffectiveness of the marine	15	light of the independent teams from the
16	section, so I cannot say that I accepted the	16	Scotland Yard team that came over wanting
17	marine section running ineffectively or	17	to go and engage with the Spanish authorities
18	inappropriately. I cannot accept that. I don't	18	and obviously the sensitivities in relation to
19	accept that responsibility because that was	19	that, that I wanted to impart to the Chief
20	not my doing, that is not something that I	20	Minister.
21	would have agreed to. However, I do accept	21	Q. On 18 March
22	that there is room for improvement.	22	A. The reason why I didn't I would like to
23	Q. And, more generally, do you accept	23	explain the reason why I didn't do that
24	ultimate responsibility as head of the	24	directly with the Chief Minister. This was in
25	organisation for the collision at sea?	25	the eye of the storm of Covid and, as we
23	organisation for the complete at sea.	23	the eye of the storm of Covid and, as we
	Page 69		Page 71
1	A. Regrettably, again, no. I don't accept	1	know, that was quite a critical time for
2	responsibility for that. Those officers that	2	Gibraltar in adapting to social distancing and
3	went out that night, I am pretty sure that they	3	all the norms that kicked into place because
4	went out to do an honest night's shift, put in a	4	of that, briefing things in and out and it was a
5	normal night shift and did not set out to or	5	tough time for Gibraltar as indeed it was for
6	indeed expect that that was going to happen.	6	the rest of the world but I did meet with the
7	It's tragic, shocking for everybody, shocking	7	Attorney General and I said, "Look, this
8	for them, shocking for us, shocking for their	8	needs to be run through, at least as a courtesy
9	families, it is a tragic situation. At the same	9	to run through," and he did and he came back
10	time, individual officers have to be	10	saying that the Chief Minister was happy that
11	accountable for their actions in the same way	11	the officers went across and that there was no
12	as any firearms' officer or other officer	12	political concerns on his part.
13	engaged in any operational duties. I was	13	Q. On 18 March you reported to the
14	asleep at four o'clock in the morning when I	14	Attorney General that the Guardia Civil
15	was informed of this. I was at home asleep.	15	expected the family to file a complaint and
16	Q. Can we now turn to A85, please, we are	16	seek compensation and on the following day
17	moving on to the legal claims issue which is	17	we see you forwarding that message to Dr
18	the final issue under a sub-issue in relation to	18	Britto. That is not in your statement. I can
19	Operation Kram. Your evidence, which the	19	take you, if necessary, to the relevant
20	attorney general accepts is almost certainly	20	documents
21	correct, is that - and it is in paragraph 898 -	21	A. Sure.
22	that you met him on 17 March to discuss	22	Q. It is B98. I do not think that this is in
23	possible legal matters arising and the	23	dispute, I just wanted to give you
24	Attorney General told you that there was no need to see the CM and that the Attorney	24	A. Sorry, what is not in my statement, Mr
25	need to see the L.M. and that the Afforney	1 25	Santos?
	need to see the Civi and that the Attorney	25	Santos.

Q. I am taking you to B98 which is a 1 wanted to see whether there was a 2 2 message from you to the Attorney General of requirement to engage counsel, which in 3 3 11 March 2020 which sets out a message by normal situations such as this is provided by 4 4 you setting out an incident report and you the DPP's office, Crown Counsel, but the 5 highlight at the top of that page potential 5 DPP advised that it was still too early, that 6 legal matters arising which the Guardia Civil 6 the letter before me at the time, which I can't 7 had informed you about. 7 remember the date or the exact content, was 8 8 A. In Spain, yes. not a direct claim and the Attorney General 9 9 Q. In Spain, yes, and then there was at the contributed further to that saying that we still 10 10 time also contact from Verralls, the survivors hadn't had the investigation completed, let 11 11 as well as the families of the deceased. alone sort of consider anything, that we 12 12 A. That is right and I remember meeting on should wait for the conclusion by the 13 that notification from Verralls --- I remember 13 Scotland Yard of the investigation and have 14 14 meeting with the Attorney General and the the final report on it. 15 15 DPP. That was at my request, simply Q. Yes, you have explained that in your 16 16 evidence and I am just trying to speed things because I wanted to have --- even though 17 17 everything had grinded to a halt because of up by focusing on points of dispute but your 18 Covid, I wanted to have a strategy in place to 18 evidence is taken as read and you have 19 19 deal with issues like the diplomatic potential adopted it today. 20 20 A. Thank you. fall out or the consequences of action, legal 21 action in Spain, coronal inquest, potential 21 Q. I am not trying to gloss over that and it is 22 22 criminal liabilities if those are found to be the right for you to point that out but I am just 23 23 case and internal matters affecting the RGP going to skip forward to 14 May. At C3762 24 24 is the letter that comes in from Mr Fischel so I wanted to discuss this with the Attorney 25 25 General as I had been doing so throughout QC on behalf of one of the injured crew Page 73 Page 75 1 and to have something in place for when the 1 members. On the same day an article had 2 time came to be kicked into play. That is 2 appeared in El Faro de Ceuta referring to a 3 3 why I make reference to his counterpart in private prosecution in Spain by the family of 4 4 one of the deceased and there was also a the negotiation process with Spain on 5 5 requisite matters because it was the Attorney complaint --- or reference to a potential 6 General who imparted to me the fact that the 6 complaint in Gibraltar. This letter came in 7 7 Chief Minister was going to go along this on 14 May and you described it as a letter 8 8 route of explaining that even that it had before action. How did you interpret this 9 9 happened in Spanish waters, he was not too letter? 10 10 concerned because it would demonstrate A. A notification that the claim was 11 11 cooperation on organised criminal activity potentially heading our way. 12 which featured as part of the law 12 Q. Did you consider ----13 13 A. But that was qualified by the DPP who enforcement angle to those talks and which 14 you have read from Mr Picardo's statement. 14 said, "No, this is not a letter of action per se." 15 15 He said this is not --- the process --- I am not Q. Yes. 16 16 A. So when I --- I was --- Mr Llamas, when fully acquainted with civil claim procedures 17 I --- he told me that, he said, "There's no need 17 but I believe that there is a process where 18 18 for you to go and see the Chief Minister once the letter is --- the letter of claim is 19 19 because this is our position." activated and despatched, there are time 20 20 Q. Just to then skip forward to 14 May 2020, limits within which the respondent has to 21 21 there is a letter of --respond but that is my understanding but the 22 22 A. I am sorry, in answer to the question, DPP advised that this is not --- we are not 23 23 because I think I digressed, the question of tied --- we are not bound to anything, we are 24 24 the notification from Verralls, I met with doing what we are doing, we are 25 them and it was the DPP who said --- look, I 25 investigating, the data is being collected so Page 74 Page 76

1	:414	1	-h11it- 4- 4h - A.Ch4
1	it's not a question that we are not taking the	1	should write to the AG about representation
2	matter seriously, we are doing our own	2	because there was an issue of a potential
3	investigations, albeit for the coroner and any	3	conflict of Crown Counsel and he did so at
4	other jurisdiction that may be interested but	4	C4088. Given that we have jumped forward
5	that would also serve the question of feeding	5	about six days, did you consider informing
6	any potential civil claim later.	6	the Chief Minister of the position at any
7	Q. Did you consider at this stage referring	7	stage before 20 May, the date of
8	the matter directly to the Chief Minister? A. This particular matter, no, because I was	8	Superintendent Yeats' letter? A. Of course I would have because it's
9	under the comfortable belief that it was not a	9	
10		10	but it's not that I would have considered
11 12	firm letter of claim and that's the information	11 12	informing the Chief Minister to seek funding
13	that was being imparted to me by the DPP and the AG.	13	at that stage because the assignment to Mr Yeats was to establish that who is going to
13	Q. I will just give you time	14	represent the RGP, who is better placed to do
	A. I did, I think, before this letter before	15	
15 16	this letter, and you mentioned an article in El	16	that. He would explore those things unfortunately I don't know the reasons why
17	Faro, I may be mistaken but I am trying to	17	but there was a couple of days between when
18	piece everything together to assist the	18	he was able to raise it, probably diary
19	Inquiry. I think there was on 11 May or 9	19	commitments, but once he did and they
20	May a I did notify the Chief Minister that	20	arrived to the conclusion that the DPP's
21	there had been Parliamentary questions	21	OCPL would be conflicted, it was the DPP
22	raised by the right wing Vox party and I	22	who advised Mr Yeats - or rather, I am not
23	wrote to the Attorney General, to the Chief	23	sure who contacted the Attorney General. I
24	Minister and I think the Minister for Justice	24	am happy - I am not a micromanager and Mr
25	advising them, "Look, this has appeared." I	25	Yeats is a competent officer. His intelligence
23	auvising them, Look, this has appeared.	23	reats is a competent officer. This intelligence
	Page 77		Page 79
1	was alerted to it by my colleagues and I	1	and trustworthy, I left it in his capable hands
1 2	was alerted to it by my colleagues and I thought that that was relevant to bring up,	1 2	and trustworthy, I left it in his capable hands to return with whatever information h e was
	was alerted to it by my colleagues and I thought that that was relevant to bring up, "Look, Gibraltar is being mentioned in this		
2	thought that that was relevant to bring up,	2	to return with whatever information h e was
2 3	thought that that was relevant to bring up, "Look, Gibraltar is being mentioned in this	2 3	to return with whatever information h e was going to come back with as to how the RGP
2 3 4	thought that that was relevant to bring up, "Look, Gibraltar is being mentioned in this" it was information that I had received	2 3 4	to return with whatever information h e was going to come back with as to how the RGP was going to represented. It would have
2 3 4 5	thought that that was relevant to bring up, "Look, Gibraltar is being mentioned in this" it was information that I had received and it was worthy for me to and I think I	2 3 4 5	to return with whatever information h e was going to come back with as to how the RGP was going to represented. It would have been at that point, because if Mr Yeats comes
2 3 4 5 6	thought that that was relevant to bring up, "Look, Gibraltar is being mentioned in this" it was information that I had received and it was worthy for me to and I think I mentioned, "Look, I haven't raised it with his Excellency yet in case you want to do it directly with them."	2 3 4 5 6	to return with whatever information h e was going to come back with as to how the RGP was going to represented. It would have been at that point, because if Mr Yeats comes back and tells me: "Look, Crown Counsel is going to represent you," then I have got a firm footing of where we are and then I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	thought that that was relevant to bring up, "Look, Gibraltar is being mentioned in this" it was information that I had received and it was worthy for me to and I think I mentioned, "Look, I haven't raised it with his Excellency yet in case you want to do it directly with them." Q. Just to go through the timeline that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	to return with whatever information h e was going to come back with as to how the RGP was going to represented. It would have been at that point, because if Mr Yeats comes back and tells me: "Look, Crown Counsel is going to represent you," then I have got a firm footing of where we are and then I would be addressing matters both to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	thought that that was relevant to bring up, "Look, Gibraltar is being mentioned in this" it was information that I had received and it was worthy for me to and I think I mentioned, "Look, I haven't raised it with his Excellency yet in case you want to do it directly with them." Q. Just to go through the timeline that followed this letter, there was a reply from	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	to return with whatever information h e was going to come back with as to how the RGP was going to represented. It would have been at that point, because if Mr Yeats comes back and tells me: "Look, Crown Counsel is going to represent you," then I have got a firm footing of where we are and then I would be addressing matters both to Governor and to the Chief Minister, but we
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	thought that that was relevant to bring up, "Look, Gibraltar is being mentioned in this" it was information that I had received and it was worthy for me to and I think I mentioned, "Look, I haven't raised it with his Excellency yet in case you want to do it directly with them." Q. Just to go through the timeline that followed this letter, there was a reply from the RGP the following day with a holding	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	to return with whatever information h e was going to come back with as to how the RGP was going to represented. It would have been at that point, because if Mr Yeats comes back and tells me: "Look, Crown Counsel is going to represent you," then I have got a firm footing of where we are and then I would be addressing matters both to Governor and to the Chief Minister, but we were still finding out way there.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	thought that that was relevant to bring up, "Look, Gibraltar is being mentioned in this" it was information that I had received and it was worthy for me to and I think I mentioned, "Look, I haven't raised it with his Excellency yet in case you want to do it directly with them." Q. Just to go through the timeline that followed this letter, there was a reply from the RGP the following day with a holding response and that was forwarded by your PA	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	to return with whatever information h e was going to come back with as to how the RGP was going to represented. It would have been at that point, because if Mr Yeats comes back and tells me: "Look, Crown Counsel is going to represent you," then I have got a firm footing of where we are and then I would be addressing matters both to Governor and to the Chief Minister, but we were still finding out way there. (12.01)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	thought that that was relevant to bring up, "Look, Gibraltar is being mentioned in this" it was information that I had received and it was worthy for me to and I think I mentioned, "Look, I haven't raised it with his Excellency yet in case you want to do it directly with them." Q. Just to go through the timeline that followed this letter, there was a reply from the RGP the following day with a holding response and that was forwarded by your PA to Superintendent Yeats. Superintendent	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	to return with whatever information h e was going to come back with as to how the RGP was going to represented. It would have been at that point, because if Mr Yeats comes back and tells me: "Look, Crown Counsel is going to represent you," then I have got a firm footing of where we are and then I would be addressing matters both to Governor and to the Chief Minister, but we were still finding out way there. (12.01) Conversely, if it was external counsel that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	thought that that was relevant to bring up, "Look, Gibraltar is being mentioned in this" it was information that I had received and it was worthy for me to and I think I mentioned, "Look, I haven't raised it with his Excellency yet in case you want to do it directly with them." Q. Just to go through the timeline that followed this letter, there was a reply from the RGP the following day with a holding response and that was forwarded by your PA to Superintendent Yeats. Superintendent Yeats then emailed the DPP and sought a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	to return with whatever information h e was going to come back with as to how the RGP was going to represented. It would have been at that point, because if Mr Yeats comes back and tells me: "Look, Crown Counsel is going to represent you," then I have got a firm footing of where we are and then I would be addressing matters both to Governor and to the Chief Minister, but we were still finding out way there. (12.01) Conversely, if it was external counsel that had to be appointed I would have no doubt
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	thought that that was relevant to bring up, "Look, Gibraltar is being mentioned in this" it was information that I had received and it was worthy for me to and I think I mentioned, "Look, I haven't raised it with his Excellency yet in case you want to do it directly with them." Q. Just to go through the timeline that followed this letter, there was a reply from the RGP the following day with a holding response and that was forwarded by your PA to Superintendent Yeats. Superintendent Yeats then emailed the DPP and sought a meeting the following week, on 19 May.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	to return with whatever information h e was going to come back with as to how the RGP was going to represented. It would have been at that point, because if Mr Yeats comes back and tells me: "Look, Crown Counsel is going to represent you," then I have got a firm footing of where we are and then I would be addressing matters both to Governor and to the Chief Minister, but we were still finding out way there. (12.01) Conversely, if it was external counsel that had to be appointed I would have no doubt have made an approach advised through and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	thought that that was relevant to bring up, "Look, Gibraltar is being mentioned in this" it was information that I had received and it was worthy for me to and I think I mentioned, "Look, I haven't raised it with his Excellency yet in case you want to do it directly with them." Q. Just to go through the timeline that followed this letter, there was a reply from the RGP the following day with a holding response and that was forwarded by your PA to Superintendent Yeats. Superintendent Yeats then emailed the DPP and sought a meeting the following week, on 19 May. The DPP at that point told Superintendent	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	to return with whatever information h e was going to come back with as to how the RGP was going to represented. It would have been at that point, because if Mr Yeats comes back and tells me: "Look, Crown Counsel is going to represent you," then I have got a firm footing of where we are and then I would be addressing matters both to Governor and to the Chief Minister, but we were still finding out way there. (12.01) Conversely, if it was external counsel that had to be appointed I would have no doubt have made an approach advised through and hopefully seek support from the Police
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	thought that that was relevant to bring up, "Look, Gibraltar is being mentioned in this" it was information that I had received and it was worthy for me to and I think I mentioned, "Look, I haven't raised it with his Excellency yet in case you want to do it directly with them." Q. Just to go through the timeline that followed this letter, there was a reply from the RGP the following day with a holding response and that was forwarded by your PA to Superintendent Yeats. Superintendent Yeats then emailed the DPP and sought a meeting the following week, on 19 May. The DPP at that point told Superintendent Yeats that the OCPL might be conflicted and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	to return with whatever information h e was going to come back with as to how the RGP was going to represented. It would have been at that point, because if Mr Yeats comes back and tells me: "Look, Crown Counsel is going to represent you," then I have got a firm footing of where we are and then I would be addressing matters both to Governor and to the Chief Minister, but we were still finding out way there. (12.01) Conversely, if it was external counsel that had to be appointed I would have no doubt have made an approach advised through and hopefully seek support from the Police Authority to support a case for external
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	thought that that was relevant to bring up, "Look, Gibraltar is being mentioned in this" it was information that I had received and it was worthy for me to and I think I mentioned, "Look, I haven't raised it with his Excellency yet in case you want to do it directly with them." Q. Just to go through the timeline that followed this letter, there was a reply from the RGP the following day with a holding response and that was forwarded by your PA to Superintendent Yeats. Superintendent Yeats then emailed the DPP and sought a meeting the following week, on 19 May. The DPP at that point told Superintendent Yeats that the OCPL might be conflicted and said he would speak to the AG about that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	to return with whatever information h e was going to come back with as to how the RGP was going to represented. It would have been at that point, because if Mr Yeats comes back and tells me: "Look, Crown Counsel is going to represent you," then I have got a firm footing of where we are and then I would be addressing matters both to Governor and to the Chief Minister, but we were still finding out way there. (12.01) Conversely, if it was external counsel that had to be appointed I would have no doubt have made an approach advised through and hopefully seek support from the Police Authority to support a case for external counsel to be appointed and then as Minister
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	thought that that was relevant to bring up, "Look, Gibraltar is being mentioned in this" it was information that I had received and it was worthy for me to and I think I mentioned, "Look, I haven't raised it with his Excellency yet in case you want to do it directly with them." Q. Just to go through the timeline that followed this letter, there was a reply from the RGP the following day with a holding response and that was forwarded by your PA to Superintendent Yeats. Superintendent Yeats then emailed the DPP and sought a meeting the following week, on 19 May. The DPP at that point told Superintendent Yeats that the OCPL might be conflicted and said he would speak to the AG about that issue. Then later that day on 19 May Mr	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	to return with whatever information h e was going to come back with as to how the RGP was going to represented. It would have been at that point, because if Mr Yeats comes back and tells me: "Look, Crown Counsel is going to represent you," then I have got a firm footing of where we are and then I would be addressing matters both to Governor and to the Chief Minister, but we were still finding out way there. (12.01) Conversely, if it was external counsel that had to be appointed I would have no doubt have made an approach advised through and hopefully seek support from the Police Authority to support a case for external counsel to be appointed and then as Minister for Finance I would have had to make that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	thought that that was relevant to bring up, "Look, Gibraltar is being mentioned in this" it was information that I had received and it was worthy for me to and I think I mentioned, "Look, I haven't raised it with his Excellency yet in case you want to do it directly with them." Q. Just to go through the timeline that followed this letter, there was a reply from the RGP the following day with a holding response and that was forwarded by your PA to Superintendent Yeats. Superintendent Yeats then emailed the DPP and sought a meeting the following week, on 19 May. The DPP at that point told Superintendent Yeats that the OCPL might be conflicted and said he would speak to the AG about that issue. Then later that day on 19 May Mr Fischel sent another letter to Mr Yeats asking	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	to return with whatever information h e was going to come back with as to how the RGP was going to represented. It would have been at that point, because if Mr Yeats comes back and tells me: "Look, Crown Counsel is going to represent you," then I have got a firm footing of where we are and then I would be addressing matters both to Governor and to the Chief Minister, but we were still finding out way there. (12.01) Conversely, if it was external counsel that had to be appointed I would have no doubt have made an approach advised through and hopefully seek support from the Police Authority to support a case for external counsel to be appointed and then as Minister for Finance I would have had to make that direct approach to the Chief Minister.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	thought that that was relevant to bring up, "Look, Gibraltar is being mentioned in this" it was information that I had received and it was worthy for me to and I think I mentioned, "Look, I haven't raised it with his Excellency yet in case you want to do it directly with them." Q. Just to go through the timeline that followed this letter, there was a reply from the RGP the following day with a holding response and that was forwarded by your PA to Superintendent Yeats. Superintendent Yeats then emailed the DPP and sought a meeting the following week, on 19 May. The DPP at that point told Superintendent Yeats that the OCPL might be conflicted and said he would speak to the AG about that issue. Then later that day on 19 May Mr Fischel sent another letter to Mr Yeats asking for confirmation as to whether the Guardia	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	to return with whatever information h e was going to come back with as to how the RGP was going to represented. It would have been at that point, because if Mr Yeats comes back and tells me: "Look, Crown Counsel is going to represent you," then I have got a firm footing of where we are and then I would be addressing matters both to Governor and to the Chief Minister, but we were still finding out way there. (12.01) Conversely, if it was external counsel that had to be appointed I would have no doubt have made an approach advised through and hopefully seek support from the Police Authority to support a case for external counsel to be appointed and then as Minister for Finance I would have had to make that direct approach to the Chief Minister. Q. At C4090, what we know is that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	thought that that was relevant to bring up, "Look, Gibraltar is being mentioned in this" it was information that I had received and it was worthy for me to and I think I mentioned, "Look, I haven't raised it with his Excellency yet in case you want to do it directly with them." Q. Just to go through the timeline that followed this letter, there was a reply from the RGP the following day with a holding response and that was forwarded by your PA to Superintendent Yeats. Superintendent Yeats then emailed the DPP and sought a meeting the following week, on 19 May. The DPP at that point told Superintendent Yeats that the OCPL might be conflicted and said he would speak to the AG about that issue. Then later that day on 19 May Mr Fischel sent another letter to Mr Yeats asking for confirmation as to whether the Guardia Civil had requested the RGP to pursue the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	to return with whatever information h e was going to come back with as to how the RGP was going to represented. It would have been at that point, because if Mr Yeats comes back and tells me: "Look, Crown Counsel is going to represent you," then I have got a firm footing of where we are and then I would be addressing matters both to Governor and to the Chief Minister, but we were still finding out way there. (12.01) Conversely, if it was external counsel that had to be appointed I would have no doubt have made an approach advised through and hopefully seek support from the Police Authority to support a case for external counsel to be appointed and then as Minister for Finance I would have had to make that direct approach to the Chief Minister. Q. At C4090, what we know is that Superintendent Yeats emails the Attorney
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	thought that that was relevant to bring up, "Look, Gibraltar is being mentioned in this" it was information that I had received and it was worthy for me to and I think I mentioned, "Look, I haven't raised it with his Excellency yet in case you want to do it directly with them." Q. Just to go through the timeline that followed this letter, there was a reply from the RGP the following day with a holding response and that was forwarded by your PA to Superintendent Yeats. Superintendent Yeats then emailed the DPP and sought a meeting the following week, on 19 May. The DPP at that point told Superintendent Yeats that the OCPL might be conflicted and said he would speak to the AG about that issue. Then later that day on 19 May Mr Fischel sent another letter to Mr Yeats asking for confirmation as to whether the Guardia Civil had requested the RGP to pursue the vessel and again signalled an intention to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	to return with whatever information h e was going to come back with as to how the RGP was going to represented. It would have been at that point, because if Mr Yeats comes back and tells me: "Look, Crown Counsel is going to represent you," then I have got a firm footing of where we are and then I would be addressing matters both to Governor and to the Chief Minister, but we were still finding out way there. (12.01) Conversely, if it was external counsel that had to be appointed I would have no doubt have made an approach advised through and hopefully seek support from the Police Authority to support a case for external counsel to be appointed and then as Minister for Finance I would have had to make that direct approach to the Chief Minister. Q. At C4090, what we know is that Superintendent Yeats emails the Attorney General, the Attorney General forwards that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	thought that that was relevant to bring up, "Look, Gibraltar is being mentioned in this" it was information that I had received and it was worthy for me to and I think I mentioned, "Look, I haven't raised it with his Excellency yet in case you want to do it directly with them." Q. Just to go through the timeline that followed this letter, there was a reply from the RGP the following day with a holding response and that was forwarded by your PA to Superintendent Yeats. Superintendent Yeats then emailed the DPP and sought a meeting the following week, on 19 May. The DPP at that point told Superintendent Yeats that the OCPL might be conflicted and said he would speak to the AG about that issue. Then later that day on 19 May Mr Fischel sent another letter to Mr Yeats asking for confirmation as to whether the Guardia Civil had requested the RGP to pursue the vessel and again signalled an intention to issue a claim. On 20 May Superintendent	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	to return with whatever information h e was going to come back with as to how the RGP was going to represented. It would have been at that point, because if Mr Yeats comes back and tells me: "Look, Crown Counsel is going to represent you," then I have got a firm footing of where we are and then I would be addressing matters both to Governor and to the Chief Minister, but we were still finding out way there. (12.01) Conversely, if it was external counsel that had to be appointed I would have no doubt have made an approach advised through and hopefully seek support from the Police Authority to support a case for external counsel to be appointed and then as Minister for Finance I would have had to make that direct approach to the Chief Minister. Q. At C4090, what we know is that Superintendent Yeats emails the Attorney General, the Attorney General forwards that email to the Chief Minister, and the Chief
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	thought that that was relevant to bring up, "Look, Gibraltar is being mentioned in this" it was information that I had received and it was worthy for me to and I think I mentioned, "Look, I haven't raised it with his Excellency yet in case you want to do it directly with them." Q. Just to go through the timeline that followed this letter, there was a reply from the RGP the following day with a holding response and that was forwarded by your PA to Superintendent Yeats. Superintendent Yeats then emailed the DPP and sought a meeting the following week, on 19 May. The DPP at that point told Superintendent Yeats that the OCPL might be conflicted and said he would speak to the AG about that issue. Then later that day on 19 May Mr Fischel sent another letter to Mr Yeats asking for confirmation as to whether the Guardia Civil had requested the RGP to pursue the vessel and again signalled an intention to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	to return with whatever information h e was going to come back with as to how the RGP was going to represented. It would have been at that point, because if Mr Yeats comes back and tells me: "Look, Crown Counsel is going to represent you," then I have got a firm footing of where we are and then I would be addressing matters both to Governor and to the Chief Minister, but we were still finding out way there. (12.01) Conversely, if it was external counsel that had to be appointed I would have no doubt have made an approach advised through and hopefully seek support from the Police Authority to support a case for external counsel to be appointed and then as Minister for Finance I would have had to make that direct approach to the Chief Minister. Q. At C4090, what we know is that Superintendent Yeats emails the Attorney General, the Attorney General forwards that

1 1 which then gets sent back to Superintendent UK because of this Covid-19 crisis and 2 2 Yeats, we now have on screen and he says: because of the lockdown in UK they have 3 3 "I think it is entirely inappropriate for this been unable to progress the matter as 4 4 matter not to have been raised with me in the expeditiously as we all would have wanted. 5 first instance by the Commissioner. This 5 "The letter from local counsel representing 6 6 the families and suggesting a future claim for matter raises issues of fundamental human 7 7 damages was only received a few days ago, rights, the right to life, potential payment of 8 huge amounts of damages, the potential 8 which is what triggered our enquiry with the 9 9 extradition, of liberty of serving police DPP only yesterday concerning legal 10 10 officers being at stake, etc, etc," representations." 11 11 and he says: We have seen that after that you messaged "Indeed it is difficult to think of an issue as 12 12 the Attorney General expressing 13 fundamental as this affecting the RGP, 13 bewilderment at the Chief Minister's stance 14 14 certainly in the time that I have been in on this issue, and we have seen your 15 explanation there. I just wanted to ask you 15 office. There is no consideration in the email 16 16 below of claims or offences going beyond the what our reaction to the situation was and if 17 17 there is anything you wish to add to what you officers crewing the vessel, which is also in 18 my view an issue that may also need further 18 said in writing. 19 19 consideration. As you know, it comes A. Yes, it's very important that I provide the 20 20 against the backdrop of the very unflattering backdrop to - because of the dates here are 21 report from the HMIC FRS. I am therefore 21 proof. 20 May, the Chief Minister already 22 22 surprised and greatly disappointed that these knew that he didn't want me in post, that he 23 23 issues have not been the subject of detailed basically, to use Mr Pyle's --24 24 Q. Sorry, but I am - you will have the chance submission to me by the Commissioner in 25 25 respect of the events in question and the to say that. Page 81 Page 83 1 issues which now arise. I shall therefore be 1 A. Okay. 2 writing directly to the Commissioner on this 2 Q. But I just want to ask you whether there 3 3 was anything that you wanted to add in terms and all other aspects of this matter. In the 4 interim I do not authorise the incurring of 4 of at the time, because I do not think that you 5 5 - is your position that at the time you were any expenditure in briefing out of this matter 6 at this stage. Please refer both the DPP and 6 already aware that the Chief Minister wanted 7 7 to remove you from your post? Superintendent Yeats to my response." 8 8 That email unsurprisingly finds its way to A. No, but I was certainly aware that he was 9 9 you, and you respond at C4096, the second extremely, extremely disappointed and 10 10 email on that page - sorry, no, 4100 - that is angry, and this is why I am saying in the 11 the Chief Minister forwarding the email to 11 wake of the intervention on 12 May when, to 12 Mr Pyle, and in 4100 is your response. You 12 quote Miss Gallagher's opening address, "all 13 13 hell broke loose" and I took this approach 14 "You are evidently very disappointed but I 14 from the Chief Minister to be connected to 15 15 want to reassure you that it has never been that. His demeanour on this based on the fact 16 16 my intention to withhold anything from you that he had told me, the previous contact I 17 17 had had with him, that he wasn't too concerning this very serious matter. I 18 18 provided you with an overview of the day of concerned that it had happened in Spain, and 19 19 the incident, then engaged with the AG as per all of a sudden turn it upside down to be 20 20 your suggestion and have been doing so ever extremely, extremely angry about it, they 21 21 since. I will hopefully be in a better position didn't bond together. It was all to do of the 22 to brief you on the full details of the incident 22 intervention on 12 May in relation to 23 23 once I receive the report of the findings of an Operation Delhi, totally unrelated to this. 24 24 Q. The Chief Minister's evidence is that you independent investigation team who were 25 called in. This team had to return early to the 25 were making excuses for not having provided Page 82 Page 84

1	him with timely information about the claims	1	all areas for improvement highlighted in
2	and that the claims had been received some	2	2015 inspection, commencement date ASAP,
3	days earlier. What is your response to that?	3	completion date 1 March 2019, and then
4	A. The Chief Minister was angry with me	4	prepare for a further inspection
5	because he alleges that I lied to him, and that	5	commissioned by the GPA in 2020."
6	is in relation to Delhi. When I met with him	6	You accept in your evidence that you did not
7	on 12 May he did not mention Operation	7	create that working group. Why was setting
8	Kram, he did not mention the HMIC report,	8	up that working group not completed by the
9	which happened to be the two issues that I	9	time of the subsequent HMIC inspection?
10	am notified were the reasons for the loss of	10	A. It's important to contextualise the action
11	confidence. There was nothing else	11	plan, which was presented as plans are,
12	mentioned, and the evidence is there to be	12	rolling plans. They are not set in stone, and I
13		13	think I clarify that in my application, but that
	appreciated. I think there is no dispute there because those are the two reasons that I was	14	
14		15	is not referred to by Mr Pyle or Mr Picardo,
15	informed, and yet the Chief Minister did not	16	regrettably. They are not set in stone and so
16	raise either of the issues with me. In fact he	1	that was an action plan that I proposed to the
17	seems to be raising it with the - he mentions	17	Police Authority, which was accepted. It was
18	the Attorney General, the HMIC report,	18	subject to a two year review of my
19	mentions it with the Attorney General and he	19	performance, contrasting it with the plan, and
20	never discussed the matter with me at all, in	20	it was dependent on many other factors. I
21	any shape, way or form neither he nor Mr	21	believe that I do mention in my application
22	Pyle.	22	the impending human resources business
23	Q. Can we now turn to the HMIC report,	23	case that we had supplied, provided to
24	please. Can we go to your application for the	24	Government, back in 2015, which was taking
25	role of Commissioner of Police dated 2	25	too long for my liking and to my colleagues'
	Page 85		Page 87
1	November 2017, this is at C593. This is your	1	liking to be sort of ratified. In fact I think the
2	application and at (x) of your application you	2	then Minister for Justice commissioned an
3	refer to the HMIC recommendations and you	3	independent sort of assessment of our own
4	say:	4	business plan, which confirmed that the RGP
5	"The inspection of the RGP by HMIC in	5	was operating below par in terms of
6	2015 revealed various areas for	6	resources, in the region of 58, I think it was.
7	improvement. While some of these	7	But the plan, I don't think I need to delve into
8	recommendations have already been	8	the detail but suffice to say that I had to
9	addressed, there still remain some requiring	9	juggle with priorities and I had to consider
10	further action. It is imperative that a working	10	whether the priority - if I had the resources
11	group is created to see this project through.	11	that would have not been an issue but
12	In my view the most pressing area for	12	considering that I did not have the resources I
13	improvement as highlighted in one of the	13	had to juggle with priorities with regards to
14	recommendations is that of the creation of	14	compromise front line policing efforts, with
	manual of guidance which should represent	15	the consequence of what that brings in terms
15			
15 16	•	1	•
16	Force policy in crime investigation standards.	16	of crime detections, crime reductions and
16 17	Force policy in crime investigation standards. This will inherently make officers better at	16 17	of crime detections, crime reductions and community satisfaction of policing visibility
16 17 18	Force policy in crime investigation standards. This will inherently make officers better at conducting investigations and is positive for	16 17 18	of crime detections, crime reductions and community satisfaction of policing visibility and so forth, or remove resources to deal
16 17 18 19	Force policy in crime investigation standards. This will inherently make officers better at conducting investigations and is positive for their all round personal development."	16 17 18 19	of crime detections, crime reductions and community satisfaction of policing visibility and so forth, or remove resources to deal with this. I could not - I had to take that
16 17 18 19 20	Force policy in crime investigation standards. This will inherently make officers better at conducting investigations and is positive for their all round personal development." If we go four pages on to 597, you set out	16 17 18 19 20	of crime detections, crime reductions and community satisfaction of policing visibility and so forth, or remove resources to deal with this. I could not - I had to take that decision on that basis. I qualified even
16 17 18 19 20 21	Force policy in crime investigation standards. This will inherently make officers better at conducting investigations and is positive for their all round personal development." If we go four pages on to 597, you set out your action plan, and then 599, the entry at	16 17 18 19 20 21	of crime detections, crime reductions and community satisfaction of policing visibility and so forth, or remove resources to deal with this. I could not - I had to take that decision on that basis. I qualified even further in my application that policing, much
16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Force policy in crime investigation standards. This will inherently make officers better at conducting investigations and is positive for their all round personal development." If we go four pages on to 597, you set out your action plan, and then 599, the entry at number 10:	16 17 18 19 20 21 22	of crime detections, crime reductions and community satisfaction of policing visibility and so forth, or remove resources to deal with this. I could not - I had to take that decision on that basis. I qualified even further in my application that policing, much in the same way as perhaps politics, changes
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Force policy in crime investigation standards. This will inherently make officers better at conducting investigations and is positive for their all round personal development." If we go four pages on to 597, you set out your action plan, and then 599, the entry at number 10: "Key actions, HMIC recommendations,"	16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	of crime detections, crime reductions and community satisfaction of policing visibility and so forth, or remove resources to deal with this. I could not - I had to take that decision on that basis. I qualified even further in my application that policing, much in the same way as perhaps politics, changes every time. The demand
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Force policy in crime investigation standards. This will inherently make officers better at conducting investigations and is positive for their all round personal development." If we go four pages on to 597, you set out your action plan, and then 599, the entry at number 10: "Key actions, HMIC recommendations," and you say:	16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	of crime detections, crime reductions and community satisfaction of policing visibility and so forth, or remove resources to deal with this. I could not - I had to take that decision on that basis. I qualified even further in my application that policing, much in the same way as perhaps politics, changes every time. The demand Q. C594, just to help you out.
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Force policy in crime investigation standards. This will inherently make officers better at conducting investigations and is positive for their all round personal development." If we go four pages on to 597, you set out your action plan, and then 599, the entry at number 10: "Key actions, HMIC recommendations,"	16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	of crime detections, crime reductions and community satisfaction of policing visibility and so forth, or remove resources to deal with this. I could not - I had to take that decision on that basis. I qualified even further in my application that policing, much in the same way as perhaps politics, changes every time. The demand

O. In the conclusion, I think you are talking 1 bottom: 2 2 about the final three lines of the first "The RGP was therefore not due up for an 3 3 paragraph of your conclusion. inspection by HMICFRS at the time and I 4 4 was fully cognisant that there were pending A. I say: 5 "In policing things change very quickly, and 5 recommendations from the previous 6 therefore whilst the intention is to deliver on 6 inspection report of 2016 which needed 7 7 the stipulated actions unexpected exigencies actioning." 8 8 Given that it had, as you say, been a busy may warrant a review of these actions," 9 9 period and you had been unable to set up the so this is not an excuse, I am not using this as 10 10 an excuse but it is to give you context that working group to address the 11 11 recommendations of the previous report, why some actions were able to be addressed and 12 some others were not." 12 did you nevertheless think it was a good idea 13 The fact that I called the HMIC report, 13 to proceed with an inspection? 14 14 knowing that we are still not completed in A. That was the position that my command 15 15 total all the recommendations, although we team colleagues stressed to me, and 16 16 felt that we had achieved some progress and obviously with the benefit of hindsight I 17 17 they do also recognise the only thing is that could have taken more heed from them. But 18 they still felt that those recommendations that 18 I was insistent in bringing in the audit team 19 19 we had addressed required further because I wanted to be transparent, to be seen 20 20 improvement, which is acceptable. As I say, to be transparent, to be seen to be 21 I wasn't using this as an excuse but it just 21 progressive, in light of the atmosphere and 22 22 demonstrate operational - I give priority to the relationship, adverse relationship that 23 23 operational demands. If I am to be criticised existed with the then Police Federation. I tell 24 24 about that I will wholeheartedly accept that. you what my thought process is, which 25 25 I don't think that I did it wrong and I just unfortunately didn't work out, but my process Page 89 Page 91 1 simply wish that I would have had the 1 was: previous to the HMIC report I had 2 opportunity to explain this to the members of 2 commissioned a team of consultants, AAP 3 3 the Police Authority who were due to, in Associates, which were tasked with 4 accordance with the terms of my 4 providing context to the raw data produced 5 5 employment, to have examined me against by the Police Federation survey and to advise 6 this and any other thing that they wanted. 6 both me and the Federation in that matter. 7 7 That review never happened. Events took That team came in and interviewed over 150 8 8 officers, which was a significant sample of over, so I was not given an opportunity to 9 9 explain my rationale, whether they would the organisation. But at the same time I had 10 have accepted it or not. It seems, it seems, 10 it in mind that I wanted - so they were to 11 11 from my communications with the Police come and deal with internal service issues, 12 Authority that they were not that dissatisfied 12 and I wanted a baseline inspection of the 13 13 RGP by HMIC which would look at what 14 Q. We will get to that, Mr McGrail. 14 service they deliver to the public in terms of 15 15 A. I appreciate. public satisfaction, crime levels and so forth, 16 16 Q. I appreciate your intention to give a full and my thought process was: we have 17 17 answer but I just want to keep us moving already dealt with internal issues, let's deal 18 18 along, but we will get to that. Can we please with the external, marry them together and 19 19 go to A54, which is your third witness that will give us a very good picture of where 20 20 statement, paragraph 15, if you want it in the RGP is. Unfortunately the HMICFRS, 21 21 hard copy. This is where you address the Mr Holewell, advised the Authority that 22 request for HMIC FRS inspection, and you 22 conducting a baseline inspection was beyond 23 23 refer to the fact that it has been common to their financial scope - or rather, Mr Britto 24 24 voluntarily request inspections every four advised Mr Holewell, and so we went back to 25 years or so, and you say, four lines from the 25 the drawing board to suss out what inspection Page 90 Page 92

1	A MARCO III III M D W I I	,	
1	the HMIC could provide. Mr Britto had	1	suggested in the report whatsoever. In fact
2	some reservations that we won't subject the	2	the overview of the report suggested the RGP
3	organisation to two inspections within short	3	provides a good service to the people of
4	periods. My initial thought process was one	4	Gibraltar but it needs improvements. I want
5	that was going to look outwards and one that	5	to bring in the comments of
6	was looking inwards, and then marry the	6	Q. We will get to the comments, I promise.
7	results of both, so In that sense	7	I think you are going to talk about the
8	HMICFRS is more strategic than - they	8	comments from the Minister and from Dr
9	already spoke to, for example, 30 officers,	9	Britto. We will get to those. Let us just
10	they did not speak to as many officers that	10	focus on the report now, if you do not mind.
11	the AAP Consultancy Group did. So I am	11	Can we just go to C556 first of all, please,
12	just trying to keep my thread - perhaps	12	just to cover the timeline. HMIC conducted
13	talking too much.	13	its inspection in October 2018. You received
14	Q. No, I am definitely not going to criticise	14	a draft report in February 2020 and that is
15	you for not addressing the question. I think	15	shared with Dr Britto, and both you and Dr
16	you have explained - my next question was	16	Britto then make comments to HMIC in
17	going to refer to Mr Ullger's position, and Mr	17	advance of the final version being settled. At
18	Yeats goes further and says that the entire	18	C556, at the bottom of the page, there is
19	command team was uncomfortable with the	19	reference to an exchange between Dr Britto
20	idea, and Dr Britto had also expressed	20	and Paul Holewell, and Dr Britto actually
21	reservations. You may consider you have	21	sets out the email that he sent to Mr
22	already answered this question but why did	22	Holewell, and he says - one particular thing I
23	you proceed nevertheless?	23	want to focus on is that he says, the third
24	A. I was focused in showing the Police	24	paragraph:
25	Federation transparency, and in fact you	25	"I can only say that I found the language
	Page 93		Page 95
			Ü
1	mention Mr Ullger but the debrief that we	1	used to be quite unfortunate and I am quite
2	received from HMIC before they left after	2	sure the same message can be conveyed in a
3	concluding the inspection was a very - so	3	more constructive tone, especially when
4	positive that even Mr Ullger thought to	4	referring to issues such as corruption."
5	himself: "Well, he was right in calling it in."	5	Do you agree with Dr Britto's observations
6	But, look, with these things, in fact I was so	6	here that the language was unfortunate?
7	in a way gutted with the final report because	7	A. Wholeheartedly. I think Mr Britto, an
8	that was not certainly what was debriefed to	8	educationalist, was an English teacher and he
9	us. I don't know what happened in between.	9	can be the best judge of this type of
10	But, look, I don't know whether the Inquiry	10	terminology.
11	has spoken to HMI Matt Power as to whether	1 1 1	
		11	Q. Did you feel there that the Police
12	the report was sufficient to cause me to - to	12	Authority were supporting the RGP?
12 13			•
	the report was sufficient to cause me to - to be a cause for me to leave my job. I do not know what has been done in that regard.	12	Authority were supporting the RGP?
13	the report was sufficient to cause me to - to be a cause for me to leave my job. I do not	12 13	Authority were supporting the RGP? A. Yes, indeed. In fact we both met with the
13 14	the report was sufficient to cause me to - to be a cause for me to leave my job. I do not know what has been done in that regard.	12 13 14	Authority were supporting the RGP? A. Yes, indeed. In fact we both met with the Minister of Justice to discuss the report.
13 14 15	the report was sufficient to cause me to - to be a cause for me to leave my job. I do not know what has been done in that regard. Certainly what I do know, having worked	12 13 14 15	Authority were supporting the RGP? A. Yes, indeed. In fact we both met with the Minister of Justice to discuss the report. Although the Minister of Justice does not
13 14 15 16	the report was sufficient to cause me to - to be a cause for me to leave my job. I do not know what has been done in that regard. Certainly what I do know, having worked with HMIC in the past - I was with them in	12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Authority were supporting the RGP? A. Yes, indeed. In fact we both met with the Minister of Justice to discuss the report. Although the Minister of Justice does not feature in the Police Act, but it is a point of
13 14 15 16 17	the report was sufficient to cause me to - to be a cause for me to leave my job. I do not know what has been done in that regard. Certainly what I do know, having worked with HMIC in the past - I was with them in the team inspecting the Sovereign Base areas in Cyprus - is that if HMI would have had any doubts as to my ability to implement	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Authority were supporting the RGP? A. Yes, indeed. In fact we both met with the Minister of Justice to discuss the report. Although the Minister of Justice does not feature in the Police Act, but it is a point of reference for me when we would discuss
13 14 15 16 17 18	the report was sufficient to cause me to - to be a cause for me to leave my job. I do not know what has been done in that regard. Certainly what I do know, having worked with HMIC in the past - I was with them in the team inspecting the Sovereign Base areas in Cyprus - is that if HMI would have had	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Authority were supporting the RGP? A. Yes, indeed. In fact we both met with the Minister of Justice to discuss the report. Although the Minister of Justice does not feature in the Police Act, but it is a point of reference for me when we would discuss resourcing and the likes. Even the Minister
13 14 15 16 17 18 19	the report was sufficient to cause me to - to be a cause for me to leave my job. I do not know what has been done in that regard. Certainly what I do know, having worked with HMIC in the past - I was with them in the team inspecting the Sovereign Base areas in Cyprus - is that if HMI would have had any doubts as to my ability to implement those recommendations or any doubt as to whether I was capable of leading the RGP, he	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Authority were supporting the RGP? A. Yes, indeed. In fact we both met with the Minister of Justice to discuss the report. Although the Minister of Justice does not feature in the Police Act, but it is a point of reference for me when we would discuss resourcing and the likes. Even the Minister of Justice, Miss Sacramento, at the time said
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	the report was sufficient to cause me to - to be a cause for me to leave my job. I do not know what has been done in that regard. Certainly what I do know, having worked with HMIC in the past - I was with them in the team inspecting the Sovereign Base areas in Cyprus - is that if HMI would have had any doubts as to my ability to implement those recommendations or any doubt as to	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Authority were supporting the RGP? A. Yes, indeed. In fact we both met with the Minister of Justice to discuss the report. Although the Minister of Justice does not feature in the Police Act, but it is a point of reference for me when we would discuss resourcing and the likes. Even the Minister of Justice, Miss Sacramento, at the time said that although at face value the report didn't
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	the report was sufficient to cause me to - to be a cause for me to leave my job. I do not know what has been done in that regard. Certainly what I do know, having worked with HMIC in the past - I was with them in the team inspecting the Sovereign Base areas in Cyprus - is that if HMI would have had any doubts as to my ability to implement those recommendations or any doubt as to whether I was capable of leading the RGP, he	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Authority were supporting the RGP? A. Yes, indeed. In fact we both met with the Minister of Justice to discuss the report. Although the Minister of Justice does not feature in the Police Act, but it is a point of reference for me when we would discuss resourcing and the likes. Even the Minister of Justice, Miss Sacramento, at the time said that although at face value the report didn't make good reading, it had very easy fixes
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	the report was sufficient to cause me to - to be a cause for me to leave my job. I do not know what has been done in that regard. Certainly what I do know, having worked with HMIC in the past - I was with them in the team inspecting the Sovereign Base areas in Cyprus - is that if HMI would have had any doubts as to my ability to implement those recommendations or any doubt as to whether I was capable of leading the RGP, he would have put it in no uncertain terms, he	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Authority were supporting the RGP? A. Yes, indeed. In fact we both met with the Minister of Justice to discuss the report. Although the Minister of Justice does not feature in the Police Act, but it is a point of reference for me when we would discuss resourcing and the likes. Even the Minister of Justice, Miss Sacramento, at the time said that although at face value the report didn't make good reading, it had very easy fixes and that I should not worry. Q. Yes, we will take you to that message. Did Dr Britto at that time, when you were
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	the report was sufficient to cause me to - to be a cause for me to leave my job. I do not know what has been done in that regard. Certainly what I do know, having worked with HMIC in the past - I was with them in the team inspecting the Sovereign Base areas in Cyprus - is that if HMI would have had any doubts as to my ability to implement those recommendations or any doubt as to whether I was capable of leading the RGP, he would have put it in no uncertain terms, he would have put it in that report. The	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Authority were supporting the RGP? A. Yes, indeed. In fact we both met with the Minister of Justice to discuss the report. Although the Minister of Justice does not feature in the Police Act, but it is a point of reference for me when we would discuss resourcing and the likes. Even the Minister of Justice, Miss Sacramento, at the time said that although at face value the report didn't make good reading, it had very easy fixes and that I should not worry. Q. Yes, we will take you to that message.
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	the report was sufficient to cause me to - to be a cause for me to leave my job. I do not know what has been done in that regard. Certainly what I do know, having worked with HMIC in the past - I was with them in the team inspecting the Sovereign Base areas in Cyprus - is that if HMI would have had any doubts as to my ability to implement those recommendations or any doubt as to whether I was capable of leading the RGP, he would have put it in no uncertain terms, he would have put it in that report. The equivalent perhaps of saying a UK force	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Authority were supporting the RGP? A. Yes, indeed. In fact we both met with the Minister of Justice to discuss the report. Although the Minister of Justice does not feature in the Police Act, but it is a point of reference for me when we would discuss resourcing and the likes. Even the Minister of Justice, Miss Sacramento, at the time said that although at face value the report didn't make good reading, it had very easy fixes and that I should not worry. Q. Yes, we will take you to that message. Did Dr Britto at that time, when you were

1	the impression that he wanted to work with	1	I did not expect the report to end up like this,
2	you on addressing the recommendations?	2	I don't think anybody did, not even Mr Britto,
3	A. Certainly. He asked - I think he	3	and we tried to find out more about why the
4	communicated his desire for us to provide	4	tone and the level of - the depth of what they
5	him with a plan of how we were going to	5	were saying to try to understand it even
6	address the recommendations, and also some	6	further. But at the same time, whilst I
7	explanations, and rightly so, quizzing why	7	personally don't agree, I am not the subject
8	the other recommendations are not being	8	matter expert on this and I wholeheartedly
9	addressed or implemented, although	9	respect Her Majesty's Inspectorate of
10	achieved, the objective was achieved, yes.	10	Constabulary for their assessment.
11	Q. If you go to B1548, please, this is the	11	Q. If we go to A27, which is your first
12	final version of the HMIC report which was	12	witness statement, and paragraph 74, you
13	sent to you and Dr Britto in April 2020. If	13	say:
14	we go over two pages to 1550 there is a	14	"Although in places the report is critical,
15	summary set out there. I just want to read	15	there no express criticism of myself. I had
16	out the first two paragraphs:	16	been in post for 18 months at the time of the
17	"The first part of our report is about the	17	inspection."
18	progress the Royal Gibraltar Police has made	18	Would you agree or disagree that the leader
19	since our 2016 inspection. When we	19	of an organisation is ultimately responsible
20	revisited the Force in 2019 we found that it	20	for the conduct of that organisation?
21	had met two out of eight areas for	21	A. Depends what conduct you are referring
22	improvement. We expected the Force to	22	to. If it is in general, yes. If it is in
23	have done more to assess and understand	23	departmental silos, it all depends the conduct
24	demand, risk and vulnerability. We also	24	and the concern relating to that conduct,
25	expected it to be better at supervising	25	where is it pitched?
	B 05		D 00
	Page 97		Page 99
1	investigations and managing capacity. We	1	Q. Is this an example of you refusing to
2	have made five new recommendations	2	accept criticism, as the Attorney General has
3	relating to those issues.	3	alleged in his evidence?
4	"The second part of the report is a new	4	A. Absolutely not. I said it publicly that I
5	inspection of the Force's legitimacy. It	5	assumed the recommendations and I
6	includes eight areas for improvement and	6	welcomed them, that I don't necessarily agree
7	makes five recommendations intended to	7	of their understanding that we were not alive
8	help the Force better promote ethics, fairness	8	to corruption, I don't agree with, but I didn't
9	and transparency."	9	even speak to HMIC in that regard. If I had
10	Do you consider the conclusions of the	10	been asked, I would have expressed my
11	HMIC report were fair?	11	views. They may have captured that, which
12	A. Not entirely. Not as regards - but I will	12	is the way audits work, which I respect, but
13	let you take me to that. You were talking	13	there is documentation that I forwarded to
14	about we were going to get to the point of the	14	them which shows how the RGP, since I
15	corruption	15	joined at least, have dealt with corruption
16	Q. We will turn to that. I just wanted to ask	16	matters. I also suggested that there are
17	you whether you considered the methodology	17	previous Commissioners still alive that could
18	and the conclusions were fair. If you would	18	also speak out in respect of that. In fact
19	rather see the reference to corruption first,	19	corrupt practices in the RGP historically have
20	that is	20	been dealt with more robustly than
21	A. I will wait for you to take me to it when	21	sometimes other criminals have sort of been
22	it's convenient for you.	22	addressed. It's not something that - it did not
23	Q. If we look at 1552	23	resonate - the findings did not resonate with
24	A. I think in answer to your question	24	what I knew of the RGP. Does not mean to
25	whether I think it was fair or not, I think that	25	say I don't respect, because that is what they
	Page 98		Page 100
			25 (D 07 + 100)

1	and all that I was to see the second	1	the DCD
1	concluded, that doesn't mean to say that I	1	the RGP
2	don't respect that, I do. And if we had to	2	A. Sorry, Mr Santos, I am not with you, I am
3	work on evidently, what we did was react to	3	not with you.
4	that recommendation positively, we	4	Q. Sorry. Your third witness statement
5	embraced it, and we put in motion methods	5	A. Ah, third.
6	and we started considering dedicating	6	Q. Sorry.
7	resources, when we had them, to form what I	7	A. I beg your pardon.
8	believe now is - or to enhance the	8	Q. No, no, no, I should have been clearer.
9	professional standards department. Just to	9	A. Okay.
10	give you context. And it's always evolving	10	Q. Your third witness statement, paragraph
11	Q. Can I just - shall we just read the	11	16, at the bottom of the page, you say - you
12	paragraph and then you can carry on giving	12	refer to the GPF survey and the Panorama
13	your reaction to it.	13	newspaper, and at the third line you say:
14	A. Sure.	14	"The GPF survey had raised similar concerns
15	Q. B1552, it is the paragraph entitled:	15	and I therefore felt it was imperative to
16	"Role models. We were told of a firm	16	request an inspection to demonstrate
17	leadership style in the Force and some of the	17	openness, transparency and a willingness to
18	workforce perceived that some managers	18	progress. I know progress had been made
19	seek too readily to blame and reprimand. We	19	with the pending recommendations some of
20	didn't encounter any evidence of bullying,	20	which had been merged with daily business
21	although looking for it did not fall within our	21	activity, but further work was required to
22	terms of reference. Leadership development	22	catch up with progress that should have been
23	is an area of improvement for the Force and	23	made before my appointment."
24	it might benefit from exchanges with officers	24	Then you communicated your intentions to
25	in England and Wales about these subjects.	25	several individuals. So there it does appear
	Page 101		Page 103
			<u> </u>
1	Our additional recommendation is that the	1	from your evidence that you saw the HMIC
2	senior leadership team produce an anti-	2	inspection as a response to the GPF survey.
3	bullying statement and improve processes to	3	A. It was triggered not because of the GPF
4	prevent bullying."	4	survey on its own but obviously it had a
5	That is the bullying paragraph. We will deal	5	bearing. The GPF survey, the detail of it was
6	with bullying first of all. Why was bullying	6	dealt with by AAP, the AAP report. But to
7	not within the HMIC's terms of reference if	7	complement the AAP report which dealt with
8	the point of the inspection, according to your	8	internal - I wanted it to - it was a two prong
9	evidence, was to address the GPF surveys?	9	approach to this matter.
10	A. No, no, it wasn't to address the GPF	10	Q. Did you produce an anti-bullying
11	surveys. That was the purpose of the AAP	11	statement and improve processes, as the
12	Associates' assessment. I don't think we need	12	HMIC suggested?
13	to confuse the AAP Associates with the	13	A. I did, I think I messaged and I would be
14	HMIC inspection.	14	very grateful if it could be shown to the
15	Q. Can we just look at paragraph 16 of your	15	Inquiry. I think there is a (inaudible) entry
16	third witness statement. It is at A54. You	16	that I make.
17	say	17	Q. Sorry, a?
18	A. 54?	18	A. A (inaudible) is a weekly bulletin that is
19	Q. Yes, your first witness statement,	19	published in the RGP and it is - I
20	paragraph 16.	20	communicated it to the Force wide - and
21	A. 16?	21	perhaps I don't know whether the Inquiry has
22	Q. Yes. This is the paragraph after the one	22	benefitted from it yet or has perused it.
23	we read earlier about your decision to seek	23	(12.33)
24	an inspection, and you say:	24	Q. Well, perhaps we will find that over the
25	"Prior to the publication of the GPF survey	25	lunchbreak and if we can find it
	Page 102		Page 104
	- 480 102		
			26 (Pages 101 to 104)

1	A. Okay.	1	paragraph, which is at B1552. It says this,
2	Q we will show and we will liaise with	2	"Tackling misconduct and corruption. This
3	A. In a very strong message, it explains that	3	is an area for improvement. The Force
4	I what the Command Team and I felt about	4	doesn't fully understand its exposure to the
5	the question of bullying. That was not	5	risk of corruption. Its professional standards
6	regarded by HMIC as a bullying statement,	6	unit lacks the resource and expertise to
7	although when I did it, I felt that it did meet	7	develop a full understanding of the risk, or to
8	that criteria. Since then, there has been a	8	monitor and mitigate the threat. Our
9	studying of how to, in conjunction with the	9	recommendation is that the senior leadership
10	Police Federation, understand how bullying	10	team determine the best model for providing
11	at work in the UK police service operated	11	counter-corruption capability to identify and
12	and in fact I believe Mr Ullger asked the then	12	pursue corrupt employees or employees who
13	Chairman	13	are susceptible to corruption." Did you agree
14	Q. Was this during your time?	14	that the RGP did not fully understand its
15	A. Yes, yes, he was asked to look, to study	15	exposure to the risk of corruption?
16	how it's done through the Police Federation	16	A. I did not fully agree. What I agree and
17	of England and Wales, come back and let's	17	still believe in is that there is a lot of room
		18	
18	work together, because the Police Federation		for improvement. It doesn't say that the RGP
19	were proposing some guidelines which, in	19	that there was corruption in there, and this
20	my view, were not necessarily suitable for	20	is even captured by the complimentary
21	application in the Police Service. They were	21	message that I received from the previous
22	more akin to, perhaps, Civil Service. There	22	Governor. It doesn't say that there was
23	is a distinction in the job of a disciplined	23	corruption, but that we didn't understand the
24	uniformed service to that of the Civil	24	potential exposure to the risk of corruption.
25	Service. In the police you may have to bark	25	That is different to saying that they had
	Page 105		Page 107
1	out commands, whereas if the bark out	1	found corrupt practices. And I understand
1 2	out commands, whereas if the bark out commands in the Civil Service, it could be	1 2	found corrupt practices. And I understand where they're coming from, but I don't
2	commands in the Civil Service, it could be	2	where they're coming from, but I don't
			where they're coming from, but I don't necessarily whole-heartedly agreed.
2 3	commands in the Civil Service, it could be interpreted to be bullying, but not necessarily	2 3	where they're coming from, but I don't necessarily whole-heartedly agreed. Gibraltar has its advantages policing in
2 3 4	commands in the Civil Service, it could be interpreted to be bullying, but not necessarily is it so in I am just coming out this has just come to my head right now. This is not	2 3 4	where they're coming from, but I don't necessarily whole-heartedly agreed. Gibraltar has its advantages policing in Gibraltar has its advantages and
2 3 4 5	commands in the Civil Service, it could be interpreted to be bullying, but not necessarily is it so in I am just coming out this has	2 3 4 5	where they're coming from, but I don't necessarily whole-heartedly agreed. Gibraltar has its advantages policing in Gibraltar has its advantages and disadvantages, and one of the main
2 3 4 5 6	commands in the Civil Service, it could be interpreted to be bullying, but not necessarily is it so in I am just coming out this has just come to my head right now. This is not at all rehearsed. But I am just trying to draw	2 3 4 5 6	where they're coming from, but I don't necessarily whole-heartedly agreed. Gibraltar has its advantages policing in Gibraltar has its advantages and
2 3 4 5 6 7	commands in the Civil Service, it could be interpreted to be bullying, but not necessarily is it so in I am just coming out this has just come to my head right now. This is not at all rehearsed. But I am just trying to draw a distinction because they were trying to say	2 3 4 5 6 7	where they're coming from, but I don't necessarily whole-heartedly agreed. Gibraltar has its advantages — policing in Gibraltar has its advantages and disadvantages, and one of the main advantages is that we know each other. That
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	commands in the Civil Service, it could be interpreted to be bullying, but not necessarily is it so in I am just coming out this has just come to my head right now. This is not at all rehearsed. But I am just trying to draw a distinction because they were trying to say that there was a dignity at work group that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	where they're coming from, but I don't necessarily whole-heartedly agreed. Gibraltar has its advantages policing in Gibraltar has its advantages and disadvantages, and one of the main advantages is that we know each other. That can also play as a disadvantage, because it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	commands in the Civil Service, it could be interpreted to be bullying, but not necessarily is it so in I am just coming out this has just come to my head right now. This is not at all rehearsed. But I am just trying to draw a distinction because they were trying to say that there was a dignity at work group that was liaising with the Police Federation on	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	where they're coming from, but I don't necessarily whole-heartedly agreed. Gibraltar has its advantages policing in Gibraltar has its advantages and disadvantages, and one of the main advantages is that we know each other. That can also play as a disadvantage, because it doesn't you are policing your own back yard basically. But when it comes to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	commands in the Civil Service, it could be interpreted to be bullying, but not necessarily is it so in I am just coming out this has just come to my head right now. This is not at all rehearsed. But I am just trying to draw a distinction because they were trying to say that there was a dignity at work group that was liaising with the Police Federation on this matter. But I wanted the concept of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	where they're coming from, but I don't necessarily whole-heartedly agreed. Gibraltar has its advantages policing in Gibraltar has its advantages and disadvantages, and one of the main advantages is that we know each other. That can also play as a disadvantage, because it doesn't you are policing your own back
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	commands in the Civil Service, it could be interpreted to be bullying, but not necessarily is it so in I am just coming out this has just come to my head right now. This is not at all rehearsed. But I am just trying to draw a distinction because they were trying to say that there was a dignity at work group that was liaising with the Police Federation on this matter. But I wanted the concept of bullying as it occurred within the police	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	where they're coming from, but I don't necessarily whole-heartedly agreed. Gibraltar has its advantages — policing in Gibraltar has its advantages and disadvantages, and one of the main advantages is that we know each other. That can also play as a disadvantage, because it doesn't — you are policing your own back yard basically. But when it comes to identifying officers who may be derailing, it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	commands in the Civil Service, it could be interpreted to be bullying, but not necessarily is it so in I am just coming out this has just come to my head right now. This is not at all rehearsed. But I am just trying to draw a distinction because they were trying to say that there was a dignity at work group that was liaising with the Police Federation on this matter. But I wanted the concept of bullying as it occurred within the police world as opposed to any other generic, I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	where they're coming from, but I don't necessarily whole-heartedly agreed. Gibraltar has its advantages policing in Gibraltar has its advantages and disadvantages, and one of the main advantages is that we know each other. That can also play as a disadvantage, because it doesn't you are policing your own back yard basically. But when it comes to identifying officers who may be derailing, it is far easier to do it here than it is to do it in a larger territory for obvious reasons. If an
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	commands in the Civil Service, it could be interpreted to be bullying, but not necessarily is it so in I am just coming out this has just come to my head right now. This is not at all rehearsed. But I am just trying to draw a distinction because they were trying to say that there was a dignity at work group that was liaising with the Police Federation on this matter. But I wanted the concept of bullying as it occurred within the police world as opposed to any other generic, I wanted more specific. For some reason or	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	where they're coming from, but I don't necessarily whole-heartedly agreed. Gibraltar has its advantages policing in Gibraltar has its advantages and disadvantages, and one of the main advantages is that we know each other. That can also play as a disadvantage, because it doesn't you are policing your own back yard basically. But when it comes to identifying officers who may be derailing, it is far easier to do it here than it is to do it in a larger territory for obvious reasons. If an officer does not live work in the place, or
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	commands in the Civil Service, it could be interpreted to be bullying, but not necessarily is it so in I am just coming out this has just come to my head right now. This is not at all rehearsed. But I am just trying to draw a distinction because they were trying to say that there was a dignity at work group that was liaising with the Police Federation on this matter. But I wanted the concept of bullying as it occurred within the police world as opposed to any other generic, I wanted more specific. For some reason or another, that research by the Police Federation did not materialise. I do not know	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	where they're coming from, but I don't necessarily whole-heartedly agreed. Gibraltar has its advantages — policing in Gibraltar has its advantages and disadvantages, and one of the main advantages is that we know each other. That can also play as a disadvantage, because it doesn't — you are policing your own back yard basically. But when it comes to identifying officers who may be derailing, it is far easier to do it here than it is to do it in a larger territory for obvious reasons. If an officer does not live work in the place, or rather does not — works in a place where he
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	commands in the Civil Service, it could be interpreted to be bullying, but not necessarily is it so in I am just coming out this has just come to my head right now. This is not at all rehearsed. But I am just trying to draw a distinction because they were trying to say that there was a dignity at work group that was liaising with the Police Federation on this matter. But I wanted the concept of bullying as it occurred within the police world as opposed to any other generic, I wanted more specific. For some reason or another, that research by the Police Federation did not materialise. I do not know why. But we did improve on our procedures	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	where they're coming from, but I don't necessarily whole-heartedly agreed. Gibraltar has its advantages policing in Gibraltar has its advantages and disadvantages, and one of the main advantages is that we know each other. That can also play as a disadvantage, because it doesn't you are policing your own back yard basically. But when it comes to identifying officers who may be derailing, it is far easier to do it here than it is to do it in a larger territory for obvious reasons. If an officer does not live work in the place, or rather does not works in a place where he does not live, he's not probably known in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	commands in the Civil Service, it could be interpreted to be bullying, but not necessarily is it so in I am just coming out this has just come to my head right now. This is not at all rehearsed. But I am just trying to draw a distinction because they were trying to say that there was a dignity at work group that was liaising with the Police Federation on this matter. But I wanted the concept of bullying as it occurred within the police world as opposed to any other generic, I wanted more specific. For some reason or another, that research by the Police Federation did not materialise. I do not know why. But we did improve on our procedures in terms of grievances and bullying at work	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	where they're coming from, but I don't necessarily whole-heartedly agreed. Gibraltar has its advantages policing in Gibraltar has its advantages and disadvantages, and one of the main advantages is that we know each other. That can also play as a disadvantage, because it doesn't you are policing your own back yard basically. But when it comes to identifying officers who may be derailing, it is far easier to do it here than it is to do it in a larger territory for obvious reasons. If an officer does not live work in the place, or rather does not works in a place where he does not live, he's not probably known in those areas. He goes back to his county, or
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	commands in the Civil Service, it could be interpreted to be bullying, but not necessarily is it so in I am just coming out this has just come to my head right now. This is not at all rehearsed. But I am just trying to draw a distinction because they were trying to say that there was a dignity at work group that was liaising with the Police Federation on this matter. But I wanted the concept of bullying as it occurred within the police world as opposed to any other generic, I wanted more specific. For some reason or another, that research by the Police Federation did not materialise. I do not know why. But we did improve on our procedures	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	where they're coming from, but I don't necessarily whole-heartedly agreed. Gibraltar has its advantages policing in Gibraltar has its advantages and disadvantages, and one of the main advantages is that we know each other. That can also play as a disadvantage, because it doesn't you are policing your own back yard basically. But when it comes to identifying officers who may be derailing, it is far easier to do it here than it is to do it in a larger territory for obvious reasons. If an officer does not live work in the place, or rather does not works in a place where he does not live, he's not probably known in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	commands in the Civil Service, it could be interpreted to be bullying, but not necessarily is it so in I am just coming out this has just come to my head right now. This is not at all rehearsed. But I am just trying to draw a distinction because they were trying to say that there was a dignity at work group that was liaising with the Police Federation on this matter. But I wanted the concept of bullying as it occurred within the police world as opposed to any other generic, I wanted more specific. For some reason or another, that research by the Police Federation did not materialise. I do not know why. But we did improve on our procedures in terms of grievances and bullying at work and I think there were policies that were	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	where they're coming from, but I don't necessarily whole-heartedly agreed. Gibraltar has its advantages policing in Gibraltar has its advantages and disadvantages, and one of the main advantages is that we know each other. That can also play as a disadvantage, because it doesn't you are policing your own back yard basically. But when it comes to identifying officers who may be derailing, it is far easier to do it here than it is to do it in a larger territory for obvious reasons. If an officer does not live work in the place, or rather does not works in a place where he does not live, he's not probably known in those areas. He goes back to his county, or whatever, and there's an element of crossing
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	commands in the Civil Service, it could be interpreted to be bullying, but not necessarily is it so in I am just coming out this has just come to my head right now. This is not at all rehearsed. But I am just trying to draw a distinction because they were trying to say that there was a dignity at work group that was liaising with the Police Federation on this matter. But I wanted the concept of bullying as it occurred within the police world as opposed to any other generic, I wanted more specific. For some reason or another, that research by the Police Federation did not materialise. I do not know why. But we did improve on our procedures in terms of grievances and bullying at work and I think there were policies that were implemented during my time before I retired	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	where they're coming from, but I don't necessarily whole-heartedly agreed. Gibraltar has its advantages policing in Gibraltar has its advantages and disadvantages, and one of the main advantages is that we know each other. That can also play as a disadvantage, because it doesn't you are policing your own back yard basically. But when it comes to identifying officers who may be derailing, it is far easier to do it here than it is to do it in a larger territory for obvious reasons. If an officer does not live work in the place, or rather does not — works in a place where he does not live, he's not probably known in those areas. He goes back to his county, or whatever, and there's an element of crossing of lines and so in that regard I believe that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	commands in the Civil Service, it could be interpreted to be bullying, but not necessarily is it so in I am just coming out this has just come to my head right now. This is not at all rehearsed. But I am just trying to draw a distinction because they were trying to say that there was a dignity at work group that was liaising with the Police Federation on this matter. But I wanted the concept of bullying as it occurred within the police world as opposed to any other generic, I wanted more specific. For some reason or another, that research by the Police Federation did not materialise. I do not know why. But we did improve on our procedures in terms of grievances and bullying at work and I think there were policies that were implemented during my time before I retired to compliment the findings of the survey, that officers, were not fully acquainted with the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	where they're coming from, but I don't necessarily whole-heartedly agreed. Gibraltar has its advantages policing in Gibraltar has its advantages and disadvantages, and one of the main advantages is that we know each other. That can also play as a disadvantage, because it doesn't you are policing your own back yard basically. But when it comes to identifying officers who may be derailing, it is far easier to do it here than it is to do it in a larger territory for obvious reasons. If an officer does not live work in the place, or rather does not works in a place where he does not live, he's not probably known in those areas. He goes back to his county, or whatever, and there's an element of crossing of lines and so in that regard I believe that identifying officers with potential for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	commands in the Civil Service, it could be interpreted to be bullying, but not necessarily is it so in I am just coming out this has just come to my head right now. This is not at all rehearsed. But I am just trying to draw a distinction because they were trying to say that there was a dignity at work group that was liaising with the Police Federation on this matter. But I wanted the concept of bullying as it occurred within the police world as opposed to any other generic, I wanted more specific. For some reason or another, that research by the Police Federation did not materialise. I do not know why. But we did improve on our procedures in terms of grievances and bullying at work and I think there were policies that were implemented during my time before I retired to compliment the findings of the survey, that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	where they're coming from, but I don't necessarily whole-heartedly agreed. Gibraltar has its advantages policing in Gibraltar has its advantages and disadvantages, and one of the main advantages is that we know each other. That can also play as a disadvantage, because it doesn't you are policing your own back yard basically. But when it comes to identifying officers who may be derailing, it is far easier to do it here than it is to do it in a larger territory for obvious reasons. If an officer does not live work in the place, or rather does not works in a place where he does not live, he's not probably known in those areas. He goes back to his county, or whatever, and there's an element of crossing of lines and so in that regard I believe that identifying officers with potential for derailment, whether at all levels I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	commands in the Civil Service, it could be interpreted to be bullying, but not necessarily is it so in I am just coming out this has just come to my head right now. This is not at all rehearsed. But I am just trying to draw a distinction because they were trying to say that there was a dignity at work group that was liaising with the Police Federation on this matter. But I wanted the concept of bullying as it occurred within the police world as opposed to any other generic, I wanted more specific. For some reason or another, that research by the Police Federation did not materialise. I do not know why. But we did improve on our procedures in terms of grievances and bullying at work and I think there were policies that were implemented during my time before I retired to compliment the findings of the survey, that officers, were not fully acquainted with the grievance procedures, so we went into detail and into improving, and probably they've	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	where they're coming from, but I don't necessarily whole-heartedly agreed. Gibraltar has its advantages policing in Gibraltar has its advantages and disadvantages, and one of the main advantages is that we know each other. That can also play as a disadvantage, because it doesn't you are policing your own back yard basically. But when it comes to identifying officers who may be derailing, it is far easier to do it here than it is to do it in a larger territory for obvious reasons. If an officer does not live work in the place, or rather does not works in a place where he does not live, he's not probably known in those areas. He goes back to his county, or whatever, and there's an element of crossing of lines and so in that regard I believe that identifying officers with potential for derailment, whether at all levels I suppose, it is far easier to identify here.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	commands in the Civil Service, it could be interpreted to be bullying, but not necessarily is it so in I am just coming out this has just come to my head right now. This is not at all rehearsed. But I am just trying to draw a distinction because they were trying to say that there was a dignity at work group that was liaising with the Police Federation on this matter. But I wanted the concept of bullying as it occurred within the police world as opposed to any other generic, I wanted more specific. For some reason or another, that research by the Police Federation did not materialise. I do not know why. But we did improve on our procedures in terms of grievances and bullying at work and I think there were policies that were implemented during my time before I retired to compliment the findings of the survey, that officers, were not fully acquainted with the grievance procedures, so we went into detail	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	where they're coming from, but I don't necessarily whole-heartedly agreed. Gibraltar has its advantages policing in Gibraltar has its advantages and disadvantages, and one of the main advantages is that we know each other. That can also play as a disadvantage, because it doesn't you are policing your own back yard basically. But when it comes to identifying officers who may be derailing, it is far easier to do it here than it is to do it in a larger territory for obvious reasons. If an officer does not live work in the place, or rather does not works in a place where he does not live, he's not probably known in those areas. He goes back to his county, or whatever, and there's an element of crossing of lines and so in that regard I believe that identifying officers with potential for derailment, whether at all levels I suppose, it is far easier to identify here. Q. Can we go to B1578, please, the final
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	commands in the Civil Service, it could be interpreted to be bullying, but not necessarily is it so in I am just coming out this has just come to my head right now. This is not at all rehearsed. But I am just trying to draw a distinction because they were trying to say that there was a dignity at work group that was liaising with the Police Federation on this matter. But I wanted the concept of bullying as it occurred within the police world as opposed to any other generic, I wanted more specific. For some reason or another, that research by the Police Federation did not materialise. I do not know why. But we did improve on our procedures in terms of grievances and bullying at work and I think there were policies that were implemented during my time before I retired to compliment the findings of the survey, that officers, were not fully acquainted with the grievance procedures, so we went into detail and into improving, and probably they've even developed even further since I've left. Q. Can we now look at the corruption	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	where they're coming from, but I don't necessarily whole-heartedly agreed. Gibraltar has its advantages policing in Gibraltar has its advantages and disadvantages, and one of the main advantages is that we know each other. That can also play as a disadvantage, because it doesn't you are policing your own back yard basically. But when it comes to identifying officers who may be derailing, it is far easier to do it here than it is to do it in a larger territory for obvious reasons. If an officer does not live work in the place, or rather does not works in a place where he does not live, he's not probably known in those areas. He goes back to his county, or whatever, and there's an element of crossing of lines and so in that regard I believe that identifying officers with potential for derailment, whether at all levels I suppose, it is far easier to identify here. Q. Can we go to B1578, please, the final paragraph, the penultimate paragraph, the last two sentences say, "The Force's current
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	commands in the Civil Service, it could be interpreted to be bullying, but not necessarily is it so in I am just coming out this has just come to my head right now. This is not at all rehearsed. But I am just trying to draw a distinction because they were trying to say that there was a dignity at work group that was liaising with the Police Federation on this matter. But I wanted the concept of bullying as it occurred within the police world as opposed to any other generic, I wanted more specific. For some reason or another, that research by the Police Federation did not materialise. I do not know why. But we did improve on our procedures in terms of grievances and bullying at work and I think there were policies that were implemented during my time before I retired to compliment the findings of the survey, that officers, were not fully acquainted with the grievance procedures, so we went into detail and into improving, and probably they've even developed even further since I've left.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	where they're coming from, but I don't necessarily whole-heartedly agreed. Gibraltar has its advantages policing in Gibraltar has its advantages and disadvantages, and one of the main advantages is that we know each other. That can also play as a disadvantage, because it doesn't you are policing your own back yard basically. But when it comes to identifying officers who may be derailing, it is far easier to do it here than it is to do it in a larger territory for obvious reasons. If an officer does not live work in the place, or rather does not works in a place where he does not live, he's not probably known in those areas. He goes back to his county, or whatever, and there's an element of crossing of lines and so in that regard I believe that identifying officers with potential for derailment, whether at all levels I suppose, it is far easier to identify here. Q. Can we go to B1578, please, the final paragraph, the penultimate paragraph, the last

position is that individuals should recognise 1 another device. 2 2 and assess any risk and manage it Q. Perhaps a mobile, but I don't know 3 themselves. This position isn't appropriate 3 whether a laptop device may be different. I 4 4 and increases officers' personal exposure to don't know if you are able to assist on that? 5 allegations of corruption. We are concerned 5 A. I don't think that that was being referred 6 6 to in that context. If I am wrong, I don't -that RGP is not doing enough to counter the 7 risk of corruption. It should do more to 7 Q. I don't have any reason to disagree with 8 protect the public, its organisation and staff 8 you. I am just putting it there for your 9 9 from corruption and allegations of comments. 10 10 corruption." In Mr Pyle's letter to the GPA, A. That is, again, complete supposition. I 11 11 he addresses concern about the potential for don't think it was referring to laptops being 12 corruption and he says that it had, to quote 12 connected to ... no, no, no, I think it was 13 him, "tellingly remained unaddressed". Do 13 more of an officer using his personal mobile 14 14 you agree that this issue was unaddressed by device taking a snapshot of another mobile 15 15 the time of your departure? and that is, as well intended as it may be, is 16 16 A. I think Mr Pyle, with respect to him, is not as HMIC rightly points out, is not best 17 17 completely mistaken. He is interpreting that evidence standards. 18 this new recommendation had been in 18 Q. What did you do to discourage that going 19 19 existence from the previous report, that's forwards? 20 20 from my take of his statement, and that was A. Well, remember that this report came out 21 not the case. This new area for improvement 21 with very little time to react to it and 22 22 everything then went really pear-shaped after was a new area in the new inspection, so it 23 23 could not have been in place, as Mr Pyle 12 May. This claim, we started work on it, in 24 24 fact, we started working even before -alleges. And it was addressed as soon as we 25 25 came to know of this recommendation. Q. Yes, February 2020. Page 109 Page 111 1 Mechanisms were put in place to bridge 1 A. As soon as we had a whiff of what the 2 potential gaps. I agree that there was rooms 2 recommendations are, a team led with Mr 3 3 for improvement and I was happy to receive Ullger started working on to addressing 4 4 them. 5 5 Q. Can we go to 1562 please. Here, there is Q. Can we go to A109, which is your 6 a page from the report which includes a 6 witness statements, your third witness 7 7 statement at page 59 of your third witness section on investigative support. Just the 8 8 final paragraph there says, "We found statement. It should have "Efficiency" at the 9 9 officers using their personal devices to top of the page. Do you have that? 10 10 examine offender's phones. This isn't good A. Witness statement --11 practice and doesn't meet best evidence 11 Q. The third witness statement, page 59, or 12 standards." Were you aware of that practice? 12 if you have the A numbers, it is A109. 13 A. No, but I whole-heartedly agree with ... 13 A. Yes, got it. 14 14 if that practice was being played, I whole-Q. Then at (b) you say: 15 heartedly agree that that was not. From what 15 "I also alluded earlier on in my statement that 16 ... I've tried to understand the detail of what 16 I tried hard to improve on efficiencies by 17 that meant and it seems ... I seem to think 17 releasing sworn police officers to core 18 that there were instances where professional 18 policing duties with police support staff 19 19 standards were actioning some form of taking over roles which did not require to be 20 20 complaint, if I'm not mistaken, where an performed by warranted officers. For this to 2.1 officer had used his mobile device to 21 materialize I required the support from 22 22 screenshot, to take a screenshot of another HMGoG which unfortunately was not 23 phone, because I don't think personally, and I 23 forthcoming. I also presented a case to make 24 24 stand to be corrected, I don't think that any cost savings arising from the appointment of 25 personal device is capable of examining 25 GPF convenors but again did not receive the Page 110 Page 112

1	support required "	1	through the main themes of the war and St.
1 2	support required." Did you make these proposals to	1 2	through the main themes of the report. She,
	Government?	1	like Mr Britto, was very critical of the report
3 4	Government? A. Yes.	3 4	format and we discussed she asked, I told
5		5	her that I had already prepared a response
	Q. When did you do so?		plan and she asked for it to be forwarded to
6 7	A. On the question of returning back office	6	her and we did and there she was very supportive of seeing this through.
8	staff to frontline policing, that featured in the business case that was developed and then	7 8	Q. What about Dr Britto, was he supportive?
9	agreed upon and the question of the	9	
10	agreed upon and the question of the efficiencies on the GP convenors, I dealt with	10	A. Absolutely.
11	directly with the Chief Minister and then	11	Q. Did they express any concerns to you? A. No.
12	with the Chief Secretary I believe.	12	
13	Q. What was the Government's response to	13	Q. Can we go to C3344, please. This is an email from Mr Pyle to the Chief Minister on
13	your proposals?	14	30 April 2020, so the same day that you meet
15	A. Very favourable in both cases.	15	Minister Sacramento and Dr Britto. The
16	Q. Now, you referred to messages between	16	second paragraph says, "Having studied the
17	you and the then Minister of Justice,	17	report I find it to be quite damning and it will
18		18	need careful handling. In essence, HMIC
18	Samantha Sacramento, they are at C6503.	19	found the RGP to have only met two out of
20	This is two thirds of the way down the page at 1308. Minister Sacramento says, "The	20	the eight areas for improvement identified in
20	report is shocking reading on the face of it. I	20 21	
21 22	but if you analyse it deeper, it's not that	22	2016. My own sense is that HMIC were very disappointed indeed to find so little progress
22	bad and it has easy solutions." Then further	22 23	had been made since their last inspection.
23	on, three from the bottom, "It can all be	23	This is a shame and they are willingness to
25	fixed. Don't worry." Do you agree with the	25	help the RGP in the future may have
23	nacu. Don't wony. Do you agree with the	23	neip me Kor in me imare may have
	Page 113		Page 115
1	Minister of Justice that the report made for	1	diminished as a result. This is something we
2	shocking reading?	2	must help correct, but I don't think the issue
3	A. The language I think it's been said the	3	is as bad as the headline suggests and believe
4	language was too harsh.	4	it is an issue of culture and leadership more
5	Q. Did you feel reassured by the Minister's	5	than anything else. Most of the issues should
6	message?	6	be relatively easy to fix, though it will take a
7	A. Most certainly, and not only did she say	7	collective effort driven bottom up from
8	in there, she said it on live television during	8	within the RGP as much as from its
9	one of our joint briefings on Covid I think it	9	leadership which needs to be both more
10	was two days before the 11th. Maybe 9 May.	10	strategic and directive. Quite simply as I see
11	I stand to be corrected. It's contained in my	11	it, the RGP needs to modernise in all senses
12	statement, but she followed up a question	12	of the word." How do you respond to Mr
13	from a newspaper reporter, although the	13	Pyle's allegation that the report was
14	briefing was specific to Covid, the reporter	14	damning?
15	asked about the HMIC report and I	15	A. I agree because I thought it was damning
16	responded, and she picked up my response in	16	too, but he qualifies it that it's in much the
17	a very supportive way.	17	same way as Ms Sacramento did in that it
18	Q. There are also messages between you and	18	was not that bad when you dipped into the
19	Dr Britto which suggests that a meeting took	19	detail.
20	place between you, Dr Britto and Ms	20	Q. Do you think that you were the right
21	Sacramento on 30 April 2020 to discuss the	21	person to lead the RGP forward in this
22	HMIC report. Did that meeting go ahead	22	collective effort that he refers to?
23	and, if so, what was discussed?	23	A. I believe I was, yes.
24	A. Yes, that meeting did go ahead at her	24	Q. Can we go to C3420 now please. This is
25	offices in Governor's Parade and we went	25	at the bottom of the page, your email to Mr
	D		
	Page 114		Page 116
			29 (Pages 113 to 116)

1	Pyle, the Chief Minister, the Minister of	1	as you lean into taking forward HMIC's
2	Justice and Dr Britto on whether to publish	2	report." Given the resource capability
3	the report in full and you say, "I have no	3	pressures of assuring such a small national
4	major issues with the report being made	4	force, I judge the headlines are
5	public." Why did you want to publish the	5	fundamentally positive, being in step with the
6	report in full?	6	Force's unique challenges, but never an easy
7	A. That's the person I am. I want to be	7	read for the leadership and officers, as such
8	transparent to the community I served and	8	reports purposely focus on shortfalls and not
9	that's it basically. The bottom line.	9	successes. Corruption, well nothing wrong
10	Q. The report was sorry. Sorry to	10	with tightening mitigation, even if it is not a
11	interrupt.	11	problem today. So, as I know you and the
12	A. The community is perfectly entitled to	12	RGP will charge on by embracing, adapting
13	know. That's the purpose of bringing in an	13	and progressing, rooting for you from afar as
14	audit report. That in itself shows a	14	always, as you walk that path with belief and
15	willingness, albeit the result was not as what	15	pride. Warmest best to you and Diane. Ed."
16	I had expected, but my intention was that.	16	There is an extra comment there says, "PS,
17	Q. The report was published on 7 May 2020.	17	really enjoying not happy to read Panorama
18	What was your sense of public reaction to the	18	anymore." (Laughter)
19	report?	19	Q. I am not going to ask you to read out Mr
20	A. Sorry, what was your question?	20	Costa's message to you, but just for your
21	Q. Sorry, what was your sense of the public	21	benefit, it is at 36, which is on the previous
22	reaction to the report?	22	page.
23	A. Well, the public reacts to what is put out	23	A. Sorry, did you say you want me to read it
24	in the media and the media, we know, can	24	out?
25	make news can balance out the headlines	25	Q. I am not going to ask you. I highlighted
	Page 117		Page 119
1	in whatever fashion they believe. In fact, I	1	it. He says, "I will forever vouch for your
1 2	in whatever fashion they believe. In fact, I think, in one of the communications with Mr	1 2	it. He says, "I will forever vouch for your integrity on "
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
2	think, in one of the communications with Mr	2	integrity on "
2 3	think, in one of the communications with Mr Britto, he describes the Gibraltar Chronicle	2 3	integrity on " A. I think it is important in all fairness to
2 3 4	think, in one of the communications with Mr Britto, he describes the Gibraltar Chronicle report as "sensationalist". Perhaps for others	2 3 4	integrity on " A. I think it is important in all fairness to me. I'd feel better if I read it.
2 3 4 5	think, in one of the communications with Mr Britto, he describes the Gibraltar Chronicle report as "sensationalist". Perhaps for others that's a subjective sort of interpretation of	2 3 4 5	integrity on " A. I think it is important in all fairness to me. I'd feel better if I read it. Q. Well then go on, I will let you read it out.
2 3 4 5 6	think, in one of the communications with Mr Britto, he describes the Gibraltar Chronicle report as "sensationalist". Perhaps for others that's a subjective sort of interpretation of what people may whether they care,	2 3 4 5 6	integrity on " A. I think it is important in all fairness to me. I'd feel better if I read it. Q. Well then go on, I will let you read it out. A. I mean, it is for the public to know.
2 3 4 5 6 7	think, in one of the communications with Mr Britto, he describes the Gibraltar Chronicle report as "sensationalist". Perhaps for others that's a subjective sort of interpretation of what people may — whether they care, whether they don't, it's a very wide spectrum	2 3 4 5 6 7	integrity on " A. I think it is important in all fairness to me. I'd feel better if I read it. Q. Well then go on, I will let you read it out. A. I mean, it is for the public to know. That's the only reason.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	think, in one of the communications with Mr Britto, he describes the Gibraltar Chronicle report as "sensationalist". Perhaps for others that's a subjective sort of interpretation of what people may whether they care, whether they don't, it's a very wide spectrum to consider and very many variants. Just to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	integrity on " A. I think it is important in all fairness to me. I'd feel better if I read it. Q. Well then go on, I will let you read it out. A. I mean, it is for the public to know. That's the only reason. Q. No, no, that is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	think, in one of the communications with Mr Britto, he describes the Gibraltar Chronicle report as "sensationalist". Perhaps for others that's a subjective sort of interpretation of what people may whether they care, whether they don't, it's a very wide spectrum to consider and very many variants. Just to highlight before I forget because I don't	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	integrity on " A. I think it is important in all fairness to me. I'd feel better if I read it. Q. Well then go on, I will let you read it out. A. I mean, it is for the public to know. That's the only reason. Q. No, no, that is A. Can we move it up please.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	think, in one of the communications with Mr Britto, he describes the Gibraltar Chronicle report as "sensationalist". Perhaps for others that's a subjective sort of interpretation of what people may whether they care, whether they don't, it's a very wide spectrum to consider and very many variants. Just to highlight before I forget because I don't know whether you have or not, but the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	integrity on " A. I think it is important in all fairness to me. I'd feel better if I read it. Q. Well then go on, I will let you read it out. A. I mean, it is for the public to know. That's the only reason. Q. No, no, that is A. Can we move it up please. Q. I was going to highlight the relevant parts but A. It says, "My dear Ian, I cannot imagine
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	think, in one of the communications with Mr Britto, he describes the Gibraltar Chronicle report as "sensationalist". Perhaps for others that's a subjective sort of interpretation of what people may whether they care, whether they don't, it's a very wide spectrum to consider and very many variants. Just to highlight before I forget because I don't know whether you have or not, but the perception of Lieutenant General Ed Davis	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	integrity on " A. I think it is important in all fairness to me. I'd feel better if I read it. Q. Well then go on, I will let you read it out. A. I mean, it is for the public to know. That's the only reason. Q. No, no, that is A. Can we move it up please. Q. I was going to highlight the relevant parts but
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	think, in one of the communications with Mr Britto, he describes the Gibraltar Chronicle report as "sensationalist". Perhaps for others that's a subjective sort of interpretation of what people may — whether they care, whether they don't, it's a very wide spectrum to consider and very many variants. Just to highlight before I forget because I don't know whether you have or not, but the perception of Lieutenant General Ed Davis was more aligned to mine, than perhaps what the Chronicle's interpretation was. Mr Davis, if we could put up his message, I think it is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	integrity on " A. I think it is important in all fairness to me. I'd feel better if I read it. Q. Well then go on, I will let you read it out. A. I mean, it is for the public to know. That's the only reason. Q. No, no, that is A. Can we move it up please. Q. I was going to highlight the relevant parts but A. It says, "My dear Ian, I cannot imagine that with all of your hard work and untiring dedication that the report made for pleasant
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	think, in one of the communications with Mr Britto, he describes the Gibraltar Chronicle report as "sensationalist". Perhaps for others that's a subjective sort of interpretation of what people may — whether they care, whether they don't, it's a very wide spectrum to consider and very many variants. Just to highlight before I forget because I don't know whether you have or not, but the perception of Lieutenant General Ed Davis was more aligned to mine, than perhaps what the Chronicle's interpretation was. Mr Davis,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	integrity on " A. I think it is important in all fairness to me. I'd feel better if I read it. Q. Well then go on, I will let you read it out. A. I mean, it is for the public to know. That's the only reason. Q. No, no, that is A. Can we move it up please. Q. I was going to highlight the relevant parts but A. It says, "My dear Ian, I cannot imagine that with all of your hard work and untiring
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	think, in one of the communications with Mr Britto, he describes the Gibraltar Chronicle report as "sensationalist". Perhaps for others that's a subjective sort of interpretation of what people may — whether they care, whether they don't, it's a very wide spectrum to consider and very many variants. Just to highlight before I forget because I don't know whether you have or not, but the perception of Lieutenant General Ed Davis was more aligned to mine, than perhaps what the Chronicle's interpretation was. Mr Davis, if we could put up his message, I think it is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	integrity on " A. I think it is important in all fairness to me. I'd feel better if I read it. Q. Well then go on, I will let you read it out. A. I mean, it is for the public to know. That's the only reason. Q. No, no, that is A. Can we move it up please. Q. I was going to highlight the relevant parts but A. It says, "My dear Ian, I cannot imagine that with all of your hard work and untiring dedication that the report made for pleasant
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	think, in one of the communications with Mr Britto, he describes the Gibraltar Chronicle report as "sensationalist". Perhaps for others that's a subjective sort of interpretation of what people may whether they care, whether they don't, it's a very wide spectrum to consider and very many variants. Just to highlight before I forget because I don't know whether you have or not, but the perception of Lieutenant General Ed Davis was more aligned to mine, than perhaps what the Chronicle's interpretation was. Mr Davis, if we could put up his message, I think it is very pertinent now. In fact, Mr Costa too.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	integrity on " A. I think it is important in all fairness to me. I'd feel better if I read it. Q. Well then go on, I will let you read it out. A. I mean, it is for the public to know. That's the only reason. Q. No, no, that is A. Can we move it up please. Q. I was going to highlight the relevant parts but A. It says, "My dear Ian, I cannot imagine that with all of your hard work and untiring dedication that the report made for pleasant reading for you. For what it may be worth, I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	think, in one of the communications with Mr Britto, he describes the Gibraltar Chronicle report as "sensationalist". Perhaps for others that's a subjective sort of interpretation of what people may — whether they care, whether they don't, it's a very wide spectrum to consider and very many variants. Just to highlight before I forget because I don't know whether you have or not, but the perception of Lieutenant General Ed Davis was more aligned to mine, than perhaps what the Chronicle's interpretation was. Mr Davis, if we could put up his message, I think it is very pertinent now. In fact, Mr Costa too. Q. A63 please. This is an email sent by the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	integrity on " A. I think it is important in all fairness to me. I'd feel better if I read it. Q. Well then go on, I will let you read it out. A. I mean, it is for the public to know. That's the only reason. Q. No, no, that is A. Can we move it up please. Q. I was going to highlight the relevant parts but A. It says, "My dear Ian, I cannot imagine that with all of your hard work and untiring dedication that the report made for pleasant reading for you. For what it may be worth, I will forever vouch for your integrity, honesty and professionalism. If I can be of any assistance to you, you know where I am.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	think, in one of the communications with Mr Britto, he describes the Gibraltar Chronicle report as "sensationalist". Perhaps for others that's a subjective sort of interpretation of what people may — whether they care, whether they don't, it's a very wide spectrum to consider and very many variants. Just to highlight before I forget because I don't know whether you have or not, but the perception of Lieutenant General Ed Davis was more aligned to mine, than perhaps what the Chronicle's interpretation was. Mr Davis, if we could put up his message, I think it is very pertinent now. In fact, Mr Costa too. Q. A63 please. This is an email sent by the former Governor at the time, on 9 May. A. He's finished his tenure in I think end of February or mid-February, around that time	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	integrity on " A. I think it is important in all fairness to me. I'd feel better if I read it. Q. Well then go on, I will let you read it out. A. I mean, it is for the public to know. That's the only reason. Q. No, no, that is A. Can we move it up please. Q. I was going to highlight the relevant parts but A. It says, "My dear Ian, I cannot imagine that with all of your hard work and untiring dedication that the report made for pleasant reading for you. For what it may be worth, I will forever vouch for your integrity, honesty and professionalism. If I can be of any assistance to you, you know where I am. With kind regards, Neil."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	think, in one of the communications with Mr Britto, he describes the Gibraltar Chronicle report as "sensationalist". Perhaps for others that's a subjective sort of interpretation of what people may — whether they care, whether they don't, it's a very wide spectrum to consider and very many variants. Just to highlight before I forget because I don't know whether you have or not, but the perception of Lieutenant General Ed Davis was more aligned to mine, than perhaps what the Chronicle's interpretation was. Mr Davis, if we could put up his message, I think it is very pertinent now. In fact, Mr Costa too. Q. A63 please. This is an email sent by the former Governor at the time, on 9 May. A. He's finished his tenure in I think end of February or mid-February, around that time and it reads, "Dear Ian, just thought I'd touch	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. I think it is important in all fairness to me. I'd feel better if I read it. Q. Well then go on, I will let you read it out. A. I mean, it is for the public to know. That's the only reason. Q. No, no, that is A. Can we move it up please. Q. I was going to highlight the relevant parts but A. It says, "My dear Ian, I cannot imagine that with all of your hard work and untiring dedication that the report made for pleasant reading for you. For what it may be worth, I will forever vouch for your integrity, honesty and professionalism. If I can be of any assistance to you, you know where I am. With kind regards, Neil." Q. What about private reactions. Was there
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	think, in one of the communications with Mr Britto, he describes the Gibraltar Chronicle report as "sensationalist". Perhaps for others that's a subjective sort of interpretation of what people may whether they care, whether they don't, it's a very wide spectrum to consider and very many variants. Just to highlight before I forget because I don't know whether you have or not, but the perception of Lieutenant General Ed Davis was more aligned to mine, than perhaps what the Chronicle's interpretation was. Mr Davis, if we could put up his message, I think it is very pertinent now. In fact, Mr Costa too. Q. A63 please. This is an email sent by the former Governor at the time, on 9 May. A. He's finished his tenure in I think end of February or mid-February, around that time and it reads, "Dear Ian, just thought I'd touch base to first and foremost check you, Diane	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	integrity on " A. I think it is important in all fairness to me. I'd feel better if I read it. Q. Well then go on, I will let you read it out. A. I mean, it is for the public to know. That's the only reason. Q. No, no, that is A. Can we move it up please. Q. I was going to highlight the relevant parts but A. It says, "My dear Ian, I cannot imagine that with all of your hard work and untiring dedication that the report made for pleasant reading for you. For what it may be worth, I will forever vouch for your integrity, honesty and professionalism. If I can be of any assistance to you, you know where I am. With kind regards, Neil." Q. What about private reactions. Was there any criticism communicated to you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	think, in one of the communications with Mr Britto, he describes the Gibraltar Chronicle report as "sensationalist". Perhaps for others that's a subjective sort of interpretation of what people may — whether they care, whether they don't, it's a very wide spectrum to consider and very many variants. Just to highlight before I forget because I don't know whether you have or not, but the perception of Lieutenant General Ed Davis was more aligned to mine, than perhaps what the Chronicle's interpretation was. Mr Davis, if we could put up his message, I think it is very pertinent now. In fact, Mr Costa too. Q. A63 please. This is an email sent by the former Governor at the time, on 9 May. A. He's finished his tenure in I think end of February or mid-February, around that time and it reads, "Dear Ian, just thought I'd touch base to first and foremost check you, Diane and the family are well given the scourge of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	integrity on " A. I think it is important in all fairness to me. I'd feel better if I read it. Q. Well then go on, I will let you read it out. A. I mean, it is for the public to know. That's the only reason. Q. No, no, that is A. Can we move it up please. Q. I was going to highlight the relevant parts but A. It says, "My dear Ian, I cannot imagine that with all of your hard work and untiring dedication that the report made for pleasant reading for you. For what it may be worth, I will forever vouch for your integrity, honesty and professionalism. If I can be of any assistance to you, you know where I am. With kind regards, Neil." Q. What about private reactions. Was there any criticism communicated to you privately?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	think, in one of the communications with Mr Britto, he describes the Gibraltar Chronicle report as "sensationalist". Perhaps for others that's a subjective sort of interpretation of what people may — whether they care, whether they don't, it's a very wide spectrum to consider and very many variants. Just to highlight before I forget because I don't know whether you have or not, but the perception of Lieutenant General Ed Davis was more aligned to mine, than perhaps what the Chronicle's interpretation was. Mr Davis, if we could put up his message, I think it is very pertinent now. In fact, Mr Costa too. Q. A63 please. This is an email sent by the former Governor at the time, on 9 May. A. He's finished his tenure in I think end of February or mid-February, around that time and it reads, "Dear Ian, just thought I'd touch base to first and foremost check you, Diane and the family are well given the scourge of CV." Meaning Covid. "Well done in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	integrity on " A. I think it is important in all fairness to me. I'd feel better if I read it. Q. Well then go on, I will let you read it out. A. I mean, it is for the public to know. That's the only reason. Q. No, no, that is A. Can we move it up please. Q. I was going to highlight the relevant parts but A. It says, "My dear Ian, I cannot imagine that with all of your hard work and untiring dedication that the report made for pleasant reading for you. For what it may be worth, I will forever vouch for your integrity, honesty and professionalism. If I can be of any assistance to you, you know where I am. With kind regards, Neil." Q. What about private reactions. Was there any criticism communicated to you privately? A. No, none whatsoever.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	think, in one of the communications with Mr Britto, he describes the Gibraltar Chronicle report as "sensationalist". Perhaps for others that's a subjective sort of interpretation of what people may — whether they care, whether they don't, it's a very wide spectrum to consider and very many variants. Just to highlight before I forget because I don't know whether you have or not, but the perception of Lieutenant General Ed Davis was more aligned to mine, than perhaps what the Chronicle's interpretation was. Mr Davis, if we could put up his message, I think it is very pertinent now. In fact, Mr Costa too. Q. A63 please. This is an email sent by the former Governor at the time, on 9 May. A. He's finished his tenure in I think end of February or mid-February, around that time and it reads, "Dear Ian, just thought I'd touch base to first and foremost check you, Diane and the family are well given the scourge of CV." Meaning Covid. "Well done in managing it so well. And second, just to let	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	integrity on " A. I think it is important in all fairness to me. I'd feel better if I read it. Q. Well then go on, I will let you read it out. A. I mean, it is for the public to know. That's the only reason. Q. No, no, that is A. Can we move it up please. Q. I was going to highlight the relevant parts but A. It says, "My dear Ian, I cannot imagine that with all of your hard work and untiring dedication that the report made for pleasant reading for you. For what it may be worth, I will forever vouch for your integrity, honesty and professionalism. If I can be of any assistance to you, you know where I am. With kind regards, Neil." Q. What about private reactions. Was there any criticism communicated to you privately? A. No, none whatsoever. Q. Are you aware of any communications
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	think, in one of the communications with Mr Britto, he describes the Gibraltar Chronicle report as "sensationalist". Perhaps for others that's a subjective sort of interpretation of what people may — whether they care, whether they don't, it's a very wide spectrum to consider and very many variants. Just to highlight before I forget because I don't know whether you have or not, but the perception of Lieutenant General Ed Davis was more aligned to mine, than perhaps what the Chronicle's interpretation was. Mr Davis, if we could put up his message, I think it is very pertinent now. In fact, Mr Costa too. Q. A63 please. This is an email sent by the former Governor at the time, on 9 May. A. He's finished his tenure in I think end of February or mid-February, around that time and it reads, "Dear Ian, just thought I'd touch base to first and foremost check you, Diane and the family are well given the scourge of CV." Meaning Covid. "Well done in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	integrity on " A. I think it is important in all fairness to me. I'd feel better if I read it. Q. Well then go on, I will let you read it out. A. I mean, it is for the public to know. That's the only reason. Q. No, no, that is A. Can we move it up please. Q. I was going to highlight the relevant parts but A. It says, "My dear Ian, I cannot imagine that with all of your hard work and untiring dedication that the report made for pleasant reading for you. For what it may be worth, I will forever vouch for your integrity, honesty and professionalism. If I can be of any assistance to you, you know where I am. With kind regards, Neil." Q. What about private reactions. Was there any criticism communicated to you privately? A. No, none whatsoever.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	think, in one of the communications with Mr Britto, he describes the Gibraltar Chronicle report as "sensationalist". Perhaps for others that's a subjective sort of interpretation of what people may — whether they care, whether they don't, it's a very wide spectrum to consider and very many variants. Just to highlight before I forget because I don't know whether you have or not, but the perception of Lieutenant General Ed Davis was more aligned to mine, than perhaps what the Chronicle's interpretation was. Mr Davis, if we could put up his message, I think it is very pertinent now. In fact, Mr Costa too. Q. A63 please. This is an email sent by the former Governor at the time, on 9 May. A. He's finished his tenure in I think end of February or mid-February, around that time and it reads, "Dear Ian, just thought I'd touch base to first and foremost check you, Diane and the family are well given the scourge of CV." Meaning Covid. "Well done in managing it so well. And second, just to let	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	integrity on " A. I think it is important in all fairness to me. I'd feel better if I read it. Q. Well then go on, I will let you read it out. A. I mean, it is for the public to know. That's the only reason. Q. No, no, that is A. Can we move it up please. Q. I was going to highlight the relevant parts but A. It says, "My dear Ian, I cannot imagine that with all of your hard work and untiring dedication that the report made for pleasant reading for you. For what it may be worth, I will forever vouch for your integrity, honesty and professionalism. If I can be of any assistance to you, you know where I am. With kind regards, Neil." Q. What about private reactions. Was there any criticism communicated to you privately? A. No, none whatsoever. Q. Are you aware of any communications

1 General Davis or Mr Pyle -- sorry, are you 1 how the service is managed. 2 2 aware of any communications between the Q. My question to you was on the back of 3 3 former Governor and Mr Pyle on the HMIC what was said in the HMIC report about the 4 4 need for an anti-bullying statement. report? 5 5 A. Yes. A. None whatsoever. 6 6 Q. Thank you. Can we now turn to Q. I think your answer was that this was 7 Operation Delhi. I can see that the time is 7 your anti-bullying statement. 8 12.55. 8 A. I produced this in response to once the 9 9 THE CHAIRMAN: I think that is probably a draft arrived and that was not accepted as the 10 10 good time for a break. - well, they never said it, they never said it 11 11 MR SANTOS: Thank you. Shall we say 1 wasn't accepted, but it didn't feature in the 12 12 report, which is why I shared it, because I o'clock. 13 THE CHAIRMAN: 2 o'clock. 13 wanted them to realise that I had taken this 14 14 MR SANTOS: 2 o'clock, yes. I am not matter seriously. Now, from there on 15 15 proposing a five minute break. obviously we worked on producing and 16 16 obliging to the recommendations. (12.55)17 17 (The short adjournment) Q. Thank you. If we can now turn to 18 (14.00)18 Operation Delhi, please. Your first statement 19 19 MR SANTOS: Can we first go to C 2523, deals with this at paragraph seven on page 3 20 20 please. This I believe is the email that you of the bundle. You say that: "On 15 October 2018 Operation Delhi was commenced. This 21 were referring to earlier when I asked you 21 22 22 about an anti-bullying statement. It is an was a 're-active' investigation arising from a 23 23 email of 9 August 2019 from Patrick Vyas(?) complaint about serious computer 24 24 hacking/sabotage offences and an alleged to all staff. Is that what you were referring to 25 conspiracy to defraud." What caused the 25 in your answer this morning? Page 121 Page 123 1 A. That was the one that I was referring to 1 operation to commence? 2 but not this particular section, because I think 2 A. First and foremost, the date 15 October, 3 3 that this is - it goes by the round to I've studied the paperwork and I have looked 4 Commissioner - ah, there we go. 4 up as to why that date features there in my 5 5 Commissioner's message. There are some statement. I have not been able to find a 6 headline in bold along the -- It is quite a long 6 reason other than if it is a typing error, in the 7 7 message. I don't know whether you want me sense that it captures my statement for the 8 to read it. 8 case. It's based on my statement that I Q 9 Q. I think the Chairman can read it in his provided for the prosecution which says that 10 own time. 10 on a certain date at 15.00 hours in October I 11 A. Okay. 11 attended to this matter, but it's not necessarily 12 Q. I just wanted to give you the opportunity 12 15 October. 13 of confirming whether that is the document 13 Q. To the best of your belief, when did it 14 you were referring to. 14 start? 15 A. Yes. But in no uncertain terms what I do 15 A. I wouldn't be able to tell you off the cuff. 16 say there is that bullying is not going to be 16 I would need to refer to my statement which I 17 tolerated in any shape or form, how we 17 provided to the prosecution case. 18 intend to deal with it, and the fact that we 18 Q. Was it a date in October 2018? 19 also have to recognise what the police service 19 A. Yes. 20 is so that they are not misconceived as to 20 O. Or thereabouts. 21 what the perception of bullying is in service, 21 A. That's when it was brought to my 22 like what I was saying. In a disciplined 22 attention, yes. 23 service you need to be assertive on many 23 Q. Do you know what it was that caused the 24 occasions and it works on command and 24 operation to commence? 25 control. That in itself says a lot in terms of 25 A. I have to measure my words here so as Page 122 Page 124

1 not to conflict, engage the restriction notice, 1 that. So that was a serious consideration that 2 2 but this related to a very serious allegation I had. However, I did not have the material 3 3 that the National Security Centralised in front of me to action anything at that 4 4 Intelligence platform had been subject of a particular moment. Mr Gaggero was 5 serious assault. 5 working, he told me, with a group of cyber 6 6 experts who had locked down the system. Q. Sorry, I am just asking more in terms of 7 the administrative process. You say it was a 7 That reassured me that whoever had 8 8 reactive investigation. authorised access in the past was now locked 9 9 A. Yes. out and could not access it, so that gave me 10 10 Q. So something must have prompted it. peace of mind, and Mr Gaggero undertook to 11 11 A. Sorry, okay. I had a visit from the provide a report to me, which is the one that 12 chairman of Bland Limited, Mr James 12 accompanies this letter. 13 Gaggero, and it was he that imparted the 13 Q. So in the period between the meetings 14 14 that took place, the October meeting where complaint. 15 he made an oral complaint to you and the 15 Q. If we go to B 5190, please, this is a letter 16 16 dated 18 December 2018 and this starts with: written complaint that you received in 17 17 "Further to my previous oral report to you, I December, is it fair to say then that you were 18 write to formally bring to your attention and 18 not actually actively pursuing the 19 19 to make a complaint in relation to the acts of investigation? 20 20 Thomas Cornelio described in this letter and A. That's right. There was things happening 21 which we believe may constitute criminal 21 in terms of movement on the three Delhi 22 22 offences." Mr Gaggero's evidence is that he suspects, Government and Financial 23 23 met with you on two occasions on 27 Secretary in particular, in terms of what 24 24 September 2018 and 27 October 2018. Government were interpreting to be the 25 25 Without giving too much importance to the malfunctioning of the system, meetings with Page 125 Page 127 1 precise date, was it on the back of one of 1 law enforcement heads. I attended to one of 2 those meetings that the investigation would 2 those meetings and it was an uncomfortable 3 3 have been commenced? meeting because things were being discussed 4 4 there that I knew or at least I had another A. Yes, on the second meeting. 5 5 Q. The second meeting. account to. And that is what was happening 6 A. When I say "commenced", if you want to 6 in between. I kept the question of the assault 7 7 on the platform quite private. I mean, there 8 8 Q. I was going to ask you, because was no - I can't remember crying(?) 9 9 Superintendent Richardson says that he was officially so that everybody in the service 10 10 made SIO in late December 2018, so I was would know. What I did was I obviously 11 going to ask you what was going on in the 11 consulted with the Governor at the time and 12 investigation beforehand. 12 told him: "Look, this has happened." I can't 13 A. Yes. The first visit we're not going to 13 remember the exact date. 14 touch on unless you want me to, but the 14 O. No, I am more interested on the 15 15 second visit by Mr Gaggero confirmed that investigation side and I just wanted to clarify 16 16 he had uncovered potential criminality, albeit the position as far as the SIO was concerned. 17 17 in an oral format he did. A very complex and You had these meetings on 27 September and 18 18 difficult to understand in terms of reading 27 October 2018. Did you take notes of 19 19 papers, and so forth, and no hard core those meetings? 20 20 evidence in front of me other than what Mr A. Yes. 21 21 Gaggero suggested, but my concern at the Q. Does the Inquiry have those notes? 22 22 time was that the alleged activities as were A. I've looked for them through the CMX 23 23 being explained had caused an impact on this bundles. I can't find them but I hope that 24 24 national security asset, a serious impact, and they can be pulled out. They should be 25 obviously the consequences arising from 25 appended to either - I'm not sure whether I Page 126 Page 128

1 provide	d one or two statements for the case	1	A. Yes, that's correct.
_	y should be there exhibited by me. I	2	Q. What was Mr Gaggero presumably
	per Mr Wyan requesting them from	3	advised by you about?
	addition to screenshots of WhatsApp	4	A. I hadn't spoken with him since October
	es that I had with Mr John Perez. If	5	and since we received the complaint, and I
	not in the main prosecution bundle	6	provided him this update in formally
•	well, at least in the disclosure that	7	identifying Mr Richardson, and I believe it
8 we've re	eceived from the RGP, I would ask	8	was Detective Chief Inspector Brian
9 that the	y be looked for perhaps in an unused	9	Finlayson as his deputy, and that's what I
10 materia	l bundle that the RGP may have not	10	believe this note reflects.
11 entirely	disclosed but they were definitely	11	Q. We have seen Superintendent
12 provide	d.	12	Richardson's daybook in relation to
	can look for those. In terms of your	13	Operation Delhi. Did you also keep a
_	s with Mr Gaggero, Mr Gaggero's	14	daybook?
	e is that by 27 September, the time of	15	A. Yes. Not on Delhi specific. It wasn't on
•	t meeting, he knew that Mr Levy KC	16	Delhi specific.
	olved with 36 North. Did Mr	17	Q. So would some of these meetings be
	reveal this connection to you when	18	reflected in your daybook?
	on 27 September?	19	A. If Mr Richardson was making notes, no.
	ieve he did, yes.	20	Q. So your policy was if Mr Richardson was
	you reveal this connection to	21	taking notes, you would not take a note.
-	endent Richardson and the team?	22	A. I wouldn't, I wouldn't. Or if any other
	t, at that particular	23	officer was taking notes I wouldn't. For
24 Q. At an	* *	24	example, the first meeting that Mr Perez
25 A. Yes.	Obviously eventually I think I	25	came to see me about, there's no notes
	Page 129		Page 131
-	l them a brief of Mr Gaggero had	1	because there was nothing of concern to me
	d to me. I did explain everything so	2	there. The first meeting of Mr Gaggero on
	knew from me, and eventually I	3	the back of what Mr Perez had come in, I
_	l that statement in support of my	4	started to gauge something there and I did the
5 account.		5	notes. Then when Mr Perez came to see me
	is stage did you also realise that	6	again I did a note and when Mr Gaggero
	y be a connection between the	7	came to see me again on the 27th you
_	tion and the Chief Minister?	8	mentioned
	pecause I did not I can't be sure	9 10	Q. 27 October.
	Astelon and the question of ders featured. Obviously eventually	11	A. I also made a note and those, I hope, are recoverable from the disclosure I made to the
	o know but I don't know at what	12	investigating officer at the time.
	d the mechanisms of who was owner	13	Q. Now, Mr Perez, Mr Vasquez and
-	and so forth. That was imparted	14	Cornelio were arrested on 11 May 2019. If
,	by Mr Gaggero to me and the detail	15	we can go to C 1733, please. I believe I am
	didn't capture. What I was capturing	16	right in recollecting that it is 10 May 2019
	pertinent matter of potential criminal	17	that they were arrested. This entry is dated
18 liability.	_	18	11 May 2019 toward the bottom of the page.
•	we go to C 1659, please. This is a	19	This is a record by Superintendent
-	conference call at your office	20	Richardson of a telephone call between him
	you, Superintendent Richardson and	21	and Mr Gaggero at ten o'clock in the
	nlayson. Towards the bottom of the	22	morning. The final entry in that page says:
	re is an entry that says: "JG advised	23	"CoP had wanted me to call yesterday." If
	SI0 and Dep", which presumably	24	we just go over the page that continues: "But
25 means D	eputy.	25	too busy. Apologised." Why did you want
	Page 130		Page 132

1 Mr Richardson to inform Mr Gaggero on the	1 with the Office of Crimin	al Prosecution and
2 day of the arrests?	2 Litigation ('OCPL'), parti	
3 A. As complainant, I felt that it was only	3 DPP. I also discussed the	-
4 prudent that he was informed by the RGP	4 the AG on a few occasion	ns when he brought
5 that arrests had been effected. He had been	5 it up and very briefly ver	bally went over the
6 informing us of civil action that his lawyers	6 evidence and progress ma	ade. I would
7 wanted to initiate and we had told him to	7 normally provide these b	
8 hold fire on that so as not to jeopardise the	8 of other subject matters the	_
9 criminal investigation. The criminal	9 AG on. The AG was init	ially enquiring
10 investigation as it happened was taking	about what evidence we	were coming across
longer to develop, than to progress, and we	and I was content to discl	lose this verbally to
12 were conscious that Mr Gaggero may be	12 him, albeit in a very brief	fashion. During
13 impinged or impeded from proceeding with	these briefings, the AG w	ould express views
14 the civil action, so I thought it was right that	of how chaotic and messy	y the matter was for
15 Mr Gaggero was informed at least that:	15 HMGoG on a number of	fronts; no
16 Look, arrests have been made and for you to	16 government official other	than Caine
17 continue with your journey on the civil action	17 Sanchez knew the ins and	d outs of the
18 if need be.	dealings between the serv	
19 Q. If we can then address the 13 May 2019	19 NSCIS platform and HM	GoG; the AG
20 meeting, it is in your first statement at	20 expressed concern over h	ow all this was
21 paragraph 10. You requested a meeting to	21 being managed internally	by HMGoG with
brief the Chief Minister, the Minister of	the consequent potential	embarrassment to
23 Justice, the Attorney General, the Chief	the administration." The	se discussions with
24 Secretary, the DPP and the Financial	the Attorney General: on	how many
25 Secretary on Operation Delhi. We have	occasions did they occur?	?
Page 133	Page 135	
1 age 133	1 age 133	
1 heard from Mr Richardson that he does not	1 A. The way I've been able	e to trace the
2 recall the Attorney General being present at	2 frequency of those meeting	
3 the meeting and he points to some text	3 understanding the subject	= -
4 messages between him and you referring to	4 the AG on aside from the	
5 Mr Llamas KC being abroad. Do you recall	5 Delhi. I met him on nume	rous occasions to
6 whether the Attorney General was present at	6 do with the intervention of	f the Grey Swan -
7 the meeting?	7 that was the Iranian Tank	er. In fact, other
8 A. My recollection is obviously tainted by	8 counsel here attended thos	se meetings. I met
9 my statement. I didn't take notes of that	9 with him in relation to the	NatWest fraud,
10 meeting and I can't say with hand on heart	10 nothing to do with a crimi	nal case but in
11 that Mr Llamas was there or not. More so	11 terms of consequence man	agement I met
when I've seen the messages of me telling Mr	with him on that and met	with him on the
13 Richardson that the AG is in London. Mr	13 memorandum of understa	nding for the
14 Richardson did allude to the possibility of Mr	14 Armed Forces Act. Quite	a substantial
15 Llamas being connected via telephone. I	amount of meetings with h	
16 can't remember. That means I can't say	him on personal matters r	_
17 whether Mr Llamas was, but then again	17 there's a couple of others.	
based on Mr Llamas's statement it seems as if	18 examples. They were not	_
19 he was, so there's a bit of some grey area	19 at the end of the meeting h	ne would say: "Ian,
20 there.	8	•
	20 how's this going?" for exa	mple, and I'd say:
Q. Can we now look at paragraphs 12 and 13	how's this going?" for exa This is going so forth."	mple, and I'd say: 'How do you see
of your statement, the first statement, which	how's this going?" for exa "This is going so forth." ' it?" "Well, it's still too ea	mple, and I'd say: 'How do you see rly." And that is
of your statement, the first statement, which is just over the page. You say: "Because of	how's this going?" for exa "This is going so forth." '22 it?" "Well, it's still too ea the type of interchange tha	mple, and I'd say: 'How do you see rly." And that is at we had. Nothing
of your statement, the first statement, which is just over the page. You say: "Because of the complexities of the case, I was aware that	how's this going?" for exa "This is going so forth." ' it?" "Well, it's still too ea the type of interchange that that I took note of. I was p	mple, and I'd say: 'How do you see rly." And that is at we had. Nothing perfectly
of your statement, the first statement, which is just over the page. You say: "Because of	how's this going?" for exa "This is going so forth." '22 it?" "Well, it's still too ea the type of interchange tha	mple, and I'd say: 'How do you see rly." And that is at we had. Nothing perfectly
of your statement, the first statement, which is just over the page. You say: "Because of the complexities of the case, I was aware that	how's this going?" for exa "This is going so forth." ' it?" "Well, it's still too ea the type of interchange that that I took note of. I was p	mple, and I'd say: 'How do you see rly." And that is at we had. Nothing perfectly

1 at that time; later obviously my mindset	1 feedback that I'm getting from Mr
2 changed, but at that time I didn't see that	2 Richardson, that it was key to the question of
3 normal(?) that the AG was telling me these	3 preferring charges, and so forth. But that
4 things. It was embarrassing for the	4 subsequently there had been an alternative
5 organisation. This was chaotic, messy, and	5 route or interpretation that could circumvent
6 he was obviously concerned, but at that point	6 the need to rely on ownership, and I
7 I had no concerns about his behaviour	7 understand that Mr Wyan was the one that
8 towards me. There was no suggestion	8 came up with the suggestion.
9 whatsoever.	9 Q. Did you agree that the ownership issued
10 Q. Why did you not take notes of his	10 needed to be resolved before the
11 statements?	11 investigation could progress?
12 A. Because it was not a meeting that was	12 A. I did not agree or disagree on that,
specific to that. It was not specific precisely	because I didn't have a decision, I didn't take
14 because of that.	14 a decision making - didn't approach it from
15 Q. Did you mention these questions or	15 that angle. I received those reports, they
16 comments from the Attorney General to	were explained to me. If it makes sense, they
17 Superintendent Richardson or to the	17 carry on and they crack on. If any of the
18 investigating team?	18 reports I got prompted any questions from
19 A. I can't recall I did. I can't recall whether I	me, I would ask, but in this case in this
20 did or not.	20 regard no. More so when I understood from
Q. If we go to paragraph 16 of your	21 Mr Richardson that they had been in
statement, the same one, you say: "The AG	discussion with the DPP about it, that the
also advised that the investigation should not	23 DPP initially was of the view that
progress until such time as the question of	24 commercial deviance was not criminal and
25 ownership of the NSCIS platform was	25 Mr Wyan proved the contrary and Mr Rocca
Page 137	Page 139
1 100 101	1
1 clarified. This was a matter that the	1 accepted that. So that is a type of interaction
2 investigation team had already identified and	2 that was being fed up to me.
3 were working to address together with the	3 Q. When you say that the AG had said that
4 DPP. It was my understanding that the	4 the investigation should not progress until
5 question of ownership of the platform,	5 such time as the question of ownership was
6 though important, was not critical to the	6 clarified, what did you understand by him
7 prosecution of the suspects." Do you recall	7 saying that the investigation should not
8 the date of this conversation?	8 progress?
9 A. No. Definitely was on more than one	9 A. That came at that meeting, which I think
occasion but he was asking me to look into	10 was 7 April, where Mr
11 the detail of the ownership because	11 Q. That is a reference to 7 April perhaps.
12 Government were claiming, so he was	12 A. No, let me try - I'm trying to focus this.
13 arguing Government's case in this regard,	No, it can't have been on that date; it must
14 that Government were the owners. Converse	14 have been on the He was saying: "Look,
15 to that, obviously the team were aware too.	you need to sort out this before moving on
16 It's not that - it was already shared with me.	16 further."
17 The team were acutely aware of that too and	17 THE CHAIRMAN: When did he say that?
18 the were dealing with it.	18 That is the question.
19 Q. Do you have any notes of this	19 A. I can't with certainty say.
20 conversation?	20 THE CHAIRMAN: Well, when could it
21 A. These were the ones on the back of the	21 have been?
22 other subject matters so it's not	A. It could have been on the back of any of
23 Q. What was your understanding of the	23 these meetings which could have been
24 importance of the ownership issue?	24 definitely before April maybe.
25 A. Initially, that it was key. I mean, this is	25 THE CHAIRMAN: On the back of any of
Page 138	
	Page 140

1	these meetings.	1	figure in this as beneficial owners of 36
2	A. Yes. Definitely before he told me that he	2	North featuring the Chief Minister, the
3	was taking a step back. He told me he was	3	Financial Secretary, Minister Licudi, and
4	taking a step back from advising us on the	4	Shadow Minister Mr Fetan(?)." And he said:
5	criminal investigation, which not really was	5	"I'm aware of that." This was said in a very
6	advice but he was communicating with me	6	quiet tone. "And I'll deal with that. You
7	and the chance that we'd had, because he was	7	leave that with me."
8	going to be advising the Government on the	8	Q. Can we go to B 74, please. Just before
9	intellectual property rights matter and it	9	we turn to that, you say in that paragraph that
10	wasn't compatible. That's what he told me.	10	the Attorney General was keen to be told of
11	But that he still wanted to be kept in the loop.	11	the evidence that the RGP was uncovering.
12	MR SANTOS: When did he say that?	12	Did you provide any evidence to him?
13	A. I think that would have been 7 April, I	13	A. No, it was basically very brief updates.
14	think, but the question of: Look, you need to	14	(14.30)
15	slow down investigation until such time as	15	Q. Can we go to B74, please. Just before we
16	you establish the ownership was probably	16	turn to that, you say in that paragraph that the
17	said before.	17	Attorney General was keen to be told of the
18	THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, but when?	18	evidence that the RGP was uncovering. Did
19	A. When, sir?	19	you provide any evidence to him?
20	THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, when.	20	A. No. It was basically very brief updates.
21	A. I cannot be	21	Q. Now can we look at B74, which is on
22	THE CHAIRMAN: Well, it is a pretty	22	screen. This is the email that you sent
23	important thing for him to say. You must	23	yourself on the night of 12 May 2020, the
24	know when he said it.	24	day of the search warrant. And, we will
25	A. Definitely before 7 April is as close I	25	come back to it in more detail when we
	Page 141		Page 143
1	think I can be as helpful as I can there. I'm	1	discuss the events of 12 May
2	sorry, I wouldn't want to misguide you, sir.		
	sorry, I wouldn't want to misguide you, sir.	2	A. I've got
3	MR SANTOS: Can we go to 167, please, of	3	A. I've got Q but for now I just wanted to ask you
3 4	MR SANTOS: Can we go to 167, please, of the same bundle. This is your response to the		0
	MR SANTOS: Can we go to 167, please, of the same bundle. This is your response to the Attorney General's affidavit, and at	3	Q but for now I just wanted to ask you
4 5 6	MR SANTOS: Can we go to 167, please, of the same bundle. This is your response to the Attorney General's affidavit, and at paragraph 122 you say: "It may be	3 4 5 6	 Q but for now I just wanted to ask you about the second paragraph. It says A I've said I've (?) got a hard copy of that one, can I
4 5 6 7	MR SANTOS: Can we go to 167, please, of the same bundle. This is your response to the Attorney General's affidavit, and at paragraph 122 you say: "It may be technically correct for the AG to state that he	3 4 5 6 7	 Q but for now I just wanted to ask you about the second paragraph. It says A I've said I've (?) got a hard copy of that one, can I Q. By all means, yes.
4 5 6 7 8	MR SANTOS: Can we go to 167, please, of the same bundle. This is your response to the Attorney General's affidavit, and at paragraph 122 you say: "It may be technically correct for the AG to state that he had no hands-on involvement in the case but	3 4 5 6 7 8	 Q but for now I just wanted to ask you about the second paragraph. It says A I've said I've (?) got a hard copy of that one, can I Q. By all means, yes. A. Thanks. It's easier for me to refer to the
4 5 6 7 8 9	MR SANTOS: Can we go to 167, please, of the same bundle. This is your response to the Attorney General's affidavit, and at paragraph 122 you say: "It may be technically correct for the AG to state that he had no hands-on involvement in the case but he certainly expressed an interest in it and	3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 Q but for now I just wanted to ask you about the second paragraph. It says A I've said I've (?) got a hard copy of that one, can I Q. By all means, yes. A. Thanks. It's easier for me to refer to the hard copy. And, are we referring to the one
4 5 6 7 8 9	MR SANTOS: Can we go to 167, please, of the same bundle. This is your response to the Attorney General's affidavit, and at paragraph 122 you say: "It may be technically correct for the AG to state that he had no hands-on involvement in the case but he certainly expressed an interest in it and discussed with me the progress of the	3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 Q but for now I just wanted to ask you about the second paragraph. It says A I've said I've (?) got a hard copy of that one, can I Q. By all means, yes. A. Thanks. It's easier for me to refer to the hard copy. And, are we referring to the one that corrects the typos or the original one?
4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR SANTOS: Can we go to 167, please, of the same bundle. This is your response to the Attorney General's affidavit, and at paragraph 122 you say: "It may be technically correct for the AG to state that he had no hands-on involvement in the case but he certainly expressed an interest in it and discussed with me the progress of the investigation as I have mentioned in my first	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 Q but for now I just wanted to ask you about the second paragraph. It says A I've said I've (?) got a hard copy of that one, can I Q. By all means, yes. A. Thanks. It's easier for me to refer to the hard copy. And, are we referring to the one that corrects the typos or the original one? Q. This looks to me like it is the original
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR SANTOS: Can we go to 167, please, of the same bundle. This is your response to the Attorney General's affidavit, and at paragraph 122 you say: "It may be technically correct for the AG to state that he had no hands-on involvement in the case but he certainly expressed an interest in it and discussed with me the progress of the investigation as I have mentioned in my first affidavit. He was keen to be told of the	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 Q but for now I just wanted to ask you about the second paragraph. It says A I've said I've (?) got a hard copy of that one, can I Q. By all means, yes. A. Thanks. It's easier for me to refer to the hard copy. And, are we referring to the one that corrects the typos or the original one? Q. This looks to me like it is the original one.
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR SANTOS: Can we go to 167, please, of the same bundle. This is your response to the Attorney General's affidavit, and at paragraph 122 you say: "It may be technically correct for the AG to state that he had no hands-on involvement in the case but he certainly expressed an interest in it and discussed with me the progress of the investigation as I have mentioned in my first affidavit. He was keen to be told of the evidence the RGP was uncovering", and	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 Q but for now I just wanted to ask you about the second paragraph. It says A I've said I've (?) got a hard copy of that one, can I Q. By all means, yes. A. Thanks. It's easier for me to refer to the hard copy. And, are we referring to the one that corrects the typos or the original one? Q. This looks to me like it is the original one. A. I've got the - the one with the red typos.
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR SANTOS: Can we go to 167, please, of the same bundle. This is your response to the Attorney General's affidavit, and at paragraph 122 you say: "It may be technically correct for the AG to state that he had no hands-on involvement in the case but he certainly expressed an interest in it and discussed with me the progress of the investigation as I have mentioned in my first affidavit. He was keen to be told of the evidence the RGP was uncovering", and there is a reference to embarrassing which	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 Q but for now I just wanted to ask you about the second paragraph. It says A I've said I've (?) got a hard copy of that one, can I Q. By all means, yes. A. Thanks. It's easier for me to refer to the hard copy. And, are we referring to the one that corrects the typos or the original one? Q. This looks to me like it is the original one. A. I've got the - the one with the red typos. Q. Well, I am happy What I will do is
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR SANTOS: Can we go to 167, please, of the same bundle. This is your response to the Attorney General's affidavit, and at paragraph 122 you say: "It may be technically correct for the AG to state that he had no hands-on involvement in the case but he certainly expressed an interest in it and discussed with me the progress of the investigation as I have mentioned in my first affidavit. He was keen to be told of the evidence the RGP was uncovering", and there is a reference to embarrassing which you have just referred to. Is this the kind of	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 Q but for now I just wanted to ask you about the second paragraph. It says A I've said I've (?) got a hard copy of that one, can I Q. By all means, yes. A. Thanks. It's easier for me to refer to the hard copy. And, are we referring to the one that corrects the typos or the original one? Q. This looks to me like it is the original one. A. I've got the - the one with the red typos. Q. Well, I am happy What I will do is read the original one, and if there are any
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR SANTOS: Can we go to 167, please, of the same bundle. This is your response to the Attorney General's affidavit, and at paragraph 122 you say: "It may be technically correct for the AG to state that he had no hands-on involvement in the case but he certainly expressed an interest in it and discussed with me the progress of the investigation as I have mentioned in my first affidavit. He was keen to be told of the evidence the RGP was uncovering", and there is a reference to embarrassing which you have just referred to. Is this the kind of thing that you have just been describing, the	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 Q but for now I just wanted to ask you about the second paragraph. It says A I've said I've (?) got a hard copy of that one, can I Q. By all means, yes. A. Thanks. It's easier for me to refer to the hard copy. And, are we referring to the one that corrects the typos or the original one? Q. This looks to me like it is the original one. A. I've got the - the one with the red typos. Q. Well, I am happy What I will do is read the original one, and if there are any corrections you can tell us. Second
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR SANTOS: Can we go to 167, please, of the same bundle. This is your response to the Attorney General's affidavit, and at paragraph 122 you say: "It may be technically correct for the AG to state that he had no hands-on involvement in the case but he certainly expressed an interest in it and discussed with me the progress of the investigation as I have mentioned in my first affidavit. He was keen to be told of the evidence the RGP was uncovering", and there is a reference to embarrassing which you have just referred to. Is this the kind of thing that you have just been describing, the kind of conversations that were happening at	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 Q but for now I just wanted to ask you about the second paragraph. It says A I've said I've (?) got a hard copy of that one, can I Q. By all means, yes. A. Thanks. It's easier for me to refer to the hard copy. And, are we referring to the one that corrects the typos or the original one? Q. This looks to me like it is the original one. A. I've got the - the one with the red typos. Q. Well, I am happy What I will do is read the original one, and if there are any corrections you can tell us. Second paragraph. "For quite some time I have been
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR SANTOS: Can we go to 167, please, of the same bundle. This is your response to the Attorney General's affidavit, and at paragraph 122 you say: "It may be technically correct for the AG to state that he had no hands-on involvement in the case but he certainly expressed an interest in it and discussed with me the progress of the investigation as I have mentioned in my first affidavit. He was keen to be told of the evidence the RGP was uncovering", and there is a reference to embarrassing which you have just referred to. Is this the kind of thing that you have just been describing, the kind of conversations that were happening at the back end of meetings?	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 Q but for now I just wanted to ask you about the second paragraph. It says A I've said I've (?) got a hard copy of that one, can I Q. By all means, yes. A. Thanks. It's easier for me to refer to the hard copy. And, are we referring to the one that corrects the typos or the original one? Q. This looks to me like it is the original one. A. I've got the - the one with the red typos. Q. Well, I am happy What I will do is read the original one, and if there are any corrections you can tell us. Second paragraph. "For quite some time I have been meeting with HMAG Mr Llamas at his
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR SANTOS: Can we go to 167, please, of the same bundle. This is your response to the Attorney General's affidavit, and at paragraph 122 you say: "It may be technically correct for the AG to state that he had no hands-on involvement in the case but he certainly expressed an interest in it and discussed with me the progress of the investigation as I have mentioned in my first affidavit. He was keen to be told of the evidence the RGP was uncovering", and there is a reference to embarrassing which you have just referred to. Is this the kind of thing that you have just been describing, the kind of conversations that were happening at the back end of meetings? A. Yes, and there was one meeting in	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 Q but for now I just wanted to ask you about the second paragraph. It says A I've said I've (?) got a hard copy of that one, can I Q. By all means, yes. A. Thanks. It's easier for me to refer to the hard copy. And, are we referring to the one that corrects the typos or the original one? Q. This looks to me like it is the original one. A. I've got the - the one with the red typos. Q. Well, I am happy What I will do is read the original one, and if there are any corrections you can tell us. Second paragraph. "For quite some time I have been meeting with HMAG Mr Llamas at his request to discuss matters relating to this
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR SANTOS: Can we go to 167, please, of the same bundle. This is your response to the Attorney General's affidavit, and at paragraph 122 you say: "It may be technically correct for the AG to state that he had no hands-on involvement in the case but he certainly expressed an interest in it and discussed with me the progress of the investigation as I have mentioned in my first affidavit. He was keen to be told of the evidence the RGP was uncovering", and there is a reference to embarrassing which you have just referred to. Is this the kind of thing that you have just been describing, the kind of conversations that were happening at the back end of meetings? A. Yes, and there was one meeting in particular where we also - this is just coming	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 Q but for now I just wanted to ask you about the second paragraph. It says A I've said I've (?) got a hard copy of that one, can I Q. By all means, yes. A. Thanks. It's easier for me to refer to the hard copy. And, are we referring to the one that corrects the typos or the original one? Q. This looks to me like it is the original one. A. I've got the - the one with the red typos. Q. Well, I am happy What I will do is read the original one, and if there are any corrections you can tell us. Second paragraph. "For quite some time I have been meeting with HMAG Mr Llamas at his request to discuss matters relating to this investigation. Mr Llamas has a view that
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR SANTOS: Can we go to 167, please, of the same bundle. This is your response to the Attorney General's affidavit, and at paragraph 122 you say: "It may be technically correct for the AG to state that he had no hands-on involvement in the case but he certainly expressed an interest in it and discussed with me the progress of the investigation as I have mentioned in my first affidavit. He was keen to be told of the evidence the RGP was uncovering", and there is a reference to embarrassing which you have just referred to. Is this the kind of thing that you have just been describing, the kind of conversations that were happening at the back end of meetings? A. Yes, and there was one meeting in particular where we also - this is just coming now obviously, refreshing myself - there was	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 Q but for now I just wanted to ask you about the second paragraph. It says A I've said I've (?) got a hard copy of that one, can I Q. By all means, yes. A. Thanks. It's easier for me to refer to the hard copy. And, are we referring to the one that corrects the typos or the original one? Q. This looks to me like it is the original one. A. I've got the - the one with the red typos. Q. Well, I am happy What I will do is read the original one, and if there are any corrections you can tell us. Second paragraph. "For quite some time I have been meeting with HMAG Mr Llamas at his request to discuss matters relating to this investigation. Mr Llamas has a view that Caine Sanchez in particular should be dealt
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR SANTOS: Can we go to 167, please, of the same bundle. This is your response to the Attorney General's affidavit, and at paragraph 122 you say: "It may be technically correct for the AG to state that he had no hands-on involvement in the case but he certainly expressed an interest in it and discussed with me the progress of the investigation as I have mentioned in my first affidavit. He was keen to be told of the evidence the RGP was uncovering", and there is a reference to embarrassing which you have just referred to. Is this the kind of thing that you have just been describing, the kind of conversations that were happening at the back end of meetings? A. Yes, and there was one meeting in particular where we also - this is just coming now obviously, refreshing myself - there was also one comment that he made regarding the	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 Q but for now I just wanted to ask you about the second paragraph. It says A I've said I've (?) got a hard copy of that one, can I Q. By all means, yes. A. Thanks. It's easier for me to refer to the hard copy. And, are we referring to the one that corrects the typos or the original one? Q. This looks to me like it is the original one. A. I've got the - the one with the red typos. Q. Well, I am happy What I will do is read the original one, and if there are any corrections you can tell us. Second paragraph. "For quite some time I have been meeting with HMAG Mr Llamas at his request to discuss matters relating to this investigation. Mr Llamas has a view that Caine Sanchez in particular should be dealt with internally via civil service disciplinary
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR SANTOS: Can we go to 167, please, of the same bundle. This is your response to the Attorney General's affidavit, and at paragraph 122 you say: "It may be technically correct for the AG to state that he had no hands-on involvement in the case but he certainly expressed an interest in it and discussed with me the progress of the investigation as I have mentioned in my first affidavit. He was keen to be told of the evidence the RGP was uncovering", and there is a reference to embarrassing which you have just referred to. Is this the kind of thing that you have just been describing, the kind of conversations that were happening at the back end of meetings? A. Yes, and there was one meeting in particular where we also - this is just coming now obviously, refreshing myself - there was also one comment that he made regarding the question of embarrassing, which I brought to	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 Q but for now I just wanted to ask you about the second paragraph. It says A I've said I've (?) got a hard copy of that one, can I Q. By all means, yes. A. Thanks. It's easier for me to refer to the hard copy. And, are we referring to the one that corrects the typos or the original one? Q. This looks to me like it is the original one. A. I've got the - the one with the red typos. Q. Well, I am happy What I will do is read the original one, and if there are any corrections you can tell us. Second paragraph. "For quite some time I have been meeting with HMAG Mr Llamas at his request to discuss matters relating to this investigation. Mr Llamas has a view that Caine Sanchez in particular should be dealt with internally via civil service disciplinary mechanisms. To this date however, the AG
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR SANTOS: Can we go to 167, please, of the same bundle. This is your response to the Attorney General's affidavit, and at paragraph 122 you say: "It may be technically correct for the AG to state that he had no hands-on involvement in the case but he certainly expressed an interest in it and discussed with me the progress of the investigation as I have mentioned in my first affidavit. He was keen to be told of the evidence the RGP was uncovering", and there is a reference to embarrassing which you have just referred to. Is this the kind of thing that you have just been describing, the kind of conversations that were happening at the back end of meetings? A. Yes, and there was one meeting in particular where we also - this is just coming now obviously, refreshing myself - there was also one comment that he made regarding the	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q but for now I just wanted to ask you about the second paragraph. It says A I've said I've (?) got a hard copy of that one, can I Q. By all means, yes. A. Thanks. It's easier for me to refer to the hard copy. And, are we referring to the one that corrects the typos or the original one? Q. This looks to me like it is the original one. A. I've got the - the one with the red typos. Q. Well, I am happy What I will do is read the original one, and if there are any corrections you can tell us. Second paragraph. "For quite some time I have been meeting with HMAG Mr Llamas at his request to discuss matters relating to this investigation. Mr Llamas has a view that Caine Sanchez in particular should be dealt with internally via civil service disciplinary mechanisms. To this date however, the AG has not been privy to the evidence that the
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR SANTOS: Can we go to 167, please, of the same bundle. This is your response to the Attorney General's affidavit, and at paragraph 122 you say: "It may be technically correct for the AG to state that he had no hands-on involvement in the case but he certainly expressed an interest in it and discussed with me the progress of the investigation as I have mentioned in my first affidavit. He was keen to be told of the evidence the RGP was uncovering", and there is a reference to embarrassing which you have just referred to. Is this the kind of thing that you have just been describing, the kind of conversations that were happening at the back end of meetings? A. Yes, and there was one meeting in particular where we also - this is just coming now obviously, refreshing myself - there was also one comment that he made regarding the question of embarrassing, which I brought to his notice saying: "Look, Michael", I said,	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 Q but for now I just wanted to ask you about the second paragraph. It says A I've said I've (?) got a hard copy of that one, can I Q. By all means, yes. A. Thanks. It's easier for me to refer to the hard copy. And, are we referring to the one that corrects the typos or the original one? Q. This looks to me like it is the original one. A. I've got the - the one with the red typos. Q. Well, I am happy What I will do is read the original one, and if there are any corrections you can tell us. Second paragraph. "For quite some time I have been meeting with HMAG Mr Llamas at his request to discuss matters relating to this investigation. Mr Llamas has a view that Caine Sanchez in particular should be dealt with internally via civil service disciplinary mechanisms. To this date however, the AG
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR SANTOS: Can we go to 167, please, of the same bundle. This is your response to the Attorney General's affidavit, and at paragraph 122 you say: "It may be technically correct for the AG to state that he had no hands-on involvement in the case but he certainly expressed an interest in it and discussed with me the progress of the investigation as I have mentioned in my first affidavit. He was keen to be told of the evidence the RGP was uncovering", and there is a reference to embarrassing which you have just referred to. Is this the kind of thing that you have just been describing, the kind of conversations that were happening at the back end of meetings? A. Yes, and there was one meeting in particular where we also - this is just coming now obviously, refreshing myself - there was also one comment that he made regarding the question of embarrassing, which I brought to his notice saying: "Look, Michael", I said,	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q but for now I just wanted to ask you about the second paragraph. It says A I've said I've (?) got a hard copy of that one, can I Q. By all means, yes. A. Thanks. It's easier for me to refer to the hard copy. And, are we referring to the one that corrects the typos or the original one? Q. This looks to me like it is the original one. A. I've got the - the one with the red typos. Q. Well, I am happy What I will do is read the original one, and if there are any corrections you can tell us. Second paragraph. "For quite some time I have been meeting with HMAG Mr Llamas at his request to discuss matters relating to this investigation. Mr Llamas has a view that Caine Sanchez in particular should be dealt with internally via civil service disciplinary mechanisms. To this date however, the AG has not been privy to the evidence that the

1 other suspects. The said evidence has been 1 O. Yes, Mr Richardson says that there were 2 2 discussed with the DPP at great length, who no such meetings. What is your reaction to 3 3 has filed" -that? 4 4 A. And - "and he has". A. I'm not going to dispute that. I don't 5 Q. "and he has", as in: and the DPP has --5 know what Mr Richardson - so obviously he 6 6 doesn't recall them, and I am just saying -A. Yeah. 7 Q. -- advised, yes? "and he has advised that 7 what I'm saying is that we met with the AG, 8 8 there is a criminal case for CS, JP and TC to and Mr Richardson has alluded to certain 9 9 answer, and that there is a realistic prospect meetings that he came along with me. 10 10 of conviction if prosecuted on community Whether he was aware that this was spoken 11 misuse offences" --11 to me or not, but I definitely attended 12 12 A. I meant "computer", obviously. meetings in the past - not necessarily specific 13 Q. Yes, correct. "computer misuse offences 13 to Delhi - I am not saying Delhi-specific, but 14 14 and conspiracy to defraud offences. At most on other matters. 15 15 of these meetings with the AG, particularly Q. If Mr Richardson had been present and 16 16 the latter ones, I have been accompanied by Delhi had been discussed, given that he was 17 17 Superintendent Richardson. The views I SIO would you have expected him to make a 18 have expressed all along have been that the 18 record of what was discussed? 19 19 alleged criminal behaviour of all the parties A. Depends. Definitely the question of the 20 20 concerned is very serious." Do you accept disciplinary route, that was - but I think he 21 that the impression given by that email is 21 was present during one of that - when that 22 22 was said. I believe he alludes to that: that he different to your witness statement, where 23 23 you state that you discussed these matters at was shocked to that. So, I don't know 24 24 the end of meetings on other topics, whereas whether he made notes of that himself, but he 25 25 it seems from this email that you are saying definitely makes reference to the question of Page 145 Page 147 1 that you have been meeting with "Mr Llamas 1 Mr Llamas suggesting: why don't you leave 2 at his request to discuss matters relating to 2 Caine Sanchez to be dealt with by the civil 3 3 this investigation"? service disciplinary route. And, he's also 4 A. It may well give that impression, but 4 present when Mr Llamas says... No, I'm not 5 5 these are notes which I qualify as speedsure whether he says he's present when he -6 typing, and I think I mentioned this at the 6 when he mentions: what if the Government 7 7 end. That I say, "It's deeply regrettable that I consented to the hacking. I'm not sure 8 8 whether he mentioned being present at that have to resort to speed-type out these notes", 9 9 so these are like when I came back from the point or not. 10 10 meeting in the shaken and worried condition, Q. Can we now go to C4490, please. This is 11 that I sat down there and I started no-- typing 11 the letters sent by your lawyers, Gomez & 12 these notes out. So - but these notes then 12 Co, to the GPA on 29 May. And paragraph 13 refresh my mind, and it's - it's from what I've 13 35, four lines down says, "For many months 14 14 based my - my statement on. the AG has been trying (unsuccessfully, we 15 15 Q. You also say in the email, "At most of might add) to persuade Mr McGrail to 16 16 these meetings with the AG, particularly the change his and the RGP's approach to the 17 17 latter ones, I have been accompanied by investigation, which would either lead to it 18 Superintendent Richardson." Mr Richardson 18 being dropped entirely or certain suspects not 19 19 being prosecuted." Do you stand by that says that he does not remember any of those 20 meetings. Do you maintain that he was 20 statement in that letter? 21 21 present at those meetings? A. Initially, when my meetings with the 22 THE CHAIRMAN: No, hang on, he said 22 Attorney General - and - and he started to 23 23 rather more than that. I mean, he said that enquire about it, it didn't raise any alarm 24 there were not meetings, because he recorded 24 bells. But that changed with time, and even 25 them all. 25 though the suggestions of whether the - the -Page 146 Page 148

1	the system was hacked, the hypothetical	1	General of the UK's National Crime Agency
2	suggestion: well (?) the system was allowed	2	('NCA'), Lynne Owens, for specialist
3	to be hacked by Government, whether Mr	3	computer forensic investigation support." Is
4	Sanchez was allowed to be - to be dealt with	4	that still your position: that that was your
5	by the disciplinary process, whe whether	5	only personal involvement other than the
6	the factor of the embarrassment to the	6	periodic briefings?
7	administration, and to Blands, and to	7	A. I submitted a statement since. This
8	everybody else. All those factors when put	8	statement was dated nearly two years ago,
9	together, and subsequently I brief - and I feel	9	the one that I'm referring to, and I have since
10	the situation I ended up in is what contributes	10	submitted a seventh statement which
11	my lawyers to - to put that in - in motion.	11	particularly arises because this has been
12	Q. So would you agree that the allegation	12	picked up by Mr Cooper and his team,
13	made here, in this letter, is stronger than what	13	claiming that my other - or suggesting that
14	you alleged in your witness statement and	14	my other actions were operational. And I
15	what you recorded in the email of 12 May?	15	have explained there, I don't know whether
16	A. Well it is stronger, because it is how I	16	you want to pull it up on the screen to show
17	ended up being treated.	17	what my other involvement is, and for the
18	Q. What was the change in approach that	18	Inquiry
19	you say the Attorney General was advocating	19	Q. Yes.
20	for?	20	A to determine whether those actions
21	A. He gave me, certainly - and - and now,	21	were - were operational actions or not.
22	with the benefit of how everything has	22	Q. I think it is worth allowing you to make
23	transpired, he certainly gave me the	23	that point, because that point is made against
24	impression that he didn't want Caine Sanchez	24	you. If we can turn to your seventh
25	to be proceeded with. And he wanted to - he	25	statement, please. It is known as your third
	•		
	Page 149		Page 151
1	wanted the investigation to stall, to - to a	1	responsive statement, and it is at page three,
2	certain degree, with the question of	2	paragraph 17. You say, "It is claimed in
3	ownership.	3	paragraph 21 that I was operationally
4	Q. When you say that he gave you the	4	involved with Op Delhi, when I have already
5	impression that he did not want Caine	5	explained my involvement, as indeed have
6	Sanchez to be prosecuted, do you say that he	6	the officers involved in the operation. I did
7	expressly told you?	7	not take any operation decisions in this
8	A. Yes, he - well, he asked: why don't you	8	investigation, and this is supported by those
9	leave that - for Sanchez to be dealt with by	9	involved in the investigating team." And
10	the disciplinary route and the civil service?	10	then you respond to what you say is the
11	Q. As Commissioner of Police, how	11	A. Series - a series of instances.
12	involved were you typically in the day-to-day	12	Q. Of the examples given by the former
13	of Operation Delhi?	13	Operation Delhi defendants. Now it's fair to
14	A. I was simply not involved.	14	say though, is it not, that in your first
15	Q. Were you more involved in Operation	15	statement you are not referring purely to
16	Delhi than other operations?	16	operational decisions. You say, "apart from
17	A. Not necessarily.	17	periodic briefings which I received from
18	Q. If we go to paragraph 11 of your first	18	Superintendent Richardson, the senior officer
19	statement (which is at A4) you state, "The	19	in the investigating team, my personal
20	investigation then began its course and apart	20	involvement in the case was limited to
21	from periodic briefings which I received	21	requesting assistance". So, is it your position
22	from Superintendent Richardson, the senior	22	that you were involved but not at an
23	officer in the investigating team, my personal	23	operational level?
24	involvement in the case was limited to	24	A. That is correct, but that also shows that at
25	requesting assistance from the Director	25	the time that I made this statement these
23	12-13-20mg applement from the Director	23	the that I mud this statement these
	Page 150		Page 152
	<u>~</u>		20 /D 140 (152)

			A10 10 11 W 1 1 1 1 1
1	other issues were totally insignificant in my	1	Although they'd be relieved, no doubt, but
2	mind and in my way of thing. This, which -	2	that's a big cloud hang left hanging over, so
3	the question of requesting resources from the	3	
4	United Kingdom, probably was the one that	4	Q. I understand the explanation, Mr
5	featured more key. I mean, the question of	5	McGrail, but my question to you was
6	writing to the see (?) Chief Secretary, or the	6	whether that was you going beyond receiving
7	writing to the - to the Financial Secretary, as	7	periodic briefings from Superintendent
8	I've explained these were all issues that I did	8	Richardson.
9	at the request of the - of the team, and - and	9	A. No, no. In this case, it's the first briefing
10	not - it does not represent any operational	10	that I'm inves introducing the team to them,
11	activity on my part at all.	11	if I believe, yes, in January?
12	Q. So for example the 8 January 2019	12	Q. 8 January, yes.
13	meeting, if we can go to that. This is C1659.	13	A. So, no, that is not an operational decision;
14	This is the conference call that we were	14	that is if anything setting tone with Mr
15	looking at earlier, and if we look at the	15	Gaggero, so that he doesn't pull out. If he
16	second page there are three entries for things	16	wanted to pull out he had time to pull out,
17	that you have said. The first one is about a	17	and then not necessarily follow the
18	timeline for action one month after Four	18	complaint, but
19	Corners seized (?), then "no element of	19	Q. Well, if it is not an operational decision
20	surprise, therefore civil action may proceed.	20	then do you categorise it as a tactical
21	Search of local premises, invite suspects to	21	decision or a strategic decision?
22	give initial AK. Prosecution deadline not	22	A. More - more on strategy than - well,
23	possible." And then the next entry, "Seeks	23	strategy - more on - more on - on morals
24	assurance that there with be no withdrawal of	24	and
25	complaint in favour of civil action, given." Is	25	Q. So, you accept you had strategic
	Page 153		Page 155
1	that not going beyond pure briefing?	1	involvement in the investigation?
2	A. No, absolutely not. I'll explain in detail	2	A. That is the extent of it, that is the extent
2 3	A. No, absolutely not. I'll explain in detail what I meant by "Seeks assurances that there	2 3	A. That is the extent of it, that is the extent of it.
2 3 4	A. No, absolutely not. I'll explain in detail what I meant by "Seeks assurances that there with be no withdrawal of complaint in favour	2 3 4	A. That is the extent of it, that is the extent of it.Q. If we go to B749, there is an exchange
2 3 4 5	A. No, absolutely not. I'll explain in detail what I meant by "Seeks assurances that there with be no withdrawal of complaint in favour of civil action". In my police career I've	2 3 4 5	A. That is the extent of it, that is the extent of it.Q. If we go to B749, there is an exchange between the DPP and you regarding
2 3 4 5 6	A. No, absolutely not. I'll explain in detail what I meant by "Seeks assurances that there with be no withdrawal of complaint in favour of civil action". In my police career I've noticed - I've come across many instances	2 3 4 5 6	A. That is the extent of it, that is the extent of it.Q. If we go to B749, there is an exchange between the DPP and you regarding Operation Delhi. Do you remember, this is
2 3 4 5 6 7	A. No, absolutely not. I'll explain in detail what I meant by "Seeks assurances that there with be no withdrawal of complaint in favour of civil action". In my police career I've noticed - I've come across many instances where complainant - a complainant in - in	2 3 4 5 6 7	A. That is the extent of it, that is the extent of it.Q. If we go to B749, there is an exchange between the DPP and you regarding Operation Delhi. Do you remember, this is the fourth and fifth entries, "Ian, are you free
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A. No, absolutely not. I'll explain in detail what I meant by "Seeks assurances that there with be no withdrawal of complaint in favour of civil action". In my police career I've noticed - I've come across many instances where complainant - a complainant in - in serious offences file a complaint, the police	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 A. That is the extent of it, that is the extent of it. Q. If we go to B749, there is an exchange between the DPP and you regarding Operation Delhi. Do you remember, this is the fourth and fifth entries, "Ian, are you free for a quick chat regarding Operation Delhi?",
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. No, absolutely not. I'll explain in detail what I meant by "Seeks assurances that there with be no withdrawal of complaint in favour of civil action". In my police career I've noticed - I've come across many instances where complainant - a complainant in - in serious offences file a complaint, the police go to town, invest resources in this (the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. That is the extent of it, that is the extent of it. Q. If we go to B749, there is an exchange between the DPP and you regarding Operation Delhi. Do you remember, this is the fourth and fifth entries, "Ian, are you free for a quick chat regarding Operation Delhi?", on 27 January. Do you recall what that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. No, absolutely not. I'll explain in detail what I meant by "Seeks assurances that there with be no withdrawal of complaint in favour of civil action". In my police career I've noticed - I've come across many instances where complainant - a complainant in - in serious offences file a complaint, the police go to town, invest resources in this (the financial resources and human resources),	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. That is the extent of it, that is the extent of it. Q. If we go to B749, there is an exchange between the DPP and you regarding Operation Delhi. Do you remember, this is the fourth and fifth entries, "Ian, are you free for a quick chat regarding Operation Delhi?", on 27 January. Do you recall what that discussion related to?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	A. No, absolutely not. I'll explain in detail what I meant by "Seeks assurances that there with be no withdrawal of complaint in favour of civil action". In my police career I've noticed - I've come across many instances where complainant - a complainant in - in serious offences file a complaint, the police go to town, invest resources in this (the financial resources and human resources), only to then the complainant withdraw their	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	A. That is the extent of it, that is the extent of it. Q. If we go to B749, there is an exchange between the DPP and you regarding Operation Delhi. Do you remember, this is the fourth and fifth entries, "Ian, are you free for a quick chat regarding Operation Delhi?", on 27 January. Do you recall what that discussion related to? A. Unfortunately not, but I've qualified that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A. No, absolutely not. I'll explain in detail what I meant by "Seeks assurances that there with be no withdrawal of complaint in favour of civil action". In my police career I've noticed - I've come across many instances where complainant - a complainant in - in serious offences file a complaint, the police go to town, invest resources in this (the financial resources and human resources), only to then the complainant withdraw their complaint, and - and it has an impact in many	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A. That is the extent of it, that is the extent of it. Q. If we go to B749, there is an exchange between the DPP and you regarding Operation Delhi. Do you remember, this is the fourth and fifth entries, "Ian, are you free for a quick chat regarding Operation Delhi?", on 27 January. Do you recall what that discussion related to? A. Unfortunately not, but I've qualified that if it refers to a "quick chat" it couldn't have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. No, absolutely not. I'll explain in detail what I meant by "Seeks assurances that there with be no withdrawal of complaint in favour of civil action". In my police career I've noticed - I've come across many instances where complainant - a complainant in - in serious offences file a complaint, the police go to town, invest resources in this (the financial resources and human resources), only to then the complainant withdraw their complaint, and - and it has an impact in many quarters. And, I specifically sought the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. That is the extent of it, that is the extent of it. Q. If we go to B749, there is an exchange between the DPP and you regarding Operation Delhi. Do you remember, this is the fourth and fifth entries, "Ian, are you free for a quick chat regarding Operation Delhi?", on 27 January. Do you recall what that discussion related to? A. Unfortunately not, but I've qualified that if it refers to a "quick chat" it couldn't have been that complicated of a matter, or else it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A. No, absolutely not. I'll explain in detail what I meant by "Seeks assurances that there with be no withdrawal of complaint in favour of civil action". In my police career I've noticed - I've come across many instances where complainant - a complainant in - in serious offences file a complaint, the police go to town, invest resources in this (the financial resources and human resources), only to then the complainant withdraw their complaint, and - and it has an impact in many quarters. And, I specifically sought the reassurance from Mr Gaggero that he was not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A. That is the extent of it, that is the extent of it. Q. If we go to B749, there is an exchange between the DPP and you regarding Operation Delhi. Do you remember, this is the fourth and fifth entries, "Ian, are you free for a quick chat regarding Operation Delhi?", on 27 January. Do you recall what that discussion related to? A. Unfortunately not, but I've qualified that if it refers to a "quick chat" it couldn't have been that complicated of a matter, or else it would have formed part of a formal meeting
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A. No, absolutely not. I'll explain in detail what I meant by "Seeks assurances that there with be no withdrawal of complaint in favour of civil action". In my police career I've noticed - I've come across many instances where complainant - a complainant in - in serious offences file a complaint, the police go to town, invest resources in this (the financial resources and human resources), only to then the complainant withdraw their complaint, and - and it has an impact in many quarters. And, I specifically sought the reassurance from Mr Gaggero that he was not going to do that. If he had, as is suggested,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A. That is the extent of it, that is the extent of it. Q. If we go to B749, there is an exchange between the DPP and you regarding Operation Delhi. Do you remember, this is the fourth and fifth entries, "Ian, are you free for a quick chat regarding Operation Delhi?", on 27 January. Do you recall what that discussion related to? A. Unfortunately not, but I've qualified that if it refers to a "quick chat" it couldn't have been that complicated of a matter, or else it would have formed part of a formal meeting or I can't - I can't recall, unfortunately.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. No, absolutely not. I'll explain in detail what I meant by "Seeks assurances that there with be no withdrawal of complaint in favour of civil action". In my police career I've noticed - I've come across many instances where complainant - a complainant in - in serious offences file a complaint, the police go to town, invest resources in this (the financial resources and human resources), only to then the complainant withdraw their complaint, and - and it has an impact in many quarters. And, I specifically sought the reassurance from Mr Gaggero that he was not going to do that. If he had, as is suggested, that he was manipulating the RGP to proceed	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. That is the extent of it, that is the extent of it. Q. If we go to B749, there is an exchange between the DPP and you regarding Operation Delhi. Do you remember, this is the fourth and fifth entries, "Ian, are you free for a quick chat regarding Operation Delhi?", on 27 January. Do you recall what that discussion related to? A. Unfortunately not, but I've qualified that if it refers to a "quick chat" it couldn't have been that complicated of a matter, or else it would have formed part of a formal meeting or I can't - I can't recall, unfortunately. Q. Then at B5050, please. This is a letter to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. No, absolutely not. I'll explain in detail what I meant by "Seeks assurances that there with be no withdrawal of complaint in favour of civil action". In my police career I've noticed - I've come across many instances where complainant - a complainant in - in serious offences file a complaint, the police go to town, invest resources in this (the financial resources and human resources), only to then the complainant withdraw their complaint, and - and it has an impact in many quarters. And, I specifically sought the reassurance from Mr Gaggero that he was not going to do that. If he had, as is suggested, that he was manipulating the RGP to proceed with its investigation, this actual poi this	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. That is the extent of it, that is the extent of it. Q. If we go to B749, there is an exchange between the DPP and you regarding Operation Delhi. Do you remember, this is the fourth and fifth entries, "Ian, are you free for a quick chat regarding Operation Delhi?", on 27 January. Do you recall what that discussion related to? A. Unfortunately not, but I've qualified that if it refers to a "quick chat" it couldn't have been that complicated of a matter, or else it would have formed part of a formal meeting or I can't - I can't recall, unfortunately. Q. Then at B5050, please. This is a letter to the Financial Secretary, where you write to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. No, absolutely not. I'll explain in detail what I meant by "Seeks assurances that there with be no withdrawal of complaint in favour of civil action". In my police career I've noticed - I've come across many instances where complainant - a complainant in - in serious offences file a complaint, the police go to town, invest resources in this (the financial resources and human resources), only to then the complainant withdraw their complaint, and - and it has an impact in many quarters. And, I specifically sought the reassurance from Mr Gaggero that he was not going to do that. If he had, as is suggested, that he was manipulating the RGP to proceed with its investigation, this actual poi this actual point kills that off, because it was me	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. That is the extent of it, that is the extent of it. Q. If we go to B749, there is an exchange between the DPP and you regarding Operation Delhi. Do you remember, this is the fourth and fifth entries, "Ian, are you free for a quick chat regarding Operation Delhi?", on 27 January. Do you recall what that discussion related to? A. Unfortunately not, but I've qualified that if it refers to a "quick chat" it couldn't have been that complicated of a matter, or else it would have formed part of a formal meeting or I can't - I can't recall, unfortunately. Q. Then at B5050, please. This is a letter to the Financial Secretary, where you write to him, and then over the page you refer to the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. No, absolutely not. I'll explain in detail what I meant by "Seeks assurances that there with be no withdrawal of complaint in favour of civil action". In my police career I've noticed - I've come across many instances where complainant - a complainant in - in serious offences file a complaint, the police go to town, invest resources in this (the financial resources and human resources), only to then the complainant withdraw their complaint, and - and it has an impact in many quarters. And, I specifically sought the reassurance from Mr Gaggero that he was not going to do that. If he had, as is suggested, that he was manipulating the RGP to proceed with its investigation, this actual poi— this actual point kills that off, because it was me putting it to him: if you want to make the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. That is the extent of it, that is the extent of it. Q. If we go to B749, there is an exchange between the DPP and you regarding Operation Delhi. Do you remember, this is the fourth and fifth entries, "Ian, are you free for a quick chat regarding Operation Delhi?", on 27 January. Do you recall what that discussion related to? A. Unfortunately not, but I've qualified that if it refers to a "quick chat" it couldn't have been that complicated of a matter, or else it would have formed part of a formal meeting or I can't - I can't recall, unfortunately. Q. Then at B5050, please. This is a letter to the Financial Secretary, where you write to him, and then over the page you refer to the Director of Public Prosecutions having
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. No, absolutely not. I'll explain in detail what I meant by "Seeks assurances that there with be no withdrawal of complaint in favour of civil action". In my police career I've noticed - I've come across many instances where complainant - a complainant in - in serious offences file a complaint, the police go to town, invest resources in this (the financial resources and human resources), only to then the complainant withdraw their complaint, and - and it has an impact in many quarters. And, I specifically sought the reassurance from Mr Gaggero that he was not going to do that. If he had, as is suggested, that he was manipulating the RGP to proceed with its investigation, this actual poi this actual point kills that off, because it was me putting it to him: if you want to make the complaint, I don't want you to - to then pull	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. That is the extent of it, that is the extent of it. Q. If we go to B749, there is an exchange between the DPP and you regarding Operation Delhi. Do you remember, this is the fourth and fifth entries, "Ian, are you free for a quick chat regarding Operation Delhi?", on 27 January. Do you recall what that discussion related to? A. Unfortunately not, but I've qualified that if it refers to a "quick chat" it couldn't have been that complicated of a matter, or else it would have formed part of a formal meeting or I can't - I can't recall, unfortunately. Q. Then at B5050, please. This is a letter to the Financial Secretary, where you write to him, and then over the page you refer to the Director of Public Prosecutions having advised that the issue of ownership is integral
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. No, absolutely not. I'll explain in detail what I meant by "Seeks assurances that there with be no withdrawal of complaint in favour of civil action". In my police career I've noticed - I've come across many instances where complainant - a complainant in - in serious offences file a complaint, the police go to town, invest resources in this (the financial resources and human resources), only to then the complainant withdraw their complaint, and - and it has an impact in many quarters. And, I specifically sought the reassurance from Mr Gaggero that he was not going to do that. If he had, as is suggested, that he was manipulating the RGP to proceed with its investigation, this actual poi— this actual point kills that off, because it was me putting it to him: if you want to make the complaint, I don't want you to - to then pull out at the last minute and lev— leave - leave	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. That is the extent of it, that is the extent of it. Q. If we go to B749, there is an exchange between the DPP and you regarding Operation Delhi. Do you remember, this is the fourth and fifth entries, "Ian, are you free for a quick chat regarding Operation Delhi?", on 27 January. Do you recall what that discussion related to? A. Unfortunately not, but I've qualified that if it refers to a "quick chat" it couldn't have been that complicated of a matter, or else it would have formed part of a formal meeting or I can't - I can't recall, unfortunately. Q. Then at B5050, please. This is a letter to the Financial Secretary, where you write to him, and then over the page you refer to the Director of Public Prosecutions having advised that the issue of ownership is integral to the prosecution of the case. This is on 8
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. No, absolutely not. I'll explain in detail what I meant by "Seeks assurances that there with be no withdrawal of complaint in favour of civil action". In my police career I've noticed - I've come across many instances where complainant - a complainant in - in serious offences file a complaint, the police go to town, invest resources in this (the financial resources and human resources), only to then the complainant withdraw their complaint, and - and it has an impact in many quarters. And, I specifically sought the reassurance from Mr Gaggero that he was not going to do that. If he had, as is suggested, that he was manipulating the RGP to proceed with its investigation, this actual poi this actual point kills that off, because it was me putting it to him: if you want to make the complaint, I don't want you to - to then pull out at the last minute and lev leave - leave all this that we've done. And not least,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. That is the extent of it, that is the extent of it. Q. If we go to B749, there is an exchange between the DPP and you regarding Operation Delhi. Do you remember, this is the fourth and fifth entries, "Ian, are you free for a quick chat regarding Operation Delhi?", on 27 January. Do you recall what that discussion related to? A. Unfortunately not, but I've qualified that if it refers to a "quick chat" it couldn't have been that complicated of a matter, or else it would have formed part of a formal meeting or I can't - I can't recall, unfortunately. Q. Then at B5050, please. This is a letter to the Financial Secretary, where you write to him, and then over the page you refer to the Director of Public Prosecutions having advised that the issue of ownership is integral to the prosecution of the case. This is on 8 April, the day after that 7 April meeting.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. No, absolutely not. I'll explain in detail what I meant by "Seeks assurances that there with be no withdrawal of complaint in favour of civil action". In my police career I've noticed - I've come across many instances where complainant - a complainant in - in serious offences file a complaint, the police go to town, invest resources in this (the financial resources and human resources), only to then the complainant withdraw their complaint, and - and it has an impact in many quarters. And, I specifically sought the reassurance from Mr Gaggero that he was not going to do that. If he had, as is suggested, that he was manipulating the RGP to proceed with its investigation, this actual poi this actual point kills that off, because it was me putting it to him: if you want to make the complaint, I don't want you to - to then pull out at the last minute and lev leave - leave all this that we've done. And not least, unfairness to those arrested, because if those	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. That is the extent of it, that is the extent of it. Q. If we go to B749, there is an exchange between the DPP and you regarding Operation Delhi. Do you remember, this is the fourth and fifth entries, "Ian, are you free for a quick chat regarding Operation Delhi?", on 27 January. Do you recall what that discussion related to? A. Unfortunately not, but I've qualified that if it refers to a "quick chat" it couldn't have been that complicated of a matter, or else it would have formed part of a formal meeting or I can't - I can't recall, unfortunately. Q. Then at B5050, please. This is a letter to the Financial Secretary, where you write to him, and then over the page you refer to the Director of Public Prosecutions having advised that the issue of ownership is integral to the prosecution of the case. This is on 8 April, the day after that 7 April meeting. "This is based in part on statements made on
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, absolutely not. I'll explain in detail what I meant by "Seeks assurances that there with be no withdrawal of complaint in favour of civil action". In my police career I've noticed - I've come across many instances where complainant - a complainant in - in serious offences file a complaint, the police go to town, invest resources in this (the financial resources and human resources), only to then the complainant withdraw their complaint, and - and it has an impact in many quarters. And, I specifically sought the reassurance from Mr Gaggero that he was not going to do that. If he had, as is suggested, that he was manipulating the RGP to proceed with its investigation, this actual poi this actual point kills that off, because it was me putting it to him: if you want to make the complaint, I don't want you to - to then pull out at the last minute and lev leave - leave all this that we've done. And not least, unfairness to those arrested, because if those arrested are then just sort of said - released	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. That is the extent of it, that is the extent of it. Q. If we go to B749, there is an exchange between the DPP and you regarding Operation Delhi. Do you remember, this is the fourth and fifth entries, "Ian, are you free for a quick chat regarding Operation Delhi?", on 27 January. Do you recall what that discussion related to? A. Unfortunately not, but I've qualified that if it refers to a "quick chat" it couldn't have been that complicated of a matter, or else it would have formed part of a formal meeting or I can't - I can't recall, unfortunately. Q. Then at B5050, please. This is a letter to the Financial Secretary, where you write to him, and then over the page you refer to the Director of Public Prosecutions having advised that the issue of ownership is integral to the prosecution of the case. This is on 8 April, the day after that 7 April meeting. "This is based in part on statements made on 26 July 2019 by two of the subjects under
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. No, absolutely not. I'll explain in detail what I meant by "Seeks assurances that there with be no withdrawal of complaint in favour of civil action". In my police career I've noticed - I've come across many instances where complainant - a complainant in - in serious offences file a complaint, the police go to town, invest resources in this (the financial resources and human resources), only to then the complainant withdraw their complaint, and - and it has an impact in many quarters. And, I specifically sought the reassurance from Mr Gaggero that he was not going to do that. If he had, as is suggested, that he was manipulating the RGP to proceed with its investigation, this actual poi this actual point kills that off, because it was me putting it to him: if you want to make the complaint, I don't want you to - to then pull out at the last minute and lev leave - leave all this that we've done. And not least, unfairness to those arrested, because if those	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. That is the extent of it, that is the extent of it. Q. If we go to B749, there is an exchange between the DPP and you regarding Operation Delhi. Do you remember, this is the fourth and fifth entries, "Ian, are you free for a quick chat regarding Operation Delhi?", on 27 January. Do you recall what that discussion related to? A. Unfortunately not, but I've qualified that if it refers to a "quick chat" it couldn't have been that complicated of a matter, or else it would have formed part of a formal meeting or I can't - I can't recall, unfortunately. Q. Then at B5050, please. This is a letter to the Financial Secretary, where you write to him, and then over the page you refer to the Director of Public Prosecutions having advised that the issue of ownership is integral to the prosecution of the case. This is on 8 April, the day after that 7 April meeting. "This is based in part on statements made on
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, absolutely not. I'll explain in detail what I meant by "Seeks assurances that there with be no withdrawal of complaint in favour of civil action". In my police career I've noticed - I've come across many instances where complainant - a complainant in - in serious offences file a complaint, the police go to town, invest resources in this (the financial resources and human resources), only to then the complainant withdraw their complaint, and - and it has an impact in many quarters. And, I specifically sought the reassurance from Mr Gaggero that he was not going to do that. If he had, as is suggested, that he was manipulating the RGP to proceed with its investigation, this actual poi this actual point kills that off, because it was me putting it to him: if you want to make the complaint, I don't want you to - to then pull out at the last minute and lev leave - leave all this that we've done. And not least, unfairness to those arrested, because if those arrested are then just sort of said - released	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. That is the extent of it, that is the extent of it. Q. If we go to B749, there is an exchange between the DPP and you regarding Operation Delhi. Do you remember, this is the fourth and fifth entries, "Ian, are you free for a quick chat regarding Operation Delhi?", on 27 January. Do you recall what that discussion related to? A. Unfortunately not, but I've qualified that if it refers to a "quick chat" it couldn't have been that complicated of a matter, or else it would have formed part of a formal meeting or I can't - I can't recall, unfortunately. Q. Then at B5050, please. This is a letter to the Financial Secretary, where you write to him, and then over the page you refer to the Director of Public Prosecutions having advised that the issue of ownership is integral to the prosecution of the case. This is on 8 April, the day after that 7 April meeting. "This is based in part on statements made on 26 July 2019 by two of the subjects under

1 meods clarification, in fitnituses to the acusted. 3 Those arrested continue on police bail, the 4 RGP finds itself in an awkward position. 5 And (?) in the absence of a definitive response, and by this I mean a witness statement by IIMGoff as to the cownership of the NSCIS platform, we will have to rely upon the evidence provided by Pland 1 Limited, who have emphatically asserted their ownership of the platform from the 10 conset of this investigation and on whose evidence we have based all our activity.* 15 A. It's pitched at that level, probably for it to carry more clout, and that is the only reason. 17 I know that the investigating team had been unable to land the - the support of the Government officials to square off the issue of the ownership, although as I say it then transported that the convenient officials to square off the issue of the ownership, although as I say it then transported the find transport of the Government officials to square off the issue of the ownership, although as I say it then transported the find transport of the Government officials to square off the issue of the ownership, although as I say it then transport of the Government officials to square off the issue of the watership, although as I say it then transport of the Government officials to square off the issue of the investigating team had been unable to land the - the support of the South of the control of the contro				
Those arrested continue on police bail, the RGP finds itself in an awkward position. And (?) in the absence of a definitive response, and by this I mean a witness statement by HMGoG as to the ownership of the NSCIS platform, we will have to rely upon the evidence provided by Bland or claim of their ownership of the platform from the construction of the investigation and on whose evidence we have based all our activity. Why were you the one to send this letter? A. It's pitched at that level, probably for it to carry more clout, and that is the only reason. I know that the investigating team had been unable to land the - the support of the Government officials to square off the issue of the ownership, although as I say it then transitive route. The progress it, that Mr Wan suggested an alternative route. The progress it, that Mr Wan suggested an alternative route. Think a few pages earlier. It is 1899 sorry, Bl1989 Well, let us go to 1899 just a because we know it is there. And it says, "Please find attached a scanned copy of a because we know it is there. And it says, "Please find attached is exempted copy of the NSCIS platform," Does that reflect your views at the time, on 8 April, that this was a key issue? A. What I did not do is tell Mr Mena that the evidence does not that it's reactial to the investigation of the hacking of the NSCIS platform," Does that reflect your views at the time, on 8 April, that this was a key issue? A. What I did not do is tell Mr Mena that the evidence in the motes of the NSCIS platform," Does that reflect your views at the time, on 8 April, that this was a key issue? A. What I did not do is tell Mr Mena that the evidence in the man and the evidence and and contrasting matters that we still vanished the evidence well not just say. Government we could not just say: Contract the first and integrated the evidence well with DPP. Not you agree with the notes of the NSCIS platform, and the proper well and the still the proper with the notes of the NSCIS platform. It is not	1	**	1	•
4 Mith the other. 5 And (?) in the absence of a definitive for esponse, and by this I mean a witness statement by HMGoG as to the ownership of the NSCIS platform, we will have to rely upon the evidence provided by Bland 11 their ownership of the platform from the onset of this investigation and on whose 21 conset of this investigation and on whose 22 conset of this investigation and on whose 23 conset of this investigation and on whose 24 conset of this investigation and on whose 25 conset of this investigation and on whose 26 conset of this investigation and on whose 27 conset of this investigation and on whose 28 conset of this investigation and on whose 29 conset of this investigation and the conset of this investigation and on whose 29 conset of the investigation and the conset of the investigation and and	2		2	_
5 And (?) in the absence of a definitive 6 response, and by this I mean a witness 5 statement by HMGoG as to the ownership of 8 the NSCIS platform, we will have to rely 10 upon the evidence provided by Bland 11 their ownership of the platform from the 12 onset of this investigation and on whose 13 evidence we have based all our activity.* 15 A. It's pitched at that level, probably for it to 16 carry more clout, and that is the only reason. 18 unable to land the - the support of the 19 Government officials to square off the issue 20 of the ownership, although as I say it then 21 transp-later transpired that becau- probably 22 influenced by the fact that they couldn't 23 progress it, that Mr Wyan suggested an 24 alternative route. 25 Q. The covering email to this is two pages, I 26 think a few pages earlier. It is 1899, sorry, 27 B1989 Well, let us go to 1899, just 28 because we know it is there. And it says, 4 "Please find attached a scanned copy of a 29 because we know it is there. And it says, 4 "Please find attached a scanned copy of a 5 letter regarding a key issue that remains 29 pending in the investigation of the hacking of 5 the NSCIS platform." Does that reflect your 20 views at the time, on 8 April, that this was a 21 key issue? 22 A. Without having the finger on the pulse as 23 the investigators did, it eventually came to 11 their Government was cooperating with 12 the RGP newerheles of the wonership. Or her 13 the RGP newerheles of the wonership of the 14 the Government was cooperating with the RGP on this cownership issue at the time? 24 A. Without having the finger on the pulse as 25 A. Without having the finger on the pulse as 26 the investigators did, it eventually came to 16 ight that they didn't have that support, and in 17 the ROTO on the support of the 18 the RGP on this ownership. Or the 18 the RGP on this ownership. 18 A. It's pitched at that level, probably in the the Government was reductant - or	3	Those arrested continue on police bail, the	3	A. I don't think one had - one thing had to do
that the Government was cooperating with the RGP on this ownership issue at the time? the NSCIS platform, we will have to rely upon the evidence provided by Bland Limited, who have emphatically asserted their ownership of the platform from the conset of this investigation and on whose evidence we have based all our activity." Why were you the one to send this letter? A. It's pitched at that level, probably for it to carry more clout, and that is the only reason. I know that the investigating team had been unable to land the -the support of the Government officials to square off the issue of the ownership, although as I say it then government officials to square off the issue of the ownership, although as I say it then government officials to square off the issue of the ownership, although as I say it then government officials to square off the issue of the ownership, although as I say it then government officials to square off the issue of the ownership, although as I say it then government officials to square off the issue of the ownership, although as I say it then government officials to square off the issue of the ownership, although as I say it then government officials to square off the issue of the ownership, although as I say it then government officials to square off the issue of the ownership, although as I say it then government officials to square off the issue of the ownership, although as I say it then government officials to square off the issue of the ownership, although as I say it then government officials to square off the issue of the ownership, although as I say it then government officials to square off the investigation of the investigation of the lacking of the NSCIS platform." Does that reflect your views at the time, on 8 April, that this was a key issue? A. I think the notes of the k—the notes of 8 April, and we could refer to them, to mention that it's crucial to the investigation but it's not fall. A. What I did not do is tell Mr Mena that the itwas official to the prosecutio	4		4	
statement by HMGoG as to the ownership of the NSCIS platform, we will have to rely upon the evidence provided by Bland Limited, who have emphatically asserted their ownership of the platform from the conset of this investigation and on whose evidence we have based all our activity." Why were you the one to send this letter? A. It's pitched at that level, probably for it to carry more clout, and that is the only reason. It know that the investigating team had been unable to land the - the support of the unable to land the - the support of	5		5	
the NSCIS platform, we will have to rely upon the evidence provided by Bland Limited, who have emphatically asserted their ownership of the platform from the consect of this investigation and on whose evidence we have based all our activity." Why were you the one to send this letter? Why were you the one to send this letter? The first pitched at that level, probably for it to carry more clout, and that is the only reason. The carry more clout, and that is the only reason. The carry more clout, and that is the only reason. The covernment officials to square off the issue of the wonvership, although as I say it then transp—later transpired that becau—probably influenced by the fact that they couldn't properly on the properly influenced by the fact that they couldn't properly on the properly influenced by the fact that they couldn't properly on the properly influenced by the fact that they couldn't properly on the properly influenced by the fact that they couldn't properly on the properly influenced by the fact that they couldn't properly influenced by the fact that they couldn't properly on the properly influenced by the fact that they couldn't properly on the properly influenced by the fact that they couldn't properly on the properly influenced by the fact that they couldn't properly on the properl	6	response, and by this I mean a witness	6	that the Government was cooperating with
upon the evidence provided by Bland Limited, who have comphatically asserted their ownership of the platform from the conset of this investigation and on whose cidence we have based all our activity." Why were you the one to send this letter? A. It's pitched at that level, probably for it to carry more clout, and that is the only reason. Iknow that the investigating team had been unable to land the - the support of the unable to land the- the support of the forement officials to square off the issue of the ownership, although as I say it then transp- later transpired that becau-probably influenced by the fact that they couldn't progress it, that Mr Wyan suggested an alternative route. Dear think a few pages earlier. It is 1899 sorry, B1989 Well, let us go to 1899, just because we know it is there. And it says, "Please find attached a canned copy of a letter regarding a key issue that remains pending in the investigation of the hacking of the NSCIS platform." Does that reflect your views at the time, on 8 April, that this was a key issue? A. It think the notes of the k—the notes of 8 April, and we could refer to them, to mention that it's crucial to the investigation but it's not fatal to the prosecution. if I'm not mistaken. A. Well, we— A. It was not fatal. That was - that shows that we still wanted, irrespective of whether it was fatal or not, that we still wanted to establish or clear up the question of the ownership. That's what I make out of it. Q. You say in that elter that "The DPP has advised that the issue of ownership of the platform is integral to the prosecution of the case." If it was integral then why did the RGP nevertheless continue with its executive Page 158 Page 160	7	statement by HMGoG as to the ownership of	7	the RGP on this ownership issue at the time?
Limited, who have emphatically asserted their ownership of the platform from the their ownership of the platform from the condended their ownership. It has been as the time, or say the platform from the corry more clourt, and that is the only reason. It from that the carry more clourt, and that is the only reason. It how that the investigating team had been unable to land the - the support of the Government officials to square off the issue of the ownership, although as I say it then transp-later transpired that becau-probably influenced by the fact that they couldn't progress it, that Mr Wyan suggested an alternative route. Page 157 I think a few pages earlier. It is 1899 sorry, Bly89 Well, let us go to 1899, just because we know it is there. And it says, Please find attached a scanned copy of a better regarding a key issue that remains pending in the investigation of the backing of the NSCIS platform." Does that reflect your views at the time, on 8 April, that this was a key issue? A I think the notes of the k—the notes of 8 April, and we could refer to them, to mention that it's crucial to the investigation of the attach or other westignation but it's not fatal to the prosecution, if I'm not mistaken. Q. Well, we — A. What I did not do is tell Mr Mena that the —it was not fatal. That was -that shows that we still wanted, irrespective of whether it was fatal or not, that we still wanted to establish or clear up the question of the advised that the issue of ownership of the platform is integral then why did the case." If it was integral then why did the gage 158 I have fatal to the prosecution of the case." If it was integral then why did the gage 158 Page 158 I have fatal the drug and in a fact that the government was rudio and the or the solider that the government was rudio and the or the solider that the government was rudio and and remains of the ownership. That's what I make out of it. Q. You say in that latter that "The DPP has advised that the issue of ownership of the platform is integral	8	the NSCIS platform, we will have to rely	8	A. Without having the finger on the pulse as
their ownership of the platform from the onset of this investigation and on whose cytidence we have based all our activity." Why were you the one to send this letter? A. It's pitched at that level, probably for it to carry more clout, and that is the only reason. It know that the investigating team had been unable to land the – the support of the Government officials to square off the issue of the ownership, although as I say it then government officials to square off the issue of the ownership, although as I say it then government officials to square off the issue of the ownership, although as I say it then government officials to square off the issue of the ownership, although as I say it then government we could not just say: Government is the owner, and accept that word without any evidence. Q. Can we now go to C1789, please. This is an entry had refers to you saying. Thanks for an entry had refers to you	9	upon the evidence provided by Bland	9	the investigators did, it eventually came to
onset of this investigation and on whose evidence we have based all our activity." Why were you the one to send this letter? A. It's pitched at that level, probably for it to carry more clout, and that is the only reason. I know that the investigating team had been unable to land the - the support of the Government officials to square off the issue of the ownership, although as I say it then transp-later transpired that becau-probably influenced by the fact that they couldn't alternative route. Dege 157 Think a few pages earlier. It is 1899 sorry, 2 B1989 Well, let us go to 1899, just 3 because we know it is there. And it says, 4 "Please find attached a scanned copy of a letter regarding a key issue that remains pending in the investigation of the hacking of the NSCIS platform." Does that reflect your views at the time, on 8 April, that this was a 8 key issue? A. I think the notes of the k- the notes of 8 April, and we could refer to them, to mention 12 that it's crucial to the investigation but it's not 2 fatal to the prosecution, if I'm not mistaken. Q. Well, we - it was not fatal. That was - that shows that was fatal or not, that we still wanted to establish or clear up the question of the case." If it was integral then why did the 25 RGP nevertheless continue with its executive 4 RGP nevertheless continue	10	Limited, who have emphatically asserted	10	light that they didn't have that support, and in
support in terms of the ownership. We had the officers had, now, legal advice from Mr 15 pitched at that level, probably for it to 16 carry more clout, and that is the only reason. 17 I know that the investigating team had been unable to land the - the support of the 18 unable to land the - the support of the 20 of the ownership, although as I say it then 21 transp-later transpired that becau-probably influenced by the fact that they couldn't 22 progress it, that Mr Wyan suggested an alternative route. 25 Q. The covering email to this is two pages, I 24 alternative route. 26 Decause we know it is there. And it is support in terms of the ownership and though as I say it then 27 transp-later transpired that becau-probably influenced by the fact that they couldn't 28 progress it, that Mr Wyan suggested an alternative route. 29 Q. The covering email to this is two pages, I 29 Think a few pages earlier. It is 1899 sorry, 29 B1989 Well, let us go to 1899, just 30 because we know it is there. And it is say, 4 "Please find attached a scanned copy of a 5 letter regarding in the investigation of the hacking of 7 the NSCIS platform." Does that reflect your views at the time, on 8 April, that this was a key issue? 4 April, and we could refer to them, to mention that it's crucial to the investigation but it's not 13 fatal to the prosecution, if I'm not mistaken. 4 Q. Well, we	11	their ownership of the platform from the	11	fact that the government was reluctant - or -
Why were you the one to send this letter? A. It's pitched at that level, probably for it to carry more clout, and that is the only reason. I know that the investigating team had been unable to land the - the support of the Government officials to square off the issue of the ownership, although as I say it then transp- later transpired flat becau- probably influenced by the fact that they couldn't progress it, that Mr Wyan suggested an alternative route. 25 Q. The covering email to this is two pages, I Page 157 1 think a few pages earlier. It is 1899 sorry, B1989 Well, let us go to 1899, just because we know it is there. And it says, Pages we know it is there. And it says, Pages at the investigation of the hacking of the NSCIS platform." Does that reflect your views at the time, on 8 April, that this was a key issue. A. I think the notes of the k—the notes of 8 April, and we could refer to them, to metion that it's crucial to the investigation but it's not fatal to the prosecution, if I'm not mistaken. Q. Well, we—if a was fatal or not, that we still wanted to establish or clear up the question of the ownership. That's was fatal or not, that we still wanted to establish or clear up the question of the convership. That's was that lates the ownership of the page 159 Page 158 Ho officers had, now, legal advice from Mr Gaggero's legal team, that seemed to be seemed to be solid. And, as police officers you go with the evidence before you and—and—and you—and that's where you—you follow the rail, in the absence of anything dese from Government ste couldn't and—and a—and you—and that's where you—you divise and—and a—and you—and that's where you—you divise where you—you divise and—and a—and you—and that's where you—you divise when the evidence before you and—and—and you—collenters, and a—and you—and that's where you—you divise with the ovidence and—and you—and that's where you—you divise with the vote of the word without and vou—and that's where you—you divendenters. Page 159 This hink a few page acle: It i	12	onset of this investigation and on whose	12	or not responsive enough to provide that
A. It's pitched at that level, probably for it to carry more clout, and that is the only reason. I know that the investigating team had been unable to land the - the support of the government officials to square off the issue of of the ownership, although as I say it then transp—later transpired that becau—probably influenced by the fact that they couldn't progress it, that Mr Wyan suggested an alternative route. 25 Q. The covering email to this is two pages, I Page 157 1 think a few pages earlier. It is 1899 sorry, B1989 Well, let us go to 1899, just because we know it is there. And it says, Pages find attached a scanned copy of a letter regarding a key issue that remains pending in the investigation of the hacking of the NSCIS platform." Does that reflect your views at the time, on 8 April, that this was a key issue? A. Think the notes of the k—the notes of 8 April, and we could refer to them, to mention that it's crucial to the investigation but it's not far fatal to the prosecution, if I'm not mistaken. Q. Well, we— A. What I did not do is tell Mr Mena that the - it was not fatal. That was - that shows that we still wanted, irrespective of whether it was fatal or not, that we still wanted to establish or clear up the question of the case." If it was integral then why did the case." If it was integral the my did the case." If it was integral to the prosecution of the case." If it was integral the my did the 25 RGP nevertheless continue with its executive action was pending. Page 158 A. Okay. And, that we've been consulting with the DPP, and that very sensitive action was pending. A. Okay. And, that we've been consulting with the DPP, and that very sensitive action was pending.	13	evidence we have based all our activity."	13	support in terms of the ownership. We had -
16 carry more clout, and that is the only reason. 17 I know that the investigating team had been unable to land the - the support of the 18 unable to land the - the support of the 20 of the ownership, although as I say it then 21 transp- later transprierd that becau- probably 22 influenced by the fact that they couldn't 23 progress it, that Mr Wyan suggested an 24 alternative route. 25 Q. The covering email to this is two pages, I 24 alternative route. 26 Q. The covering email to this is two pages, I 25 Display. 27 B1989 Well, let us go to 1899, just 3 because we know it is there. And it says, 24 "Please find attached a scanned copy of a 5 letter regarding a key issue that remains 6 pending in the investigation of the hacking of the NSCIS platform." Does that reflect your 25 views at the time, on 8 April, that this was a 29 key issue? 28 A. I think the notes of the k- the notes of 8 14 April, and we could refer to them, to mention 22 that it's crucial to the investigation but it's not 24 that it's crucial to the investigation but it's not 25 that it's crucial to the investigation but it's not 26 that it's crucial to the investigation but it's not 27 that it's crucial to the investigation but it's not 28 that it's crucial to the investigation but it's not 29 that it's not 29 that it's not 20 that it's crucial to the investigation but it's not 20 that it's not 21 that it's crucial to the investigation but it's not 21 that it's crucial to the investigation but it's not 22 that it is an 22 that	14	Why were you the one to send this letter?	14	the officers had, now, legal advice from Mr
Iknow that the investigating team had been unable to land the - the support of the order unable to land the - the support of the order transport of the support of the of the ownership, although as I say it then transport transport that becau probably influenced by the fact that they couldn't 22 progress it, that Mr Wyan suggested an alternative route. 23 progress it, that Mr Wyan suggested an alternative route. 24 Q. The covering email to this is two pages, I Page 157 25 Q. The covering email to this is two pages, I Page 159 26 think a few pages earlier. It is 1899 sorry, 2 B1989 Well, let us go to 1899, just 3 because we know it is there. And it says, 4 "Please find attached a seanned copy of a letter regarding a key issue that remains 6 pending in the investigation of the hacking of 7 the NSCIS platform." Does that reflect your 8 views at the time, on 8 April, that this was a 8 key issue? 26 A. I think the notes of the k— the notes of 8 April, and we could refer to them, to mention 12 that it's crucial to the investigation but it's not 15 fatal to the prosecution, if I'm not mistaken. Q. Well, we — 27 You say in that letter that "The DPP has advised that the issue of ownership of the establish or clear up the question of the 20 ownership. That's what I make out of it. 21 Q. You say in that letter that "The DPP has advised that the issue of ownership of the 22 platform is integral to the prosecution of the 23 platform is integral to the prosecution of the 24 case." If it was integral then why did the 25 RGP nevertheless continue with its executive 26 was pending.	15	A. It's pitched at that level, probably for it to	15	Bland's - from Mr Gaggero's legal team, that
and - and you - and that's where you - you follow the trail, in the absence of anything else from Government officials to square off the issue of the ownership, although as I say it then 20 transp—later transpired that becau—probably influenced by the fact that they couldn't 22 progress it, that Mr Wyan suggested an 23 alternative route. 24 alternative route. 25 Q. The covering email to this is two pages, I 26 Days and entry in a daybook, superintendent 27 an entry in a daybook, referring to a 28 page 159 an entry in a daybook, referring to a 29 page 159 an entry in a daybook, referring to a 29 page 159 an entry in a daybook, referring to a 29 page 159 an entry and entry that refers to you saying, "Thanks 29 because we know it is there. And it says, 4 "Please find attached a seanned copy of a 29 letter regarding a key issue that the most of the hacking of 29 the NSCIS platform." Does that reflect your 20 views at the time, on 8 April, that this was a 29 key issue? 29 sexiple of the NSCIS platform." Does that reflect your 20 views at the time, on 8 April, that this was a 29 key issue? 29 sexiple of the investigation but it's not 20 fatal to the prosecution, if I'm not mistaken. 20 Well, we — 21 that it's crucial to the investigation but it's not 21 that it's crucial to the investigation but it's not 22 that it's crucial to the investigation but it's not 24 that it's crucial to the investigation but it's not 25 that it's crucial to the investigation but it's not 26 and 27 that was fatal or not, that we still wanted to 28 establish or clear up the question of the 29 ownership. That's what I make out of it. 20 Q. You say in that letter that "The DPP has 24 advised that the issue of ownership of the 29 advised that the issue of ownership of the 29 platform is integral to the prosecution of the 29 age 158 Page 158	16	carry more clout, and that is the only reason.	16	seemed to be solid. And, as police officers
follow the trail, in the absence of anything else from Government we could not just say: influenced by the fact that they couldn't progress it, that Mr Wyan suggested an alternative route. Q. The covering email to this is two pages, I Page 157 think a few pages earlier. It is 1899 sorry, B1989 Well, let us go to 1899, just because we know it is there. And it says, Please find attached a scanned copy of a letter regarding a key issue that remains pending in the investigation of the hacking of the NSCIS platform." Does that reflect your views at the time, on 8 April, that this was a key issue? A. I think the notes of the k—the notes of 8 April, and we could refer to them, to mention that it's crucial to the investigation but it's not fatal to the prosecution, if I'm not mistaken. Q. Well, we — A. What I did not do is tell Mr Mena that the ist was fatal or not, that we still wanted, irrespective of whether it was fatal or not, that we still wanted to establish or clear up the question of the ownership. That's what I make out of it. Q. You say in that letter that "The DPP has advised that the issue of ownership of the platform is integral to the prosecution of the case." If it was integral then why did the RGP nevertheless continue with its executive action was pending. Page 158 follow the trail, in the absence of anything else from Government we could net to the dovernent is the owner, and accept that word without any evidence. Q. Can we now go to C1789, please. This is an entry in a daybook, Superintendent Richardson's daybook, referring to a conference call with Mr Gaggero at your office. And, halfway down the page there is an entry that refers to you saying. "Thanks for patience, identify criminal info liability for all four on bail, and have consulted with DPP. Very sensitive executive action pending, not to be discussed by iPhone." Do you agree with the notes that that matter was discussed? Do you agree that that is an accurate not? A. That - that's - it seems that that was part of a - an u	17	I know that the investigating team had been	17	you go with the evidence before you and -
of the ownership, although as I say it then transp—later transpired that becau—probably influenced by the fact that they couldn't progress it, that Mr Wyan suggested an alternative route. Q. The covering email to this is two pages, I Page 157 think a few pages earlier. It is 1899 sorry, B1989 Well, let us go to 1899, just because we know it is there. And it says, Please find attached a scanned copy of a letter regarding a key issue that remains pending in the investigation of the hacking of the NSCIS platform." Does that reflect your sviews at the time, on 8 April, that this was a key issue? A. I think the notes of the k—the notes of 8 April, and we could refer to them, to mention that it's crucial to the investigation but it's not fatal to the prosecution, if I'm not mistaken. Q. Well, we— A. What I did not do is tell Mr Mena that the eit was not fatal. That was - that shows that we still wanted, irrespective of whether it was fatal or not, that we still wanted for establish or clear up the question of the ownership. That's what I make out of it. Q. You say in that letter that "The DPP has advised that the issue of ownership of the gadvised that the issue of ownership of the gad	18	unable to land the - the support of the	18	and - and you - and that's where you - you
transp—later transpired that becau—probably influenced by the fact that they couldn't progress it, that Mr Wyan suggested an alternative route. 23			1	•
influenced by the fact that they couldn't progress it, that Mr Wyan suggested an alternative route. Q. The covering email to this is two pages, I Page 157 Think a few pages earlier. It is 1899 sorry, 2 B1899 Well, let us go to 1899, just 3 because we know it is there. And it says, 4 "Please find attached a scanned copy of a 5 because we know it is there. And it says, 4 "Please find attached a scanned copy of a 6 be ming in the investigation of the hacking of 7 the NSCIS platform." Does that reflect your views at the time, on 8 April, that this was a 8 see y issue? A. I think the notes of the k—the notes of 8 A. That it did not do is tell Mr Mena that the -it was not fatal. That was -that shows that was fatal or not, that we still wanted, irrespective of whether it was fatal or not, that we still wanted it cestablish or clear up the question of the ownership. That's what I make out of it. 20 Q. Yo us ay in that letter that "The DPP has advised that the issue of ownership of the platform is integral to the prosecution of the case." If it was integral then why did the 24 RGP nevertheless continue with its executive Page 158 word without any evidence. 22 Q. Can we now go to C1789, please. This is an anetry in a daybook, Superintendent Richardson's daybook, Superint	20	of the ownership, although as I say it then	20	else from Government we could not just say:
23 progress it, that Mr Wyan suggested an 24 alternative route. 25 Q. The covering email to this is two pages, I 26 Page 157 27 Page 159 28 Page 159 1 think a few pages earlier. It is 1899 sorry, 2 B1989 Well, let us go to 1899, just 3 because we know it is there. And it says, 4 "Please find attached a scanned copy of a bletter regarding a key issue that remains pending in the investigation of the hacking of the NSCIS platform." Does that reflect your views at the time, on 8 April, that this was a key issue? 10 A. I think the notes of the k—the notes of 8 April, and we could refer to them, to mention that it's crucial to the investigation but it's not fatal to the prosecution, if I'm not mistaken. 14 Q. Well, we 15 A. What I did not do is tell Mr Mena that the it was not fatal. That was - that shows that we still wanted, irrespective of whether it was fatal or not, that we still wanted to establish or clear up the question of the ownership. That's what I make out of it. 20 Q. You say in that letter that "The DPP has advised that the issue of ownership of the platform is integral to the prosecution of the case." If it was integral then why did the 25 RGP nevertheless continue with its executive 23 Q. Can we now go to C1789, please. This is an entry in a daybook, superintendent 24 Richardson's daybook, referring to a conference call with Mr Gaggero at your office. And, halfway down the page there is an entry that refers to you saying. "Thanks an entry that refers to you saying. "Thanks for patience, identify criminal info liability of patience, identify criminal info liability for patience, identify criminal info liability of patience, identify criminal info liability for patience, identify criminal info liability of pa	21	transp later transpired that becau probably	21	Government is the owner, and accept that
alternative route. Q. The covering email to this is two pages, I Page 157 Page 159 1 think a few pages earlier. It is 1899 sorry, B1989 Well, let us go to 1899, just because we know it is there. And it says, "Please find attached a scanned copy of a letter regarding a key issue that remains pending in the investigation of the hacking of the NSCIS platform." Does that reflect your views at the time, on 8 April, that this was a key issue? A. I think the notes of the k the notes of 8 land and we could refer to them, to mention that it's crucial to the investigation but it's not fatal to the prosecution, if I'm not mistaken. A. What I did not do is tell Mr Mena that the letit was not fatal. That was -that shows that we still wanted, irrespective of whether it was fatal or not, that we still wanted to establish or clear up the question of the case." If it was integral to the prosecution of the platform is integral to the prosecution of the case." If it was integral then why did the RGP nevertheless continue with its executive 24 an entry in a daybook, sperrintendent Richardson's daybook, referring to a 25 conference call with Mr Gaggero at your office. And, halfway down the page there is an entry that refers to you saying. "Thanks for patience, identify criminal info liability for all four on bail, and have consulted with DPP. Very sensitive executive action pending, not to be discussed by IPhone." Do you agree with the notes that that matter was discussed? Do you agree that that matter was discussed? Do you agree that that was part of a - an update that was provided to Mr Gaggero. I know that Mr Richardson was in far more regular contact with him, that they had some fluid relationship there in terms of evidence and - and contrasting matters that needed to be contrasted, but in this occasion it seems that I thanked the man for his patience, this is obviously after the - the arrests, yes. This is five days before the search warrant. A. Okay. And, that we've been consulting with the DPP, and that very	22	influenced by the fact that they couldn't	22	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
25 Q. The covering email to this is two pages, I Page 157 1 think a few pages earlier. It is 1899 sorry, 2 B1989 Well, let us go to 1899, just 3 because we know it is there. And it says, 4 "Please find attached a scanned copy of a 1 letter regarding a key issue that remains 5 pending in the investigation of the hacking of 7 the NSCIS platform." Does that reflect your 8 views at the time, on 8 April, that this was a 9 key issue? 10 A. I think the notes of the k the notes of 8 11 April, and we could refer to them, to mention 12 that it's crucial to the investigation but it's not 13 fatal to the prosecution, if I'm not mistaken. 14 Q. Well, we 15 A. What I did not do is tell Mr Mena that the 16 - it was not fatal. That was - that shows that 17 we still wanted, irrespective of whether it 18 was fatal or not, that we still wanted to 19 establish or clear up the question of the 20 ownership. That's what I make out of it. 21 Q. You say in that letter that "The DPP has 22 advised that the issue of ownership of the 23 platform is integral to the prosecution of the 24 case." If it was integral then why did the 25 RGP nevertheless continue with its executive 12	23		1	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
think a few pages earlier. It is 1899 sorry, B1989 Well, let us go to 1899, just because we know it is there. And it says, letter regarding a key issue that remains pending in the investigation of the hacking of the NSCIS platform." Does that reflect your views at the time, on 8 April, that this was a key issue? A. I think the notes of the k the notes of 8 April, and we could refer to them, to mention that it's crucial to the investigation but it's not fatal to the prosecution, if I'm not mistaken. Q. Well, we A. What I did not do is tell Mr Mena that the it was not fatal. That was - that shows that we still wanted, irrespective of whether it was fatal or not, that we still wanted to establish or clear up the question of the cownership. That's what I make out of it. Q. You say in that letter that "The DPP has advised that the issue of ownership of the platform is integral to the prosecution of the case." If it was integral then why did the RGP nevertheless continue with its executive Page 158 Conference call with Mr Gaggero at your office. And, halfway down the page there is an entry that refers to you saying, "Thanks for patience, identify criminal info liability for all four on bail, and have consulted with DPP. Very sensitive executive action pending, not to be discussed by iPhone." Do you agree with the notes that that matter was discussed? Do you agree that that is an accurate not? A. That - that's - it seems that that was part of a - an update that was provided to Mr Gaggero. I know that Mr Richardson was in far more regular contact with him, that they had some fluid relationship there in terms of evidence and - and contrasting matters that needed to be contrasted, but in this occasion it seems that I thanked the man for his patience, this is obviously after the - the arrest had been - had taken place, yes? Q. After the arrests, yes. This is five days before the search warrant. A. Okay. And, that very been consulting with the DPP, and that very sensitive action was pending.	24	alternative route.	24	
think a few pages earlier. It is 1899 sorry, B1989 Well, let us go to 1899, just because we know it is there. And it says, "Please find attached a scanned copy of a letter regarding a key issue that remains pending in the investigation of the hacking of the NSCIS platform." Does that reflect your views at the time, on 8 April, that this was a key issue? A. I think the notes of the k—the notes of 8 April, and we could refer to them, to mention that it's crucial to the investigation but it's not fatal to the prosecution, if I'm not mistaken. Q. Well, we A. What I did not do is tell Mr Mena that the it was not fatal. That was - that shows that we still wanted, irrespective of whether it was fatal or not, that we still wanted to establish or clear up the question of the ownership. That's what I make out of it. Q. You say in that letter that "The DPP has advised that the issue of ownership of the platform is integral to the prosecution of the case." If it was integral then why did the RGP nevertheless continue with its executive Page 158 conference call with Mr Gaggero at your office. And, halfway down the page there is an entry that refers to you saying, "Thanks for patience, identify criminal info liability for all four on bail, and have consulted with DPP. Very sensitive executive action pending, not to be discussed by iPhone." Do you agree with the notes that that matter was discussed? Do you agree that that was part of a - an update that was provided to Mr Gaggero. I know that Mr Richardson was in far more regular contact with him, that they had some fluid relationship there in terms of evidence and - and contrasting matters that needed to be contrasted, but in this occasion it seems that I thanked the man for his seems that I thanked the man for his seems that I thanked the man for his expression it is expected to the action of the 20 A. Okay. And, that we've been consulting with the DPP, and that very sensitive action was pending.	25	Q. The covering email to this is two pages, I	25	Richardson's daybook, referring to a
think a few pages earlier. It is 1899 sorry, B1989 Well, let us go to 1899, just because we know it is there. And it says, "Please find attached a scanned copy of a letter regarding a key issue that remains pending in the investigation of the hacking of the NSCIS platform." Does that reflect your views at the time, on 8 April, that this was a key issue? A. I think the notes of the k the notes of 8 April, and we could refer to them, to mention that it's crucial to the investigation but it's not fatal to the prosecution, if I'm not mistaken. Q. Well, we A. What I did not do is tell Mr Mena that the it was not fatal. That was - that shows that we still wanted, irrespective of whether it was fatal or not, that we still wanted to establish or clear up the question of the ownership. That's what I make out of it. Q. You say in that letter that "The DPP has advised that the issue of ownership of the platform is integral to the prosecution of the case." If it was integral then why did the RGP nevertheless continue with its executive conference call with Mr Gaggero at your office. And, halfway down the page there is an entry that refers to you saying, "Thanks for patience, identify criminal info liability for all four on bail, and have consulted with DPP. Very sensitive executive action pending, not to be discussed by iPhone." Do you agree with the notes that that matter was discussed? Do you agree that that is an accurate not? A. That - that's - it seems that that was part of a - an update that was provided to Mr Gaggero. I know that Mr Richardson was in far more regular contact with him, that they had some fluid relationship there in terms of evidence and - and contrasting matters that needed to be contrasted, but in this occasion it seems that I thanked the man for his evidence and - and contrasting matters that needed to be contrasted, but in this occ		Page 157		Page 159
2 B1989 Well, let us go to 1899, just 3 because we know it is there. And it says, 4 "Please find attached a scanned copy of a 5 letter regarding a key issue that remains 6 pending in the investigation of the hacking of 7 the NSCIS platform." Does that reflect your 8 views at the time, on 8 April, that this was a 9 key issue? 10 A. I think the notes of the k the notes of 8 11 April, and we could refer to them, to mention 12 that it's crucial to the investigation but it's not 13 fatal to the prosecution, if I'm not mistaken. 14 Q. Well, we 15 A. What I did not do is tell Mr Mena that the 16 - it was not fatal. That was - that shows that 17 we still wanted, irrespective of whether it 18 was fatal or not, that we still wanted to 19 establish or clear up the question of the 20 ownership. That's what I make out of it. 21 Q. You say in that letter that "The DPP has 22 advised that the issue of ownership of the 23 platform is integral to the prosecution of the 24 case." If it was integral then why did the 25 RGP nevertheless continue with its executive Page 158 2 office. And, halfway down the page there is an entry that refers to you saying, "Thanks for patience, identify criminal info liability for all four on bail, and have consulted with DPP. Very sensitive executive action pending, not to be discussed by iPhone." Do you agree with the notes that that matter was discussed? Do you agree that that is an accurate not? A. That - that's - it seems that that was part of a - an update that was provided to Mr Gaggero. I know that Mr Richardson was in far more regular contact with him, that they had some fluid relationship there in terms of evidence and - and contrasting matters that needed to be contrasted, but in this occasion it seems that I thanked the man for his patience, tidentify criminal info liability for all four on bail, and have consulted with DPP. very sensitive executive action The provent in the investigation of the backing of the NSCIS platform." Does that reflect your of a - an update that was p		0		<u> </u>
because we know it is there. And it says, "Please find attached a scanned copy of a letter regarding a key issue that remains pending in the investigation of the hacking of the NSCIS platform." Does that reflect your views at the time, on 8 April, that this was a key issue? A. I think the notes of the k— the notes of 8 April, and we could refer to them, to mention that it's crucial to the investigation but it's not fatal to the prosecution, if I'm not mistaken. Q. Well, we A. What I did not do is tell Mr Mena that the - it was not fatal. That was - that shows that we still wanted, irrespective of whether it was fatal or not, that we still wanted to establish or clear up the question of the ownership. That's what I make out of it. Q. You say in that letter that "The DPP has advised that the issue of ownership of the platform is integral to the prosecution of the case." If it was integral then why did the Page 158 an entry that refers to you saying, "Thanks for patience, identify criminal info liability for all four on bail, and have consulted with DPP. Very sensitive executive action pending, not to be discussed by iPhone." Do you agree with the notes that that matter was discussed? Do you agree that that is an accurate not? A. That - that's - it seems that that was part of a - an update that was provided to Mr Gaggero. I know that Mr Richardson was in far more regular contact with him, that they had some fluid relationship there in terms of evidence and - and contrasting matters that needed to be contrasted, but in this occasion it seems that I thanked the man for his patience, this is obviously after the - the arrest had been - had taken place, yes? Q. After the arrests, yes. This is five days before the search warrant. A. Okay. And, that ve've been consulting with the DPP, and that very sensitive action was pending.	1	think a few pages earlier. It is 1899 sorry,	1	conference call with Mr Gaggero at your
"Please find attached a scanned copy of a letter regarding a key issue that remains 5 for patience, identify criminal info liability 5 for all four on bail, and have consulted with 5 DPP. Very sensitive executive action 7 pending, not to be discussed by iPhone." Do you agree with the notes that that matter was discussed? Do you agree that that is an accurate not? A. I think the notes of the k the notes of 8 10 A. I think the notes of the k the notes of 8 11 April, and we could refer to them, to mention 11 that it's crucial to the investigation but it's not 12 fatal to the prosecution, if I'm not mistaken. 13 Gaggero. I know that Mr Richardson was in far more regular contact with him, that they had some fluid relationship there in terms of evidence and - and contrasting matters that needed to be contrasted, but in this occasion it seems that I thanked the man for his patience, this is obviously after the - the arrest had been - had taken place, yes? Q. After the arrests, yes. This is five days advised that the issue of ownership of the platform is integral to the prosecution of the case." If it was integral then why did the RGP nevertheless continue with its executive Page 158 Page 160 Pag	2	B1989 Well, let us go to 1899, just	2	office. And, halfway down the page there is
for all four on bail, and have consulted with DPP. Very sensitive executive action pending in the investigation of the hacking of the NSCIS platform." Does that reflect your views at the time, on 8 April, that this was a key issue? A. I think the notes of the k—the notes of 8 April, and we could refer to them, to mention that it's crucial to the investigation but it's not fatal to the prosecution, if I'm not mistaken. Q. Well, we A. What I did not do is tell Mr Mena that the it was not fatal. That was - that shows that we still wanted, irrespective of whether it was fatal or not, that we still wanted to setablish or clear up the question of the ownership. That's what I make out of it. Q. You say in that letter that "The DPP has advised that the issue of ownership of the platform is integral to the prosecution of the case." If it was integral then why did the RGP nevertheless continue with its executive The the time, on 8 April, that this was a before the search warrant. The then time, on 8 April, that this was a before the search warrant. The think the notes that that matter was discussed? Do you agree that that is an accurate not? A. That - that's - it seems that that was part of a - an update that was provided to Mr Gaggero. I know that Mr Richardson was in far more regular contact with him, that they had some fluid relationship there in terms of evidence and - and contrasting matters that needed to be contrasted, but in this occasion it seems that I thanked the man for his patience, this is obviously after the - the arrest had been - had taken place, yes? Q. After the arrests, yes. This is five days before the search warrant. A. Okay. And, that we've been consulting with the DPP, and that very sensitive action was pending. Page 158	3	because we know it is there. And it says,	3	
pending in the investigation of the hacking of the NSCIS platform." Does that reflect your views at the time, on 8 April, that this was a key issue? A. I think the notes of the k the notes of 8 April, and we could refer to them, to mention that it's crucial to the investigation but it's not fatal to the prosecution, if I'm not mistaken. Q. Well, we A. What I did not do is tell Mr Mena that the - it was not fatal. That was - that shows that we still wanted, irrespective of whether it was fatal or not, that we still wanted to establish or clear up the question of the cownership. That's what I make out of it. Q. You say in that letter that "The DPP has advised that the issue of ownership of the platform is integral to the prosecution of the case." If it was integral then why did the RGP nevertheless continue with its executive Page 158 DPP. Very sensitive executive action pending, not to be discussed by iPhone." Do you agree with the notes that that matter was discussed? Do you agree that that is an accurate not? A. That - that's - it seems that that was part of a - an update that was provided to Mr Gaggero. I know that Mr Richardson was in far more regular contact with him, that they had some fluid relationship there in terms of evidence and - and contrasting matters that needed to be contrasted, but in this occasion it seems that I thanked the man for his patience, this is obviously after the - the arrest had been - had taken place, yes? Q. After the arrests, yes. This is five days before the search warrant. A. Okay. And, that we've been consulting with the DPP, and that very sensitive action was pending.	4		4	• •
the NSCIS platform." Does that reflect your views at the time, on 8 April, that this was a key issue? A. I think the notes of the k the notes of 8 April, and we could refer to them, to mention that it's crucial to the investigation but it's not fatal to the prosecution, if I'm not mistaken. Q. Well, we A. What I did not do is tell Mr Mena that the - it was not fatal. That was - that shows that we still wanted, irrespective of whether it was fatal or not, that we still wanted to establish or clear up the question of the ownership. That's what I make out of it. Q. You say in that letter that "The DPP has advised that the issue of ownership of the platform is integral to the prosecution of the case." If it was integral then why did the RGP nevertheless continue with its executive Page 158 pending, not to be discussed by iPhone." Do you agree with the notes that that matter was discussed? Do you agree with the notes that that matter was discussed? Do you agree with the notes that that matter was discussed? Do you agree with the notes that that matter was discussed? Do you agree with the notes that that matter was discussed? Do you agree with the notes that that that is an accurate not? A. That - that's - it seems that that was part of a - an update that was provided to Mr Gaggero. I know that Mr Richardson was in far more regular contact with him, that they had some fluid relationship there in terms of evidence and - and contrasting matters that needed to be contrasted, but in this occasion it seems that I thanked the man for his patience, this is obviously after the - the arrest had been - had taken place, yes? Q. You say in that letter that "The DPP has advised that the issue of ownership of the platform is integral to the prosecution of the case." If it was integral then why did the RGP nevertheless continue with its executive Page 158	5		5	
views at the time, on 8 April, that this was a key issue? 9 discussed? Do you agree that that is an accurate not? 10 A. I think the notes of the k the notes of 8 10 accurate not? 11 A. That - that's - it seems that that was part of a - an update that was provided to Mr 13 Gaggero. I know that Mr Richardson was in far more regular contact with him, that they had some fluid relationship there in terms of evidence and - and contrasting matters that needed to be contrasted, but in this occasion it seems that I thanked the man for his patience, this is obviously after the - the arrest had been - had taken place, yes? Q. You say in that letter that "The DPP has advised that the issue of ownership of the platform is integral to the prosecution of the RGP nevertheless continue with its executive Page 158 Page 160 Page 160	6		6	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
discussed? Do you agree that that is an accurate not? A. I think the notes of the k—the notes of 8 April, and we could refer to them, to mention that it's crucial to the investigation but it's not fatal to the prosecution, if I'm not mistaken. Q. Well, we A. What I did not do is tell Mr Mena that the it was not fatal. That was - that shows that we still wanted, irrespective of whether it was fatal or not, that we still wanted to establish or clear up the question of the ownership. That's what I make out of it. Q. You say in that letter that "The DPP has advised that the issue of ownership of the platform is integral to the prosecution of the RGP nevertheless continue with its executive discussed? Do you agree that that is an accurate not? A. That - that's - it seems that that was part of a - an update that was provided to Mr Gaggero. I know that Mr Richardson was in far more regular contact with him, that they had some fluid relationship there in terms of evidence and - and contrasting matters that needed to be contrasted, but in this occasion it seems that I thanked the man for his patience, this is obviously after the - the arrest had been - had taken place, yes? Q. After the arrests, yes. This is five days before the search warrant. A. Okay. And, that we've been consulting with the DPP, and that very sensitive action was pending.	7	the NSCIS platform." Does that reflect your		
A. I think the notes of the k the notes of 8 April, and we could refer to them, to mention that it's crucial to the investigation but it's not fatal to the prosecution, if I'm not mistaken. Q. Well, we A. What I did not do is tell Mr Mena that the - it was not fatal. That was - that shows that we still wanted, irrespective of whether it was fatal or not, that we still wanted to establish or clear up the question of the ownership. That's what I make out of it. Q. You say in that letter that "The DPP has advised that the issue of ownership of the platform is integral to the prosecution of the case." If it was integral then why did the RGP nevertheless continue with its executive 10 A. That - that's - it seems that that was part of a - an update that was provided to Mr Gaggero. I know that Mr Richardson was in far more regular contact with him, that they had some fluid relationship there in terms of evidence and - and contrasting matters that needed to be contrasted, but in this occasion it seems that I thanked the man for his patience, this is obviously after the - the arrest had been - had taken place, yes? Q. You say in that letter that "The DPP has advised that the issue of ownership of the platform is integral to the prosecution of the case." If it was integral then why did the RGP nevertheless continue with its executive Page 158 Page 160		<u> •</u>	8	•
April, and we could refer to them, to mention that it's crucial to the investigation but it's not fatal to the prosecution, if I'm not mistaken. Q. Well, we A. What I did not do is tell Mr Mena that the it was not fatal. That was - that shows that we still wanted, irrespective of whether it was fatal or not, that we still wanted to establish or clear up the question of the ownership. That's what I make out of it. Q. You say in that letter that "The DPP has advised that the issue of ownership of the platform is integral to the prosecution of the RGP nevertheless continue with its executive Page 158 A. That - that's - it seems that that was part of a - an update that was provided to Mr Gaggero. I know that Mr Richardson was in far more regular contact with him, that they had some fluid relationship there in terms of evidence and - and contrasting matters that needed to be contrasted, but in this occasion it seems that I thanked the man for his patience, this is obviously after the - the arrest had been - had taken place, yes? Q. After the arrests, yes. This is five days before the search warrant. A. Okay. And, that we've been consulting with the DPP, and that very sensitive action was pending. Page 160		•		
that it's crucial to the investigation but it's not fatal to the prosecution, if I'm not mistaken. Q. Well, we A. What I did not do is tell Mr Mena that the it was not fatal. That was - that shows that we still wanted, irrespective of whether it was fatal or not, that we still wanted to establish or clear up the question of the Q. You say in that letter that "The DPP has advised that the issue of ownership of the platform is integral to the prosecution of the RGP nevertheless continue with its executive 12 of a - an update that was provided to Mr Gaggero. I know that Mr Richardson was in far more regular contact with him, that they had some fluid relationship there in terms of evidence and - and contrasting matters that needed to be contrasted, but in this occasion it seems that I thanked the man for his patience, this is obviously after the - the arrest had been - had taken place, yes? Q. After the arrests, yes. This is five days before the search warrant. A. Okay. And, that we've been consulting with the DPP, and that very sensitive action was pending. Page 158 Page 160	10		1	
fatal to the prosecution, if I'm not mistaken. Q. Well, we A. What I did not do is tell Mr Mena that the it was not fatal. That was - that shows that we still wanted, irrespective of whether it establish or clear up the question of the ownership. That's what I make out of it. Q. You say in that letter that "The DPP has advised that the issue of ownership of the platform is integral to the prosecution of the RGP nevertheless continue with its executive 13 Gaggero. I know that Mr Richardson was in far more regular contact with him, that they had some fluid relationship there in terms of evidence and - and contrasting matters that needed to be contrasted, but in this occasion it seems that I thanked the man for his patience, this is obviously after the - the arrest had been - had taken place, yes? Q. After the arrests, yes. This is five days before the search warrant. A. Okay. And, that we've been consulting with the DPP, and that very sensitive action was pending. Page 158 Page 160			1	
14 Q. Well, we 15 A. What I did not do is tell Mr Mena that the 16 - it was not fatal. That was - that shows that 17 we still wanted, irrespective of whether it 18 was fatal or not, that we still wanted to 19 establish or clear up the question of the 20 ownership. That's what I make out of it. 21 Q. You say in that letter that "The DPP has 22 advised that the issue of ownership of the 23 platform is integral to the prosecution of the 24 case." If it was integral then why did the 25 RGP nevertheless continue with its executive Page 158 14 far more regular contact with him, that they had some fluid relationship there in terms of evidence and - and contrasting matters that needed to be contrasted, but in this occasion it seems that I thanked the man for his patience, this is obviously after the - the arrest had been - had taken place, yes? Q. After the arrests, yes. This is five days before the search warrant. A. Okay. And, that we've been consulting with the DPP, and that very sensitive action was pending. Page 160		S		
A. What I did not do is tell Mr Mena that the - it was not fatal. That was - that shows that we still wanted, irrespective of whether it was fatal or not, that we still wanted to establish or clear up the question of the ownership. That's what I make out of it. Q. You say in that letter that "The DPP has advised that the issue of ownership of the platform is integral to the prosecution of the case." If it was integral then why did the RGP nevertheless continue with its executive Page 158 had some fluid relationship there in terms of evidence and - and contrasting matters that needed to be contrasted, but in this occasion it seems that I thanked the man for his patience, this is obviously after the - the arrest had been - had taken place, yes? Q. After the arrests, yes. This is five days before the search warrant. A. Okay. And, that we've been consulting with the DPP, and that very sensitive action was pending. Page 160				
- it was not fatal. That was - that shows that we still wanted, irrespective of whether it was fatal or not, that we still wanted to establish or clear up the question of the ownership. That's what I make out of it. Q. You say in that letter that "The DPP has advised that the issue of ownership of the platform is integral to the prosecution of the case." If it was integral then why did the RGP nevertheless continue with its executive Page 158 evidence and - and contrasting matters that needed to be contrasted, but in this occasion it seems that I thanked the man for his patience, this is obviously after the - the arrest had been - had taken place, yes? Q. After the arrests, yes. This is five days before the search warrant. A. Okay. And, that we've been consulting with the DPP, and that very sensitive action was pending. Page 160		-	1	
we still wanted, irrespective of whether it was fatal or not, that we still wanted to establish or clear up the question of the ownership. That's what I make out of it. Q. You say in that letter that "The DPP has advised that the issue of ownership of the platform is integral to the prosecution of the case." If it was integral then why did the RGP nevertheless continue with its executive 17 needed to be contrasted, but in this occasion it seems that I thanked the man for his patience, this is obviously after the - the arrest had been - had taken place, yes? Q. After the arrests, yes. This is five days before the search warrant. A. Okay. And, that we've been consulting with the DPP, and that very sensitive action was pending. Page 158 Page 160				<u>-</u>
was fatal or not, that we still wanted to establish or clear up the question of the ownership. That's what I make out of it. Q. You say in that letter that "The DPP has advised that the issue of ownership of the platform is integral to the prosecution of the case." If it was integral then why did the RGP nevertheless continue with its executive 18 it seems that I thanked the man for his patience, this is obviously after the - the arrest had been - had taken place, yes? Q. After the arrests, yes. This is five days before the search warrant. A. Okay. And, that we've been consulting with the DPP, and that very sensitive action was pending. Page 158 Page 160			1	9
establish or clear up the question of the ownership. That's what I make out of it. Q. You say in that letter that "The DPP has advised that the issue of ownership of the platform is integral to the prosecution of the case." If it was integral then why did the RGP nevertheless continue with its executive Page 158 patience, this is obviously after the - the arrest had been - had taken place, yes? Q. After the arrests, yes. This is five days before the search warrant. A. Okay. And, that we've been consulting with the DPP, and that very sensitive action was pending. Page 160		* *	1	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
20 ownership. That's what I make out of it. 21 Q. You say in that letter that "The DPP has 22 advised that the issue of ownership of the 23 platform is integral to the prosecution of the 24 case." If it was integral then why did the 25 RGP nevertheless continue with its executive Page 158 20 arrest had been - had taken place, yes? Q. After the arrests, yes. This is five days before the search warrant. A. Okay. And, that we've been consulting with the DPP, and that very sensitive action was pending. Page 158				
Q. You say in that letter that "The DPP has advised that the issue of ownership of the platform is integral to the prosecution of the case." If it was integral then why did the RGP nevertheless continue with its executive Page 158 Q. After the arrests, yes. This is five days before the search warrant. A. Okay. And, that we've been consulting with the DPP, and that very sensitive action was pending. Page 158			1	-
22 advised that the issue of ownership of the 23 platform is integral to the prosecution of the 24 case." If it was integral then why did the 25 RGP nevertheless continue with its executive Page 158 22 before the search warrant. A. Okay. And, that we've been consulting with the DPP, and that very sensitive action was pending. Page 160		<u>-</u>	1	
platform is integral to the prosecution of the case." If it was integral then why did the RGP nevertheless continue with its executive Page 158 A. Okay. And, that we've been consulting with the DPP, and that very sensitive action was pending. Page 160		The state of the s		
24 case." If it was integral then why did the 25 RGP nevertheless continue with its executive Page 158 24 with the DPP, and that very sensitive action was pending. Page 160		_	1	
25 RGP nevertheless continue with its executive 25 was pending. Page 158 Page 160			1	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Page 158 Page 160		- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1	-
	25	KGP nevertheless continue with its executive	25	was pending.
		Page 158		Page 160
	<u> </u>	U	1	

		1	
1	Q. Was that a reference to the James Levy	1	Q. Sorry, did you say that you have never
2	search warrants?	2	met with him, or you never met him?
3	A. I never disclosed that to him.	3	A. Not - we've (?) never met with him
4	Q. Yes, sorry, but were you referring when	4	around this (?).
5	you said, "Very sensitive executive action"	5	Q. In relation to the investigation.
6	A. That - that was - yes, that was obviously -	6	A. What I do recall is that I attended a social
7	I - that's what I was referring to but I'd never	7	function at the Rock Hotel, I forget the date.
8	disclosed that to him.	8	Mr Gaggero was there, I mean there were
9	Q. Because, 7 May is the day of the second	9	dignitaries - all of Gibraltar's dignitaries were
10	hearing before the Stipendiary Magistrate;	10	there, and I was a guest, too, and I - and I
11	that is the application.	11	saw Mr Levy with a - a couple of fellow
12	A. Well, you	12	colleagues. And I've always had a good
13	Q. Why did you think it necessary to inform	13	relationship with Mr Levy, always. I think
14	him that very sensitive action was pending?	14	he rooted for me to be Commissioner at one
15	A. Again, on the same principles of keeping	15	point - at least, that's what he used to tell my
16	a complainant informed.	16	partner. But at that point the eye contact,
17	Q. Can we go over the page, just to the entry	17	body language said it all, he was obviously
18	more than halfway down, this is now	18	not the same person. But I didn't exchange
19	Superintendent Richardson it seems	19	words, I just greeted him.
20	speaking, or Mr Gaggero, and the entry says,	20	Q. Is it fair to say that you sometime
21	"Grey man is in joint meeting with	21	proactively chased Mr Richardson on matters
22	Commissioner of Police, made him feel very	22	relating to Operation Delhi, as well?
23	uncomfortable of government involvement.	23	A. No, at all, at all. Remember, around this
24	Grey man had approached him. Grey man	24	period is when - when we were in the eye of
25	feels let down and betrayed." Can you	25	
23	leels let down and betrayed. Can you	23	the storm, and people were dying, and there
	Page 161		Page 163
1	avalain what was discussed 9. What	1	was a lot of things hannoning. Social
1	explain what was discussed? What	1	was a lot of things happening. Social
2	discussion that note is recording.	2	lockdown, so the RGP was trying to carry on
2 3	discussion that note is recording. A. I can't understand what it says, the (?)	2 3	lockdown, so the RGP was trying to carry on with normal business in the midst of a
2 3 4	discussion that note is recording. A. I can't understand what it says, the (?) "Grey man in joint meeting with CoP". I -	2 3 4	lockdown, so the RGP was trying to carry on with normal business in the midst of a pandemic that was hitting the world, so I
2 3 4 5	discussion that note is recording. A. I can't understand what it says, the (?) "Grey man in joint meeting with CoP". I - I	2 3 4 5	lockdown, so the RGP was trying to carry on with normal business in the midst of a pandemic that was hitting the world, so I wasn't chasing inquiries at all.
2 3 4 5 6	discussion that note is recording. A. I can't understand what it says, the (?) "Grey man in joint meeting with CoP". I- I Q. That is what I wanted to ask you about:	2 3 4 5 6	lockdown, so the RGP was trying to carry on with normal business in the midst of a pandemic that was hitting the world, so I wasn't chasing inquiries at all. Q. Can we now just go to the NDM
2 3 4 5 6 7	discussion that note is recording. A. I can't understand what it says, the (?) "Grey man in joint meeting with CoP". I - I Q. That is what I wanted to ask you about: do you remember meeting - I believe that	2 3 4 5 6 7	lockdown, so the RGP was trying to carry on with normal business in the midst of a pandemic that was hitting the world, so I wasn't chasing inquiries at all. Q. Can we now just go to the NDM assessment please, B3452. This is the NDM
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	discussion that note is recording. A. I can't understand what it says, the (?) "Grey man in joint meeting with CoP". I - I Q. That is what I wanted to ask you about: do you remember meeting - I believe that "Grey man", we have been told is a reference	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	lockdown, so the RGP was trying to carry on with normal business in the midst of a pandemic that was hitting the world, so I wasn't chasing inquiries at all. Q. Can we now just go to the NDM assessment please, B3452. This is the NDM assessment regarding the involvement of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	discussion that note is recording. A. I can't understand what it says, the (?) "Grey man in joint meeting with CoP". I - I Q. That is what I wanted to ask you about: do you remember meeting - I believe that "Grey man", we have been told is a reference to Mr Levy?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	lockdown, so the RGP was trying to carry on with normal business in the midst of a pandemic that was hitting the world, so I wasn't chasing inquiries at all. Q. Can we now just go to the NDM assessment please, B3452. This is the NDM assessment regarding the involvement of Haim Judah Levy with 36 North Limited.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	discussion that note is recording. A. I can't understand what it says, the (?) "Grey man in joint meeting with CoP". I- I Q. That is what I wanted to ask you about: do you remember meeting - I believe that "Grey man", we have been told is a reference to Mr Levy? A. That is how Mr Gaggero described him,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	lockdown, so the RGP was trying to carry on with normal business in the midst of a pandemic that was hitting the world, so I wasn't chasing inquiries at all. Q. Can we now just go to the NDM assessment please, B3452. This is the NDM assessment regarding the involvement of Haim Judah Levy with 36 North Limited. Superintendent Richardson sent this to you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	discussion that note is recording. A. I can't understand what it says, the (?) "Grey man in joint meeting with CoP". I- I Q. That is what I wanted to ask you about: do you remember meeting - I believe that "Grey man", we have been told is a reference to Mr Levy? A. That is how Mr Gaggero described him, yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	lockdown, so the RGP was trying to carry on with normal business in the midst of a pandemic that was hitting the world, so I wasn't chasing inquiries at all. Q. Can we now just go to the NDM assessment please, B3452. This is the NDM assessment regarding the involvement of Haim Judah Levy with 36 North Limited. Superintendent Richardson sent this to you on 25 February 2020, and you replied on 1
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	discussion that note is recording. A. I can't understand what it says, the (?) "Grey man in joint meeting with CoP". I- I Q. That is what I wanted to ask you about: do you remember meeting - I believe that "Grey man", we have been told is a reference to Mr Levy? A. That is how Mr Gaggero described him, yes. Q. Do you know why he referred to him as	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	lockdown, so the RGP was trying to carry on with normal business in the midst of a pandemic that was hitting the world, so I wasn't chasing inquiries at all. Q. Can we now just go to the NDM assessment please, B3452. This is the NDM assessment regarding the involvement of Haim Judah Levy with 36 North Limited. Superintendent Richardson sent this to you on 25 February 2020, and you replied on 1 March 2020. This is at 3272. And your
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	discussion that note is recording. A. I can't understand what it says, the (?) "Grey man in joint meeting with CoP". I - I Q. That is what I wanted to ask you about: do you remember meeting - I believe that "Grey man", we have been told is a reference to Mr Levy? A. That is how Mr Gaggero described him, yes. Q. Do you know why he referred to him as "Grey man"?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	lockdown, so the RGP was trying to carry on with normal business in the midst of a pandemic that was hitting the world, so I wasn't chasing inquiries at all. Q. Can we now just go to the NDM assessment please, B3452. This is the NDM assessment regarding the involvement of Haim Judah Levy with 36 North Limited. Superintendent Richardson sent this to you on 25 February 2020, and you replied on 1 March 2020. This is at 3272. And your email is the second one down, "Paul, I have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	discussion that note is recording. A. I can't understand what it says, the (?) "Grey man in joint meeting with CoP". I - I Q. That is what I wanted to ask you about: do you remember meeting - I believe that "Grey man", we have been told is a reference to Mr Levy? A. That is how Mr Gaggero described him, yes. Q. Do you know why he referred to him as "Grey man"? A. I've heard Mr Richardson's explanation,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	lockdown, so the RGP was trying to carry on with normal business in the midst of a pandemic that was hitting the world, so I wasn't chasing inquiries at all. Q. Can we now just go to the NDM assessment please, B3452. This is the NDM assessment regarding the involvement of Haim Judah Levy with 36 North Limited. Superintendent Richardson sent this to you on 25 February 2020, and you replied on 1 March 2020. This is at 3272. And your email is the second one down, "Paul, I have perused the documents you attached to your
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	discussion that note is recording. A. I can't understand what it says, the (?) "Grey man in joint meeting with CoP". I- I Q. That is what I wanted to ask you about: do you remember meeting - I believe that "Grey man", we have been told is a reference to Mr Levy? A. That is how Mr Gaggero described him, yes. Q. Do you know why he referred to him as "Grey man"? A. I've heard Mr Richardson's explanation, which is not more or less the same as mine,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	lockdown, so the RGP was trying to carry on with normal business in the midst of a pandemic that was hitting the world, so I wasn't chasing inquiries at all. Q. Can we now just go to the NDM assessment please, B3452. This is the NDM assessment regarding the involvement of Haim Judah Levy with 36 North Limited. Superintendent Richardson sent this to you on 25 February 2020, and you replied on 1 March 2020. This is at 3272. And your email is the second one down, "Paul, I have perused the documents you attached to your email below. On the basis of the information
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	discussion that note is recording. A. I can't understand what it says, the (?) "Grey man in joint meeting with CoP". I - I Q. That is what I wanted to ask you about: do you remember meeting - I believe that "Grey man", we have been told is a reference to Mr Levy? A. That is how Mr Gaggero described him, yes. Q. Do you know why he referred to him as "Grey man"? A. I've heard Mr Richardson's explanation, which is not more or less the same as mine, but it enlightened - it gave me another	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	lockdown, so the RGP was trying to carry on with normal business in the midst of a pandemic that was hitting the world, so I wasn't chasing inquiries at all. Q. Can we now just go to the NDM assessment please, B3452. This is the NDM assessment regarding the involvement of Haim Judah Levy with 36 North Limited. Superintendent Richardson sent this to you on 25 February 2020, and you replied on 1 March 2020. This is at 3272. And your email is the second one down, "Paul, I have perused the documents you attached to your email below. On the basis of the information contained in this document, I support in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	discussion that note is recording. A. I can't understand what it says, the (?) "Grey man in joint meeting with CoP". I - I Q. That is what I wanted to ask you about: do you remember meeting - I believe that "Grey man", we have been told is a reference to Mr Levy? A. That is how Mr Gaggero described him, yes. Q. Do you know why he referred to him as "Grey man"? A. I've heard Mr Richardson's explanation, which is not more or less the same as mine, but it enlightened - it gave me another perspective. I - I didn't probe Mr Gaggero	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	lockdown, so the RGP was trying to carry on with normal business in the midst of a pandemic that was hitting the world, so I wasn't chasing inquiries at all. Q. Can we now just go to the NDM assessment please, B3452. This is the NDM assessment regarding the involvement of Haim Judah Levy with 36 North Limited. Superintendent Richardson sent this to you on 25 February 2020, and you replied on 1 March 2020. This is at 3272. And your email is the second one down, "Paul, I have perused the documents you attached to your email below. On the basis of the information contained in this document, I support in principle the suggested course of action. As
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	discussion that note is recording. A. I can't understand what it says, the (?) "Grey man in joint meeting with CoP". I - I Q. That is what I wanted to ask you about: do you remember meeting - I believe that "Grey man", we have been told is a reference to Mr Levy? A. That is how Mr Gaggero described him, yes. Q. Do you know why he referred to him as "Grey man"? A. I've heard Mr Richardson's explanation, which is not more or less the same as mine, but it enlightened - it gave me another perspective. I - I didn't probe Mr Gaggero for his description, but I took it to be that -	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	lockdown, so the RGP was trying to carry on with normal business in the midst of a pandemic that was hitting the world, so I wasn't chasing inquiries at all. Q. Can we now just go to the NDM assessment please, B3452. This is the NDM assessment regarding the involvement of Haim Judah Levy with 36 North Limited. Superintendent Richardson sent this to you on 25 February 2020, and you replied on 1 March 2020. This is at 3272. And your email is the second one down, "Paul, I have perused the documents you attached 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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	discussion that note is recording. A. I can't understand what it says, the (?) "Grey man in joint meeting with CoP". I - I Q. That is what I wanted to ask you about: do you remember meeting - I believe that "Grey man", we have been told is a reference to Mr Levy? A. That is how Mr Gaggero described him, yes. Q. Do you know why he referred to him as "Grey man"? A. I've heard Mr Richardson's explanation, which is not more or less the same as mine, but it enlightened - it gave me another perspective. I - I didn't probe Mr Gaggero for his description, but I took it to be that - "Grey" in the sense of not squeaky clean. It's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	lockdown, so the RGP was trying to carry on with normal business in the midst of a pandemic that was hitting the world, so I wasn't chasing inquiries at all. Q. Can we now just go to the NDM assessment please, B3452. This is the NDM assessment regarding the involvement of Haim Judah Levy with 36 North Limited. Superintendent Richardson sent this to you on 25 February 2020, and you replied on 1 March 2020. This is at 3272. And your email is the second one down, "Paul, I have perused the documents you attached 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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	discussion that note is recording. A. I can't understand what it says, the (?) "Grey man in joint meeting with CoP". I - I Q. That is what I wanted to ask you about: do you remember meeting - I believe that "Grey man", we have been told is a reference to Mr Levy? A. That is how Mr Gaggero described him, yes. Q. Do you know why he referred to him as "Grey man"? A. I've heard Mr Richardson's explanation, which is not more or less the same as mine, but it enlightened - it gave me another perspective. I - I didn't probe Mr Gaggero for his description, but I took it to be that - "Grey" in the sense of not squeaky clean. It's not a - sort of a That - that - that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	lockdown, so the RGP was trying to carry on with normal business in the midst of a pandemic that was hitting the world, so I wasn't chasing inquiries at all. Q. Can we now just go to the NDM assessment please, B3452. This is the NDM assessment regarding the involvement of Haim Judah Levy with 36 North Limited. Superintendent Richardson sent this to you on 25 February 2020, and you replied on 1 March 2020. This is at 3272. And your email is the second one down, "Paul, I have perused the documents you attached 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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	discussion that note is recording. A. I can't understand what it says, the (?) "Grey man in joint meeting with CoP". I-I Q. That is what I wanted to ask you about: do you remember meeting - I believe that "Grey man", we have been told is a reference to Mr Levy? A. That is how Mr Gaggero described him, yes. Q. Do you know why he referred to him as "Grey man"? A. I've heard Mr Richardson's explanation, which is not more or less the same as mine, but it enlightened - it gave me another perspective. I - I didn't probe Mr Gaggero for his description, but I took it to be that - "Grey" in the sense of not squeaky clean. It's not a - sort of a That - that - that impression is what I took.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	lockdown, so the RGP was trying to carry on with normal business in the midst of a pandemic that was hitting the world, so I wasn't chasing inquiries at all. Q. Can we now just go to the NDM assessment please, B3452. This is the NDM assessment regarding the involvement of Haim Judah Levy with 36 North Limited. Superintendent Richardson sent this to you on 25 February 2020, and you replied on 1 March 2020. This is at 3272. And your email is the second one down, "Paul, I have perused the documents you attached 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 operational security. Given the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	discussion that note is recording. A. I can't understand what it says, the (?) "Grey man in joint meeting with CoP". I - I Q. That is what I wanted to ask you about: do you remember meeting - I believe that "Grey man", we have been told is a reference to Mr Levy? A. That is how Mr Gaggero described him, yes. Q. Do you know why he referred to him as "Grey man"? A. I've heard Mr Richardson's explanation, which is not more or less the same as mine, but it enlightened - it gave me another perspective. I - I didn't probe Mr Gaggero for his description, but I took it to be that - "Grey" in the sense of not squeaky clean. It's not a - sort of a That - that - that impression is what I took. Q. So, do you have a recollection of a joint	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	lockdown, so the RGP was trying to carry on with normal business in the midst of a pandemic that was hitting the world, so I wasn't chasing inquiries at all. Q. Can we now just go to the NDM assessment please, B3452. This is the NDM assessment regarding the involvement of Haim Judah Levy with 36 North Limited. Superintendent Richardson sent this to you on 25 February 2020, and you replied on 1 March 2020. This is at 3272. And your email is the second one down, "Paul, I have perused the documents you attached 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 operational security. Given the complex nature of this investigation and the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	discussion that note is recording. A. I can't understand what it says, the (?) "Grey man in joint meeting with CoP". I - I Q. That is what I wanted to ask you about: do you remember meeting - I believe that "Grey man", we have been told is a reference to Mr Levy? A. That is how Mr Gaggero described him, yes. Q. Do you know why he referred to him as "Grey man"? A. I've heard Mr Richardson's explanation, which is not more or less the same as mine, but it enlightened - it gave me another perspective. I - I didn't probe Mr Gaggero for his description, but I took it to be that - "Grey" in the sense of not squeaky clean. It's not a - sort of a That - that - that impression is what I took. Q. So, do you have a recollection of a joint meeting with Mr Levy?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	lockdown, so the RGP was trying to carry on with normal business in the midst of a pandemic that was hitting the world, so I wasn't chasing inquiries at all. Q. Can we now just go to the NDM assessment please, B3452. This is the NDM assessment regarding the involvement of Haim Judah Levy with 36 North Limited. Superintendent Richardson sent this to you on 25 February 2020, and you replied on 1 March 2020. This is at 3272. And your email is the second one down, "Paul, I have perused the documents you attached 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 operational security. Given the complex nature of this investigation and the reputational risks at stake, I would ask that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	discussion that note is recording. A. I can't understand what it says, the (?) "Grey man in joint meeting with CoP". I - I Q. That is what I wanted to ask you about: do you remember meeting - I believe that "Grey man", we have been told is a reference to Mr Levy? A. That is how Mr Gaggero described him, yes. Q. Do you know why he referred to him as "Grey man"? A. I've heard Mr Richardson's explanation, which is not more or less the same as mine, but it enlightened - it gave me another perspective. I - I didn't probe Mr Gaggero for his description, but I took it to be that - "Grey" in the sense of not squeaky clean. It's not a - sort of a That - that - that impression is what I took. Q. So, do you have a recollection of a joint meeting with Mr Levy? A. No. I'd never met with him. And, when	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	lockdown, so the RGP was trying to carry on with normal business in the midst of a pandemic that was hitting the world, so I wasn't chasing inquiries at all. Q. Can we now just go to the NDM assessment please, B3452. This is the NDM assessment regarding the involvement of Haim Judah Levy with 36 North Limited. Superintendent Richardson sent this to you on 25 February 2020, and you replied on 1 March 2020. This is at 3272. And your email is the second one down, "Paul, I have perused the documents you attached 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 operational security. Given the complex nature of this investigation and the reputational risks at stake, I would ask that you consult with the DPP to ensure our
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	discussion that note is recording. A. I can't understand what it says, the (?) "Grey man in joint meeting with CoP". I - I Q. That is what I wanted to ask you about: do you remember meeting - I believe that "Grey man", we have been told is a reference to Mr Levy? A. That is how Mr Gaggero described him, yes. Q. Do you know why he referred to him as "Grey man"? A. I've heard Mr Richardson's explanation, which is not more or less the same as mine, but it enlightened - it gave me another perspective. I - I didn't probe Mr Gaggero for his description, but I took it to be that - "Grey" in the sense of not squeaky clean. It's not a - sort of a That - that - that impression is what I took. Q. So, do you have a recollection of a joint meeting with Mr Levy?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	lockdown, so the RGP was trying to carry on with normal business in the midst of a pandemic that was hitting the world, so I wasn't chasing inquiries at all. Q. Can we now just go to the NDM assessment please, B3452. This is the NDM assessment regarding the involvement of Haim Judah Levy with 36 North Limited. Superintendent Richardson sent this to you on 25 February 2020, and you replied on 1 March 2020. This is at 3272. And your email is the second one down, "Paul, I have perused the documents you attached 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 operational security. Given the complex nature of this investigation and the reputational risks at stake, I would ask that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	discussion that note is recording. A. I can't understand what it says, the (?) "Grey man in joint meeting with CoP". I - I Q. That is what I wanted to ask you about: do you remember meeting - I believe that "Grey man", we have been told is a reference to Mr Levy? A. That is how Mr Gaggero described him, yes. Q. Do you know why he referred to him as "Grey man"? A. I've heard Mr Richardson's explanation, which is not more or less the same as mine, but it enlightened - it gave me another perspective. I - I didn't probe Mr Gaggero for his description, but I took it to be that - "Grey" in the sense of not squeaky clean. It's not a - sort of a That - that - that impression is what I took. Q. So, do you have a recollection of a joint meeting with Mr Levy? A. No. I'd never met with him. And, when	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	lockdown, so the RGP was trying to carry on with normal business in the midst of a pandemic that was hitting the world, so I wasn't chasing inquiries at all. Q. Can we now just go to the NDM assessment please, B3452. This is the NDM assessment regarding the involvement of Haim Judah Levy with 36 North Limited. Superintendent Richardson sent this to you on 25 February 2020, and you replied on 1 March 2020. This is at 3272. And your email is the second one down, "Paul, I have perused the documents you attached 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 operational security. Given the complex nature of this investigation and the reputational risks at stake, I would ask that you consult with the DPP to ensure our

1	email refers to being sent from your iPhone,	1	question you were asked was whether or not
2	just further down. How long had you been	2	you were asking the consent of the DPP to
3	able to look at the NDM before agreeing in	3	proceed by way of a search warrant?
4	principle to the course of action?	4	A. No, we would never ask the consent of.
5	A. I read it - it - I think it's a Sunday there,	5	We would consult and the only thing was we
6	so that probably was my Sunday reading, and	6	would seek advice but not consent because
7	- and making notes on it and so forth, so	7	that and it was rightly pointed out by the
8	Q. But, you had the chance to read it	8	DPP that that is an operational matter.
9	properly?	9	MR SANTOS: (To the witness): So when
10	A. Oh, I - I read it - knowing the sensitivities	10	you say you consult, did you mean seek
11	of it I read it in sufficient detail.	11	advice or just
12	Q. What do you mean in the second line,	12	A. Run it past him.
13	where you refer to supporting "the suggested	13	Q. Run it past him?
14	course of action"?	14	A. Yes.
15	A. Basically, that there's - there's two issues	15	Q. If we go to B3455, please, this is the
16	there, basically. Whether the DPP felt that	16	NDM document towards the end which
17	James Levy was a suspect - that whether the	17	refers to the grounds for suspecting that the
18	assessment that the team had arrived at, that	18	agreement to deprive Bland Ltd of the
19	the - that Mr Levy had to - questions to	19	NSCIS maintenance contract was by
20	answer as a suspect; that was one. And, on	20	dishonesty and then it sets out the
21	the question of how we are going to approach	21	conclusions that are drawn in respect of Mr
22	that matter, which was evident from the	22	Levy. Did you also agree that there were
23	NDM assessment that it was going to be	23	sufficient grounds to suspect Mr Levy of
24	approached with a warrant - a search warrant.	24	involvement in a conspiracy to defraud on
25	Q. So, if we go to 3456 Sorry, just to	25	the basis of what was set out in the NDM?
	7, 8, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1,	-	
	Page 165		Page 167
1	clarify, actually I do not think I have to take	1	A. On the basis of that information available
1 2	clarify, actually I do not think I have to take	1 2	A. On the basis of that information available to me, yes.
2	you there. So, by agreeing with the course of	2	to me, yes.
2 3	you there. So, by agreeing with the course of action you were agreeing to the proposal to	2 3	to me, yes. Q. And at 3457, 37 says, "Given the political
2 3 4	you there. So, by agreeing with the course of action you were agreeing to the proposal to go by way of search warrant?	2 3 4	to me, yes. Q. And at 3457, 37 says, "Given the political sensitivities of the persons involved, the least
2 3 4 5	you there. So, by agreeing with the course of action you were agreeing to the proposal to go by way of search warrant? A. Yes.	2 3 4 5	to me, yes. Q. And at 3457, 37 says, "Given the political sensitivities of the persons involved, the least disruptive and most diplomatic means of
2 3 4 5 6	you there. So, by agreeing with the course of action you were agreeing to the proposal to go by way of search warrant? A. Yes. Q. And, you also say in this witness	2 3 4 5 6	to me, yes. Q. And at 3457, 37 says, "Given the political sensitivities of the persons involved, the least disruptive and most diplomatic means of police intervention will be deployed." What
2 3 4 5 6 7	you there. So, by agreeing with the course of action you were agreeing to the proposal to go by way of search warrant? A. Yes. Q. And, you also say in this witness statement that you asked Mr Richardson to	2 3 4 5 6 7	to me, yes. Q. And at 3457, 37 says, "Given the political sensitivities of the persons involved, the least disruptive and most diplomatic means of police intervention will be deployed." What did you understand the words "police
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	you there. So, by agreeing with the course of action you were agreeing to the proposal to go by way of search warrant? A. Yes. Q. And, you also say in this witness statement that you asked Mr Richardson to "consult with the DPP to ensure our intended"	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	to me, yes. Q. And at 3457, 37 says, "Given the political sensitivities of the persons involved, the least disruptive and most diplomatic means of police intervention will be deployed." What did you understand the words "police intervention" to mean?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	you there. So, by agreeing with the course of action you were agreeing to the proposal to go by way of search warrant? A. Yes. Q. And, you also say in this witness statement that you asked Mr Richardson to "consult with the DPP to ensure our intended activity is legally supported." What did you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	to me, yes. Q. And at 3457, 37 says, "Given the political sensitivities of the persons involved, the least disruptive and most diplomatic means of police intervention will be deployed." What did you understand the words "police intervention" to mean? A. That's the tactical activity, are they going
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	you there. So, by agreeing with the course of action you were agreeing to the proposal to go by way of search warrant? A. Yes. Q. And, you also say in this witness statement that you asked Mr Richardson to "consult with the DPP to ensure our intended activity is legally supported." What did you mean by ensuring "our intended activity is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	to me, yes. Q. And at 3457, 37 says, "Given the political sensitivities of the persons involved, the least disruptive and most diplomatic means of police intervention will be deployed." What did you understand the words "police intervention" to mean? A. That's the tactical activity, are they going to go full blown with uniformed, blue lights,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	you there. So, by agreeing with the course of action you were agreeing to the proposal to go by way of search warrant? A. Yes. Q. And, you also say in this witness statement that you asked Mr Richardson to "consult with the DPP to ensure our intended activity is legally supported." What did you mean by ensuring "our intended activity is legally supported"?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	to me, yes. Q. And at 3457, 37 says, "Given the political sensitivities of the persons involved, the least disruptive and most diplomatic means of police intervention will be deployed." What did you understand the words "police intervention" to mean? A. That's the tactical activity, are they going to go full blown with uniformed, blue lights, sirens? Obviously not. Is it going to be a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	you there. So, by agreeing with the course of action you were agreeing to the proposal to go by way of search warrant? A. Yes. Q. And, you also say in this witness statement that you asked Mr Richardson to "consult with the DPP to ensure our intended activity is legally supported." What did you mean by ensuring "our intended activity is legally supported"? A. Package-wise, that we were on solid	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	to me, yes. Q. And at 3457, 37 says, "Given the political sensitivities of the persons involved, the least disruptive and most diplomatic means of police intervention will be deployed." What did you understand the words "police intervention" to mean? A. That's the tactical activity, are they going to go full blown with uniformed, blue lights, sirens? Obviously not. Is it going to be a discreet approach, low key? At what time
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	you there. So, by agreeing with the course of action you were agreeing to the proposal to go by way of search warrant? A. Yes. Q. And, you also say in this witness statement that you asked Mr Richardson to "consult with the DPP to ensure our intended activity is legally supported." What did you mean by ensuring "our intended activity is legally supported"? A. Package-wise, that we were on solid footing with regards to addressing Mr Levy,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	to me, yes. Q. And at 3457, 37 says, "Given the political sensitivities of the persons involved, the least disruptive and most diplomatic means of police intervention will be deployed." What did you understand the words "police intervention" to mean? A. That's the tactical activity, are they going to go full blown with uniformed, blue lights, sirens? Obviously not. Is it going to be a discreet approach, low key? At what time are you going to do the what time is the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	you there. So, by agreeing with the course of action you were agreeing to the proposal to go by way of search warrant? A. Yes. Q. And, you also say in this witness statement that you asked Mr Richardson to "consult with the DPP to ensure our intended activity is legally supported." What did you mean by ensuring "our intended activity is legally supported"? A. Package-wise, that we were on solid footing with regards to addressing Mr Levy, and that includes everything that was referred	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	to me, yes. Q. And at 3457, 37 says, "Given the political sensitivities of the persons involved, the least disruptive and most diplomatic means of police intervention will be deployed." What did you understand the words "police intervention" to mean? A. That's the tactical activity, are they going to go full blown with uniformed, blue lights, sirens? Obviously not. Is it going to be a discreet approach, low key? At what time are you going to do the what time is the approach going to be made? Are you going
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	you there. So, by agreeing with the course of action you were agreeing to the proposal to go by way of search warrant? A. Yes. Q. And, you also say in this witness statement that you asked Mr Richardson to "consult with the DPP to ensure our intended activity is legally supported." What did you mean by ensuring "our intended activity is legally supported"? A. Package-wise, that we were on solid footing with regards to addressing Mr Levy, and that includes everything that was referred to in the - in the NDM.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	to me, yes. Q. And at 3457, 37 says, "Given the political sensitivities of the persons involved, the least disruptive and most diplomatic means of police intervention will be deployed." What did you understand the words "police intervention" to mean? A. That's the tactical activity, are they going to go full blown with uniformed, blue lights, sirens? Obviously not. Is it going to be a discreet approach, low key? At what time are you going to do the what time is the approach going to be made? Are you going to wait for him as he comes out of his house
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	you there. So, by agreeing with the course of action you were agreeing to the proposal to go by way of search warrant? A. Yes. Q. And, you also say in this witness statement that you asked Mr Richardson to "consult with the DPP to ensure our intended activity is legally supported." What did you mean by ensuring "our intended activity is legally supported"? A. Package-wise, that we were on solid footing with regards to addressing Mr Levy, and that includes everything that was referred to in the - in the NDM. (15.00))	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	to me, yes. Q. And at 3457, 37 says, "Given the political sensitivities of the persons involved, the least disruptive and most diplomatic means of police intervention will be deployed." What did you understand the words "police intervention" to mean? A. That's the tactical activity, are they going to go full blown with uniformed, blue lights, sirens? Obviously not. Is it going to be a discreet approach, low key? At what time are you going to do the what time is the approach going to be made? Are you going to wait for him as he comes out of his house or are you going to go to his workplace?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	you there. So, by agreeing with the course of action you were agreeing to the proposal to go by way of search warrant? A. Yes. Q. And, you also say in this witness statement that you asked Mr Richardson to "consult with the DPP to ensure our intended activity is legally supported." What did you mean by ensuring "our intended activity is legally supported"? A. Package-wise, that we were on solid footing with regards to addressing Mr Levy, and that includes everything that was referred to in the - in the NDM. (15.00)) Q. So were you asking Mr Richardson	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	to me, yes. Q. And at 3457, 37 says, "Given the political sensitivities of the persons involved, the least disruptive and most diplomatic means of police intervention will be deployed." What did you understand the words "police intervention" to mean? A. That's the tactical activity, are they going to go full blown with uniformed, blue lights, sirens? Obviously not. Is it going to be a discreet approach, low key? At what time are you going to do the what time is the approach going to be made? Are you going to wait for him as he comes out of his house or are you going to go to his workplace? Those types of tactical considerations.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	you there. So, by agreeing with the course of action you were agreeing to the proposal to go by way of search warrant? A. Yes. Q. And, you also say in this witness statement that you asked Mr Richardson to "consult with the DPP to ensure our intended activity is legally supported." What did you mean by ensuring "our intended activity is legally supported"? A. Package-wise, that we were on solid footing with regards to addressing Mr Levy, and that includes everything that was referred to in the - in the NDM. (15.00)) Q. So were you asking Mr Richardson specifically to seek the DPP's advice on the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	to me, yes. Q. And at 3457, 37 says, "Given the political sensitivities of the persons involved, the least disruptive and most diplomatic means of police intervention will be deployed." What did you understand the words "police intervention" to mean? A. That's the tactical activity, are they going to go full blown with uniformed, blue lights, sirens? Obviously not. Is it going to be a discreet approach, low key? At what time are you going to do the what time is the approach going to be made? Are you going to wait for him as he comes out of his house or are you going to go to his workplace? Those types of tactical considerations. Q. Now can we go to 3612, please, this is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	you there. So, by agreeing with the course of action you were agreeing to the proposal to go by way of search warrant? A. Yes. Q. And, you also say in this witness statement that you asked Mr Richardson to "consult with the DPP to ensure our intended activity is legally supported." What did you mean by ensuring "our intended activity is legally supported"? A. Package-wise, that we were on solid footing with regards to addressing Mr Levy, and that includes everything that was referred to in the - in the NDM. (15.00)) Q. So were you asking Mr Richardson specifically to seek the DPP's advice on the decision to proceed with a search warrant?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. And at 3457, 37 says, "Given the political sensitivities of the persons involved, the least disruptive and most diplomatic means of police intervention will be deployed." What did you understand the words "police intervention" to mean? A. That's the tactical activity, are they going to go full blown with uniformed, blue lights, sirens? Obviously not. Is it going to be a discreet approach, low key? At what time are you going to do the what time is the approach going to be made? Are you going to wait for him as he comes out of his house or are you going to go to his workplace? Those types of tactical considerations. Q. Now can we go to 3612, please, this is the charging advice document prepared by
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	you there. So, by agreeing with the course of action you were agreeing to the proposal to go by way of search warrant? A. Yes. Q. And, you also say in this witness statement that you asked Mr Richardson to "consult with the DPP to ensure our intended activity is legally supported." What did you mean by ensuring "our intended activity is legally supported"? A. Package-wise, that we were on solid footing with regards to addressing Mr Levy, and that includes everything that was referred to in the - in the NDM. (15.00)) Q. So were you asking Mr Richardson specifically to seek the DPP's advice on the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. And at 3457, 37 says, "Given the political sensitivities of the persons involved, the least disruptive and most diplomatic means of police intervention will be deployed." What did you understand the words "police intervention" to mean? A. That's the tactical activity, are they going to go full blown with uniformed, blue lights, sirens? Obviously not. Is it going to be a discreet approach, low key? At what time are you going to do the what time is the approach going to be made? Are you going to wait for him as he comes out of his house or are you going to go to his workplace? Those types of tactical considerations. Q. Now can we go to 3612, please, this is the charging advice document prepared by the then Inspector Wyan at Superintendent
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	you there. So, by agreeing with the course of action you were agreeing to the proposal to go by way of search warrant? A. Yes. Q. And, you also say in this witness statement that you asked Mr Richardson to "consult with the DPP to ensure our intended activity is legally supported." What did you mean by ensuring "our intended activity is legally supported"? A. Package-wise, that we were on solid footing with regards to addressing Mr Levy, and that includes everything that was referred to in the - in the NDM. (15.00)) Q. So were you asking Mr Richardson specifically to seek the DPP's advice on the decision to proceed with a search warrant? A. Are you asking it's to consult with the DPP.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. And at 3457, 37 says, "Given the political sensitivities of the persons involved, the least disruptive and most diplomatic means of police intervention will be deployed." What did you understand the words "police intervention" to mean? A. That's the tactical activity, are they going to go full blown with uniformed, blue lights, sirens? Obviously not. Is it going to be a discreet approach, low key? At what time are you going to do the what time is the approach going to be made? Are you going to wait for him as he comes out of his house or are you going to go to his workplace? Those types of tactical considerations. Q. Now can we go to 3612, please, this is the charging advice document prepared by the then Inspector Wyan at Superintendent Richardson's request to provide to the DPP.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	you there. So, by agreeing with the course of action you were agreeing to the proposal to go by way of search warrant? A. Yes. Q. And, you also say in this witness statement that you asked Mr Richardson to "consult with the DPP to ensure our intended activity is legally supported." What did you mean by ensuring "our intended activity is legally supported"? A. Package-wise, that we were on solid footing with regards to addressing Mr Levy, and that includes everything that was referred to in the - in the NDM. (15.00)) Q. So were you asking Mr Richardson specifically to seek the DPP's advice on the decision to proceed with a search warrant? A. Are you asking it's to consult with the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. And at 3457, 37 says, "Given the political sensitivities of the persons involved, the least disruptive and most diplomatic means of police intervention will be deployed." What did you understand the words "police intervention" to mean? A. That's the tactical activity, are they going to go full blown with uniformed, blue lights, sirens? Obviously not. Is it going to be a discreet approach, low key? At what time are you going to do the what time is the approach going to be made? Are you going to wait for him as he comes out of his house or are you going to go to his workplace? Those types of tactical considerations. Q. Now can we go to 3612, please, this is the charging advice document prepared by the then Inspector Wyan at Superintendent Richardson's request to provide to the DPP. Did Mr Richardson or Mr Wyan send or
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	you there. So, by agreeing with the course of action you were agreeing to the proposal to go by way of search warrant? A. Yes. Q. And, you also say in this witness statement that you asked Mr Richardson to "consult with the DPP to ensure our intended activity is legally supported." What did you mean by ensuring "our intended activity is legally supported"? A. Package-wise, that we were on solid footing with regards to addressing Mr Levy, and that includes everything that was referred to in the - in the NDM. (15.00)) Q. So were you asking Mr Richardson specifically to seek the DPP's advice on the decision to proceed with a search warrant? A. Are you asking it's to consult with the DPP. Q. So what do you mean by consulting with, if not seeking legal advice?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. And at 3457, 37 says, "Given the political sensitivities of the persons involved, the least disruptive and most diplomatic means of police intervention will be deployed." What did you understand the words "police intervention" to mean? A. That's the tactical activity, are they going to go full blown with uniformed, blue lights, sirens? Obviously not. Is it going to be a discreet approach, low key? At what time are you going to do the what time is the approach going to be made? Are you going to wait for him as he comes out of his house or are you going to go to his workplace? Those types of tactical considerations. Q. Now can we go to 3612, please, this is the charging advice document prepared by the then Inspector Wyan at Superintendent Richardson's request to provide to the DPP.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	you there. So, by agreeing with the course of action you were agreeing to the proposal to go by way of search warrant? A. Yes. Q. And, you also say in this witness statement that you asked Mr Richardson to "consult with the DPP to ensure our intended activity is legally supported." What did you mean by ensuring "our intended activity is legally supported"? A. Package-wise, that we were on solid footing with regards to addressing Mr Levy, and that includes everything that was referred to in the - in the NDM. (15.00)) Q. So were you asking Mr Richardson specifically to seek the DPP's advice on the decision to proceed with a search warrant? A. Are you asking it's to consult with the DPP. Q. So what do you mean by consulting with,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. And at 3457, 37 says, "Given the political sensitivities of the persons involved, the least disruptive and most diplomatic means of police intervention will be deployed." What did you understand the words "police intervention" to mean? A. That's the tactical activity, are they going to go full blown with uniformed, blue lights, sirens? Obviously not. Is it going to be a discreet approach, low key? At what time are you going to do the what time is the approach going to be made? Are you going to wait for him as he comes out of his house or are you going to go to his workplace? Those types of tactical considerations. Q. Now can we go to 3612, please, this is the charging advice document prepared by the then Inspector Wyan at Superintendent Richardson's request to provide to the DPP. Did Mr Richardson or Mr Wyan send or show you a version of this document at any
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	you there. So, by agreeing with the course of action you were agreeing to the proposal to go by way of search warrant? A. Yes. Q. And, you also say in this witness statement that you asked Mr Richardson to "consult with the DPP to ensure our intended activity is legally supported." What did you mean by ensuring "our intended activity is legally supported"? A. Package-wise, that we were on solid footing with regards to addressing Mr Levy, and that includes everything that was referred to in the - in the NDM. (15.00)) Q. So were you asking Mr Richardson specifically to seek the DPP's advice on the decision to proceed with a search warrant? A. Are you asking it's to consult with the DPP. Q. So what do you mean by consulting with, if not seeking legal advice? A. Run it past him; run it past him. THE CHAIRMAN: (To the witness): The	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. And at 3457, 37 says, "Given the political sensitivities of the persons involved, the least disruptive and most diplomatic means of police intervention will be deployed." What did you understand the words "police intervention" to mean? A. That's the tactical activity, are they going to go full blown with uniformed, blue lights, sirens? Obviously not. Is it going to be a discreet approach, low key? At what time are you going to do the what time is the approach going to be made? Are you going to wait for him as he comes out of his house or are you going to go to his workplace? Those types of tactical considerations. Q. Now can we go to 3612, please, this is the charging advice document prepared by the then Inspector Wyan at Superintendent Richardson's request to provide to the DPP. Did Mr Richardson or Mr Wyan send or show you a version of this document at any point? A. I have subsequently read it a long time
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	you there. So, by agreeing with the course of action you were agreeing to the proposal to go by way of search warrant? A. Yes. Q. And, you also say in this witness statement that you asked Mr Richardson to "consult with the DPP to ensure our intended activity is legally supported." What did you mean by ensuring "our intended activity is legally supported"? A. Package-wise, that we were on solid footing with regards to addressing Mr Levy, and that includes everything that was referred to in the - in the NDM. (15.00)) Q. So were you asking Mr Richardson specifically to seek the DPP's advice on the decision to proceed with a search warrant? A. Are you asking it's to consult with the DPP. Q. So what do you mean by consulting with, if not seeking legal advice? A. Run it past him; run it past him.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. And at 3457, 37 says, "Given the political sensitivities of the persons involved, the least disruptive and most diplomatic means of police intervention will be deployed." What did you understand the words "police intervention" to mean? A. That's the tactical activity, are they going to go full blown with uniformed, blue lights, sirens? Obviously not. Is it going to be a discreet approach, low key? At what time are you going to do the what time is the approach going to be made? Are you going to wait for him as he comes out of his house or are you going to go to his workplace? Those types of tactical considerations. Q. Now can we go to 3612, please, this is the charging advice document prepared by the then Inspector Wyan at Superintendent Richardson's request to provide to the DPP. Did Mr Richardson or Mr Wyan send or show you a version of this document at any point?

1	ago but I can't be sure that it was shared with	1	but that doesn't apply to this. But in this
2	me and if it was, there has to be an audit trail	2	case, yes, we knew there was going to be a
3	in terms of an email trail because that will	3	streamlining of charges because there were
4	not have been sent to me by in hard copy,	4	many repeated counts, albeit on different
5	they would probably have emailed me and I	5	dates, but specifically they were they
6	have looked through my emails	6	could stand on their own but you don't it's
7	THE CHAIRMAN: (To the witness): There	7	not viable and prosecutors do not work like
8	is no such email.	8	that, in my experience. They prefer a sample
9	A. There is not, that's what I mean, so I can't	9	that captures as much of the evidence
10	comment.	10	possible and then the others are either not
11	MR SANTOS: (To the witness): I think	11	preferred or, if anything, sometimes it even
12	your answer deals with my next question but	12	cuts (inaudible).
13	I am going to put it to you just so that you are	13	Q. We have heard from Mr Richardson and
14	aware, in Superintendent Wyan's evidence on	14	Mr Wyan that they had two meetings with
15	Friday, he stated that he believed there was a	15	the DPP in March, the beginning of March
16	meeting in your office where you went	16	and the beginning of April 2020, I just want
17	through an iteration of that charging advice	17	to ask some questions about your
18	and he updated you on the investigation. Do	18	understanding of what happened at those
19	you recall a meeting of that nature?	19	meetings. If we go to A1427, this is Mr
20	A. I would not dispute it but I cannot recall	20	Richardson's account of 3 March meeting
21	the finer detail of it.	21	and he says at paragraph 14 in the final
22	THE CHAIRMAN: (To the witness): He or	22	sentence, "The DPP inclined to the view that
23	Mr Richardson said that the fact that the	23	JL's involvement in Operation Delhi arose
24	document is addressed, as you can see there,	24	from sharp business practice." Did that view
25	to the Commissioner of Police, does not	25	of the DPP get back to you via Mr
23	to the Commissioner of Fonce, does not	23	of the Bit get odek to you via via
	Page 169		Page 171
1	necessarily mean that it was either sent to	1	Richardson or Mr Wyan?
	•		
2	you or that you received it?	2	A. At one point it did. I believe it could
3	you or that you received it? A. That's right, that is a historical feature at	2 3	A. At one point it did. I believe it could possibly have been when it was resolved that
3 4	you or that you received it? A. That's right, that is a historical feature at least in the RGP. We haven't moved on	2 3 4	A. At one point it did. I believe it could possibly have been when it was resolved that sharp business practice or commercial
3 4 5	you or that you received it? A. That's right, that is a historical feature at least in the RGP. We haven't moved on maybe on in that regard. Every	2 3 4 5	A. At one point it did. I believe it could possibly have been when it was resolved that sharp business practice or commercial deviance which the DPP was, I believe,
3 4 5 6	you or that you received it? A. That's right, that is a historical feature at least in the RGP. We haven't moved on maybe on in that regard. Every correspondence is addressed to the	2 3 4 5 6	A. At one point it did. I believe it could possibly have been when it was resolved that sharp business practice or commercial deviance which the DPP was, I believe, suggesting was not there was no criminal
3 4 5 6 7	you or that you received it? A. That's right, that is a historical feature at least in the RGP. We haven't moved on maybe on in that regard. Every correspondence is addressed to the Commissioner even though it's not it	2 3 4 5 6 7	A. At one point it did. I believe it could possibly have been when it was resolved that sharp business practice or commercial deviance which the DPP was, I believe, suggesting was not there was no criminal liability to be attached had then been changed
3 4 5 6 7 8	you or that you received it? A. That's right, that is a historical feature at least in the RGP. We haven't moved on maybe on in that regard. Every correspondence is addressed to the Commissioner even though it's not it doesn't reach him or it's just a formality.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A. At one point it did. I believe it could possibly have been when it was resolved that sharp business practice or commercial deviance which the DPP was, I believe, suggesting was not there was no criminal liability to be attached had then been changed that position had changed when Mr Wyan
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	you or that you received it? A. That's right, that is a historical feature at least in the RGP. We haven't moved on maybe on in that regard. Every correspondence is addressed to the Commissioner even though it's not it doesn't reach him or it's just a formality. MR SANTOS: (To the witness): Were you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. At one point it did. I believe it could possibly have been when it was resolved that sharp business practice or commercial deviance which the DPP was, I believe, suggesting was not there was no criminal liability to be attached had then been changed that position had changed when Mr Wyan argued the case.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	you or that you received it? A. That's right, that is a historical feature at least in the RGP. We haven't moved on maybe on in that regard. Every correspondence is addressed to the Commissioner even though it's not it doesn't reach him or it's just a formality. MR SANTOS: (To the witness): Were you aware at that point of the number of charges	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. At one point it did. I believe it could possibly have been when it was resolved that sharp business practice or commercial deviance which the DPP was, I believe, suggesting was not there was no criminal liability to be attached had then been changed that position had changed when Mr Wyan argued the case. Q. At the 8 April 2020 meeting on the
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	you or that you received it? A. That's right, that is a historical feature at least in the RGP. We haven't moved on maybe on in that regard. Every correspondence is addressed to the Commissioner even though it's not it doesn't reach him or it's just a formality. MR SANTOS: (To the witness): Were you aware at that point of the number of charges that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	A. At one point it did. I believe it could possibly have been when it was resolved that sharp business practice or commercial deviance which the DPP was, I believe, suggesting was not there was no criminal liability to be attached had then been changed that position had changed when Mr Wyan argued the case. Q. At the 8 April 2020 meeting on the strength of the charging advice?
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	you or that you received it? A. That's right, that is a historical feature at least in the RGP. We haven't moved on maybe on in that regard. Every correspondence is addressed to the Commissioner even though it's not it doesn't reach him or it's just a formality. MR SANTOS: (To the witness): Were you aware at that point of the number of charges that A. Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A. At one point it did. I believe it could possibly have been when it was resolved that sharp business practice or commercial deviance which the DPP was, I believe, suggesting was not there was no criminal liability to be attached had then been changed that position had changed when Mr Wyan argued the case. Q. At the 8 April 2020 meeting on the strength of the charging advice? A. I cannot follow the chronology because I
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	you or that you received it? A. That's right, that is a historical feature at least in the RGP. We haven't moved on maybe on in that regard. Every correspondence is addressed to the Commissioner even though it's not it doesn't reach him or it's just a formality. MR SANTOS: (To the witness): Were you aware at that point of the number of charges that A. Yes. Q were being considered?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. At one point it did. I believe it could possibly have been when it was resolved that sharp business practice or commercial deviance which the DPP was, I believe, suggesting was not there was no criminal liability to be attached had then been changed that position had changed when Mr Wyan argued the case. Q. At the 8 April 2020 meeting on the strength of the charging advice? A. I cannot follow the chronology because I am not alive to it.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	you or that you received it? A. That's right, that is a historical feature at least in the RGP. We haven't moved on maybe on in that regard. Every correspondence is addressed to the Commissioner even though it's not it doesn't reach him or it's just a formality. MR SANTOS: (To the witness): Were you aware at that point of the number of charges that A. Yes. Q were being considered? A. Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A. At one point it did. I believe it could possibly have been when it was resolved that sharp business practice or commercial deviance which the DPP was, I believe, suggesting was not there was no criminal liability to be attached had then been changed that position had changed when Mr Wyan argued the case. Q. At the 8 April 2020 meeting on the strength of the charging advice? A. I cannot follow the chronology because I am not alive to it. Q. Well, there were two meetings, the first
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	you or that you received it? A. That's right, that is a historical feature at least in the RGP. We haven't moved on maybe on in that regard. Every correspondence is addressed to the Commissioner even though it's not it doesn't reach him or it's just a formality. MR SANTOS: (To the witness): Were you aware at that point of the number of charges that A. Yes. Q were being considered? A. Yes. Q. What was your view on the large number	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A. At one point it did. I believe it could possibly have been when it was resolved that sharp business practice or commercial deviance which the DPP was, I believe, suggesting was not there was no criminal liability to be attached had then been changed that position had changed when Mr Wyan argued the case. Q. At the 8 April 2020 meeting on the strength of the charging advice? A. I cannot follow the chronology because I am not alive to it. Q. Well, there were two meetings, the first one the DPP said "sharp business practice,"
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	you or that you received it? A. That's right, that is a historical feature at least in the RGP. We haven't moved on maybe on in that regard. Every correspondence is addressed to the Commissioner even though it's not it doesn't reach him or it's just a formality. MR SANTOS: (To the witness): Were you aware at that point of the number of charges that A. Yes. Q were being considered? A. Yes. Q. What was your view on the large number of charges at the time?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. At one point it did. I believe it could possibly have been when it was resolved that sharp business practice or commercial deviance which the DPP was, I believe, suggesting was not there was no criminal liability to be attached had then been changed that position had changed when Mr Wyan argued the case. Q. At the 8 April 2020 meeting on the strength of the charging advice? A. I cannot follow the chronology because I am not alive to it. Q. Well, there were two meetings, the first one the DPP said "sharp business practice," and then 8 April there was the note
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	you or that you received it? A. That's right, that is a historical feature at least in the RGP. We haven't moved on maybe on in that regard. Every correspondence is addressed to the Commissioner even though it's not it doesn't reach him or it's just a formality. MR SANTOS: (To the witness): Were you aware at that point of the number of charges that A. Yes. Q were being considered? A. Yes. Q. What was your view on the large number of charges at the time? A. I think that was very clear from the outset	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. At one point it did. I believe it could possibly have been when it was resolved that sharp business practice or commercial deviance which the DPP was, I believe, suggesting was not there was no criminal liability to be attached had then been changed that position had changed when Mr Wyan argued the case. Q. At the 8 April 2020 meeting on the strength of the charging advice? A. I cannot follow the chronology because I am not alive to it. Q. Well, there were two meetings, the first one the DPP said "sharp business practice," and then 8 April there was the note suggests that the DPP said that the note
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	you or that you received it? A. That's right, that is a historical feature at least in the RGP. We haven't moved on maybe on in that regard. Every correspondence is addressed to the Commissioner even though it's not it doesn't reach him or it's just a formality. MR SANTOS: (To the witness): Were you aware at that point of the number of charges that A. Yes. Q were being considered? A. Yes. Q. What was your view on the large number of charges at the time? A. I think that was very clear from the outset that that was not going to be sustainable or	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. At one point it did. I believe it could possibly have been when it was resolved that sharp business practice or commercial deviance which the DPP was, I believe, suggesting was not there was no criminal liability to be attached had then been changed that position had changed when Mr Wyan argued the case. Q. At the 8 April 2020 meeting on the strength of the charging advice? A. I cannot follow the chronology because I am not alive to it. Q. Well, there were two meetings, the first one the DPP said "sharp business practice," and then 8 April there was the note suggests that the DPP said that the note says, "Reasonable grounds to question would
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	you or that you received it? A. That's right, that is a historical feature at least in the RGP. We haven't moved on maybe on in that regard. Every correspondence is addressed to the Commissioner even though it's not it doesn't reach him or it's just a formality. MR SANTOS: (To the witness): Were you aware at that point of the number of charges that A. Yes. Q were being considered? A. Yes. Q. What was your view on the large number of charges at the time? A. I think that was very clear from the outset that that was not going to be sustainable or proper. I have dealt with many	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. At one point it did. I believe it could possibly have been when it was resolved that sharp business practice or commercial deviance which the DPP was, I believe, suggesting was not there was no criminal liability to be attached had then been changed that position had changed when Mr Wyan argued the case. Q. At the 8 April 2020 meeting on the strength of the charging advice? A. I cannot follow the chronology because I am not alive to it. Q. Well, there were two meetings, the first one the DPP said "sharp business practice," and then 8 April there was the note suggests that the DPP said that the note says, "Reasonable grounds to question would be a lingering doubt, otherwise obligation to
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	you or that you received it? A. That's right, that is a historical feature at least in the RGP. We haven't moved on maybe on in that regard. Every correspondence is addressed to the Commissioner even though it's not it doesn't reach him or it's just a formality. MR SANTOS: (To the witness): Were you aware at that point of the number of charges that A. Yes. Q were being considered? A. Yes. Q. What was your view on the large number of charges at the time? A. I think that was very clear from the outset that that was not going to be sustainable or proper. I have dealt with many investigations where there are multiple	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. At one point it did. I believe it could possibly have been when it was resolved that sharp business practice or commercial deviance which the DPP was, I believe, suggesting was not there was no criminal liability to be attached had then been changed that position had changed when Mr Wyan argued the case. Q. At the 8 April 2020 meeting on the strength of the charging advice? A. I cannot follow the chronology because I am not alive to it. Q. Well, there were two meetings, the first one the DPP said "sharp business practice," and then 8 April there was the note suggests that the DPP said that the note says, "Reasonable grounds to question would be a lingering doubt, otherwise obligation to interview under caution." As far as you are
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	you or that you received it? A. That's right, that is a historical feature at least in the RGP. We haven't moved on maybe on in that regard. Every correspondence is addressed to the Commissioner even though it's not it doesn't reach him or it's just a formality. MR SANTOS: (To the witness): Were you aware at that point of the number of charges that A. Yes. Q were being considered? A. Yes. Q. What was your view on the large number of charges at the time? A. I think that was very clear from the outset that that was not going to be sustainable or proper. I have dealt with many investigations where there are multiple charges and there's other ways of reducing it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. At one point it did. I believe it could possibly have been when it was resolved that sharp business practice or commercial deviance which the DPP was, I believe, suggesting was not there was no criminal liability to be attached had then been changed that position had changed when Mr Wyan argued the case. Q. At the 8 April 2020 meeting on the strength of the charging advice? A. I cannot follow the chronology because I am not alive to it. Q. Well, there were two meetings, the first one the DPP said "sharp business practice," and then 8 April there was the note suggests that the DPP said that the note says, "Reasonable grounds to question would be a lingering doubt, otherwise obligation to interview under caution." As far as you are concerned, your position is that at one point
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	you or that you received it? A. That's right, that is a historical feature at least in the RGP. We haven't moved on maybe on in that regard. Every correspondence is addressed to the Commissioner even though it's not it doesn't reach him or it's just a formality. MR SANTOS: (To the witness): Were you aware at that point of the number of charges that A. Yes. Q were being considered? A. Yes. Q. What was your view on the large number of charges at the time? A. I think that was very clear from the outset that that was not going to be sustainable or proper. I have dealt with many investigations where there are multiple charges and there's other ways of reducing it to be a lesser format. I mean, the Chairman	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. At one point it did. I believe it could possibly have been when it was resolved that sharp business practice or commercial deviance which the DPP was, I believe, suggesting was not there was no criminal liability to be attached had then been changed that position had changed when Mr Wyan argued the case. Q. At the 8 April 2020 meeting on the strength of the charging advice? A. I cannot follow the chronology because I am not alive to it. Q. Well, there were two meetings, the first one the DPP said "sharp business practice," and then 8 April there was the note suggests that the DPP said that the note says, "Reasonable grounds to question would be a lingering doubt, otherwise obligation to interview under caution." As far as you are concerned, your position is that at one point there was the view of sharp business practice
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	you or that you received it? A. That's right, that is a historical feature at least in the RGP. We haven't moved on maybe on in that regard. Every correspondence is addressed to the Commissioner even though it's not it doesn't reach him or it's just a formality. MR SANTOS: (To the witness): Were you aware at that point of the number of charges that A. Yes. Q were being considered? A. Yes. Q. What was your view on the large number of charges at the time? A. I think that was very clear from the outset that that was not going to be sustainable or proper. I have dealt with many investigations where there are multiple charges and there's other ways of reducing it to be a lesser format. I mean, the Chairman will remember the TAC taking into	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. At one point it did. I believe it could possibly have been when it was resolved that sharp business practice or commercial deviance which the DPP was, I believe, suggesting was not there was no criminal liability to be attached had then been changed that position had changed when Mr Wyan argued the case. Q. At the 8 April 2020 meeting on the strength of the charging advice? A. I cannot follow the chronology because I am not alive to it. Q. Well, there were two meetings, the first one the DPP said "sharp business practice," and then 8 April there was the note suggests that the DPP said that the note says, "Reasonable grounds to question would be a lingering doubt, otherwise obligation to interview under caution." As far as you are concerned, your position is that at one point there was the view of sharp business practice and at a later date the DPP had been
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	you or that you received it? A. That's right, that is a historical feature at least in the RGP. We haven't moved on maybe on in that regard. Every correspondence is addressed to the Commissioner even though it's not it doesn't reach him or it's just a formality. MR SANTOS: (To the witness): Were you aware at that point of the number of charges that A. Yes. Q were being considered? A. Yes. Q. What was your view on the large number of charges at the time? A. I think that was very clear from the outset that that was not going to be sustainable or proper. I have dealt with many investigations where there are multiple charges and there's other ways of reducing it to be a lesser format. I mean, the Chairman will remember the TAC taking into consideration sort of watering down of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. At one point it did. I believe it could possibly have been when it was resolved that sharp business practice or commercial deviance which the DPP was, I believe, suggesting was not there was no criminal liability to be attached had then been changed that position had changed when Mr Wyan argued the case. Q. At the 8 April 2020 meeting on the strength of the charging advice? A. I cannot follow the chronology because I am not alive to it. Q. Well, there were two meetings, the first one the DPP said "sharp business practice," and then 8 April there was the note suggests that the DPP said that the note says, "Reasonable grounds to question would be a lingering doubt, otherwise obligation to interview under caution." As far as you are concerned, your position is that at one point there was the view of sharp business practice and at a later date the DPP had been A. Yes.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	you or that you received it? A. That's right, that is a historical feature at least in the RGP. We haven't moved on maybe on in that regard. Every correspondence is addressed to the Commissioner even though it's not it doesn't reach him or it's just a formality. MR SANTOS: (To the witness): Were you aware at that point of the number of charges that A. Yes. Q were being considered? A. Yes. Q. What was your view on the large number of charges at the time? A. I think that was very clear from the outset that that was not going to be sustainable or proper. I have dealt with many investigations where there are multiple charges and there's other ways of reducing it to be a lesser format. I mean, the Chairman will remember the TAC taking into	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. At one point it did. I believe it could possibly have been when it was resolved that sharp business practice or commercial deviance which the DPP was, I believe, suggesting was not there was no criminal liability to be attached had then been changed that position had changed when Mr Wyan argued the case. Q. At the 8 April 2020 meeting on the strength of the charging advice? A. I cannot follow the chronology because I am not alive to it. Q. Well, there were two meetings, the first one the DPP said "sharp business practice," and then 8 April there was the note suggests that the DPP said that the note says, "Reasonable grounds to question would be a lingering doubt, otherwise obligation to interview under caution." As far as you are concerned, your position is that at one point there was the view of sharp business practice and at a later date the DPP had been
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	you or that you received it? A. That's right, that is a historical feature at least in the RGP. We haven't moved on maybe on in that regard. Every correspondence is addressed to the Commissioner even though it's not it doesn't reach him or it's just a formality. MR SANTOS: (To the witness): Were you aware at that point of the number of charges that A. Yes. Q were being considered? A. Yes. Q. What was your view on the large number of charges at the time? A. I think that was very clear from the outset that that was not going to be sustainable or proper. I have dealt with many investigations where there are multiple charges and there's other ways of reducing it to be a lesser format. I mean, the Chairman will remember the TAC taking into consideration sort of watering down of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. At one point it did. I believe it could possibly have been when it was resolved that sharp business practice or commercial deviance which the DPP was, I believe, suggesting was not there was no criminal liability to be attached had then been changed that position had changed when Mr Wyan argued the case. Q. At the 8 April 2020 meeting on the strength of the charging advice? A. I cannot follow the chronology because I am not alive to it. Q. Well, there were two meetings, the first one the DPP said "sharp business practice," and then 8 April there was the note suggests that the DPP said that the note says, "Reasonable grounds to question would be a lingering doubt, otherwise obligation to interview under caution." As far as you are concerned, your position is that at one point there was the view of sharp business practice and at a later date the DPP had been A. Yes.

1	position?	1	took it that the team had the green light.
2	THE CHAIRMAN: Following the charging	2	Q. So is your evidence that your
3	advice?	3	understanding as of 8 April or shortly after
4	MR SANTOS: Following the charging	4	that meeting was that the DPP had given the
5	advice. (To the witness): And you do not	5	green light to the search warrant?
6	know whether you learned of the position,	6	A. It must have, yes, in the sense that he was
7	the initial view before the change of position	7	content to defend it as I later came to know.
8	or afterwards?	8	Q. I am sorry, let us deal with this in stages.
9	A. Well, jointly afterwards, yes. I cannot	9	As far as you were aware, had the DPP
10	my position was like a from a bird's eye	10	advised on a search warrant?
11	perspective. I was not involved in the detail.	11	A. No, he had not advised. They had
12	Q. Paragraph 41 of the same statement at	12	consulted with him and he had expressed his
13	A1432 Mr Richardson says, "At the time of	13	view that his preference was this but
14	the application we did not know of any	14	underscoring very clearly this is the way it
15	concerns on the part of either the DPP or AG.	15	was mentioned to me, underscoring very
16	At the end of a video conference call on 8	16	clearly that it's not a matter that he's going to
17	April 2020 I remember the DPP confirming	17	get involved in.
18	that he understood our rationale for	18	Q. So they did report back to you at the time
19	preferring a warrant to a production order.	19	that the DPP had expressed a preference for a
20	This was an operational decision for the	20	production order?
21	police although he would have opted for a	21	A. It was not highlighted as such, if you
22	production order rather than a warrant,	22	know what I mean. It's not it is not
23	whatever we chose he would back us. At	23	something that was I tell you why; I tell
24	that point, the choice between a warrant and	24	you why, because if it had, Mr Richardson or
25	=	25	
23	a production order was secondary to the DPP	23	Mr Wyan would not have applied for a
	Page 173		Page 175
1		1	
1	agreeing that JL should be treated as a	1	warrant if there was any doubt or any
2	suspect and I did not note this exchange."	2	potential
2 3	suspect and I did not note this exchange." Did Superintendent Richardson or Inspector	2 3	potentialQ. I am just trying to clarify exactly what Mr
2 3 4	suspect and I did not note this exchange." Did Superintendent Richardson or Inspector Wyan report back to you that the DPP would	2 3 4	potential Q. I am just trying to clarify exactly what Mr Richardson reported to you as to what the
2 3 4 5	suspect and I did not note this exchange." Did Superintendent Richardson or Inspector Wyan report back to you that the DPP would have opted for a production order rather than	2 3 4 5	potential Q. I am just trying to clarify exactly what Mr Richardson reported to you as to what the DPP had said. If you can just to the best
2 3 4 5 6	suspect and I did not note this exchange." Did Superintendent Richardson or Inspector Wyan report back to you that the DPP would have opted for a production order rather than a warrant?	2 3 4 5 6	potential Q. I am just trying to clarify exactly what Mr Richardson reported to you as to what the DPP had said. If you can just to the best of your recollection
2 3 4 5 6 7	suspect and I did not note this exchange." Did Superintendent Richardson or Inspector Wyan report back to you that the DPP would have opted for a production order rather than a warrant? A. I have dwelled on this point significantly	2 3 4 5 6 7	potential Q. I am just trying to clarify exactly what Mr Richardson reported to you as to what the DPP had said. If you can just to the best of your recollection A. The best of my recollection is that it was,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	suspect and I did not note this exchange." Did Superintendent Richardson or Inspector Wyan report back to you that the DPP would have opted for a production order rather than a warrant? A. I have dwelled on this point significantly and I have tried to rack my brain. When they	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	potential Q. I am just trying to clarify exactly what Mr Richardson reported to you as to what the DPP had said. If you can just to the best of your recollection A. The best of my recollection is that it was, "We've got the green light," and a warrant
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	suspect and I did not note this exchange." Did Superintendent Richardson or Inspector Wyan report back to you that the DPP would have opted for a production order rather than a warrant? A. I have dwelled on this point significantly and I have tried to rack my brain. When they came back after I asked them to confer with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	potential Q. I am just trying to clarify exactly what Mr Richardson reported to you as to what the DPP had said. If you can just to the best of your recollection A. The best of my recollection is that it was, "We've got the green light," and a warrant will be defended. That's the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	suspect and I did not note this exchange." Did Superintendent Richardson or Inspector Wyan report back to you that the DPP would have opted for a production order rather than a warrant? A. I have dwelled on this point significantly and I have tried to rack my brain. When they came back after I asked them to confer with the DPP, they came back and basically it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	potential Q. I am just trying to clarify exactly what Mr Richardson reported to you as to what the DPP had said. If you can just to the best of your recollection A. The best of my recollection is that it was, "We've got the green light," and a warrant will be defended. That's the Q. And did he say that the DPP would prefer
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	suspect and I did not note this exchange." Did Superintendent Richardson or Inspector Wyan report back to you that the DPP would have opted for a production order rather than a warrant? A. I have dwelled on this point significantly and I have tried to rack my brain. When they came back after I asked them to confer with the DPP, they came back and basically it was, "Boss, we've got the green light," and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	potential Q. I am just trying to clarify exactly what Mr Richardson reported to you as to what the DPP had said. If you can just to the best of your recollection A. The best of my recollection is that it was, "We've got the green light," and a warrant will be defended. That's the Q. And did he say that the DPP would prefer the option of a production order?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	suspect and I did not note this exchange." Did Superintendent Richardson or Inspector Wyan report back to you that the DPP would have opted for a production order rather than a warrant? A. I have dwelled on this point significantly and I have tried to rack my brain. When they came back after I asked them to confer with the DPP, they came back and basically it was, "Boss, we've got the green light," and that for me suggested that everything had	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	potential Q. I am just trying to clarify exactly what Mr Richardson reported to you as to what the DPP had said. If you can just to the best of your recollection A. The best of my recollection is that it was, "We've got the green light," and a warrant will be defended. That's the Q. And did he say that the DPP would prefer the option of a production order? A. I can't put hand on heart and say that they
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	suspect and I did not note this exchange." Did Superintendent Richardson or Inspector Wyan report back to you that the DPP would have opted for a production order rather than a warrant? A. I have dwelled on this point significantly and I have tried to rack my brain. When they came back after I asked them to confer with the DPP, they came back and basically it was, "Boss, we've got the green light," and that for me suggested that everything had been squared off. There was talk about the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	potential Q. I am just trying to clarify exactly what Mr Richardson reported to you as to what the DPP had said. If you can just to the best of your recollection A. The best of my recollection is that it was, "We've got the green light," and a warrant will be defended. That's the Q. And did he say that the DPP would prefer the option of a production order? A. I can't put hand on heart and say that they did but it's an inference that I draw, that there
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	suspect and I did not note this exchange." Did Superintendent Richardson or Inspector Wyan report back to you that the DPP would have opted for a production order rather than a warrant? A. I have dwelled on this point significantly and I have tried to rack my brain. When they came back after I asked them to confer with the DPP, they came back and basically it was, "Boss, we've got the green light," and that for me suggested that everything had been squared off. There was talk about the warrant. There was a suggestion to me on	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	potential Q. I am just trying to clarify exactly what Mr Richardson reported to you as to what the DPP had said. If you can just to the best of your recollection A. The best of my recollection is that it was, "We've got the green light," and a warrant will be defended. That's the Q. And did he say that the DPP would prefer the option of a production order? A. I can't put hand on heart and say that they did but it's an inference that I draw, that there was I know they talked about the word
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	suspect and I did not note this exchange." Did Superintendent Richardson or Inspector Wyan report back to you that the DPP would have opted for a production order rather than a warrant? A. I have dwelled on this point significantly and I have tried to rack my brain. When they came back after I asked them to confer with the DPP, they came back and basically it was, "Boss, we've got the green light," and that for me suggested that everything had been squared off. There was talk about the warrant. There was a suggestion to me on potential scenarios to Mr Richardson, "What	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	potential Q. I am just trying to clarify exactly what Mr Richardson reported to you as to what the DPP had said. If you can just to the best of your recollection A. The best of my recollection is that it was, "We've got the green light," and a warrant will be defended. That's the Q. And did he say that the DPP would prefer the option of a production order? A. I can't put hand on heart and say that they did but it's an inference that I draw, that there was I know they talked about the word and that the warrant was not an unlawful
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	suspect and I did not note this exchange." Did Superintendent Richardson or Inspector Wyan report back to you that the DPP would have opted for a production order rather than a warrant? A. I have dwelled on this point significantly and I have tried to rack my brain. When they came back after I asked them to confer with the DPP, they came back and basically it was, "Boss, we've got the green light," and that for me suggested that everything had been squared off. There was talk about the warrant. There was a suggestion to me on potential scenarios to Mr Richardson, "What if Mr Levy gets up and walks away with his	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	potential Q. I am just trying to clarify exactly what Mr Richardson reported to you as to what the DPP had said. If you can just to the best of your recollection A. The best of my recollection is that it was, "We've got the green light," and a warrant will be defended. That's the Q. And did he say that the DPP would prefer the option of a production order? A. I can't put hand on heart and say that they did but it's an inference that I draw, that there was I know they talked about the word and that the warrant was not an unlawful approach and that he would resist any
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	suspect and I did not note this exchange." Did Superintendent Richardson or Inspector Wyan report back to you that the DPP would have opted for a production order rather than a warrant? A. I have dwelled on this point significantly and I have tried to rack my brain. When they came back after I asked them to confer with the DPP, they came back and basically it was, "Boss, we've got the green light," and that for me suggested that everything had been squared off. There was talk about the warrant. There was a suggestion to me on potential scenarios to Mr Richardson, "What if Mr Levy gets up and walks away with his phone, what are you going to do," because	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	potential Q. I am just trying to clarify exactly what Mr Richardson reported to you as to what the DPP had said. If you can just to the best of your recollection A. The best of my recollection is that it was, "We've got the green light," and a warrant will be defended. That's the Q. And did he say that the DPP would prefer the option of a production order? A. I can't put hand on heart and say that they did but it's an inference that I draw, that there was I know they talked about the word and that the warrant was not an unlawful approach and that he would resist any challenge to it.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	suspect and I did not note this exchange." Did Superintendent Richardson or Inspector Wyan report back to you that the DPP would have opted for a production order rather than a warrant? A. I have dwelled on this point significantly and I have tried to rack my brain. When they came back after I asked them to confer with the DPP, they came back and basically it was, "Boss, we've got the green light," and that for me suggested that everything had been squared off. There was talk about the warrant. There was a suggestion to me on potential scenarios to Mr Richardson, "What if Mr Levy gets up and walks away with his phone, what are you going to do," because there was no arrest plan, it was more of a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	potential Q. I am just trying to clarify exactly what Mr Richardson reported to you as to what the DPP had said. If you can just to the best of your recollection A. The best of my recollection is that it was, "We've got the green light," and a warrant will be defended. That's the Q. And did he say that the DPP would prefer the option of a production order? A. I can't put hand on heart and say that they did but it's an inference that I draw, that there was I know they talked about the word and that the warrant was not an unlawful approach and that he would resist any challenge to it. Q. In McGrail 1, paragraph 23 at A7, you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	suspect and I did not note this exchange." Did Superintendent Richardson or Inspector Wyan report back to you that the DPP would have opted for a production order rather than a warrant? A. I have dwelled on this point significantly and I have tried to rack my brain. When they came back after I asked them to confer with the DPP, they came back and basically it was, "Boss, we've got the green light," and that for me suggested that everything had been squared off. There was talk about the warrant. There was a suggestion to me on potential scenarios to Mr Richardson, "What if Mr Levy gets up and walks away with his phone, what are you going to do," because there was no arrest plan, it was more of a voluntary interview request, and I was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	potential Q. I am just trying to clarify exactly what Mr Richardson reported to you as to what the DPP had said. If you can just to the best of your recollection A. The best of my recollection is that it was, "We've got the green light," and a warrant will be defended. That's the Q. And did he say that the DPP would prefer the option of a production order? A. I can't put hand on heart and say that they did but it's an inference that I draw, that there was I know they talked about the word and that the warrant was not an unlawful approach and that he would resist any challenge to it. Q. In McGrail 1, paragraph 23 at A7, you say halfway down that paragraph, "I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	suspect and I did not note this exchange." Did Superintendent Richardson or Inspector Wyan report back to you that the DPP would have opted for a production order rather than a warrant? A. I have dwelled on this point significantly and I have tried to rack my brain. When they came back after I asked them to confer with the DPP, they came back and basically it was, "Boss, we've got the green light," and that for me suggested that everything had been squared off. There was talk about the warrant. There was a suggestion to me on potential scenarios to Mr Richardson, "What if Mr Levy gets up and walks away with his phone, what are you going to do," because there was no arrest plan, it was more of a voluntary interview request, and I was putting those scenarios just to be perhaps	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. I am just trying to clarify exactly what Mr Richardson reported to you as to what the DPP had said. If you can just to the best of your recollection A. The best of my recollection is that it was, "We've got the green light," and a warrant will be defended. That's the Q. And did he say that the DPP would prefer the option of a production order? A. I can't put hand on heart and say that they did but it's an inference that I draw, that there was I know they talked about the word and that the warrant was not an unlawful approach and that he would resist any challenge to it. Q. In McGrail 1, paragraph 23 at A7, you say halfway down that paragraph, "I understand that Superintendent Richardson
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	suspect and I did not note this exchange." Did Superintendent Richardson or Inspector Wyan report back to you that the DPP would have opted for a production order rather than a warrant? A. I have dwelled on this point significantly and I have tried to rack my brain. When they came back after I asked them to confer with the DPP, they came back and basically it was, "Boss, we've got the green light," and that for me suggested that everything had been squared off. There was talk about the warrant. There was a suggestion to me on potential scenarios to Mr Richardson, "What if Mr Levy gets up and walks away with his phone, what are you going to do," because there was no arrest plan, it was more of a voluntary interview request, and I was putting those scenarios just to be perhaps devil's advocate and I remember Mr	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	potential Q. I am just trying to clarify exactly what Mr Richardson reported to you as to what the DPP had said. If you can just to the best of your recollection A. The best of my recollection is that it was, "We've got the green light," and a warrant will be defended. That's the Q. And did he say that the DPP would prefer the option of a production order? A. I can't put hand on heart and say that they did but it's an inference that I draw, that there was I know they talked about the word and that the warrant was not an unlawful approach and that he would resist any challenge to it. Q. In McGrail 1, paragraph 23 at A7, you say halfway down that paragraph, "I understand that Superintendent Richardson did in fact communicate with the DPP who
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	suspect and I did not note this exchange." Did Superintendent Richardson or Inspector Wyan report back to you that the DPP would have opted for a production order rather than a warrant? A. I have dwelled on this point significantly and I have tried to rack my brain. When they came back after I asked them to confer with the DPP, they came back and basically it was, "Boss, we've got the green light," and that for me suggested that everything had been squared off. There was talk about the warrant. There was a suggestion to me on potential scenarios to Mr Richardson, "What if Mr Levy gets up and walks away with his phone, what are you going to do," because there was no arrest plan, it was more of a voluntary interview request, and I was putting those scenarios just to be perhaps devil's advocate and I remember Mr Richardson saying he's not going to do that to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	potential Q. I am just trying to clarify exactly what Mr Richardson reported to you as to what the DPP had said. If you can just to the best of your recollection A. The best of my recollection is that it was, "We've got the green light," and a warrant will be defended. That's the Q. And did he say that the DPP would prefer the option of a production order? A. I can't put hand on heart and say that they did but it's an inference that I draw, that there was I know they talked about the word and that the warrant was not an unlawful approach and that he would resist any challenge to it. Q. In McGrail 1, paragraph 23 at A7, you say halfway down that paragraph, "I understand that Superintendent Richardson did in fact communicate with the DPP who confirmed that JL
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	suspect and I did not note this exchange." Did Superintendent Richardson or Inspector Wyan report back to you that the DPP would have opted for a production order rather than a warrant? A. I have dwelled on this point significantly and I have tried to rack my brain. When they came back after I asked them to confer with the DPP, they came back and basically it was, "Boss, we've got the green light," and that for me suggested that everything had been squared off. There was talk about the warrant. There was a suggestion to me on potential scenarios to Mr Richardson, "What if Mr Levy gets up and walks away with his phone, what are you going to do," because there was no arrest plan, it was more of a voluntary interview request, and I was putting those scenarios just to be perhaps devil's advocate and I remember Mr Richardson saying he's not going to do that to me, he's not going to do that to me. He was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	potential Q. I am just trying to clarify exactly what Mr Richardson reported to you as to what the DPP had said. If you can just to the best of your recollection A. The best of my recollection is that it was, "We've got the green light," and a warrant will be defended. That's the Q. And did he say that the DPP would prefer the option of a production order? A. I can't put hand on heart and say that they did but it's an inference that I draw, that there was I know they talked about the word and that the warrant was not an unlawful approach and that he would resist any challenge to it. Q. In McGrail 1, paragraph 23 at A7, you say halfway down that paragraph, "I understand that Superintendent Richardson did in fact communicate with the DPP who confirmed that JL was to be treated as a suspect. Furthermore,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	suspect and I did not note this exchange." Did Superintendent Richardson or Inspector Wyan report back to you that the DPP would have opted for a production order rather than a warrant? A. I have dwelled on this point significantly and I have tried to rack my brain. When they came back after I asked them to confer with the DPP, they came back and basically it was, "Boss, we've got the green light," and that for me suggested that everything had been squared off. There was talk about the warrant. There was a suggestion to me on potential scenarios to Mr Richardson, "What if Mr Levy gets up and walks away with his phone, what are you going to do," because there was no arrest plan, it was more of a voluntary interview request, and I was putting those scenarios just to be perhaps devil's advocate and I remember Mr Richardson saying he's not going to do that to me, he's not going to do that to me. He was confident and said, "That's your call." I was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	potential Q. I am just trying to clarify exactly what Mr Richardson reported to you as to what the DPP had said. If you can just to the best of your recollection A. The best of my recollection is that it was, "We've got the green light," and a warrant will be defended. That's the Q. And did he say that the DPP would prefer the option of a production order? A. I can't put hand on heart and say that they did but it's an inference that I draw, that there was I know they talked about the word and that the warrant was not an unlawful approach and that he would resist any challenge to it. Q. In McGrail 1, paragraph 23 at A7, you say halfway down that paragraph, "I understand that Superintendent Richardson did in fact communicate with the DPP who confirmed that JL was to be treated as a suspect. Furthermore, that he would not advise on the team's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	suspect and I did not note this exchange." Did Superintendent Richardson or Inspector Wyan report back to you that the DPP would have opted for a production order rather than a warrant? A. I have dwelled on this point significantly and I have tried to rack my brain. When they came back after I asked them to confer with the DPP, they came back and basically it was, "Boss, we've got the green light," and that for me suggested that everything had been squared off. There was talk about the warrant. There was a suggestion to me on potential scenarios to Mr Richardson, "What if Mr Levy gets up and walks away with his phone, what are you going to do," because there was no arrest plan, it was more of a voluntary interview request, and I was putting those scenarios just to be perhaps devil's advocate and I remember Mr Richardson saying he's not going to do that to me, he's not going to do that to me. He was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	potential Q. I am just trying to clarify exactly what Mr Richardson reported to you as to what the DPP had said. If you can just to the best of your recollection A. The best of my recollection is that it was, "We've got the green light," and a warrant will be defended. That's the Q. And did he say that the DPP would prefer the option of a production order? A. I can't put hand on heart and say that they did but it's an inference that I draw, that there was I know they talked about the word and that the warrant was not an unlawful approach and that he would resist any challenge to it. Q. In McGrail 1, paragraph 23 at A7, you say halfway down that paragraph, "I understand that Superintendent Richardson did in fact communicate with the DPP who confirmed that JL was to be treated as a suspect. Furthermore,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	suspect and I did not note this exchange." Did Superintendent Richardson or Inspector Wyan report back to you that the DPP would have opted for a production order rather than a warrant? A. I have dwelled on this point significantly and I have tried to rack my brain. When they came back after I asked them to confer with the DPP, they came back and basically it was, "Boss, we've got the green light," and that for me suggested that everything had been squared off. There was talk about the warrant. There was a suggestion to me on potential scenarios to Mr Richardson, "What if Mr Levy gets up and walks away with his phone, what are you going to do," because there was no arrest plan, it was more of a voluntary interview request, and I was putting those scenarios just to be perhaps devil's advocate and I remember Mr Richardson saying he's not going to do that to me, he's not going to do that to me. He was confident and said, "That's your call." I was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	potential Q. I am just trying to clarify exactly what Mr Richardson reported to you as to what the DPP had said. If you can just to the best of your recollection A. The best of my recollection is that it was, "We've got the green light," and a warrant will be defended. That's the Q. And did he say that the DPP would prefer the option of a production order? A. I can't put hand on heart and say that they did but it's an inference that I draw, that there was I know they talked about the word and that the warrant was not an unlawful approach and that he would resist any challenge to it. Q. In McGrail 1, paragraph 23 at A7, you say halfway down that paragraph, "I understand that Superintendent Richardson did in fact communicate with the DPP who confirmed that JL was to be treated as a suspect. Furthermore, that he would not advise on the team's

		1	
1	course of action as this was purely an	1	Q. Can we look at paragraph 21 and 22 of
2	operational matter for the RGP to decide	2	your first statement, this is your account of
3	upon but	3	what occurred at the meeting, you talk about
4	that he would defend the actions if and when	4	the Attorney General addressing the charges
5	it was needed to Superintendent	5	and the number of charges and he was
6	Richardson	6	illustrating on his writing pad, streamlining
7	will no doubt be able to corroborate this."	7	80 charges down to 17 and you say, "I asked
8	Why does your evidence not mention the	8	him to rationalise these thoughts but he
9	DPP's preference for a production order?	9	replied saying that this was just an example.
10	A. Because it did not feature prominently in	10	The concept of providing sample counts
11	the brief that I received. The main emphasis	11	instead of a proliferation of charges is based
12	was that the classification of Mr Levy was	12	on being able to capture as much of the
13	suspect and the method to deal with him was	13	evidence as possible of all the alleged
14	up to the RGP to decide according to the	14	criminal behaviour and for this to be
15	DPP. What the level of discussion that Mr	15	reflected in a reduced charge format. I was
16	Richardson or Mr Wyan had with the DPP on	16	asking for the AG's rationalisation to better
17	the merits or not of the warrant, I am not	17	understand whether he was considering doing
18	privy to, but from what they mentioned is	18	away with certain types of offences or simply
19	that they also sort of didn't feature, it was a	19	reducing the repeated counts i.e. was he
20	secondary matter and not necessarily	20	thinking of samples of the alleged
21	prominent.	21	unauthorised access to computers and do
22	Q. Then moving forwards to the sorry,	22	away with the conspiracy charges or was he
23	moving backwards to 7 April 2020, there was	23	considering both - and which counts would
24	a meeting between you, Superintendent	24	be considered and which would, not, and
25	Richardson, the Attorney General and Mr	25	why. Notwithstanding this, the question of
	Page 177		Page 179
1	Designation 2011 design	1	one Continue along the City of
1	Devincenzi, you will be aware that there is a	1	proffering charges was still, in my view,
2	disagreement about what exactly was said at	2	premature because the investigating team still
3	that meeting or what was understood, but in	3	had to interview JL. His interview could lead
4	terms of the date there is also a bit of doubt	4	to more counts being added or clarify matters
5 6	as to whether it happened on 7 April or	5 6	and therefore generate less counts. It was clear to me and the investigating team that
7	actually in early May. What is your position as to when the meeting took place?	7	
	A. I think that that meeting was called by the		charges could not be proffered until all
8 9	A. I think that that meeting was called by the Attorney General and I got the date from my	8	enquires with suspects had been closed. That particular
10	Outlook Calendar I believe. It should be	9 10	
10	disclosed in my bundle when I was allowed	11	meeting ended with the AG asking us to revert to
12	to and it's confirmed but I even knew	12	see him once we had listed all the charges
13	about this date before I got confirmation of it	13	that had been uncovered." Did you agree to
14	subsequently. For some reason I had a paper	14	rationalise the charges at that meeting?
15	which I haven't been able to find and it's	15	A. Eventually, yes, we rationalised them
16	somewhere amongst	16	once the all lines had been exhausted.
17	THE CHAIRMAN: (To the witness): You	17	Q. Did you agree to do that before taking
18	can you are agreeing that it was on 7	18	any further steps in the investigation?
19	April?	19	A. No.
20	A. Yes.	20	Q. Given that you were receiving advice
21	THE CHAIRMAN: Let us move on from	21	from the Attorney General to slim down the
22	there.	22	charges, did that make you think it was an
23	MR SANTOS: (To the witness): Did you	23	important step in the investigation?
1		24	A. No. What struck me was that it was the
24	take any notes of this meeting?		
24 25	take any notes of this meeting? A. No, because Mr Richardson was there.	25	
	A. No, because Mr Richardson was there.		AG calling me to discuss this matter of

1	charges rather than a matter which is	1	therefore, advised Mr McGrail that I
2	which I feel is the cockpit of the DPP but,	2	considered it vital that the investigation
3	look, I have I enjoyed a good working	3	should proceed and be conducted prudently
4	relationship with the AG and he's the AG.	4	and with tremendous care. With this in mind
5	He's the DPP's boss although he's not he's	5	I explained to Mr McGrail that I was deeply
6	delegated his prosecutorial power to the DPP	6	concerned that the RGP were proceeding
7	but, look, I had no issues in that regard until	7	without first resolving the ownership dispute,
8	later on.	8	since it seemed to me that the issue would
9	Q. Did you record your agreement to	9	likely have an impact on some of the
10	rationalise the charges anywhere?	10	proposed charges. I told him that I was also
11	A. No, but I have to agree that what I	11	concerned about the proposed number of
12	remember seeing was that he had he was	12	chares, 76, which seemed wholly excessive.
13	not doodling but he was he had a scrap	13	I reminded Mr McGrail of the general
14	piece of paper and he was explaining from 76	14	wisdom of focusing charges appropriately."
15	or 80 charges this could go down to 25, then	15	Do you agree with that account of what was
16	streamline it first.	16	said?
17	Q. I just asked because you said that in your	17	A. The concept is there but it did not it is
18	statement, you do not have a note of what	18	coming across as lecturing us in what we had
19	was agreed?	19	to do and whilst if I didn't know that I had to
20	A. No.	20	do it, I would have welcomed that lecturing
21	Q. Can we turn to Mr Devincenzi's version,	21	but the fact is that we went to that meeting
22	it is A1305, that is paragraph 4 and he says,	22	knowing that we had to do what he was
23	"The Attorney General initially raised a	23	saying.
24	concern about number of charges." He told	24	Q. Was it a lecturing?
25	you that the numbers seemed high and then	25	A. No, not at all, at all. He comes across
	Page 181		Page 183
	U		U
1	he said five lines from the bottom, "I	1	here as saying that the RGP don't know what
		_	mere as saying that the real don't make
2	understood the task of rationalising primarily	2	they're doing in the bottom line and that
2 3			· -
	understood the task of rationalising primarily to mean pruning the list to make sure the charges did not overlap but also making	2	they're doing in the bottom line and that certainly was not the case. This had already been considered and it is a natural thing for
3	understood the task of rationalising primarily to mean pruning the list to make sure the charges did not overlap but also making certain the RGP could properly substantiate	2 3	they're doing in the bottom line and that certainly was not the case. This had already
3 4	understood the task of rationalising primarily to mean pruning the list to make sure the charges did not overlap but also making	2 3 4 5 6	they're doing in the bottom line and that certainly was not the case. This had already been considered and it is a natural thing for us — Mr Devincenzi's account is far more accurate in the sense that he says they were
3 4 5	understood the task of rationalising primarily to mean pruning the list to make sure the charges did not overlap but also making certain the RGP could properly substantiate them. My impression was that Mr McGrail and Mr Richardson were open to undertaking	2 3 4 5	they're doing in the bottom line and that certainly was not the case. This had already been considered and it is a natural thing for us Mr Devincenzi's account is far more
3 4 5 6	understood the task of rationalising primarily to mean pruning the list to make sure the charges did not overlap but also making certain the RGP could properly substantiate them. My impression was that Mr McGrail and Mr Richardson were open to undertaking this exercise if not wholly convinced it was	2 3 4 5 6	they're doing in the bottom line and that certainly was not the case. This had already been considered and it is a natural thing for us Mr Devincenzi's account is far more accurate in the sense that he says they were wholly accepting it wasn't agreed that there was never going to be any contention
3 4 5 6 7	understood the task of rationalising primarily to mean pruning the list to make sure the charges did not overlap but also making certain the RGP could properly substantiate them. My impression was that Mr McGrail and Mr Richardson were open to undertaking this exercise if not wholly convinced it was necessary and said they would report back to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	they're doing in the bottom line and that certainly was not the case. This had already been considered and it is a natural thing for us Mr Devincenzi's account is far more accurate in the sense that he says they were wholly accepting it wasn't agreed that there was never going to be any contention issue for us.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	understood the task of rationalising primarily to mean pruning the list to make sure the charges did not overlap but also making certain the RGP could properly substantiate them. My impression was that Mr McGrail and Mr Richardson were open to undertaking this exercise if not wholly convinced it was necessary and said they would report back to the Attorney General and the DPP." Do you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	they're doing in the bottom line and that certainly was not the case. This had already been considered and it is a natural thing for us Mr Devincenzi's account is far more accurate in the sense that he says they were wholly accepting it wasn't agreed that there was never going to be any contention issue for us. Q. And then if we go to 32, he says, "After a
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	understood the task of rationalising primarily to mean pruning the list to make sure the charges did not overlap but also making certain the RGP could properly substantiate them. My impression was that Mr McGrail and Mr Richardson were open to undertaking this exercise if not wholly convinced it was necessary and said they would report back to the Attorney General and the DPP." Do you agree with that account?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	they're doing in the bottom line and that certainly was not the case. This had already been considered and it is a natural thing for us Mr Devincenzi's account is far more accurate in the sense that he says they were wholly accepting it wasn't agreed that there was never going to be any contention issue for us. Q. And then if we go to 32, he says, "After a long and amicable discussion, we reached
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	understood the task of rationalising primarily to mean pruning the list to make sure the charges did not overlap but also making certain the RGP could properly substantiate them. My impression was that Mr McGrail and Mr Richardson were open to undertaking this exercise if not wholly convinced it was necessary and said they would report back to the Attorney General and the DPP." Do you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	they're doing in the bottom line and that certainly was not the case. This had already been considered and it is a natural thing for us Mr Devincenzi's account is far more accurate in the sense that he says they were wholly accepting it wasn't agreed that there was never going to be any contention issue for us. Q. And then if we go to 32, he says, "After a long and amicable discussion, we reached what for me was a very clear understanding
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	understood the task of rationalising primarily to mean pruning the list to make sure the charges did not overlap but also making certain the RGP could properly substantiate them. My impression was that Mr McGrail and Mr Richardson were open to undertaking this exercise if not wholly convinced it was necessary and said they would report back to the Attorney General and the DPP." Do you agree with that account? A. Absolutely. In fact that we were convinced, no we already came with that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	they're doing in the bottom line and that certainly was not the case. This had already been considered and it is a natural thing for us Mr Devincenzi's account is far more accurate in the sense that he says they were wholly accepting it wasn't agreed that there was never going to be any contention issue for us. Q. And then if we go to 32, he says, "After a long and amicable discussion, we reached what for me was a very clear understanding between us, namely, that the RGP would not
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	understood the task of rationalising primarily to mean pruning the list to make sure the charges did not overlap but also making certain the RGP could properly substantiate them. My impression was that Mr McGrail and Mr Richardson were open to undertaking this exercise if not wholly convinced it was necessary and said they would report back to the Attorney General and the DPP." Do you agree with that account? A. Absolutely. In fact that we were convinced, no we already came with that frame set with that mindset, it was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	they're doing in the bottom line and that certainly was not the case. This had already been considered and it is a natural thing for us Mr Devincenzi's account is far more accurate in the sense that he says they were wholly accepting it wasn't agreed that there was never going to be any contention issue for us. Q. And then if we go to 32, he says, "After a long and amicable discussion, we reached what for me was a very clear understanding between us, namely, that the RGP would not take any further action until they had (i)
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	understood the task of rationalising primarily to mean pruning the list to make sure the charges did not overlap but also making certain the RGP could properly substantiate them. My impression was that Mr McGrail and Mr Richardson were open to undertaking this exercise if not wholly convinced it was necessary and said they would report back to the Attorney General and the DPP." Do you agree with that account? A. Absolutely. In fact that we were convinced, no we already came with that frame set with that mindset, it was something that was a no brainer, this is what	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	they're doing in the bottom line and that certainly was not the case. This had already been considered and it is a natural thing for us Mr Devincenzi's account is far more accurate in the sense that he says they were wholly accepting it wasn't agreed that there was never going to be any contention issue for us. Q. And then if we go to 32, he says, "After a long and amicable discussion, we reached what for me was a very clear understanding between us, namely, that the RGP would not take any further action until they had (i) clarified the question of the ownership of the
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	understood the task of rationalising primarily to mean pruning the list to make sure the charges did not overlap but also making certain the RGP could properly substantiate them. My impression was that Mr McGrail and Mr Richardson were open to undertaking this exercise if not wholly convinced it was necessary and said they would report back to the Attorney General and the DPP." Do you agree with that account? A. Absolutely. In fact that we were convinced, no we already came with that frame set with that mindset, it was something that was a no brainer, this is what was going to happen but we wanted to hear	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	they're doing in the bottom line and that certainly was not the case. This had already been considered and it is a natural thing for us Mr Devincenzi's account is far more accurate in the sense that he says they were wholly accepting it wasn't agreed that there was never going to be any contention issue for us. Q. And then if we go to 32, he says, "After a long and amicable discussion, we reached what for me was a very clear understanding between us, namely, that the RGP would not take any further action until they had (i) clarified the question of the ownership of the NSCIS platform; (ii) rationalise the charges
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	understood the task of rationalising primarily to mean pruning the list to make sure the charges did not overlap but also making certain the RGP could properly substantiate them. My impression was that Mr McGrail and Mr Richardson were open to undertaking this exercise if not wholly convinced it was necessary and said they would report back to the Attorney General and the DPP." Do you agree with that account? A. Absolutely. In fact that we were convinced, no we already came with that frame set with that mindset, it was something that was a no brainer, this is what	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	they're doing in the bottom line and that certainly was not the case. This had already been considered and it is a natural thing for us Mr Devincenzi's account is far more accurate in the sense that he says they were wholly accepting it wasn't agreed that there was never going to be any contention issue for us. Q. And then if we go to 32, he says, "After a long and amicable discussion, we reached what for me was a very clear understanding between us, namely, that the RGP would not take any further action until they had (i) clarified the question of the ownership of the NSCIS platform; (ii) rationalise the charges which the DPP had told me was extremely
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	understood the task of rationalising primarily to mean pruning the list to make sure the charges did not overlap but also making certain the RGP could properly substantiate them. My impression was that Mr McGrail and Mr Richardson were open to undertaking this exercise if not wholly convinced it was necessary and said they would report back to the Attorney General and the DPP." Do you agree with that account? A. Absolutely. In fact that we were convinced, no we already came with that frame set with that mindset, it was something that was a no brainer, this is what was going to happen but we wanted to hear	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	they're doing in the bottom line and that certainly was not the case. This had already been considered and it is a natural thing for us Mr Devincenzi's account is far more accurate in the sense that he says they were wholly accepting it wasn't agreed that there was never going to be any contention issue for us. Q. And then if we go to 32, he says, "After a long and amicable discussion, we reached what for me was a very clear understanding between us, namely, that the RGP would not take any further action until they had (i) clarified the question of the ownership of the NSCIS platform; (ii) rationalise the charges which the DPP had told me was extremely possible to do and (iii) whereupon Mr
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	understood the task of rationalising primarily to mean pruning the list to make sure the charges did not overlap but also making certain the RGP could properly substantiate them. My impression was that Mr McGrail and Mr Richardson were open to undertaking this exercise if not wholly convinced it was necessary and said they would report back to the Attorney General and the DPP." Do you agree with that account? A. Absolutely. In fact that we were convinced, no we already came with that frame set with that mindset, it was something that was a no brainer, this is what was going to happen but we wanted to hear what the AG he had called the meeting so we wanted to hear what he had to ask us about.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	they're doing in the bottom line and that certainly was not the case. This had already been considered and it is a natural thing for us Mr Devincenzi's account is far more accurate in the sense that he says they were wholly accepting it wasn't agreed that there was never going to be any contention issue for us. Q. And then if we go to 32, he says, "After a long and amicable discussion, we reached what for me was a very clear understanding between us, namely, that the RGP would not take any further action until they had (i) clarified the question of the ownership of the NSCIS platform; (ii) rationalise the charges which the DPP had told me was extremely possible to do and (iii) whereupon Mr McGrail would meet with me and the DPP
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	understood the task of rationalising primarily to mean pruning the list to make sure the charges did not overlap but also making certain the RGP could properly substantiate them. My impression was that Mr McGrail and Mr Richardson were open to undertaking this exercise if not wholly convinced it was necessary and said they would report back to the Attorney General and the DPP." Do you agree with that account? A. Absolutely. In fact that we were convinced, no we already came with that frame set with that mindset, it was something that was a no brainer, this is what was going to happen but we wanted to hear what the AG he had called the meeting so we wanted to hear what he had to ask us about. Q. Then can we go to the Attorney General's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	they're doing in the bottom line and that certainly was not the case. This had already been considered and it is a natural thing for us Mr Devincenzi's account is far more accurate in the sense that he says they were wholly accepting it wasn't agreed that there was never going to be any contention issue for us. Q. And then if we go to 32, he says, "After a long and amicable discussion, we reached what for me was a very clear understanding between us, namely, that the RGP would not take any further action until they had (i) clarified the question of the ownership of the NSCIS platform; (ii) rationalise the charges which the DPP had told me was extremely possible to do and (iii) whereupon Mr McGrail would meet with me and the DPP before taking any further steps. It was clear
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	understood the task of rationalising primarily to mean pruning the list to make sure the charges did not overlap but also making certain the RGP could properly substantiate them. My impression was that Mr McGrail and Mr Richardson were open to undertaking this exercise if not wholly convinced it was necessary and said they would report back to the Attorney General and the DPP." Do you agree with that account? A. Absolutely. In fact that we were convinced, no we already came with that frame set with that mindset, it was something that was a no brainer, this is what was going to happen but we wanted to hear what the AG he had called the meeting so we wanted to hear what he had to ask us about. Q. Then can we go to the Attorney General's version which is at A277, paragraph 29, he	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	they're doing in the bottom line and that certainly was not the case. This had already been considered and it is a natural thing for us Mr Devincenzi's account is far more accurate in the sense that he says they were wholly accepting it wasn't agreed that there was never going to be any contention issue for us. Q. And then if we go to 32, he says, "After a long and amicable discussion, we reached what for me was a very clear understanding between us, namely, that the RGP would not take any further action until they had (i) clarified the question of the ownership of the NSCIS platform; (ii) rationalise the charges which the DPP had told me was extremely possible to do and (iii) whereupon Mr McGrail would meet with me and the DPP before taking any further steps. It was clear beyond peradventure that nothing other than
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	understood the task of rationalising primarily to mean pruning the list to make sure the charges did not overlap but also making certain the RGP could properly substantiate them. My impression was that Mr McGrail and Mr Richardson were open to undertaking this exercise if not wholly convinced it was necessary and said they would report back to the Attorney General and the DPP." Do you agree with that account? A. Absolutely. In fact that we were convinced, no we already came with that frame set with that mindset, it was something that was a no brainer, this is what was going to happen but we wanted to hear what the AG he had called the meeting so we wanted to hear what he had to ask us about. Q. Then can we go to the Attorney General's version which is at A277, paragraph 29, he says, "In that meeting, Mr McGrail and I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	they're doing in the bottom line and that certainly was not the case. This had already been considered and it is a natural thing for us Mr Devincenzi's account is far more accurate in the sense that he says they were wholly accepting it wasn't agreed that there was never going to be any contention issue for us. Q. And then if we go to 32, he says, "After a long and amicable discussion, we reached what for me was a very clear understanding between us, namely, that the RGP would not take any further action until they had (i) clarified the question of the ownership of the NSCIS platform; (ii) rationalise the charges which the DPP had told me was extremely possible to do and (iii) whereupon Mr McGrail would meet with me and the DPP before taking any further steps. It was clear beyond peradventure that nothing other than what we had agreed to do would happen until
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	understood the task of rationalising primarily to mean pruning the list to make sure the charges did not overlap but also making certain the RGP could properly substantiate them. My impression was that Mr McGrail and Mr Richardson were open to undertaking this exercise if not wholly convinced it was necessary and said they would report back to the Attorney General and the DPP." Do you agree with that account? A. Absolutely. In fact that we were convinced, no we already came with that frame set with that mindset, it was something that was a no brainer, this is what was going to happen but we wanted to hear what the AG he had called the meeting so we wanted to hear what he had to ask us about. Q. Then can we go to the Attorney General's version which is at A277, paragraph 29, he says, "In that meeting, Mr McGrail and I agreed that, as he had said in his original	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	they're doing in the bottom line and that certainly was not the case. This had already been considered and it is a natural thing for us Mr Devincenzi's account is far more accurate in the sense that he says they were wholly accepting it wasn't agreed that there was never going to be any contention issue for us. Q. And then if we go to 32, he says, "After a long and amicable discussion, we reached what for me was a very clear understanding between us, namely, that the RGP would not take any further action until they had (i) clarified the question of the ownership of the NSCIS platform; (ii) rationalise the charges which the DPP had told me was extremely possible to do and (iii) whereupon Mr McGrail would meet with me and the DPP before taking any further steps. It was clear beyond peradventure that nothing other than what we had agreed to do would happen until we meet again." Just breaking that down, do
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	understood the task of rationalising primarily to mean pruning the list to make sure the charges did not overlap but also making certain the RGP could properly substantiate them. My impression was that Mr McGrail and Mr Richardson were open to undertaking this exercise if not wholly convinced it was necessary and said they would report back to the Attorney General and the DPP." Do you agree with that account? A. Absolutely. In fact that we were convinced, no we already came with that frame set with that mindset, it was something that was a no brainer, this is what was going to happen but we wanted to hear what the AG he had called the meeting so we wanted to hear what he had to ask us about. Q. Then can we go to the Attorney General's version which is at A277, paragraph 29, he says, "In that meeting, Mr McGrail and I agreed that, as he had said in his original email of 11 May 2019, the investigation did	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	they're doing in the bottom line and that certainly was not the case. This had already been considered and it is a natural thing for us Mr Devincenzi's account is far more accurate in the sense that he says they were wholly accepting it wasn't agreed that there was never going to be any contention issue for us. Q. And then if we go to 32, he says, "After a long and amicable discussion, we reached what for me was a very clear understanding between us, namely, that the RGP would not take any further action until they had (i) clarified the question of the ownership of the NSCIS platform; (ii) rationalise the charges which the DPP had told me was extremely possible to do and (iii) whereupon Mr McGrail would meet with me and the DPP before taking any further steps. It was clear beyond peradventure that nothing other than what we had agreed to do would happen until we meet again." Just breaking that down, do you agree that there was a clear
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	understood the task of rationalising primarily to mean pruning the list to make sure the charges did not overlap but also making certain the RGP could properly substantiate them. My impression was that Mr McGrail and Mr Richardson were open to undertaking this exercise if not wholly convinced it was necessary and said they would report back to the Attorney General and the DPP." Do you agree with that account? A. Absolutely. In fact that we were convinced, no we already came with that frame set with that mindset, it was something that was a no brainer, this is what was going to happen but we wanted to hear what the AG he had called the meeting so we wanted to hear what he had to ask us about. Q. Then can we go to the Attorney General's version which is at A277, paragraph 29, he says, "In that meeting, Mr McGrail and I agreed that, as he had said in his original	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	they're doing in the bottom line and that certainly was not the case. This had already been considered and it is a natural thing for us Mr Devincenzi's account is far more accurate in the sense that he says they were wholly accepting it wasn't agreed that there was never going to be any contention issue for us. Q. And then if we go to 32, he says, "After a long and amicable discussion, we reached what for me was a very clear understanding between us, namely, that the RGP would not take any further action until they had (i) clarified the question of the ownership of the NSCIS platform; (ii) rationalise the charges which the DPP had told me was extremely possible to do and (iii) whereupon Mr McGrail would meet with me and the DPP before taking any further steps. It was clear beyond peradventure that nothing other than what we had agreed to do would happen until we meet again." Just breaking that down, do
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	understood the task of rationalising primarily to mean pruning the list to make sure the charges did not overlap but also making certain the RGP could properly substantiate them. My impression was that Mr McGrail and Mr Richardson were open to undertaking this exercise if not wholly convinced it was necessary and said they would report back to the Attorney General and the DPP." Do you agree with that account? A. Absolutely. In fact that we were convinced, no we already came with that frame set with that mindset, it was something that was a no brainer, this is what was going to happen but we wanted to hear what the AG he had called the meeting so we wanted to hear what he had to ask us about. Q. Then can we go to the Attorney General's version which is at A277, paragraph 29, he says, "In that meeting, Mr McGrail and I agreed that, as he had said in his original email of 11 May 2019, the investigation did indeed raise issues of serious concern. I,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	they're doing in the bottom line and that certainly was not the case. This had already been considered and it is a natural thing for us Mr Devincenzi's account is far more accurate in the sense that he says they were wholly accepting it wasn't agreed that there was never going to be any contention issue for us. Q. And then if we go to 32, he says, "After a long and amicable discussion, we reached what for me was a very clear understanding between us, namely, that the RGP would not take any further action until they had (i) clarified the question of the ownership of the NSCIS platform; (ii) rationalise the charges which the DPP had told me was extremely possible to do and (iii) whereupon Mr McGrail would meet with me and the DPP before taking any further steps. It was clear beyond peradventure that nothing other than what we had agreed to do would happen until we meet again." Just breaking that down, do you agree that there was a clear understanding between you that the RGP
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	understood the task of rationalising primarily to mean pruning the list to make sure the charges did not overlap but also making certain the RGP could properly substantiate them. My impression was that Mr McGrail and Mr Richardson were open to undertaking this exercise if not wholly convinced it was necessary and said they would report back to the Attorney General and the DPP." Do you agree with that account? A. Absolutely. In fact that we were convinced, no we already came with that frame set with that mindset, it was something that was a no brainer, this is what was going to happen but we wanted to hear what the AG he had called the meeting so we wanted to hear what he had to ask us about. Q. Then can we go to the Attorney General's version which is at A277, paragraph 29, he says, "In that meeting, Mr McGrail and I agreed that, as he had said in his original email of 11 May 2019, the investigation did	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	they're doing in the bottom line and that certainly was not the case. This had already been considered and it is a natural thing for us Mr Devincenzi's account is far more accurate in the sense that he says they were wholly accepting it wasn't agreed that there was never going to be any contention issue for us. Q. And then if we go to 32, he says, "After a long and amicable discussion, we reached what for me was a very clear understanding between us, namely, that the RGP would not take any further action until they had (i) clarified the question of the ownership of the NSCIS platform; (ii) rationalise the charges which the DPP had told me was extremely possible to do and (iii) whereupon Mr McGrail would meet with me and the DPP before taking any further steps. It was clear beyond peradventure that nothing other than what we had agreed to do would happen until we meet again." Just breaking that down, do you agree that there was a clear

1	would not take any action before the RGP	1	basis that the ownership of the platform had
2	clarified the question of ownership?	2	not been established."
3	A. There was absolutely no arrangement or	3	A. That is not the meeting of the 7th.
4	that sort and there can't it can only be put	4	Q. That is the earlier meeting that you were
5	at the extreme case, extreme case, to	5	referring to previously
6	misunderstanding but certainly that was not	6	A. Yes, and it could well be, because I'm
7	what was on the cards what was	7	trying to piece together when was the DPP
8	discussed.	8	present and it is quite possible that this was
9	Q. What about taking no further steps	9	on the back of an Operation Kram meeting
10	that the RGP would not take any action	10	where the DPP said, "Don't worry about the
11	without rationalising the charges?	11	notification of action," it could have been
12	A. Or sorting out the ownership for that	12	there and on the back of that one, this was
13	matter, no, that was not an arrangement that	13	discussed. That's just to provide as much
14	was entered.	14	help as I can in the context.
15	Q. Were either of those two issues resolved	15	Q. Given that the AG had once asked you to
16	before 12 May 2020, ownership or charges?	16	pause the investigation, if not on 7 April, and
17	A. I think it was a question of ownership by	17	you had decided to proceed with the warrant,
18	then had been squared off with the DPP and	18	why did you not consider updating him
19	Mr Wyan that it was not a necessary act	19	before proceeding with the warrant? Or shall
20	yes, I'm pretty sure that by then	20	I just ask you the question without anything
21	Q. The alternative route had been identified?	21	beforehand, why did you decide not to
22	A. Yes.	22	inform the AG before proceeding with the
23	Q. But in terms of sorting out the position of	23	warrant?
24	ownership with the government	24	A. It is not common practice to advise an
25	A. The government had not responded. We	25	AG. I don't think I have ever done so. I
23	A. The government had not responded. We	23	AG. 1 don't timik I have ever done so. 1
	Page 185		Page 187
_			
1	were still no wiser as to what the government	1	don't think I have ever done so. To give
2	the government's argument for its claim or	2	advance notice of operational activity is not
2 3	the government's argument for its claim or what the ownership was.	2 3	advance notice of operational activity is not good practice in this regard and I don't think
2 3 4	 the government's argument for its claim or what the ownership was.Q. Do you accept that the Attorney General	2 3 4	advance notice of operational activity is not good practice in this regard and I don't think it would have been proper but in any event I
2 3 4 5	 the government's argument for its claim or what the ownership was.Q. Do you accept that the Attorney General asked you to pause the investigation before	2 3 4 5	advance notice of operational activity is not good practice in this regard and I don't think it would have been proper but in any event I had not I don't have any experience of
2 3 4 5 6	the government's argument for its claim or what the ownership was. Q. Do you accept that the Attorney General asked you to pause the investigation before taking any further steps at that meeting?	2 3 4 5 6	advance notice of operational activity is not good practice in this regard and I don't think it would have been proper but in any event I had not I don't have any experience of telling the AG beforehand not whether it
2 3 4 5 6 7	 the government's argument for its claim or what the ownership was. Q. Do you accept that the Attorney General asked you to pause the investigation before taking any further steps at that meeting? A. Not at that meeting. He had done that in 	2 3 4 5 6 7	advance notice of operational activity is not good practice in this regard and I don't think it would have been proper but in any event I had not I don't have any experience of telling the AG beforehand not whether it is Mr Llamas or whether it's been a previous
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 the government's argument for its claim or what the ownership was. Q. Do you accept that the Attorney General asked you to pause the investigation before taking any further steps at that meeting? A. Not at that meeting. He had done that in previous ones which is what I started to gain 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	advance notice of operational activity is not good practice in this regard and I don't think it would have been proper but in any event I had not I don't have any experience of telling the AG beforehand not whether it is Mr Llamas or whether it's been a previous AG, "Look, we're going to do this," I don't
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	the government's argument for its claim or what the ownership was. Q. Do you accept that the Attorney General asked you to pause the investigation before taking any further steps at that meeting? A. Not at that meeting. He had done that in previous ones which is what I started to gain the vibes of him wanting to stall it by the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	advance notice of operational activity is not good practice in this regard and I don't think it would have been proper but in any event I had not I don't have any experience of telling the AG beforehand not whether it is Mr Llamas or whether it's been a previous AG, "Look, we're going to do this," I don't think I have ever come across that situation.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	the government's argument for its claim or what the ownership was. Q. Do you accept that the Attorney General asked you to pause the investigation before taking any further steps at that meeting? A. Not at that meeting. He had done that in previous ones which is what I started to gain the vibes of him wanting to stall it by the question of using the question of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	advance notice of operational activity is not good practice in this regard and I don't think it would have been proper but in any event I had not I don't have any experience of telling the AG beforehand not whether it is Mr Llamas or whether it's been a previous AG, "Look, we're going to do this," I don't think I have ever come across that situation. MR SANTOS: Thank you, Mr McGrail, we
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 the government's argument for its claim or what the ownership was. Q. Do you accept that the Attorney General asked you to pause the investigation before taking any further steps at that meeting? A. Not at that meeting. He had done that in previous ones which is what I started to gain the vibes of him wanting to stall it by the question of using the question of the determination of the ownership and not at 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	advance notice of operational activity is not good practice in this regard and I don't think it would have been proper but in any event I had not I don't have any experience of telling the AG beforehand not whether it is Mr Llamas or whether it's been a previous AG, "Look, we're going to do this," I don't think I have ever come across that situation. MR SANTOS: Thank you, Mr McGrail, we are about to turn to the events of 12 May but
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	the government's argument for its claim or what the ownership was. Q. Do you accept that the Attorney General asked you to pause the investigation before taking any further steps at that meeting? A. Not at that meeting. He had done that in previous ones which is what I started to gain the vibes of him wanting to stall it by the question of using the question of the determination of the ownership and not at that meeting.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	advance notice of operational activity is not good practice in this regard and I don't think it would have been proper but in any event I had not I don't have any experience of telling the AG beforehand not whether it is Mr Llamas or whether it's been a previous AG, "Look, we're going to do this," I don't think I have ever come across that situation. MR SANTOS: Thank you, Mr McGrail, we are about to turn to the events of 12 May but I think that is probably a convenient moment
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	the government's argument for its claim or what the ownership was. Q. Do you accept that the Attorney General asked you to pause the investigation before taking any further steps at that meeting? A. Not at that meeting. He had done that in previous ones which is what I started to gain the vibes of him wanting to stall it by the question of using the question of the determination of the ownership and not at that meeting. Q. If we can just before we pause, can I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	advance notice of operational activity is not good practice in this regard and I don't think it would have been proper but in any event I had not I don't have any experience of telling the AG beforehand not whether it is Mr Llamas or whether it's been a previous AG, "Look, we're going to do this," I don't think I have ever come across that situation. MR SANTOS: Thank you, Mr McGrail, we are about to turn to the events of 12 May but I think that is probably a convenient moment for the break.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	the government's argument for its claim or what the ownership was. Q. Do you accept that the Attorney General asked you to pause the investigation before taking any further steps at that meeting? A. Not at that meeting. He had done that in previous ones which is what I started to gain the vibes of him wanting to stall it by the question of using the question of the determination of the ownership and not at that meeting. Q. If we can just before we pause, can I take you to B74 again, this is your email of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	advance notice of operational activity is not good practice in this regard and I don't think it would have been proper but in any event I had not I don't have any experience of telling the AG beforehand not whether it is Mr Llamas or whether it's been a previous AG, "Look, we're going to do this," I don't think I have ever come across that situation. MR SANTOS: Thank you, Mr McGrail, we are about to turn to the events of 12 May but I think that is probably a convenient moment for the break. THE CHAIRMAN: We will adjourn.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	the government's argument for its claim or what the ownership was. Q. Do you accept that the Attorney General asked you to pause the investigation before taking any further steps at that meeting? A. Not at that meeting. He had done that in previous ones which is what I started to gain the vibes of him wanting to stall it by the question of using the question of the determination of the ownership and not at that meeting. Q. If we can just before we pause, can I take you to B74 again, this is your email of 12 May, uncorrected version, and feel free to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	advance notice of operational activity is not good practice in this regard and I don't think it would have been proper but in any event I had not I don't have any experience of telling the AG beforehand not whether it is Mr Llamas or whether it's been a previous AG, "Look, we're going to do this," I don't think I have ever come across that situation. MR SANTOS: Thank you, Mr McGrail, we are about to turn to the events of 12 May but I think that is probably a convenient moment for the break. THE CHAIRMAN: We will adjourn. (15.26)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	the government's argument for its claim or what the ownership was. Q. Do you accept that the Attorney General asked you to pause the investigation before taking any further steps at that meeting? A. Not at that meeting. He had done that in previous ones which is what I started to gain the vibes of him wanting to stall it by the question of using the question of the determination of the ownership and not at that meeting. Q. If we can just before we pause, can I take you to B74 again, this is your email of 12 May, uncorrected version, and feel free to correct me with your hard version, but in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	advance notice of operational activity is not good practice in this regard and I don't think it would have been proper but in any event I had not I don't have any experience of telling the AG beforehand not whether it is Mr Llamas or whether it's been a previous AG, "Look, we're going to do this," I don't think I have ever come across that situation. MR SANTOS: Thank you, Mr McGrail, we are about to turn to the events of 12 May but I think that is probably a convenient moment for the break. THE CHAIRMAN: We will adjourn. (15.26) (Adjourned for a short time)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	the government's argument for its claim or what the ownership was. Q. Do you accept that the Attorney General asked you to pause the investigation before taking any further steps at that meeting? A. Not at that meeting. He had done that in previous ones which is what I started to gain the vibes of him wanting to stall it by the question of using the question of the determination of the ownership and not at that meeting. Q. If we can just before we pause, can I take you to B74 again, this is your email of 12 May, uncorrected version, and feel free to correct me with your hard version, but in the bottom bit of B74, what is stated here is the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	advance notice of operational activity is not good practice in this regard and I don't think it would have been proper but in any event I had not I don't have any experience of telling the AG beforehand not whether it is Mr Llamas or whether it's been a previous AG, "Look, we're going to do this," I don't think I have ever come across that situation. MR SANTOS: Thank you, Mr McGrail, we are about to turn to the events of 12 May but I think that is probably a convenient moment for the break. THE CHAIRMAN: We will adjourn. (15.26) (Adjourned for a short time) (15.36)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	the government's argument for its claim or what the ownership was. Q. Do you accept that the Attorney General asked you to pause the investigation before taking any further steps at that meeting? A. Not at that meeting. He had done that in previous ones which is what I started to gain the vibes of him wanting to stall it by the question of using the question of the determination of the ownership and not at that meeting. Q. If we can just before we pause, can I take you to B74 again, this is your email of 12 May, uncorrected version, and feel free to correct me with your hard version, but in the bottom bit of B74, what is stated here is the final paragraph, "I get periodic briefs from	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	advance notice of operational activity is not good practice in this regard and I don't think it would have been proper but in any event I had not I don't have any experience of telling the AG beforehand not whether it is Mr Llamas or whether it's been a previous AG, "Look, we're going to do this," I don't think I have ever come across that situation. MR SANTOS: Thank you, Mr McGrail, we are about to turn to the events of 12 May but I think that is probably a convenient moment for the break. THE CHAIRMAN: We will adjourn. (15.26) (Adjourned for a short time) (15.36) MR SANTOS: Just, McGrail, turning to the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	what the ownership was. Q. Do you accept that the Attorney General asked you to pause the investigation before taking any further steps at that meeting? A. Not at that meeting. He had done that in previous ones which is what I started to gain the vibes of him wanting to stall it by the question of using the question of the determination of the ownership and not at that meeting. Q. If we can just before we pause, can I take you to B74 again, this is your email of 12 May, uncorrected version, and feel free to correct me with your hard version, but in the bottom bit of B74, what is stated here is the final paragraph, "I get periodic briefs from the investigating on the progress of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	advance notice of operational activity is not good practice in this regard and I don't think it would have been proper but in any event I had not I don't have any experience of telling the AG beforehand not whether it is Mr Llamas or whether it's been a previous AG, "Look, we're going to do this," I don't think I have ever come across that situation. MR SANTOS: Thank you, Mr McGrail, we are about to turn to the events of 12 May but I think that is probably a convenient moment for the break. THE CHAIRMAN: We will adjourn. (15.26) (Adjourned for a short time) (15.36) MR SANTOS: Just, McGrail, turning to the events of 12May can we please go to your
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	the government's argument for its claim or what the ownership was. Q. Do you accept that the Attorney General asked you to pause the investigation before taking any further steps at that meeting? A. Not at that meeting. He had done that in previous ones which is what I started to gain the vibes of him wanting to stall it by the question of using the question of the determination of the ownership and not at that meeting. Q. If we can just before we pause, can I take you to B74 again, this is your email of 12 May, uncorrected version, and feel free to correct me with your hard version, but in the bottom bit of B74, what is stated here is the final paragraph, "I get periodic briefs from the investigating on the progress of the investigation. I am fully aware of the full	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	advance notice of operational activity is not good practice in this regard and I don't think it would have been proper but in any event I had not I don't have any experience of telling the AG beforehand not whether it is Mr Llamas or whether it's been a previous AG, "Look, we're going to do this," I don't think I have ever come across that situation. MR SANTOS: Thank you, Mr McGrail, we are about to turn to the events of 12 May but I think that is probably a convenient moment for the break. THE CHAIRMAN: We will adjourn. (15.26) (Adjourned for a short time) (15.36) MR SANTOS: Just, McGrail, turning to the events of 12May can we please go to your statement at A190, paragraph 40. That
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	the government's argument for its claim or what the ownership was. Q. Do you accept that the Attorney General asked you to pause the investigation before taking any further steps at that meeting? A. Not at that meeting. He had done that in previous ones which is what I started to gain the vibes of him wanting to stall it by the question of using the question of the determination of the ownership and not at that meeting. Q. If we can just before we pause, can I take you to B74 again, this is your email of 12 May, uncorrected version, and feel free to correct me with your hard version, but in the bottom bit of B74, what is stated here is the final paragraph, "I get periodic briefs from the investigating on the progress of the investigation. I am fully aware of the full range of sensitivities surrounding the matter	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	advance notice of operational activity is not good practice in this regard and I don't think it would have been proper but in any event I had not I don't have any experience of telling the AG beforehand not whether it is Mr Llamas or whether it's been a previous AG, "Look, we're going to do this," I don't think I have ever come across that situation. MR SANTOS: Thank you, Mr McGrail, we are about to turn to the events of 12 May but I think that is probably a convenient moment for the break. THE CHAIRMAN: We will adjourn. (15.26) (Adjourned for a short time) (15.36) MR SANTOS: Just, McGrail, turning to the events of 12May can we please go to your statement at A190, paragraph 40. That would be in your case your third witness
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	what the ownership was. Q. Do you accept that the Attorney General asked you to pause the investigation before taking any further steps at that meeting? A. Not at that meeting. He had done that in previous ones which is what I started to gain the vibes of him wanting to stall it by the question of using the question of the determination of the ownership and not at that meeting. Q. If we can just before we pause, can I take you to B74 again, this is your email of 12 May, uncorrected version, and feel free to correct me with your hard version, but in the bottom bit of B74, what is stated here is the final paragraph, "I get periodic briefs from the investigating on the progress of the investigation. I am fully aware of the full range of sensitivities surrounding the matter because of the personalities involved. At a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	advance notice of operational activity is not good practice in this regard and I don't think it would have been proper but in any event I had not I don't have any experience of telling the AG beforehand not whether it is Mr Llamas or whether it's been a previous AG, "Look, we're going to do this," I don't think I have ever come across that situation. MR SANTOS: Thank you, Mr McGrail, we are about to turn to the events of 12 May but I think that is probably a convenient moment for the break. THE CHAIRMAN: We will adjourn. (15.26) (Adjourned for a short time) (15.36) MR SANTOS: Just, McGrail, turning to the events of 12May can we please go to your statement at A190, paragraph 40. That would be in your case your third witness statement. Sorry, no, you will have to follow
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	what the ownership was. Q. Do you accept that the Attorney General asked you to pause the investigation before taking any further steps at that meeting? A. Not at that meeting. He had done that in previous ones which is what I started to gain the vibes of him wanting to stall it by the question of using the question of the determination of the ownership and not at that meeting. Q. If we can just before we pause, can I take you to B74 again, this is your email of 12 May, uncorrected version, and feel free to correct me with your hard version, but in the bottom bit of B74, what is stated here is the final paragraph, "I get periodic briefs from the investigating on the progress of the investigation. I am fully aware of the full range of sensitivities surrounding the matter because of the personalities involved. At a meeting in the office of the AG with the DPP	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	advance notice of operational activity is not good practice in this regard and I don't think it would have been proper but in any event I had not I don't have any experience of telling the AG beforehand not whether it is Mr Llamas or whether it's been a previous AG, "Look, we're going to do this," I don't think I have ever come across that situation. MR SANTOS: Thank you, Mr McGrail, we are about to turn to the events of 12 May but I think that is probably a convenient moment for the break. THE CHAIRMAN: We will adjourn. (15.26) (Adjourned for a short time) (15.36) MR SANTOS: Just, McGrail, turning to the events of 12May can we please go to your statement at A190, paragraph 40. That would be in your case your third witness statement. Sorry, no, you will have to follow this on screen, this is not your statement,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	what the ownership was. Q. Do you accept that the Attorney General asked you to pause the investigation before taking any further steps at that meeting? A. Not at that meeting. He had done that in previous ones which is what I started to gain the vibes of him wanting to stall it by the question of using the question of the determination of the ownership and not at that meeting. Q. If we can just before we pause, can I take you to B74 again, this is your email of 12 May, uncorrected version, and feel free to correct me with your hard version, but in the bottom bit of B74, what is stated here is the final paragraph, "I get periodic briefs from the investigating on the progress of the investigation. I am fully aware of the full range of sensitivities surrounding the matter because of the personalities involved. At a meeting in the office of the AG with the DPP present, the AG was suggesting that I stop	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	advance notice of operational activity is not good practice in this regard and I don't think it would have been proper but in any event I had not I don't have any experience of telling the AG beforehand not whether it is Mr Llamas or whether it's been a previous AG, "Look, we're going to do this," I don't think I have ever come across that situation. MR SANTOS: Thank you, Mr McGrail, we are about to turn to the events of 12 May but I think that is probably a convenient moment for the break. THE CHAIRMAN: We will adjourn. (15.26) (Adjourned for a short time) (15.36) MR SANTOS: Just, McGrail, turning to the events of 12May can we please go to your statement at A190, paragraph 40. That would be in your case your third witness statement. Sorry, no, you will have to follow this on screen, this is not your statement, sorry. This is the Chief Minister's witness
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	what the ownership was. Q. Do you accept that the Attorney General asked you to pause the investigation before taking any further steps at that meeting? A. Not at that meeting. He had done that in previous ones which is what I started to gain the vibes of him wanting to stall it by the question of using the question of the determination of the ownership and not at that meeting. Q. If we can just before we pause, can I take you to B74 again, this is your email of 12 May, uncorrected version, and feel free to correct me with your hard version, but in the bottom bit of B74, what is stated here is the final paragraph, "I get periodic briefs from the investigating on the progress of the investigation. I am fully aware of the full range of sensitivities surrounding the matter because of the personalities involved. At a meeting in the office of the AG with the DPP	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	advance notice of operational activity is not good practice in this regard and I don't think it would have been proper but in any event I had not I don't have any experience of telling the AG beforehand not whether it is Mr Llamas or whether it's been a previous AG, "Look, we're going to do this," I don't think I have ever come across that situation. MR SANTOS: Thank you, Mr McGrail, we are about to turn to the events of 12 May but I think that is probably a convenient moment for the break. THE CHAIRMAN: We will adjourn. (15.26) (Adjourned for a short time) (15.36) MR SANTOS: Just, McGrail, turning to the events of 12May can we please go to your statement at A190, paragraph 40. That would be in your case your third witness statement. Sorry, no, you will have to follow this on screen, this is not your statement,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	what the ownership was. Q. Do you accept that the Attorney General asked you to pause the investigation before taking any further steps at that meeting? A. Not at that meeting. He had done that in previous ones which is what I started to gain the vibes of him wanting to stall it by the question of using the question of the determination of the ownership and not at that meeting. Q. If we can just before we pause, can I take you to B74 again, this is your email of 12 May, uncorrected version, and feel free to correct me with your hard version, but in the bottom bit of B74, what is stated here is the final paragraph, "I get periodic briefs from the investigating on the progress of the investigation. I am fully aware of the full range of sensitivities surrounding the matter because of the personalities involved. At a meeting in the office of the AG with the DPP present, the AG was suggesting that I stop	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	advance notice of operational activity is not good practice in this regard and I don't think it would have been proper but in any event I had not I don't have any experience of telling the AG beforehand not whether it is Mr Llamas or whether it's been a previous AG, "Look, we're going to do this," I don't think I have ever come across that situation. MR SANTOS: Thank you, Mr McGrail, we are about to turn to the events of 12 May but I think that is probably a convenient moment for the break. THE CHAIRMAN: We will adjourn. (15.26) (Adjourned for a short time) (15.36) MR SANTOS: Just, McGrail, turning to the events of 12May can we please go to your statement at A190, paragraph 40. That would be in your case your third witness statement. Sorry, no, you will have to follow this on screen, this is not your statement, sorry. This is the Chief Minister's witness

1	to him of 12 May at 12.25. Why did you	1	A. I informed the Chief Minister at the latest
2	decide to send this message to the Chief	2	possible opportunity, in his capacity as Chief
3	Minister?	3	Minister, not as a friend or because of his
4	A. It was a sensitive intervention and I did	4	personal relationship with Mr Levy. I think
5	not want him to hear it from anybody else	5	that it was a good call because advising him
6	first other than myself.	6	beforehand, who knows what could have
7	Q. The reply from the Chief Minister is over	7	happened, so I think it was the right call of
8	the page	8	me to advise him at the point of - as close to
9	THE CHAIRMAN: Why do you say that it	9	the point of intervention as possible.
10	was in relation to the case against Perez,	10	Q. Did you agree with his comments about
11	Cornelio and Sanchez and not in relation to	11	requesting the information voluntarily?
12	the case against Mr Levy himself?	12	A. No.
13	A. Well, it does - it says Hassans for JL,	13	Q. Why not?
14	meaning James Levy, in respect - because the	14	A. I had the knowledge of the reasons why
15	other three had already been arrested, had	15	the officers had sought the search warrant
16	been processed and interviewed, but this was	16	and there was concern that Mr Levy could
17	in relation to an intervention at Hassans for	17	dispose of evidence if he was put on notice.
18		18	And as it happened, I am not alive to the
19	JL, Mr Levy, in relation to the case of. THE CHAIRMAN: But it was not in	19	processes of warrants and the provisions that
20	relation to their case, the search warrant at	20	go attached to it, but as it applies in this
20		21	case, and we have heard from Mr Wyan and I
22	Hassans was in relation to the case against	22	didn't know the ins and outs of it, but that
	Mr Levy.	1	
23	A. Yes, yes, but it was in relation to the pre- arrests of the other three defendants. It's	23	was part of the provision, to ask for voluntary
24		24	handing over in lieu of executing the warrant,
25	what's related to it, being connected to it.	25	but have the warrant there in case the
	Page 189		Page 191
_			
1	THE CHAIRMAN: Anyway, you did not	1	voluntary consent was not presented.
2	mean anything significant by that.	2	Q. Did you agree with the Chief Minister's
2 3	mean anything significant by that. A. Other than let him know that we were	2 3	Q. Did you agree with the Chief Minister's view that he should not comment further?
2 3 4	mean anything significant by that. A. Other than let him know that we were doing this activity on Mr Levy.	2 3 4	Q. Did you agree with the Chief Minister's view that he should not comment further?A. Absolutely. If only, if only he had kept
2 3 4 5	mean anything significant by that. A. Other than let him know that we were doing this activity on Mr Levy. MR SANTOS: The Chief Minister's reply is	2 3 4 5	Q. Did you agree with the Chief Minister's view that he should not comment further?A. Absolutely. If only, if only he had kept to that comment.
2 3 4 5 6	mean anything significant by that. A. Other than let him know that we were doing this activity on Mr Levy. MR SANTOS: The Chief Minister's reply is on the following page:	2 3 4 5 6	 Q. Did you agree with the Chief Minister's view that he should not comment further? A. Absolutely. If only, if only he had kept to that comment. Q. Can we now look at A279, please. You
2 3 4 5 6 7	mean anything significant by that. A. Other than let him know that we were doing this activity on Mr Levy. MR SANTOS: The Chief Minister's reply is on the following page: "Ian, Thank you for the courtesy of this	2 3 4 5 6 7	 Q. Did you agree with the Chief Minister's view that he should not comment further? A. Absolutely. If only, if only he had kept to that comment. Q. Can we now look at A279, please. You send a materially identical message to the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	mean anything significant by that. A. Other than let him know that we were doing this activity on Mr Levy. MR SANTOS: The Chief Minister's reply is on the following page: "Ian, Thank you for the courtesy of this information. I think that is a bad decision. A	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 Q. Did you agree with the Chief Minister's view that he should not comment further? A. Absolutely. If only, if only he had kept to that comment. Q. Can we now look at A279, please. You send a materially identical message to the Attorney General, 37. Why did you feel the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	mean anything significant by that. A. Other than let him know that we were doing this activity on Mr Levy. MR SANTOS: The Chief Minister's reply is on the following page: "Ian, Thank you for the courtesy of this information. I think that is a bad decision. A search warrant should only have been sought	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 Q. Did you agree with the Chief Minister's view that he should not comment further? A. Absolutely. If only, if only he had kept to that comment. Q. Can we now look at A279, please. You send a materially identical message to the Attorney General, 37. Why did you feel the need to update the Attorney General?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	mean anything significant by that. A. Other than let him know that we were doing this activity on Mr Levy. MR SANTOS: The Chief Minister's reply is on the following page: "Ian, Thank you for the courtesy of this information. I think that is a bad decision. A search warrant should only have been sought if you believed that the person in question	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 Q. Did you agree with the Chief Minister's view that he should not comment further? A. Absolutely. If only, if only he had kept to that comment. Q. Can we now look at A279, please. You send a materially identical message to the Attorney General, 37. Why did you feel the need to update the Attorney General? A. Again, for the same reasons that I've
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	mean anything significant by that. A. Other than let him know that we were doing this activity on Mr Levy. MR SANTOS: The Chief Minister's reply is on the following page: "Ian, Thank you for the courtesy of this information. I think that is a bad decision. A search warrant should only have been sought if you believed that the person in question was not going to cooperate and will try	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 Q. Did you agree with the Chief Minister's view that he should not comment further? A. Absolutely. If only, if only he had kept to that comment. Q. Can we now look at A279, please. You send a materially identical message to the Attorney General, 37. Why did you feel the need to update the Attorney General? A. Again, for the same reasons that I've alluded to in terms of the Chief Minister. It's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	mean anything significant by that. A. Other than let him know that we were doing this activity on Mr Levy. MR SANTOS: The Chief Minister's reply is on the following page: "Ian, Thank you for the courtesy of this information. I think that is a bad decision. A search warrant should only have been sought if you believed that the person in question was not going to cooperate and will try destroy evidence. If, as you say, you are	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 Q. Did you agree with the Chief Minister's view that he should not comment further? A. Absolutely. If only, if only he had kept to that comment. Q. Can we now look at A279, please. You send a materially identical message to the Attorney General, 37. Why did you feel the need to update the Attorney General? A. Again, for the same reasons that I've alluded to in terms of the Chief Minister. It's a high profile individual, Mr Levy, and it was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	mean anything significant by that. A. Other than let him know that we were doing this activity on Mr Levy. MR SANTOS: The Chief Minister's reply is on the following page: "Ian, Thank you for the courtesy of this information. I think that is a bad decision. A search warrant should only have been sought if you believed that the person in question was not going to cooperate and will try destroy evidence. If, as you say, you are hoping for cooperation, especially in a case	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 Q. Did you agree with the Chief Minister's view that he should not comment further? A. Absolutely. If only, if only he had kept to that comment. Q. Can we now look at A279, please. You send a materially identical message to the Attorney General, 37. Why did you feel the need to update the Attorney General? A. Again, for the same reasons that I've alluded to in terms of the Chief Minister. It's a high profile individual, Mr Levy, and it was going to have an impact so best hear it from
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	mean anything significant by that. A. Other than let him know that we were doing this activity on Mr Levy. MR SANTOS: The Chief Minister's reply is on the following page: "Ian, Thank you for the courtesy of this information. I think that is a bad decision. A search warrant should only have been sought if you believed that the person in question was not going to cooperate and will try destroy evidence. If, as you say, you are hoping for cooperation, especially in a case involving a senior Silk and head of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 Q. Did you agree with the Chief Minister's view that he should not comment further? A. Absolutely. If only, if only he had kept to that comment. Q. Can we now look at A279, please. You send a materially identical message to the Attorney General, 37. Why did you feel the need to update the Attorney General? A. Again, for the same reasons that I've alluded to in terms of the Chief Minister. It's a high profile individual, Mr Levy, and it was going to have an impact so best hear it from me than get it from another source. I did the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	mean anything significant by that. A. Other than let him know that we were doing this activity on Mr Levy. MR SANTOS: The Chief Minister's reply is on the following page: "Ian, Thank you for the courtesy of this information. I think that is a bad decision. A search warrant should only have been sought if you believed that the person in question was not going to cooperate and will try destroy evidence. If, as you say, you are hoping for cooperation, especially in a case involving a senior Silk and head of Gibraltar's largest legal firm, you should, in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q. Did you agree with the Chief Minister's view that he should not comment further? A. Absolutely. If only, if only he had kept to that comment. Q. Can we now look at A279, please. You send a materially identical message to the Attorney General, 37. Why did you feel the need to update the Attorney General? A. Again, for the same reasons that I've alluded to in terms of the Chief Minister. It's a high profile individual, Mr Levy, and it was going to have an impact so best hear it from me than get it from another source. I did the same with the Minister of Justice who was at
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	mean anything significant by that. A. Other than let him know that we were doing this activity on Mr Levy. MR SANTOS: The Chief Minister's reply is on the following page: "Ian, Thank you for the courtesy of this information. I think that is a bad decision. A search warrant should only have been sought if you believed that the person in question was not going to cooperate and will try destroy evidence. If, as you say, you are hoping for cooperation, especially in a case involving a senior Silk and head of Gibraltar's largest legal firm, you should, in my view, first have sought to contact that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 Q. Did you agree with the Chief Minister's view that he should not comment further? A. Absolutely. If only, if only he had kept to that comment. Q. Can we now look at A279, please. You send a materially identical message to the Attorney General, 37. Why did you feel the need to update the Attorney General? A. Again, for the same reasons that I've alluded to in terms of the Chief Minister. It's a high profile individual, Mr Levy, and it was going to have an impact so best hear it from me than get it from another source. I did the same with the Minister of Justice who was at the meeting with me. I have to say that I did
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	mean anything significant by that. A. Other than let him know that we were doing this activity on Mr Levy. MR SANTOS: The Chief Minister's reply is on the following page: "Ian, Thank you for the courtesy of this information. I think that is a bad decision. A search warrant should only have been sought if you believed that the person in question was not going to cooperate and will try destroy evidence. If, as you say, you are hoping for cooperation, especially in a case involving a senior Silk and head of Gibraltar's largest legal firm, you should, in my view, first have sought to contact that person and obtain cooperation. Given my	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 Q. Did you agree with the Chief Minister's view that he should not comment further? A. Absolutely. If only, if only he had kept to that comment. Q. Can we now look at A279, please. You send a materially identical message to the Attorney General, 37. Why did you feel the need to update the Attorney General? A. Again, for the same reasons that I've alluded to in terms of the Chief Minister. It's a high profile individual, Mr Levy, and it was going to have an impact so best hear it from me than get it from another source. I did the same with the Minister of Justice who was at the meeting with me. I have to say that I did not know the time, although I knew that there
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	mean anything significant by that. A. Other than let him know that we were doing this activity on Mr Levy. MR SANTOS: The Chief Minister's reply is on the following page: "Ian, Thank you for the courtesy of this information. I think that is a bad decision. A search warrant should only have been sought if you believed that the person in question was not going to cooperate and will try destroy evidence. If, as you say, you are hoping for cooperation, especially in a case involving a senior Silk and head of Gibraltar's largest legal firm, you should, in my view, first have sought to contact that person and obtain cooperation. Given my close personal relationship with JL, I won't	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. Did you agree with the Chief Minister's view that he should not comment further? A. Absolutely. If only, if only he had kept to that comment. Q. Can we now look at A279, please. You send a materially identical message to the Attorney General, 37. Why did you feel the need to update the Attorney General? A. Again, for the same reasons that I've alluded to in terms of the Chief Minister. It's a high profile individual, Mr Levy, and it was going to have an impact so best hear it from me than get it from another source. I did the same with the Minister of Justice who was at the meeting with me. I have to say that I did not know the time, although I knew that there was a warrant going to be executed, I did not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	mean anything significant by that. A. Other than let him know that we were doing this activity on Mr Levy. MR SANTOS: The Chief Minister's reply is on the following page: "Ian, Thank you for the courtesy of this information. I think that is a bad decision. A search warrant should only have been sought if you believed that the person in question was not going to cooperate and will try destroy evidence. If, as you say, you are hoping for cooperation, especially in a case involving a senior Silk and head of Gibraltar's largest legal firm, you should, in my view, first have sought to contact that person and obtain cooperation. Given my close personal relationship with JL, I won't comment further."	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. Did you agree with the Chief Minister's view that he should not comment further? A. Absolutely. If only, if only he had kept to that comment. Q. Can we now look at A279, please. You send a materially identical message to the Attorney General, 37. Why did you feel the need to update the Attorney General? A. Again, for the same reasons that I've alluded to in terms of the Chief Minister. It's a high profile individual, Mr Levy, and it was going to have an impact so best hear it from me than get it from another source. I did the same with the Minister of Justice who was at the meeting with me. I have to say that I did not know the time, although I knew that there was a warrant going to be executed, I did not know the time this was going to happen.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	mean anything significant by that. A. Other than let him know that we were doing this activity on Mr Levy. MR SANTOS: The Chief Minister's reply is on the following page: "Ian, Thank you for the courtesy of this information. I think that is a bad decision. A search warrant should only have been sought if you believed that the person in question was not going to cooperate and will try destroy evidence. If, as you say, you are hoping for cooperation, especially in a case involving a senior Silk and head of Gibraltar's largest legal firm, you should, in my view, first have sought to contact that person and obtain cooperation. Given my close personal relationship with JL, I won't comment further." Now, the Chief Minister refers to his close	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. Did you agree with the Chief Minister's view that he should not comment further? A. Absolutely. If only, if only he had kept to that comment. Q. Can we now look at A279, please. You send a materially identical message to the Attorney General, 37. Why did you feel the need to update the Attorney General? A. Again, for the same reasons that I've alluded to in terms of the Chief Minister. It's a high profile individual, Mr Levy, and it was going to have an impact so best hear it from me than get it from another source. I did the same with the Minister of Justice who was at the meeting with me. I have to say that I did not know the time, although I knew that there was a warrant going to be executed, I did not know the time this was going to happen. What I had asked the team to do was to give
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	mean anything significant by that. A. Other than let him know that we were doing this activity on Mr Levy. MR SANTOS: The Chief Minister's reply is on the following page: "Ian, Thank you for the courtesy of this information. I think that is a bad decision. A search warrant should only have been sought if you believed that the person in question was not going to cooperate and will try destroy evidence. If, as you say, you are hoping for cooperation, especially in a case involving a senior Silk and head of Gibraltar's largest legal firm, you should, in my view, first have sought to contact that person and obtain cooperation. Given my close personal relationship with JL, I won't comment further." Now, the Chief Minister refers to his close personal relationship with Mr Levy. You	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. Did you agree with the Chief Minister's view that he should not comment further? A. Absolutely. If only, if only he had kept to that comment. Q. Can we now look at A279, please. You send a materially identical message to the Attorney General, 37. Why did you feel the need to update the Attorney General? A. Again, for the same reasons that I've alluded to in terms of the Chief Minister. It's a high profile individual, Mr Levy, and it was going to have an impact so best hear it from me than get it from another source. I did the same with the Minister of Justice who was at the meeting with me. I have to say that I did not know the time, although I knew that there was a warrant going to be executed, I did not know the time this was going to happen. What I had asked the team to do was to give me a minute's grace before actually
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	mean anything significant by that. A. Other than let him know that we were doing this activity on Mr Levy. MR SANTOS: The Chief Minister's reply is on the following page: "Ian, Thank you for the courtesy of this information. I think that is a bad decision. A search warrant should only have been sought if you believed that the person in question was not going to cooperate and will try destroy evidence. If, as you say, you are hoping for cooperation, especially in a case involving a senior Silk and head of Gibraltar's largest legal firm, you should, in my view, first have sought to contact that person and obtain cooperation. Given my close personal relationship with JL, I won't comment further." Now, the Chief Minister refers to his close personal relationship with Mr Levy. You were obviously aware of this, so did you still	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. Did you agree with the Chief Minister's view that he should not comment further? A. Absolutely. If only, if only he had kept to that comment. Q. Can we now look at A279, please. You send a materially identical message to the Attorney General, 37. Why did you feel the need to update the Attorney General? A. Again, for the same reasons that I've alluded to in terms of the Chief Minister. It's a high profile individual, Mr Levy, and it was going to have an impact so best hear it from me than get it from another source. I did the same with the Minister of Justice who was at the meeting with me. I have to say that I did not know the time, although I knew that there was a warrant going to be executed, I did not know the time this was going to happen. What I had asked the team to do was to give me a minute's grace before actually intercepting, wherever they were going to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	mean anything significant by that. A. Other than let him know that we were doing this activity on Mr Levy. MR SANTOS: The Chief Minister's reply is on the following page: "Ian, Thank you for the courtesy of this information. I think that is a bad decision. A search warrant should only have been sought if you believed that the person in question was not going to cooperate and will try destroy evidence. If, as you say, you are hoping for cooperation, especially in a case involving a senior Silk and head of Gibraltar's largest legal firm, you should, in my view, first have sought to contact that person and obtain cooperation. Given my close personal relationship with JL, I won't comment further." Now, the Chief Minister refers to his close personal relationship with Mr Levy. You	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. Did you agree with the Chief Minister's view that he should not comment further? A. Absolutely. If only, if only he had kept to that comment. Q. Can we now look at A279, please. You send a materially identical message to the Attorney General, 37. Why did you feel the need to update the Attorney General? A. Again, for the same reasons that I've alluded to in terms of the Chief Minister. It's a high profile individual, Mr Levy, and it was going to have an impact so best hear it from me than get it from another source. I did the same with the Minister of Justice who was at the meeting with me. I have to say that I did not know the time, although I knew that there was a warrant going to be executed, I did not know the time this was going to happen. What I had asked the team to do was to give me a minute's grace before actually
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	mean anything significant by that. A. Other than let him know that we were doing this activity on Mr Levy. MR SANTOS: The Chief Minister's reply is on the following page: "Ian, Thank you for the courtesy of this information. I think that is a bad decision. A search warrant should only have been sought if you believed that the person in question was not going to cooperate and will try destroy evidence. If, as you say, you are hoping for cooperation, especially in a case involving a senior Silk and head of Gibraltar's largest legal firm, you should, in my view, first have sought to contact that person and obtain cooperation. Given my close personal relationship with JL, I won't comment further." Now, the Chief Minister refers to his close personal relationship with Mr Levy. You were obviously aware of this, so did you still consider it appropriate to notify the Chief Minister of the warrant notwithstanding that	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 agree with the Chief Minister's view that he should not comment further? A. Absolutely. If only, if only he had kept to that comment. Q. Can we now look at A279, please. You send a materially identical message to the Attorney General, 37. Why did you feel the need to update the Attorney General? A. Again, for the same reasons that I've alluded to in terms of the Chief Minister. It's a high profile individual, Mr Levy, and it was going to have an impact so best hear it from me than get it from another source. I did the same with the Minister of Justice who was at the meeting with me. I have to say that I did not know the time, although I knew that there was a warrant going to be executed, I did not know the time this was going to happen. What I had asked the team to do was to give me a minute's grace before actually intercepting, wherever they were going to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	mean anything significant by that. A. Other than let him know that we were doing this activity on Mr Levy. MR SANTOS: The Chief Minister's reply is on the following page: "Ian, Thank you for the courtesy of this information. I think that is a bad decision. A search warrant should only have been sought if you believed that the person in question was not going to cooperate and will try destroy evidence. If, as you say, you are hoping for cooperation, especially in a case involving a senior Silk and head of Gibraltar's largest legal firm, you should, in my view, first have sought to contact that person and obtain cooperation. Given my close personal relationship with JL, I won't comment further." Now, the Chief Minister refers to his close personal relationship with Mr Levy. You were obviously aware of this, so did you still consider it appropriate to notify the Chief	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 agree with the Chief Minister's view that he should not comment further? A. Absolutely. If only, if only he had kept to that comment. Q. Can we now look at A279, please. You send a materially identical message to the Attorney General, 37. Why did you feel the need to update the Attorney General? A. Again, for the same reasons that I've alluded to in terms of the Chief Minister. It's a high profile individual, Mr Levy, and it was going to have an impact so best hear it from me than get it from another source. I did the same with the Minister of Justice who was at the meeting with me. I have to say that I did not know the time, although I knew that there was a warrant going to be executed, I did not know the time this was going to happen. What I had asked the team to do was to give me a minute's grace before actually intercepting, wherever they were going to intercept, so that I could advise the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	mean anything significant by that. A. Other than let him know that we were doing this activity on Mr Levy. MR SANTOS: The Chief Minister's reply is on the following page: "Ian, Thank you for the courtesy of this information. I think that is a bad decision. A search warrant should only have been sought if you believed that the person in question was not going to cooperate and will try destroy evidence. If, as you say, you are hoping for cooperation, especially in a case involving a senior Silk and head of Gibraltar's largest legal firm, you should, in my view, first have sought to contact that person and obtain cooperation. Given my close personal relationship with JL, I won't comment further." Now, the Chief Minister refers to his close personal relationship with Mr Levy. You were obviously aware of this, so did you still consider it appropriate to notify the Chief Minister of the warrant notwithstanding that	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 agree with the Chief Minister's view that he should not comment further? A. Absolutely. If only, if only he had kept to that comment. Q. Can we now look at A279, please. You send a materially identical message to the Attorney General, 37. Why did you feel the need to update the Attorney General? A. Again, for the same reasons that I've alluded to in terms of the Chief Minister. It's a high profile individual, Mr Levy, and it was going to have an impact so best hear it from me than get it from another source. I did the same with the Minister of Justice who was at the meeting with me. I have to say that I did not know the time, although I knew that there was a warrant going to be executed, I did not know the time this was going to happen. What I had asked the team to do was to give me a minute's grace before actually intercepting, wherever they were going to intercept, so that I could advise the personalities involved. And I did so, and I

Sacramento and I text her the same message	1	A. No.
2 and she acknowledged. I can't remember	2	Q. Over the page on B75 you give an
3 whether she acknowledged by text - I would	3	account of what occurred in the penultimate
4 have to check - or whether she went to the	4	paragraph, last line. You say:
5 nod, she was sitting across the room and she	5	"A few minutes later the CM and AG entered
6 nodded. Probably both.	6	the room from the CM's office. The CM
7 Q. The Attorney General's response to your	7	states words to the effect in both the English
8 message is on the following page:	8	and Spanish language: 'What are you doing,
9 "Ian, we had agreed that you would come to	9	Ian? This is a complete blunder. Why go
me with a rationalisation of the charges	10	with a warrant? Do you suspect Haim has
11 before doing anything?"	11	committed a crime? Look, Haim can be
12 You reply:	12	many things and he has been in messes
13 "We agreed we'd do that when all the loose	13	before but he's not a criminal. He's a senior
ends were tied up and this included the	14	silk, head of the Jewish community, helps out
15 enquiries with JL."	15	the RGP if needed, he is the head of the
16 "No. That was not what we agreed,"	16	biggest law firm and he has a very good
the Attorney General answers, and you say:	17	reputation as a lawyer. Are you suggeting
18 "I am in the bunker. Will come round to	18	that Haim would destroy or dispose of
19 your office as soon as I finish here."	19	evidence? You know Gibraltar. This will
20 What were your thoughts about the Attorney	20	get out and you are managing this
21 General's response?	21	investigation very, very wrongly. Why didn't
A. That he had completely misconstrued the	22	you ask him to give you what you needed?'
23 situation.	23	To this I said that what the team were after
Q. Now, in terms of the meeting with the	24	were devices which we knew JL would not
25 Chief Minister and the Attorney General, I	25	hand over unless compelled to do so with a
Page 193		Page 195
1 think it is clear that you did not take	1	warrant. CM says words to the effect: 'But
2 contemporaneous notes of that meeting, but	2	have you asked him?' I felt the CM was
3 correct me if I am wrong.	3	questioning an operational decision on a live
4 A. The notes that I took, which are here in	4	criminal matter and that this was not
5 the email, they were typed out practically as	5	appropriate. He said he hoped that I was
6 soon as I got to the station. After I briefed	6	right and that he was wrong as there would
7 my team I got down and started typing those	7	be consequences if he was found to be right,
8 notes out. I saved them on to the desktop and	8	in that we had not conducted ourselves
9 then when I got home there is a possibility	9	properly on this matter."
10 that I added more to the notes and then	10	Is that still your recollection of the
11 emailed those notes to myself. So I	11	conversation that took place?
12 definitely started that way, way - before the	12	A. That is the text of it. There was a lot of
13 close of play, must have been 2.00 or	13	emotion, there was a lot of anger. The Chief
14 3.00pm.	14	Minister's steamed into that room with - I've
15 Q. So that is the earliest contemporaneous	15	never seen him before like that: flared
16 note or the earliest note that we have from	16	nostrils, disjointed face, and really let rip.
you as to what occurred in that meeting.	17	Q. What did you understand the Chief
18 A. I believe so, yes. I don't think the Chief	18	Minister to mean when he said there would
19 Minister or the Attorney General made any	19	be consequences if he was found to be right?
20 notes.	20	A. (Pause) That my head was on the line.
21 Q. No, no, I am referring to you.	21	Q. You say it was not appropriate for the
22 A. Ah, okay.	22	Chief Minister to be questioning you on an
Q. There is no other file saved that you	23	operational decision on a live criminal
24 A. No.	24	matter. Did you feel it was open to you to
25 Q talk about in the desktop.	25	ignore these comments and press on?
Page 194		Page 196
1 -0-		0

_			
1	A. Sorry, can you repeat?	1	"Look, I am not shrugging responsibility here
2	Q. Yes.	2	but the team has been consulting with the
3	THE CHAIRMAN: Are you feeling all	3	DPP on this." That is the extent of my input
4	right?	4	that, in that sense.
5	A. Yes, sir.	5	Q. Given the context of the conversation was
6	THE CHAIRMAN: You are sure?	6	about the choice of warrant or a voluntary
7	A. I am.	7	handover production order, was that not a
8	MR SANTOS: Do say if you need a break at	8	reference to the warrant?
9	any stage. You say it was not appropriate for	9	A. No.
10	the Chief Minister to be questioning you on	10	Q. What was it a reference to?
11	an operational decision on a live criminal	11	A. To the general issues of how Mr Levy
12	matter. Did you feel it was open to you to	12	had been addressed, because Mr Picardo was
13	ignore these comments and press on?	13	arguing that: (a) it was a commercial dispute;
14	A. It was not - at that moment in time that	14	(b) that Mr Levy was not - that we were
15	was not in my mind. I was absorbing the	15	being advised wrong on his status as a
16	rebuke as much as I could. I couldn't think	16	suspect; that he could be many things but he
17	further than what was happening at that	17	was certainly not a criminal, so he was
18	moment.	18	advocating for Mr Levy in the strongest and
19	Q. Then if we read on, you say:	19	angriest of terms.
20	"He stated that he would be calling in the	20	Q. Did you not consider that using that
21	senior command team to address us on how	21	general phrasing, that the DPP had been
22	inept we were investigating white collar	22	consulted throughout, might be interpreted as
23	crime. I advised that the warrant had been	23	meaning that the DPP had advised in favour
24	signed by a judge who was satisfied that this	24	of a warrant?
25	was the likely method we had to resort to in	25	A. It seems to be that that is what they
	Page 197		Page 199
			2 100 277
1	order to recover the material which could	1	interpreted, because Mr Llamas says that
2	hold evidence, and that all the grounds to	2	they got the impression, but what is
3	deal with JL had been consulted with DPP.	3	categorical is that I did not say that the DPP
4	CM dismisses this, saying that it is very easy	4	had specifically (as later they have alluded
5	to obtain a search warrant. CM was very	5	to) specifically advised on the warrant. I said
6	angry that we had obtained a warrant without	6	that the DPP had been consulted by the team,
7	considering a voluntary handing over of the	7	and
8	material we were after. I posed the question	8	Q. Did you make clear that the DPP had not
9	whether he genuinely believed JL would be	9	advised on the warrant?
10	handing over the material if asked without a	10	A. No, I did not make that clear.
11	warrant. CM said he would not. There was a	11	Q. Sorry, I think I cut across you, so if you
12	heated debate on whether the actions of the	12	were going to say something else, please
13	team were proper or not, with me saying they	13	A. No, I did not make that clear. It was a
14	were and the CM saying they were not. I	14	statement over a berating of a very serious
15	stated that it would be left to a court to	15	magnitude. The detail was not there - I was
16	decide who was right or wrong. I said this	16	being bombarded with questions: "But have
17	because CM said that JL should not hand	17	you asked him?" This is at the time when the
18	over his mobile device to the RGP but would	18	officers have just got in. It's not after the
19	do so to a court."	19	event, the officers, as far as I understand, had
20	Just focusing on the words you say "the	20	not even asserted their position with the
21	grounds to deal with JL had been consulted	21	warrant, and I was already getting the
22	with the DPP", are those the exact words that	22	dressing down of my law enforcement career,
23	you used in the meeting?	23	which in my view, then, and now, is
24	A. I cannot say that those were the exact	24	completely inappropriate and improper.
25	words but all I can say is that I told him:	25	Q. Can I just take you back to where you
	D 400		D 200
	Page 198		Page 200

1	say:	1	"The CM insists in his letter that I told him
2	"I advised that the warrant had been signed	2	that the Op Delhi investigation team had
3	by a judge who was satisfied that this was the	3	executed the search warrant on the advice of
4	likely method we had to resort to in order to	4	the DPP. This was not the case - what I was
5	recover the material which could hold	5	referring to was that the status of "suspect"
6	evidence and that all the grounds to deal with	6	for JL had been the subject of consultation
7			and agreement with the DPP who had
8	dismisses this, saying that it is very easy to	7 8	advised the team generallyon the
9	obtain a search warrant."	9	investigation throughout. Notwithstanding, it
10	Why did you not clarify at that point that you	10	is abundantly clear from my account and the
11	were not referring specifically to the warrant	11	letter in question that the CM raised a
12	in terms of the DPP?	12	number of operational issues with me
13	A. Because I didn't have to. They had the	13	concerning Op Delhi but yet in Parliament
14	warrant, which was signed by a judge, and	14	claimed he had not."
15	that for me is justification of the action.	15	Do you agree that what is said there is your
16		16	statement is more specific than what you
	Q. If we go to your statement, your third	17	
17	statement, A119, please, paragraph 147(iii)(e).	18	recorded as having said in your email of 12 May?
18	` / ` /	19	*
19	A. Sorry, what paragraph was it?	20	A. Clearly. I have elaborated from those notes, I think the paragraphs that are included
20 21	Q. Sorry, 147(iii)(e). A119, so it is on page	20 21	in my statement are more elaborate, from
	69 of your statement.	22	notes that I made, those contemporaneous
22	A. A119?	1	· •
23	Q. Sorry, A119, do you have that page?	23	notes.
24	A. Yes.	24	Q. When you say:
25	Q. There is (e) there, but just before I go to	25	"What I was referring to was that the status
	Page 201		Page 203
1	that, did you know at the time that the	1	of 'suspect' for JL had been the subject of
2	officers - at the time this conversation was		consultation and agreement with the DPP,"
		2 3	<u> </u>
3 4	going on, that the officers had not asserted their authority under warrant yet?	4	are those words you actually said or are you explaining here what you meant by the words
5	A. I wasn't - I mean, there was only a spell	5	that you used?
6	of being advised by Mr Richardson of one	6	A. I would agree with you that this is to do
7	minute, a couple of minutes after I engaged	7	what I meant, because it was the challenge
8	with the Chief Minister over text, and maybe	8	,
9	·		that Mr Levy was not a criminal, that what
10	ten minutes later I got called out of that	9	we were investigating was not a crime, that this was a civil dispute or commercial
	meeting to attend the cabinet room. So a		•
11 12	warrant is not going to be fulfilled, or the	11	dispute. So that is what I was trying to
	-L:	12	incompany the state of the same and the same thing
	objective are not going to be fulfilled in ten	12	impart, that: "Look, we have not done this
13	minutes, not what they were certainly dealing	13	because we have woken up one morning and
13 14	minutes, not what they were certainly dealing with. So I think it's an irrefutable assumption	13 14	because we have woken up one morning and said: 'We are going to go for Mr Levy'," this
13 14 15	minutes, not what they were certainly dealing with. So I think it's an irrefutable assumption that I'm making and can be explored with	13 14 15	because we have woken up one morning and said: 'We are going to go for Mr Levy'," this has been well thought out and it's been
13 14 15 16	minutes, not what they were certainly dealing with. So I think it's an irrefutable assumption that I'm making and can be explored with time lines that at the time that I was getting	13 14 15 16	because we have woken up one morning and said: 'We are going to go for Mr Levy'," this has been well thought out and it's been consulted, it's not an off-the-cuff action.
13 14 15 16 17	minutes, not what they were certainly dealing with. So I think it's an irrefutable assumption that I'm making and can be explored with time lines that at the time that I was getting the rebuke the officers had still not asserted	13 14 15 16 17	because we have woken up one morning and said: 'We are going to go for Mr Levy'," this has been well thought out and it's been consulted, it's not an off-the-cuff action. Q. Can we go back to B75 now and your
13 14 15 16 17 18	minutes, not what they were certainly dealing with. So I think it's an irrefutable assumption that I'm making and can be explored with time lines that at the time that I was getting the rebuke the officers had still not asserted themselves, they were probably even waiting	13 14 15 16 17 18	because we have woken up one morning and said: 'We are going to go for Mr Levy'," this has been well thought out and it's been consulted, it's not an off-the-cuff action. Q. Can we go back to B75 now and your email. The next paragraph reads:
13 14 15 16 17 18 19	minutes, not what they were certainly dealing with. So I think it's an irrefutable assumption that I'm making and can be explored with time lines that at the time that I was getting the rebuke the officers had still not asserted themselves, they were probably even waiting for Mr Levy to come, because that's	13 14 15 16 17 18 19	because we have woken up one morning and said: 'We are going to go for Mr Levy'," this has been well thought out and it's been consulted, it's not an off-the-cuff action. Q. Can we go back to B75 now and your email. The next paragraph reads: "AG stated that I had betrayed him because
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	minutes, not what they were certainly dealing with. So I think it's an irrefutable assumption that I'm making and can be explored with time lines that at the time that I was getting the rebuke the officers had still not asserted themselves, they were probably even waiting for Mr Levy to come, because that's apparently what - how it unfolded, Mr Levy	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	because we have woken up one morning and said: 'We are going to go for Mr Levy'," this has been well thought out and it's been consulted, it's not an off-the-cuff action. Q. Can we go back to B75 now and your email. The next paragraph reads: "AG stated that I had betrayed him because the action carried out by the team was not
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	minutes, not what they were certainly dealing with. So I think it's an irrefutable assumption that I'm making and can be explored with time lines that at the time that I was getting the rebuke the officers had still not asserted themselves, they were probably even waiting for Mr Levy to come, because that's apparently what - how it unfolded, Mr Levy was refusing. So they hadn't even had that	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	because we have woken up one morning and said: 'We are going to go for Mr Levy'," this has been well thought out and it's been consulted, it's not an off-the-cuff action. Q. Can we go back to B75 now and your email. The next paragraph reads: "AG stated that I had betrayed him because the action carried out by the team was not what had been agreed with him.
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	minutes, not what they were certainly dealing with. So I think it's an irrefutable assumption that I'm making and can be explored with time lines that at the time that I was getting the rebuke the officers had still not asserted themselves, they were probably even waiting for Mr Levy to come, because that's apparently what - how it unfolded, Mr Levy was refusing. So they hadn't even had that face to face with Mr Levy when I was	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	because we have woken up one morning and said: 'We are going to go for Mr Levy'," this has been well thought out and it's been consulted, it's not an off-the-cuff action. Q. Can we go back to B75 now and your email. The next paragraph reads: "AG stated that I had betrayed him because the action carried out by the team was not what had been agreed with him. Notwithstanding that, what the AG stated
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	minutes, not what they were certainly dealing with. So I think it's an irrefutable assumption that I'm making and can be explored with time lines that at the time that I was getting the rebuke the officers had still not asserted themselves, they were probably even waiting for Mr Levy to come, because that's apparently what - how it unfolded, Mr Levy was refusing. So they hadn't even had that face to face with Mr Levy when I was already getting the rebuke.	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	because we have woken up one morning and said: 'We are going to go for Mr Levy'," this has been well thought out and it's been consulted, it's not an off-the-cuff action. Q. Can we go back to B75 now and your email. The next paragraph reads: "AG stated that I had betrayed him because the action carried out by the team was not what had been agreed with him. Notwithstanding that, what the AG stated was incorrect. The AG has no operational
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	minutes, not what they were certainly dealing with. So I think it's an irrefutable assumption that I'm making and can be explored with time lines that at the time that I was getting the rebuke the officers had still not asserted themselves, they were probably even waiting for Mr Levy to come, because that's apparently what - how it unfolded, Mr Levy was refusing. So they hadn't even had that face to face with Mr Levy when I was already getting the rebuke. Q. In paragraph (e) here you are referring to	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	because we have woken up one morning and said: 'We are going to go for Mr Levy'," this has been well thought out and it's been consulted, it's not an off-the-cuff action. Q. Can we go back to B75 now and your email. The next paragraph reads: "AG stated that I had betrayed him because the action carried out by the team was not what had been agreed with him. Notwithstanding that, what the AG stated was incorrect. The AG has no operational remit and his address to me in this regard is
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	minutes, not what they were certainly dealing with. So I think it's an irrefutable assumption that I'm making and can be explored with time lines that at the time that I was getting the rebuke the officers had still not asserted themselves, they were probably even waiting for Mr Levy to come, because that's apparently what - how it unfolded, Mr Levy was refusing. So they hadn't even had that face to face with Mr Levy when I was already getting the rebuke.	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	because we have woken up one morning and said: 'We are going to go for Mr Levy'," this has been well thought out and it's been consulted, it's not an off-the-cuff action. Q. Can we go back to B75 now and your email. The next paragraph reads: "AG stated that I had betrayed him because the action carried out by the team was not what had been agreed with him. Notwithstanding that, what the AG stated was incorrect. The AG has no operational
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	minutes, not what they were certainly dealing with. So I think it's an irrefutable assumption that I'm making and can be explored with time lines that at the time that I was getting the rebuke the officers had still not asserted themselves, they were probably even waiting for Mr Levy to come, because that's apparently what - how it unfolded, Mr Levy was refusing. So they hadn't even had that face to face with Mr Levy when I was already getting the rebuke. Q. In paragraph (e) here you are referring to	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	because we have woken up one morning and said: 'We are going to go for Mr Levy'," this has been well thought out and it's been consulted, it's not an off-the-cuff action. Q. Can we go back to B75 now and your email. The next paragraph reads: "AG stated that I had betrayed him because the action carried out by the team was not what had been agreed with him. Notwithstanding that, what the AG stated was incorrect. The AG has no operational remit and his address to me in this regard is

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	that he was steering clear from the criminal investigation. I felt totally cornered, having to explain a tactical decision on a live criminal investigation. AG says words to the effect: 'Ian, I liked you and how you worked but as from today I cannot entertain you again. This really shocked and hurt me.' The AG couldn't be more mistaken. My hypothesis is that the AG himself is under	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A. No, no, the fact that we had acted against Mr Levy - well, if that is what you want I will stop it there, but I think the fact that we acted against Mr Levy had exposed the inability of the Attorney General, in my view, that he had to keep the lid on this particular job, by whatever means, whatever means, by referring to the stalling of the investigation due to ownership, by the
10	some form of pressure to ensure that the	10	suggestions of disciplinary route for Mr
11	investigation is terminated and the	11	Sanchez, and there was other ingredients
12	intervention of JL has shown him up for not	12	there that gave me the impression this man is
13	having achieved the stopping of the	13	under some brief to keep a lid on this. The
14	investigation. It is not that RGP has put itself	14	fact that we had executed - taken executive
15	in this situation. The team has acted	15	action against Mr Levy had shown him up
16	appropriately and without fear or favour. I	16	for not having been able to achieve his brief.
17	fully understand there could potentially be	17	That's what my theory suggests.
18	reputational damage in a number of	18	Q. Why do you say that the Attorney
19	quarters."	19	General cannot question you on an
20	What did you mean there when you say, four	20	operational matter?
21	lines from the bottom "the intervention of	21	A. Because there is an independence issue
22	JL"? What was that a reference to?	22	here ion terms of the police, and the judiciary
23	A. Can you tell me?	23	and law officers. There's an appropriate - if
24	Q. Just in the paragraph I have read.	24	he wants to challenge there's an appropriate
25	A. Yes, that my hypothesis is that the AG	25	method to do so, not in the fashion that he
	Page 205		Page 207
1	himself	1	
	IIIIISEII	I I	did, acting as a wingman for the Chief
		1 2	did, acting as a wingman for the Chief Minister.
2	Q. " is under some form of pressure to	2	Minister.
		l	
2 3	Q. " is under some form of pressure to ensure that the investigation is terminated and the intervention of JL has shown him	2 3	Minister. Q. Was the search warrant an operational, a
2 3 4	Q. " is under some form of pressure to ensure that the investigation is terminated	2 3 4	Minister. Q. Was the search warrant an operational, a strategic or a tactical decision?
2 3 4 5	Q. " is under some form of pressure to ensure that the investigation is terminated and the intervention of JL has shown him up."	2 3 4 5	Minister. Q. Was the search warrant an operational, a strategic or a tactical decision? A. That was a totally operational and tactical
2 3 4 5 6	Q. " is under some form of pressure to ensure that the investigation is terminated and the intervention of JL has shown him up." A. Yes.	2 3 4 5 6	Minister. Q. Was the search warrant an operational, a strategic or a tactical decision? A. That was a totally operational and tactical decision.
2 3 4 5 6 7	 Q. " is under some form of pressure to ensure that the investigation is terminated and the intervention of JL has shown him up." A. Yes. Q. What is that a reference to? 	2 3 4 5 6 7	Minister. Q. Was the search warrant an operational, a strategic or a tactical decision? A. That was a totally operational and tactical decision. Q. Just further on, the next paragraph starts:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 Q. " is under some form of pressure to ensure that the investigation is terminated and the intervention of JL has shown him up." A. Yes. Q. What is that a reference to? A. Okay. Mr Picardo in his berating was 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Minister. Q. Was the search warrant an operational, a strategic or a tactical decision? A. That was a totally operational and tactical decision. Q. Just further on, the next paragraph starts: "Further comments by the CM, the AG
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 Q. " is under some form of pressure to ensure that the investigation is terminated and the intervention of JL has shown him up." A. Yes. Q. What is that a reference to? A. Okay. Mr Picardo in his berating was telling me that I should have advised the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Minister. Q. Was the search warrant an operational, a strategic or a tactical decision? A. That was a totally operational and tactical decision. Q. Just further on, the next paragraph starts: "Further comments by the CM, the AG should have been aware of the intervention as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 Q. " is under some form of pressure to ensure that the investigation is terminated and the intervention of JL has shown him up." A. Yes. Q. What is that a reference to? A. Okay. Mr Picardo in his berating was telling me that I should have advised the Attorney General because he is the leader of 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Minister. Q. Was the search warrant an operational, a strategic or a tactical decision? A. That was a totally operational and tactical decision. Q. Just further on, the next paragraph starts: "Further comments by the CM, the AG should have been aware of the intervention as he is leader of the Bar and heads the disciplinary committee for the Bar." Then further down, after those bullet points:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q. " is under some form of pressure to ensure that the investigation is terminated and the intervention of JL has shown him up." A. Yes. Q. What is that a reference to? A. Okay. Mr Picardo in his berating was telling me that I should have advised the Attorney General because he is the leader of the Bar, or at least words to that effect, and he heads the disciplinary committees of the Bar. In other words, because there was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Minister. Q. Was the search warrant an operational, a strategic or a tactical decision? A. That was a totally operational and tactical decision. Q. Just further on, the next paragraph starts: "Further comments by the CM, the AG should have been aware of the intervention as he is leader of the Bar and heads the disciplinary committee for the Bar." Then further down, after those bullet points: "I have discussed the above with my
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q. " is under some form of pressure to ensure that the investigation is terminated and the intervention of JL has shown him up." A. Yes. Q. What is that a reference to? A. Okay. Mr Picardo in his berating was telling me that I should have advised the Attorney General because he is the leader of the Bar, or at least words to that effect, and he heads the disciplinary committees of the Bar. In other words, because there was suspected criminality of a lawyer involved	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Minister. Q. Was the search warrant an operational, a strategic or a tactical decision? A. That was a totally operational and tactical decision. Q. Just further on, the next paragraph starts: "Further comments by the CM, the AG should have been aware of the intervention as he is leader of the Bar and heads the disciplinary committee for the Bar." Then further down, after those bullet points: "I have discussed the above with my command team senior officers, who are also
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 Q. " is under some form of pressure to ensure that the investigation is terminated and the intervention of JL has shown him up." A. Yes. Q. What is that a reference to? A. Okay. Mr Picardo in his berating was telling me that I should have advised the Attorney General because he is the leader of the Bar, or at least words to that effect, and he heads the disciplinary committees of the Bar. In other words, because there was suspected criminality of a lawyer involved that I should have consulted with him before 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Minister. Q. Was the search warrant an operational, a strategic or a tactical decision? A. That was a totally operational and tactical decision. Q. Just further on, the next paragraph starts: "Further comments by the CM, the AG should have been aware of the intervention as he is leader of the Bar and heads the disciplinary committee for the Bar." Then further down, after those bullet points: "I have discussed the above with my command team senior officers, who are also concerned and worried about the level of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. " is under some form of pressure to ensure that the investigation is terminated and the intervention of JL has shown him up." A. Yes. Q. What is that a reference to? A. Okay. Mr Picardo in his berating was telling me that I should have advised the Attorney General because he is the leader of the Bar, or at least words to that effect, and he heads the disciplinary committees of the Bar. In other words, because there was suspected criminality of a lawyer involved that I should have consulted with him before the action we took. He was suggesting that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Minister. Q. Was the search warrant an operational, a strategic or a tactical decision? A. That was a totally operational and tactical decision. Q. Just further on, the next paragraph starts: "Further comments by the CM, the AG should have been aware of the intervention as he is leader of the Bar and heads the disciplinary committee for the Bar." Then further down, after those bullet points: "I have discussed the above with my command team senior officers, who are also concerned and worried about the level of interference by the CM and demeanour of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. " is under some form of pressure to ensure that the investigation is terminated and the intervention of JL has shown him up." A. Yes. Q. What is that a reference to? A. Okay. Mr Picardo in his berating was telling me that I should have advised the Attorney General because he is the leader of the Bar, or at least words to that effect, and he heads the disciplinary committees of the Bar. In other words, because there was suspected criminality of a lawyer involved that I should have consulted with him before the action we took. He was suggesting that whatever action had to be sanctioned by - or	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Minister. Q. Was the search warrant an operational, a strategic or a tactical decision? A. That was a totally operational and tactical decision. Q. Just further on, the next paragraph starts: "Further comments by the CM, the AG should have been aware of the intervention as he is leader of the Bar and heads the disciplinary committee for the Bar." Then further down, after those bullet points: "I have discussed the above with my command team senior officers, who are also concerned and worried about the level of interference by the CM and demeanour of the AG."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. " is under some form of pressure to ensure that the investigation is terminated and the intervention of JL has shown him up." A. Yes. Q. What is that a reference to? A. Okay. Mr Picardo in his berating was telling me that I should have advised the Attorney General because he is the leader of the Bar, or at least words to that effect, and he heads the disciplinary committees of the Bar. In other words, because there was suspected criminality of a lawyer involved that I should have consulted with him before the action we took. He was suggesting that whatever action had to be sanctioned by - or sanction or in consultation. Clearly that is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Minister. Q. Was the search warrant an operational, a strategic or a tactical decision? A. That was a totally operational and tactical decision. Q. Just further on, the next paragraph starts: "Further comments by the CM, the AG should have been aware of the intervention as he is leader of the Bar and heads the disciplinary committee for the Bar." Then further down, after those bullet points: "I have discussed the above with my command team senior officers, who are also concerned and worried about the level of interference by the CM and demeanour of the AG." Which members of the senior management
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. " is under some form of pressure to ensure that the investigation is terminated and the intervention of JL has shown him up." A. Yes. Q. What is that a reference to? A. Okay. Mr Picardo in his berating was telling me that I should have advised the Attorney General because he is the leader of the Bar, or at least words to that effect, and he heads the disciplinary committees of the Bar. In other words, because there was suspected criminality of a lawyer involved that I should have consulted with him before the action we took. He was suggesting that whatever action had to be sanctioned by - or sanction or in consultation. Clearly that is not the way things work, how matters of this	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Minister. Q. Was the search warrant an operational, a strategic or a tactical decision? A. That was a totally operational and tactical decision. Q. Just further on, the next paragraph starts: "Further comments by the CM, the AG should have been aware of the intervention as he is leader of the Bar and heads the disciplinary committee for the Bar." Then further down, after those bullet points: "I have discussed the above with my command team senior officers, who are also concerned and worried about the level of interference by the CM and demeanour of the AG." Which members of the senior management team did you discuss the issue with on 12
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. " is under some form of pressure to ensure that the investigation is terminated and the intervention of JL has shown him up." A. Yes. Q. What is that a reference to? A. Okay. Mr Picardo in his berating was telling me that I should have advised the Attorney General because he is the leader of the Bar, or at least words to that effect, and he heads the disciplinary committees of the Bar. In other words, because there was suspected criminality of a lawyer involved that I should have consulted with him before the action we took. He was suggesting that whatever action had to be sanctioned by - or sanction or in consultation. Clearly that is not the way things work, how matters of this nature work.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Minister. Q. Was the search warrant an operational, a strategic or a tactical decision? A. That was a totally operational and tactical decision. Q. Just further on, the next paragraph starts: "Further comments by the CM, the AG should have been aware of the intervention as he is leader of the Bar and heads the disciplinary committee for the Bar." Then further down, after those bullet points: "I have discussed the above with my command team senior officers, who are also concerned and worried about the level of interference by the CM and demeanour of the AG." Which members of the senior management team did you discuss the issue with on 12 May?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. " is under some form of pressure to ensure that the investigation is terminated and the intervention of JL has shown him up." A. Yes. Q. What is that a reference to? A. Okay. Mr Picardo in his berating was telling me that I should have advised the Attorney General because he is the leader of the Bar, or at least words to that effect, and he heads the disciplinary committees of the Bar. In other words, because there was suspected criminality of a lawyer involved that I should have consulted with him before the action we took. He was suggesting that whatever action had to be sanctioned by - or sanction or in consultation. Clearly that is not the way things work, how matters of this nature work. Q. I am just asking you to explain the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Minister. Q. Was the search warrant an operational, a strategic or a tactical decision? A. That was a totally operational and tactical decision. Q. Just further on, the next paragraph starts: "Further comments by the CM, the AG should have been aware of the intervention as he is leader of the Bar and heads the disciplinary committee for the Bar." Then further down, after those bullet points: "I have discussed the above with my command team senior officers, who are also concerned and worried about the level of interference by the CM and demeanour of the AG." Which members of the senior management team did you discuss the issue with on 12 May? A. Those that would have been present on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. " is under some form of pressure to ensure that the investigation is terminated and the intervention of JL has shown him up." A. Yes. Q. What is that a reference to? A. Okay. Mr Picardo in his berating was telling me that I should have advised the Attorney General because he is the leader of the Bar, or at least words to that effect, and he heads the disciplinary committees of the Bar. In other words, because there was suspected criminality of a lawyer involved that I should have consulted with him before the action we took. He was suggesting that whatever action had to be sanctioned by - or sanction or in consultation. Clearly that is not the way things work, how matters of this nature work. Q. I am just asking you to explain the meaning of the words "the intervention of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Minister. Q. Was the search warrant an operational, a strategic or a tactical decision? A. That was a totally operational and tactical decision. Q. Just further on, the next paragraph starts: "Further comments by the CM, the AG should have been aware of the intervention as he is leader of the Bar and heads the disciplinary committee for the Bar." Then further down, after those bullet points: "I have discussed the above with my command team senior officers, who are also concerned and worried about the level of interference by the CM and demeanour of the AG." Which members of the senior management team did you discuss the issue with on 12 May? A. Those that would have been present on the day at the station. Incidentally, I didn't
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. " is under some form of pressure to ensure that the investigation is terminated and the intervention of JL has shown him up." A. Yes. Q. What is that a reference to? A. Okay. Mr Picardo in his berating was telling me that I should have advised the Attorney General because he is the leader of the Bar, or at least words to that effect, and he heads the disciplinary committees of the Bar. In other words, because there was suspected criminality of a lawyer involved that I should have consulted with him before the action we took. He was suggesting that whatever action had to be sanctioned by - or sanction or in consultation. Clearly that is not the way things work, how matters of this nature work. Q. I am just asking you to explain the meaning of the words "the intervention of JL".	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Minister. Q. Was the search warrant an operational, a strategic or a tactical decision? A. That was a totally operational and tactical decision. Q. Just further on, the next paragraph starts: "Further comments by the CM, the AG should have been aware of the intervention as he is leader of the Bar and heads the disciplinary committee for the Bar." Then further down, after those bullet points: "I have discussed the above with my command team senior officers, who are also concerned and worried about the level of interference by the CM and demeanour of the AG." Which members of the senior management team did you discuss the issue with on 12 May? A. Those that would have been present on the day at the station. Incidentally, I didn't remember Mr Richardson but he has
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 under some form of pressure to ensure that the investigation is terminated and the intervention of JL has shown him up." A. Yes. Q. What is that a reference to? A. Okay. Mr Picardo in his berating was telling me that I should have advised the Attorney General because he is the leader of the Bar, or at least words to that effect, and he heads the disciplinary committees of the Bar. In other words, because there was suspected criminality of a lawyer involved that I should have consulted with him before the action we took. He was suggesting that whatever action had to be sanctioned by - or sanction or in consultation. Clearly that is not the way things work, how matters of this nature work. Q. I am just asking you to explain the meaning of the words "the intervention of JL". A. The fact that we had acted on Mr Levy.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Minister. Q. Was the search warrant an operational, a strategic or a tactical decision? A. That was a totally operational and tactical decision. Q. Just further on, the next paragraph starts: "Further comments by the CM, the AG should have been aware of the intervention as he is leader of the Bar and heads the disciplinary committee for the Bar." Then further down, after those bullet points: "I have discussed the above with my command team senior officers, who are also concerned and worried about the level of interference by the CM and demeanour of the AG." Which members of the senior management team did you discuss the issue with on 12 May? A. Those that would have been present on the day at the station. Incidentally, I didn't remember Mr Richardson but he has confirmed that he attended. I definitely
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. " is under some form of pressure to ensure that the investigation is terminated and the intervention of JL has shown him up." A. Yes. Q. What is that a reference to? A. Okay. Mr Picardo in his berating was telling me that I should have advised the Attorney General because he is the leader of the Bar, or at least words to that effect, and he heads the disciplinary committees of the Bar. In other words, because there was suspected criminality of a lawyer involved that I should have consulted with him before the action we took. He was suggesting that whatever action had to be sanctioned by - or sanction or in consultation. Clearly that is not the way things work, how matters of this nature work. Q. I am just asking you to explain the meaning of the words "the intervention of JL".	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Minister. Q. Was the search warrant an operational, a strategic or a tactical decision? A. That was a totally operational and tactical decision. Q. Just further on, the next paragraph starts: "Further comments by the CM, the AG should have been aware of the intervention as he is leader of the Bar and heads the disciplinary committee for the Bar." Then further down, after those bullet points: "I have discussed the above with my command team senior officers, who are also concerned and worried about the level of interference by the CM and demeanour of the AG." Which members of the senior management team did you discuss the issue with on 12 May? A. Those that would have been present on the day at the station. Incidentally, I didn't remember Mr Richardson but he has
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 under some form of pressure to ensure that the investigation is terminated and the intervention of JL has shown him up." A. Yes. Q. What is that a reference to? A. Okay. Mr Picardo in his berating was telling me that I should have advised the Attorney General because he is the leader of the Bar, or at least words to that effect, and he heads the disciplinary committees of the Bar. In other words, because there was suspected criminality of a lawyer involved that I should have consulted with him before the action we took. He was suggesting that whatever action had to be sanctioned by - or sanction or in consultation. Clearly that is not the way things work, how matters of this nature work. Q. I am just asking you to explain the meaning of the words "the intervention of JL". A. The fact that we had acted on Mr Levy.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Minister. Q. Was the search warrant an operational, a strategic or a tactical decision? A. That was a totally operational and tactical decision. Q. Just further on, the next paragraph starts: "Further comments by the CM, the AG should have been aware of the intervention as he is leader of the Bar and heads the disciplinary committee for the Bar." Then further down, after those bullet points: "I have discussed the above with my command team senior officers, who are also concerned and worried about the level of interference by the CM and demeanour of the AG." Which members of the senior management team did you discuss the issue with on 12 May? A. Those that would have been present on the day at the station. Incidentally, I didn't remember Mr Richardson but he has confirmed that he attended. I definitely

			_
1	counsel on him saying: "Ian, this is serious	1	Q. Yes, sorry, but I think the Chairman's
2	enough, you should go to the Governor and	2	question was as to when you asked for the
3	to the GPA."	3	meeting first.
4	Q. You mention Mr Richardson. He said he	4	THE CHAIRMAN: I think you asked on
5	was not there for this briefing as he was at	5	12th but I thought you met on 13th, but that
6	Hassans still at the time. Did you manage to	6	may be wrong.
7	brief him at some stage?	7	A. It couldn't have been on 13th because my
8	A. Maybe the briefing took place by the time	8	notes, which are time stamped on 12th, say
9	he - I called him back.	9	that I met him in my office in person.
10	Q. So do you remember one way or another	10	THE CHAIRMAN: Ah, okay. Yes. He
11	whether you briefed Mr Richardson	11	does not remember this meeting at all.
12	specifically?	12	MR SANTOS: Dr Britto's evidence is that
13	A. I did. When I say I briefed the command	13	he does not remember a meeting other than
14	team, I say that anybody who was present on	14	on 15 May.
15	duty at the time	15	A. Mr Ullger was also present at this
16	Q. Sorry, my question is specifically about	16	meeting.
17	Mr Richardson. Do you have a recollection	17	Q. Can we go to paragraph 34 of your
18	of briefing him?	18	statement, which is at A11, your first
19	A. On his own, no, but I remember gathering	19	statement. It is at the top of that page, I am
20	the team and telling them.	20	just picking it up from the second line of
21	Q. You say that you briefed the Chair of the	21	page A11, which is also page 11 of your first
22	GPA. Do you have a note of that briefing?	22	statement. It says:
23	A. No.	23	"I was struggling to understand how the CM
24	Q. You will have seen in Mr Britto's	24	was seemingly aware of parts of the evidence
25	evidence that he states that you met on 15	25	gathered in Op Delhi e.g. he was challenging
	D 200		D 211
	Page 209		Page 211
1	May and that that is the first time he learned	1	the need to obtain JL's devices when, he
2	of Operation Delhi. Are you certain that you	2	claimed, the investigating team already had
3	informed him on 12 May?	3	the data we needed from the other suspects.
4	A. Yes, and I also met him again on 15th. It	4	What had been extracted from the suspects'
5	was a pre-scheduled meeting that we had, but	5	mobile devices was information that only the
6	I either called him or text him saying: "I need	6	investigating team and the DPP (and crown
7	to brief you about an important matter," and	7	counsel) would have been privy to. It is
8	he popped in.	8	certainly not something I would have
9	THE CHAIRMAN: That was the following	9	expected the CM to have been aware of."
10	day, was it not?	10	(16.05)
11	A. No. On the same day.	11	What did he say to make you think that he
12	THE CHAIRMAN: Did you not email him	12	was aware of evidence?
13	on 12th and see him on 13th?	13	A. Precisely that. Why do you need his
14	A. I think I text him. We can bring up the	14	phones if you've got the other side's already.
15		15	Q. Did he mention anything more specific
16	MR SANTOS: Yes, let us just have a look at	16	than that?
17		17	A. He said, "You've got what you needed
18	A. I think it was by text that I asked that I	18	from the others", and that is what struck me
19	needed to brief him.	19	saying, "How does he know what we've
20	Q. We are just getting the text but Dr Britto's	20	got?" It's it phased me there and then.
21	evidence is that you on 12 May 2020 you	21	Q. You state that he also made a passing but
22	asked to see him. We will just find the texts	22	seemingly unconnected comment that he had
23	now.	23	earlier that morning been speaking to JL
24	A. No, we had a meeting scheduled for 15th	24	about reopening the places of worship. Is
25	too.	25	there a reason why that didn't feature in your
	D 240		D 242
	Page 210		Page 212
			53 (Pages 209 to 212)

1	note of 12 May?	1	years ago, I believe I have a good
2	A. It doesn't, does it?	2	recollection of it. I set out in the following
3	Q. We haven't been able to find it.	3	paragraphs my memory of that conversation
4	A. It's contained on the updated notes which	4	and the upshot of it for me. I made clear, in
5	I did. So, for the purpose of everybody here,	5	firm and forthright language, to Mr McGrail
6	I emailed myself these notes on the 12th, on	6	that I considered that the RGP had not acted
7	the same day of the meeting and then on the	7	properly in the execution of a search warrant
8	following day, I again emailed myself with	8	in respect of a senior lawyer like Mr Levy. I
9	further recollections of the meeting of the	9	repeated the points made in my WhatsApp
10	12th and I also corrected some of the typos in	10	reply. In person, I robustly told Mr McGrail
11	red of the original notes. And if I take you to	11	that he should not think that I was making
12	the third paragraph, it says, "He also said he	12	this point because I was close to Mr Levy. I
13	communicated with JL a lot and he'd only	13	told him that I would be making the same
14	been in contact with him that morning	14	point if any other senior member of the legal
15		15	profession had been involved."
16	discussing the reopening of places of worship." That was relating to the pandemic.	16	Do you agree that that was said?
17	So it was an unrelated comment which there	17	A. Not in that context. Not in those softer
18		18	
	and then did not resonate much, because I	19	terms, no. O But putting tone to one side in terms of
19	was not focused on where this was coming		Q. But putting tone to one side, in terms of
20 21	I didn't know where this was coming from. I	20 21	the substance of the message, is that what the Chief Minister said?
	was very much in shock and shaken, but he	22	
22	did say that. And since then obviously I have		A. Yes, he said that we were not acting
23	developed suspicions as to why he said it, but	23	properly, yes. He also mentioned that he
24	I am sure you will take me to that.	24	would have reacted the same had it been
25	Q. Can you describe you have described	25	other prominent lawyers. Yes, he mentioned
	Page 213		Page 215
1	his damage Did you feel that the Chief	,	
	his demeanour. Did you leef that the Chief	1	two lawyers in particular.
2	his demeanour. Did you feel that the Chief Minister was attempting to influence you as	$\begin{bmatrix} 1\\2 \end{bmatrix}$	two lawyers in particular. Q. Then if you are finished with 44? There
	Minister was attempting to influence you as far as the investigation was concerned?		two lawyers in particular. Q. Then if you are finished with 44? There is no secret over the names that he gave, the
2	Minister was attempting to influence you as	2	Q. Then if you are finished with 44? There
2 3	Minister was attempting to influence you as far as the investigation was concerned?	2 3	Q. Then if you are finished with 44? There is no secret over the names that he gave, the
2 3 4	Minister was attempting to influence you as far as the investigation was concerned? A. Not only that, he threatened me.	2 3 4	Q. Then if you are finished with 44? There is no secret over the names that he gave, the names of Sir Peter Caruana QC (now KC)
2 3 4 5	Minister was attempting to influence you as far as the investigation was concerned? A. Not only that, he threatened me. Q. Did you feel that he was pressuring you	2 3 4 5	Q. Then if you are finished with 44? There is no secret over the names that he gave, the names of Sir Peter Caruana QC (now KC) and Melo Triay as senior lawyers who you
2 3 4 5 6	Minister was attempting to influence you as far as the investigation was concerned? A. Not only that, he threatened me. Q. Did you feel that he was pressuring you as far as the investigation going ahead the	2 3 4 5 6	Q. Then if you are finished with 44? There is no secret over the names that he gave, the names of Sir Peter Caruana QC (now KC) and Melo Triay as senior lawyers who you are and he says "who I am not personally
2 3 4 5 6 7	Minister was attempting to influence you as far as the investigation was concerned? A. Not only that, he threatened me. Q. Did you feel that he was pressuring you as far as the investigation going ahead the ongoing investigation was concerned?	2 3 4 5 6 7	Q. Then if you are finished with 44? There is no secret over the names that he gave, the names of Sir Peter Caruana QC (now KC) and Melo Triay as senior lawyers who you are and he says "who I am not personally linked to and who have not been seen as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Minister was attempting to influence you as far as the investigation was concerned? A. Not only that, he threatened me. Q. Did you feel that he was pressuring you as far as the investigation going ahead the ongoing investigation was concerned? A. I do.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q. Then if you are finished with 44? There is no secret over the names that he gave, the names of Sir Peter Caruana QC (now KC) and Melo Triay as senior lawyers who you are and he says "who I am not personally linked to and who have not been seen as personal or political supporters of mine", but
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Minister was attempting to influence you as far as the investigation was concerned? A. Not only that, he threatened me. Q. Did you feel that he was pressuring you as far as the investigation going ahead the ongoing investigation was concerned? A. I do. Q. Would you say that you matched the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q. Then if you are finished with 44? There is no secret over the names that he gave, the names of Sir Peter Caruana QC (now KC) and Melo Triay as senior lawyers who you are and he says "who I am not personally linked to and who have not been seen as personal or political supporters of mine", but I am just trying to get an indication from you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Minister was attempting to influence you as far as the investigation was concerned? A. Not only that, he threatened me. Q. Did you feel that he was pressuring you as far as the investigation going ahead the ongoing investigation was concerned? A. I do. Q. Would you say that you matched the Chief Minister's tone?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q. Then if you are finished with 44? There is no secret over the names that he gave, the names of Sir Peter Caruana QC (now KC) and Melo Triay as senior lawyers who you are and he says "who I am not personally linked to and who have not been seen as personal or political supporters of mine", but I am just trying to get an indication from you as to whether you disagree with the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Minister was attempting to influence you as far as the investigation was concerned? A. Not only that, he threatened me. Q. Did you feel that he was pressuring you as far as the investigation going ahead the ongoing investigation was concerned? A. I do. Q. Would you say that you matched the Chief Minister's tone? A. I was trying to remain calm and collected,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q. Then if you are finished with 44? There is no secret over the names that he gave, the names of Sir Peter Caruana QC (now KC) and Melo Triay as senior lawyers who you are and he says "who I am not personally linked to and who have not been seen as personal or political supporters of mine", but I am just trying to get an indication from you as to whether you disagree with the recollection of what was said, subject to we
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Minister was attempting to influence you as far as the investigation was concerned? A. Not only that, he threatened me. Q. Did you feel that he was pressuring you as far as the investigation going ahead the ongoing investigation was concerned? A. I do. Q. Would you say that you matched the Chief Minister's tone? A. I was trying to remain calm and collected, professional. I measured my words but there	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q. Then if you are finished with 44? There is no secret over the names that he gave, the names of Sir Peter Caruana QC (now KC) and Melo Triay as senior lawyers who you are and he says "who I am not personally linked to and who have not been seen as personal or political supporters of mine", but I am just trying to get an indication from you as to whether you disagree with the recollection of what was said, subject to we already have your evidence as to what the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Minister was attempting to influence you as far as the investigation was concerned? A. Not only that, he threatened me. Q. Did you feel that he was pressuring you as far as the investigation going ahead the ongoing investigation was concerned? A. I do. Q. Would you say that you matched the Chief Minister's tone? A. I was trying to remain calm and collected, professional. I measured my words but there was no way of appeasing him. He was just	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q. Then if you are finished with 44? There is no secret over the names that he gave, the names of Sir Peter Caruana QC (now KC) and Melo Triay as senior lawyers who you are and he says "who I am not personally linked to and who have not been seen as personal or political supporters of mine", but I am just trying to get an indication from you as to whether you disagree with the recollection of what was said, subject to we already have your evidence as to what the tone of this was. But other than that, in terms
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Minister was attempting to influence you as far as the investigation was concerned? A. Not only that, he threatened me. Q. Did you feel that he was pressuring you as far as the investigation going ahead the ongoing investigation was concerned? A. I do. Q. Would you say that you matched the Chief Minister's tone? A. I was trying to remain calm and collected, professional. I measured my words but there was no way of appeasing him. He was just not there was no way of swaying him, of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q. Then if you are finished with 44? There is no secret over the names that he gave, the names of Sir Peter Caruana QC (now KC) and Melo Triay as senior lawyers who you are and he says "who I am not personally linked to and who have not been seen as personal or political supporters of mine", but I am just trying to get an indication from you as to whether you disagree with the recollection of what was said, subject to we already have your evidence as to what the tone of this was. But other than that, in terms of what was said, do you disagree with
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Minister was attempting to influence you as far as the investigation was concerned? A. Not only that, he threatened me. Q. Did you feel that he was pressuring you as far as the investigation going ahead the ongoing investigation was concerned? A. I do. Q. Would you say that you matched the Chief Minister's tone? A. I was trying to remain calm and collected, professional. I measured my words but there was no way of appeasing him. He was just not there was no way of swaying him, of trying to calm him down in any way	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q. Then if you are finished with 44? There is no secret over the names that he gave, the names of Sir Peter Caruana QC (now KC) and Melo Triay as senior lawyers who you are and he says "who I am not personally linked to and who have not been seen as personal or political supporters of mine", but I am just trying to get an indication from you as to whether you disagree with the recollection of what was said, subject to we already have your evidence as to what the tone of this was. But other than that, in terms of what was said, do you disagree with anything that he has set out there?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Minister was attempting to influence you as far as the investigation was concerned? A. Not only that, he threatened me. Q. Did you feel that he was pressuring you as far as the investigation going ahead the ongoing investigation was concerned? A. I do. Q. Would you say that you matched the Chief Minister's tone? A. I was trying to remain calm and collected, professional. I measured my words but there was no way of appeasing him. He was just not there was no way of swaying him, of trying to calm him down in any way whatsoever. He was so angry. He was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. Then if you are finished with 44? There is no secret over the names that he gave, the names of Sir Peter Caruana QC (now KC) and Melo Triay as senior lawyers who you are and he says "who I am not personally linked to and who have not been seen as personal or political supporters of mine", but I am just trying to get an indication from you as to whether you disagree with the recollection of what was said, subject to we already have your evidence as to what the tone of this was. But other than that, in terms of what was said, do you disagree with anything that he has set out there? A. Yes, in that paragraph, yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Minister was attempting to influence you as far as the investigation was concerned? A. Not only that, he threatened me. Q. Did you feel that he was pressuring you as far as the investigation going ahead the ongoing investigation was concerned? A. I do. Q. Would you say that you matched the Chief Minister's tone? A. I was trying to remain calm and collected, professional. I measured my words but there was no way of appeasing him. He was just not there was no way of swaying him, of trying to calm him down in any way whatsoever. He was so angry. He was furious.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. Then if you are finished with 44? There is no secret over the names that he gave, the names of Sir Peter Caruana QC (now KC) and Melo Triay as senior lawyers who you are and he says "who I am not personally linked to and who have not been seen as personal or political supporters of mine", but I am just trying to get an indication from you as to whether you disagree with the recollection of what was said, subject to we already have your evidence as to what the tone of this was. But other than that, in terms of what was said, do you disagree with anything that he has set out there? A. Yes, in that paragraph, yes. Q. You agree?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Minister was attempting to influence you as far as the investigation was concerned? A. Not only that, he threatened me. Q. Did you feel that he was pressuring you as far as the investigation going ahead the ongoing investigation was concerned? A. I do. Q. Would you say that you matched the Chief Minister's tone? A. I was trying to remain calm and collected, professional. I measured my words but there was no way of appeasing him. He was just not there was no way of swaying him, of trying to calm him down in any way whatsoever. He was so angry. He was furious. Q. Can we go to his account of this please, it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. Then if you are finished with 44? There is no secret over the names that he gave, the names of Sir Peter Caruana QC (now KC) and Melo Triay as senior lawyers who you are and he says "who I am not personally linked to and who have not been seen as personal or political supporters of mine", but I am just trying to get an indication from you as to whether you disagree with the recollection of what was said, subject to we already have your evidence as to what the tone of this was. But other than that, in terms of what was said, do you disagree with anything that he has set out there? A. Yes, in that paragraph, yes. Q. You agree? A. Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Minister was attempting to influence you as far as the investigation was concerned? A. Not only that, he threatened me. Q. Did you feel that he was pressuring you as far as the investigation going ahead the ongoing investigation was concerned? A. I do. Q. Would you say that you matched the Chief Minister's tone? A. I was trying to remain calm and collected, professional. I measured my words but there was no way of appeasing him. He was just not there was no way of swaying him, of trying to calm him down in any way whatsoever. He was so angry. He was furious. Q. Can we go to his account of this please, it is at A191. Just looking at 42, these are the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. Then if you are finished with 44? There is no secret over the names that he gave, the names of Sir Peter Caruana QC (now KC) and Melo Triay as senior lawyers who you are and he says "who I am not personally linked to and who have not been seen as personal or political supporters of mine", but I am just trying to get an indication from you as to whether you disagree with the recollection of what was said, subject to we already have your evidence as to what the tone of this was. But other than that, in terms of what was said, do you disagree with anything that he has set out there? A. Yes, in that paragraph, yes. Q. You agree? A. Yes. Q. Then 45, "I recall telling Mr McGrail that the communications devices of senior
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Minister was attempting to influence you as far as the investigation was concerned? A. Not only that, he threatened me. Q. Did you feel that he was pressuring you as far as the investigation going ahead the ongoing investigation was concerned? A. I do. Q. Would you say that you matched the Chief Minister's tone? A. I was trying to remain calm and collected, professional. I measured my words but there was no way of appeasing him. He was just not there was no way of swaying him, of trying to calm him down in any way whatsoever. He was so angry. He was furious. Q. Can we go to his account of this please, it is at A191. Just looking at 42, these are the things that the Chief Minister says about that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. Then if you are finished with 44? There is no secret over the names that he gave, the names of Sir Peter Caruana QC (now KC) and Melo Triay as senior lawyers who you are and he says "who I am not personally linked to and who have not been seen as personal or political supporters of mine", but I am just trying to get an indication from you as to whether you disagree with the recollection of what was said, subject to we already have your evidence as to what the tone of this was. But other than that, in terms of what was said, do you disagree with anything that he has set out there? A. Yes, in that paragraph, yes. Q. You agree? A. Yes. Q. Then 45, "I recall telling Mr McGrail
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Minister was attempting to influence you as far as the investigation was concerned? A. Not only that, he threatened me. Q. Did you feel that he was pressuring you as far as the investigation going ahead the ongoing investigation was concerned? A. I do. Q. Would you say that you matched the Chief Minister's tone? A. I was trying to remain calm and collected, professional. I measured my words but there was no way of appeasing him. He was just not there was no way of swaying him, of trying to calm him down in any way whatsoever. He was so angry. He was furious. Q. Can we go to his account of this please, it is at A191. Just looking at 42, these are the things that the Chief Minister says about that meeting. "The Attorney General, who I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. Then if you are finished with 44? There is no secret over the names that he gave, the names of Sir Peter Caruana QC (now KC) and Melo Triay as senior lawyers who you are and he says "who I am not personally linked to and who have not been seen as personal or political supporters of mine", but I am just trying to get an indication from you as to whether you disagree with the recollection of what was said, subject to we already have your evidence as to what the tone of this was. But other than that, in terms of what was said, do you disagree with anything that he has set out there? A. Yes, in that paragraph, yes. Q. You agree? A. Yes. Q. Then 45, "I recall telling Mr McGrail that the communications devices of senior lawyers were likely to include legally
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Minister was attempting to influence you as far as the investigation was concerned? A. Not only that, he threatened me. Q. Did you feel that he was pressuring you as far as the investigation going ahead the ongoing investigation was concerned? A. I do. Q. Would you say that you matched the Chief Minister's tone? A. I was trying to remain calm and collected, professional. I measured my words but there was no way of appeasing him. He was just not there was no way of swaying him, of trying to calm him down in any way whatsoever. He was so angry. He was furious. Q. Can we go to his account of this please, it is at A191. Just looking at 42, these are the things that the Chief Minister says about that meeting. "The Attorney General, who I believe was with me at the time that I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. Then if you are finished with 44? There is no secret over the names that he gave, the names of Sir Peter Caruana QC (now KC) and Melo Triay as senior lawyers who you are and he says "who I am not personally linked to and who have not been seen as personal or political supporters of mine", but I am just trying to get an indication from you as to whether you disagree with the recollection of what was said, subject to we already have your evidence as to what the tone of this was. But other than that, in terms of what was said, do you disagree with anything that he has set out there? A. Yes, in that paragraph, yes. Q. You agree? A. Yes. Q. Then 45, " I recall telling Mr McGrail that the communications devices of senior lawyers were likely to include legally privileged material which would have to be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Minister was attempting to influence you as far as the investigation was concerned? A. Not only that, he threatened me. Q. Did you feel that he was pressuring you as far as the investigation going ahead the ongoing investigation was concerned? A. I do. Q. Would you say that you matched the Chief Minister's tone? A. I was trying to remain calm and collected, professional. I measured my words but there was no way of appeasing him. He was just not there was no way of swaying him, of trying to calm him down in any way whatsoever. He was so angry. He was furious. Q. Can we go to his account of this please, it is at A191. Just looking at 42, these are the things that the Chief Minister says about that meeting. "The Attorney General, who I believe was with me at the time that I received the WhatsApp from Mr McGrail	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. Then if you are finished with 44? There is no secret over the names that he gave, the names of Sir Peter Caruana QC (now KC) and Melo Triay as senior lawyers who you are and he says "who I am not personally linked to and who have not been seen as personal or political supporters of mine", but I am just trying to get an indication from you as to whether you disagree with the recollection of what was said, subject to we already have your evidence as to what the tone of this was. But other than that, in terms of what was said, do you disagree with anything that he has set out there? A. Yes, in that paragraph, yes. Q. You agree? A. Yes. Q. Then 45, " I recall telling Mr McGrail that the communications devices of senior lawyers were likely to include legally privileged material which would have to be sifted through by the RGP in a warrant type
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Minister was attempting to influence you as far as the investigation was concerned? A. Not only that, he threatened me. Q. Did you feel that he was pressuring you as far as the investigation going ahead the ongoing investigation was concerned? A. I do. Q. Would you say that you matched the Chief Minister's tone? A. I was trying to remain calm and collected, professional. I measured my words but there was no way of appeasing him. He was just not there was no way of swaying him, of trying to calm him down in any way whatsoever. He was so angry. He was furious. Q. Can we go to his account of this please, it is at A191. Just looking at 42, these are the things that the Chief Minister says about that meeting. "The Attorney General, who I believe was with me at the time that I received the WhatsApp from Mr McGrail was present during the whole of this meeting.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. Then if you are finished with 44? There is no secret over the names that he gave, the names of Sir Peter Caruana QC (now KC) and Melo Triay as senior lawyers who you are and he says "who I am not personally linked to and who have not been seen as personal or political supporters of mine", but I am just trying to get an indication from you as to whether you disagree with the recollection of what was said, subject to we already have your evidence as to what the tone of this was. But other than that, in terms of what was said, do you disagree with anything that he has set out there? A. Yes, in that paragraph, yes. Q. You agree? A. Yes. Q. Then 45, "I recall telling Mr McGrail that the communications devices of senior lawyers were likely to include legally privileged material which would have to be sifted through by the RGP in a warrant type situation such as this one they had brought

1	have in dealing with 'white collar crime'.	1	reputational damage or anything of that . It
2	Additionally, there would be personally	2	was to seek his support for the creation of a
3	sensitive information on such devices. I told	3	task force of multi agencies to address this
4	Mr McGrail that there would be myriad,	4	money laundering investigation, and I briefed
5	unrelated, conversations between Mr Levy	5	him on that and it followed a letter to all
6	and me, for example, on matters outside the	6	heads and this communication that was
7	RGP's interest, but which would be private."	7	exchanged and the Chief Minister was
8	In your recollection did he say these things?	8	absolutely in total support. He knew the
9	A. Not to my recollection.	9	subject or the lawyer in question, and the
10	Q. What there did he not say?	10	only reference to that lawyer in question in
11	A. That there would be conversations	11	this particular case was, "Why are you
12	between him and Mr Levy on private	12	focusing on Mr Levy when you should be
13	matters. I can't recall him saying that. And	13	focusing on Mr Miles." That is what he said.
14	the context of the white collar crime was not	14	It's not the question of further elaboration as
15	in that context. The white collar crime was a	15	he said. That was not it was another sort
		16	
16	more generalised comment that the RGP		of punch saying, "And you're focusing on
17	were inept to investigate white collar crime.	17	James, Mr Levy. Why don't you focus on
18	Q. If you are done with 45?	18	Miles."
19	A. And the question of legally privileged	19	Q. The first sentence, though, do you
20	material, he raised it and I said that measures	20	disagree that that was said? "I said that if the
21	were in place that would protect that, and he	21	police were investigating a lawyer for an
22	said, "That's what you say." I said, "Well,	22	offence in respect of which they might
23	you'll have to trust me." But that was the	23	destroy evidence, then they could seek to
24	challenged. So whatever I was saying was	24	persuade a magistrate of the need for a search
25	coming back straightaway with double jabs.	25	warrant."
	Page 217		Page 219
	0 77 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1		
	() Then he says "I said that it the police	1 1	A. No. I cannot associate myself with any of
1 2	Q. Then he says, "I said that if the police were investigating a lawyer for an offence in	$\begin{vmatrix} 1 \\ 2 \end{vmatrix}$	A. No, I cannot associate myself with any of that.
2	were investigating a lawyer for an offence in	2	that.
2 3	were investigating a lawyer for an offence in respect of which	2 3	that. Q. Then 47, "During the course of this
2 3 4	were investigating a lawyer for an offence in respect of which they might destroy evidence, then they could	2 3 4	that. Q. Then 47, "During the course of this conversation, I was both angry and seriously
2 3 4 5	were investigating a lawyer for an offence in respect of which they might destroy evidence, then they could seek to persuade a magistrate of the need for	2 3 4 5	that. Q. Then 47, "During the course of this conversation, I was both angry and seriously concerned about the effect of the RGP's
2 3 4 5 6	were investigating a lawyer for an offence in respect of which they might destroy evidence, then they could seek to persuade a magistrate of the need for a search warrant. I believe I also gave the	2 3 4 5 6	that. Q. Then 47, "During the course of this conversation, I was both angry and seriously concerned about the effect of the RGP's actions. I told Mr McGrail that I could
2 3 4 5 6 7	were investigating a lawyer for an offence in respect of which they might destroy evidence, then they could seek to persuade a magistrate of the need for a search warrant. I believe I also gave the example of another ongoing investigation	2 3 4 5 6 7	that. Q. Then 47, "During the course of this conversation, I was both angry and seriously concerned about the effect of the RGP's actions. I told Mr McGrail that I could imagine that the Government might face
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	were investigating a lawyer for an offence in respect of which they might destroy evidence, then they could seek to persuade a magistrate of the need for a search warrant. I believe I also gave the example of another ongoing investigation which Mr McGrail had himself also alerted	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	that. Q. Then 47, "During the course of this conversation, I was both angry and seriously concerned about the effect of the RGP's actions. I told Mr McGrail that I could imagine that the Government might face financial consequences from claims for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	were investigating a lawyer for an offence in respect of which they might destroy evidence, then they could seek to persuade a magistrate of the need for a search warrant. I believe I also gave the example of another ongoing investigation which Mr McGrail had himself also alerted me to, namely an investigation into another	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	that. Q. Then 47, "During the course of this conversation, I was both angry and seriously concerned about the effect of the RGP's actions. I told Mr McGrail that I could imagine that the Government might face financial consequences from claims for damages for breaches of privacy,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	were investigating a lawyer for an offence in respect of which they might destroy evidence, then they could seek to persuade a magistrate of the need for a search warrant. I believe I also gave the example of another ongoing investigation which Mr McGrail had himself also alerted me to, namely an investigation into another lawyer who I had been informed by the then	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	that. Q. Then 47, "During the course of this conversation, I was both angry and seriously concerned about the effect of the RGP's actions. I told Mr McGrail that I could imagine that the Government might face financial consequences from claims for damages for breaches of privacy, confidentiality and other claims."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	were investigating a lawyer for an offence in respect of which they might destroy evidence, then they could seek to persuade a magistrate of the need for a search warrant. I believe I also gave the example of another ongoing investigation which Mr McGrail had himself also alerted me to, namely an investigation into another lawyer who I had been informed by the then Commissioner was being investigated for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	that. Q. Then 47, "During the course of this conversation, I was both angry and seriously concerned about the effect of the RGP's actions. I told Mr McGrail that I could imagine that the Government might face financial consequences from claims for damages for breaches of privacy, confidentiality and other claims." Did he say that to you?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	were investigating a lawyer for an offence in respect of which they might destroy evidence, then they could seek to persuade a magistrate of the need for a search warrant. I believe I also gave the example of another ongoing investigation which Mr McGrail had himself also alerted me to, namely an investigation into another lawyer who I had been informed by the then Commissioner was being investigated for large scale drug money laundering with, he	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	that. Q. Then 47, "During the course of this conversation, I was both angry and seriously concerned about the effect of the RGP's actions. I told Mr McGrail that I could imagine that the Government might face financial consequences from claims for damages for breaches of privacy, confidentiality and other claims." Did he say that to you? A. No. He only said that there would be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	were investigating a lawyer for an offence in respect of which they might destroy evidence, then they could seek to persuade a magistrate of the need for a search warrant. I believe I also gave the example of another ongoing investigation which Mr McGrail had himself also alerted me to, namely an investigation into another lawyer who I had been informed by the then Commissioner was being investigated for large scale drug money laundering with, he had told me, greatly incriminating factors.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	that. Q. Then 47, "During the course of this conversation, I was both angry and seriously concerned about the effect of the RGP's actions. I told Mr McGrail that I could imagine that the Government might face financial consequences from claims for damages for breaches of privacy, confidentiality and other claims." Did he say that to you? A. No. He only said that there would be consequences if he was found — that he
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	were investigating a lawyer for an offence in respect of which they might destroy evidence, then they could seek to persuade a magistrate of the need for a search warrant. I believe I also gave the example of another ongoing investigation which Mr McGrail had himself also alerted me to, namely an investigation into another lawyer who I had been informed by the then Commissioner was being investigated for large scale drug money laundering with, he had told me, greatly incriminating factors. Mr McGrail had alerted me to this latter case	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	that. Q. Then 47, "During the course of this conversation, I was both angry and seriously concerned about the effect of the RGP's actions. I told Mr McGrail that I could imagine that the Government might face financial consequences from claims for damages for breaches of privacy, confidentiality and other claims." Did he say that to you? A. No. He only said that there would be consequences if he was found that he hoped that I was right because if I wasn't
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	were investigating a lawyer for an offence in respect of which they might destroy evidence, then they could seek to persuade a magistrate of the need for a search warrant. I believe I also gave the example of another ongoing investigation which Mr McGrail had himself also alerted me to, namely an investigation into another lawyer who I had been informed by the then Commissioner was being investigated for large scale drug money laundering with, he had told me, greatly incriminating factors. Mr McGrail had alerted me to this latter case given the potential damage to Gibraltar's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	that. Q. Then 47, "During the course of this conversation, I was both angry and seriously concerned about the effect of the RGP's actions. I told Mr McGrail that I could imagine that the Government might face financial consequences from claims for damages for breaches of privacy, confidentiality and other claims." Did he say that to you? A. No. He only said that there would be consequences if he was found — that he hoped that I was right because if I wasn't obviously there was going to be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	were investigating a lawyer for an offence in respect of which they might destroy evidence, then they could seek to persuade a magistrate of the need for a search warrant. I believe I also gave the example of another ongoing investigation which Mr McGrail had himself also alerted me to, namely an investigation into another lawyer who I had been informed by the then Commissioner was being investigated for large scale drug money laundering with, he had told me, greatly incriminating factors. Mr McGrail had alerted me to this latter case given the potential damage to Gibraltar's reputation as a financial services centre from	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	that. Q. Then 47, "During the course of this conversation, I was both angry and seriously concerned about the effect of the RGP's actions. I told Mr McGrail that I could imagine that the Government might face financial consequences from claims for damages for breaches of privacy, confidentiality and other claims." Did he say that to you? A. No. He only said that there would be consequences if he was found that he hoped that I was right because if I wasn't obviously there was going to be consequences and he left it at that and I took
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	were investigating a lawyer for an offence in respect of which they might destroy evidence, then they could seek to persuade a magistrate of the need for a search warrant. I believe I also gave the example of another ongoing investigation which Mr McGrail had himself also alerted me to, namely an investigation into another lawyer who I had been informed by the then Commissioner was being investigated for large scale drug money laundering with, he had told me, greatly incriminating factors. Mr McGrail had alerted me to this latter case given the potential damage to Gibraltar's reputation as a financial services centre from the impending arrest of this lawyer, which he	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	that. Q. Then 47, "During the course of this conversation, I was both angry and seriously concerned about the effect of the RGP's actions. I told Mr McGrail that I could imagine that the Government might face financial consequences from claims for damages for breaches of privacy, confidentiality and other claims." Did he say that to you? A. No. He only said that there would be consequences if he was found — that he hoped that I was right because if I wasn't obviously there was going to be consequences and he left it at that and I took it like I've explained.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	were investigating a lawyer for an offence in respect of which they might destroy evidence, then they could seek to persuade a magistrate of the need for a search warrant. I believe I also gave the example of another ongoing investigation which Mr McGrail had himself also alerted me to, namely an investigation into another lawyer who I had been informed by the then Commissioner was being investigated for large scale drug money laundering with, he had told me, greatly incriminating factors. Mr McGrail had alerted me to this latter case given the potential damage to Gibraltar's reputation as a financial services centre from the impending arrest of this lawyer, which he had told me repeatedly was imminent."	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	that. Q. Then 47, "During the course of this conversation, I was both angry and seriously concerned about the effect of the RGP's actions. I told Mr McGrail that I could imagine that the Government might face financial consequences from claims for damages for breaches of privacy, confidentiality and other claims." Did he say that to you? A. No. He only said that there would be consequences if he was found that he hoped that I was right because if I wasn't obviously there was going to be consequences and he left it at that and I took it like I've explained. Q. Then he said, "I told Mr McGrail that Mr
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	were investigating a lawyer for an offence in respect of which they might destroy evidence, then they could seek to persuade a magistrate of the need for a search warrant. I believe I also gave the example of another ongoing investigation which Mr McGrail had himself also alerted me to, namely an investigation into another lawyer who I had been informed by the then Commissioner was being investigated for large scale drug money laundering with, he had told me, greatly incriminating factors. Mr McGrail had alerted me to this latter case given the potential damage to Gibraltar's reputation as a financial services centre from the impending arrest of this lawyer, which he had told me repeatedly was imminent."	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	that. Q. Then 47, "During the course of this conversation, I was both angry and seriously concerned about the effect of the RGP's actions. I told Mr McGrail that I could imagine that the Government might face financial consequences from claims for damages for breaches of privacy, confidentiality and other claims." Did he say that to you? A. No. He only said that there would be consequences if he was found that he hoped that I was right because if I wasn't obviously there was going to be consequences and he left it at that and I took it like I've explained. Q. Then he said, "I told Mr McGrail that Mr Levy and we were all officers of the Court.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	were investigating a lawyer for an offence in respect of which they might destroy evidence, then they could seek to persuade a magistrate of the need for a search warrant. I believe I also gave the example of another ongoing investigation which Mr McGrail had himself also alerted me to, namely an investigation into another lawyer who I had been informed by the then Commissioner was being investigated for large scale drug money laundering with, he had told me, greatly incriminating factors. Mr McGrail had alerted me to this latter case given the potential damage to Gibraltar's reputation as a financial services centre from the impending arrest of this lawyer, which he had told me repeatedly was imminent." Is that something	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	that. Q. Then 47, "During the course of this conversation, I was both angry and seriously concerned about the effect of the RGP's actions. I told Mr McGrail that I could imagine that the Government might face financial consequences from claims for damages for breaches of privacy, confidentiality and other claims." Did he say that to you? A. No. He only said that there would be consequences if he was found that he hoped that I was right because if I wasn't obviously there was going to be consequences and he left it at that and I took it like I've explained. Q. Then he said, "I told Mr McGrail that Mr Levy and we were all officers of the Court. In circumstances such as these, the duties of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	were investigating a lawyer for an offence in respect of which they might destroy evidence, then they could seek to persuade a magistrate of the need for a search warrant. I believe I also gave the example of another ongoing investigation which Mr McGrail had himself also alerted me to, namely an investigation into another lawyer who I had been informed by the then Commissioner was being investigated for large scale drug money laundering with, he had told me, greatly incriminating factors. Mr McGrail had alerted me to this latter case given the potential damage to Gibraltar's reputation as a financial services centre from the impending arrest of this lawyer, which he had told me repeatedly was imminent." Is that something A. No. He's got that completely wrong. He's conflated two different issues.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	that. Q. Then 47, "During the course of this conversation, I was both angry and seriously concerned about the effect of the RGP's actions. I told Mr McGrail that I could imagine that the Government might face financial consequences from claims for damages for breaches of privacy, confidentiality and other claims." Did he say that to you? A. No. He only said that there would be consequences if he was found — that he hoped that I was right because if I wasn't obviously there was going to be consequences and he left it at that and I took it like I've explained. Q. Then he said, "I told Mr McGrail that Mr Levy and we were all officers of the Court. In circumstances such as these, the duties of an officer of the Court would require us to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	were investigating a lawyer for an offence in respect of which they might destroy evidence, then they could seek to persuade a magistrate of the need for a search warrant. I believe I also gave the example of another ongoing investigation which Mr McGrail had himself also alerted me to, namely an investigation into another lawyer who I had been informed by the then Commissioner was being investigated for large scale drug money laundering with, he had told me, greatly incriminating factors. Mr McGrail had alerted me to this latter case given the potential damage to Gibraltar's reputation as a financial services centre from the impending arrest of this lawyer, which he had told me repeatedly was imminent." Is that something A. No. He's got that completely wrong. He's conflated two different issues. Q. Well, in terms of what he said to you, it's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	that. Q. Then 47, "During the course of this conversation, I was both angry and seriously concerned about the effect of the RGP's actions. I told Mr McGrail that I could imagine that the Government might face financial consequences from claims for damages for breaches of privacy, confidentiality and other claims." Did he say that to you? A. No. He only said that there would be consequences if he was found — that he hoped that I was right because if I wasn't obviously there was going to be consequences and he left it at that and I took it like I've explained. Q. Then he said, "I told Mr McGrail that Mr Levy and we were all officers of the Court. In circumstances such as these, the duties of an officer of the Court would require us to cooperate and provide such information as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	were investigating a lawyer for an offence in respect of which they might destroy evidence, then they could seek to persuade a magistrate of the need for a search warrant. I believe I also gave the example of another ongoing investigation which Mr McGrail had himself also alerted me to, namely an investigation into another lawyer who I had been informed by the then Commissioner was being investigated for large scale drug money laundering with, he had told me, greatly incriminating factors. Mr McGrail had alerted me to this latter case given the potential damage to Gibraltar's reputation as a financial services centre from the impending arrest of this lawyer, which he had told me repeatedly was imminent." Is that something A. No. He's got that completely wrong. He's conflated two different issues. Q. Well, in terms of what he said to you, it's that he said	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	that. Q. Then 47, "During the course of this conversation, I was both angry and seriously concerned about the effect of the RGP's actions. I told Mr McGrail that I could imagine that the Government might face financial consequences from claims for damages for breaches of privacy, confidentiality and other claims." Did he say that to you? A. No. He only said that there would be consequences if he was found that he hoped that I was right because if I wasn't obviously there was going to be consequences and he left it at that and I took it like I've explained. Q. Then he said, "I told Mr McGrail that Mr Levy and we were all officers of the Court. In circumstances such as these, the duties of an officer of the Court would require us to cooperate and provide such information as we might have available on the basis of an
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	were investigating a lawyer for an offence in respect of which they might destroy evidence, then they could seek to persuade a magistrate of the need for a search warrant. I believe I also gave the example of another ongoing investigation which Mr McGrail had himself also alerted me to, namely an investigation into another lawyer who I had been informed by the then Commissioner was being investigated for large scale drug money laundering with, he had told me, greatly incriminating factors. Mr McGrail had alerted me to this latter case given the potential damage to Gibraltar's reputation as a financial services centre from the impending arrest of this lawyer, which he had told me repeatedly was imminent." Is that something A. No. He's got that completely wrong. He's conflated two different issues. Q. Well, in terms of what he said to you, it's that he said A. It's true that I briefed him on another	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	that. Q. Then 47, "During the course of this conversation, I was both angry and seriously concerned about the effect of the RGP's actions. I told Mr McGrail that I could imagine that the Government might face financial consequences from claims for damages for breaches of privacy, confidentiality and other claims." Did he say that to you? A. No. He only said that there would be consequences if he was found that he hoped that I was right because if I wasn't obviously there was going to be consequences and he left it at that and I took it like I've explained. Q. Then he said, "I told Mr McGrail that Mr Levy and we were all officers of the Court. In circumstances such as these, the duties of an officer of the Court would require us to cooperate and provide such information as we might have available on the basis of an Order (be it a Production Order or another
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	were investigating a lawyer for an offence in respect of which they might destroy evidence, then they could seek to persuade a magistrate of the need for a search warrant. I believe I also gave the example of another ongoing investigation which Mr McGrail had himself also alerted me to, namely an investigation into another lawyer who I had been informed by the then Commissioner was being investigated for large scale drug money laundering with, he had told me, greatly incriminating factors. Mr McGrail had alerted me to this latter case given the potential damage to Gibraltar's reputation as a financial services centre from the impending arrest of this lawyer, which he had told me repeatedly was imminent." Is that something A. No. He's got that completely wrong. He's conflated two different issues. Q. Well, in terms of what he said to you, it's that he said	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	that. Q. Then 47, "During the course of this conversation, I was both angry and seriously concerned about the effect of the RGP's actions. I told Mr McGrail that I could imagine that the Government might face financial consequences from claims for damages for breaches of privacy, confidentiality and other claims." Did he say that to you? A. No. He only said that there would be consequences if he was found that he hoped that I was right because if I wasn't obviously there was going to be consequences and he left it at that and I took it like I've explained. Q. Then he said, "I told Mr McGrail that Mr Levy and we were all officers of the Court. In circumstances such as these, the duties of an officer of the Court would require us to cooperate and provide such information as we might have available on the basis of an
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	were investigating a lawyer for an offence in respect of which they might destroy evidence, then they could seek to persuade a magistrate of the need for a search warrant. I believe I also gave the example of another ongoing investigation which Mr McGrail had himself also alerted me to, namely an investigation into another lawyer who I had been informed by the then Commissioner was being investigated for large scale drug money laundering with, he had told me, greatly incriminating factors. Mr McGrail had alerted me to this latter case given the potential damage to Gibraltar's reputation as a financial services centre from the impending arrest of this lawyer, which he had told me repeatedly was imminent." Is that something A. No. He's got that completely wrong. He's conflated two different issues. Q. Well, in terms of what he said to you, it's that he said A. It's true that I briefed him on another matter, but not because of the question of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	that. Q. Then 47, "During the course of this conversation, I was both angry and seriously concerned about the effect of the RGP's actions. I told Mr McGrail that I could imagine that the Government might face financial consequences from claims for damages for breaches of privacy, confidentiality and other claims." Did he say that to you? A. No. He only said that there would be consequences if he was found — that he hoped that I was right because if I wasn't obviously there was going to be consequences and he left it at that and I took it like I've explained. Q. Then he said, "I told Mr McGrail that Mr Levy and we were all officers of the Court. In circumstances such as these, the duties of an officer of the Court would require us to cooperate and provide such information as we might have available on the basis of an Order (be it a Production Order or another type of Order to disclose information or for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	were investigating a lawyer for an offence in respect of which they might destroy evidence, then they could seek to persuade a magistrate of the need for a search warrant. I believe I also gave the example of another ongoing investigation which Mr McGrail had himself also alerted me to, namely an investigation into another lawyer who I had been informed by the then Commissioner was being investigated for large scale drug money laundering with, he had told me, greatly incriminating factors. Mr McGrail had alerted me to this latter case given the potential damage to Gibraltar's reputation as a financial services centre from the impending arrest of this lawyer, which he had told me repeatedly was imminent." Is that something A. No. He's got that completely wrong. He's conflated two different issues. Q. Well, in terms of what he said to you, it's that he said A. It's true that I briefed him on another	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	that. Q. Then 47, "During the course of this conversation, I was both angry and seriously concerned about the effect of the RGP's actions. I told Mr McGrail that I could imagine that the Government might face financial consequences from claims for damages for breaches of privacy, confidentiality and other claims." Did he say that to you? A. No. He only said that there would be consequences if he was found that he hoped that I was right because if I wasn't obviously there was going to be consequences and he left it at that and I took it like I've explained. Q. Then he said, "I told Mr McGrail that Mr Levy and we were all officers of the Court. In circumstances such as these, the duties of an officer of the Court would require us to cooperate and provide such information as we might have available on the basis of an Order (be it a Production Order or another

discovery of documents and data). I added 1 Did you say that? 2 2 that I believed that Mr McGrail knew that my A. I've qualified in my statements that I can't 3 3 position in respect of this investigation was recall saying that, but if I did, it was in the 4 4 that it should of course continue and that if context that I think Mr Richardson explained 5 evidence was found of corruption in public 5 yesterday. To any veteran police officer, and 6 6 I've even since established that even my office of one of the persons being 7 7 investigated, who was a civil servant, I had junior counsel, who is not that old, still 8 been clear that the Government would be the 8 considers the AG's chambers to be that of the 9 complainant in those circumstances." 9 prosecution Crown prosecutors. So, if it was 10 10 A. He did say that. He did say that if Caine a slip of the tongue, I have sought advice 11 11 Sanchez was in any way implicated that the from the AG's chambers and they jump back 12 Government had to be the complainant. I 12 at me, as I'm saying this is -- I said, "Well the 13 said, "Look, he may be facing a charge of 13 DPP". That is what I am trying to say, 14 14 misconduct or misfeasance in public office. because even till today when I talk about 15 15 Even with that offence, we have to be the with ex colleagues the AG's chambers, is the 16 16 complainants." Crown Counsel's office, which now is called 17 17 Q. Then he says that in response to his the OCPL. But they are using this and it 18 points --18 does hurt, because it seems as if in front of 19 19 A. And that is the point, at that point, despite the most, two very powerful and high profile 20 20 all the shock, I'm thinking, hang on, this is officials that I am messing about with and 21 now -- we've got the Attorney General telling 21 reacting in a way that shows no integrity. 22 22 me a couple of weeks back, "Why don't you And they are using this example, which is 23 23 deal with Mr Sanchez via the disciplinary very regrettable that they are using because 24 24 route?", and now I'm getting it from the there's nothing to it. 25 25 Chief Minister that they have to be ... you Q. Do you recall the Attorney General Page 221 Page 223 1 cannot move on Mr Sanchez unless we say 1 saying that it was not true that you had taken 2 2 advice? so. So that was already chiming big time. 3 3 Q. He then says that you told him that the A. I explained if it did happen, I cannot 4 4 recall but if it did happen, it was in that warrant had been granted by the court and 5 5 that you should let the court decide if it had context and it must have been one after the 6 been properly granted and that he said that 6 other. "The AG, sorry the DPP." Confusion 7 7 was not the point as the damage in attending of the ... 8 8 Mr Levy's home and office in execution of Q. Then the Chief Minister says, "Mr 9 9 the warrant had already been done and that McGrail then insisted that he had sought the 10 10 he knew from his previous practice that the advice of the Director of Public Prosecutions 11 11 on whether to obtain a search warrant or a justices of the peace routinely granted 12 warrants based on the information laid before 12 production order for Mr Levy. Mr McGrail 13 13 then specifically told me that the advice of them without careful legal analysis. Do you 14 recall an exchange of that nature? 14 the DPP was that they should proceed by 15 15 way of search warrant." A. He said that warrants were very easily 16 16 obtained. He never mentioned justices of the A. That is not what was said, and thankfully, 17 peace. In any event, this was not a JP that 17 because of the evidence that has transpired, 18 18 did it, it was a magistrate, but he did not according to Mr Llamas, it was an 19 19 detail. He said that it's very easy to get a impression that they got not that I 20 20 warrant and that we were wrongly advised in categorically said that. I'm so grateful that 21 21 terms of I understood the suspect's status of that has been disclosed. Look, if that is the 22 22 impression that they got because of what I 23 23 Q. At 49 he then says, "Mr McGrail then said, I can to a certain extent perhaps now in 24 24 retorted that he had taken the advice of the the cold light, accept that they may have got 25 Attorney General on this matter." 25 that impression when I said it, but there is no Page 222 Page 224

1		1	
1	way that I categorically said the AG has	1	was totally untrue and I said so. I could not
2	the DPP there we go that the DPP has	2	believe he had said that. In fact, we had only
3	advised on the warrant, because (a) I knew	3	discussed the Criminal Investigation once, in
4	that they hadn't, that the team had gone on it,	4	the meeting of 7 April 2020, during which
5	why was it just it's nonsensical. Why am	5	we had not discussed the issue of a search
6	I going to say that the DPP it's going to	6	warrant on Mr Levy at all. When I refuted
7	come out. It doesn't make any sense.	7	this, Mr McGrail then said that he had been
8	Q. According to the Chief Minister, the	8	taking advice from the DPP and that the DPP
9	Attorney General then said he did not believe	9	had advised him that the RGP should proceed
10	that the DPP had given such advice and the	10	by way of a search warrant. The Chief
11	Chief Minister agreed with him. D you recall	11	Minister and I told Mr McGrail that we
12 13	that being said?	12	found it very difficult to believe that he could have received such advice from the DPP."
	A. What I do recall is the Chief Minister	13	
14	saying that he believed that we had been	14	Is your position the same as far as the
15 16	wrongly advised and I took that to be in the	15	Attorney General's account is concerned? A. Not all.
16 17	context of Mr Levy as a suspect, that he was	16	
17	convinced that Mr Levy was not a criminal.	17	Q. Sorry, your position as to what you said?
18	Q. Did you at any stage clarify that you were	18	A. My position is as I have articulated it, it is
19	only talking about the grounds?	19	not in sync with that.
20	A. No.	20	Q. Sorry, I should have been a bit clearer.
21	Q. Can we go to your fifth affidavit at	21	You said that you had been taking advice
22	paragraph 114. This is at 165 please.	22	from the DPP but you didn't specify that it
23	A. 104?	23	related to the search warrant and that you
24	Q. 114, it is at the bottom of page 24 of your	24	don't recall saying that you had taken the
25	fifth affidavit. You say, "I refer to FP's	25	advice of the AG, but if you had that was a
	Page 225		Page 227
1	comments in para.49 that I claimed the RGP	1	mistaken reference to the AG's chambers
2	had obtained advice from the AG regarding	2	which you corrected to the DPP?
3	the warrant" Sorry, we have actually	3	A. Yes.
4	dealt with this. You have already explained	4	Q. Can we go to A310 please, this is Mr
5	your position on this. Is it possible that you	5	Llamas's second witness statement, at
6	referred to the AG's chambers, even with the	6	paragraph 45. He denies that he berated you
7	Attorney General standing right in front of	7	on 12 May 2020 in response to your second
8	you?	8	witness statement. Do you maintain that
9	A. Yes.	9	both the Attorney General and the Chief
10	Q. Just looking then at the Attorney	10	Minister berated you or just the Chief
11	General's account, which is at A280	11	Minister?
12	A. It is possible but I can't recall saying it,	12	A. The Chief Minister was the principal
13	but if it was, that's how it would have come	13	berater and to a lesser extent Mr Llamas, but
14	out.	14	he did and I couldn't believe it because I've
15	Q. A280 now. This is the Attorney	15	always had a good relationship with him.
16	General's account of what occurred and it is	16	And this is what was going through my head
17	very similar to the Chief Minister's so I am	17	that this man is obviously under some form
18	not going to go through it line by line, but to	18	of pressure himself and has had to react in
19	confirm the key point, can I take you to 43	19	this way.
20	and 44, which read as follows, "Secondly, Mr	20	Q. Did you feel that he was attempting to
21	McGrail sought to defend his decision by	21	pressure you?
22	making two comments which startled me.	22	A. There and then what he was doing was
23	He first said that he had been taking advice	23	calling my integrity into question and at the
24	from me and intimated that I had approved of	24	same time siding up with the Chief Minister.
25	the course of action the RGP had taken. This	25	So he was berating me, a matter which I took
	D _c 22/		D 220
1	Page 226		Page 228

1	very much to heart that he was questioning	1	then he lied to both of us, and the Attorney
2	well, he was putting my integrity into doubt.	2	General says, "Exactly. He certainly gave us
3	Q. But did you feel that he was pressuring	3	the impression that SW decision was
4	you in relation to the ongoing investigation?	4	sanctioned by DPP." He then says that's
5	A. It was starting to tick in my head that	5	the message that you were referring to earlier
6	there was something more than met the eye	6	"CoP has since called DPP trying to cover
7	here and the events that followed from there	7	his back with him. I've told DPP not to say
8	on cemented that posture.	8	or do anything without speaking to me first."
9	Q. Can we go now to B1417.	9	The Chief Minister, "Incredible. There is
10	THE CHAIRMAN: Can you just be a little	10	some game afoot here." Do you agree with
11	more specific, than there was did he say	11	what Mr Llamas says in terms of you giving
12	something something more than meets the	12	the impression that the search warrant
13	eye?	13	decision was sanctioned by the DPP?
14	A. Yes, there was something there amidst	14	A. I cannot comment on what impression
15	more than met the eye, sir, in terms of the	15	they took because that's for them to assess.
16	change in Attorney General's demeanour	16	What I can say is what I said but what is
17	towards me and in fact it is qualified. It is	17	clear from there is that it was a mere
18	qualified because, when he had a chat with	18	impression and not categorical as is now
19	me on his own the following day, he told me,	19	described. So basically, the allegation that I
20	"Ian, forget Attorney General to	20	lied to the Chief Minister is not categorical
21	Commissioner of Police, this is Michael to	21	according to this contemporaneous text.
22	Ian", he was showing that we had a	22	Q. Did you call the DPP?
23	relationship and that he felt that that	23	A. I can't remember I did, but if I did, it was
24	relationship had been betrayed. But it was	24	certainly not to cover up at all. There was
25	very it was a very emotional tone that sort	25	nothing to cover up. If anything, if there was
	D 200		D 024
	Page 229		Page 231
1	of that he was shocked he'd been put in this	1	a call and obviously the DPP will be able to
2	position by me.	2	recall if he does, I can only come up to what
3	MR SANTOS: Can we go to B1417 please.	3	possibilities it could have been regarding that
4	These are the emails between the Attorney	4	conversation. Definitely around the incident,
5	General and the Chief Minister, messages	5	but I can't recall it.
6	sorry, messages between the Attorney	6	Q. Just bear with me one second. (Pause)
7	General and the Chief Minister. On 12 May		
		7	Can we just deal with the correspondence on
8	he says, "Spoken to DPP. He is categorical	7 8	Can we just deal with the correspondence on 13 May 2020, B1902 please. This is a letter
8 9	he says, "Spoken to DPP. He is categorical		13 May 2020, B1902 please. This is a letter
	•	8	13 May 2020, B1902 please. This is a letter from Lewis Baglietto of Hassans to the
9	he says, "Spoken to DPP. He is categorical that whilst he told RGP that an interview	8 9	13 May 2020, B1902 please. This is a letter
9 10	he says, "Spoken to DPP. He is categorical that whilst he told RGP that an interview with JL would likely be necessary, he	8 9 10	13 May 2020, B1902 please. This is a letter from Lewis Baglietto of Hassans to the Attorney General on the night of 12 May.
9 10 11	he says, "Spoken to DPP. He is categorical that whilst he told RGP that an interview with JL would likely be necessary, he strongly advised against a search warrant."	8 9 10 11	13 May 2020, B1902 please. This is a letter from Lewis Baglietto of Hassans to the Attorney General on the night of 12 May. Then if we go to your witness statement at
9 10 11 12	he says, "Spoken to DPP. He is categorical that whilst he told RGP that an interview with JL would likely be necessary, he strongly advised against a search warrant." Does that accord with your understanding of	8 9 10 11 12	13 May 2020, B1902 please. This is a letter from Lewis Baglietto of Hassans to the Attorney General on the night of 12 May. Then if we go to your witness statement at paragraph 53, your first witness statement,
9 10 11 12 13	he says, "Spoken to DPP. He is categorical that whilst he told RGP that an interview with JL would likely be necessary, he strongly advised against a search warrant." Does that accord with your understanding of what the DPP told Mr Richardson? A. No, and this is what I want to say. If the	8 9 10 11 12 13	13 May 2020, B1902 please. This is a letter from Lewis Baglietto of Hassans to the Attorney General on the night of 12 May. Then if we go to your witness statement at paragraph 53, your first witness statement, that is A16, you say that you saw that email,
9 10 11 12 13 14	he says, "Spoken to DPP. He is categorical that whilst he told RGP that an interview with JL would likely be necessary, he strongly advised against a search warrant." Does that accord with your understanding of what the DPP told Mr Richardson? A. No, and this is what I want to say. If the DPP had strongly advised against a warrant,	8 9 10 11 12 13 14	13 May 2020, B1902 please. This is a letter from Lewis Baglietto of Hassans to the Attorney General on the night of 12 May. Then if we go to your witness statement at paragraph 53, your first witness statement, that is A16, you say that you saw that email, that the AG had sent you an email on the
9 10 11 12 13 14 15	he says, "Spoken to DPP. He is categorical that whilst he told RGP that an interview with JL would likely be necessary, he strongly advised against a search warrant." Does that accord with your understanding of what the DPP told Mr Richardson? A. No, and this is what I want to say. If the	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	13 May 2020, B1902 please. This is a letter from Lewis Baglietto of Hassans to the Attorney General on the night of 12 May. Then if we go to your witness statement at paragraph 53, your first witness statement, that is A16, you say that you saw that email, that the AG had sent you an email on the previous day. You state that you were
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	he says, "Spoken to DPP. He is categorical that whilst he told RGP that an interview with JL would likely be necessary, he strongly advised against a search warrant." Does that accord with your understanding of what the DPP told Mr Richardson? A. No, and this is what I want to say. If the DPP had strongly advised against a warrant, the warrant would probably not have been	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	13 May 2020, B1902 please. This is a letter from Lewis Baglietto of Hassans to the Attorney General on the night of 12 May. Then if we go to your witness statement at paragraph 53, your first witness statement, that is A16, you say that you saw that email, that the AG had sent you an email on the previous day. You state that you were initially amenable to meet to discuss this
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	he says, "Spoken to DPP. He is categorical that whilst he told RGP that an interview with JL would likely be necessary, he strongly advised against a search warrant." Does that accord with your understanding of what the DPP told Mr Richardson? A. No, and this is what I want to say. If the DPP had strongly advised against a warrant, the warrant would probably not have been taken. There would be more consultation around that. To my understanding, there was	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	13 May 2020, B1902 please. This is a letter from Lewis Baglietto of Hassans to the Attorney General on the night of 12 May. Then if we go to your witness statement at paragraph 53, your first witness statement, that is A16, you say that you saw that email, that the AG had sent you an email on the previous day. You state that you were initially amenable to meet to discuss this email, however you later change your mind. Why did you change your mind?
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	he says, "Spoken to DPP. He is categorical that whilst he told RGP that an interview with JL would likely be necessary, he strongly advised against a search warrant." Does that accord with your understanding of what the DPP told Mr Richardson? A. No, and this is what I want to say. If the DPP had strongly advised against a warrant, the warrant would probably not have been taken. There would be more consultation around that. To my understanding, there was never any strong objection or strong advice	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	13 May 2020, B1902 please. This is a letter from Lewis Baglietto of Hassans to the Attorney General on the night of 12 May. Then if we go to your witness statement at paragraph 53, your first witness statement, that is A16, you say that you saw that email, that the AG had sent you an email on the previous day. You state that you were initially amenable to meet to discuss this email, however you later change your mind. Why did you change your mind? A. Initially it is true that I said I was happy
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	he says, "Spoken to DPP. He is categorical that whilst he told RGP that an interview with JL would likely be necessary, he strongly advised against a search warrant." Does that accord with your understanding of what the DPP told Mr Richardson? A. No, and this is what I want to say. If the DPP had strongly advised against a warrant, the warrant would probably not have been taken. There would be more consultation around that. To my understanding, there was never any strong objection or strong advice by the DPP. That's my understanding,	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	13 May 2020, B1902 please. This is a letter from Lewis Baglietto of Hassans to the Attorney General on the night of 12 May. Then if we go to your witness statement at paragraph 53, your first witness statement, that is A16, you say that you saw that email, that the AG had sent you an email on the previous day. You state that you were initially amenable to meet to discuss this email, however you later change your mind. Why did you change your mind? A. Initially it is true that I said I was happy to meet, then when I met with my fellow
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	he says, "Spoken to DPP. He is categorical that whilst he told RGP that an interview with JL would likely be necessary, he strongly advised against a search warrant." Does that accord with your understanding of what the DPP told Mr Richardson? A. No, and this is what I want to say. If the DPP had strongly advised against a warrant, the warrant would probably not have been taken. There would be more consultation around that. To my understanding, there was never any strong objection or strong advice by the DPP. That's my understanding, because if I had known that myself, then	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	13 May 2020, B1902 please. This is a letter from Lewis Baglietto of Hassans to the Attorney General on the night of 12 May. Then if we go to your witness statement at paragraph 53, your first witness statement, that is A16, you say that you saw that email, that the AG had sent you an email on the previous day. You state that you were initially amenable to meet to discuss this email, however you later change your mind. Why did you change your mind? A. Initially it is true that I said I was happy to meet, then when I met with my fellow colleagues, they expressed the view that it
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	he says, "Spoken to DPP. He is categorical that whilst he told RGP that an interview with JL would likely be necessary, he strongly advised against a search warrant." Does that accord with your understanding of what the DPP told Mr Richardson? A. No, and this is what I want to say. If the DPP had strongly advised against a warrant, the warrant would probably not have been taken. There would be more consultation around that. To my understanding, there was never any strong objection or strong advice by the DPP. That's my understanding,	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	13 May 2020, B1902 please. This is a letter from Lewis Baglietto of Hassans to the Attorney General on the night of 12 May. Then if we go to your witness statement at paragraph 53, your first witness statement, that is A16, you say that you saw that email, that the AG had sent you an email on the previous day. You state that you were initially amenable to meet to discuss this email, however you later change your mind. Why did you change your mind? A. Initially it is true that I said I was happy to meet, then when I met with my fellow
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	he says, "Spoken to DPP. He is categorical that whilst he told RGP that an interview with JL would likely be necessary, he strongly advised against a search warrant." Does that accord with your understanding of what the DPP told Mr Richardson? A. No, and this is what I want to say. If the DPP had strongly advised against a warrant, the warrant would probably not have been taken. There would be more consultation around that. To my understanding, there was never any strong objection or strong advice by the DPP. That's my understanding, because if I had known that myself, then matters would not have progressed any further until that was cleared up.	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	13 May 2020, B1902 please. This is a letter from Lewis Baglietto of Hassans to the Attorney General on the night of 12 May. Then if we go to your witness statement at paragraph 53, your first witness statement, that is A16, you say that you saw that email, that the AG had sent you an email on the previous day. You state that you were initially amenable to meet to discuss this email, however you later change your mind. Why did you change your mind? A. Initially it is true that I said I was happy to meet, then when I met with my fellow colleagues, they expressed the view that it was not appropriate and I reconsidered and then politely declined the invitation,
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	he says, "Spoken to DPP. He is categorical that whilst he told RGP that an interview with JL would likely be necessary, he strongly advised against a search warrant." Does that accord with your understanding of what the DPP told Mr Richardson? A. No, and this is what I want to say. If the DPP had strongly advised against a warrant, the warrant would probably not have been taken. There would be more consultation around that. To my understanding, there was never any strong objection or strong advice by the DPP. That's my understanding, because if I had known that myself, then matters would not have progressed any	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	13 May 2020, B1902 please. This is a letter from Lewis Baglietto of Hassans to the Attorney General on the night of 12 May. Then if we go to your witness statement at paragraph 53, your first witness statement, that is A16, you say that you saw that email, that the AG had sent you an email on the previous day. You state that you were initially amenable to meet to discuss this email, however you later change your mind. Why did you change your mind? A. Initially it is true that I said I was happy to meet, then when I met with my fellow colleagues, they expressed the view that it was not appropriate and I reconsidered and
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	he says, "Spoken to DPP. He is categorical that whilst he told RGP that an interview with JL would likely be necessary, he strongly advised against a search warrant." Does that accord with your understanding of what the DPP told Mr Richardson? A. No, and this is what I want to say. If the DPP had strongly advised against a warrant, the warrant would probably not have been taken. There would be more consultation around that. To my understanding, there was never any strong objection or strong advice by the DPP. That's my understanding, because if I had known that myself, then matters would not have progressed any further until that was cleared up. Q. The Chief Minister's response is entonces nos ha mentido a los dos meaning in that case	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	13 May 2020, B1902 please. This is a letter from Lewis Baglietto of Hassans to the Attorney General on the night of 12 May. Then if we go to your witness statement at paragraph 53, your first witness statement, that is A16, you say that you saw that email, that the AG had sent you an email on the previous day. You state that you were initially amenable to meet to discuss this email, however you later change your mind. Why did you change your mind? A. Initially it is true that I said I was happy to meet, then when I met with my fellow colleagues, they expressed the view that it was not appropriate and I reconsidered and then politely declined the invitation, explaining that it was not appropriate for the Commissioner to meet up with the lawyer of
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	he says, "Spoken to DPP. He is categorical that whilst he told RGP that an interview with JL would likely be necessary, he strongly advised against a search warrant." Does that accord with your understanding of what the DPP told Mr Richardson? A. No, and this is what I want to say. If the DPP had strongly advised against a warrant, the warrant would probably not have been taken. There would be more consultation around that. To my understanding, there was never any strong objection or strong advice by the DPP. That's my understanding, because if I had known that myself, then matters would not have progressed any further until that was cleared up. Q. The Chief Minister's response is entonces	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	13 May 2020, B1902 please. This is a letter from Lewis Baglietto of Hassans to the Attorney General on the night of 12 May. Then if we go to your witness statement at paragraph 53, your first witness statement, that is A16, you say that you saw that email, that the AG had sent you an email on the previous day. You state that you were initially amenable to meet to discuss this email, however you later change your mind. Why did you change your mind? A. Initially it is true that I said I was happy to meet, then when I met with my fellow colleagues, they expressed the view that it was not appropriate and I reconsidered and then politely declined the invitation, explaining that it was not appropriate for the

a criminal suspect that was still to be 1 sinister whatsoever. 2 2 interviewed. And the tone of the email ... of Q. If we can go to the transcript and pick it 3 3 up at the bottom of page 2 please, just on the the Attorney General's response still gave me 4 4 second page there, towards the top, you those vibes that there was something more to 5 this. He told me that with respect it was his -5 actually discuss what had occurred with the 6 - he was the one who'd call whether it was 6 Attorney-General earlier where there had 7 7 been a conversation at the end of the meeting appropriate or not. 8 Q. Can we look at B1907 please. This is 8 about the 12th May? 9 9 your email to the Attorney General at 2.12 on A. Yes. 10 10 13 May, and in the fourth paragraph you Q. And this is what you say to Mr 11 explain your reasons, you explain what had 11 Richardson. You say: "Yeah, yesterday the 12 occurred in line with the body worn video 12 CM and erm I said and I said er uhm well footage. "Mr Levy pressed for an 13 13 look, this is not a question of shrugging 14 14 responsibility. We have actually been explanation as to why we had not simply 15 obtained a production order and therefore not 15 engaged with the DPP and I have his advice 16 need to use a warrant." And you set out the 16 on the question of having to do these, er 17 reasons for that. Had those reasons been 17 these interventions." Is that what you said to 18 explained to Mr Levy, or was this just you 18 the Chief Minister? 19 19 explaining your actions to the Attorney A. I've already explained what I said and it 20 20 was that the team had been engaging with the General? 21 A. This text was probably provided -- I 21 DPP throughout the investigation and I did 22 22 would not have had the detail of this text, this not all go into specifics. 23 23 was provided to me by Mr Richardson and/or Q. Yes, but here when you are saying, a day 24 Mr Wyan. It is an account that I requested 24 later, to Mr Richardson what you said to the 25 25 from them to provide explanations to the Chief Minister, you used the word "advice" -Page 233 Page 235 1 Attorney General. 1 you used the words "advice on the question 2 Q. Can we now just look at a conversation 2 of having to do these... interventions".? 3 3 that you had with Superintendent A. That is what the - I was telling Mr 4 Richardson. Sorry, Sir, this is going to take 4 Richardson what the Chief Minister was 5 5 just two more minutes, this section and then claiming against me. 6 perhaps we can consider what we do next. 6 Q. Well, sorry, just to give you one more 7 7 chance to look at this. You say: "Yesterday Can we go to a conversation with 8 8 Superintendent Richardson after the meeting the CM and ... I ... I said ... well this is not a 9 9 of 13 May. After that meeting, you drove question of shrugging responsibility. We 10 10 back to the police station with Mr Richardson have actually been engaged with the DPP and and you continued -- we know that the I have his advice on the question of having to 11 11 12 recording was running. 12 do these ... these interventions." Is that not 13 13 (16.35)you quoting yourself? 14 14 The transcripts which are exhibited to your A. Well, yes. Sir, I beg your pardon. You 15 second witness statement do not include the 15 are correct. Q. And you then say "Now, he has taken 16 conversation that you had with Mr 16 17 Richardson. Do you know why your lawyers 17 that..." As in the DPP advising that on the 18 did not include that conversation within the 18 warrant when I am referring to is the DPP 19 19 advising was what that - [Jamie] has." transcript? 20 20 A. Because I did not present it to them. A. Haim, ves. 21 21 That's entirely my fault. I did not -- I Q. Sorry, Haim, yes correct. Is it possible 22 22 that you used the word "interventions" to the stopped the transcript at the end of the 23 meeting. 23 Chief Minister? Q. Is there any reason why you did so? 24 24 A. That is not my recollection, no. 25 A. None - nothing whatsoever. No, nothing 25 Q. Sir, I am just conscious that it is 38 past Page 234 Page 236

1 4.00 now. I am still not obviously - I am 1 minutes at the end of the meeting? 2 2 about to move to 13 May. A. I did not consider that. I did not. 3 3 Q. Did you consider asking the other people THE CHAIRMAIN: Yes. 4 4 present if you could record the meeting? MR SANTOS: I am completely in your 5 hands as to whether we stop today or whether 5 A. I did not consider that. 6 6 Q. Why did you not consider those options? we press on. 7 7 A. I was so affected by what had happened THE CHAIRMAN: Well, you are going to 8 8 the previous day my suspicions were piqued. need to finish tomorrow at a sufficiently 9 9 early stage to allow others to have a fair It's with the benefit of hindsight that if I had 10 10 crack of the whip. asked for that conversation or announced it, 11 11 MR SANTOS: Could we go on perhaps for that the conversation would not have been 12 another 15 minutes today? 12 held in the same open candid manner that it 13 MR CHAIRMAN: Yes, so far as I am 13 was held. In other words, what was spoken -14 14 concerned. Does anyone have any great my belief, what was spoken would not have 15 15 difficulty with that? (No response) No. been spoken. And I am not proud that I did 16 16 Well, we can go on until 5 o'clock. that. It's unprecedented but thank God I did 17 17 MR SANTOS: Thank you, sir. Is the witness it because the inquiry now has benefit. Look, 18 - (To the witness) Are you okay to 18 when I did it I never had intention. The 19 19 continue? inquiry was - an inquiry was never on the 20 20 A. Yes, absolutely. radar. I had no intention of publishing it to 21 Q. Turning to 13 May meeting, I just refer to 21 any media, pass it on to the Sun. That was 22 22 the fact that you took a secret audio pure sort of protection from these powerful 23 23 recording of them. Why did you make these people. I'm not proud. I'm saying it. I'm not 24 24 secret recordings? proud. 25 25 A. Everything that I did on that day was Q. Did you give any consideration as to Page 237 Page 239 1 influenced by the berating and the joining of 1 whether making the record was lawful, for 2 dots that I was doing in respect of the 2 example, under Data Protection Law? 3 3 A. No. I didn't. activities of the Attorney-General, and later 4 on the intervention of the CM. I had very 4 Q. Did you consider whether it was unlawful 5 5 prominent in my mind the threat that had under any --6 been levelled at me, the change in attitude of 6 A. No. 7 7 Q. Putting legalities to one side, did you the Attorney-General, and I was now piecing 8 8 that together to come to the conclusion that think it was appropriate to secretly record the 9 9 these high-powered individuals were batting Attorney-General and the DPP? 10 10 for Mr Levy. And I felt vulnerable, A. Under those circumstances I think it was. 11 11 extremely worried. There was also litigation I feel it was and I strongly feel it was. Even 12 threats from Hassans, and well suggested 12 with the - just coming to terms with it, even 13 criminal offences of misfeasance in public 13 with my contemporaneous notes that I took, 14 office on the part of my officers, which I take 14 and I'm the only one that has presented notes, 15 that personal to me, and all that, coupled 15 those are being challenged as inaccurate. 16 16 with, as I say, all the other ingredients that The transcripts are being taken to the side 17 led to the intervention in terms of my 17 where - and that is the recording. Imagine if 18 18 meetings with the Attorney-General and the there wasn't a recording. I would still be 19 19 comments that he had made, and the branded even further, a liar and so forth. So, 20 20 misconstruing and the challenge on my in a way I'm not - it was done and I'm glad it 21 21 integrity the day before, drove me to take that was done and that the threat picture that I 22 22 23 Q. When did you first inform Mr Richardson 23 Q. Given your concerns, did you consider 24 24 that you had recorded the 13 May meeting? the option of suggesting that a minute be 25 taken and that everybody agree on the 25 A. Sorry? Page 238 Page 240

1	Q. When did you first inform Mr	1	meeting - about an agreement at that meeting
2	Richardson?	2	of 7 April?
3	A. Mr Richardson had brought in the	3	A. He refers to "both of you" because he is
4	transcript - rather the recording of the body	4	referring to myself and Mr Richardson who
5	worn camera to the Commissioner's Suite	5	was at the meeting of the so-called
6	where I had two - a personal assistant and a	6	arrangements. So was Mr DaVincenzi.
7	personal secretary and he had asked me	7	What is my reaction? My reaction, I come
8	permission to use the secretaries to transcribe	8	back to the fact that he has now to justify the
9	the body worn camera footage, and they were	9	fact that he was not able to put the lid on this
10	there, so he came in and out from that office	10	by saying nothing could - don't do anything
11	regularly, and at one point during that time	11	further. So, in other words, self-protection,
12	when I came back, and I explained that we	12	self-serving in saying: I told you not to do
13	were still working on the matter, I did tell	13 14	that and you've gone against me. He never
14	him: look, I have recorded this meeting, and he was shocked - it's true.		said that, but that is what his narrative is to the CM.
15	Q. Did you tell him you would be recording	15 16	
16 17	the future meetings?	17	Q. Can we go to B/172 please, the entry at
18	A. I believe I did.	18	9:10. You say - he says that: "You have what?" You say: "Made a flawed
	Q. Did you tell anybody else in those	19	
19	meetings that you were recording them?	20	investigation on the process and everything else. What I'll do today is offer my - offer
20 21	- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	20	every single paper, every single file, every
22	A. I can't think I mentioned it as candidly to others as I did to Mr Richardson.	22	single exhibit to an independent police
23	Q. I will just take you to the transcript now	23	service to look into it, and what I can
24	to ask you for your reaction. Can we go to	24	anticipate that would show is that we
25	bundle B/170 please? Just in the bottom box	25	wouldn't - that any other police force would
23	bundle B/1/0 please: Just in the bottom box	23	wouldn't - that any other police force would
	Page 241		Page 243
1	there the Attorney-General says: "For me it	1	not have gone in the way that we have done
1 2	there, the Attorney-General says: "For me it	1 2	not have gone in the way that we have done. They would have picked up Haim Levy at 6
2	was clear since you raised the matter, I repeat	2	They would have picked up Haim Levy at 6
2 3	was clear since you raised the matter, I repeat my position from which I would never budge	2 3	They would have picked up Haim Levy at 6 o'clock in the morning. Now, if that is where
2 3 4	was clear since you raised the matter, I repeat my position from which I would never budge because I'm 200 per cent certain of what we	2 3 4	They would have picked up Haim Levy at 6 o'clock in the morning. Now, if that is where this is going I'm now officially asking that
2 3 4 5	was clear since you raised the matter, I repeat my position from which I would never budge because I'm 200 per cent certain of what we discussed here in this room that day. You	2 3 4 5	They would have picked up Haim Levy at 6 o'clock in the morning. Now, if that is where this is going I'm now officially asking that this matter be investigated by an external
2 3 4	was clear since you raised the matter, I repeat my position from which I would never budge because I'm 200 per cent certain of what we discussed here in this room that day. You both left this room with an agreement that	2 3 4	They would have picked up Haim Levy at 6 o'clock in the morning. Now, if that is where this is going I'm now officially asking that this matter be investigated by an external police service to see whether the RGP has
2 3 4 5 6 7	was clear since you raised the matter, I repeat my position from which I would never budge because I'm 200 per cent certain of what we discussed here in this room that day. You both left this room with an agreement that you were going to rationalize the grounds	2 3 4 5 6 7	They would have picked up Haim Levy at 6 o'clock in the morning. Now, if that is where this is going I'm now officially asking that this matter be investigated by an external police service to see whether the RGP has flawed in this investigation." You say that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	was clear since you raised the matter, I repeat my position from which I would never budge because I'm 200 per cent certain of what we discussed here in this room that day. You both left this room with an agreement that you were going to rationalize the grounds and that you would come. Nothing else	2 3 4 5 6	They would have picked up Haim Levy at 6 o'clock in the morning. Now, if that is where this is going I'm now officially asking that this matter be investigated by an external police service to see whether the RGP has flawed in this investigation." You say that any other police force would have not going
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	was clear since you raised the matter, I repeat my position from which I would never budge because I'm 200 per cent certain of what we discussed here in this room that day. You both left this room with an agreement that you were going to rationalize the grounds and that you would come. Nothing else would happen, and that once you had	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	They would have picked up Haim Levy at 6 o'clock in the morning. Now, if that is where this is going I'm now officially asking that this matter be investigated by an external police service to see whether the RGP has flawed in this investigation." You say that any other police force would have not going about it the way that you had done - that they
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	was clear since you raised the matter, I repeat my position from which I would never budge because I'm 200 per cent certain of what we discussed here in this room that day. You both left this room with an agreement that you were going to rationalize the grounds and that you would come. Nothing else would happen, and that once you had rationalized the grounds, reduced the 76	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	They would have picked up Haim Levy at 6 o'clock in the morning. Now, if that is where this is going I'm now officially asking that this matter be investigated by an external police service to see whether the RGP has flawed in this investigation." You say that any other police force would have not going about it the way that you had done - that they would have gone in at 6 o'clock in the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	was clear since you raised the matter, I repeat my position from which I would never budge because I'm 200 per cent certain of what we discussed here in this room that day. You both left this room with an agreement that you were going to rationalize the grounds and that you would come. Nothing else would happen, and that once you had rationalized the grounds, reduced the 76 charges to whatever you reduce it, we were	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	They would have picked up Haim Levy at 6 o'clock in the morning. Now, if that is where this is going I'm now officially asking that this matter be investigated by an external police service to see whether the RGP has flawed in this investigation." You say that any other police force would have not going about it the way that you had done - that they
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	was clear since you raised the matter, I repeat my position from which I would never budge because I'm 200 per cent certain of what we discussed here in this room that day. You both left this room with an agreement that you were going to rationalize the grounds and that you would come. Nothing else would happen, and that once you had rationalized the grounds, reduced the 76 charges to whatever you reduce it, we were going to call Christian in. We were going to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	They would have picked up Haim Levy at 6 o'clock in the morning. Now, if that is where this is going I'm now officially asking that this matter be investigated by an external police service to see whether the RGP has flawed in this investigation." You say that any other police force would have not going about it the way that you had done - that they would have gone in at 6 o'clock in the morning. Then at 176 you make a similar
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	was clear since you raised the matter, I repeat my position from which I would never budge because I'm 200 per cent certain of what we discussed here in this room that day. You both left this room with an agreement that you were going to rationalize the grounds and that you would come. Nothing else would happen, and that once you had rationalized the grounds, reduced the 76 charges to whatever you reduce it, we were going to call Christian in. We were going to assume that ownership to the Government,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	They would have picked up Haim Levy at 6 o'clock in the morning. Now, if that is where this is going I'm now officially asking that this matter be investigated by an external police service to see whether the RGP has flawed in this investigation." You say that any other police force would have not going about it the way that you had done - that they would have gone in at 6 o'clock in the morning. Then at 176 you make a similar comment saying that any other police service
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	was clear since you raised the matter, I repeat my position from which I would never budge because I'm 200 per cent certain of what we discussed here in this room that day. You both left this room with an agreement that you were going to rationalize the grounds and that you would come. Nothing else would happen, and that once you had rationalized the grounds, reduced the 76 charges to whatever you reduce it, we were going to call Christian in. We were going to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	They would have picked up Haim Levy at 6 o'clock in the morning. Now, if that is where this is going I'm now officially asking that this matter be investigated by an external police service to see whether the RGP has flawed in this investigation." You say that any other police force would have not going about it the way that you had done - that they would have gone in at 6 o'clock in the morning. Then at 176 you make a similar comment saying that any other police service would have taken Mr Levy's phone off him.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	was clear since you raised the matter, I repeat my position from which I would never budge because I'm 200 per cent certain of what we discussed here in this room that day. You both left this room with an agreement that you were going to rationalize the grounds and that you would come. Nothing else would happen, and that once you had rationalized the grounds, reduced the 76 charges to whatever you reduce it, we were going to call Christian in. We were going to assume that ownership to the Government, and therefore we would have placed ourselves in an absolutely legally certain	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	They would have picked up Haim Levy at 6 o'clock in the morning. Now, if that is where this is going I'm now officially asking that this matter be investigated by an external police service to see whether the RGP has flawed in this investigation." You say that any other police force would have not going about it the way that you had done - that they would have gone in at 6 o'clock in the morning. Then at 176 you make a similar comment saying that any other police service would have taken Mr Levy's phone off him. Had the RGP already taken a different
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	was clear since you raised the matter, I repeat my position from which I would never budge because I'm 200 per cent certain of what we discussed here in this room that day. You both left this room with an agreement that you were going to rationalize the grounds and that you would come. Nothing else would happen, and that once you had rationalized the grounds, reduced the 76 charges to whatever you reduce it, we were going to call Christian in. We were going to assume that ownership to the Government, and therefore we would have placed ourselves in an absolutely legally certain position and you would advance with that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	They would have picked up Haim Levy at 6 o'clock in the morning. Now, if that is where this is going I'm now officially asking that this matter be investigated by an external police service to see whether the RGP has flawed in this investigation." You say that any other police force would have not going about it the way that you had done - that they would have gone in at 6 o'clock in the morning. Then at 176 you make a similar comment saying that any other police service would have taken Mr Levy's phone off him. Had the RGP already taken a different approach to Mr Levy than it would to other
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	was clear since you raised the matter, I repeat my position from which I would never budge because I'm 200 per cent certain of what we discussed here in this room that day. You both left this room with an agreement that you were going to rationalize the grounds and that you would come. Nothing else would happen, and that once you had rationalized the grounds, reduced the 76 charges to whatever you reduce it, we were going to call Christian in. We were going to assume that ownership to the Government, and therefore we would have placed ourselves in an absolutely legally certain	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	They would have picked up Haim Levy at 6 o'clock in the morning. Now, if that is where this is going I'm now officially asking that this matter be investigated by an external police service to see whether the RGP has flawed in this investigation." You say that any other police force would have not going about it the way that you had done - that they would have gone in at 6 o'clock in the morning. Then at 176 you make a similar comment saying that any other police service would have taken Mr Levy's phone off him. Had the RGP already taken a different approach to Mr Levy than it would to other suspects by that point?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	was clear since you raised the matter, I repeat my position from which I would never budge because I'm 200 per cent certain of what we discussed here in this room that day. You both left this room with an agreement that you were going to rationalize the grounds and that you would come. Nothing else would happen, and that once you had rationalized the grounds, reduced the 76 charges to whatever you reduce it, we were going to call Christian in. We were going to assume that ownership to the Government, and therefore we would have placed ourselves in an absolutely legally certain position and you would advance with that initially and then the time you would have	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	They would have picked up Haim Levy at 6 o'clock in the morning. Now, if that is where this is going I'm now officially asking that this matter be investigated by an external police service to see whether the RGP has flawed in this investigation." You say that any other police force would have not going about it the way that you had done - that they would have gone in at 6 o'clock in the morning. Then at 176 you make a similar comment saying that any other police service would have taken Mr Levy's phone off him. Had the RGP already taken a different approach to Mr Levy than it would to other suspects by that point? A. Yes, I would agree that the phrase used
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	was clear since you raised the matter, I repeat my position from which I would never budge because I'm 200 per cent certain of what we discussed here in this room that day. You both left this room with an agreement that you were going to rationalize the grounds and that you would come. Nothing else would happen, and that once you had rationalized the grounds, reduced the 76 charges to whatever you reduce it, we were going to call Christian in. We were going to assume that ownership to the Government, and therefore we would have placed ourselves in an absolutely legally certain position and you would advance with that initially and then the time you would have been able to assess the time, the question of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	They would have picked up Haim Levy at 6 o'clock in the morning. Now, if that is where this is going I'm now officially asking that this matter be investigated by an external police service to see whether the RGP has flawed in this investigation." You say that any other police force would have not going about it the way that you had done - that they would have gone in at 6 o'clock in the morning. Then at 176 you make a similar comment saying that any other police service would have taken Mr Levy's phone off him. Had the RGP already taken a different approach to Mr Levy than it would to other suspects by that point? A. Yes, I would agree that the phrase used by Mr Richardson is "Mr Levy was treated"
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	was clear since you raised the matter, I repeat my position from which I would never budge because I'm 200 per cent certain of what we discussed here in this room that day. You both left this room with an agreement that you were going to rationalize the grounds and that you would come. Nothing else would happen, and that once you had rationalized the grounds, reduced the 76 charges to whatever you reduce it, we were going to call Christian in. We were going to assume that ownership to the Government, and therefore we would have placed ourselves in an absolutely legally certain position and you would advance with that initially and then the time you would have been able to assess the time, the question of ownership would hopefully, would have been	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	They would have picked up Haim Levy at 6 o'clock in the morning. Now, if that is where this is going I'm now officially asking that this matter be investigated by an external police service to see whether the RGP has flawed in this investigation." You say that any other police force would have not going about it the way that you had done - that they would have gone in at 6 o'clock in the morning. Then at 176 you make a similar comment saying that any other police service would have taken Mr Levy's phone off him. Had the RGP already taken a different approach to Mr Levy than it would to other suspects by that point? A. Yes, I would agree that the phrase used by Mr Richardson is "Mr Levy was treated with kid gloves" which I don't have a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	was clear since you raised the matter, I repeat my position from which I would never budge because I'm 200 per cent certain of what we discussed here in this room that day. You both left this room with an agreement that you were going to rationalize the grounds and that you would come. Nothing else would happen, and that once you had rationalized the grounds, reduced the 76 charges to whatever you reduce it, we were going to call Christian in. We were going to assume that ownership to the Government, and therefore we would have placed ourselves in an absolutely legally certain position and you would advance with that initially and then the time you would have been able to assess the time, the question of ownership would hopefully, would have been clarified, which would have opened more	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	They would have picked up Haim Levy at 6 o'clock in the morning. Now, if that is where this is going I'm now officially asking that this matter be investigated by an external police service to see whether the RGP has flawed in this investigation." You say that any other police force would have not going about it the way that you had done - that they would have gone in at 6 o'clock in the morning. Then at 176 you make a similar comment saying that any other police service would have taken Mr Levy's phone off him. Had the RGP already taken a different approach to Mr Levy than it would to other suspects by that point? A. Yes, I would agree that the phrase used by Mr Richardson is "Mr Levy was treated with kid gloves" which I don't have a problem with, but the fact that it took nine or
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	was clear since you raised the matter, I repeat my position from which I would never budge because I'm 200 per cent certain of what we discussed here in this room that day. You both left this room with an agreement that you were going to rationalize the grounds and that you would come. Nothing else would happen, and that once you had rationalized the grounds, reduced the 76 charges to whatever you reduce it, we were going to call Christian in. We were going to assume that ownership to the Government, and therefore we would have placed ourselves in an absolutely legally certain position and you would advance with that initially and then the time you would have been able to assess the time, the question of ownership would hopefully, would have been clarified, which would have opened more doors or not for you, and for me it was clear	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	They would have picked up Haim Levy at 6 o'clock in the morning. Now, if that is where this is going I'm now officially asking that this matter be investigated by an external police service to see whether the RGP has flawed in this investigation." You say that any other police force would have not going about it the way that you had done - that they would have gone in at 6 o'clock in the morning. Then at 176 you make a similar comment saying that any other police service would have taken Mr Levy's phone off him. Had the RGP already taken a different approach to Mr Levy than it would to other suspects by that point? A. Yes, I would agree that the phrase used by Mr Richardson is "Mr Levy was treated with kid gloves" which I don't have a problem with, but the fact that it took nine or 10 hours for Mr Levy to sort out his head of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	was clear since you raised the matter, I repeat my position from which I would never budge because I'm 200 per cent certain of what we discussed here in this room that day. You both left this room with an agreement that you were going to rationalize the grounds and that you would come. Nothing else would happen, and that once you had rationalized the grounds, reduced the 76 charges to whatever you reduce it, we were going to call Christian in. We were going to assume that ownership to the Government, and therefore we would have placed ourselves in an absolutely legally certain position and you would advance with that initially and then the time you would have been able to assess the time, the question of ownership would hopefully, would have been clarified, which would have opened more doors or not for you, and for me it was clear that you - your text of yesterday whilst all	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	They would have picked up Haim Levy at 6 o'clock in the morning. Now, if that is where this is going I'm now officially asking that this matter be investigated by an external police service to see whether the RGP has flawed in this investigation." You say that any other police force would have not going about it the way that you had done - that they would have gone in at 6 o'clock in the morning. Then at 176 you make a similar comment saying that any other police service would have taken Mr Levy's phone off him. Had the RGP already taken a different approach to Mr Levy than it would to other suspects by that point? A. Yes, I would agree that the phrase used by Mr Richardson is "Mr Levy was treated with kid gloves" which I don't have a problem with, but the fact that it took nine or 10 hours for Mr Levy to sort out his head of how he was going to deal with it, that was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	was clear since you raised the matter, I repeat my position from which I would never budge because I'm 200 per cent certain of what we discussed here in this room that day. You both left this room with an agreement that you were going to rationalize the grounds and that you would come. Nothing else would happen, and that once you had rationalized the grounds, reduced the 76 charges to whatever you reduce it, we were going to call Christian in. We were going to assume that ownership to the Government, and therefore we would have placed ourselves in an absolutely legally certain position and you would advance with that initially and then the time you would have been able to assess the time, the question of ownership would hopefully, would have been clarified, which would have opened more doors or not for you, and for me it was clear that you - your text of yesterday whilst all this was happening, well you know how I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	They would have picked up Haim Levy at 6 o'clock in the morning. Now, if that is where this is going I'm now officially asking that this matter be investigated by an external police service to see whether the RGP has flawed in this investigation." You say that any other police force would have not going about it the way that you had done - that they would have gone in at 6 o'clock in the morning. Then at 176 you make a similar comment saying that any other police service would have taken Mr Levy's phone off him. Had the RGP already taken a different approach to Mr Levy than it would to other suspects by that point? A. Yes, I would agree that the phrase used by Mr Richardson is "Mr Levy was treated with kid gloves" which I don't have a problem with, but the fact that it took nine or 10 hours for Mr Levy to sort out his head of how he was going to deal with it, that was giving him too much leeway there. But 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	was clear since you raised the matter, I repeat my position from which I would never budge because I'm 200 per cent certain of what we discussed here in this room that day. You both left this room with an agreement that you were going to rationalize the grounds and that you would come. Nothing else would happen, and that once you had rationalized the grounds, reduced the 76 charges to whatever you reduce it, we were going to call Christian in. We were going to assume that ownership to the Government, and therefore we would have placed ourselves in an absolutely legally certain position and you would advance with that initially and then the time you would have been able to assess the time, the question of ownership would hopefully, would have been clarified, which would have opened more doors or not for you, and for me it was clear that you - your text of yesterday whilst all this was happening, well you know how I feel about it." How do you react 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	They would have picked up Haim Levy at 6 o'clock in the morning. Now, if that is where this is going I'm now officially asking that this matter be investigated by an external police service to see whether the RGP has flawed in this investigation." You say that any other police force would have not going about it the way that you had done - that they would have gone in at 6 o'clock in the morning. Then at 176 you make a similar comment saying that any other police service would have taken Mr Levy's phone off him. Had the RGP already taken a different approach to Mr Levy than it would to other suspects by that point? A. Yes, I would agree that the phrase used by Mr Richardson is "Mr Levy was treated with kid gloves" which I don't have a problem with, but the fact that it took nine or 10 hours for Mr Levy to sort out his head of how he was going to deal with it, that was giving him too much leeway there. But that is something that the RGP and Mr Richardson

1	live with and they were the officers with	1	O Lam carry Mr MaGrail and you just
1 2	live with and they were the officers with those decisions, and I respect the way they	1 2	Q. I am sorry, Mr McGrail, can you just answer the question?
	handled it.	3	A. I will get to it - and at one point Mr
3 4	Q. At 179 you say, in reference to the	4	Yamas called me up and said, "Ian, stop the
5	allegation of misfeasance against	5	investigation." I says, "Hang on a minute.
6	Superintendent Richardson, you say - 179. I	6	We haven't completed it." "Look, I'm going
7	will just have to come back to that on these.	7	to write to you and if there isn't any sort of
8	I cannot find that one. Sorry, yes, the very	8	I'm going to write to you to tell you that even
9	top box. "No, no, no. Not investigate - not	9	if you have evidence to proffer charges, I am
10	investigate that, that, that allegation. I am	10	not going to allow a prosecution in this
11	taking personally too. He is my officer. I	11	regard, and I am asking you to stop it." So,
12	stand in front of him for all of this." Would	12	he wrote to me to that effect, and that is what
13	you still stand in front of Superintendent	13	I am referring to, even before charge. So, we
13	Richardson and Inspector Wayn for their	14	are not talking about nolle prosequi here. We
15	actions in how they dealt with Mr Levy?	15	are falking about the Attorney-General
16	A. 100 per cent.	16	advising, look, even if you present this case
17	Q. Over the page, the end of the third box,	17	before charge, I am not going to prosecute it.
18	you say, five lines from the bottom: "The	18	And that's what he did in this. I'm using this
19	DPP sees that there is - we thought that there	19	analogy because it's very pertinent. Serious
20	is, but confirmed with the DPP, the DPP sees	20	matters and very similar into what I'm trying
20	that there is a case to be put to the - to trial. I	20	to explain.
22	get the whole periphery. I get it all. I cannot	22	Q. So, what you were saying - referring to
23	pull it. You can. You can, Michael." Then	23	there was that it was up to the Attorney-
24	the Attorney-General replies, "But it hasn't	24	General to pull the investigation?
25	got to. It hasn't got to get to that, Ian." And	25	A. I cannot stop an investigation. That's my
23			
	Page 245		Page 247
1	then you say: "Well, then - then who stops	1	role and the police's role. Then the
1 2	it? I cannot stop it. I cannot say I - there is	2	prosecutors then say: I'm not going to run it,
	it? I cannot stop it. I cannot say I - there is no offence." Then further down you say: "If	2 3	prosecutors then say: I'm not going to run it, that's their prerogative, and in this case it was
2	it? I cannot stop it. I cannot say I - there is no offence." Then further down you say: "If we cannot, I would understand and I've said	2 3 4	prosecutors then say: I'm not going to run it, that's their prerogative, and in this case it was palpable that that is what was wanted. In
2 3	it? I cannot stop it. I cannot say I - there is no offence." Then further down you say: "If we cannot, I would understand and I've said it - I 've said it before. I would not raise any	2 3 4 5	prosecutors then say: I'm not going to run it, that's their prerogative, and in this case it was palpable that that is what was wanted. In fact, that's how it ended.
2 3 4 5 6	it? I cannot stop it. I cannot say I - there is no offence." Then further down you say: "If we cannot, I would understand and I've said it - I 've said it before. I would not raise any objections if this is pulled, but I will not pull	2 3 4 5 6	prosecutors then say: I'm not going to run it, that's their prerogative, and in this case it was palpable that that is what was wanted. In fact, that's how it ended. Q. When you say that you would raise no
2 3 4 5	it? I cannot stop it. I cannot say I - there is no offence." Then further down you say: "If we cannot, I would understand and I've said it - I 've said it before. I would not raise any objections if this is pulled, but I will not pull it, Ian. The RGP cannot pull it and if there	2 3 4 5	prosecutors then say: I'm not going to run it, that's their prerogative, and in this case it was palpable that that is what was wanted. In fact, that's how it ended. Q. When you say that you would raise no objections, you would not raise any
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	it? I cannot stop it. I cannot say I - there is no offence." Then further down you say: "If we cannot, I would understand and I've said it - I 've said it before. I would not raise any objections if this is pulled, but I will not pull it, Ian. The RGP cannot pull it and if there are legal routes to pull it, those - I'm asking	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	prosecutors then say: I'm not going to run it, that's their prerogative, and in this case it was palpable that that is what was wanted. In fact, that's how it ended. Q. When you say that you would raise no objections, you would not raise any objections to that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	it? I cannot stop it. I cannot say I - there is no offence." Then further down you say: "If we cannot, I would understand and I've said it - I 've said it before. I would not raise any objections if this is pulled, but I will not pull it, Ian. The RGP cannot pull it and if there are legal routes to pull it, those - I'm asking why not." What do you mean by "pull it"	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	prosecutors then say: I'm not going to run it, that's their prerogative, and in this case it was palpable that that is what was wanted. In fact, that's how it ended. Q. When you say that you would raise no objections, you would not raise any objections to that A. Well, because even if I object, it doesn't
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	it? I cannot stop it. I cannot say I - there is no offence." Then further down you say: "If we cannot, I would understand and I've said it - I 've said it before. I would not raise any objections if this is pulled, but I will not pull it, Ian. The RGP cannot pull it and if there are legal routes to pull it, those - I'm asking why not." What do you mean by "pull it" there?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	prosecutors then say: I'm not going to run it, that's their prerogative, and in this case it was palpable that that is what was wanted. In fact, that's how it ended. Q. When you say that you would raise no objections, you would not raise any objections to that A. Well, because even if I object, it doesn't have any effect, but I respect but don't
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	it? I cannot stop it. I cannot say I - there is no offence." Then further down you say: "If we cannot, I would understand and I've said it - I 've said it before. I would not raise any objections if this is pulled, but I will not pull it, Ian. The RGP cannot pull it and if there are legal routes to pull it, those - I'm asking why not." What do you mean by "pull it" there? A. At that stage nobody had been charged.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	prosecutors then say: I'm not going to run it, that's their prerogative, and in this case it was palpable that that is what was wanted. In fact, that's how it ended. Q. When you say that you would raise no objections, you would not raise any objections to that A. Well, because even if I object, it doesn't have any effect, but I respect but don't necessarily agree. It's happened before. It's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	it? I cannot stop it. I cannot say I - there is no offence." Then further down you say: "If we cannot, I would understand and I've said it - I 've said it before. I would not raise any objections if this is pulled, but I will not pull it, Ian. The RGP cannot pull it and if there are legal routes to pull it, those - I'm asking why not." What do you mean by "pull it" there? A. At that stage nobody had been charged. There were only people under arrest and in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	prosecutors then say: I'm not going to run it, that's their prerogative, and in this case it was palpable that that is what was wanted. In fact, that's how it ended. Q. When you say that you would raise no objections, you would not raise any objections to that A. Well, because even if I object, it doesn't have any effect, but I respect but don't necessarily agree. It's happened before. It's happened many times. In this case, look
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	it? I cannot stop it. I cannot say I - there is no offence." Then further down you say: "If we cannot, I would understand and I've said it - I 've said it before. I would not raise any objections if this is pulled, but I will not pull it, Ian. The RGP cannot pull it and if there are legal routes to pull it, those - I'm asking why not." What do you mean by "pull it" there? A. At that stage nobody had been charged. There were only people under arrest and in the previous serious matter - I'll mention the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	prosecutors then say: I'm not going to run it, that's their prerogative, and in this case it was palpable that that is what was wanted. In fact, that's how it ended. Q. When you say that you would raise no objections, you would not raise any objections to that A. Well, because even if I object, it doesn't have any effect, but I respect but don't necessarily agree. It's happened before. It's happened many times. In this case, look because - probably because of the post I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	it? I cannot stop it. I cannot say I - there is no offence." Then further down you say: "If we cannot, I would understand and I've said it - I 've said it before. I would not raise any objections if this is pulled, but I will not pull it, Ian. The RGP cannot pull it and if there are legal routes to pull it, those - I'm asking why not." What do you mean by "pull it" there? A. At that stage nobody had been charged. There were only people under arrest and in the previous serious matter - I'll mention the one it is because it's no secret - in the matter	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	prosecutors then say: I'm not going to run it, that's their prerogative, and in this case it was palpable that that is what was wanted. In fact, that's how it ended. Q. When you say that you would raise no objections, you would not raise any objections to that A. Well, because even if I object, it doesn't have any effect, but I respect but don't necessarily agree. It's happened before. It's happened many times. In this case, look because - probably because of the post I held, I had direct contact with the Attorney-
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	it? I cannot stop it. I cannot say I - there is no offence." Then further down you say: "If we cannot, I would understand and I've said it - I 've said it before. I would not raise any objections if this is pulled, but I will not pull it, Ian. The RGP cannot pull it and if there are legal routes to pull it, those - I'm asking why not." What do you mean by "pull it" there? A. At that stage nobody had been charged. There were only people under arrest and in the previous serious matter - I'll mention the one it is because it's no secret - in the matter of the Grey Swan, the infamous seizure of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	prosecutors then say: I'm not going to run it, that's their prerogative, and in this case it was palpable that that is what was wanted. In fact, that's how it ended. Q. When you say that you would raise no objections, you would not raise any objections to that A. Well, because even if I object, it doesn't have any effect, but I respect but don't necessarily agree. It's happened before. It's happened many times. In this case, look because - probably because of the post I held, I had direct contact with the Attorney-General, but in previous occasions the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	it? I cannot stop it. I cannot say I - there is no offence." Then further down you say: "If we cannot, I would understand and I've said it - I 've said it before. I would not raise any objections if this is pulled, but I will not pull it, Ian. The RGP cannot pull it and if there are legal routes to pull it, those - I'm asking why not." What do you mean by "pull it" there? A. At that stage nobody had been charged. There were only people under arrest and in the previous serious matter - I'll mention the one it is because it's no secret - in the matter of the Grey Swan, the infamous seizure of the tanker that was bound to Syria to offload	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	prosecutors then say: I'm not going to run it, that's their prerogative, and in this case it was palpable that that is what was wanted. In fact, that's how it ended. Q. When you say that you would raise no objections, you would not raise any objections to that A. Well, because even if I object, it doesn't have any effect, but I respect but don't necessarily agree. It's happened before. It's happened many times. In this case, look because - probably because of the post I held, I had direct contact with the Attorney-General, but in previous occasions the Attorney-General, or the AG's Chambers, as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	it? I cannot stop it. I cannot say I - there is no offence." Then further down you say: "If we cannot, I would understand and I've said it - I 've said it before. I would not raise any objections if this is pulled, but I will not pull it, Ian. The RGP cannot pull it and if there are legal routes to pull it, those - I'm asking why not." What do you mean by "pull it" there? A. At that stage nobody had been charged. There were only people under arrest and in the previous serious matter - I'll mention the one it is because it's no secret - in the matter of the Grey Swan, the infamous seizure of the tanker that was bound to Syria to offload with Iranian crude oil and was intercepted	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	prosecutors then say: I'm not going to run it, that's their prerogative, and in this case it was palpable that that is what was wanted. In fact, that's how it ended. Q. When you say that you would raise no objections, you would not raise any objections to that A. Well, because even if I object, it doesn't have any effect, but I respect but don't necessarily agree. It's happened before. It's happened many times. In this case, look because - probably because of the post I held, I had direct contact with the Attorney-General, but in previous occasions the Attorney-General, or the AG's Chambers, as it was, would pull cases without offering any
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	it? I cannot stop it. I cannot say I - there is no offence." Then further down you say: "If we cannot, I would understand and I've said it - I 've said it before. I would not raise any objections if this is pulled, but I will not pull it, Ian. The RGP cannot pull it and if there are legal routes to pull it, those - I'm asking why not." What do you mean by "pull it" there? A. At that stage nobody had been charged. There were only people under arrest and in the previous serious matter - I'll mention the one it is because it's no secret - in the matter of the Grey Swan, the infamous seizure of the tanker that was bound to Syria to offload with Iranian crude oil and was intercepted here, the RGP carried out a painstaking	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	prosecutors then say: I'm not going to run it, that's their prerogative, and in this case it was palpable that that is what was wanted. In fact, that's how it ended. Q. When you say that you would raise no objections, you would not raise any objections to that A. Well, because even if I object, it doesn't have any effect, but I respect but don't necessarily agree. It's happened before. It's happened many times. In this case, look because - probably because of the post I held, I had direct contact with the Attorney-General, but in previous occasions the Attorney-General, or the AG's Chambers, as it was, would pull cases without offering any reasons, and the police would think: well,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	it? I cannot stop it. I cannot say I - there is no offence." Then further down you say: "If we cannot, I would understand and I've said it - I 've said it before. I would not raise any objections if this is pulled, but I will not pull it, Ian. The RGP cannot pull it and if there are legal routes to pull it, those - I'm asking why not." What do you mean by "pull it" there? A. At that stage nobody had been charged. There were only people under arrest and in the previous serious matter - I'll mention the one it is because it's no secret - in the matter of the Grey Swan, the infamous seizure of the tanker that was bound to Syria to offload with Iranian crude oil and was intercepted here, the RGP carried out a painstaking investigation under real time constraints	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	prosecutors then say: I'm not going to run it, that's their prerogative, and in this case it was palpable that that is what was wanted. In fact, that's how it ended. Q. When you say that you would raise no objections, you would not raise any objections to that A. Well, because even if I object, it doesn't have any effect, but I respect but don't necessarily agree. It's happened before. It's happened many times. In this case, look because - probably because of the post I held, I had direct contact with the Attorney-General, but in previous occasions the Attorney-General, or the AG's Chambers, as it was, would pull cases without offering any reasons, and the police would think: well, what's going on? That wasn't even a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	it? I cannot stop it. I cannot say I - there is no offence." Then further down you say: "If we cannot, I would understand and I've said it - I 've said it before. I would not raise any objections if this is pulled, but I will not pull it, Ian. The RGP cannot pull it and if there are legal routes to pull it, those - I'm asking why not." What do you mean by "pull it" there? A. At that stage nobody had been charged. There were only people under arrest and in the previous serious matter - I'll mention the one it is because it's no secret - in the matter of the Grey Swan, the infamous seizure of the tanker that was bound to Syria to offload with Iranian crude oil and was intercepted here, the RGP carried out a painstaking investigation under real time constraints because it had an impact in the Middle East,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	prosecutors then say: I'm not going to run it, that's their prerogative, and in this case it was palpable that that is what was wanted. In fact, that's how it ended. Q. When you say that you would raise no objections, you would not raise any objections to that A. Well, because even if I object, it doesn't have any effect, but I respect but don't necessarily agree. It's happened before. It's happened many times. In this case, look because - probably because of the post I held, I had direct contact with the Attorney-General, but in previous occasions the Attorney-General, or the AG's Chambers, as it was, would pull cases without offering any reasons, and the police would think: well, what's going on? That wasn't even a consultation, without having a consultation.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	it? I cannot stop it. I cannot say I - there is no offence." Then further down you say: "If we cannot, I would understand and I've said it - I 've said it before. I would not raise any objections if this is pulled, but I will not pull it, Ian. The RGP cannot pull it and if there are legal routes to pull it, those - I'm asking why not." What do you mean by "pull it" there? A. At that stage nobody had been charged. There were only people under arrest and in the previous serious matter - I'll mention the one it is because it's no secret - in the matter of the Grey Swan, the infamous seizure of the tanker that was bound to Syria to offload with Iranian crude oil and was intercepted here, the RGP carried out a painstaking investigation under real time constraints because it had an impact in the Middle East, and there was retribution from the Iranian	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	prosecutors then say: I'm not going to run it, that's their prerogative, and in this case it was palpable that that is what was wanted. In fact, that's how it ended. Q. When you say that you would raise no objections, you would not raise any objections to that A. Well, because even if I object, it doesn't have any effect, but I respect but don't necessarily agree. It's happened before. It's happened many times. In this case, look because - probably because of the post I held, I had direct contact with the Attorney-General, but in previous occasions the Attorney-General, or the AG's Chambers, as it was, would pull cases without offering any reasons, and the police would think: well, what's going on? That wasn't even a consultation, without having a consultation. So, I have the confidence of telling him from
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	it? I cannot stop it. I cannot say I - there is no offence." Then further down you say: "If we cannot, I would understand and I've said it - I 've said it before. I would not raise any objections if this is pulled, but I will not pull it, Ian. The RGP cannot pull it and if there are legal routes to pull it, those - I'm asking why not." What do you mean by "pull it" there? A. At that stage nobody had been charged. There were only people under arrest and in the previous serious matter - I'll mention the one it is because it's no secret - in the matter of the Grey Swan, the infamous seizure of the tanker that was bound to Syria to offload with Iranian crude oil and was intercepted here, the RGP carried out a painstaking investigation under real time constraints because it had an impact in the Middle East, and there was retribution from the Iranian revolutionary corps or guards in the Straits of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	prosecutors then say: I'm not going to run it, that's their prerogative, and in this case it was palpable that that is what was wanted. In fact, that's how it ended. Q. When you say that you would raise no objections, you would not raise any objections to that A. Well, because even if I object, it doesn't have any effect, but I respect but don't necessarily agree. It's happened before. It's happened many times. In this case, look because - probably because of the post I held, I had direct contact with the Attorney-General, but in previous occasions the Attorney-General, or the AG's Chambers, as it was, would pull cases without offering any reasons, and the police would think: well, what's going on? That wasn't even a consultation, without having a consultation. So, I have the confidence of telling him from - I am using the previous knowledge that I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	it? I cannot stop it. I cannot say I - there is no offence." Then further down you say: "If we cannot, I would understand and I've said it - I 've said it before. I would not raise any objections if this is pulled, but I will not pull it, Ian. The RGP cannot pull it and if there are legal routes to pull it, those - I'm asking why not." What do you mean by "pull it" there? A. At that stage nobody had been charged. There were only people under arrest and in the previous serious matter - I'll mention the one it is because it's no secret - in the matter of the Grey Swan, the infamous seizure of the tanker that was bound to Syria to offload with Iranian crude oil and was intercepted here, the RGP carried out a painstaking investigation under real time constraints because it had an impact in the Middle East, and there was retribution from the Iranian revolutionary corps or guards in the Straits of Hormuz, and we were under real pressure to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	prosecutors then say: I'm not going to run it, that's their prerogative, and in this case it was palpable that that is what was wanted. In fact, that's how it ended. Q. When you say that you would raise no objections, you would not raise any objections to that A. Well, because even if I object, it doesn't have any effect, but I respect but don't necessarily agree. It's happened before. It's happened many times. In this case, look because - probably because of the post I held, I had direct contact with the Attorney-General, but in previous occasions the Attorney-General, or the AG's Chambers, as it was, would pull cases without offering any reasons, and the police would think: well, what's going on? That wasn't even a consultation, without having a consultation. So, I have the confidence of telling him from - I am using the previous knowledge that I had of how we operated: look, if you don't
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	it? I cannot stop it. I cannot say I - there is no offence." Then further down you say: "If we cannot, I would understand and I've said it - I 've said it before. I would not raise any objections if this is pulled, but I will not pull it, Ian. The RGP cannot pull it and if there are legal routes to pull it, those - I'm asking why not." What do you mean by "pull it" there? A. At that stage nobody had been charged. There were only people under arrest and in the previous serious matter - I'll mention the one it is because it's no secret - in the matter of the Grey Swan, the infamous seizure of the tanker that was bound to Syria to offload with Iranian crude oil and was intercepted here, the RGP carried out a painstaking investigation under real time constraints because it had an impact in the Middle East, and there was retribution from the Iranian revolutionary corps or guards in the Straits of Hormuz, and we were under real pressure to deliver on evidence. Mr Caruana will vouch	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	prosecutors then say: I'm not going to run it, that's their prerogative, and in this case it was palpable that that is what was wanted. In fact, that's how it ended. Q. When you say that you would raise no objections, you would not raise any objections to that A. Well, because even if I object, it doesn't have any effect, but I respect but don't necessarily agree. It's happened before. It's happened many times. In this case, look because - probably because of the post I held, I had direct contact with the Attorney-General, but in previous occasions the Attorney-General, or the AG's Chambers, as it was, would pull cases without offering any reasons, and the police would think: well, what's going on? That wasn't even a consultation, without having a consultation. So, I have the confidence of telling him from - I am using the previous knowledge that I had of how we operated: look, if you don't want this to carry on, it's your call. It's not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	it? I cannot stop it. I cannot say I - there is no offence." Then further down you say: "If we cannot, I would understand and I've said it - I 've said it before. I would not raise any objections if this is pulled, but I will not pull it, Ian. The RGP cannot pull it and if there are legal routes to pull it, those - I'm asking why not." What do you mean by "pull it" there? A. At that stage nobody had been charged. There were only people under arrest and in the previous serious matter - I'll mention the one it is because it's no secret - in the matter of the Grey Swan, the infamous seizure of the tanker that was bound to Syria to offload with Iranian crude oil and was intercepted here, the RGP carried out a painstaking investigation under real time constraints because it had an impact in the Middle East, and there was retribution from the Iranian revolutionary corps or guards in the Straits of Hormuz, and we were under real pressure to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	prosecutors then say: I'm not going to run it, that's their prerogative, and in this case it was palpable that that is what was wanted. In fact, that's how it ended. Q. When you say that you would raise no objections, you would not raise any objections to that A. Well, because even if I object, it doesn't have any effect, but I respect but don't necessarily agree. It's happened before. It's happened many times. In this case, look because - probably because of the post I held, I had direct contact with the Attorney-General, but in previous occasions the Attorney-General, or the AG's Chambers, as it was, would pull cases without offering any reasons, and the police would think: well, what's going on? That wasn't even a consultation, without having a consultation. So, I have the confidence of telling him from - I am using the previous knowledge that I had of how we operated: look, if you don't
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	it? I cannot stop it. I cannot say I - there is no offence." Then further down you say: "If we cannot, I would understand and I've said it - I 've said it before. I would not raise any objections if this is pulled, but I will not pull it, Ian. The RGP cannot pull it and if there are legal routes to pull it, those - I'm asking why not." What do you mean by "pull it" there? A. At that stage nobody had been charged. There were only people under arrest and in the previous serious matter - I'll mention the one it is because it's no secret - in the matter of the Grey Swan, the infamous seizure of the tanker that was bound to Syria to offload with Iranian crude oil and was intercepted here, the RGP carried out a painstaking investigation under real time constraints because it had an impact in the Middle East, and there was retribution from the Iranian revolutionary corps or guards in the Straits of Hormuz, and we were under real pressure to deliver on evidence. Mr Caruana will vouch	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	prosecutors then say: I'm not going to run it, that's their prerogative, and in this case it was palpable that that is what was wanted. In fact, that's how it ended. Q. When you say that you would raise no objections, you would not raise any objections to that A. Well, because even if I object, it doesn't have any effect, but I respect but don't necessarily agree. It's happened before. It's happened many times. In this case, look because - probably because of the post I held, I had direct contact with the Attorney-General, but in previous occasions the Attorney-General, or the AG's Chambers, as it was, would pull cases without offering any reasons, and the police would think: well, what's going on? That wasn't even a consultation, without having a consultation. So, I have the confidence of telling him from - I am using the previous knowledge that I had of how we operated: look, if you don't want this to carry on, it's your call. It's not

relationship I had with him. And that's what I 1 anything. If we can go to the audio at 34.20 2 2 mean by: you can pull it, not me. I cannot please: [Audio clip played] If you want to 3 3 follow this exchange. It is on page B/184, if stop it. 4 4 Q. On B/181 at the bottom of the page, you you can scroll down a little bit. Thank you. 5 say: "Haim has on video alluded to that. I 5 [Audio clip played] Sorry, it starts just after 6 am under pressure from the governor to see 6 the entry at 34.10 where you are saying: " 7 this investigation through." You: "Yeah. I 7 Exactly, exactly."? 8 do not know where that came from." "Where 8 A. Okay. 9 has he said that?" "Ehm on tape in front of 9 Q. Just about there it should start: [Audio 10 10 all of them there, because he was suggesting clip played] You seem to refer there to the 11 that this is led from outside; that we're being 11 Police Complaints Board here, but we have 12 compelled." Do you agree with the 12 not been able to find a reference to the 13 suggestion by Mr Levy that the RGP was 13 Governor or the GPA. Is there any reference 14 14 under pressure from the Governor or proceed to the Governor or GPA? 15 15 with the investigation? A. I will explain. Obviously this was audio 16 16 A. I don't, and it concerns me because if recording. If we take this down to the 17 17 what Mr Levy is saying that it was down to a previous page where I say - I've got to refer--18 commercial dispute, surely he must realise 18 19 19 that a Governor does not get involved in Q. You say, "I'm duty bound to"? 20 20 A. "I'm duty bound to. I've got to refer the commercial disputes. I think that's a given. 21 So, it concerns me that Mr Levy was thinking 21 fact that there is a criminal investigation 22 22 made against use." Right, and for orientation that the UK government were directing this, 23 23 and my theory is because he knew that it had purpose, if I am sitting where the Attorney 24 24 to do with national security. That's the only General was sitting, I was sat there. The 25 25 interest a UK government would have on an Convent is behind. I said - when I said that, Page 249 Page 251 1 investigation of this matter, that it impinged 1 I said "I've got to refer to..." point in the 2 on national security. 2 direction of the Convent, which is the 3 3 Q. was the RGP under pressure from Mr Governor's office. 4 Gagerro to proceed with the investigation? 4 Q. So, when you said "I've got to refer..." 5 5 you were pointing and indicating that you A. Absolutely not, and I can qualify it, the 6 fact that I told him if the allegation is that Mr 6 would be referring to --7 7 Gagerro used the RGP for his sole purposes, A. He knew that I was referring to, and that's 8 8 I disqualified all that by telling him: look, when he said: you shouldn't do anything 9 9 you're not going to pull out. So, it's the other about it yet. So, behind Mr - at his 10 10 way around actually. I more or less told him conference table, his back is to the 11 that it would look - I would not expect him 11 Governor's office and I - that's what I 12 to pull the complaint once investigation was 12 pointed to him saying: we've got to refer the 13 over if it was - if he had filed it to settle any 13 matter to there. 14 scores or get even with anybody, but I was 14 Q. Did you refer to the GPA? 15 15 A. I did because eventually I did even report not entertaining any of that. 16 16 Q. Can we go to A/19 now please, your it to the GPA, but I was specifically saying: 17 witness statement, paragraph 58.15? You 17 go to the Governor. 18 say: "I stated I needed to refer up to the 18 Q. You did not refer to going to the GPA? 19 19 Governor and the GPA the fact that a A. No, no. I didn't, I didn't. 20 criminal complaint had been made against 20 Q. I think, given the time, that is as far as we 21 21 me by Hassans. The ALLEGATION told me can take things. 22 that for the moment I should not be doing 22 THE CHAIRMAN: 10 o'clock tomorrow? 23 anything." Now, the transcript deals with 23 A. Yes, sir. 24 that but we need to go to the audio file here 24 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. 25 because the transcript does not capture 25 MR SANTOS: Thank you. Page 250 Page 252

1	(Adjourned until 10 o'clock on Tuesday, 16	
2	April 2024)	
3	(17.01)	
	Page 253	

	<u> </u>	1	<u> </u>	1 480 201
A	absence 157:5	51:18,20 59:17	64:11,21 74:11	advantages 108:4
$\frac{11}{\text{A}/19250:16}$	159:19	160:10 184:6	103:21 153:11	108:5,7
A109 112:5,12	absol 47:13	accused 157:2	157:13 164:25	adverse 91:22
A11 211:18,21	absolutely 19:19	achieve 18:23	166:9,10 168:9	advice 5:8 59:25
A119 201:17,20,22	21:6,16,19 24:13	164:19 207:16	188:2 190:4	141:6 159:14
201:23	26:25 39:21	achieved 89:16	acts 125:19	166:18,23 167:6
A1305 181:22	53:18 100:4	97:10,10 205:13	actual 154:17,18	167:11 168:19
A134 58:23 59:12	115:9 154:2	acknowledged	acutely 138:17	169:17 172:11
A1427 171:19	182:12 185:3	193:2,3	adapting 72:2	173:3,5 180:20
A1432 173:13	192:4 219:8	acquainted 76:16	119:12	203:3 222:24
A16 232:13	237:20 242:15	106:21	add 56:3 83:17	223:10 224:2,10
A160 36:23	250:5	act 60:13 96:16	84:3 148:15	224:13 225:10
A190 188:20	absorbing 197:15	136:14 185:19	added 10:16,18	226:2,23 227:8
A191 214:19	absurd 41:10	acted 205:15	180:4 194:10	227:13,21,25
A230 64:6	abundantly	206:24 207:1,4	221:1	230:19 235:15,25
A254 44:24	203:10	215:6	addition 129:4	236:1,11
A264 60:24	accept 21:24 54:21	acting 45:1 208:1	additional 19:1	advise 92:5 176:24
A27 99:11	68:3,22 69:4,7,13	215:22	102:1	187:24 191:8
A277 182:21	69:18,19,21,23	action 35:16 57:3	Additionally 217:2	192:23
A279 192:6	70:1 87:6 89:24	73:20,21 76:8,14	address 42:16	advised 12:9,10
A280 226:11,15	100:2 145:20	86:10,21 87:10	84:12 90:21	55:13 75:5 76:22
A310 228:4	155:25 159:21	87:16 127:3	91:10 97:6 102:9	79:22 80:15
A4 150:19	186:4 224:24	133:6,14,17	102:10 133:19	92:21,24 130:23
A54 90:19 102:16	acceptable 89:20	153:18,20,25	138:3 197:21	131:3 137:23
A63 118:16	accepted 69:16	154:5 159:1	204:24 219:3	145:7,7 156:20
A66 6:19	87:17 90:10	160:6,24 161:5	addressed 86:9	158:22 175:10,11
A7 176:18	123:9,11 140:1	161:14 164:17	89:11,19 97:9	183:1 197:23
A73 25:16	accepting 184:7	165:4,14 166:3	100:22 109:24	199:15,23 200:5
A74 38:18	accepts 58:21	177:1 184:14	169:24 170:6	200:9 201:2
A85 70:16	70:20	185:1,10 187:11	199:12	202:6 203:8
AAP 92:2 93:11	access 127:8,9	201:15 204:16,20	addresses 109:11	206:9 222:20
102:11,13 104:6	179:21	206:16,17 207:15	addressing 80:9	225:3,15 227:9
104:6,7	accident 38:4	226:25	86:25 93:15 97:2	230:11,15
abbreviation 26:3	68:16	actioning 91:7	112:3 166:13	adviser 61:2
ability 94:19	accompanied	110:19	179:4	advises 16:4
able 8:25 17:11	145:16 146:17	actions 6:23 15:5	adjourn 188:14	advising 77:25
40:14 54:13	accompanies	27:14 28:13,14	Adjourned 188:16	141:4,8 191:5
57:17 58:2,4	127:12	70:11 86:23 89:7	253:1	236:17,19 247:16
61:10 79:18	accord 230:12	89:8,11 151:14	adjournment	advisor 52:18
89:11 111:4	account 28:23	151:20,21 177:4	66:17 121:17	advocate 174:21
124:5,15 136:1	128:5 130:5	198:12 220:6	administration	advocating 149:19
165:3 177:7	171:20 179:2	233:19 245:15	135:23 149:7	199:18
178:15 179:12	182:11 183:15	activated 65:20	administrative	afar 119:13
207:16 213:3	184:5 195:3	76:19	125:7	affairs 21:14 29:6
232:1 242:18	203:10 214:18	actively 37:23	admitted 170:25	affidavit 2:9 3:11
243:9 251:12	226:11,16 227:15	127:18	adopt 29:19	3:17,24 4:2
ably 68:9	233:24	activities 65:2	adopted 75:19	11:22 37:7 142:5
abnormal 35:19	accountable 70:11	126:22 238:3	advance 95:17	142:12 225:21,25
abroad 134:5	accurate 13:4	activity 25:25	188:2 242:16	afoot 231:10
	1	1	1	1

Page 255

African 26:1 203:15 204:6 alleged 42:8,19 74:22 90:17 148:16 14	
	19:18
AG 18:24 23:9,13 215:16 216:17 100:3 123:24 98:24 121:25 165:21 16	
25:19 27:13,21 231:10 238:25 126:22 145:19 123:6 145:9 176:16 24	
28:10,12 37:6,12	
37:16,17,22,25 249:12 alleges 43:16 85:5 247:2 161:24 16	
41:11,13 51:4 agreed 19:1 29:3 109:24 answered 35:8 appropriat	
52:18 59:21 60:2 69:21 108:3 allow 1:13 237:9 93:22 42:22 109	
60:4,6,9,13 61:2 113:9 181:19 247:10 answers 193:17 190:23 19	
61:3,5,22 77:13	
78:18 79:1 82:19	,
134:13 135:4,9,9 204:21 225:11 allowing 69:14 104:10 121:22 240:8	00.,
135:13,19 136:4 agreeing 165:3 151:22 123:4,7 appropriat	elv
136:25 137:3,22	•
140:3 142:7 178:18 alluded 112:15 anticipating 68:19 approved 1	
144:23 145:15 agreement 27:22 147:8 192:11 anybody 34:15 226:24	
146:16 147:7	12
148:14 173:15 203:7 204:2 alludes 147:22 189:5 209:14 18:17	
180:10,25 181:4	te
181:4 182:17 ah 103:5 122:4 alternative 139:4 anymore 119:18 13:11	
186:23,24 187:15 194:22 211:10 157:24 185:21 Anyway 190:1 approxima	telv
187:22,25 188:6 ahead 114:22,24 Ambassador 52:3 apart 150:20 5:19 13:14	•
188:8 195:5 214:6 52:12 152:16 April 1:1 9'	7:13
204:19,22,23 aides 46:20 amenable 55:16 Apologised 132:25 114:21 11	
205:4,8,9,25 aim 62:8 232:16 apparently 48:5 140:10,11	,24
208:8,17 224:6 AIS 22:11 23:1 amicable 184:11 63:4 202:20 141:13,25	*
225:1 226:2 24:15 46:19 amidst 229:14 appear 26:10 156:22 15	58:8,11
227:25 232:14 49:12 50:17,18 amount 5:13 50:5 53:22 103:25 171:16 17	-
AG's 179:16 223:8 56:19 65:19 136:15 appeared 24:15 173:17 17	75:3
223:11,15 226:6 AK 153:22 amounts 81:8 76:2 77:25 177:23 17	78:5,19
228:1 248:16 akin 105:22 ample 42:19 appearing 3:22 187:16 22	27:4
agencies 35:6 alarm 148:23 analogy 247:19 appeasing 214:13 243:2 253	3:2
219:3 albeit 36:8 41:7 analyse 50:2 appended 128:25 area 12:14	68:20
Agency 151:1 44:12 77:3 113:22 application 85:24 86:12 101	:23
ago 39:16 83:7 117:15 126:16 analysis 49:11,17 86:2,2 87:13,21 107:3 109	9:21,22
151:8 169:1 135:12 171:4 63:21 222:13 88:21 105:21 134:19	
215:1 Alcaidesa 11:23 anchorage 57:17 161:11 173:14 areas 68:6	
agree 24:17 27:3 12:9,13 anchors 57:16,16 applied 175:25 87:1 94:1	7 97:21
32:9 46:1 49:7 alerted 78:1 218:8 and/or 16:22 applies 191:20 98:6 108:	17
64:21 68:22 96:5 218:14 17:18 233:23 apply 67:23 171:1 115:20	
99:7,18 100:6,8 Algeciras 39:23 anger 196:13 appointed 80:14 argued 172	
107:13,16,16 40:2,14 angle 74:13 139:15 80:18 arguing 13	8:13
109:14 110:2,13 aligned 118:12 angriest 199:19 appointment 199:13	
110:15 113:25 alive 100:7,17 angry 84:10,20 103:23 112:24 argument 1	
116:15 139:9,12 172:13 191:18 85:4 198:6 appreciate 39:17 arises 18:20)
149:12 160:8,9 allegation 116:13 214:16 220:4 90:15,16 157:1 151:11	=
167:22 180:13,17 125:2 149:12 announced 239:10 appreciated 85:13 arising 70:2	
181:11 182:11 231:19 245:5,10 announcing 18:9 approach 29:20 112:24 12	23:22
183:15 184:24 250:6,21 answer 15:10 80:15,20 84:13 126:25	. 1.4
191:10 192:2 allegations 109:5,9 35:10 48:13 104:9 139:14 Armed 136	:14

				1 486 200
arose 5:10 171:23	128:6	222:7	audit 68:13,15	B1552 101:15
arrangement	asserted 157:10	attention 35:21	91:18 117:14	107:1
185:3,13	200:20 202:3,17	63:15 124:22	169:2	B1578 108:23
arrangements	assertive 122:23	125:18	audits 68:4 100:12	B1757 50:24 51:2
243:6	assess 97:23 109:2	attitude 238:6	August 121:23	B1902 232:8
arrest 59:7 160:20	231:15 242:18	attorney 23:7,16	authorise 82:4	B1907 233:8
174:18 218:17	assessment 88:3	23:17 24:19 26:9	authorised 66:24	B1989 158:2
246:12	99:10 102:12	26:19 28:5 30:23	127:8	B3452 164:7
arrested 132:14,17	164:7,8 165:18	32:6 33:9,12	authorities 31:24	B3455 167:15
154:23,24 157:3	165:23	38:11 42:11,14	67:4 71:17	B5050 156:16
189:15	asset 126:24	53:11 55:8,15	authority 12:8	B5736 51:1
arrests 133:2,5,16	assets 17:17,17	61:19 62:18	17:18 22:8 53:1	B74 143:15,21
160:21 189:24	assigned 57:1,8	70:20,24,25 72:7	57:12 58:3,4	186:14,17
arrived 27:9 30:25	assignment 79:12	72:14 73:2,14,24	80:17 87:17 90:3	B749 156:4
79:20 123:9	assist 77:18 111:4	74:5 75:8 77:23	90:12 92:21	B75 195:2 204:17
165:18	assistance 31:23	79:23 80:22,23	96:12 202:4	B98 72:22 73:1
article 76:1 77:16	31:24 120:18	80:25 83:12	automatic 22:11	back 22:17 25:16
articulated 227:18	150:25 152:21	85:18,19 100:2	available 17:16	45:7,12 48:5
articulates 60:21	assistant 4:25	133:23 134:2,6	21:25 39:20	72:9 80:3,6 81:1
ASAP 87:2	241:6	135:24 137:16	53:14 59:20	87:24 92:24
aside 136:4	assisted 24:14	142:5 143:10,17	61:17 65:18	105:17 108:9,17
asked 19:8 28:1,2	associate 220:1	148:22 149:19	168:1 220:23	113:6 123:2
29:2,10 30:9	Associates 92:3	177:25 178:9	aware 9:21 10:2	126:1 132:3
35:3 37:15 61:8	102:13	179:4 180:21	37:12 38:4 43:17	135:7 138:21
61:14 64:4 97:3	Associates' 102:12	181:23 182:10,20	67:4,11 84:6,8	140:22,25 141:3
100:10 105:12,15	assume 52:10 53:9	186:4 192:8,9	110:12 120:24	141:4 142:18
114:15 115:3,5	61:22 242:13	193:7,17,20,25	121:2 134:24	143:25 146:9
121:21 150:8	assumed 61:3	194:19 206:10	138:15,17 143:5	159:5 171:25
166:7 167:1	65:21 100:5	207:5,18 214:21	147:10 169:14	173:23 174:4,9
174:9 179:7	assumption 52:15	221:21 222:25	170:10 175:9	174:10 175:18
181:17 186:5	62:22,24 202:14	223:25 225:9	178:1 186:20	182:9 187:9,12
187:15 192:20	assurance 153:24	226:7,10,15	190:22 208:9	200:25 204:17
196:2 198:10	assurances 154:3	227:15 228:9	211:24 212:9,12	209:9 217:25
200:17 210:18,22	assuring 119:3	229:16,20 230:4	awkward 157:4	221:22 223:11
211:2,4 239:10	Astelon 130:10	230:6 231:1	B	231:7 234:10
241:7	142:25	232:10 233:3,9	b 6:5 9:24 11:14	241:12 243:8
asking 30:11 53:3	atmosphere 91:21	233:19 234:1	13:7 15:23 31:15	245:7 252:10
55:9 78:20 125:6	attached 158:4	251:23	60:8 112:14	backdrop 81:20
136:25 138:10	164:14 172:7	Attorney- 247:23	125:15 143:8	83:20
166:17,20 167:2	191:20	248:14	199:14	background 71:13
179:16 180:10	attempting 214:2	Attorney-General	B/170 241:25	backwards 177:23
206:21 239:3	228:20	235:6 238:3,7,18	B/170 241.23 B/172 243:16	bad 113:23 116:3
244:4 246:8	attend 202:10	240:9 242:1,25	B/172 243.10 B/181 249:4	116:18 190:8
247:11	attended 27:12	245:24 247:15 248:16	B/184 251:3	Baglietto 232:9
asleep 70:14,15	28:11 124:11 128:1 136:8		B100 56:7	bail 157:3 160:5 balance 117:25
aspect 14:7,14 49:3	147:11 163:6	Attorneys 59:24 audio 237:22	B100 30:7 B101 63:2	Bar 206:11,13
aspects 82:3	208:24	250:24 251:1,2,5	B1351 54:1,1	208:10,11
aspects 82:5 assault 125:5	attending 6:13	250:24 251:1,2,5	B1417 229:9 230:3	Barbara 13:15
assauit 123.3	attenuing 0.13	431.7,13	B1548 97:11	Daivala 13.13
			= 10 10 7 / 111	

				1 age 257
14:6,18 18:19	131:7,10 132:15	23:25 24:3 26:6	241:25 245:9,17	brings 88:15
Bárbara 44:3,17	147:22 155:11	29:12 33:6,14,18	brain 14:24 174:8	British 7:2 16:22
bark 105:25 106:1	162:7 172:2,5	45:6 54:7,14,17	brainer 182:15	25:14 44:19
base 94:17 118:21	178:10 194:18	55:14	branch 68:18	49:25 52:2,12
based 24:22 84:15	214:22 215:1	BGTW' 26:8	branded 240:19	64:15
124:8 134:18	218:6 225:9	big 155:2 222:2	breaches 67:8	Britto 52:25 72:18
146:14 156:23	227:2,12 228:14	biggest 195:16	220:9	92:23 93:1,20
157:13 179:11	241:18	bird's 173:10	break 24:24 66:15	95:9,15,16,19,20
222:12	believed 8:10	bit 134:19 178:4	121:10,15 188:13	96:7,24 97:13
baseline 92:12,22	169:15 190:10	186:17 227:20	197:8	99:2 114:19,20
basic 23:21	198:9 221:2	251:4	breaking 184:23	115:2,8,15 117:2
basically 83:23	225:14	bitt 26:5	Brian 130:22	118:3
108:10 117:9	believing 60:15	blame 101:19	131:8	Britto's 96:5
143:13,20 165:15	bells 148:24	Bland 125:12	bridge 110:1	209:24 210:20
165:16 174:10	beneficial 143:1	157:9 167:18	brief 21:20 55:6	211:12
231:19	benefit 91:16	Bland's 159:15	82:22 130:1	broke 84:13
basis 39:13 61:7	101:24 119:21	Blands 149:7	133:22 135:12	brought 14:22
64:25 88:20	149:22 239:9,17	blown 168:10	143:13,20 149:9	24:23 36:7 60:7
164:15 167:25	benefitted 104:22	blue 168:10	177:11 207:13,16	62:16 63:15
168:1 187:1	berated 228:6,10	blunder 195:9	209:7 210:7,19	124:21 135:4
220:23	berater 228:13	board 7:19 8:12	briefed 20:3,19	142:23 216:24
batting 238:9	berating 200:14	23:1 92:25	23:9,19 27:6	241:3
beach 13:15 14:5,6	206:8 228:25	251:11	28:4,5,8 30:13,14	BTGW 56:14
14:12 18:19 44:3	238:1	boat 56:19 67:20	34:15 37:9 62:25	63:23,25 65:23
bear 232:6	best 2:3,14,22 3:6	boats 7:17 49:13	194:6 209:11,13	66:24
bearing 104:5	3:12,18 4:7	body 163:17	209:21 218:24	budge 242:3
becau 157:21	17:13,13 18:20	233:12 241:4,9	219:4	bullet 208:12
beg 14:11 103:7	21:25 22:3 24:1	bold 122:6	briefing 6:20 8:5	bulletin 104:18
236:14	27:17 39:19	bond 122.0 bombarded	12:25 16:3 20:12	bullying 101:20
began 150:20	53:14 54:17	200:16	20:21 22:5 23:6	102:3,4,5,6,6
beginning 30:5	56:14 61:16 96:9	bond 84:21	25:18 26:24	105:5,6,10 106:3
171:15,16	107:10 110:11	borderline 14:8	27:13 28:13,23	105.5,0,10 100.5
behalf 75:25	111:16 119:15	boss 174:11 181:5	31:18 33:1 34:5	122:21
behaving 43:16	124:13 176:5,7	bosses 39:25 43:22	35:13 51:1,3,5,12	bundle 1:20
behaviour 137:7	192:13	bottom 6:25 51:7	51:16 55:5 63:5	123:20 129:6,10
145:19 179:14	betrayed 161:25	56:9,11 60:8	72:4 82:5 114:14	142:4 178:11
belief 2:4,15,23	204:19 229:24	91:1 95:18	154:1 155:9	241:25
3:7,13,19 4:8	better 53:13 54:16	103:11 113:24	209:5,8,18,22	bundles 128:23
77:10 119:14	79:14 82:21	116:7,25 117:9	briefings 15:6	bunker 192:25
124:13 239:14	86:17 97:25 98:8	130:22 132:18	114:9 135:7,13	193:18
believe 1:20 9:7,13	120:4 179:16	182:1 184:2	150:21 151:6	business 87:22
24:1 28:4 46:18	bewilderment	186:17 205:21	150:21 151:0	88:4 103:20
49:16 57:6 64:13	83:13	225:24 235:3	briefly 135:5	113:8 164:3
76:17 87:21	beyond 81:16	241:25 245:18	briefs 186:18	171:24 172:4,15
101:8 105:12	92:22 154:1	249:4	bring 68:6 78:2	171:24 172:4,13
107:17 108:19	155:6 184:21	bouncing 174:25	95:5 125:18	busy 91:8 132:25
113:12 116:3,23	BGCW 8:23	bound 76:23	210:14	
118:1 121:20	BGTW 11:9 17:5	246:16 251:19,20	bringing 91:18	C
125:21 129:20	18:17 21:13	box 18:15 31:16	117:13	C 121:19 130:19
123.21 127.20	10.1/21.13	NUA 10.13 31.10	11/.13	132:15
		<u> </u>	<u> </u>	

				1 age 230
C1659 153:13	94:21 110:25	casualties 18:9	Chair 49:8	chaotic 135:14
C1789 159:23	capacity 98:1	catch 103:22	CHAIRMAIN	137:5
C3344 115:12	191:2	catch-up 1:9,12	237:3	chares 183:12
C3420 116:24	capt 49:19	categorical 200:3	chairman 1:3,17	charge 119:12
C3762 75:23	capture 130:16	230:8 231:18,20	25:3 30:8,15	179:15 221:13
C4088 79:4	179:12 250:25	categorically	45:13,19,22 46:3	247:13,17
C4090 80:21	captured 49:19	224:20 225:1	46:8,13,15,21	charged 246:11
C4096 82:9	100:11 107:20	categorise 155:20	47:7,16,22,25	charges 139:3
C4432 65:13	captures 124:7	cause 18:11 64:17	48:3,8,19,24 49:8	170:10,16,21,25
C4490 148:10	171:9	94:12,13	52:25 66:16	171:3 179:4,5,7
C5251 66:21	capturing 130:16	caused 35:24	105:13 121:9,13	179:11,22 180:1
C556 95:11,18	cards 185:7	45:24 46:3 68:13	122:9 125:12	180:7,12,14,22
C5633 50:8	care 118:6 183:4	123:25 124:23	140:17,20,25	181:1,10,15,24
C593 86:1	career 154:5	126:23	141:18,20,22	182:4 183:10,14
C594 88:24	200:22	caution 172:20	146:22 166:25	184:16 185:11,16
C6503 113:18	careful 115:18	caveat 41:7	169:7,22 170:22	193:10 242:11
ca 40:1	222:13	cemented 229:8	173:2 178:17,21	247:9
cabinet 202:10	carried 27:14	cent 13:22 18:6	188:14 189:9,19	charging 168:19
Caine 135:16	28:16 65:3 67:24	26:12 242:4	190:1 197:3,6	169:17 172:11
144:21 148:2	68:2,4,5,13,15	245:16	210:9,12 211:4	173:2,4
149:24 150:5	204:20 246:18	Centralised 125:3	211:10 229:10	chart 14:22 16:10
221:10	carry 101:12	centre 218:16	237:7,13 252:22	16:10
Calendar 178:10	139:17 157:16	certain 17:7 18:5,6	252:24	chase 24:3 25:8,13
call 5:18 6:1 8:5	164:2 248:24	24:14 26:5,24	Chairman's 211:1	26:7 30:1,20
13:8 29:1 130:20	Caruana 216:4	27:4 31:3,10	challenge 42:20	46:5 50:12 51:10
132:20,23 153:14	246:24	32:7 33:10,13	176:17 204:7	59:2
160:1 173:16	case 8:20,24 23:3	39:13 47:14 49:2	207:24 238:20	chased 163:21
174:24 191:5,7	50:12 60:1,12	124:10 147:8	challenged 5:9	chasing 34:24
231:22 232:1	63:3 73:23 78:7	148:18 150:2	60:20 217:24	164:5
233:6 242:12	80:17 87:23	179:18 182:5	240:15	chat 7:12 156:8,12
248:24,25	109:21 112:23	210:2 224:23	challenges 119:6	229:18
called 5:17 40:20	113:8 124:8,17	242:4,15,25	challenging	chatting 20:5
42:22,23 44:12	129:1 134:24	certainly 16:24	211:25	check 1:24 118:21
82:25 89:13	136:10 138:13	29:17,19 33:20	chambers 223:8	193:4
178:8 182:17	139:19 142:8	34:8 38:17 46:2	223:11,15 226:6	Chief 7:1,3 8:2
202:9 209:9	145:8 150:24	47:11 70:20	228:1 248:16	9:11 10:12 11:5
210:6 223:16	152:20 155:9	81:14 84:8 94:8	chance 83:24	11:10 18:25 19:6
231:6 247:4	156:21 158:24	94:15 97:3 114:7	141:7 165:8	19:10,11,15
calling 94:5	171:2 172:9	142:9 149:21,23	236:7	21:17 26:11,17
180:25 197:20	184:3 185:5,5	184:3 185:6	change 89:5	27:7 32:4,6 33:8
228:23	188:21 189:10,12	199:17 202:13	148:16 149:18	33:11,12 34:1
calm 214:11,15	189:18,20,21	212:8 231:2,24	173:7 229:16	44:16,18 52:1
camera 241:5,9	190:13 191:21,25	certainty 13:22	232:17,18 238:6	53:11 56:2 59:16
candid 239:12	203:4 218:14	14:25 15:6 17:9	changed 1:12	63:18,25 64:3,5
candidly 61:16	219:11 230:25	17:10 22:18	67:25 137:2	64:22 65:1,9
241:21	245:21 247:16	30:17 31:9,12	148:24 172:7,8	71:19,24 72:10
capability 107:11	248:3,12	140:19	172:25	74:7,18 77:8,20
119:2	cases 113:15	Ceuta 31:21 76:2	changes 88:22	77:23 79:6,11
capable 68:10 80:1	248:17	Chair 209:21	channel 52:6	80:10,20,24,24

				1 486 237
82:11 83:13,21	77:6,11 78:24	clout 157:16	68:12 69:25	213:17 217:16
84:6,14,24 85:4	83:6 111:23	CM 7:8 18:16 20:5	colonial 36:20	231:14 244:12
85:15 113:11,12	186:2	25:19 52:13	colony 60:3	comments 61:7
115:13 117:1	claimed 152:2	55:13 60:5 70:25	Comandante 13:9	95:5,6,8,16 111:9
130:8 131:8	203:14 212:2	71:1 195:5,6	come 35:20 43:14	137:16 191:10
133:22,23 143:2	226:1	196:1,2 198:4,5	45:7,12,21 57:18	196:25 197:13
153:6 188:24	claiming 59:16	198:11,14,17	68:8 71:10 80:3	208:8 226:1,22
189:2,7 190:5,20	138:12 151:13	201:7 203:1,11	92:11 105:17	238:19
190:23 191:1,2	236:5	208:8,16 211:23	106:5 132:3	commerce 57:15
192:2,11 193:25	claims 41:9 70:17	212:9 235:12	143:25 154:6	commercial
194:18 196:13,17	81:16 85:1,2	236:8 238:4	188:9 193:9,18	139:24 172:4
196:22 197:10	220:8,10	243:15	202:19 225:7	199:13 204:10
202:8 208:1	clarification 12:2	CM's 52:16 195:6	226:13 232:2	249:18,20
214:1,10,20	12:6 157:2	202:25	238:8 242:8	commissioned
215:21 219:7	clarified 138:1	CMX 128:22	243:7 245:7	87:5 88:2 92:2
221:25 224:8	140:6 184:15	coastal 57:15	comes 42:4 75:24	Commissioner
225:8,11,13	185:2 242:20	coastline 11:24	80:5 81:19	4:24,25 10:1
226:17 227:10	clarify 32:2 87:13	13:24	108:10 168:15	32:25 51:5 81:5
228:9,10,12,24	128:15 166:1	cockpit 181:2	183:25	81:24 82:2 85:25
230:5,7,24 231:9	176:3 180:4	cognisant 91:4	comfortable 62:20	122:4 150:11
231:20 235:18,25	201:10 225:18	col 36:20	77:10 136:25	161:22 163:14
236:4,23	clarity 42:24 58:17	cold 224:24	comfortably 13:21	169:25 170:7
chiming 222:2	classification	collar 197:22	14:20	218:11 229:21
Chipolina 13:8	177:12	217:1,14,15,17	coming 9:4 15:9	232:25
choice 173:24	clean 162:19	colleague 42:11,12	39:12 106:4	Commissioner's
199:6	clear 7:6 26:13	colleagues 78:1	108:2 135:10	122:5 241:5
chose 173:23	55:2 158:19	91:15 163:12	142:20 183:18	Commissioners
Christian 242:12	170:17 180:6	223:15 232:21	213:19,20 217:25	100:17
Chronicle 118:3	184:12,20,24	colleagues' 87:25	240:12	commit 17:11
Chronicle's	194:1 200:8,10	collected 76:25	command 4:22,23	commitments
118:13	200:13 203:10	214:11	5:22 6:2 9:8	79:19
chronology 172:12	205:1 215:4	collective 116:7,22	23:12 65:19	committed 195:11
CI 6:12	221:8 231:17	collision 7:6,18	91:14 93:19	committee 208:11
circumstances	242:2,21	8:10,14,21 9:18	105:4 122:24	committees 206:12
8:15 68:12	cleared 230:23	11:12 12:21	197:21 208:14	common 7:10
220:20 221:9	clearer 54:4 103:8	13:12,21 16:4	209:13	26:19 90:23
240:10	227:20	17:1,6,7 18:17	Commander 7:1	187:24
circumvent 139:5	clearly 7:21 35:10	21:12 23:15,24	commands 106:1	commonly 14:16
civil 12:20 24:6	62:18 63:9	24:7,12,17,18	106:2	communicate
56:18 72:14 73:6	175:14,16 203:19	27:25 30:4,9,18	commence 124:1	176:21
76:16 77:6 78:22	206:18	31:3,10 32:3,15	124:24	communicated
105:22,24 106:2	clip 251:2,5,10	32:17,18,19	commenced 25:14	33:22 52:25 97:4
133:6,14,17	close 35:3 38:2	33:14,24 37:11	123:21 126:3,6	103:24 104:20
144:22 148:2	44:18,19 141:25	38:5,12,22 40:23	commencement	120:21 213:13
150:10 153:20,25	190:18,20 191:8	45:23 46:9 54:5	87:2	communicating
154:5 204:10	194:13 215:12	54:11 55:10	comment 29:22	7:11 53:20 141:6
221:7	closed 180:9	56:13 57:19 59:1	119:16 142:22	communication
claim 71:6,8,9	closer 14:15	59:8,9,18 61:6	169:10 190:19	19:22 37:23
75:8 76:10,16,18	cloud 155:2	63:22,24 65:22	192:3,5 212:22	52:19 219:6

		l	l	1
communications	compliment	conducted 95:12	conscious 133:12	constructive 96:3
9:25 52:14 53:21	106:20	183:3 196:8	236:25	consult 164:24
90:11 118:2	complimentary	conducting 86:18	consciously 69:14	166:8,20 167:5
120:24 121:2	107:20	92:22	consent 167:2,4,6	167:10
216:20	comprised 4:23	confer 174:9	192:1	Consultancy 93:11
community 36:1	compromise 88:14	conference 130:20	consented 148:7	consultants 92:2
88:17 117:8,12	computer 123:23	153:14 160:1	consequence 7:23	consultation 203:6
145:10 195:14	145:12,13 151:3	173:16 252:10	59:5 65:8 88:15	204:2 206:18
compatible 141:10	computer-related	confidence 85:11	136:11	230:17 248:20,20
compelled 195:25	18:5	248:21	consequences	consulted 128:11
249:12	computers 179:21	confident 174:24	24:11 65:12	160:5 175:12
compensation	Concepcion 12:16	confidentiality	73:20 126:25	198:3,21 199:22
72:16	concept 106:10	220:10	196:7,19 220:8	200:6 201:7
competent 68:10	179:10 183:17	confirm 1:25 2:2,8	220:13,16	204:16 206:15
79:25	concern 29:7	2:13,19 3:5,10,11	consequent 135:22	consulting 134:25
complainant 133:3	99:24 109:11	3:16,17,23 4:6	consider 27:5	160:23 166:22
154:7,7,11	126:21 132:1	7:13 17:15 37:10	75:11 76:12 77:7	199:2
161:16 221:9,12	135:20 181:24	54:13 58:5 61:10	79:5 88:9 93:21	contact 18:20 24:5
complainants	182:25 191:16	226:19	98:10 118:8	27:18 38:2 53:10
221:16	concerned 5:6	confirmation 8:13	187:18 190:23	59:20 73:10
complaint 72:15	10:24 13:3 21:22	12:23 13:16	199:20 234:6	84:16 160:14
76:5,6 110:20	23:17 27:6 33:15	17:13,21 24:9	238:23 239:2,3,5	163:16 190:16
123:23 125:14,19	53:15,16 65:10	31:8,13 55:10	239:6 240:4	213:14 248:14
127:15,16 131:5	69:2 74:10 84:18	56:17 59:8 62:9	consideration	contacted 13:18
153:25 154:4,8	109:5 128:16	66:1 78:21	16:17 81:15,19	79:23
154:12,20,25	137:6 145:20	178:13	127:1 164:20	contain 10:20
155:18 250:12,20	172:21 183:6,11	confirmed 11:13	170:24 239:25	contained 9:14
Complaints	208:15 214:3,7	21:23 38:24 51:9	considerations	15:17 114:11
251:11	220:5 227:15	88:4 126:15	36:19 168:17	164:16 213:4
complement 25:9	237:14	176:22 178:12	considered 19:9	contemporaneous
104:7	concerning 82:17	208:24 245:20	79:10 98:17	13:4 194:2,15
complete 86:25	83:9 203:13	confirming 57:2	170:13 179:24	203:22 231:21
111:10 195:9	concerns 36:10	122:13 173:17	183:2 184:4	240:13
completed 4:14	60:21 72:12	confirms 34:4	215:6	content 7:15 71:2
49:15 75:10 87:8	103:14 115:10	conflated 218:21	considering 24:10	75:7 135:11
89:14 247:6	137:7 173:15	conflict 79:3 125:1	30:6 88:12 101:6	175:7
completely 109:17	238:23 249:16,21	conflicted 78:17	179:17,23 198:7	contention 184:8
193:22 200:24	concert 24:22	79:21	considers 60:4	context 89:10 92:4
218:20 237:4	concluded 101:1	conflicting 8:19	223:8	101:10 111:6
completion 87:3	concluding 59:13	confuse 102:13	conspiracy 123:25	187:14 199:5
complex 12:14	94:3	confusion 45:22	145:14 167:24	215:17 217:14,15
126:17 164:22	conclusion 75:12	224:6	179:22	223:4 224:5
complexities	79:20 89:1,3	conjunction 58:3	Constabulary	225:16
134:24	238:8	105:9	99:10	contextualise
compliant 50:4	conclusions 98:10	connected 84:14	constantly 39:12	87:10
complicated 18:4	98:18 167:21	111:12 134:15	constitute 125:21	continue 133:17
33:23 156:13	condition 146:10	189:25	constitutional	157:3 158:25
complications	conduct 99:20,21	connection 129:18	21:13	221:4 237:19
34:20 43:23	99:23,24	129:21 130:7	constraints 246:19	continued 66:18
	1	1	1	1

				1 486 201
66:20 234:11	16:19 17:21,25	cost 112:24	created 43:3 86:11	158:12
continues 26:2	22:9 25:10 32:5	Costa 118:15	creation 86:14	crude 246:17
132:24	33:10 40:22,25	Costa 118.13	219:2	crying 128:8
contract 167:19	41:4,5,16,22,24	Cotton 57:10	credit 50:10,15	CS 6:16 144:25
	41:25 42:1 51:2	cou 43:16	· ·	145:8
contrary 43:4 65:20 139:25			crew 7:20 46:10,22 75:25	cue 37:2
	54:10 65:16,16	counsel 5:8 75:2,4		cue 37:2 cuff 21:1 124:15
contrasted 160:17	65:24 CoP 51:8 130:24	79:3 80:6,13,18 83:5 136:8 209:1	crewing 81:17 crews 50:3	cull 21:1 124:13 culmination 32:16
contrasting 87:19				culture 116:4
160:16	132:23 162:4 231:6	212:7 223:7	crime 66:4,6 86:16	
contributed 46:2 75:9		Counsel's 223:16	88:16,16 92:15	current 60:4 108:25
	copy 90:21 144:5,9 158:4 169:4	counter 109:6	151:1 195:11	
contributes 149:10		counter-corrupt	197:23 204:9	cursor 20:17
control 12:11 53:1	core 112:17	107:11	217:14,15,17	Customs 36:4
122:25	126:19	counterpart 74:3	crime' 217:1	cut 200:11
convened 6:10	Cornelio 125:20	counterparts 40:3	criminal 36:12,21	cuts 171:12
convenient 66:14	132:14 189:11	64:20	73:22 74:11	CV 118:23
98:22 188:12	cornered 205:2	counts 171:4	125:21 130:17	cyber 127:5
convenors 112:25	Corners 153:19	179:10,19,23	133:9,9 135:1	Cyprus 94:18
113:10	coronal 73:21	180:4,5	136:10 139:24	D
Convent 251:25	coroner 77:3	county 108:17	141:5 145:8,19	
252:2	corps 246:22	couple 10:13 57:9	160:4 172:6	D 225:11
conversation	correct 5:20 8:2	79:17 136:17	179:14 195:13	daily 103:20
16:15 19:15	14:17 16:8 32:1	163:11 202:7	196:4,23 197:11	damage 205:18
32:10 38:16 42:7	34:10 42:9 43:25	221:22	199:17 204:8	218:15 219:1
138:8,20 196:11	44:1 52:22 58:21	coupled 238:15	205:1,4 225:17	222:7
199:5 202:2	70:21 71:7,14	course 1:5 4:15	227:3 233:1	damages 81:8 83:7
214:25 215:3	116:2 131:1	11:18 25:18	238:13 250:20	220:9
220:4 232:4	142:7 145:13	38:20 79:9	251:21	damning 115:17
234:2,7,16,18	152:24 186:16	150:20 164:17	criminality 59:4	116:14,15
235:7 239:10,11	194:3 236:15,21	165:4,14 166:2	126:16 206:14	data 13:16,20
conversations	corrected 110:24	177:1 220:3	criminals 100:21	17:14 22:16 66:8
142:17 217:5,11	114:11 213:10	221:4 226:25	crisis 83:1	76:25 92:4 212:3
Converse 138:14	228:2	court 198:15,19	criteria 105:8	221:1 240:2
Conversely 80:13	corrections 144:16	220:19,21 222:4	critical 7:17 72:1	date 75:7 79:7
convey 28:21	corrects 144:10	222:5	99:14 115:2	87:2,3 124:2,4,10
conveyed 96:2	correlate 18:7	courtesy 72:8	138:6	124:18 126:1
conviction 145:10	correspondence	190:7	criticise 93:14	128:13 138:8
convinced 60:22	170:6 232:7	cover 49:10 95:12	criticised 89:23	140:13 144:23
182:8,13 225:17	corroborate 177:7	231:6,24,25	criticism 99:15	162:25 163:7
Cooper 151:12	corrupt 100:19	covering 157:25	100:2 120:21	172:23 178:4,9
cooperate 190:11	107:12 108:1	Covid 71:25 73:18	cross-border	178:13
220:22	corruption 96:4	114:9,14 118:23	64:11	dated 85:25
cooperating 159:6	98:15,19 100:8	Covid-19 83:1	Cross-examined	125:16 132:17
cooperation 25:22	100:15 106:25	coxswain's 67:19	66:19	151:8
25:24 64:11	107:2,5,13,15,19	cr 36:21	crossing 108:18	dates 41:10 83:20
74:11 190:13,17	107:23,24 109:5	crack 139:17	crown 75:4 79:3	171:5
coordinates 12:24	109:7,9,10,12	237:10	80:6 212:6 223:9	DaVincenzi 243:6
13:12 14:18,19	119:9 221:5	crashed 48:6	223:16	Davis 118:11,13
14:23 15:14	COS 13:10	create 87:7	crucial 58:11	121:1
				day 34:17,19 35:16
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	ı	<u> </u>

				1 age 202
37:8 72:16 76:1	dear 118:20	145:14 167:24	descent 26:1	213:23
78:11,19 82:18	120:12	degree 30:13	describe 213:25	development
115:14 133:2	death 18:20 27:18	150:2	described 43:2	86:19 101:22
143:24 156:22	deaths 25:25 40:16	degrees 13:12,13	67:1 76:7 125:20	deviance 139:24
161:9 208:22	debate 198:12	delegated 181:6	162:10 213:25	172:5
	debrief 45:1 94:1	Delhi 84:23 85:6	231:19	
210:10,11 213:7				device 110:21,25
213:8 229:19	debriefed 94:8	121:7 123:18,21	describes 29:18	111:1,3,14
232:15 235:23	deceased 73:11	127:21 131:13,15	118:3	198:18
237:25 238:21	76:4	131:16 133:25	describing 142:16	devices 110:9
239:8 242:5	December 125:16	136:5 147:13,16	description 162:18	195:24 212:1,5
day-to-day 150:12	126:10 127:17	150:13,16 152:4	desire 97:4	216:20 217:3
daybook 131:12	decide 177:2,14	152:13 156:6,8	desktop 194:8,25	devil's 174:21
131:14,18 159:24	187:21 189:2	163:22 171:23	despatch 9:8	Devincenzi 178:1
159:25	198:16 222:5	203:2,13 210:2	despatched 76:19	Devincenzi's
days 54:19 61:12	decided 7:8 29:1	211:25	despite 7:5 221:19	181:21 184:5
79:5,17 83:7	187:17	Delhi-specific	destroy 190:12	DI 13:8
85:3 114:10	decision 88:20	136:18 147:13	195:18 218:4	Diane 118:21
160:21	102:23 139:13,14	deliver 89:6 92:14	219:23	119:15
daytime 1:10	155:13,19,21,21	246:24	detail 16:5 24:24	diary 79:18
DCI 5:18,24 6:1	166:19 173:20	delve 88:7	41:1 59:23 88:8	died 8:13
6:21 12:19 13:17	190:8 196:3,23	demand 88:23	104:5 106:22	different 53:20
13:19 20:12,19	197:11 205:3	97:24	110:16 116:19	107:25 111:3
22:6 23:11	208:4,6 226:21	demands 89:23	130:15 138:11	145:22 171:4
de 12:15 76:2	231:3,13 238:22	demeanour 84:15	143:25 154:2	218:21 244:14
deadline 153:22	decisions 152:7,16	208:16 214:1	164:18 165:11	difficult 29:14
deal 6:3 27:10	245:2	229:16	169:21 173:11	81:12 126:18
35:21 47:5 50:25	declared 66:4	demonstrate 74:10	200:15 222:19	227:12
71:8,9 73:19	declined 232:23	89:22 103:16	233:22	difficulty 237:15
88:18 92:11,17	dedicating 101:6	demonstrating	detailed 81:23	dignitaries 163:9,9
102:5 122:18	dedication 120:14	64:9	details 22:5 35:3	dignity 106:8
143:6 175:8	deemed 49:9	denies 228:6	51:10 55:18	digressed 74:23
177:13 198:3,21	deep 34:25	deny 41:13	82:22	dimension 14:4
201:6 221:23	deeper 113:22	Dep 130:24	detections 88:16	dimensional 14:2
232:7 244:22	deeply 62:15 146:7	department 12:4	detective 45:1 57:9	diminished 116:1
dealing 7:16 8:9	183:5	22:25 101:9	57:10,25 131:8	diplomatic 29:4
12:13 21:1 35:17	Defence 7:2	departmental	detectives 56:25	36:17 38:7 64:17
35:22 36:1,11,15	defend 175:7	99:23	determination	73:19 168:5
60:18 138:18	177:4 226:21	departure 109:15	186:11	dipped 116:18
202:13 217:1	defendants 152:13	dependent 87:20	determine 41:23	direct 61:15 75:8
dealings 135:18	189:24	depending 67:9	57:5 62:4 107:10	80:20 248:14
deals 71:6 123:19	defended 176:9	depends 99:21,23	151:20	directed 6:1
169:12 250:23	definitely 93:14	147:19	determined 33:2	directing 249:22
dealt 51:1 92:17	129:11 138:9	deployed 168:6	40:24 41:4 51:10	direction 252:2
100:15,20 104:6	140:24 141:2,25	deprive 167:18	51:18	directive 116:10
104:7 113:10	147:11,19,25	depth 99:4	develop 107:7	directly 61:9 64:3
144:21 148:2	194:12 208:24	deputy 5:1 130:25	133:11	71:24 77:8 78:8
149:4 150:9	232:4	131:9	developed 24:22	82:2 113:11
170:19 226:4	definitive 157:5	derailing 108:11	43:2 67:19	Director 150:25
245:15	defraud 123:25	derailment 108:21	106:24 113:8	156:19 224:10
	I	I	I	I

				1 age 203
disadvantage	discussing 29:24	73:25 76:24,24	231:4,6,7,13,22	212:23 231:5
108:8	41:21 63:9	77:2 82:20 109:6	232:1 235:15,21	235:6
disadvantages	213:15	179:17 184:2	236:10,17,18	earliest 194:15,16
108:6	discussion 41:25	190:4 193:11	240:9 245:19,20	early 7:7 8:3,6
disagree 27:3	139:22 156:10	195:8 228:22	245:20	15:4 16:18 39:23
99:18 111:7	162:2 177:15	238:2 250:22	DPP's 75:4 79:20	75:5 82:25
139:12 216:10,14	184:11	doodling 181:13	166:18 177:9	136:22 178:6
219:20	discussions 38:8	doors 242:21	181:5	237:9
disagreement	135:23	dos 230:25	Dr 72:17 93:20	easier 108:12,22
178:2	dishonesty 167:20	dots 238:2	95:8,15,15,19,20	144:8
disappointed	disjointed 196:16	double 217:25	96:5,24 97:13	easily 222:15
81:22 82:14 84:9	dismisses 198:4	doubt 16:7 19:19	114:19,20 115:8	east 13:15 18:18
115:22	201:8	21:6 35:25 80:14	115:15 117:2	44:16 246:20
discharges 35:15	disorder 36:2,8	94:20 155:1	210:20 211:12	eastern 11:24 26:6
disciplinary	displayed 65:24	172:19 176:1	drabs 8:18	57:16
144:22 147:20	dispose 191:17	177:7 178:4	draft 15:19 67:14	eastwards 13:25
148:3 149:5	195:18	229:2	95:14 96:25	easy 96:21 113:23
150:10 206:12	dispute 72:23	doubting 15:1,7	123:9	116:6 119:6
207:10 208:11	75:17 85:13	doubts 94:19	draw 62:11 106:6	198:4 201:8
221:23	147:4 169:20	DPP 73:15 74:25	176:13	222:19
disciplined 105:23	183:7 199:13	75:5 76:13,22	drawing 92:25	Ed 118:11 119:15
122:22	204:10,11 249:18	77:12 78:14,16	drawn 167:21	educationalist
disclose 135:11	disputed 40:19	78:25 79:21 82:6	dressing 200:22	96:8
220:25	disputes 249:20	83:9 133:24	dribs 8:17	effect 29:16 51:12
disclosed 54:19	disqualified 250:8	135:3 138:4	driven 116:7	195:7 196:1
129:11 161:3,8	disrespect 42:18	139:22,23 145:2	dropped 148:18	205:5 206:11
178:11 224:21	disrespecting	145:5 156:5	drove 234:9	220:5 247:12
disclosure 129:7	60:16	158:21 160:6,24	238:21	248:10
132:11	disruptive 168:5	164:24 165:16	drug 25:25 218:12	effected 133:5
discourage 111:18	dissatisfied 90:12	166:8,21 167:2,8	due 40:15 53:10	effective 67:23
discovery 221:1	dissecting 32:14	168:21 171:15,22	90:3 91:2 207:9	68:1 69:2
discreet 168:12	distance 13:23,24	171:25 172:5,15	dust 15:4	effects 18:12
discuss 60:11 64:3	44:2 54:16	172:17,23 173:15	duties 70:13	efficiencies 112:16
70:22 73:24	distancing 72:2	173:17,25 174:4	112:18 220:20	113:10
96:14,17 114:21	distinct 30:3	174:10 175:4,9	duty 9:15,17 12:7	Efficiency 112:8
144:1,19 146:2	distinction 58:25	175:19 176:5,10	209:15 251:19,20	efficient 69:2
180:25 208:19	62:11 105:23	176:21 177:15,16	dwelled 174:7	effort 116:7,22
232:16 235:5	106:7	181:2,6 182:10	dying 163:25	efforts 57:20 88:14
discussed 13:5	document 6:6	184:17,19 185:18	dynamic 15:2	Ehm 249:9
27:15 28:17 41:1	122:13 164:16	186:23 187:7,10	19:24	eight 54:24 97:21
41:7 85:20	167:16 168:19,23	198:3,22 199:3		98:6 115:20
114:23 115:3	169:24	199:21,23 200:3	<u>E</u>	either 22:12,16
128:3 135:3	documentation	200:6,8 201:7,12	e 80:2 201:25	23:2 25:13 44:25
142:10 145:2,23	100:13	203:4,7 204:2	202:24	85:16 128:25
147:16,18 160:7	documents 72:20	212:6 223:13	e.g 211:25	148:17 170:1
160:9 162:1	164:14 221:1	224:6,14 225:2,2	earlier 15:25 36:3	171:10 173:15
185:8 187:13	dog 28:24	225:6,10 227:8,8	45:18 63:19 85:3	185:15 210:6
208:13 227:3,5	doing 20:2 34:24	227:13,22 228:2	102:23 112:15	El 76:2 77:16
242:5	42:10 69:20	230:8,13,15,20	121:21 153:15	elaborate 203:21
			158:1 187:4	
	=	-	-	-

elaborated 10:6	engage 18:21	243:16 251:6	101:20 102:9	Excellency 78:7
203:19	71:17 75:2 125:1	equipment 57:15	104:1 110:11	excessive 183:12
elaboration	engaged 19:14	equivalent 94:24	111:17 125:22	exchange 11:7
219:14	57:11 70:13	er 235:12,16	126:20 129:15	43:4 54:2 95:19
element 24:4	82:19 202:7	erm 235:12	135:6,10 142:13	156:4 163:18
108:18 153:19	235:15 236:10	error 17:25 124:6	143:11,12,18,19	174:2 222:14
eliciting 47:6	engagement 40:11	ES 25:24	144:24 145:1	251:3
email 6:7 15:24	40:13 43:7	especially 96:3	157:9,13 159:17	exchanged 219:7
32:23 33:23 34:7	engaging 43:6	190:13	159:22 160:16	exchanges 101:24
34:9,11 35:12	235:20	essence 29:24	169:14 171:9	excuse 47:8 89:9
39:15 51:3 80:24	England 101:25	115:18	172:25 175:2	89:10,21
81:15 82:8,10,11	105:17	establish 29:8	177:8 179:13	excuses 84:25
95:21 115:13	English 96:8 195:7	40:14 79:13	190:12 191:17	executed 192:18
116:25 118:16	enhance 55:24	141:16 158:19	195:19 198:2	203:3 207:14
121:20,23 143:22	101:8	established 60:2	201:6 209:25	executing 191:24
145:21,25 146:15	enjoyed 181:3	67:21 187:2	210:21 211:12,24	execution 215:7
149:15 157:25	enjoying 119:17	223:6	212:12 216:12	222:8
164:13,15 165:1	enlightened	establishing 22:17	218:4 219:23	executive 158:25
169:3,8 182:24	162:16	28:18 54:10 57:1	221:5 224:17	160:6 161:5
186:14 194:5	enquire 148:23	ethics 98:8	246:24 247:9	207:14
203:17 204:18	enquires 180:8	Europa 8:22 9:2	evident 21:16	exemplary 42:13
210:12 232:13,14	enquiries 193:15	9:19	39:11 65:5	exercise 182:8
232:17 233:2,9	enquiring 17:16	eva 43:15	165:22	exhausted 180:16
emailed 78:14	135:9	evasive 41:12,14	evidently 82:14	exhibit 243:22
169:5 194:11	enquiry 58:9 83:8	42:8 43:12	101:3	exhibited 129:2
213:6,8	ensure 18:24	evasively 60:13	evolving 101:10	234:14
emails 80:22 169:6	164:24 166:8	evasiveness 62:14	ex 223:15	exigencies 89:7
230:4	205:10 206:3	evening 38:11 63:6	exact 32:2,18	existed 91:23
embarrassing	ensuring 166:10	event 60:14 188:4	40:22 41:4,23	existence 109:19
137:4 142:14,23	entered 185:14	200:19 222:17	51:9,14,17 54:10	expect 70:6 99:1
embarrassment	195:5	events 81:25 90:7	57:2,5 75:7	250:11
135:22 149:6	entertain 205:6	144:1 188:11,19	128:13 198:22,24	expectant 17:14
embraced 101:5	entertaining	229:7	exactly 46:5 50:11	expected 67:6,8
embracing 119:12	250:15	eventually 47:23	176:3 178:2	72:15 97:22,25
emotion 196:13	entire 93:18	129:25 130:3,11	231:2 251:7,7	117:16 147:17
emotional 229:25	entirely 45:23 81:3	159:9 180:15	examination 68:18	212:9
emphasis 177:11	98:12 129:11	252:15	Examination-in	expecting 68:16,17
emphatically	148:18 234:21	everybody 70:7	1:19	expeditiously 83:4
157:10	entitled 21:25	128:9 149:8	examine 110:10	expenditure 19:2
employees 107:12	48:15 101:15	213:5 238:25	examined 90:5	82:5
107:12	117:12	evidence 4:16 5:17	examining 110:25	experience 171:8
employment 90:5	entonces 230:24	10:7 17:14 23:16	example 67:16	188:5
encounter 101:20	entries 50:11	26:21 28:22 47:6	93:9 100:1	expert 50:22 99:8
ended 149:10,17	153:16 156:7	55:24 56:12,15	131:24 136:20	expertise 107:6
180:10 248:5 ends 54:12 193:14	entry 13:7,19 16:2 86:21 104:15	58:6,7,11,14,18	153:12 179:9 217:6 218:7	216:25 experts 127:6
ends 54:12 193:14 enforcement 52:9		61:8,24 63:23 70:19 71:4 75:16	217:6 218:7	experts 127:6
74:13 128:1	130:23 132:17,22 153:23 159:24	75:18 84:24	examples 136:18	explain 12:13 35:15 64:5 71:23
200:22	160:3 161:17,20	85:12 87:6 100:3	152:12	90:2,9 130:2
200.22	100.5 101.17,20	05.12 07.0 100.3	134.14	70.4,7 130.4
			l	l

				1 age 203
154:2 162:1	extracted 212:4	152:13 163:20	features 124:4	final 2:10,20 3:25
205:3 206:21	extraction 13:17	237:9	featuring 143:2	15:21,22 22:6
233:11,11 247:21	66:8	fairly 17:7	February 95:14	30:25 39:5 65:13
251:15	extradition 81:9	fairness 98:8	111:25 118:19	65:15 67:25
explained 23:12	extreme 185:5,5	120:3 157:2	164:11	70:18 75:14 89:2
27:16 37:9 64:4	extremely 35:23	fall 15:15 73:20	fed 140:2	94:7 95:17 97:12
75:15 93:16	84:9,9,20,20	101:21	Federation 91:23	108:23 110:8
126:23 139:16	184:17 238:11	families 35:25	92:5,6 93:25	132:22 171:21
151:15 152:5	eye 71:25 163:16	70:9 73:11 83:6	105:10,16,18	186:18
153:8 183:5	163:24 173:10	family 72:15 76:3	106:9,15	Finance 80:19
220:17 223:4	229:6,13,15	118:22	feedback 139:1	financial 92:23
224:3 226:4	227.0,13,13	far 1:7,8 5:6 13:3	feeding 39:12	127:22 133:24
233:18 235:19	$\overline{\mathbf{F}}$	15:10 21:21	59:21 62:19 77:5	143:3 153:7
241:12	face 55:6,6 96:20	23:16 27:5 31:13	feel 8:4 42:22	154:10 156:17
explaining 74:8	113:21 196:16	53:15,16 54:8	96:11 114:5	218:16 220:8
181:14 204:4	202:22,22 220:7	67:4,11 69:1	120:4 149:9	find 48:21 99:3
232:24 233:19	faced 27:17	108:12,22 128:16	159:5 161:22	104:24,25 115:17
explains 105:3	facilitate 43:6 47:5	160:14 172:20	181:2 186:15	115:22 124:5
explains 103.3 explanation 19:23	facility 1:9	175:9 184:5	192:8 196:24	128:23 158:4
21:2 48:20 64:22	facing 221:13	200:19 214:3,6	197:12 214:1,5	178:15 210:22
83:15 155:4	fact 15:8 17:10	227:14 237:13	228:20 229:3	213:3 245:8
162:14 233:14	24:2,15 33:15	252:20	240:11,11 242:24	251:12
explanations 97:7	41:21 43:19	Faro 76:2 77:17	feeling 197:3	finding 80:11
233:25	44:25 55:23	fashion 118:1	feels 161:25	findings 67:15
explore 79:15	59:10 61:14 63:3	135:12 207:25	fellow 163:11	82:23 100:23
explored 43:9	74:6 84:15 85:16	fast 6:22 15:2,5,5	232:20	106:20
202:15	88:1 89:13 90:23	fatal 158:13,16,18	felt 48:14 62:16	finds 82:8 157:4
exploring 27:19	93:25 94:6 95:1	fatalities 7:20	89:16,18 103:15	fine 55:16
exposed 207:4	96:13 100:18	fatality 36:6	105:4,7 133:3	finer 169:21
exposure 107:4,15	105:12 111:24	fathom 34:23	165:16 196:2	finger 159:8
107:24 109:4	118:1,15 122:18	fault 234:21	205:2 229:23	finish 193:19
express 99:15	136:7 157:22	faulty 22:12 23:2	238:10	237:8
115:10 135:13	159:11 169:23	47:21,23	Fetan 143:4	finished 49:16
expressed 63:11	176:21 182:12	favour 153:25	Field 5:18,24 6:1	118:18 216:2
93:20 100:10	183:21 206:24	154:4 199:23	6:12,22 12:19	Finlayson 130:22
135:20 142:9	207:1,3,14 227:2	205:16	13:17,19 16:3	131:9
145:18 175:12,19	229:17 237:22	favourable 113:15	20:12,19 22:6	fire 133:8
232:21	243:8,9 244:20	FCDO 32:23	23:11	firearms' 70:12
expressing 83:12	248:5 250:6,19	33:22	Field's 15:7	firm 77:11 80:8
expression 63:1	251:21	FCO 31:25 33:16	fifth 3:9 36:24,25	101:16 190:15
expressly 150:7	factor 149:6	51:3	37:1,4 156:7	195:16 215:5
extent 59:23 156:2	factors 87:20	fear 205:16	225:21,25	firmly 11:9
156:2 199:3	149:8 218:13	feature 96:16	fifty 44:9	first 1:22,23 5:15
224:23 228:13	facts 23:21 33:2	123:11 170:3	figure 33:25 143:1	22:13 31:16
external 21:14	factual 55:16	177:10,19 212:25	figures 50:2,2	32:24 54:18 60:2
29:5 80:13,17	failed 38:1	featured 36:18	file 72:15 154:8	64:8 81:5 89:2
92:18 244:5	failings 69:5	49:14 74:12	194:23 243:21	95:11 97:16,17
extra 119:16	failures 68:3	113:7 130:11	250:24	98:19 99:11
extract 22:15	fair 13:20 98:11,18	153:5	filed 145:3 250:13	102:6,19 118:21
	98:25 127:17			, , ,
	l	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

				1 age 200
121:19 123:18	251:3	179:15	front 1:20 3:21	176:23
124:2 126:13	followed 67:5,7,12	formed 156:14	40:12 51:22	future 83:6 115:25
129:16 131:24	78:10 114:12	former 118:17	59:14 88:14	241:17
132:2 133:20	219:5 229:7	120:25 121:3	126:20 127:3	
134:22 142:11	following 23:18	152:12	223:18 226:7	G
150:18 152:14	27:7 38:8 40:10	forth 20:4 36:22	245:12,13 249:9	Gagerro 250:4,7
153:17 155:9	40:11,13 43:20	88:18 92:15	frontline 113:7	Gaggero 125:13
172:14 179:2	67:2 72:16 78:11	126:19 130:14	fronts 135:15	126:15,21 127:4
181:16 183:7	78:15 173:2,4	136:21 139:3	FRS 81:21 90:22	127:10 129:14,18
189:6 190:16	190:6 193:8	165:7 240:19	fulfilled 202:11,12	130:1,15 131:2
210:1 211:3,18	210:9 213:8	forthcoming	full 18:2 54:19	132:2,6,21 133:1
211:21 219:19	215:2 229:19	112:23	82:22 90:16	133:12,15 154:14
226:23 231:8	follows 7:14 25:21	forthright 215:5	107:7 117:3,6	155:15 160:1,13
232:12 240:23	28:24 33:4 51:7	forward 26:18,21	168:10 186:20	161:20 162:10,17
241:1	226:20	74:20 75:23 79:4	fully 43:17 68:17	163:8
firstly 61:7	foot 64:18	116:21 119:1	76:16 91:4	Gaggero's 125:22
Fischel 75:24	footage 63:21	forwarded 26:16	106:21 107:4,14	129:14 159:15
78:20	233:13 241:9	78:12 100:13	100:21 107:4,14	gain 186:8
		115:5	205:17	Gallagher's 84:12
fishing 14:15 five 5:22 6:10,14	footing 80:8 166:13	forwarding 72:17	function 163:7	game 231:10
13:13 40:7 98:2	force 86:16 94:24	82:11	functioning 56:20	gaps 110:2
98:7 121:15	97:20,22 98:8	forwards 26:22	68:9	Garrett 57:11
160:21 182:1	101:17,23 104:20	80:23 111:19	functions 68:18	Gary 45:2
245:18	107:3 118:25	177:22	fundamental 81:6	gathered 144:25
fix 116:6	119:4 219:3	found 8:24 46:10	81:13	211:25
fixed 113:25	243:25 244:8	46:22 47:22	fundamentally	gathering 209:19
fixes 96:21	Force's 98:5	57:24 67:16	119:5	gauge 132:4
flared 196:15	108:25 119:6	73:22 95:25	funding 79:11	GBC 1:8
flawed 243:18	Forces 7:2 136:14	97:20 108:1	furious 214:17	GC 13:9,15 38:21
244:7	Foreign 52:11	110:8 115:19	further 7:24 11:11	40:13,15,20,20
flippancy 29:17	54:23	196:7,19 220:13	11:17 22:5 37:16	40:25
	foremost 118:21	221:5 227:12	51:4 54:12 55:17	general 23:7,18
flippant 29:13 42:8	124:2	four 5:1,19 7:19	55:17,24 56:3,3,5	24:20 26:9,19
flow 20:7	forensic 151:3	22:7 70:14 86:20	63:5,8 75:9	28:6 32:6 33:9
fluid 32:10 160:15	forever 120:1,16	90:24,25 148:13	81:18 86:10 87:4	33:12 38:11
focus 14:3,3 35:14	forget 118:9 163:7	153:18 160:5	88:21 89:19	42:11,15 53:11
58:13 95:10,23	229:20	205:20	93:18 99:6	55:8,15 59:24
119:8 140:12	form 16:18 19:14	fourth 2:25 3:2	103:21 106:24	60:25 61:19
219:17	43:13 85:21	51:8 156:7	113:23 125:17	62:19 64:9 70:20
focused 19:25	101:7 110:19	233:10	140:16 164:20	70:24 71:1 72:7
36:16 38:3 93:24	122:17 205:10	FP's 225:25	165:2 180:18	72:14 73:2,14,25
213:19	206:2 228:17	frame 182:14	184:14,20 185:9	74:6 75:8 77:23
	formal 24:8	fraud 136:9	186:6 190:19	79:23 80:23,23
focusing 75:17 183:14 198:20	156:14	free 156:7 186:15	192:3 197:17	80:25 83:12
				85:18,19 99:22
219:12,13,16 follow 1:13,17:3	formality 170:8	frequency 136:2	208:7,8,12 213:9	100:2 118:11
follow 1:13 17:3	formally 37:10	Friday 169:15	219:14 230:23	121:1 133:23
26:20 27:17	125:18 131:6	friend 191:3	240:19 243:11 246:3	134:2,6 135:24
155:17 159:19	format 115:3	friendships 5:11		137:16 143:10,17
172:12 188:22	126:17 170:22	5:12	Furthermore	148:22 149:19
				1 10.22 177.17

				Page 207
151 1 177 25	02 10 06 25	142 0 15 140 10	202 2 11 12	(1 20 114 25
151:1 177:25	92:19 96:25	143:8,15 148:10	202:3,11,12	61:20 114:25
178:9 179:4	101:10 122:12	150:18 153:13	204:14 214:6	252:3,11 CP 112:10
180:21 181:23	146:4 153:22	154:9 156:4	220:15 225:6,6	GP 113:10
182:10 183:13	188:1 192:20	158:2 159:17,23	226:18 228:16	GPA 41:10 87:5
186:4 192:8,9	195:2,22 236:6	161:17 164:6	234:4 237:7	109:10 148:12
193:17,25 194:19	239:25	165:25 166:4	242:7,12,12	202:25 209:3,22
199:11,21 206:10	given 7:7 8:3 20:13 21:13 29:3 32:3	167:15 168:10,16	244:4,8,22 247:6	250:19 251:13,14
207:5,19 214:21 221:21 222:25		168:18 171:19	247:8,10,17	252:14,16,18 CDE 7:2 102:0 10
	33:7,10 36:2,11	181:15 182:20	248:2,19,25 250:9 252:18	GPF 7:3 102:9,10
223:25 225:9	37:21 38:1 39:17	184:10 188:19		102:25 103:12,14
226:7 228:9	39:18 41:1 52:15	191:20 195:9	gold 6:3,9 Gomez 148:11	104:2,3,5 112:25
229:20 230:5,7	53:2 59:24 79:4	201:16,25 204:14		grace 192:21
231:2 232:10	90:8 91:8 118:22	204:17 209:2	good 5:5 25:23,24	Grande 52:4
233:9,20 234:1	119:2 145:21	211:17 214:18	54:3 57:25 63:10	granted 222:4,6,11
247:24 248:15	147:16 152:12	225:2,21 226:18 228:4 229:9	68:11 91:12	grapple 15:12
251:24	153:25 164:21		92:19 95:3 96:21	grateful 104:14 224:20
General's 23:16 30:23 142:5	168:3 175:4 180:20 187:15	230:3 232:11 234:7 235:2,22	110:10 121:10 163:12 181:3	
		,		gravity 24:10 67:9
182:20 193:7,21	190:17 199:5	237:11,16 241:24	188:3 191:5	great 16:7 145:2
226:11,16 227:15	218:15 225:10	243:16 250:16,24	195:16 215:1	237:14
229:16 233:3	238:23 249:20 252:20	251:1 252:17	228:15	greatly 81:22 218:13
generalised 217:16		God 239:16	government 21:18	
generally 69:23	gives 65:15	goes 93:18 108:17	21:18 87:24	green 174:11
generallyon 203:8	giving 101:12 125:25 231:11	122:3 GOG 35:2	113:3 127:22,24	175:1,5 176:8
generate 180:5 generic 106:12	244:23	going 5:15 21:8	135:16 138:12,14 141:8 148:6	greeted 163:19 grey 134:19 136:6
genuinely 198:9	glad 240:20	25:1 26:17 42:16	149:3 157:19	161:21,24,24
getting 20:3 54:9	gloss 75:21	53:25 65:12 68:6	159:6,11,20,21	162:4,8,13,19
54:15 61:13	gloss 75.21 gloves 244:19	68:17,19 69:7	161:23 185:24,25	246:15
139:1 200:21	go 4:4 6:18 9:24	70:6 71:10 74:7	186:1 220:7	grievance 106:22
202:16,23 210:20	11:14,25 12:3,7	75:23 79:13 80:3	221:8,12 242:13	grievances 106:17
202.10,23 210.20	18:13 25:16	80:4,7 81:16	249:22,25	grinded 73:17
Gibraltar 7:2	28:22 30:22	93:5,14,17 94:25	government's	grounds 167:17,23
15:11 16:22 22:8	32:22 36:13	95:7 97:5 98:14	113:13 138:13	172:18 198:2,21
23:4 25:14 30:2	45:21 50:24	111:18 119:19,25	186:2	201:6 225:19
30:20 36:10 44:5	53:24 54:1 56:7	120:10 122:16	governor 7:1 8:1	242:7,10
44:20 49:23 50:1	56:10 58:22	126:8,11,11,13	11:16 19:13,18	group 6:3 10:12
59:4 60:3 64:10	61:25 63:2 65:13	136:20,21 141:8	20:7,11,18 21:9	51:25 52:1,22,23
64:15 65:7 72:2	71:17 74:7,18	147:4 154:1,15	21:11,24 27:9,12	52:23 53:2,17
72:5 76:6 78:3	78:9 85:24 86:20	155:6 159:5	28:11 29:7 30:8	56:8 58:20 86:11
95:4 97:18 108:4	90:19 95:11	165:21,23 168:9	31:2 39:19 42:16	86:25 87:7,8
108:5 118:3	97:11,14 99:11	168:11,13,14,14	56:2 59:25 80:10	91:10 93:11
195:19	108:23 110:5	168:16 169:13	107:22 118:17	106:8 127:5
Gibraltar's 12:15	112:5 114:22,24	170:18 171:2	120:25 121:3	Guardia 12:20
163:9 190:15	115:12 116:24	174:17,22,23	128:11 209:2	24:6 56:18 72:14
218:15	120:5 121:19	175:16 182:16	249:6,14,19	73:6 78:21
give 16:11 26:23	122:4 125:15	184:8 188:8	250:19 251:13,14	guards 246:22
37:2 72:23 77:14	130:19 132:15,24	190:11 192:13,18	252:17	guest 163:10
89:10,22 90:16	137:21 142:3	192:19,22 200:12	governor's 39:17	guidance 86:15
ĺ		ĺ		
	I	<u> </u>	I	1

guidelines 105:19	239:7 248:11,12	heed 91:17	93:1 94:2,16	47:13,14
gutted 94:7	happening 16:12	held 239:12,13	95:12,16 97:12	hurt 205:7 223:18
guys 11:20	16:13 30:20	248:14	98:11 100:9	hypothesis 16:20
	36:10 43:5	hell 84:13	102:14 104:1,12	17:4 25:13 29:25
H	127:20 128:5	help 54:4 58:2	105:6 111:16	59:3 205:9,25
h 80:2	142:17 164:1	64:8 88:24 98:8	114:15,22 115:18	hypothetical 149:1
ha 230:25	197:17 242:23	115:25 116:2	115:21 121:3	
hacked 149:1,3	happens 26:11	187:14	123:3	I
hacking 148:7	happy 72:10 79:24	helpful 52:7 64:19	HMIC's 102:7	i.e 179:19
158:6	110:3 119:17	142:1	119:1	Ian 1:18 7:25
hacking/sabotage	144:14 232:19	helpfully 26:3	HMICFRS 91:3	11:16 54:3,17
123:24	hard 34:23 58:5	helps 64:2,23	92:20 93:8	55:15 64:1 66:18
Haim 164:9	90:21 112:16	195:14	hold 29:20 133:8	118:20 120:12
195:10,11,18	120:13 126:19	high 29:20 56:1	198:2 201:5	136:19 156:7
236:20,21 244:2	144:5,9 169:4	67:15 181:25	holders 56:1	190:7 193:9
249:5	186:16	192:12 223:19	holding 78:11	195:9 205:5
halfway 160:2	harsh 114:4	high-level 38:7	Holewell 92:21,24	209:1 229:20,22
161:18 176:19	Hassans 189:13,17	high-powered	95:20,22	245:25 246:7
halt 73:17	189:21 209:6	238:9	home 70:15 194:9	247:4
hand 65:4,9,11	232:9 238:12	highlight 11:1,7	222:8	idea 91:12 93:20
134:10 176:12	250:21	44:7 58:25 68:6	honest 70:4	identical 192:7
195:25 198:17	head 4:24 20:6	73:5 118:9	honesty 120:16	identification
handing 191:24	21:17,18 69:24	120:10	hope 11:19 35:1,5	22:11
198:7,10	106:5 190:14	highlighted 57:4	128:23 132:10	identified 6:13
handled 245:3	195:14,15 196:20	86:13 87:1	hoped 196:5	69:6 115:20
handling 115:18	228:16 229:5	119:25 175:21	220:14	138:2 185:21
handover 199:7	244:21	highly 24:6,18,25	hopefully 1:23	identify 107:11
hands 29:13 80:1	heading 76:11	25:5 30:19 31:6	80:16 82:21	108:22 160:4
237:5	headline 116:3	51:15 54:14	242:19	identifying 108:11
hands-on 142:8	122:6	55:13 61:17	hoping 190:13	108:20 131:7
hang 146:22	headlines 33:4	Hill 17:18 22:7,23	Hormuz 246:23	ignore 196:25
221:20 247:5	51:6 117:25	him?' 196:2	Hotel 163:7	197:13
hang 155:2	119:4	hindsight 53:18	hour 8:6 25:22	ii 184:16
hanging 155:2	heads 128:1	91:16 239:9	hours 7:7,14 8:3	iii 184:18
happen 25:1 42:25	206:12 208:10	historical 170:3	11:8,11,13,15,21	illicit 64:21
70:6 182:16	219:6	historically 100:19	13:7 18:14 20:9	illustrating 179:6
184:22 192:19	hear 11:17 54:3	hits 31:19	20:15,18,23	IM 61:2,4,8,14
224:3,4 242:9	56:14 182:16,18	hitting 164:4	27:11 31:17 33:5	images 58:2
happened 16:25	189:5 192:13	HM 36:4	33:22 37:14 43:9	imagine 120:12
18:7 22:19,20	heard 134:1	HMAG 144:18	43:9,20 54:20	220:7 240:17
23:21 25:1,12	162:14 171:13	HMG 11:19	124:10 244:21	immediately 55:7
28:4,15 30:1,2,19	191:21	HMGoG 29:7	house 28:25	imminent 218:18
31:7,12 33:5,24	hearing 161:10	112:22 135:15,19	168:15	impact 35:7
34:22 40:4 43:24	hearings 1:7	135:21 157:1,7	housing 12:14	126:23,24 154:12
45:4 46:17 55:14	heart 134:10	HMI 94:11,18	how's 136:20	183:9 192:13
62:7 66:11,12	176:12 229:1	HMIC 81:21 85:8	huge 64:17 81:8	246:20
74:9 84:18 85:9	heartedly 110:15	85:18,23 86:3,5	human 81:6 87:22	impart 71:19
90:7 94:9 128:12	heat 47:9	86:23 87:9 89:13	154:10	204:12
133:10 171:18	heated 198:12	90:22 92:1,13	hundred 26:12	imparted 43:21
178:5 191:7,18				44:15,22 74:6

				1 age 207
77:12 125:13	inappropriate	incurring 82:4	54:20 55:3,21,24	insisted 224:9
130:2,14	27:5 81:3 200:24	independence	58:6,7,12 59:19	insistent 91:18
imparting 42:9	inappropriately	207:21	59:22 60:6,10	insists 203:1
43:18	69:18	independent 18:21	61:4,5,16,18,23	inspecting 94:17
impeded 133:13	inaudible 48:3	27:20 43:7 71:15	63:20 65:18	inspection 86:5
impending 87:22	56:23 104:15,18	82:24 88:3	77:11 78:4 80:2	87:2,4,9 90:22
218:17	171:12	243:22	85:1 164:15	91:3,6,13 92:12
imperative 39:18	incident 6:4 7:9,17	indicate 40:2	168:1 190:8	92:22,25 94:3
86:10 103:15	8:17,20 9:1	indicating 65:25	191:11 212:5	95:13 97:19 98:5
impinged 133:13	10:11,12,20 11:6	252:5	217:3 220:22,25	99:17 102:8,14
250:1	11:23 12:9,10,12	indication 16:11	222:12	102:24 103:16
implement 94:19	13:11 15:3 22:19	60:17 216:9	informed 11:5	104:2 109:22
implemented 97:9	26:4 28:18 29:5	indications 45:3	13:18 37:14	115:23
106:19	29:8 31:23 32:8	individual 70:10	38:10,17,21	inspections 90:24
implicated 221:11	32:12,13,16 33:2	192:12	40:21 55:12	93:3
importance 21:10	33:4,17 34:21	individuals 103:25	70:15 73:7 85:15	inspector 9:14,15
125:25 138:24	35:20 36:4 37:8	109:1 238:9	133:4,15 161:16	131:8 168:20
important 44:7	40:4,16,18 43:5	ineffectively 69:17	191:1 210:3	174:3 245:14
58:8,24 83:19	43:10,24 45:4	ineffectiveness	218:10	Inspectorate 99:9
87:10 120:3	51:25 52:21 56:8	69:15	informing 55:3	instance 81:5
138:6 141:23	59:10 60:19	inefficiency 69:15	79:5,11 133:6	instances 49:20
180:23 210:7	61:10,12 62:7,9	inept 197:22	ingredients 207:11	50:5 64:10
impression 43:1	68:8,25 73:4	217:17	238:16	110:18 152:11
97:1 145:21	82:19,22 232:4	inevitably 68:5	inherently 86:17	154:6
146:4 149:24	Incidentally	infamous 246:15	initial 7:13 8:20,25	instructing 53:23
150:5 162:21	208:22	inference 176:13	10:15 33:3 55:5	instructions 46:19
182:6 200:2	incidents 18:8	infers 32:18	93:4 153:22	50:4 66:22 67:5
207:12 224:19,22	35:18	influence 214:2	173:7	67:6
224:25 231:3,12	inclined 171:22	influenced 157:22	initially 135:9	integral 156:20
231:14,18	include 28:14	238:1	138:25 139:23	158:23,24
improper 200:24	216:21 234:15,18	info 56:10 160:4	148:21 181:23	integrity 120:2,16
204:25	included 10:9 34:7	inform 7:8 133:1	232:16,19 242:17	223:21 228:23
improve 68:21	193:14 203:20	161:13 187:22	initiate 133:7	229:2 238:21
102:3 104:11	includes 28:18	240:23 241:1	initiated 6:23	intellectual 141:9
106:16 112:16	98:6 110:6	information 2:4	injured 75:25	intelligence 79:25
improvement 68:7	166:14	2:14,23 3:6,13,19	input 5:7 199:3	125:4
68:23 69:12,22	including 6:23	4:8 8:16 9:10,17	inquest 73:21	intend 122:18
86:7,13 87:1	23:14 49:24	9:22,22 10:8,17	inquiries 164:5	164:19
89:20 97:22 98:6	50:12 61:5	12:18,20 17:13	inquiry 1:6 10:8	intended 98:7
101:23 107:3,18	incomprehensible	18:11,16 19:4,10	10:18 36:20,21	111:15 164:25
109:21 110:3	60:12	19:13,20 20:3	57:22 62:3,4	166:8,10 176:25
115:20	inconceivable	21:21,24,25 22:3	64:4 77:19 94:10	intention 78:23
improvements	37:24	22:14,22 23:5	104:15,21 128:21	82:16 89:6 90:16
95:4	incorrect 204:23	25:9,10 26:23 34:17 35:11	151:18 239:17,19	117:16 239:18,20
improving 106:23	increases 109:4 Incredible 231:9		239:19 ins 135:17 191:22	intentional 49:9 intentions 27:16
inability 207:5 inaccurate 8:19		37:25 39:1,7,19 40:17 42:9,17,18	inside 29:12 34:22	103:24
18:10 42:17	incriminating 218:13	40:17 42:9,17,18	54:6 66:25	interaction 140:1
240:15	incumbent 59:25	51:15 53:14	insignificant 153:1	intercept 192:23
270.1 <i>3</i>	incumbent 37.23	J1.1J JJ.14	msigmiicant 155.1	тистеері 192.23
	l		l	

				Page 270
intercepted 246:17	introducing	247:5,24,25	184:9 207:21	journey 133:17
intercepting	155:10	247.3,24,23	208:19 227:5	JP 145:8 222:17
192:22	inves 155:10	250:12 251:21	issued 139:9	Judah 164:9
interceptors 65:19	invest 154:9	investigations 68:5	issues 30:7 36:14	judge 96:9 119:4
interchange	investigate 217:17	77:3 86:18 98:1	36:17 60:20	197:24 201:3,14
136:23	245:9,10	170:20	64:17 73:19 81:6	judiciary 207:22
interest 1:6 63:11	investigated 49:2	investigative 110:7	81:23 82:1 85:9	juggle 88:9,13
142:9 217:7	218:11 221:7	investigators 66:7	85:16 92:11,17	July 66:22 156:24
249:25	244:5	159:9	96:4 98:3 116:5	jump 48:16 223:11
interested 77:4	investigating	invitation 35:1	117:4 153:1,8	jump 48.10 223.11 jumped 79:4
128:14	18:22 57:7 76:25	67:3 232:23	165:15 181:7	jumping 35:4
interference	132:12 134:25	invite 153:21	182:25 185:15	48:20 51:21
208:16	137:18 150:23	invoking 7:21	199:11 203:12	June 4:13 41:10
interim 8:1 19:18	152:9,19 157:17	involved 7:11,18	218:21	63:16
27:11 28:11 30:8	180:2,6 186:19	10:14 25:14 47:6	iteration 169:17	junior 223:7
82:4	197:22 204:9	50:12,18 65:8	1001 401011 109.1/	junior 223:7 jurisdiction 77:4
82:4 Interior 52:4	212:2,6 218:2	129:17 142:25	J	Justice 77:24 88:2
interior 52:4 internal 73:23	212:2,6 218:2	150:12,14,15	jabs 217:25	96:14,15,19
92:11,17 104:8	investigation 26:2	150:12,14,15	James 125:12	113:17 114:1
internally 135:21	27:21 31:20 33:3	168:4 173:11	161:1 165:17	117:2 133:23
144:22	40:15 49:14	175:17 186:22	189:14 219:17	192:15
international 14:1	53:23 56:12 58:8	192:24 206:14	Jamie 236:19	justices 222:11,16
15:11 16:23	58:10 68:16	215:15 249:19	January 153:12	justification
44:19	75:10,13 82:24	involvement 142:8	155:11,12 156:9	201:15
interpret 76:8	86:16 123:22	150:24 151:5,17	jeopardise 133:8	justify 243:8
interpretation	125:8 126:2,12	150:24 151:5,17	Jewish 195:14	Justify 243.6
28:20 38:24	127:19 128:15	161:23 164:8	JF 16:4	K
118:5,13 139:5	130:8 133:9,10	167:24 171:23	JG 130:23	k 158:10
interpreted 31:13	135:3 137:23	involves 64:11	JL 174:1 176:22	KC 129:16 134:5
106:3 199:22	138:2 139:11	involving 36:4	180:3 189:13,18	216:4
200:1	140:4,7 141:5,15	40:16 190:14	190:18 193:15	keen 1:6 37:20
interpreting	142:11 144:20	inwards 93:6	195:24 198:3,9	54:6 55:11
109:17 127:24	146:3 148:17	ion 207:22	198:17,21 201:7	142:12 143:10,17
interrupt 117:11	150:1,20 151:3	iPhone 160:7	203:6 204:1	keep 90:17 93:12
interrupt 117.11	150:1,20 151:5	165:1	205:12,22 206:4	131:13 207:6,13
84:22 136:6	156:1,25 157:12	Iranian 136:7	206:23 212:23	keeping 161:15
168:6,8 189:4,17	158:6,12 163:5	246:17,21	213:13 230:10	kept 20:6 35:3
191:9 205:12,21	164:22 169:18	irrefutable 202:14	JL's 171:23 212:1	40:21 41:9 46:20
206:4,22 208:9	180:18,23 182:24	irrespective 40:21	job 94:13 105:23	128:6 141:11
238:4,17	183:2 186:5,20	158:17	207:7	192:4
interventions	186:25 187:16	issue 5:15 32:21	John 5:18 6:22	key 37:25 44:8
235:17 236:2,12	195:21 203:2,9	70:17,18 78:19	9:14 12:19 129:5	55:20 57:3 86:23
236:22	205:2,4,11,14	78:24 79:2 81:12	joined 4:12 6:16	138:25 139:2
interview 172:20	206:3 207:9	81:18 83:14	27:12 28:12	153:5 158:5,9
174:19 180:3,3	214:3,6,7 218:7,9	88:11 109:14	100:15	168:12 226:19
230:9	219:4 221:3	116:2,4 138:24	joining 14:13	kicked 72:3 74:2
interviewed 92:7	227:3 229:4	156:20 157:19	238:1	kicks 47:2
189:16 233:2	235:21 243:19	158:5,9,22 159:2	joint 114:9 161:21	kid 244:19
intimated 226:24	244:7 246:19	159:7 183:8	162:4,22	kills 154:18
mumateu 220.27	277./ 270.1 <i>)</i>	137.7 103.0	jointly 173:9	kilometre 14:5,6
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>		I

				1 agc 2/1
kind 120:19	knowledge 2:4,14	216:21 234:17	83:5 109:10	liar 240:19
142:15,17	2:23 3:6,12,18	lead 116:21 148:17	125:15,20 127:12	liberty 81:9
kindly 33:1	4:8 191:14	180:3	148:20 149:13	Licudi 143:3
Kingdom 153:4	248:22	leader 99:18	156:16 157:14	lid 207:6,13 243:9
knew 23:13,20	known 6:21 14:16	206:10 208:10	158:5,21 159:5	lied 85:5 231:1,20
39:21 59:21 60:9	33:6,17 108:16	leadership 101:17	202:25 203:1,11	lieu 191:24
65:11 83:22	151:25 230:21	101:22 102:2	219:5 232:8	Lieutenant 118:11
100:24 128:4	knows 191:6	107:9 116:4,9	letters 148:11	120:25
129:16 130:3	Kram 5:16 10:2	119:7	letting 11:16	life 35:22 81:7
135:17 171:2	70:19 85:8 187:9	leading 94:21	lev 154:21	light 71:15 91:21
178:12 192:17		lean 119:1	level 8:5 24:24	159:10 174:11
195:24 219:8	L	learn 22:21	28:5 60:10 99:4	175:1,5 176:8
221:2 222:10	la 11:24 12:15,15	learned 22:13	152:23 157:15	224:24
225:3 249:23	14:16	44:25 173:6	177:15 208:15	lights 168:10
252:7	lacks 107:6	210:1	levelled 238:6	liked 205:5
knock-on 18:11	laid 222:12	LEAs 25:22	levels 92:15	likes 96:18
know 7:24 9:3,23	land 157:18	leave 94:13 143:7	108:21	liking 87:25 88:1
11:16 13:23,25	language 95:25	148:1 150:9	Levy 129:16 159:1	limited 6:24
14:21 23:3 36:12	96:6 114:3,4	154:21,21	161:1 162:9,23	125:12 150:24
38:14 46:5,17,24	163:17 195:8	lecturing 183:18	163:11,13 164:9	152:20 157:10
48:17 49:3,4	215:5	183:20,24	165:17,19 166:13	164:9
53:6 54:6 55:11	laptop 111:3	led 35:11 112:2	167:22,23 174:16	limits 76:20
56:21 59:23 66:3	laptops 111:11	238:17 249:11	177:12 189:12,14	line 31:19 32:9
66:3,8,9,11 69:9	large 12:14 50:3	leeway 244:23	189:18,22 190:4	35:5 40:11 88:14
72:1 79:16 80:21	170:15 218:12	left 42:25 80:1	190:21 191:4,16	103:13 117:9
81:19 94:9,10,14	larger 108:13	94:2 106:24	192:12 199:11,14	165:12 184:2
94:15 103:18	largest 51:8	155:2 198:15	199:18 202:19,20	195:4 196:20
104:21 106:15	190:15	220:16 242:6	202:22 204:8	211:20 226:18,18
108:7 109:25	lasted 51:11	legal 52:18 59:25	206:24 207:2,4	233:12
111:2,4 117:13	late 126:10	61:2 70:17,23	207:15 215:8,12	Linea 12:15
117:24 118:10,25	laterally 14:1	73:6,20 83:9	217:5,12 219:12	Linea's 11:24
119:11 120:6,18	latest 191:1	159:14,15 166:23	219:17 220:19	lines 22:7 38:19
122:7 124:23	Laughter 119:18	190:15 215:14	222:22 224:12	39:5 55:12 60:8
128:10 130:12,12	launch 45:24	222:13 246:8	225:16,17 227:6	89:2 90:25
141:24 147:5,23	46:11	legalities 240:7	233:13,18 238:10	108:19 148:13
151:15 157:17	laundering 218:12	legally 164:25	244:2,15,18,21	180:16 182:1
158:3 160:13	219:4	166:9,11 216:21	245:15 249:13,17	202:16 205:21
162:12 164:18	law 52:8 74:12	217:19 242:15	249:21	245:18
173:6,14 175:7	128:1 195:16	legitimacy 98:5	Levy' 204:14	lingering 172:19
175:0;14 175:7	200:22 207:23	length 145:2	Levy's 222:8	linked 216:7
183:19 184:1	240:2	lesser 170:22	244:13	linking 40:3
190:3 191:22	lawful 240:1	228:13	Lewis 232:9	list 182:3
190:3 191:22	lawyer 61:20	let's 35:5 92:17	liabilities 36:22	listed 180:12
202:1 212:19	195:17 206:14	105:17	73:22	litigation 135:2
213:20 234:11,17	215:8 218:2,10	letter 41:9 74:21	liability 130:18	238:11
242:23 249:8	218:17 219:9,10	75:6,24 76:6,7,9	160:4 172:7	little 111:21
knowing 21:11	219:21 232:25	76:14,18,18	liaise 18:23 71:3	115:22 229:10
89:14 165:10	lawyers 133:6	77:11,15,16	105:2	251:4
183:22	148:11 149:11	78:10,20 79:8	liaising 106:9	live 1:7,15 108:14
	215:25 216:1,5	, 5.1.5,20 / 5.0		
	<u> </u>			1

				1 age 2/2
108:16 114:8	165:3 179:1	167:19	17:17 51:25	29:2,11 31:2
196:3,23 197:11	181:3,7 188:8	Majesty's 99:9	52:21 56:8	37:9 45:20 61:1
205:3 245:1	192:6 195:11	major 18:8 58:10	marked 1:21	66:18 90:14
live-feed 39:10,13	199:1 204:12	117:4	Marlaska 52:4	148:15 155:5
Llamas 23:10 61:1	210:16 221:13	making 44:17	marry 92:18 93:6	176:18 182:6,22
74:16 134:5,11	224:21 233:8	62:22,24 63:1	mass 18:9	183:1,5,13
134:15,17 144:18	234:2 235:13	84:25 131:19	matched 214:9	184:19 188:10,18
144:20 146:1	234.2 233.13	139:14 165:7	material 127:2	214:23 215:5,10
148:1,4 188:7	241:14 243:23	182:4 202:15	129:10 198:1,8	216:19 217:4
200:1 224:18	247:6,16 248:12	215:11,13 226:22	198:10 201:5	218:8,14 220:6
228:13 231:11	248:23 250:8,11	240:1	216:22 217:20	220:18 221:2
Llamas's 134:18	looked 63:19	malfunctioning	materialise 106:15	222:23 224:9,12
228:5	124:3 128:22	127:25	materialize 112:21	226:21 227:7,11
local 83:5 153:21	129:9 169:6	man 43:11 160:18	materially 192:7	247:1
location 11:13	looking 20:16	161:21,24,24	Matt 94:11	me.' 205:7
16:3,7 20:13,17	32:14 93:6 96:25	162:4,8,13	matter 19:25	mean 17:18,22
20:20,21 23:23	101:21 153:15	207:12 228:17	30:18 38:7 54:24	20:24 25:4,8
28:9,15 29:8,11	214:19 226:10	manage 109:2	62:23 65:5 77:2	43:10 50:21 63:7
39:20 41:6 51:9	looks 16:2 63:22	209:6	77:8,9 81:4,6	100:24 101:1
51:14,17 57:2,5	144:11	managed 123:1	82:3,5,17 83:3	120:6 128:7
61:6 64:1,8	loop 41:9 52:12	135:21	85:20 92:6 99:8	138:25 146:23
lockdown 83:2	53:10 141:11	management 4:20	104:9 106:10	153:5 157:6
164:2	loose 54:12 84:13	7:23 67:16,21	123:14 124:11	163:8 165:12
locked 127:6,8	193:13	136:11 208:18	130:17 135:14	166:10,22 167:10
log 9:8 16:2	los 230:25	managers 47:4,4	138:1 141:9	168:8 169:9
logs 7:12	loss 35:22 85:10	67:23 101:18	156:13 160:8	170:1,22 175:22
London 31:18	lot 5:7 107:17	managing 98:1	165:22 167:8	182:3 190:2
39:16,25 43:22	122:25 164:1	118:24 195:20	175:16 177:2,20	196:18 202:5
51:17,19 52:17	196:12,13 213:13	Mandelberg 57:23	180:25 181:1	205:20 246:9
54:5 55:11	low 168:12	manipulating	185:13 186:21	249:2
134:13	lower 12:17	154:16	196:4,9,24	meaning 19:9
London.' 37:21	loyalty 60:4	manner 69:3	197:12 207:20	22:10 118:23
long 4:10 87:25	lunch 52:5	239:12	210:7 218:25	189:14 199:23
122:6 165:2	lunchbreak	manual 86:15	222:25 228:25	206:22 230:25
168:25 184:11	104:25	map 16:10	241:13 242:2	means 15:8 27:19
longer 133:11	Lutkin 9:15	March 5:16 6:8	244:5 246:13,14	56:12 64:14
look 8:7 11:3	Lynne 151:2	29:1 37:8,14	250:1 252:13	130:25 134:16
15:23 23:7 45:19	M	38:11,21 44:25	matters 63:9 70:23	144:7 168:5
49:7 63:16 72:7		53:21,25 54:3,21	73:6,23 74:5	207:7,8
74:25 77:25 78:3	ma 42:3	56:9 61:11 63:7	80:9 100:16	meant 110:17
78:6 80:6 92:13	Madrid 52:3,12,17	70:22 71:21	135:8 136:3,16	145:12 154:3
93:5 94:6,10	magistrate 161:10	72:13 73:3 87:3	138:22 144:19	204:4,7
98:23 102:15	218:5 219:24	164:12 171:15,15	145:23 146:2	measure 124:25
105:15 106:25	222:18	171:20	147:14 160:16	measured 214:12
128:12 129:13	magnitude 200:15 main 108:6 115:1	margin 17:25 21:4	163:21 180:4	measures 94:25
133:16 134:21	129:6 177:11	marine 12:11 50:3	206:19 217:6,13	217:20
138:10 140:14	maintain 146:20	66:22 67:20,22	230:22 247:20	mechanisms 110:1
141:14 142:24	228:8	68:9 69:15,17	McGrail 1:4,17,18	130:13 144:23
143:21 153:15	maintenance	maritime 10:12,20	4:11 23:18 24:13	media 35:4 117:24
	mamichance			

				Page 2/3
117.24 220.21	172.14 220.10	02.11 104.12	49.10 65.4 02.10	190:5 192:2
117:24 239:21 meet 6:2 37:15	172:14 238:18 241:17,20	83:11 104:13 messages 20:1	48:19 65:4 92:10 95:10 127:10	196:3 192:2
40:7 72:6 105:7	meets 229:12	26:21 52:16	146:13 153:2	226:17 230:24
110:11 115:14	Melo 216:5	113:16 114:18	183:4 197:15	minute 21:4
184:19,23 232:16	member 4:22	129:5 134:4,12	232:17,18 238:5	121:15 154:21
232:20,25	53:17 215:14	230:5,6	mindset 43:1	202:7 238:24
meeting 6:9 42:21	members 10:13	messes 195:12	137:1 182:14	247:5
43:20 45:14	23:12 76:1 90:2	messing 223:20	mine 20:25 118:12	minute's 192:21
47:13,15 62:22	208:18	messing 223.20 messy 135:14	162:15 216:8	minutes 13:13,13
63:4 73:12,14	membership 53:2	137:5	minister 7:1 8:2	40:7 51:11 195:5
78:15 114:19,22	memorandum	met 5:22 32:25	9:11 10:13 11:5	202:7,9,13 234:5
114:24 126:4,5	136:13	54:4 60:11 70:22	11:11 19:6,10,11	237:12 239:1
127:14 128:3	memory 215:3	71:2,14 74:24	19:15 21:17	miscommunicati
129:16 131:24	Mena 158:15	85:6 96:13 97:21	26:12,17 27:7	44:11
132:2 133:20,21	mentido 230:25	115:19 125:23	32:4,7 33:8,11,13	misconceived
134:3,7,10	mention 85:7,8	129:19 135:8	34:1 44:16,18	122:20
136:19 137:12	87:21 94:1	136:3,5,8,11,12	52:1,4 53:11	misconduct 49:19
140:9 142:19	137:15 158:11	136:15 147:7	56:2 59:16 62:10	107:2 221:14
144:18 146:1,10	177:8 209:4	162:24 163:2,2,3	63:18 64:1,4,5	misconstrued
153:13 156:14,22	212:15 246:13	209:25 210:4	65:1,10 71:20,24	193:22
161:21 162:4,7	mentioned 24:25	211:5,9 229:6,15	72:10 74:7,18	misconstruing
162:23 169:16,19	25:4 41:6 42:3	232:20	77:8,20,24,24	238:20
171:20 172:10	77:16 78:3,6	method 7:10 57:14	79:6,11 80:10,18	misfeasance
175:4 177:24	85:12 132:8	177:13 197:25	80:20,24 82:11	221:14 238:13
178:3,7,8,24	142:11 146:6	201:4 207:25	83:21 84:6,14	245:5
179:3 180:10,14	148:8 175:15	methodology	85:4,15 88:2	misguide 142:2
182:17,22 183:21	177:18 215:23,25	98:17	95:8 96:14,15,18	misleading 42:10
186:6,7,12,23	222:16 241:21	methods 67:18	113:11,17,20	42:17
187:3,4,9 192:16	mentions 85:17,19	101:5	114:1 115:13,15	missed 10:9
192:25 193:24	148:6	Metropolitan 45:3	117:1,1 130:8	mistaken 7:25
194:2,17 198:23	mere 17:10 231:17	Michael 23:9	133:22,22 143:2	10:19 49:22
202:10 210:5,24	merged 103:20	142:24 229:21	143:3,4 189:3,7	77:17 109:17
211:3,11,13,16	merits 177:17	245:23	190:20,24 191:1	110:20 158:13
213:7,9 214:21	message 7:9,13,16	micromanager	191:3 192:11,15	205:8 228:1
214:24 227:4	11:15,18 18:14	79:24	193:25 194:19	misunderstanding
234:8,9,23 235:7	18:15 19:5 20:10	mid-February	196:18,22 197:10	185:6
237:21 239:1,4	20:15,18 25:19	118:19	202:8 208:2	misuse 145:11,13
240:24 241:14	26:8,11,14 27:2	mid-morning	214:2,20 215:21	mitigate 107:8
243:1,1,5	37:16 53:7 55:7	66:15	219:7 221:25	mitigation 119:10
meetings 126:2	58:15 63:19	midday 28:25 40:8	224:8 225:8,11	mixed 64:24
127:13,25 128:2	72:17 73:2,3	Middle 246:20	225:13 227:11	mobile 110:21
128:17,19 129:14	96:2,23 105:3	midst 164:3	228:10,11,12,24	111:2,13,14
131:17 136:2,8	107:21 114:6	miles 8:22 9:2,19	230:5,7 231:9,20	198:18 212:5
136:15 140:23	118:14 119:20	13:14,24 14:4,17	235:18,25 236:4	model 107:10
141:1 142:18	122:5,7 188:25	18:18 33:25	236:23	models 101:16
145:15,24 146:16	189:2 192:7	34:22 43:24 44:9	Minister's 18:25	modernise 116:11
146:20,21,24	193:1,8 215:20	44:9,10,12,14,16	64:22 80:25	Mole 25:21 28:25
147:2,9,12	231:5	45:5 219:13,18	83:13 84:24	moment 10:24
148:21 171:14,19	messaged 52:1	mind 21:7 34:4	114:5 188:24	39:15 47:9 49:13
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

				1 age 274
66:14 127:4	31:20 40:17	116:9,11 157:2	normally 135:7	37:22 38:1,4
188:12 197:14,18	natural 184:4	negative 35:7	norms 72:3	41:8 52:10,14
250:22	natural 164:22	negative 33.7 negotiation 74:4	north 11:23 12:14	NP's 52:15
Monday 1:1	169:19 206:20	negotiations 64:18	13:13 26:1	NSCIS 135:19
money 218:12	222:14	neighbouring	129:17 143:2	137:25 157:8
219:4	NatWest 136:9	12:15 36:9	164:9	158:7 167:19
monitor 107:8	nautical 18:18	Neil 120:19	northern 14:7,14	184:16
month 153:18	33:24 43:24	neither 22:7 85:21	nos 230:25	number 21:19
months 4:14 36:3	44:12,14,16	networks 36:12	nostrils 196:16	86:22 135:15
63:13,14 99:16	navigation 45:25	never 15:13 34:2	note 31:18 41:2	170:10,15 179:5
148:13	navigational 16:10	47:11 48:19	60:25 130:20	181:24 183:11
morals 155:23	46:20	82:15 85:20 90:7	131:10,21 132:6	203:12 205:18
morning 5:19,23	NCA' 151:2	119:6 123:10,10	132:10 136:24	numbers 112:12
6:11,14 7:8 8:4	NDM 164:6,7	161:3,7 162:24	162:2 172:16,17	181:25
11:6 16:1 34:12	165:3,23 166:15	163:1,2,3 167:4	174:2 181:18	numerous 61:9
34:16 37:20	167:16,25	184:8 196:15	194:16,16 209:22	62:2,5 136:5
38:20 43:21 51:6	nearly 54:18 151:8	222:16 230:19	213:1	
54:24 70:14	necessarily 30:7	239:18,19 242:3	notes 13:2 128:18	0
121:25 132:22	31:11 44:4 100:6	243:13	128:21 131:19,21	o'clock 6:14 34:16
204:13 212:23	105:20 106:3	nevertheless 91:12	131:23,25 132:5	54:24 70:14
213:14 244:3,11	108:3 124:11	93:23 158:25	134:9 137:10	121:12,13,14
motion 101:5	147:12 150:17	new 25:21,23	138:19 146:5,8	132:21 237:16
149:11	155:17 170:1	28:25 31:16	146:12,12 147:24	244:3,10 252:22
motive 21:20	177:20 248:11	56:15 98:2,4	158:10,10 160:8	253:1
move 45:9,11	necessary 19:1	109:18,21,22,22	165:7 178:24	object 248:9
53:25 120:9	72:19 161:13	news 56:14 117:25	194:2,4,8,10,11	objection 230:19
178:21 222:1	182:9 185:19	newspaper 103:13	194:20 203:20,22	objections 246:6
237:2	230:10	114:13	203:23 211:8	248:7,8
moved 51:16 58:6	need 5:10 11:18	Nick 11:21 20:11	213:4,6,11	objective 97:10
170:4	18:23 70:25	30:24 54:8,9	240:13,14	202:12
movement 127:21	74:17 81:18 88:7	55:9	notice 62:17 125:1	objectives 164:19
moving 19:24	102:12 115:18	nicknamed 56:24	142:24 188:2	obligation 172:19
70:17 90:17	122:23 123:4	night 37:13,17	191:17	obliging 123:16
140:15 177:22,23	124:16 133:18	58:1 70:3,5	noticed 154:6	oblivious 60:15
MP 7:8 60:6,11,13	139:6 140:15	143:23 232:10	notification 73:13	observations 96:5
60:15	141:14 192:9	night' 29:15	74:24 76:10	obtain 55:17
multi 219:3	197:8 210:6	night's 70:4	187:11	190:17 198:5
multiple 170:20,25	212:1,13 218:5	nine 4:14 13:13	notified 8:1 85:10	201:9 212:1
murder 58:9	219:24 233:16	244:20	notify 77:20	224:11
myriad 217:4	237:8 250:24	NMH 28:25 30:25	190:23	obtained 66:2
	needed 17:21 18:1	no 146:11	notifying 6:25	198:6 222:16
N 142.25	19:4,11 31:8,9,25	nod 193:5	notion 41:8	226:2 233:15
names 142:25	38:24 41:8 91:6	nodded 193:6	notwithstanding	obvious 48:20
216:3,4	139:10 160:17	nolle 247:14	159:1 179:25	52:20 63:12
narrative 243:14	177:5 195:15	non- 57:12	190:24 203:9	108:13
national 119:3	210:19 212:3,17	nonsensical 21:21	204:22	obviously 10:25
125:3 126:24	250:18	225:5	November 86:1	19:9 34:2 38:15
151:1 249:24	needed?' 195:22	normal 61:20 70:5	NP 27:11,21,22	58:1 71:18 91:16
250:2	needs 72:8 95:4	75:3 137:3 164:3	37:12,13,15,17	104:4 123:15
nationals 26:1				126:25 128:10
	-	=	-	-

				1 age 2/3
129:25 130:11	offences 81:16	57:22 135:16	123:18,21 124:1	original 144:10,11
134:8 137:1,6	123:24 125:22	officially 128:9	124:24 131:13	144:15 182:23
138:15 142:21	145:11,13,14	244:4	133:25 150:13,15	213:11
145:12 147:5	154:8 179:18	officials 7:11 10:1	152:6,7,13 156:6	originally 10:17
160:19 161:6	238:13	157:19 223:20	156:8 163:22	Outlook 178:10
163:17 168:11	offender's 110:10	offload 246:16	171:23 187:9	outs 135:17 191:22
190:22 213:22	offer 243:20,20	Oh 47:11 165:10	210:2	outset 170:17
220:15 228:17	offering 248:17	oil 246:17	operational 70:13	outside 18:17 26:5
232:1 237:1	office 5:18 6:2,10	Ok 55:18	89:22,23 151:14	29:12 33:7,14,18
251:15	23:10 27:12	okay 10:23 11:20	151:21 152:16,23	54:7 55:14 56:13
occasion 48:12	28:12 29:21	18:23 32:3 84:1	153:10 155:13,19	59:11 63:23,25
138:10 160:17	42:14 52:11	103:9 105:1	164:21 167:8	65:23 66:24
occasions 61:9	54:23 56:1 60:2	122:11 125:11	173:20 177:2	217:6 249:11
62:2,3 122:24	75:4 81:15 113:6	160:23 194:22	188:2 196:3,23	outstanding 27:15
125:23 135:4,25	130:20 135:1	206:8 211:10	197:11 203:12	28:17
136:5 248:15	160:2 169:16	237:18 251:8	204:23 207:20	outwards 93:5
occur 11:8 54:14	186:23 193:19	old 223:7	204.23 207.20	overlap 182:4
135:25	195:6 211:9	once 7:23 48:5	,	_
occurred 7:7 8:22			operationally 152:3	oversight 67:16,22 67:23 68:1
	221:6,14 222:8	55:17 69:11		
9:2,18 11:12 12:21 16:5 17:1	223:16 238:14	76:18 79:19	operations 150:16	overview 82:18
	241:10 252:3,11	82:23 123:8	opportunity 42:20	95:2
17:8 23:15,24	officer 4:11 7:3	180:12,16 187:15	62:17 90:2,8	Owens 151:2
24:7,12,19 25:5	9:16 12:7 42:13	227:3 242:9	122:12 191:2	owned 156:25
26:4 27:25 28:19	48:14 57:8 70:12	250:12	opposed 14:1	owner 130:13
29:9 31:4,11	70:12 79:25	ones 136:4 138:21	106:12	159:21
38:6,23 40:19	108:14 110:21	145:16 146:17	opposite 26:6	owners 138:14
45:23 49:23	111:13 131:23	186:8	opted 173:21	143:1
54:25 55:1 57:19	132:12 150:23	ongoing 31:20	174:5	ownership 137:25
59:2,11 60:22	152:18 220:21	33:3 214:7 218:7	option 176:11	138:5,11,24
62:10 63:23 68:8	223:5 245:11	229:4	238:24	139:6,9 140:5
68:25 106:11	officers 23:19	onset 157:12	options 239:6	141:16 150:3
179:3 194:17	39:22,22 40:1,6	Op 152:4 203:2,13	oral 125:17 126:17	156:20 157:7,11
195:3 226:16	49:4 57:9 58:4	211:25	127:15	157:20 158:20,22
233:12 235:5	64:14,20 66:23	open 40:9 182:7	order 42:23	159:7,13 183:7
occurring 49:25	70:2,10 72:11	196:24 197:12	173:19,22,25	184:15 185:2,12
56:13 63:24	81:10,17 86:17	239:12	174:5 175:20	185:16,17,24
OCPL 78:17 79:21	92:8 93:9,10	opened 10:13	176:11 177:9	186:3,11 187:1
223:17	101:24 106:21	40:15 52:24	198:1 199:7	207:9 242:13,19
OCPL' 135:2	108:11,20 110:9	242:20	201:4 220:24,24	P
October 4:12	112:17,20 119:7	opening 84:12	220:25 224:12	
95:13 123:20	134:25 152:6	openness 103:17	233:15	PA 78:12
124:2,10,12,18	159:14,16 191:15	operate 36:13	orders 65:21	Pacheco 13:9
125:24 127:14	200:18,19 202:2	66:24	organisation 4:24	pacing 15:3
128:18 131:4	202:3,17 207:23	operated 105:11	69:25 92:9 93:3	package 30:7
132:9	208:14 220:19	248:23	99:19,20 109:8	59:11
off-the-cuff 204:16	238:14 245:1	operating 88:5	137:5	Package-wise
offence 218:2	officers' 109:4	operation 5:16	organised 36:11	166:12
219:22 221:15	offices 114:25	10:2 67:3 70:19	74:11	pad 179:6
246:3	official 52:11	84:23 85:7 121:7	orientation 251:22	page 2:11,20 3:25
				4:4 6:25 11:3,14

				1 age 270
12:17 15:24	99:12 101:12,15	145:15 146:16	performed 112:20	87:14 199:12
31:16 37:6 45:10	102:5,15,20,22	151:11	period 91:9 127:13	206:8
45:14 51:23 56:9	103:10 107:1	parties 145:19	163:24	Picardo's 74:14
56:11 60:9 73:5	108:24,24 110:8	partner 163:16	periodic 150:21	pick 235:2
82:10 95:18	115:16 123:19	parts 120:10	151:6 152:17	picked 114:16
103:11 110:6	133:21 137:21	211:24	155:7 186:18	151:12 244:2
112:7,9,11	142:6 143:9,16	party 77:22	periods 93:4	picking 211:20
113:19 116:25	144:4,17 148:12	pass 38:1,25 39:7	periphery 245:22	picture 7:6 18:3
119:22 123:19	150:18 152:2,3	61:22 239:21	permission 241:8	55:25 92:19
130:23 132:18,22	171:21 173:12	passed 59:23	permit 1:12	240:21
132:24 134:23	176:18,19 179:1	passing 61:5	person 31:21	pictures 58:1
152:1 153:16	181:22 182:21	212:21	68:14 116:21	piece 77:18 181:14
156:18 160:2	186:18 188:20	path 119:14	117:7 163:18	187:7
161:17 189:8	195:4 201:17,19	patience 160:4,19	170:25 190:10,17	piecing 238:7
190:6 193:8	202:24 204:18	Patrick 121:23	211:9 215:10	piqued 239:8
195:2 201:20,23	205:24 208:7	patrolling 49:13	personal 86:19	pitched 99:25
211:19,21,21	211:17 213:12	patrols 50:17	109:4 110:9,25	157:15
225:24 235:3,4	216:16 225:22	67:24 68:2	111:13 136:16	place 8:14 14:19
245:17 249:4	228:6 232:12	Paul 95:20 164:13	150:23 151:5	16:21 17:5 18:17
251:3,17	233:10 250:17	pause 186:5,13	152:19 190:18,21	21:12 30:10
pages 7:4 23:8	paragraphs 32:24	187:16 196:20	191:4 216:8	31:23 32:8 33:6
86:20 97:14	62:13 97:16	232:6	238:15 241:6,7	33:14,17 37:11
157:25 158:1	134:21 203:20	payment 81:7	personalities	38:12 46:9 47:1
painstaking	215:3	peace 65:4 127:10	186:22 192:24	47:3 54:5,11
246:18	pardon 14:11	222:11,17	personally 99:7	55:11 61:11
palpable 248:4	103:7 236:14	pear-shaped	110:23 216:6	65:22 66:9 67:22
pandemic 164:4	Parliament 203:13	111:22	217:2 245:11	72:3 73:18 74:1
213:16	Parliamentary	pending 91:4	persons 8:12 29:20	108:14,15 109:23
Panorama 103:12	77:21	103:19 158:6	59:6 168:4 221:6	110:1 114:20
119:17	part 12:24 25:7,13	160:7,25 161:14	perspective 162:17	127:14 160:20
paper 178:14	26:7 29:25 30:20	penultimate 16:2	173:11	178:7 196:11
181:14 243:21	32:21 45:8 49:14	108:24 195:3	persuade 148:15	209:8 217:21
papers 9:6 126:19	62:15 68:15	people 59:6 95:3	218:5 219:24	placed 13:20 79:14
paperwork 124:3	72:12 74:12	118:6 163:25	pertinent 118:15	242:14
par 88:5	97:17 98:4	239:3,23 246:12	130:17 247:19	places 99:14
para.49 226:1	153:11 156:14,23	peradventure	perused 104:22	212:24 213:15
Parade 114:25	160:11 173:15	184:21	164:14	plan 86:21 87:11
paragraph 6:20	191:23 238:14	perceived 101:18	Peter 216:4	87:16,19 88:4,7
7:4 8:8,8 11:21	participating 67:2	perceiving 43:12	phased 212:20	97:5 115:5
12:7 22:4 23:8	particular 10:10	percent 47:14	phone 110:23	174:18
28:7,23 30:24	27:22,24 34:7	perception 118:11	174:17 244:13	planned 38:8
31:1 36:23 37:4	49:6 57:1,8 77:9	122:21	phones 110:10	planning 7:22
37:7 38:19 39:5	95:22 122:2	Perez 129:5	212:14	plans 87:11,12
40:9,12 44:24	127:4,23 129:23	131:24 132:3,5	phrase 27:3	platform 125:4
45:15 51:8,23,24	142:20 144:21	132:13 189:10	244:17	128:7 135:19
58:18,23 59:14	180:9 207:7	perfectly 117:12	phrasing 199:21	137:25 138:5
64:6 65:14,15	216:1 219:11	136:24	physical 37:2	156:25 157:8,11
67:2 70:21 89:3 90:20 95:24	244:25	performance 87:19	physically 3:22 Picardo 52:24	158:7,23 184:16
90.20 93:24	particularly 135:2	0/.17	1 ICATUO 32:24	187:1
				l

				Page 277
play 74:2 108:8	61:19 62:19	police's 248:1	possibly 23:11	preferred 171:11
194:13	75:22 78:16 80:5	policies 106:18	45:5 172:3	preferring 139:3
played 110:14	96:16 98:14	policing 88:14,17	post 43:5 60:16	173:19
251:2,5,10	102:8 129:24	88:21 89:5 108:4	83:22 84:7 99:16	premature 180:2
pleasant 120:14	130:13 137:6	108:9 112:18	248:13	premises 153:21
please 1:22,24 2:7	148:9 151:23,23	113:7	post-incident 7:22	prepare 87:4
2:17,25 3:9,15,23	154:18 157:1	policy 86:16	47:1,3,4	prepared 10:3,4
3:25 6:19 7:4	163:15,16 168:24	131:20	posture 229:8	41:2 115:4
11:14 12:17	170:10 172:2,21	politely 232:23	potential 36:2,21	168:19
15:23 18:13 22:4	173:24 174:7	political 24:11	73:5,19,21 76:5	preparing 10:7
25:17 31:15	191:8,9 201:10	29:4 72:12 168:3	77:6 79:2 81:7,8	prerogative 248:3
32:22 36:23	215:12,14 221:19	216:8	107:24 108:20	presence 23:19
38:18 44:24	221:19 222:7	politics 88:22	109:11 110:2	26:15 42:10
50:24 54:1 56:7	226:19 241:11	Polo 13:9	126:16 130:17	present 23:10
58:23 59:12 62:1	244:16 247:3	popped 210:8	135:22 174:15	41:12 47:12
63:17 66:21	252:1	port 12:4,8 17:18	176:2 218:15	60:10,14 134:2,6
70:16 82:6 85:24	pointed 167:7	22:8,24 56:25	potentially 22:10	146:21 147:15,21
88:25 90:18	252:12	57:12,22 58:3,4	49:18 76:11	148:4,5,8 186:24
95:11 97:11	pointing 252:5	Portuguese 31:22	205:17	187:8 208:21
108:23 110:5	points 59:13 63:24	32:2	power 94:11 181:6	209:14 211:15
115:12 116:24	75:17 111:16	posed 198:8	powerful 223:19	214:24 234:20
118:16 120:9	134:3 208:12	position 32:2,18	239:22	239:4 247:16
121:20 123:18	215:9 221:18	37:10 60:23	PR 26:2	presented 87:11
125:15 130:19	police 7:2,3 10:1	74:19 79:6 82:21	practically 14:13	112:23 192:1
132:15 142:3	18:20 21:15 22:9	84:5 91:14 93:17	43:8 194:5	240:14
143:8,15 148:10	23:1 27:18 31:24	109:1,3 128:16	practice 18:21	press 25:23 26:3
151:25 156:16	33:1 39:22 40:5	151:4 152:21	46:16,17 50:16	31:19 196:25
158:4 159:23	45:3 51:5 53:1	157:4 172:8,21	66:5 110:11,12	197:13 237:6
164:7 167:15	56:19 57:11	173:1,6,7,10	110:14 171:24	pressed 233:13
168:18 188:19	64:10,12,20 65:2	178:6 185:23	172:4,15,22	pressing 86:12
192:6 200:12	65:19 71:2 80:16	200:20 221:3	187:24 188:3	pressure 205:10
201:17 214:18	81:9 85:25 87:17	226:5 227:14,17	222:10	206:2 228:18,21
225:22 228:4	90:3,11 91:23	227:18 230:2	practices 27:17	246:23 249:6,14
230:3 232:8	92:5 93:24 96:11	242:3,16	100:19 108:1	250:3
233:8 235:3	96:16 97:18	positive 86:18 94:4	pre- 189:23	pressures 119:3
241:25 243:16	105:10,11,16,18	119:5	pre-scheduled	pressuring 214:5
250:16 251:2	105:21,25 106:9	positively 101:4	210:5	229:3
pleased 46:12	106:11,14 112:17	poss 49:18	preceding 8:7	presumably
63:11 65:9	112:18 122:19	possibilities 232:3	51:24	130:24 131:2
plot 22:24,25	150:11 154:5,8	possibility 29:3	precise 23:22	pretexts 44:14
57:18	157:3 159:16	38:5,14 134:14	55:22 126:1	pretty 70:3 141:22
plotted 14:23	161:22 168:6,7	194:9	precisely 30:15	185:20
15:13,14 16:9	169:25 173:21	possible 21:11	137:13 212:13	prevent 102:4
22:9 42:3 54:15	207:22 218:1	28:1,2 57:6	precision 55:17,19	previous 34:18
plotting 57:14	219:21 223:5	70:23 153:23	55:23	51:14 84:16 91:5
poi 154:17	229:21 234:10	171:10 179:13	prefer 171:8	91:11 92:1
point 8:22 9:2,19	243:22,25 244:6	184:18 187:8	176:10	100:17 107:21
17:7 19:21 26:3	244:8,12 248:18	191:2,9 226:5,12	preference 175:13	109:19 119:21
42:7 43:15 55:4	251:11	236:21	175:19 177:9	125:17 186:8
	1		1	•

				Page 2/8
188:7 222:10	93:23 153:20	progressed 230:22	protect 109:8	published 104:19
232:15 239:8	154:16 166:19	progressing	217:21	117:17
246:13 248:15,22	167:3 183:3	119:13 186:25	protection 239:22	publishing 239:20
251:17	187:17 224:14	progressive 91:21	240:2	pull 151:16 154:20
previously 187:5	227:9 249:14	project 86:11	proud 239:15,23	155:15,16,16
pride 119:15	250:4	proliferation	239:24	245:23 246:6,7,8
primarily 182:2	proceeded 149:25	179:11	proved 139:25	246:9 247:24
primary 102.2	proceeding 133:13	prominent 177:21	provide 8:5 9:10	248:17 249:2
principal 228:12	183:6 187:19,22	215:25 238:5	18:10 23:5 54:15	250:9,12
principle 164:17	proceedings 1:14	prominently	56:24 59:17	pulled 128:24
165:4	process 66:7 74:4	177:10	83:19 93:1 97:4	246:6
principles 161:15	76:15,17 91:24	promise 95:6	127:11 135:7	pulling 68:11
Prior 102:25	91:25 92:16 93:4	promote 98:8	143:12,19 159:12	pulse 159:8
priorities 88:9,13	125:7 149:5	prompted 56:15	168:21 187:13	punch 219:16
priority 88:10	243:19	58:14 125:10	220:22 233:25	pure 154:1 239:22
89:22	processed 189:16	139:18	provided 5:7,8	purely 152:15
privacy 220:9	processes 102:3	prong 104:8	6:21 12:20,24	177:1
private 76:3	104:11 191:19	proof 83:21	16:19 22:3 33:11	purpose 57:21
120:20 128:7	produce 10:7,18	proper 56:12	34:1,3,5 40:10,25	102:11 117:13
217:7,12	102:2 104:10	67:17,21 170:19	56:1 59:19 75:3	213:5 251:23
privately 120:22	produced 13:3	188:4 198:13	82:18 84:25	purposely 56:22
privileged 216:22	92:4 123:8	properly 165:9	87:23 124:9,17	119:8
217:19	producing 123:15	182:5 196:9	129:1,12 130:1,4	purposes 250:7
privy 38:15 144:24	product 30:5,6	215:7,23 222:6	131:6 157:9	pursue 78:22
177:18 212:7	production 173:19	property 141:9	160:12 233:21,23	107:12
pro 43:18	173:22,25 174:5	proposal 166:3	provider 135:18	pursuing 127:18
proactively 163:21	175:20 176:11	proposals 113:2	provides 16:5 95:3	pursuit 16:21 17:5
probable 30:19	177:9 199:7	113:14	providing 10:14	30:5 32:15,21
31:7 51:16 54:14	220:24 224:12	proposed 32:9	41:15 92:4	56:13 63:22,24
probably 13:6	233:15	87:16 183:10,11	107:10 179:10	67:17,18
31:7 36:16 55:13	profession 215:15	proposing 105:19	provision 191:23	pursuits 49:20,21
66:14 79:18	professional 36:20	121:15	provisional 17:4	49:22 67:15
106:23 108:16	101:9 107:5	prosecute 247:17	40:25 41:5,16	put 46:25 69:13
121:9 141:16	110:18 214:12	prosecuted 145:10	57:7	70:4 94:22,23
153:4 157:15,21	professionalism	148:19 150:6	provisions 191:19	101:5 110:1
165:6 169:5	120:17	prosecution 76:3	proviso 25:7	117:23 118:14
188:12 193:6	proffer 247:9	124:9,17 129:6	prudent 133:4	149:8,11 169:13
202:18 230:16	proffered 180:7	135:1 138:7	prudently 183:3	176:12 185:4
233:21 248:13	proffering 180:1	153:22 156:21	pruning 182:3	191:17 205:14
probe 162:17	profile 192:12	158:13,23 223:9	PS 119:16	230:1 243:9
probed 42:23	223:19	247:10	public 1:6,6 36:2,7	245:21
probing 54:12	progress 52:6 54:4	Prosecutions	64:9 92:14,15	putting 111:8
problem 119:11	83:3 89:16 97:18	156:19 224:10	109:8 117:5,18	154:19 174:20
244:20	103:18,18,22	prosecutorial	117:21,23 120:6	215:19 229:2
procedure 46:25	115:22 133:11	181:6	156:19 221:5,14	240:7
47:1,4	135:6 137:24	prosecutors 171:7	224:10 238:13	Pyle 19:18,21
procedures 7:22	139:11 140:4,8	223:9 248:2	publication 102:25	21:20 29:18
76:16 106:16,22	142:10 157:23	prosequi 247:14	publicly 100:4	30:24 31:16
proceed 91:13	186:19	prospect 145:9	publish 117:2,5	32:23 33:15,21
	1	1	1	1

				1 age 277
34:6,16 35:11	190:10 198:8	raising 85:17	reads 118:20	received 8:17
36:15 38:10 39:1	203:11 207:19	range 186:21	204:18	11:22 12:3,18
39:8 41:16 42:6	209:16 211:2	ratified 88:1	real 246:19,23	13:8 26:13,22
43:11 47:7 51:3	217:19 218:25	rationale 90:9	realise 59:22	34:18 51:4 53:7
51:12 52:21	217:17 218:23	173:18	123:13 130:6	64:25 78:4 83:7
53:22 54:2,3,17	228:23 235:13,16	rationalisation	249:18	85:2 94:2 95:13
58:19 59:16	236:1,9,11	179:16 193:10	realistic 145:9	107:21 127:16
60:24 61:24 62:6	242:18 247:2	rationalise 179:8	really 111:22	129:8 131:5
62:16 82:12	questionable	180:14 181:10	119:17 141:5	139:15 150:21
85:22 87:14	11:10	184:16	196:16 205:7	152:17 170:2
109:16,23 115:13	questioning 196:3	rationalised	reason 10:15	177:11 214:23
117:1 121:1,3	196:22 197:10	180:15	21:19 49:6 64:7	227:13
Pyle's 28:22 32:9	229:1	rationalising	71:22,23 106:13	receiving 11:4
35:13 62:8 83:23	questions 19:16,17	182:2 185:11	111:7 120:7	155:6 180:20
109:10 116:13	42:21 62:12	rationalize 242:7	124:6 157:16	recent 50:14
107.10 110.13	77:21 137:15	rationalized	178:14 212:25	recognise 21:10
0	139:18 165:19	242:10	234:24	89:17 109:1
QC 75:25 216:4	171:17 200:16	raw 92:4	Reasonable	122:19
qualified 76:13	quick 31:18 156:8	re-active' 123:22	172:18	recollecting
88:20 156:11	156:12	reach 37:20 170:8	reasons 56:21	132:16
223:2 229:17,18	quickly 35:6 89:5	reached 184:11	59:15 63:12	recollection 23:22
qualifies 116:16	quiet 143:6	react 101:3 111:21	79:16 85:10,14	24:1,10 31:1
qualify 59:1 146:5	quite 13:4 34:24	228:18 242:24	108:13 191:14	41:15 50:11,13
250:5	43:4 47:16 57:24	reacted 215:24	192:10 233:11,17	55:2 134:8
quarters 154:13	72:1 96:1,1	reacting 223:21	233:17 248:18	162:22 176:6,7
205:19	115:17 116:10	reacting 223.21	reassurance	196:10 209:17
query 27:23,24	122:6 128:7	46:10 83:16	154:14	215:2 216:11
question 11:10	136:14 144:17	101:13 117:18,22	reassure 82:15	217:8,9 236:24
15:10 19:7 28:14	187:8	147:2 241:24	reassured 114:5	recollections 213:9
35:9 39:6 45:12	quizzing 97:7	243:7,7	127:7	recommendation
48:13 49:9,25	quote 84:12	reactions 120:20	reassuring 65:1	101:4 102:1
50:15 51:2 61:15	109:12	reactive 125:8	rebuke 197:16	107:9 109:18,25
62:6,18 69:4	quotes 39:24,24	reacts 117:23	202:17,23	recommendations
74:22,23 77:1,5	40:6	read 9:6 25:20	recall 12:24 13:1	68:20 86:3,8,14
81:25 93:15,16	quoting 44:13,14	32:24 45:8 49:17	14:25 15:7 30:11	86:23 89:15,18
93:22 98:24	236:13	50:13 55:8 74:14	30:12 40:24	91:5,11 94:20
105:5 113:6,9		75:18 97:15	47:10 57:23	97:2,6,8 98:2,7
114:12 117:20	R	101:11 102:23	134:2,5 137:19	100:5 103:19
123:2 128:6	rack 14:24 174:8	119:7,17,19,23	137:19 138:7	112:2 123:16
130:10 137:24	radar 13:11 65:23	120:4,5 122:8,9	147:6 156:9,15	reconsidered
138:5 139:2	66:2 239:20	144:15 165:5,8	163:6 169:19,20	232:22
140:5,18 141:14	raise 27:22,23	165:10,11 168:25	216:19 217:13	record 132:19
142:23 147:19,25	79:18 85:16	197:19 205:24	222:14 223:3,25	147:18 181:9
150:2 153:3,5	148:23 182:25	226:20	224:4 225:11,13	239:4 240:1,8
155:5 158:19	246:5 248:6,7	readily 101:19	226:12 227:24	recorded 146:24
165:21 167:1	raised 77:22 78:6	reading 96:21	232:2,5	149:15 203:17
169:12 172:18	81:4 103:14	113:21 114:2	receive 8:18 12:1	240:24 241:14
179:25 184:15	181:23 203:11	120:15 126:18	82:23 110:3	recording 162:2
185:2,17 186:10	217:20 242:2	165:6	112:25	234:12 237:23
186:10 187:20	raises 81:6			
	I	<u> </u>	l	1

				1 450 200
240:17,18 241:4	144:9 151:9	regularly 49:12	28:16 109:13	114:1,15,22
241:16,20 251:16	152:15 159:25	241:11	remains 158:5	115:1,2,17
recordings 237:24	161:4,7 187:5	rehearsed 106:6	remember 16:12	116:13 117:3,4,6
recover 198:1	194:21 201:11	reinforce 21:6	16:14 31:5,6	117:10,14,17,19
201:5	202:24 203:5,25	reinforcing 31:8	46:24 47:18	117:22 118:4
recoverable	207:8 231:5	43:14	63:14 71:5 73:12	119:2 120:14
132:11	236:18 243:4	relate 57:17	73:13 75:7	121:4 123:3,12
red 144:13 213:11	247:13,22 252:6	related 25:25	111:20 128:8,13	125:17 127:11
reduce 242:11	252:7	125:2 156:10	129:3 134:16	174:4 175:18
reduced 179:15	refers 6:9 39:16	189:25 227:23	146:19 156:6	182:9 252:15
242:10	116:22 156:12	relating 62:12	162:7 163:23	reported 12:8 33:8
reducing 170:21	160:3 165:1	98:3 99:24	170:23 173:17	51:19 54:22
179:19	167:17 190:20	136:16 144:19	174:21 181:12	67:10 72:13
reductions 88:16	243:3	146:2 163:22	193:2 208:23,25	176:4
refer 6:25 32:13	reffer 51:13	213:16	209:10,19 211:11	reporter 114:13
39:2 51:24 66:23	reflect 158:7	relation 10:2	211:13 231:23	114:14
82:6 86:3 90:23	reflected 131:18	13:25 16:9 23:23	reminded 38:17	reporting 13:19
93:17 103:12	179:15	39:11 53:22	183:13	32:6 33:16
124:16 144:8	reflects 131:10	70:18 71:18	remit 204:24	reports 8:19,21
156:18 158:11	refresh 146:13	84:22 85:6	remove 84:7 88:18	9:1 15:18 119:8
165:13 225:25	refreshing 142:21	125:19 131:12	reopening 212:24	139:15,18
237:21 250:18	refusing 100:1	136:9 163:5	213:15	represent 79:14
251:10,20 252:1	202:21	189:10,11,17,18	repeat 197:1 242:2	80:7 86:15
252:4,12,14,18	refuted 227:6	189:20,21,23	repeated 171:4	153:10
refer 251:17	regard 13:5 57:20	229:4	179:19 215:9	representation
reference 13:2	94:14 100:9	relations 39:9,9	repeatedly 42:2	79:1
14:22 28:19 37:3	108:19 138:13	relationship 4:19	61:14 218:18	representations
41:3 44:2,17	139:20 170:5	5:4,6 61:21	replied 29:12 32:1	83:10
45:18 74:3 76:5	181:7 188:3	91:22,22 160:15	164:11 179:9	represented 57:20
95:19 96:17	204:24 247:11	163:13 181:4	replies 245:24	80:4
98:19 101:22	regarded 105:6	190:18,21,25	reply 11:20 55:18	representing 83:5
102:7 140:11	regarding 52:16	191:4 228:15	61:16 78:10	reprimand 101:19
142:14 147:25	142:22 156:5,8	229:23,24 249:1	189:7 190:5	reputation 195:17
161:1 162:8	158:5 164:8	relatively 116:6	193:12 215:10	218:16
199:8,10 205:22	226:2 232:3	relayed 12:19	report 11:23 12:1	reputational 65:6
206:7 219:10	regardless 40:18	release 25:23 26:4	12:3 15:18,19,21	65:7 164:23
228:1 245:4	regards 7:24 54:8	released 154:24	15:22 49:18,19	205:18 219:1
251:12,13	54:17 88:13	releasing 59:5	52:6 65:14 67:14	request 10:5 51:6
referred 24:2 42:5	98:12 120:19	112:17	67:25 73:4 75:14	73:15 90:22,24
50:10 87:14	166:13	relevant 61:18	81:21 82:23 85:8	103:16 144:19
111:5 113:16	region 49:21 88:6	65:17 72:19 78:2	85:18,23 89:13	146:2 153:9
142:15 162:12	regrettable 22:15	120:10	91:6,11 92:1	168:21 174:19
166:14 226:6	35:23 56:19	relieved 155:1	94:7,12,23 95:1,2	requested 9:10
referring 13:6	62:15 68:11	reluctant 159:11	95:10,14 96:14	43:8 78:22
32:20 34:10,18	146:7 223:23	rely 139:6 157:8	96:20,25 97:12	133:21 233:24
51:13 62:6 76:2	regrettably 70:1	relying 57:14 61:4	97:17 98:4,11	requesting 68:15
77:7 96:4 99:21	87:15	remain 86:9	99:1,14 104:6,7	129:3 150:25
111:11 121:21,24	regular 59:20	214:11	109:19 110:6	152:21 153:3
122:1,14 134:4	160:14	remained 27:15	111:20 113:21	191:11

require 112:19	responds 55:15	25:23 31:23	164:10 166:7,17	rolling 87:12
220:21	60:24	34:24 45:24 65:6	168:22 169:23	room 68:23 69:22
required 12:23	response 18:25	67:20 73:23	171:13 172:1	107:17 193:5
65:25 89:19	19:7 49:4 61:24	78:11,22 79:14	173:13 172:1	195:6 196:14
103:21 112:21	63:18,25 78:12	80:3 81:13 86:5	174:22 175:24	202:10 242:5,6
113:1	80:25 82:7,12	88:4 91:2 92:13	176:4,20 177:6	rooms 68:22 110:2
requirement 75:2	85:3 104:2	92:20 94:21 95:2	177:16,25 178:25	rooted 163:14
requiring 86:9	113:13 114:16	96:12 100:14,19	182:7 202:6	rooting 119:13
requisite 74:5	115:4 123:8	100:24 103:1	208:23 209:4,11	round 28:3 86:19
rescue 67:3	142:4 157:6	104:19 107:14,18	209:17 223:4	122:3 193:18
research 106:14	193:7,21 221:17	109:6 115:19,25	230:13 233:23	route 74:8 139:5
reservations 93:2	228:7 230:24	116:8,11,21	234:4,8,10,17	147:20 148:3
93:21	233:3 237:15	119:12 129:8,10	235:11,24 236:4	150:10 157:24
resist 176:16	responses 11:4	133:4 142:13	240:23 241:2,3	185:21 207:10
resolved 35:5	20:25 21:1	143:11,18 154:16	241:22 243:4	221:24
139:10 159:2	responsibilities	157:4 158:25	244:18,24 245:6	routes 246:8
172:3 185:15	21:14 69:8	159:7 164:2	245:14	routine 68:18
resolving 183:7	responsibility 29:6	170:4 177:2,14	Richardson's	routinely 222:11
resonate 100:23	68:3 69:5,7,19,24	182:5 183:6	131:12 159:25	Royal 97:18
100:23 213:18	70:2 199:1	184:1,13,25	162:14 168:21	rules 1:12
resort 146:8	235:14 236:9	185:1,10 195:15	171:20	run 72:8,9 166:24
197:25 201:4	responsible 69:10	198:18 205:14	right 4:21 5:3,23	166:24 167:12,13
resource 107:6	99:19	215:6 216:23,25	9:13 22:2 30:10	248:2
119:2	responsive 152:1	217:16 226:1,25	47:16 48:2 58:22	running 60:25
resources 87:22	159:12	227:9 230:9	73:12 75:22	69:17 234:12
88:6,10,12,18	rest 72:6	244:6,14,24	77:22 81:7 94:5	runway 14:8,13
101:7 153:3	restriction 125:1	246:7,18 249:13	106:5 116:20	18:18 26:6
154:9,10,10	result 6:22 8:10	250:3,7	127:20 132:16	
resourcing 96:18	27:18 116:1	RGP's 24:15	133:14 170:3	S
respect 27:16	117:15	148:16 217:7	191:7 196:6,7,19	s 43:12
35:14 39:10	results 68:11 93:7	220:5	197:4 198:16	Sacramento 96:19
81:25 99:9	retired 4:13	RGP/Spanish	220:14 226:7	113:18,20 114:21
100:12,18,25	106:19	25:22	251:22	115:15 116:17
101:2 109:16	retirement 15:19	rib 7:18,20	rightly 36:17 97:7	193:1
167:21 189:14	retorted 222:24	Richardson 4:17	111:16 167:7	safe 52:10,14 53:9
215:8 218:3	retribution 36:13	4:21 5:25 6:8,12	rights 81:7 141:9	61:22
219:22 221:3	246:21	15:25 23:11 41:3	rip 196:16	safeguard 164:21
233:5 238:2	return 80:2 82:25	41:11 42:13	risk 65:6,7 97:24	Samantha 113:18
245:2 248:10	returning 113:6	47:17 126:9	107:5,7,15,24	sample 36:14 92:8
respectful 29:20	reveal 129:18,21	129:22 130:21	109:2,7	171:8 179:10
respond 11:12	revealed 86:6	131:7,19,20	risks 164:23	samples 179:20
54:9 76:21 82:9	revert 180:11	132:20 133:1	robustly 100:20	Sanchez 135:17
116:12 152:10	review 87:18 89:8	134:1,13,14	215:10	144:21 148:2
responded 114:16	90:7	137:17 139:2,21	Rocca 139:25	149:4,24 150:6,9
185:25	revisited 97:20	145:17 146:18,18	Rock 163:7	189:11 207:11
respondent 76:20	revolutionary	147:1,5,8,15	role 35:15 39:17	221:11,23 222:1
responding 19:16	246:22	150:22 152:18	85:25 101:16	sanction 206:18
19:17 20:1 32:17	RGP 4:11 8:11	155:8 160:13	248:1,1	sanctioned 206:17
67:1	12:2 23:19 24:5	161:19 163:21	roles 112:19	231:4,13 Santa 13:15 14:5
				Santa 15.15 14.5

				Page 282
14:17 18:18 44:3	gave 12.0 10.16	savaanahat 110.22	000 0.5 15.0 10	107.21 200.14 10
44:17	says 13:8 18:16 23:18 26:16	screenshot 110:22 110:22	see 9:5 15:9,10 16:9 20:9 28:14	197:21 208:14,18
Santos 1:3,16,19	28:10 30:24 31:1	screenshots 129:4	29:2,3 43:4 50:2	215:8,14 216:5 216:20
25:16 30:22	31:17 34:20	scroll 251:4	70:25 72:17	sensationalist
45:17,21 46:14	44:24 45:10 47:7	se 76:14	74:18 75:1 86:11	118:4
58:24 66:13,19	51:4,7 54:3,18	sea 59:18 69:25	98:19 116:10	sense 18:2 40:5
72:25 103:2	60:25 64:7 65:11	search 67:2 143:24	121:7 131:25	42:15 93:7
121:11,14,19	65:15,16 81:2,11	153:21 160:22	132:5,7 136:21	115:21 117:18,21
141:12 142:3	93:18 95:22,23	161:2 165:24	137:2 153:6	124:7 139:16
167:9 169:11	107:1 109:12	166:4,19 167:3	169:24 180:12	162:19 175:6
170:9 173:4	110:8 113:20	175:5,10 189:20	210:13,22 244:6	184:6 199:4
178:23 188:10,18	115:16 119:16	190:9 191:15	249:6	225:7
190:5 197:8	120:1,12 122:25	198:5 201:9	seeing 115:7	senses 116:11
210:16 211:12	124:9 126:9	203:3 208:3	181:12	sensitive 160:6,24
230:3 237:4,11	130:23 132:22	203.3 208.3 215:7 218:6	seek 72:16 79:11	161:5,14 189:4
237:17 252:25	144:4 146:19	219:24 224:11,15	80:16 101:19	217:3
sat 146:11 251:24	147:1 148:4,5,13	227:5,10,23	102:23 166:18	sensitivities 71:18
satellite 45:25	158:3 161:20	230:11 231:12	167:6,10 218:5	165:10 168:4
46:20	162:3 168:3	second 2:6,8 15:24	219:2,23	186:21
satisfaction 88:17	171:21 172:18	40:11 64:6 82:9	seeking 31:23	sent 6:7 7:15 16:1
92:15	173:13 181:22	98:4 115:16	64:21 166:23	25:19,20 26:9,11
satisfied 27:8	182:22 184:6,10	118:24 126:4,5	Seeks 153:23	26:15,17 27:2
197:24 201:3	189:13 196:1	126:15 144:4,16	154:3	34:11 39:21
saved 53:19 194:8	200:1 205:4	153:16 161:9	seemingly 65:10	78:20 81:1 95:21
194:23	211:22 213:12	164:13 165:12	211:24 212:22	97:13 118:16
savings 112:24	214:20 216:6	211:20 228:5,7	seen 4:15 6:6	143:22 148:11
saw 39:15 104:1	218:1 221:17	232:6 234:15	14:21 32:5 42:12	164:10 165:1
163:11 232:13	222:3,23 224:8	235:4	83:11,14 91:19	169:4 170:1
saying 15:1 19:24	230:8 231:2,4,11	secondary 173:25	91:20 131:11	232:14
31:5,6 47:8,10	242:1 243:17	177:20	134:12 196:15	sentence 30:25
52:2 72:10 75:9	247:5	Secondly 29:21	209:24 216:7	52:5 171:22
84:10 94:24 99:5	scale 218:12	64:16 226:20	sees 245:19,20	219:19
107:25 122:22	scanned 158:4	secret 216:3	seized 153:19	sentences 108:25
140:7,14 142:24	scenario 174:25	237:22,24 246:14	seizure 246:15	separate 7:16
145:25 147:6,7	scenarios 174:15	secretaries 241:8	self-protection	September 125:24
147:13 160:3	174:20	secretary 113:12	243:11	128:17 129:15,19
174:22 179:9	scene 66:4,6	127:23 133:24,25	self-serving	sergeant 9:17,21
183:23 184:1	scheduled 210:24	143:3 153:6,7	243:12	57:9,10
198:4,13,14	scientific 18:4	156:17 241:7	send 19:5,12 20:10	series 152:11,11
201:8 209:1	scope 92:23	secretly 240:8	20:17 40:1 58:15	serious 8:17 36:2,7
210:6 212:19	scores 250:14	section 9:12 10:5	157:14 168:22	36:9 58:8 65:5,7
217:13,24 219:16	Scotland 71:16	66:22 67:20,22	189:2 192:7	82:17 123:23
223:3,12 224:1	75:13	68:9 69:1,16,17	sending 35:12 40:5	125:2,5 126:24
225:14 226:12	scourge 118:22	110:7 122:2	sends 11:17	127:1 145:20
227:24 235:23	scrap 181:13	234:5	senior 4:20 5:18	154:8 182:25
239:23 243:10,12	screen 3:23 20:6	securing 27:19	9:17 39:22 57:7	200:14 209:1
244:12 247:22	65:23 66:2 81:2	security 125:3	102:2 107:9	246:13 247:19
249:17 251:6	143:22 151:16	126:24 164:21	150:22 152:18	seriously 77:2
252:12,16	188:23	249:24 250:2	190:14 195:13	123:14 220:4

servant 221:7 shock 35:23 190:2 slip 223:10 236:6,21 240:25 servicet 4:25 5:13 shock 35:23 213:21 221:20 significantly 174.7 slipped 10:15 236:6,21 240:25 49:16 92:11,14 95:3 105:11,21 105:22,242.5 106:22,242.5 106:22,242.5 106:22 12:19,21 133:14 226:17 230:18 35:18 shortfalls 68:7 105:22,242.5 106:21 1,24 short 66:17 93:3 121:17 188:16 sinple 61:14,15 small 119:3 sort 14:2 29:21 128:9 135:18 shortfalls 68:7 69:9 119:8 shortfalls 68:7 73:15 90:1 social 35:47:22 188:1,3 100:21 139:10 243:23 340:43:23 340:45:17 98:23 340:46:12 340:46:12 340:46:12 340:46:12 340:46:12 340:46:12 340:29:29:29 320:29:29:23 320:44:17:29:19 340:29:19 39:24:29:22 320:14:38:12 340:48:39:29 340:48:39:29 340:48:39:29 340:48:39:29 340:48:39:29 340:48:39:29 340:48:39:29 340:48:39:29 340:48:39:29 340:48:39:29 340:48:39:29 340:48:39:29 340:48:39:29 340:48:39:29 340:48:39:29					Page 283
	gamyant 221.7	ah o ak 25.22	100.2	din 222.10	226.6 21 240.25
served 4:25 5:13 shocked 7:21 silk 190:14 195:14 slow 141:15 sort 14:2 29:21 service 4:12 35:25 49:16 92:11,14 shocking 70:7.7,8 106:21 20:19,21 shocking 70:7.7,8 similar 36:4 smith 45:2 32:18 50:5 75:11 105:22,24,25 114:2 short 66:17 93:3 114:2 simple 61:14,15 snapshot 111:14 154:24 162:20 122:23 123:1 121:17 188:16 shortfalls 68:7 69:9 119:8 154:25 190:1 73:15 90:1 163:6 164:1 229:25 239:22 150:10 243:23 show 149:39:25 show 34:9 39:25 simultaneous softer 215:17 244:21 247:2 softer 215:17 244:21 247:2 244:22 247:2 163:6 164:1 229:25 239:22 244:22 248:2 35:14 softer 215:17 244:21 247:7 244:21 247:7 244:21 247:7 244:21 247:2 244:21 247:2 244:22 247:7 244:21 247:2 244:21 247:2 244:21 247:2 244:21 247:2 244:21 247:2 244:22 248:2 246:24 248:2 246:24 248:2 251:5 350*4 39:25 350*4 39:25 350*4 39:25 350*4 39:25 350*4 39:25 350*4 39:25 350*4 39:25 350*4 3				_	•
117:8 147:23 205:7 230:1 241:15 230:1 241:1			· ·		
service 4:12 35:25 230:1 241:15 similar 36:4 Smith 45:2 32:18 50:5 75:11 32:18 50:5 75:11 32:18 50:5 75:11 32:18 50:5 75:11 88:13 30:21 88:13 30:21 88:12 30:5 89:12 30:5 89:12 30:5 89:12 30:5 89:12 30:5 89:12 30:5 89:12 30:5 89:12 30:5 89:12 30:5 89:12 30:5 89:12 30:5 89:12 30:5 89:12 30:5 89:12 30:5 89:12 30:5 89:12 30:5 89:12 30:5 89:12 30:5 <					
49:16 92:11,144 95:3 105:11,21 105:22,24,25 106:2 122:19,21 114:2 simple 61:14,15 simple					
95:3 105:11,21 105:22,24,25 106:2 122:19,21 122:23 123:1 128:9 135:18 shortfalls 68:7 116:10 150:14 128:9 135:18 shortfalls 68:7 116:10 150:14 128:9 135:18 shortfalls 68:7 116:10 150:14 128:9 135:18 shorty 175:3 show 34:9 39:25 services 218:16 serving 81:9 97:5 15:16 168:23 87:12,15 91:9 97:5 164:19 97:5 164:19 97:5 164:19 97:15 164:19 97:15 164:19 97:15 164:19 167:25 182:14 215:2 216:15 167:20 setting 73:4 87:7 167:20 182:14 167:25 182:14 167:20 setting 73:4 87:7 155:14 188:25 seventh 3:21,24 151:10,24 Shadow 143:4 shaken 7:21 146:10 213:21 shame 115:24 shame 115:24 shape 43:13 85:21 122:17 share 56:5 share 169:1 share 17:24 172:4,15,22 172:4 130:12 138:16 169:1 share 17:24 172:4,15,22 172:4 172:4;13,22 172:4 172:4;13,22 172:4 172:4;13,22 172:4 172:4;13,19 172:4 172:4;13,19 172:4 172:4;13,19 172:4 172:4;13,19 172:4 172:4;13,19 172:4 172:4;13,19 172:4 172:4;13,19 173:19 173:19 174:10:10:10:10:10:10:10:10:10:10:10:10:10:					
105:22,24,25	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	0		00 0	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
106:2 122:19,21 121:17 188:16 189:1 121:17 188:16 189:1 121:17 188:16 189:1 121:17 188:16 189:1 121:17 188:16 189:1 189:14 189:18 189:					
121:17 188:16	· · ·		·	_	
128:9 135:18	•				
144:22 148:3 69:9 119:8 shortly 175:3 show 34:9 39:25 services 218:16 serving 81:9 50:18,23 105:2 stee 6:3 22:17 59:13 243:24 showed 15:24 showed 15:24 shown 15:15 21:7 97:15 164:19 93:24 229:22 shown 15:15 21:7 233:16 stee 5:2 216:15 57:24 104:14 233:16 172:25 205:15 shows 38:4 61:8 172:25 205:15 shows 38:4 61:8 100:14 117:14 setting 73:4 87:7 stee 125:20:13 223:21 223:21 223:21 223:21 223:21 223:21 223:21 223:21 223:21 223:21 223:21 233:19 stited 15:5 95:17 seven 34:16 235:13 sinsterly 49:7 stitus 73:4 87:7 stitus 73:4 188:25 100:14 117:14 125:2 16:4 125:2 16:4 125:2 16:4 125:2 13:19 stited 15:5 95:17 seven 34:16 235:13 236:9 stitus 10:32					
150:10 243:23 show 34:9 39:25 services 218:16 50:18,23 105:2 20:25 solely 19:25 32:15 sought 40:21 47:8 solid 159:16 16:12 20:31:0 224:9 223:10 224:9 223:10 224:9 223:10 224:9 223:10 224:9 223:10 224:9 223:10 224:9 223:10 224:9 223:10 224:9 223:10 224:9 223:10 224:9 223:11 23:10 224:9 223:10					
244:6,12 show 34:9 39:25 simultaneous solcly 19:25 32:15 sorts 47:3 sorts 16:12 sorts 16:12 sorts 17:13 sorts 17:13 sorts 47:3 sorts 17:13 southcen 11:15 southcen 11:15 southcen 11:15 southcen 11:					
services 218:16 serving 81:9 set 6:3 22:17 59:13 70:5 71:10 86:20 87:12,15 91:9 97:15 164:19 97:15 164:19 97:15 164:19 97:15 164:19 97:15 164:19 97:24 29:22 8howing 64:19 97:24 29:22 8howing 64:19 97:24 29:22 8howing 64:19 97:24 20:22 8howing 64:19 97:24 29:22 8howing 64:19 97:24 29:22 8howing 64:19 93:24 229:22 8howing 64:19 8howing					
serving 81:9 151:16 168:23 single 243:21,21 61:21 78:14 154:13 set 63 22:17 59:13 243:24 243:22 solid 159:16 190:9,16 19!:15 70:5 71:10 86:20 showed 15:24 sinister 235:1 solid 159:16 190:9,16 19!:15 97:15 164:19 93:24 229:22 showing 64:19 93:24 229:22 SIO 57:6,7 126:10 65:14 67:14 source 9:22 192:14 215:2 216:15 57:24 104:14 sinisterly 49:7 solutions 13:23 source 9:22 192:14 233:16 172:25 205:12 46:12 47:11,19 somewhat 22:17 source 9:22 192:14 26t7:20 shows 38:4 61:8 141:19 142:2 21:11 54:13 57:6 sourtes 22:16,18 2stting 73:4 87:7 100:14 117:14 197:5 216:4 109:24 112:1 Source 9:22 192:14 2sttle 250:13 223:21 223:61 233:4 193:19 194:6 30:19 37:20 40:4 2sttle 250:13 223:21 236:14,25 237:17 sorry 11:17 12:1 64:18 73:8,9,21 2sted 15:5 95:17 350 130:24 sitten 193:5 39:2,4,6 41:20 30:19 37:20 40:4 2sty 13:19 SiD (30:24 <td>,</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	,				
set 6:3 22:17 59:13 243:24 243:22 solid 159:16 190:9;16 191:15 70:5 71:10 86:20 showed 15:24 sinister 235:1 166:12 223:10 224:9 87:12,15 91:9 93:24 229:22 SIO 57:6,7 126:10 65:14 67:14 source 9:22 192:14 167:25 182:14 50:21 61:15 57:24 104:14 50:14 167:17 southons 113:23 source 9:22 192:14 233:16 172:25 205:12 46:12 47:11,19 29:23 southorn 13:23 southern 14:10,10 set 73:3 95:21 206:4 207:15 49:1 66:15 soom 16:18 20:4 14:11,12 167:20 shows 38:4 61:8 141:19 142:2 21:11 54:13 57:6 Southern 14:10,10 settle 250:13 233:1 233:11 235:13 236:9 233:14 197:5 216:4 109:24 112:1 5pain 25:24 29:4 settle 15:5 95:17 shrugging 199:1 235:13 236:9 235:13 236:9 36:14,25 237:17 30:19 37:20 40:4 seventh 3:21,24 151:10,24 128:15 215:19 35:14 32 44:11 20:8,14 74:4 76:3 84:18 Shadow 143:4 36c 26:6 52:9 251:23,24 44:6 45:6,7,9,					<u> </u>
70:5 71:10 86:20 showed 15:24 showing 64:19 sinister 235:1 sinister 235:1 166:12 Solis 15:17 49:17 223:10 224:9 226:21 226:21 226:21 226:21 226:21 226:21 226:21 226:21 226:21 226:21 226:21 226:21 223:10 224:9 226:21 227:21 227:21 227:21 228:22 228:23 228:23 228:23 228:23 228:23 228:23 229:12 228:23			,		
87:12,15 91:9 97:15 164:19 showing 64:19 93:24 229:22 Shown 15:15 21:7 97:15 164:19 showing 64:19 93:24 229:22 Shown 15:15 21:7 SIO 57:6,7 126:10 128:16 147:17 store 121:52 216:15 215:216:15 215:22 216:15 23:16 172:25 205:12 206:4 207:15 206:25 206:4 207:15 206:4 207:15 206:4 207:15 206:4 207:15 206:25 206:4 207:15 206:4 207:15 206:4 2		_	=		•
97:15 164:19 93:24 229:22 shown 15:15 21:7 SIO 57:6,7 126:10 65:14 67:14 source 9:22 192:14 215:2 216:15 235:16 57:24 104:14 sir 1:16 4:21 46:2 206:4 207:15 46:12 47:11,19 29:23 source 9:22 192:14 30:24 12:11 29:23 source 9:22 192:14 30:21 29:23 source 9:22 192:14 46:12 47:11,19 29:23 29:23 source 9:22 192:14 46:12 47:11,19 29:23 29:13 29:14 21:11 23:12 30:11 30:11 17:12:1 30:11 17:12:1 30:11 17:12:1 30:11 17:12:1 30:12:12:12 30:12:12:					
167:25 182:14 215:2 216:15 57:24 104:14 sir 1:16 4:21 46:2 29:23 sources 22:16,18 23:4 53:20 sets 73:3 95:21 206:4 207:15 49:1 66:15 30:11 54:13 57:6 30:14 117:14 197:5 216:4 199:24 112:1 30:14 117:14 197:5 216:4 199:24 112:1 30:13 57:24 29:4	,	S			
215:2 216:15 57:24 104:14 17:25 205:12 46:12 47:11,19 29:23 southern 14:10,10			,		
233:16 sets 73:3 95:21 172:25 205:12 206:4 207:15 46:12 47:11,19 49:1 66:15 29:23 soon 16:18 20:4 southern 14:10,10 setting 73:4 87:7 155:14 188:25 100:14 117:14 155:24 158:16 197:5 216:4 229:15 234:4 21:11 54:13 57:6 Sovereign 94:17 Spain 25:24 29:4 settle 250:13 settled 15:5 95:17 seven 34:16 223:21 235:13 236:9 Sirens 168:11 235:13 236:9 36:25 37:1,3 36:25 37:1,3 39:2,4,6 41:20 Spain 25:24 29:4 30:19 37:20 40:4 seven 34:16 123:19 235:13 236:9 Sto 130:24 sirens 168:11 sitting 193:5 251:23,24 36:25 37:1,3 39:2,4,6 41:20 Spanish 12:22 151:10,24 240:7,16 316:25 21:14 siding 228:24 situation 8:9 29:4 47:2 67:1 70:9 58:24 71:12 46:14 50:24 51:2 25:5,25 29:9 24:5,7,12,19 25:2 25:5,25 29:9 shaken 7:21 146:10 213:21 shame 115:24 shape 43:13 85:21 122:17 siding 228:24 sigh 34:2 216:24 174:25 188:9 193:23 205:15 82:10 83:24 117:10,20,021 119:23 121:1 120:21 33:25 34:23,25 25:5,25 29:9 share 66:5 signal 17:19 22:8 share 19:20 situations 75:3 signal 48:2 34:22 43:24 119:23 121:1 125:6,11 142:2 44:12,14,16 79:5 175:8 177:22 40:16,19 42:4 43:25 44:4 45:4 44:25 67:17 7:20 44:26,11 142:2 25:5,25 29:9 44:26,11 142:2 25:5,25 29:9 42:10 20:11 20					1
sets 73:3 95:21 206:4 207:15 49:1 66:15 soon 16:18 20:4 14:11,12 setting 73:4 87:7 100:14 117:14 197:5 216:4 21:11 54:13 57:6 Sovereign 94:17 settle 250:13 223:21 236:14,25 237:17 sory 11:17 12:1 64:18 73:8,9,21 seven 34:16 235:13 236:9 sirens 168:11 36:25 37:1,3 Spanish 12:22 123:19 SIO 130:24 sitting 193:5 39:2,4,6 41:20 13:21 15:15 seventh 3:21,24 128:15 215:19 situation 8:9 29:4 46:14 50:24 51:2 224:57,12,19 25:2 Shadow 143:4 240:7,16 47:2 67:1 70:9 58:24 71:12 24:57,712,19 25:2 shame 115:24 side's 212:14 83:16 149:10 72:24 74:22 25:5,25 29:9 shame 43:13 85:21 sign 43:10 situations 75:3 119:23 12:1 33:25 34:23,25 share 56:5 signal 17:19 22:8 situations 75:3 119:23 12:1 40:16,19 42:4 share 56:5 signal 17:19 22:8 situations 75:3 119:23 12:1 40:16,19 42:4 share 16:13 signal 56:22 situations 75:3 119:23 12:1					
167:20 shows 38:4 61:8 141:19 142:2 21:11 54:13 57:6 Sovereign 94:17 setting 73:4 87:7 155:14 188:25 152:24 158:16 197:5 216:4 109:24 112:1 Spain 25:24 29:4 settle 250:13 23:21 23:61:4,25 237:17 sorry 11:7 12:1 64:18 73:8,9,21 settled 15:5 95:17 shrugging 199:1 252:23 sirens 168:11 36:25 37:1,3 Spanish 12:22 123:19 SI0 130:24 sitting 193:5 39:2,4,6 41:20 13:21 15:15 seventh 3:21,24 36e 26:6 52:9 251:23,24 44:6 45:6,7,9,21 16:16,23 17:1,8 151:10,24 128:15 215:19 situation 8:9 29:4 46:14 50:24 51:2 22:12 23:25 24:3 Shaken 7:21 side's 212:14 83:16 149:10 72:24 74:22 25:5,25 29:9 146:10 213:21 sight 34:2 216:24 174:25 188:9 82:10 83:24 33:12,20 32:8 shame 15:24 signal 3*:10 situations 75:3 119:23 12:1 40:16,19 42:4 share 56:5 signal 17:19 22:8 SIV 13:17 125:6,11 142:2 43:25 44:4 45:4 share 19:20 56:23 <td></td> <td></td> <td>· ·</td> <td></td> <td></td>			· ·		
setting 73:4 87:7 100:14 117:14 197:5 216:4 109:24 112:1 Spain 25:24 29:4 155:14 188:25 152:24 158:16 229:15 234:4 193:19 194:6 30:19 37:20 40:4 settle 250:13 233:21 shrugging 199:1 236:14,25 237:17 sorry 11:17 12:1 64:18 73:8,9,21 seven 34:16 235:13 236:9 sirens 168:11 36:25 37:1,3 39:24,46 41:20 39:24,46 41:20 123:19 Si0 130:24 sitting 193:5 39:24,46 41:20 13:21 15:15 seventh 3:21,24 side 26:6 52:9 251:23,24 44:6 45:6,7,9,21 16:16,23 17:1,8 151:10,24 128:15 215:19 situation 8:9 29:4 46:14 50:24 51:2 21:12 23:25 24:3 Shadow 143:4 240:7,16 47:2 67:1 70:9 58:24 71:12 24:5,7,12,19 25:2 shaken 7:21 siding 228:24 174:25 188:9 82:10 83:24 31:12,20 32:8 shame 115:24 sifted 216:23 193:23 205:15 103:2,4,6 104:17 33:25 34:23,25 share 56:5 signal 17:19 22:8 siV 13:17 125:6,11 142:2 43:25 44:4 45:4 share 66:5 signalled 78:23 <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·</td>					· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
155:14 188:25 152:24 158:16 229:15 234:4 193:19 194:6 30:19 37:20 40:4 settle 250:13 233:21 236:14,25 237:17 sorry 11:17 12:1 64:18 73:8,9,21 settled 15:5 95:17 shrugging 199:1 252:23 14:11 20:8,14 74:4 76:3 84:18 seven 34:16 235:13 236:9 sirens 168:11 36:25 37:1,3 39:2,4,6 41:20 13:21 15:15 seventh 3:21,24 side 26:6 52:9 251:23,24 44:6 45:6,7,9,21 16:16,23 17:1,8 151:10,24 128:15 215:19 situation 8:9 29:4 46:14 50:24 51:2 21:12 23:25 24:3 Shadow 143:4 240:7,16 47:2 67:1 70:9 58:24 71:12 24:5,7,12,19 25:2 shaken 7:21 side's 212:14 83:16 149:10 72:24 74:22 25:5,25 29:9 146:10 213:21 sifted 216:23 193:23 205:15 103:2,4,6 104:17 33:25 34:23,25 shape 43:13 85:21 sign 43:10 situations 75:3 119:23 12:1 40:16,19 42:4 shared 19:20 56:23 signal 17:19 22:8 SIV 13:17 125:6,11 142:2 43:25 44:4 45:4 shareholders signalure 1:25 <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>					
settle 250:13 223:21 236:14,25 237:17 sorry 11:17 12:1 64:18 73:8,9,21 settled 15:5 95:17 shrugging 199:1 252:23 14:11 20:8,14 74:4 76:3 84:18 seven 34:16 235:13 236:9 sirens 168:11 36:25 37:1,3 Spanish 12:22 seventh 3:21,24 side 26:6 52:9 251:23,24 44:6 45:6,7,9,21 16:16,23 17:1,8 151:10,24 128:15 215:19 situation 8:9 29:4 46:14 50:24 51:2 21:12 23:25 24:3 Shadow 143:4 240:7,16 47:2 67:1 70:9 58:24 71:12 24:5,7,12,19 25:2 shaken 7:21 siding 228:24 174:25 188:9 82:10 83:24 31:12,20 32:8 shame 115:24 sifted 216:23 193:23 205:15 103:2,4,6 104:17 33:25 34:23,25 shape 43:13 85:21 sign 43:10 situations 75:3 117:10,10,20,21 35:2,8 38:6,13,23 share 56:5 signal 17:19 22:8 six 18:18 33:24 158:1 161:4 48:24 50:20 52:8 shared 19:20 56:23 six 18:18 33:24 158:1 161:4 48:24 50:20 52:8 shareholders signature 1:25 sixth 3:15 18:14 1	<u> </u>				
settled 15:5 95:17 shrugging 199:1 252:23 14:11 20:8,14 74:4 76:3 84:18 seven 34:16 235:13 236:9 sirens 168:11 36:25 37:1,3 Spanish 12:22 123:19 SIO 130:24 sitting 193:5 39:2,4,6 41:20 13:21 15:15 seventh 3:21,24 side 26:6 52:9 251:23,24 44:6 45:6,7,9,21 16:16,23 17:1,8 151:10,24 128:15 215:19 situation 8:9 29:4 46:14 50:24 51:2 21:12 23:25 24:3 Shadow 143:4 240:7,16 47:2 67:1 70:9 58:24 71:12 24:5,7,12,19 25:2 shaken 7:21 siding 228:24 174:25 188:9 82:10 83:24 31:12,20 32:8 shame 115:24 sight 34:2 193:23 205:15 103:2,4,6 104:17 33:25 34:23,25 shape 43:13 85:21 sign 43:10 situations 75:3 119:23 121:1 40:16,19 42:4 share 56:5 signal 17:19 22:8 six 18:18 33:24 15:1 16:4 48:24 50:20 52:8 shared 19:20 56:23 signals 56:22 44:12,14,16 79:5 175:8 177:22 62:10 64:13,14 shareholders signature 1:25 sixth 3:15 18:14					
seven 34:16 235:13 236:9 sirens 168:11 36:25 37:1,3 Spanish 12:22 seventh 3:21,24 side 26:6 52:9 251:23,24 44:6 45:6,7,9,21 16:16,23 17:1,8 151:10,24 128:15 215:19 situation 8:9 29:4 46:14 50:24 51:2 21:12 23:25 24:3 Shadow 143:4 240:7,16 47:2 67:1 70:9 58:24 71:12 24:5,7,12,19 25:2 shaken 7:21 side's 212:14 83:16 149:10 72:24 74:22 25:5,25 29:9 146:10 213:21 siding 228:24 174:25 188:9 82:10 83:24 31:12,20 32:8 shame 115:24 sifted 216:23 193:23 205:15 103:2,4,6 104:17 33:25 34:23,25 shape 43:13 85:21 sigh 43:10 situations 75:3 119:23 12:1 40:16,19 42:4 share 56:5 signal 17:19 22:8 SIV 13:17 125:6,11 142:2 43:25 44:4 45:4 shared 19:20 56:23 six 18:18 33:24 158:1 161:4 48:24 50:20 52:8 95:15 123:12 signalled 78:23 34:22 43:24 163:1 165:25 54:25 61:11 62:8 shareholders signature 1:25 sixth 3:15 18:14 skip 52:5 74:20 <td></td> <td></td> <td>-</td> <td></td> <td></td>			-		
123:19 SIO 130:24 sitting 193:5 39:2,4,6 41:20 13:21 15:15 seventh 3:21,24 side 26:6 52:9 251:23,24 44:6 45:6,7,9,21 16:16,23 17:1,8 151:10,24 128:15 215:19 situation 8:9 29:4 46:14 50:24 51:2 21:12 23:25 24:3 Shadow 143:4 240:7,16 47:2 67:1 70:9 58:24 71:12 24:5,7,12,19 25:2 shaken 7:21 siding 228:24 174:25 188:9 82:10 83:24 31:12,20 32:8 shame 115:24 sifted 216:23 193:23 205:15 103:2,4,6 104:17 33:25 34:23,25 shape 43:13 85:21 sign 43:10 situations 75:3 119:23 12:1 40:16,19 42:4 share 56:5 signal 17:19 22:8 SIV 13:17 125:6,11 142:2 43:25 44:4 45:4 shared 19:20 56:23 six 18:18 33:24 158:1 161:4 48:24 50:20 52:8 95:15 123:12 signals 56:22 44:12,14,16 79:5 175:8 177:22 62:10 64:13,14 shareholders signature 1:25 sixth 3:15 18:14 188:22,24 197:1 64:19 65:17 sharing 57:21 3:16,25 4:4,5 signed 197:24 slightly 29:13,18 <td></td> <td>00 0</td> <td></td> <td>•</td> <td></td>		00 0		•	
seventh 3:21,24 side 26:6 52:9 251:23,24 44:6 45:6,7,9,21 16:16,23 17:1,8 Shadow 143:4 240:7,16 47:2 67:1 70:9 58:24 71:12 24:5,7,12,19 25:2 shaken 7:21 side's 212:14 83:16 149:10 72:24 74:22 25:5,25 29:9 shame 115:24 sifted 216:23 193:23 205:15 103:2,4,6 104:17 33:25 34:23,25 shape 43:13 85:21 sign 43:10 situations 75:3 119:23 121:1 40:16,19 42:4 share 56:5 signal 17:19 22:8 SIV 13:17 125:6,11 142:2 48:24 50:20 52:8 95:15 123:12 signals 56:22 six 18:18 33:24 158:1 161:4 48:24 50:20 52:8 95:15 123:12 signals 56:22 sixth 3:15 18:14 188:22,24 197:1 64:19 65:17 130:11 2:10,19 3:1,2,10 skip 52:5 74:20 200:11 201:19,20 66:25 67:4 71:17 sharp 171:24 signed 197:24 slight) 29:13,18 226:3 227:17,20 93:10 100:9,18				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	_ <u>-</u>
151:10,24 128:15 215:19 situation 8:9 29:4 46:14 50:24 51:2 21:12 23:25 24:3 Shadow 143:4 240:7,16 47:2 67:1 70:9 58:24 71:12 24:5,7,12,19 25:2 shaken 7:21 side's 212:14 83:16 149:10 72:24 74:22 25:5,25 29:9 shame 115:24 sifted 216:23 193:23 205:15 103:2,4,6 104:17 33:25 34:23,25 shape 43:13 85:21 sign 43:10 situations 75:3 117:10,10,20,21 35:2,8 38:6,13,23 share 56:5 signal 17:19 22:8 SIV 13:17 125:6,11 142:2 43:25 44:4 45:4 shared 19:20 56:23 signalled 78:23 34:22 43:24 158:1 161:4 48:24 50:20 52:8 95:15 123:12 signals 56:22 34:22 43:24 163:1 165:25 54:25 61:11 62:8 130:11 2:10,19 3:1,2,10 skip 52:5 74:20 200:11 201:19,20 66:25 67:4 71:17 sharing 57:21 3:16,25 4:4,5 75:23 201:23 209:16 74:9 195:8 sharp 171:24 201:2,14 slightly 29:13,18 226:3 227:17,20 93:10 100:9,18			O		
Shadow 143:4 240:7,16 47:2 67:1 70:9 58:24 71:12 24:5,7,12,19 25:2 shaken 7:21 side's 212:14 83:16 149:10 72:24 74:22 25:5,25 29:9 146:10 213:21 siding 228:24 174:25 188:9 82:10 83:24 31:12,20 32:8 shame 115:24 sifted 216:23 193:23 205:15 103:2,4,6 104:17 33:25 34:23,25 shape 43:13 85:21 sight 34:2 216:24 117:10,10,20,21 35:2,8 38:6,13,23 share 56:5 signal 17:19 22:8 SIV 13:17 125:6,11 142:2 43:25 44:4 45:4 shared 19:20 56:23 six 18:18 33:24 158:1 161:4 48:24 50:20 52:8 95:15 123:12 signalled 78:23 34:22 43:24 163:1 165:25 54:25 61:11 62:8 130:11 signature 1:25 sixth 3:15 18:14 188:22,24 197:1 64:19 65:17 sharing 57:21 3:16,25 4:4,5 75:23 201:23 209:16 74:9 195:8 sharp 171:24 signed 197:24 slightly 29:13,18 226:3 227:17,20 93:10 100:9,18	1		*		
shaken 7:21 side's 212:14 83:16 149:10 72:24 74:22 25:5,25 29:9 shame 115:24 sifted 216:23 174:25 188:9 82:10 83:24 31:12,20 32:8 shape 43:13 85:21 sight 34:2 216:24 117:10,10,20,21 35:2,8 38:6,13,23 share 56:5 signal 17:19 22:8 SIV 13:17 125:6,11 142:2 43:25 44:4 45:4 shared 19:20 56:23 six 18:18 33:24 158:1 161:4 48:24 50:20 52:8 95:15 123:12 signals 56:22 44:12,14,16 79:5 175:8 177:22 54:25 61:11 62:8 130:11 signature 1:25 sixth 3:15 18:14 188:22,24 197:1 64:19 65:17 sharing 57:21 3:16,25 4:4,5 75:23 201:23 209:16 74:9 195:8 sharp 171:24 signed 197:24 slightly 29:13,18 226:3 227:17,20 93:10 100:9,18	*				
146:10 213:21 siding 228:24 174:25 188:9 82:10 83:24 31:12,20 32:8 shame 115:24 sifted 216:23 193:23 205:15 103:2,4,6 104:17 33:25 34:23,25 shape 43:13 85:21 sight 34:2 216:24 117:10,10,20,21 35:2,8 38:6,13,23 share 56:5 signal 17:19 22:8 situations 75:3 119:23 12:1 40:16,19 42:4 shared 19:20 56:23 six 18:18 33:24 158:1 161:4 48:24 50:20 52:8 95:15 123:12 signalled 78:23 34:22 43:24 163:1 165:25 54:25 61:11 62:8 138:16 169:1 signature 1:25 sixth 3:15 18:14 188:22,24 197:1 62:10 64:13,14 shareholders 2:10,19 3:1,2,10 skip 52:5 74:20 200:11 201:19,20 66:25 67:4 71:17 sharing 57:21 signed 197:24 slight 17:24 211:1 224:6 speak 71:1 78:18 172:4,15,22 201:2,14 slightly 29:13,18 226:3 227:17,20 93:10 100:9,18		•			1
shame 115:24 shape 43:13 85:21sifted 216:23 sight 34:2193:23 205:15 216:24103:2,4,6 104:17 117:10,10,20,2133:25 34:23,25 35:2,8 38:6,13,23share 56:5 shared 19:20signal 17:19 22:8 56:23SIV 13:17 six 18:18 33:24125:6,11 142:2 158:1 161:443:25 44:4 45:4 48:24 50:20 52:895:15 123:12 138:16 169:1signalled 78:23 signature 1:2534:22 43:24 44:12,14,16 79:5163:1 165:25 175:8 177:2254:25 61:11 62:8 62:10 64:13,14shareholders 130:11signature 1:25 2:10,19 3:1,2,10sixth 3:15 18:14 skip 52:5 74:20188:22,24 197:1 200:11 201:19,2066:25 67:4 71:17 75:23sharp 171:24 172:4,15,22signed 197:24 201:2,14slight 17:24 slightly 29:13,18226:3 227:17,2093:10 100:9,18					· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
shape 43:13 85:21sight 34:2216:24117:10,10,20,2135:2,8 38:6,13,23122:17sign 43:10situations 75:3119:23 121:140:16,19 42:4share 56:5signal 17:19 22:8SIV 13:17125:6,11 142:243:25 44:4 45:4shared 19:2056:23six 18:18 33:24158:1 161:448:24 50:20 52:895:15 123:12signalled 78:2334:22 43:24163:1 165:2554:25 61:11 62:8138:16 169:1signals 56:2244:12,14,16 79:5175:8 177:2262:10 64:13,14shareholderssignature 1:25sixth 3:15 18:14188:22,24 197:164:19 65:17130:112:10,19 3:1,2,10skip 52:5 74:20200:11 201:19,2066:25 67:4 71:17sharing 57:213:16,25 4:4,575:23201:23 209:1674:9 195:8sharp 171:24signed 197:24slight 17:24211:1 224:6speak 71:1 78:18172:4,15,22201:2,14slightly 29:13,18226:3 227:17,2093:10 100:9,18					· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
122:17 sign 43:10 situations 75:3 119:23 121:1 40:16,19 42:4 share 56:5 signal 17:19 22:8 SIV 13:17 125:6,11 142:2 43:25 44:4 45:4 shared 19:20 56:23 six 18:18 33:24 158:1 161:4 48:24 50:20 52:8 95:15 123:12 signalled 78:23 34:22 43:24 163:1 165:25 54:25 61:11 62:8 138:16 169:1 signature 1:25 sixth 3:15 18:14 188:22,24 197:1 64:19 65:17 shareholders signature 1:25 sixth 3:15 18:14 188:22,24 197:1 64:19 65:17 sharing 57:21 3:16,25 4:4,5 75:23 201:23 209:16 74:9 195:8 sharp 171:24 signed 197:24 slight 17:24 211:1 224:6 speak 71:1 78:18 172:4,15,22 201:2,14 slightly 29:13,18 226:3 227:17,20 93:10 100:9,18				/ /	
share 56:5 shared 19:20signal 17:19 22:8 56:23SIV 13:17 six 18:18 33:24125:6,11 142:2 158:1 161:443:25 44:4 45:4 48:24 50:20 52:895:15 123:12 138:16 169:1signalled 78:23 signals 56:2234:22 43:24 44:12,14,16 79:5163:1 165:25 175:8 177:2254:25 61:11 62:8 62:10 64:13,14shareholders 130:11 sharing 57:212:10,19 3:1,2,10 3:16,25 4:4,5skip 52:5 74:20 75:23200:11 201:19,20 201:23 209:1666:25 67:4 71:17 74:9 195:8sharp 171:24 172:4,15,22signed 197:24 201:2,14slight 17:24 slightly 29:13,18211:1 224:6 226:3 227:17,20speak 71:1 78:18 93:10 100:9,18	_	O .			
shared 19:20 56:23 six 18:18 33:24 158:1 161:4 48:24 50:20 52:8 95:15 123:12 signalled 78:23 34:22 43:24 163:1 165:25 54:25 61:11 62:8 138:16 169:1 signals 56:22 44:12,14,16 79:5 175:8 177:22 62:10 64:13,14 shareholders 2:10,19 3:1,2,10 skip 52:5 74:20 200:11 201:19,20 66:25 67:4 71:17 sharing 57:21 3:16,25 4:4,5 75:23 201:23 209:16 74:9 195:8 sharp 171:24 signed 197:24 slight 17:24 211:1 224:6 speak 71:1 78:18 172:4,15,22 201:2,14 slightly 29:13,18 226:3 227:17,20 93:10 100:9,18		O .			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
95:15 123:12 signalled 78:23 34:22 43:24 163:1 165:25 54:25 61:11 62:8 138:16 169:1 signals 56:22 44:12,14,16 79:5 175:8 177:22 62:10 64:13,14 shareholders signature 1:25 sixth 3:15 18:14 188:22,24 197:1 64:19 65:17 sharing 57:21 3:16,25 4:4,5 75:23 201:23 209:16 74:9 195:8 sharp 171:24 signed 197:24 slight 17:24 211:1 224:6 speak 71:1 78:18 172:4,15,22 201:2,14 slightly 29:13,18 226:3 227:17,20 93:10 100:9,18		<u> </u>		· ·	
138:16 169:1 signals 56:22 44:12,14,16 79:5 175:8 177:22 62:10 64:13,14 shareholders signature 1:25 sixth 3:15 18:14 188:22,24 197:1 64:19 65:17 130:11 2:10,19 3:1,2,10 skip 52:5 74:20 200:11 201:19,20 66:25 67:4 71:17 sharing 57:21 3:16,25 4:4,5 75:23 201:23 209:16 74:9 195:8 sharp 171:24 signed 197:24 slight 17:24 211:1 224:6 speak 71:1 78:18 172:4,15,22 201:2,14 slightly 29:13,18 226:3 227:17,20 93:10 100:9,18					
shareholders signature 1:25 sixth 3:15 18:14 188:22,24 197:1 64:19 65:17 130:11 2:10,19 3:1,2,10 skip 52:5 74:20 200:11 201:19,20 66:25 67:4 71:17 sharing 57:21 3:16,25 4:4,5 75:23 201:23 209:16 74:9 195:8 sharp 171:24 signed 197:24 slight 17:24 211:1 224:6 speak 71:1 78:18 172:4,15,22 201:2,14 slightly 29:13,18 226:3 227:17,20 93:10 100:9,18		<u> </u>			
130:11 2:10,19 3:1,2,10 skip 52:5 74:20 200:11 201:19,20 66:25 67:4 71:17 sharing 57:21 3:16,25 4:4,5 75:23 201:23 209:16 74:9 195:8 sharp 171:24 signed 197:24 slight 17:24 211:1 224:6 speak 71:1 78:18 172:4,15,22 201:2,14 slightly 29:13,18 226:3 227:17,20 93:10 100:9,18		O .			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
sharing 57:21 3:16,25 4:4,5 75:23 201:23 209:16 74:9 195:8 sharp 171:24 signed 197:24 slight 17:24 211:1 224:6 speak 71:1 78:18 172:4,15,22 201:2,14 slightly 29:13,18 226:3 227:17,20 93:10 100:9,18		O .		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
sharp 171:24 signed 197:24 slight 17:24 211:1 224:6 speak 71:1 78:18 172:4,15,22 201:2,14 slightly 29:13,18 226:3 227:17,20 93:10 100:9,18			-	•	
172:4,15,22 201:2,14 slightly 29:13,18 226:3 227:17,20 93:10 100:9,18					
		<u> </u>	<u> </u>		_
Simit 70.4,5 Significant 92:8 Sim 180:21 230:0 234:4 Speaking 101:20		-		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	SIIII /0:4,3	significant 92:8	SIIII 180:21	230:0 234:4	speaking 101:20
		<u> </u>		<u> </u>	<u> </u>

				1 age 204
212:23 231:8	stamped 211:8	124:7,8,16 130:4	storm 71:25	164:20 203:6
special 94:25	stamped 211.8 stance 30:4 83:13	133:20 134:9,18	163:25	204:1 216:11
specialist 151:2	stand 110:24	134:22,22 137:22	straddled 16:23	219:9
specific 41:1 46:19	114:11 148:19	145:22 146:14	24:3	subjective 118:5
106:13 114:14	171:6 245:12,13	148:20 149:14	straightaway	subjects 101:25
131:15,16 136:4	standard 66:5	150:19 151:7,8	217:25	156:24
137:13,13 147:12	standards 36:21	151:10,25 152:1	Straits 246:22	submission 81:24
203:16 212:15	67:21 86:16	151:10,25 152:1	strange 48:9	submitted 9:7
229:11	101:9 107:5	166:7 173:12	strategic 93:8	151:7,10
specifically 13:1	110:12,19 111:17	179:2 181:18	116:10 155:21,25	subsequent 87:9
30:12 46:25 57:4	standing 65:21	188:20,22,23,25	208:4	subsequently 6:16
154:13 166:18	226:7	200:14 201:16,17	strategy 73:18	8:24 9:9 10:16
171:5 200:4,5	start 1:4 124:14	201:21 203:16,21	155:22,23	139:4 149:9
201:11 209:12,16	251:9	211:18,19,22	stray 64:12,14	168:25 178:14
224:13 252:16	started 46:5 101:6	228:5,8 232:11	strayed 50:19	
specifics 235:22	111:23,24 112:3	232:12 234:15		substance 215:20 substantial 136:14
specify 227:22	132:4 146:11	250:17	straying 48:24 stream 1:15	substantiate 182:5
_ ·		statements 1:21	stream 1:13 streamed 1:8	
spectrum 118:7	148:22 186:8 194:7,12	43:3 112:6 129:1	streamed 1:8 streamline 181:16	successes 119:9 sudden 84:19
speculation 35:4 speed 53:14,16	starting 229:5	137:11 156:23		sudden 84:19 suffice 88:8
67:15 75:16	starting 229:3 startled 226:22	223:2	streamlining 171:3 179:6	
		_		sufficient 94:12
speed- 146:5	starts 125:16	states 37:7 195:7	streets 36:8	165:11 167:23
speed-type 146:8	208:7 251:5	209:25	strength 63:20 172:11	sufficiently 237:8
spell 202:5	state 142:7 145:23	stating 13:10	•	suggested 8:21
spoke 52:2 58:19	150:19 212:21	station 9:16 17:19	strenuously 41:13	9:18 46:16 51:15
78:25 93:9	232:15	22:8 56:23 194:6	stress 68:24	95:1,2 100:16
spoken 94:11	stated 13:15	208:22 234:10	stressed 91:15	104:12 126:21
131:4 147:10	169:15 186:17	stats 50:9,19	strike 48:8 69:8	154:15 157:23
230:8 239:13,14	197:20 198:15	status 199:15	strong 105:3	164:17 165:13
239:15	204:19,22 250:18	203:5,25 222:21	230:19,19	174:12 238:12
square 157:19	statement 1:24 2:3	steamed 196:14	stronger 149:13	suggesting 12:21
squared 174:13	2:7 3:3,21 4:1,3	steering 205:1	149:16	38:9 41:5 44:10
185:18	4:7 6:19 9:14	step 119:5 141:3,4	strongest 199:18	83:6 148:1
squeaky 162:19	15:1 19:3 25:17	180:23	strongly 230:11,15	151:13 172:6
stack 59:18	27:11 28:8 30:23	steps 46:21 180:18	240:11	186:24 206:16
staff 10:4 109:8	36:24 37:1,4	184:20 185:9	struck 180:24	238:24 249:10
112:18 113:7	38:9 39:4 40:8	186:6	212:18	suggestion 16:6
121:24	41:24 44:23	Stipendiary	struggling 211:23	17:24 82:20
stage 23:20 37:19	51:22 57:21	161:10	studied 115:16	137:8 139:8
38:5 42:25 58:7	58:22 59:14	stipulated 89:7	124:3	149:2 174:14
77:7 79:7,12	62:20 64:7 72:18	stone 87:12,15	study 105:15	249:13
82:6 130:6 197:9	72:24 74:14	stop 45:15 186:24	studying 18:22	suggestions 148:25
209:7 225:18	90:20 99:12	207:3 237:5	105:9	207:10
237:9 246:11	102:3,16,19	246:2 247:4,11	style 101:17	suggests 18:16
stage' 31:25	103:4,10 104:11	247:25 249:3	sub-issue 70:18	55:20 114:19
stages 15:4 175:8	105:6 109:20	stopped 20:4	subject 13:16	116:3 172:17
stake 81:10 164:23	112:7,8,10,11,15	234:22	81:23 87:18 93:2	207:17
stall 150:1 186:9	114:12 121:22	stopping 205:13	99:7 125:4 135:8	suggeting 195:17
stalling 207:8	123:4,7,18 124:5	stops 246:1	136:3 138:22	suitable 105:20

				1 480 200
Suite 241:5	148:5,7 169:1	50:18	talked 176:14	50:22 57:13,13
summary 97:15	182:3 185:20	sworn 1:18 112:17	talking 32:11,11	65:25
Sun 239:21	197:6 213:24	sync 227:19	32:12,13,19,20	technically 142:7
Sunday 5:16 165:5	surely 249:18	Syria 246:16	62:23,25 89:1	technicians 38:25
165:6	surprise 153:20	system 13:17	93:13 98:13	telephone 132:20
Superintendent	surprised 22:21,23	22:11 127:6,25	225:19 247:14,15	134:15
4:16 5:24 6:7,12	22:24 23:1,4	149:1,2	talks 35:7 37:21	television 114:8
15:25 41:2,11,14	81:22	systems 45:25 46:4	39:16,18 74:13	tell 10:10 20:6
45:2 47:17 78:13	surrounding 8:15	46:11,23	talks/meetings	29:15 30:16,17
78:13,16,24 79:8	186:21		52:17	91:23 124:15
80:22 81:1 82:7	survey 92:5	T	tanker 136:7	144:16 158:15
126:9 129:22	102:25 103:12,14	tab 1:22	246:16	163:15 175:23,23
130:21 131:11	104:2,4,5 106:20	table 252:10	tape 249:9	205:23 241:13,16
132:19 137:17	surveys 102:9,11	TAC 170:23	Tarifa 12:10	241:19 247:8
145:17 146:18	survivors 73:10	Tackling 107:2	task 57:1,8 60:8	telling 21:16 61:13
150:22 152:18	susceptible 107:13	tactical 155:20	182:2 219:3	134:12 137:3
155:7 159:24	suspect 8:11 65:24	164:18 168:9,17	tasked 92:3	188:6 206:9
161:19 164:10	66:2 67:18	205:3 208:4,5	TC 145:8	209:20 216:19
168:20 169:14	165:17,20 167:23	tainted 134:8	teacher 96:8	221:21 236:3
174:3 176:20	174:2 176:23	take 6:5 10:22	team 4:20,22,23	248:21 250:8
177:5,24 234:3,8	177:13 195:10	22:6 23:15 27:20	5:22 6:2 18:22	tellingly 109:13
245:6,13	199:16 203:5	46:22 47:3 58:13	23:12 27:13,20	tells 80:6
superintendents	225:16 233:1	66:14 72:19	28:10,12 43:7	ten 6:8 44:9 51:11
4:18 5:2,3	suspect' 204:1	88:19 96:23	53:23 65:19	132:21 202:9,12
supervising 97:25	suspect's 222:21	98:13,21 109:20	71:16 82:24,25	tenure 118:18
supplied 87:23	suspected 54:25	110:22 116:6	91:15,18 92:2,7	terminated 205:11
support 80:16,17	206:14	128:18 131:21	93:19 94:17	206:3
110:7 112:18,21	suspecting 167:17	134:9 137:10	102:2 105:4	terminology 96:10
113:1 130:4	suspects 127:22	139:13 152:7	107:10 112:2	terms 14:18 17:6
151:3 157:18	138:7 145:1	166:1 178:24	129:22 137:18	20:16 54:16
159:10,13 164:16	148:18 153:21	184:14 185:1,10	138:2,15,17	56:11 57:25 84:3
219:2,8	180:9 212:3	186:14 194:1	144:25 150:23	88:5,15 90:4
supported 43:19	244:16	200:25 213:11,24	151:12 152:9,19	92:14 94:22
152:8 164:25	suspects' 212:4	226:19 234:4	153:9 155:10	101:22 102:7
166:9,11	suspicions 213:23	238:14,21 241:23	157:17 159:15	106:17 122:15,25
supporters 216:8	239:8	251:16 252:21 taken 8:14 14:15	165:18 175:1	125:6 126:18
supporting 65:2	suss 92:25	16:21 17:5 30:9	180:2,6 192:20	127:21,23 129:13
96:12 165:13	sustainable 170:18	33:14 37:11 46:9	194:7 195:23	136:11 159:13
supportive 114:17	SW 231:3	61:11 65:22	197:21 198:13	160:15 169:3
115:7,8	Swan 136:6 246:15	75:18 91:17	199:2 200:6	178:4 185:23
suppose 57:13 108:22	swaying 214:14	123:13 160:20	203:2,8 204:20	192:11 193:24
	switch 48:15 switched 22:12	207:14 222:24	205:15 208:14,19	199:19 201:12
supposition 111:10	23:2 24:16 47:9	224:1 226:25	209:14,20 212:2 212:6 225:4	207:22 215:18,19 216:13 218:22
Supt 23:10	47:21 48:1,4,11	227:24 230:17	235:20	222:21 229:15
sure 31:22 53:13	49:12 56:22	236:16 238:25	team's 176:24	231:11 238:17
70:3 72:21 79:23	switching 49:10	240:16 244:13,14	teams 71:15	240:12
96:2 101:14	50:16	talk 95:7 174:13	technical 13:16	territorial 12:22
128:25 130:9	switching-off	179:3 194:25	17:21 18:4 24:9	16:22 23:25
120.23 130.7	5witching-uii	223:14	17.21 10.7 27.9	10.22 23.23
	l		l	

				1 486 200	
25:15 29:10	24:21 29:21	third 2:17 6:18	68:25 70:10 72:1	181:24 183:10	
44:20 49:23 50:1	34:10,15 35:8,11	11:22 39:4 51:21	72:5 73:10 74:2	184:17 198:25	
64:15	39:23 40:12 45:6	58:22 90:19	75:6 76:19 77:14	203:1 215:10,13	
territory 108:13	45:8,17 46:15	95:23 102:16	81:14 84:4,5	217:3 218:13,18	
text 134:3 193:1,3	47:12 48:11,14	103:4,5,10,13	87:9 88:23 91:3	220:6,18 222:3	
196:12 202:8	49:21 50:9,21	112:6,7,11	92:9 96:19,24	224:13 227:11	
210:6,14,18,20	51:11 52:20	151:25 188:21	99:6,16 105:14	229:19 230:9,13	
231:21 233:21,22	53:12,24 57:10	201:16 213:12	106:19 109:15	231:7 233:5	
242:22	57:20,22 58:21	245:17	111:21 118:17,19	243:12 250:6,10	
texts 210:22	66:10,13 71:6	thirds 113:19	121:7,10 122:10	250:21	
thank 1:16 4:10	72:22 74:23	Thomas 125:20	126:22 128:11	tolerated 122:17	
12:6 20:9 64:1	77:15,19,24 78:5	thought 18:1	129:15 132:12	tomorrow 237:8	
66:13,16 75:20	81:3,12 84:4	22:13 25:4 45:10	137:1,2,24 140:5	252:22	
121:6,11 123:17	85:13 87:13 88:1	64:16 78:2 91:24	141:15 144:17	tone 96:3 99:4	
188:10 190:7	88:6,7 89:1,25	92:16 93:4 94:4	148:24 152:25	143:6 155:14	
237:17 239:16	91:12 93:15 95:7	116:15 118:20	155:16 158:8	214:10 215:19	
251:4 252:24,25	96:7 97:3 98:24	133:14 204:15	159:7 168:12,13	216:13 229:25	
thanked 160:18	98:25,25 99:2	211:5 245:19	168:25 170:16	233:2	
thankfully 224:16	102:12 104:13,15	thoughts 179:8	173:13 175:18	tongue 223:10	
thanks 11:16,20	106:18 109:16	193:20	188:16 192:17,19	top 11:3 18:15	
12:2 19:3 20:11	110:17,23,24	thread 93:12	197:14 200:17	45:14 73:5 112:9	
31:17 32:3 144:8	111:5,11,12	threat 107:8 238:5	202:1,2,16,16	211:19 235:4	
160:3	114:3,9 116:2,20	240:21	209:6,8,15 210:1	245:9	
theme 60:25	118:2,14,18	threatened 214:4	211:8 214:22	topics 145:24	
themes 115:1	120:3 121:9	threats 238:12	222:2 228:24	total 89:15 219:8	
theories 25:9	122:2,9 123:6	three 5:1,2,3,15	241:11 242:17,18	totally 60:15 84:23	
theory 24:21 48:16	129:25 140:9	6:13 8:22 9:2,19	246:19 252:20	153:1 205:2	
48:20 49:1	141:13,14 142:1	22:16 38:19 39:5	timeline 9:9,25	208:5 227:1	
207:17 249:23	146:6 147:20	45:5 54:18 60:8	10:3,15 78:9	touch 118:20	
thereabouts	151:22 158:1,10	61:12 63:13,14	95:12 153:18	126:14	
124:20	159:3 161:13	89:2 113:24	timely 59:17 61:6	touched 66:6	
they'd 155:1	163:13 165:5	127:21 152:1	85:1	tough 72:5	
thing 26:19 44:8	166:1 169:11	153:16 189:15,24	times 6:6 60:11	Tournada 14:16	
89:17 90:6 95:22	170:17 178:8	Thursday's 35:7	67:5,12 248:12	towing 48:6	
141:23 142:16	180:22 185:17	tick 229:5	today 15:9 25:23	town 12:15 36:9	
153:2 159:3	187:25 188:1,3,9	tied 76:23 193:14	52:2,5 75:19	154:9	
167:5 184:4	188:12 190:8	tighten 68:20	119:11 205:6	toyed 16:18	
things 17:15 18:3	191:4,7 194:1,18	tightening 119:10	223:14 237:5,12	trace 136:1	
20:2 21:2 24:23	197:16 200:11	till 223:14	243:20	tracing 13:11	
33:23 58:11 72:4	202:14 203:20	time 4:13,18 6:21	told 9:16 21:4	track 6:23	
75:16 79:15 89:5	207:3 210:14,18	8:1 9:3 10:4,6,10	23:23 31:2 32:4	tracks 49:10	
94:6 127:20	211:1,4 212:11	10:14 11:8 19:13	34:4 37:25 45:10	traffic 12:11	
128:3 137:4	215:11 223:4	19:23 20:21 22:1	70:24 74:17	tragic 35:18 68:12	
153:16 164:1	240:8,10 241:21	23:3,13 24:16	78:16,25 84:16	70:7,9	
195:12 199:16	248:18 249:20	34:2 42:2 49:5	101:16 115:3	trail 159:19 169:2	
206:19 214:20	252:20	49:15 54:18	127:5 128:12	169:3	
217:8 252:21	thinking 5:23	57:19 60:21	133:7 141:2,3,10	training 67:17	
think 5:8 13:6	118:25 179:20	64:18,25 65:17	142:12 143:10,17	transcribe 241:8	
15:17 18:14	221:20 249:21	66:7 67:7 68:24	150:7 162:8	transcript 234:19	
				_	
	I	I	ı	1	

				Page 28/	
234:22 235:2	22.4 22.6 21.15	THZ 21.24 42.0	246:4	58:19 131:6	
	22:4 23:6 31:15 36:23 38:18	UK 31:24 43:8		160:12 192:9	
241:4,23 250:23 250:25		53:24 83:1,2 94:24 105:11	understanding 8:23 54:16 76:21		
	44:23 50:8 59:12 66:21 70:16		100:7 107:7	updated 169:18 213:4	
transcripts 234:14 240:16		249:22,25			
	84:19 85:23	UK's 151:1	136:3,13 138:4	updates 7:24	
transp 157:21	98:16 121:6	Ullger 94:1,4 105:12 112:3	138:23 171:18	59:17 143:13,20	
transparency	123:17 143:9,16		175:3 184:12,25	updating 187:18	
93:25 98:9	151:24 181:21 188:11	211:15	230:12,18,20	upshot 215:4	
103:17		Ullger's 93:17	understood 17:20	upside 84:19	
transparent 18:24	turned 45:25	ultimate 69:24	37:22 67:19	use 27:3 83:23	
19:12 91:19,20	46:11,23	ultimately 99:19	139:20 173:18	233:16 241:8	
117:8	turning 11:2	un 34:5	178:3 182:2	251:22	
transpired 20:8	188:18 237:21	unable 1:11 83:3	222:21	V	
149:23 157:21	twenty 44:9	91:9 157:18	undertaking 182:7	value 96:20	
224:17	twisted 63:13	unaddressed	undertook 127:10	variants 118:8	
transposed 9:9	two 7:4,19 8:12	109:13,14	unexpected 89:7	various 86:6	
treated 149:17	14:2 23:7 30:3	unauthorised	unfairness 154:23	Various 80.0 Vasquez 132:13	
174:1 176:23	32:24 39:22,22	179:21	unflattering 81:20	vasquez 132.13	
244:18	40:1,5 47:14	unbeknown 33:21	unfolded 202:20	vast 50.4,5 vein 58:20	
tremendous 183:4	49:24 50:12 59:6	uncertain 12:11	unfolding 8:16	verbal 6:20	
trial 245:21	85:9,14 87:18	94:22 122:15	unfortunate 35:18	verbally 9:4 55:3	
Triay 216:5	93:3 97:14,16,21	uncertainty 23:14	96:1,6	130:15 135:5,11	
tried 14:24 99:3	104:8 108:25	uncomfortable	unfortunately	verification 18:1	
110:16 112:16	113:19 114:10	93:19 128:2	79:16 91:25	19:5 41:8	
174:8	115:19 125:23	161:23	92:20 112:22	Verralls 73:10,13	
triggered 83:8 104:3	129:1 151:8 156:24 157:25	uncommon 8:18 35:20	156:11,15 unhappy 60:18	74:24	
true 2:3,13,22 3:5	165:15 171:14	unconnected	uniformed 105:24	version 10:21	
3:12,18 4:7	172:14 185:15	212:22	168:10	95:17 97:12	
34:23 218:24	214:25 216:1	uncorrected	uninjured 7:20	168:23 181:21	
224:1 232:19	218:21 223:19	186:15	unique 119:6	182:21 186:15,16	
241:15	226:22 234:5	uncovered 126:16	unit 107:6	vertical 14:2	
truly 62:15	241:6	180:13	United 153:4	vessel 8:11,12	
trust 217:23	two-fold 64:8	uncovering 142:13	unlawful 176:15	22:10 23:2 34:25	
trustworthy 80:1	TY 11:18	143:11,18	240:4	36:5,5 48:7	
try 57:17 99:5	tying 54:11	underscoring	unprecedented	65:24 66:2,4	
140:12 190:11	type 96:9 136:23	175:14,15	239:16	78:23 81:17	
trying 15:9 32:2	140:1 216:23	understand 17:22	unrelated 84:23	vessel's 22:10	
42:6 75:16,21	220:25 248:25	34:6 48:7 52:8	213:17 217:5	vessels 67:18	
77:17 93:12	typed 194:5	60:1 69:11 97:23	unsuccessfully	veteran 223:5	
106:6,7 140:12	types 168:17	99:5 105:10	148:14	vi 6:24	
148:14 164:2	179:18	107:4,14,23	unsurprisingly	viable 171:7	
176:3 187:7	typically 150:12	108:1 110:16	82:8	vibes 186:9 233:4	
204:11 214:11,15	typing 124:6 146:6	126:18 139:7	untiring 120:13	video 173:16	
216:9 223:13	146:11 194:7	140:6 155:4	untrue 227:1	233:12 249:5	
231:6 247:20	typos 144:10,13	162:3 168:7	unused 129:9	view 38:22 81:18	
Tuesday 253:1	213:10	176:20 179:17	unusual 8:16	86:12 105:20	
turn 1:22 5:15 7:4		196:17 200:19	update 37:16,19	139:23 144:20	
11:1 12:16,19	U	205:17 211:23	40:10 56:10	170:15 171:22,24	
11.11 12.110,17	uhm 235:12	203.17 211.23	10.10 20.10	172:22 173:7	
	l	l	l	<u> </u>	

				Page 288	
177.12.100.1			l . 	l	
175:13 180:1	126:6,14 132:25	222:20 224:11,15	175:14 194:12,12	217:1,14,15,17	
190:16 192:3	142:2 149:24	225:3 226:3	206:19 209:10	whole- 110:14	
200:23 207:6	150:5 151:16	227:6,10,23	214:13,14,15	whole-heartedly	
232:21	154:19,20 171:16	230:11,15,16	221:11 223:21	108:3 110:13	
views 64:24	189:5 207:2	231:12 233:16	224:15 225:1	wholeheartedly	
100:11 135:13	230:14 248:24	236:18	227:10 228:19	68:14 89:24 96:7	
145:17 158:8	251:2	warranted 112:20	240:20 244:1,9	99:8	
village 14:16	wanted 17:12	warrants 161:2	245:2 250:10	wholly 182:8	
virtually 26:5,23	24:13 28:20 50:7	191:19 222:12,15	Wayn 245:14	183:12 184:7	
27:4 32:7 33:9	56:14 57:5 62:11	wasn't 10:16 38:15	ways 170:21	204:25	
33:13	63:8 71:19 72:23	43:16 47:19 53:5	we're 40:2 126:13	WHSS 54:13	
visibility 88:17	73:16,18,24 75:1	53:8 84:17 89:21	188:8 249:11	wide 104:20 118:7	
vision 58:1	83:4,15 84:3,6	102:10 123:11	we've 129:8	wildly 17:23	
visit 125:11 126:13	90:6 91:19 92:10	131:15 141:10	154:22 160:23	willingness 103:17	
126:15	92:12 97:1 98:16	164:5 184:7	163:3 174:11	115:24 117:15	
vital 183:2	104:8 106:10,13	202:5 220:14	176:8 212:19	Windmill 17:18	
voluntarily 90:24	122:12 123:13	240:18 248:19	221:21 252:12	22:7,23	
191:11	128:15 132:23	wasn 53:8	week 4:16 37:21	wing 77:22	
voluntary 174:19	133:7 141:11	watch 1:11,14	38:8 39:16 78:15	wingman 208:1	
191:23 192:1	144:3 149:25	watering 170:24	weekly 104:18	wireless 17:11	
198:7 199:6	150:1 155:16	waters 12:22	weeks 221:22	wisdom 183:14	
vouch 120:1,16	158:17,18 162:6	13:21 14:1 15:11	welcomed 100:6	wiser 186:1	
246:24	182:16,18 248:4	15:12,16 16:16	183:20	wish 60:19 83:17	
Vox 77:22	wanting 55:22	16:22,23,24,25	Wendy 56:24	90:1	
VTS 12:7	71:16 186:9	17:2,8 23:25	went 70:3,4 72:11	withdraw 154:11	
vulnerability	wants 207:24	24:4,8,13,19 25:2	92:24 106:22	withdrawal	
97:24	Warmest 119:15	25:6,15 29:10	111:22 114:25	153:24 154:4	
vulnerable 238:10	warped 29:23	30:2,21 31:12,22	135:5 169:16	withheld 60:5	
Vyas 121:23	warrant 89:8	32:8 33:18,25	183:21 193:4	61:17	
	143:24 160:22	34:23,25 38:6,13	west 13:14	withhold 21:8	
W	165:24,24 166:4	38:23 40:19,20	WhatsApp 7:9	82:16	
wait 75:12 98:21	166:19 167:3	42:4 43:25 44:4	10:11 18:15 20:1	witness 1:21,23	
168:15	173:19,22,24	44:5,19,20 45:5	52:22,23 129:4	2:3,7 3:3 4:6	
waiting 24:8	174:6,14 175:5	48:5,25 49:24	188:25 214:23	6:18 19:3 28:8	
202:18	175:10 176:1,8	50:1,20 54:25	215:9	36:24 37:1 51:21	
wake 36:7 84:11	176:15 177:17	61:11 62:8,11	WhatsApps 10:20	64:6 90:19 99:12	
Wales 101:25	187:17,19,23	64:13,15 65:17	whatsoever 19:19	102:16,19 103:4	
105:17	189:20 190:9,24	66:25 74:9	43:1,11 95:1	103:10 112:6,6,7	
walk 119:14	191:15,24,25	waving 29:13	120:23 121:5	112:10,11 145:22	
walking 28:24	192:18 195:10	way 19:17 26:13	137:9 214:16	149:14 157:6	
walks 174:16	196:1 197:23	28:3 43:13,16	234:25 235:1	166:6,25 167:9	
waned 63:5	198:5,6,11 199:6	60:18 64:2,13,23	whe 149:5	169:7,11,22	
want 11:7 18:8,10	199:8,24 200:5,9	69:13 70:11	whiff 112:1	170:9 173:5	
22:6 32:24 35:15	200:21 201:2,9	76:11 80:11 82:8	whilst 28:24 36:15	178:17,23 188:21	
39:2 48:18,21	201:11,14 202:4	85:21 88:22 94:7	55:16 89:6 99:6	188:24 228:5,8	
49:6 71:10 78:7	202:11 203:3	100:12 113:19	183:19 230:9	232:11,12 234:15	
82:15 83:22 84:2	208:3 215:7	114:17 116:17	242:22	237:17,18 250:17	
90:17,20 95:4,23	216:23 218:6	136:1 153:2	whip 237:10	woke 43:21	
97:15 117:5,7	219:25 222:4,9	166:4 167:3	white 197:22	woken 204:13	
119:23 122:7	217.20 222.199	100.1107.0			
				<u> </u>	

wondered 37:18 word 15:8 55:19 wordhy 78:5 wouldn't 14:21 yesterday 83:9 143:23 144:1 16 102:15,20,21 55:19,20 116:12 159:22 176:14 235:25 236:22 wording 16:4 words 124:25 163:19 168:7 195:7 196:1 204:3,4 205:4 131:23 142:2 242:22 yesterday's 34:21 YVSVU 71:3 186:15 188:11 253:1 16.05 212:10 16.05 212:10 16.35 234:13 165 225:22 1659 130:19 1659 130:19 1659 130:19 1659 130:19 167 142:3 179:6 written 9:5 127:16 198:20,22,25 204:3,4 205:4 179:6 written 9:5 127:16 0 0 03.40 11:12 12.33 104:23 12.33 104:23 17 70:22 152:2
word 15:8 55:19 wouldn't 14:21 132:23 223:5 149:15 185:16 103:11 137:21 55:19,20 116:12 124:15 131:22,22 235:11 236:7 186:15 188:11 253:1 159:22 176:14 131:23 142:2 242:22 189:1 203:17 16.05 212:10 235:25 236:22 write 79:1 125:18 YVSVU 71:3 208:19 210:3,21 16.35 234:13 words 124:25 156:17 247:7,8 230:7 232:10 165 225:22 195:7 196:1 83:18 153:6,7 208:19 210:3,21 165 225:22 12.01 80:12 1680 6:5 12.15 27:9,11 1680 6:5 12.25 189:1 1681 15:23 17 70:22 152:2
55:19,20 116:12 124:15 131:22,22 235:11 236:7 186:15 188:11 253:1 159:22 176:14 131:23 142:2 242:22 189:1 203:17 16.05 212:10 235:25 236:22 243:25 242:22 228:19 210:3,21 16.35 234:13 words 124:25 156:17 247:7,8 225:11 236:7 208:19 210:3,21 165 225:22 163:19 168:7 165:17 247:7,8 230:7 232:10 1659 130:19 12.01 80:12 167 142:3 1680 6:5 198:20,22,25 179:6 0 204:3,4 205:4 written 9:5 127:16 0 03.40 11:12 12.33 104:23 17.70:22 152:2
159:22 176:14 235:25 236:22 wording 16:4 words 124:25 163:19 168:7 195:7 196:1 198:20,22,25 204:3.4 205:4 131:23 142:2 242:22 yesterday's 34:21 YVSVU 71:3 242:22 yesterday's 34:21 208:19 210:3,21 230:7 232:10 16.05 212:10 16.05 225:22 16.05 23:13 165 225:22 160 23:13 165 225:22 165 225:22 165 23:13 165 23:13
235:25 236:22 wording 16:4 write 79:1 125:18 to 30:19 16:35 234:13 235:25 236:22 words 124:25 write 79:1 125:18 to 30:19 16:35 234:13 208:19 210:3,21 to 30:19 to 30:19 to 30:19 to 30:19 208:19 210:3,21 to 30:19 208:19 210:3,2
wording 16:4 write 79:1 125:18 YVSVU 71:3 213:1 228:7 165 225:22 words 124:25 156:17 247:7,8 Z 230:7 232:10 1659 130:19 163:19 168:7 writing 62:20 82:2 Z 12.01 80:12 167 142:3 198:20,22,25 179:6 0 12.15 27:9,11 1680 6:5 204:3,4 205:4 written 9:5 127:16 3.40 11:12 12.33 104:23 17 70:22 152:2
words 124:25 156:17 247:7,8 230:7 232:10 1659 130:19 163:19 168:7 195:7 196:1 198:20,22,25 179:6 12.01 80:12 167 142:3 1680 6:5 1680 6:5 179:6 12.25 189:1 1681 15:23 1770:22 152:2
163:19 168:7 writing 62:20 82:2 Z 12.01 80:12 167 142:3 195:7 196:1 83:18 153:6,7 0 12.15 27:9,11 1680 6:5 198:20,22,25 179:6 0 12.25 189:1 1681 15:23 204:3,4 205:4 written 9:5 127:16 03.40 11:12 12.33 104:23 17 70:22 152:2
195:7 196:1 198:20,22,25 204:3.4 205:4 198:20,22,25 33:18 153:6,7 179:6 12.15 27:9,11 12.25 189:1 12.33 104:23 17 70:22 152:2
198:20,22,25
204:3.4 205:4 written 9:5 127:16 03.40 11:12 12.33 104:23 17.70:22 152:2
\(\alpha \tau_1 \) \(\alpha \tau_2 \) \(\alpha \tau_1 \) \(\alpha \tau_2 \) \(\alpha \tau_2 \) \(\alpha \tau_2 \) \(\alpha \tau_2 \tau_2 \) \(\alpha \tau_2 \tau_2 \) \(\alpha \tau_2 \tau_2 \tau_2 \) \(\alpha \tau_2
206:11,13,22 wrong 17:23 34:11 0400 33:5 12.55 121:8,16 179:7
214:12 236:1
239:13 243:11 63:10 71:7 89:25 07.41 11:8 122 142.0 170 58:23 59:14
work 1:10 5:7 03:10 71:7 83:23 07.43 11:11 12th 210:13 211:5 170A 59:15
17:12 57:25 194:3 196:6 09.35 13:7 211:8 213:6,10 1733 132:15
58:10 91:25 97:1
100:12 101:3 211:6 218:20 09.41 11:21 20:9 13 133:19 134:21 1748 34:10
100.12 101.3 211.0 218.20 20:15,18 13 133.19 134.21 1748 34.10 103:21 105:11,18 wrongly 195:21 20:15,18 232:8 233:10 176 244:11
105.21 105.11,18 Wrongly 155.21 106:8,17 108:14 222:20 225:15 09.49 18:14 234:9 237:2,21 179 245:4,6
100.8,17 108.14 222.20 223.13 0914 54:20 234.9 237.2,21 179 243.4,0 18 44:25 71:21
171:7 206:19,20 247:12 240.24 13.33 31:17 72:13 99:16
worked 5:4 04:15 Wyon 42:14 120:2 1308 112:20 125:16
123:15 205:5 139:7,25 157:23 187:3 121:11 1306 113:20 1830 60:3
workforce 101:18 168:20,22 171:14 164:11 176:18 1319 13.7 1899 158:1,2
working 16:20 108.20,22 171.14 10 53:21 86:22 1344 9:24 19 37:6 43:20
17:4 24:21 25:8 175:25 177:16 132:16 133:21 1345 18:13 137:0 43:20 14:25 78:15,19
25:12 29:25 30:3 175:23 177:16 244:21 252:22 1343 18:15 19.1 61:8,25 62:
41:23 58:12 69:1 233:24 244:25 253:1 13th 210:13 211:5 19.4 61:18
86:10,25 87:7,8 Wyan's 169:14 10.01 1:2 211:7 1984 4:12
91:10 111:24
112:3 127:5 X 10.47 33:19 14 74:20 73:23 14 000 \$23:19
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$
245:16 241:13 245:16 14.30 143:14 225:25 85:25
workplace 168:16 Y 101 63:17 143.01 143.14 121:13,14 235
works 108:15 Yamas 247:4 1010hrs 23:9 201:20 2.00 194:13
122:24 yard 71:16 75:13 1015 37:14 201.20 2.12 233:9
world 72:6 106:12 108:10 104 225:23 90:20 123:20 20 64:6 78:24 79
164:4 Yeah 145:6 235:11 11 6:8 53:25 54:2 124:2,12 209:25 83:21
worn 233:12 241:5 249:7 61:11 73:3 77:19 211:14 237:12 200 242:4
132:14,18 150:18 211.14 237.12 2015 86:6 87:2,2
worried 146:10 years 4:14 5:13 182:24 211:21 15.00 124:10 2016 66:22 91:6
208:15 238:11 90:25 151:8 11.15 56:6 17. 15.26 188:15 97:19 115:21
worry 64:2 96:22 215:1 11.30 66:17 15.36 188:17 2017 86:1
113:25 187:10 Yeats 78:13,14,17 11.40 66:17 150 92:7 2018 95:13 123:2
worship 212:24 78:20,25 79:13 114 225:22,24 1550 97:14 124:18 125:16
213:16 79:22,25 80:5,22 11th 114:10 1552 98:23 125:24 126:10
worth 37:18 81:2 82:7 93:18 12 13:13 56:9 1562 110:5 128:18
120:15 151:22 208:25 84:11,22 85:7 15th 210:4,24 2019 87:3 97:20
Yeats' 79:8 111:23 134:21 13th 210.4,24 121:23 132:14

			1	'age 290
132:18 133:19	34.10 251:6	67 38:19 39:5		
153:12 156:24	34.10 251:0 34.20 251:1	68 7:5		
182:24 2019/2020 4:20	3456 165:25	69 40:9,12 201:21		
2019/2020 4:20 2020 4:13 5:17 6:8	3457 168:3 35 4:14 148:13	7		
37:15 38:12,21	36 13:12 119:21	7 117:17 140:10,11		
41:10 53:25	129:17 143:1	141:13,25 156:22		
61:12 73:3 74:20	164:9	161:9 177:23		
87:5 95:14 97:13	3612 168:18	178:5,18 187:16		
111:25 114:21	37 168:3 192:8	227:4 243:2		
115:14 117:17	38 236:25	7.57 34:12		
143:23 164:11,12	36 230.23	71 22:4		
171:16 172:10	4	73 23:7 51:23,25		
173:17 177:23	4 66:23 181:22	74 99:12 143:8		
	4.00 237:1	76 181:14 183:12		
185:16 210:21 227:4 228:7	40 188:20	242:10		
	41 173:12	77 51:23		
232:8 2024 1:1 253:2	4100 82:10,12	7th 187:3		
	42 214:19	7th 107.3		
21 152:3 179:1 22 179:1	43 226:19	8		
	44 216:2 226:20	8 5:16 6:8 38:11		
23 176:18	45 216:19 217:18	54:21 63:7 66:22		
24 225:24	228:6	153:12 155:12		
25 5:19 164:11	47 6:20 220:3	156:21 158:8,10		
181:15	49 222:23	172:10,16 173:16		
25.3 28:23	7) 222.23	175:3		
25.6 44:24	5	80 179:7 181:15		
251 28:23	5 237:16	81 36:24 37:4,5		
2523 121:19	50 8:8	84 30:24		
256 45:9,10 26 156:24	51 7:4	86 37:7		
	5190 125:15	898 70:21		
26.4 45:16 27 125:23,24	53 232:12	8th 29:1		
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	54 102:18			
128:17,18 129:15 129:19 132:9	57 22:5 49:23	9		
156:9	58 11:22 12:7 88:6	9 37:8,14 38:20		
27th 132:7	58.15 250:17	77:19 114:10		
27th 132:7 29 148:12 182:21	59 49:21,22 50:11	118:17 121:23		
29 148:12 182:21 294 23:17	112:7,11	9.27 11:15		
294 23:17 295 30:22	597 86:20	9:10 243:17		
493 3U.44	599 86:21	92 58:18		
3		940hrs 12:18		
3 41:10 61:1	6	9th 34:17 54:23		
123:19 171:20	6 21:19 244:2,10			
3.00pm 194:14	6.05 11:6			
3.17.6 50:11	6.5 14:4			
30 93:9 114:21	6.54 13:14,24			
115:14	14:17			
32 184:10	60 12:16			
3272 164:12	63 23:8			
34 211:17	65 27:10 28:7			
01 211.1/			l l	