1	(Tuesday, 7 May 2024)	1	office of the most senior elected official in
2	(10.00)	2	the land - or politician in the land - and have
3	MR SANTOS: Good morning, sir. Good	3	him lie to you, not once but twice, in my
4	morning, Chief Minister.	4	office to my face, as I said yesterday, was
5	MR PICARDO, Resumed	5	really quite remarkable. I was just this
	QUESTIONED BY MR SANTOS	6	
6	-		morning watching breakfast tv and I heard
7	(Resumed)	7	Andy Burnham, the re-elected Mayor of
8	Q. I just want to pick up on one thing	8	Manchester, say, "We cannot live in a
9	relating to the incident at sea, yesterday, that	9	country in which public servants are not
10	I did not get a chance to ask you yesterday.	10	wholly truthful with politicians", and that
11	Your disclosed WhatsApp exchanges with	11	resonated greatly with me, and for that
12	Mr Pyle only go as far as 30 April 2020, so	12	reason that was the thing that most led to my
13	we do not seem to have your exchanges with	13	loss of confidence, but in Mr McGrail, it is
14	Mr Pyle at the time of the incident at sea. Do	14	fair to say he had a fairly bad week, because
15	you know why that is?	15	less that 48 hours later, I was reading in a
16	A. So, when you say, "as far as April 2020",	16	newspaper about claims made against in
17	you seem to be going forward, but you are	17	effect, the Government of Gibraltar which I
18	asking me about	18	had not been alerted to, and all of those
19	Q. Far backwards. As far back. The earliest	19	things came together in that week to make
20	we have. Sorry, let me be clear. The earliest	20	this, as I told you yesterday I think, suddenly
21	messages we have are on 30 April 2020.	21	from being something that was an issue with
22	A. I do not know whether I have the	22	the RGP, and the HMIC report was there and
23	WhatsApp messages which go back to that	23	it was an issue - to suddenly this became,
24	time, but I mean, my team would have - my	24	what I called, the crocodile nearest the canoe.
25	legal team would have checked and would	25	The thing that most quickly needed to be
23	legal team would have checked and would	25	The thing that most quickly needed to be
	Page 1		Page 3
1	have disclosed anything that is within scope	1	dealt with.
1 2	have disclosed anything that is within scope of the requirement of the Inquiry for	1 2	<b>dealt with.</b> Q. We were talking about your meeting with
2	of the requirement of the Inquiry for	2	Q. We were talking about your meeting with
2 3	of the requirement of the Inquiry for disclosure. I mean, I do not know whether there were WhatsApp exchanges at that time,	2 3	Q. We were talking about your meeting with Mr Pyle and your subsequent email exchanges on 17 May, and of course on 18
2 3 4	of the requirement of the Inquiry for disclosure. I mean, I do not know whether there were WhatsApp exchanges at that time, or whether in fact Mr Pyle were speaking on	2 3 4 5	Q. We were talking about your meeting with Mr Pyle and your subsequent email exchanges on 17 May, and of course on 18 May you and Mr Pyle met with Dr Britto. If
2 3 4 5 6	of the requirement of the Inquiry for disclosure. I mean, I do not know whether there were WhatsApp exchanges at that time, or whether in fact Mr Pyle were speaking on the phone or meeting about these issues, or	2 3 4 5 6	Q. We were talking about your meeting with Mr Pyle and your subsequent email exchanges on 17 May, and of course on 18 May you and Mr Pyle met with Dr Britto. If we can go to A207, your witness statement
2 3 4 5 6 7	of the requirement of the Inquiry for disclosure. I mean, I do not know whether there were WhatsApp exchanges at that time, or whether in fact Mr Pyle were speaking on the phone or meeting about these issues, or whether there are some messages which have	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>Q. We were talking about your meeting with Mr Pyle and your subsequent email exchanges on 17 May, and of course on 18 May you and Mr Pyle met with Dr Britto. If we can go to A207, your witness statement</li> <li>A. Is that in the paginated bundle?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	of the requirement of the Inquiry for disclosure. I mean, I do not know whether there were WhatsApp exchanges at that time, or whether in fact Mr Pyle were speaking on the phone or meeting about these issues, or whether there are some messages which have been deemed not to be in the scope of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>Q. We were talking about your meeting with Mr Pyle and your subsequent email exchanges on 17 May, and of course on 18 May you and Mr Pyle met with Dr Britto. If we can go to A207, your witness statement</li> <li>A. Is that in the paginated bundle?</li> <li>Q. It probably is in your witness statements</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	of the requirement of the Inquiry for disclosure. I mean, I do not know whether there were WhatsApp exchanges at that time, or whether in fact Mr Pyle were speaking on the phone or meeting about these issues, or whether there are some messages which have been deemed not to be in the scope of the inquiry, and I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q. We were talking about your meeting with Mr Pyle and your subsequent email exchanges on 17 May, and of course on 18 May you and Mr Pyle met with Dr Britto. If we can go to A207, your witness statement</li> <li>A. Is that in the paginated bundle?</li> <li>Q. It probably is in your witness statements bundle, because I am going to your evidence</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	of the requirement of the Inquiry for disclosure. I mean, I do not know whether there were WhatsApp exchanges at that time, or whether in fact Mr Pyle were speaking on the phone or meeting about these issues, or whether there are some messages which have been deemed not to be in the scope of the inquiry, and I Q. Perhaps we can clarify that with your	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>Q. We were talking about your meeting with Mr Pyle and your subsequent email exchanges on 17 May, and of course on 18 May you and Mr Pyle met with Dr Britto. If we can go to A207, your witness statement</li> <li>A. Is that in the paginated bundle?</li> <li>Q. It probably is in your witness statements bundle, because I am going to your evidence at paragraph 89 of your first witness</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	of the requirement of the Inquiry for disclosure. I mean, I do not know whether there were WhatsApp exchanges at that time, or whether in fact Mr Pyle were speaking on the phone or meeting about these issues, or whether there are some messages which have been deemed not to be in the scope of the inquiry, and I Q. Perhaps we can clarify that with your team.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>Q. We were talking about your meeting with Mr Pyle and your subsequent email exchanges on 17 May, and of course on 18 May you and Mr Pyle met with Dr Britto. If we can go to A207, your witness statement</li> <li>A. Is that in the paginated bundle?</li> <li>Q. It probably is in your witness statements bundle, because I am going to your evidence at paragraph 89 of your first witness statement.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	of the requirement of the Inquiry for disclosure. I mean, I do not know whether there were WhatsApp exchanges at that time, or whether in fact Mr Pyle were speaking on the phone or meeting about these issues, or whether there are some messages which have been deemed not to be in the scope of the inquiry, and I Q. Perhaps we can clarify that with your team. A. I can do that in the break if you wish.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Q. We were talking about your meeting with Mr Pyle and your subsequent email exchanges on 17 May, and of course on 18 May you and Mr Pyle met with Dr Britto. If we can go to A207, your witness statement</li> <li>A. Is that in the paginated bundle?</li> <li>Q. It probably is in your witness statements bundle, because I am going to your evidence at paragraph 89 of your first witness statement.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>of the requirement of the Inquiry for disclosure. I mean, I do not know whether there were WhatsApp exchanges at that time, or whether in fact Mr Pyle were speaking on the phone or meeting about these issues, or whether there are some messages which have been deemed not to be in the scope of the inquiry, and I Q. Perhaps we can clarify that with your team.</li> <li>A. I can do that in the break if you wish.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. Yes. One other question</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Q. We were talking about your meeting with Mr Pyle and your subsequent email exchanges on 17 May, and of course on 18 May you and Mr Pyle met with Dr Britto. If we can go to A207, your witness statement</li> <li>A. Is that in the paginated bundle?</li> <li>Q. It probably is in your witness statements bundle, because I am going to your evidence at paragraph 89 of your first witness statement.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. You say that you, "recall that Mr Britto</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>of the requirement of the Inquiry for disclosure. I mean, I do not know whether there were WhatsApp exchanges at that time, or whether in fact Mr Pyle were speaking on the phone or meeting about these issues, or whether there are some messages which have been deemed not to be in the scope of the inquiry, and I Q. Perhaps we can clarify that with your team.</li> <li>A. I can do that in the break if you wish.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. Yes. One other question about the matters we covered yesterday. Is it</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Q. We were talking about your meeting with Mr Pyle and your subsequent email exchanges on 17 May, and of course on 18 May you and Mr Pyle met with Dr Britto. If we can go to A207, your witness statement</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>of the requirement of the Inquiry for disclosure. I mean, I do not know whether there were WhatsApp exchanges at that time, or whether in fact Mr Pyle were speaking on the phone or meeting about these issues, or whether there are some messages which have been deemed not to be in the scope of the inquiry, and I Q. Perhaps we can clarify that with your team.</li> <li>A. I can do that in the break if you wish.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. Yes. One other question about the matters we covered yesterday. Is it fair to say that in terms of your loss of</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Q. We were talking about your meeting with Mr Pyle and your subsequent email exchanges on 17 May, and of course on 18 May you and Mr Pyle met with Dr Britto. If we can go to A207, your witness statement</li> <li>A. Is that in the paginated bundle?</li> <li>Q. It probably is in your witness statements bundle, because I am going to your evidence at paragraph 89 of your first witness statement.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. You say that you, "recall that Mr Britto was very concerned, but not surprised, when the Governor and I shared our concerns with</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>of the requirement of the Inquiry for disclosure. I mean, I do not know whether there were WhatsApp exchanges at that time, or whether in fact Mr Pyle were speaking on the phone or meeting about these issues, or whether there are some messages which have been deemed not to be in the scope of the inquiry, and I Q. Perhaps we can clarify that with your team.</li> <li>A. I can do that in the break if you wish.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. Yes. One other question about the matters we covered yesterday. Is it fair to say that in terms of your loss of confidence in Mr McGrail that everything</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Q. We were talking about your meeting with Mr Pyle and your subsequent email exchanges on 17 May, and of course on 18 May you and Mr Pyle met with Dr Britto. If we can go to A207, your witness statement</li> <li>A. Is that in the paginated bundle?</li> <li>Q. It probably is in your witness statements bundle, because I am going to your evidence at paragraph 89 of your first witness statement.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. You say that you, "recall that Mr Britto was very concerned, but not surprised, when the Governor and I shared our concerns with him." Why did you get the impression that</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>of the requirement of the Inquiry for disclosure. I mean, I do not know whether there were WhatsApp exchanges at that time, or whether in fact Mr Pyle were speaking on the phone or meeting about these issues, or whether there are some messages which have been deemed not to be in the scope of the inquiry, and I Q. Perhaps we can clarify that with your team.</li> <li>A. I can do that in the break if you wish.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. Yes. One other question about the matters we covered yesterday. Is it fair to say that in terms of your loss of confidence in Mr McGrail that everything changed on 12 May, and that from your</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Q. We were talking about your meeting with Mr Pyle and your subsequent email exchanges on 17 May, and of course on 18 May you and Mr Pyle met with Dr Britto. If we can go to A207, your witness statement</li> <li>A. Is that in the paginated bundle?</li> <li>Q. It probably is in your witness statements bundle, because I am going to your evidence at paragraph 89 of your first witness statement.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. You say that you, "recall that Mr Britto was very concerned, but not surprised, when the Governor and I shared our concerns with him." Why did you get the impression that he was not surprised?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>of the requirement of the Inquiry for disclosure. I mean, I do not know whether there were WhatsApp exchanges at that time, or whether in fact Mr Pyle were speaking on the phone or meeting about these issues, or whether there are some messages which have been deemed not to be in the scope of the inquiry, and I Q. Perhaps we can clarify that with your team.</li> <li>A. I can do that in the break if you wish.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. Yes. One other question about the matters we covered yesterday. Is it fair to say that in terms of your loss of confidence in Mr McGrail that everything changed on 12 May, and that from your perspective the other reasons pale into</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q. We were talking about your meeting with Mr Pyle and your subsequent email exchanges on 17 May, and of course on 18 May you and Mr Pyle met with Dr Britto. If we can go to A207, your witness statement</li></ul>
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ \end{array} $	<ul> <li>of the requirement of the Inquiry for disclosure. I mean, I do not know whether there were WhatsApp exchanges at that time, or whether in fact Mr Pyle were speaking on the phone or meeting about these issues, or whether there are some messages which have been deemed not to be in the scope of the inquiry, and I Q. Perhaps we can clarify that with your team.</li> <li>A. I can do that in the break if you wish.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. Yes. One other question about the matters we covered yesterday. Is it fair to say that in terms of your loss of confidence in Mr McGrail that everything changed on 12 May, and that from your perspective the other reasons pale into insignificance compared to your exchanges</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Q. We were talking about your meeting with Mr Pyle and your subsequent email exchanges on 17 May, and of course on 18 May you and Mr Pyle met with Dr Britto. If we can go to A207, your witness statement A. Is that in the paginated bundle?</li> <li>Q. It probably is in your witness statements bundle, because I am going to your evidence at paragraph 89 of your first witness statement.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. You say that you, "recall that Mr Britto was very concerned, but not surprised, when the Governor and I shared our concerns with him." Why did you get the impression that he was not surprised?</li> <li>A. Well, because of what Mr - I think I referred to him as Mr Britto, I should refer to</li> </ul>
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array}$	of the requirement of the Inquiry for disclosure. I mean, I do not know whether there were WhatsApp exchanges at that time, or whether in fact Mr Pyle were speaking on the phone or meeting about these issues, or whether there are some messages which have been deemed not to be in the scope of the inquiry, and I Q. Perhaps we can clarify that with your team. A. I can do that in the break if you wish. Q. Thank you. Yes. One other question about the matters we covered yesterday. Is it fair to say that in terms of your loss of confidence in Mr McGrail that everything changed on 12 May, and that from your perspective the other reasons pale into insignificance compared to your exchanges with Mr McGrail on that day?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Q. We were talking about your meeting with Mr Pyle and your subsequent email exchanges on 17 May, and of course on 18 May you and Mr Pyle met with Dr Britto. If we can go to A207, your witness statement A. Is that in the paginated bundle?</li> <li>Q. It probably is in your witness statements bundle, because I am going to your evidence at paragraph 89 of your first witness statement.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. You say that you, "recall that Mr Britto was very concerned, but not surprised, when the Governor and I shared our concerns with him." Why did you get the impression that he was not surprised?</li> <li>A. Well, because of what Mr - I think I referred to him as Mr Britto, I should refer to him as Dr Britto - Dr Britto was sharing with</li> </ul>
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	<ul> <li>of the requirement of the Inquiry for disclosure. I mean, I do not know whether there were WhatsApp exchanges at that time, or whether in fact Mr Pyle were speaking on the phone or meeting about these issues, or whether there are some messages which have been deemed not to be in the scope of the inquiry, and I Q. Perhaps we can clarify that with your team.</li> <li>A. I can do that in the break if you wish.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. Yes. One other question about the matters we covered yesterday. Is it fair to say that in terms of your loss of confidence in Mr McGrail that everything changed on 12 May, and that from your perspective the other reasons pale into insignificance compared to your exchanges with Mr McGrail on that day?</li> <li>A. That is overwhelmingly the most</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q. We were talking about your meeting with Mr Pyle and your subsequent email exchanges on 17 May, and of course on 18 May you and Mr Pyle met with Dr Britto. If we can go to A207, your witness statement A. Is that in the paginated bundle?</li> <li>Q. It probably is in your witness statements bundle, because I am going to your evidence at paragraph 89 of your first witness statement.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. You say that you, "recall that Mr Britto was very concerned, but not surprised, when the Governor and I shared our concerns with him." Why did you get the impression that he was not surprised?</li> <li>A. Well, because of what Mr - I think I referred to him as Mr Britto, I should refer to him as Dr Britto - Dr Britto was sharing with us also his impressions of Ian McGrail and</li> </ul>
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ \end{array}$	<ul> <li>of the requirement of the Inquiry for disclosure. I mean, I do not know whether there were WhatsApp exchanges at that time, or whether in fact Mr Pyle were speaking on the phone or meeting about these issues, or whether there are some messages which have been deemed not to be in the scope of the inquiry, and I Q. Perhaps we can clarify that with your team.</li> <li>A. I can do that in the break if you wish.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. Yes. One other question about the matters we covered yesterday. Is it fair to say that in terms of your loss of confidence in Mr McGrail that everything changed on 12 May, and that from your perspective the other reasons pale into insignificance compared to your exchanges with Mr McGrail on that day?</li> <li>A. That is overwhelmingly the most important aspect of what led me to lose</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q. We were talking about your meeting with Mr Pyle and your subsequent email exchanges on 17 May, and of course on 18 May you and Mr Pyle met with Dr Britto. If we can go to A207, your witness statement A. Is that in the paginated bundle?</li> <li>Q. It probably is in your witness statements bundle, because I am going to your evidence at paragraph 89 of your first witness statement.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. You say that you, "recall that Mr Britto was very concerned, but not surprised, when the Governor and I shared our concerns with him." Why did you get the impression that he was not surprised?</li> <li>A. Well, because of what Mr - I think I referred to him as Mr Britto, I should refer to him as Dr Britto - Dr Britto was sharing with us also his impressions of Ian McGrail and the relationship that he felt Ian McGrail had</li> </ul>
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ \end{array}$	of the requirement of the Inquiry for disclosure. I mean, I do not know whether there were WhatsApp exchanges at that time, or whether in fact Mr Pyle were speaking on the phone or meeting about these issues, or whether there are some messages which have been deemed not to be in the scope of the inquiry, and I Q. Perhaps we can clarify that with your team. A. I can do that in the break if you wish. Q. Thank you. Yes. One other question about the matters we covered yesterday. Is it fair to say that in terms of your loss of confidence in Mr McGrail that everything changed on 12 May, and that from your perspective the other reasons pale into insignificance compared to your exchanges with Mr McGrail on that day? A. That is overwhelmingly the most important aspect of what led me to lose confidence in Mr McGrail. As you can	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. We were talking about your meeting with Mr Pyle and your subsequent email exchanges on 17 May, and of course on 18 May you and Mr Pyle met with Dr Britto. If we can go to A207, your witness statement A. Is that in the paginated bundle?</li> <li>Q. It probably is in your witness statements bundle, because I am going to your evidence at paragraph 89 of your first witness statement.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. You say that you, "recall that Mr Britto was very concerned, but not surprised, when the Governor and I shared our concerns with him." Why did you get the impression that he was not surprised?</li> <li>A. Well, because of what Mr - I think I referred to him as Mr Britto, I should refer to him as Dr Britto - Dr Britto was sharing with us also his impressions of Ian McGrail and the relationship that he felt Ian McGrail had with his staff, with his officers, and even the</li> </ul>
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	<ul> <li>of the requirement of the Inquiry for disclosure. I mean, I do not know whether there were WhatsApp exchanges at that time, or whether in fact Mr Pyle were speaking on the phone or meeting about these issues, or whether there are some messages which have been deemed not to be in the scope of the inquiry, and I Q. Perhaps we can clarify that with your team.</li> <li>A. I can do that in the break if you wish.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. Yes. One other question about the matters we covered yesterday. Is it fair to say that in terms of your loss of confidence in Mr McGrail that everything changed on 12 May, and that from your perspective the other reasons pale into insignificance compared to your exchanges with Mr McGrail on that day?</li> <li>A. That is overwhelmingly the most important aspect of what led me to lose confidence in Mr McGrail. As you can imagine, having the most senior law</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Q. We were talking about your meeting with Mr Pyle and your subsequent email exchanges on 17 May, and of course on 18 May you and Mr Pyle met with Dr Britto. If we can go to A207, your witness statement A. Is that in the paginated bundle?</li> <li>Q. It probably is in your witness statements bundle, because I am going to your evidence at paragraph 89 of your first witness statement.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. You say that you, "recall that Mr Britto was very concerned, but not surprised, when the Governor and I shared our concerns with him." Why did you get the impression that he was not surprised?</li> <li>A. Well, because of what Mr - I think I referred to him as Mr Britto, I should refer to him as Dr Britto - Dr Britto was sharing with us also his impressions of Ian McGrail and the relationship that he felt Ian McGrail had with his staff, with his officers, and even the relationship with the GPA.</li> </ul>
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ \end{array}$	of the requirement of the Inquiry for disclosure. I mean, I do not know whether there were WhatsApp exchanges at that time, or whether in fact Mr Pyle were speaking on the phone or meeting about these issues, or whether there are some messages which have been deemed not to be in the scope of the inquiry, and I Q. Perhaps we can clarify that with your team. A. I can do that in the break if you wish. Q. Thank you. Yes. One other question about the matters we covered yesterday. Is it fair to say that in terms of your loss of confidence in Mr McGrail that everything changed on 12 May, and that from your perspective the other reasons pale into insignificance compared to your exchanges with Mr McGrail on that day? A. That is overwhelmingly the most important aspect of what led me to lose confidence in Mr McGrail. As you can	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. We were talking about your meeting with Mr Pyle and your subsequent email exchanges on 17 May, and of course on 18 May you and Mr Pyle met with Dr Britto. If we can go to A207, your witness statement A. Is that in the paginated bundle?</li> <li>Q. It probably is in your witness statements bundle, because I am going to your evidence at paragraph 89 of your first witness statement.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. You say that you, "recall that Mr Britto was very concerned, but not surprised, when the Governor and I shared our concerns with him." Why did you get the impression that he was not surprised?</li> <li>A. Well, because of what Mr - I think I referred to him as Mr Britto, I should refer to him as Dr Britto - Dr Britto was sharing with us also his impressions of Ian McGrail and the relationship that he felt Ian McGrail had with his staff, with his officers, and even the</li> </ul>
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	<ul> <li>of the requirement of the Inquiry for disclosure. I mean, I do not know whether there were WhatsApp exchanges at that time, or whether in fact Mr Pyle were speaking on the phone or meeting about these issues, or whether there are some messages which have been deemed not to be in the scope of the inquiry, and I Q. Perhaps we can clarify that with your team.</li> <li>A. I can do that in the break if you wish.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. Yes. One other question about the matters we covered yesterday. Is it fair to say that in terms of your loss of confidence in Mr McGrail that everything changed on 12 May, and that from your perspective the other reasons pale into insignificance compared to your exchanges with Mr McGrail on that day?</li> <li>A. That is overwhelmingly the most important aspect of what led me to lose confidence in Mr McGrail. As you can imagine, having the most senior law</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Q. We were talking about your meeting with Mr Pyle and your subsequent email exchanges on 17 May, and of course on 18 May you and Mr Pyle met with Dr Britto. If we can go to A207, your witness statement A. Is that in the paginated bundle?</li> <li>Q. It probably is in your witness statements bundle, because I am going to your evidence at paragraph 89 of your first witness statement.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. You say that you, "recall that Mr Britto was very concerned, but not surprised, when the Governor and I shared our concerns with him." Why did you get the impression that he was not surprised?</li> <li>A. Well, because of what Mr - I think I referred to him as Mr Britto, I should refer to him as Dr Britto - Dr Britto was sharing with us also his impressions of Ian McGrail and the relationship that he felt Ian McGrail had with his staff, with his officers, and even the relationship with the GPA.</li> </ul>

1 (Pages 1 to 4)

1	said to you in your witness statement.	1	Governor and the Chief Minister in front of
2	A. Yes. There isn't.	2	him addressing him on a seminal issue, and
3	Q. Is it mentioned	3	that that might have made him nervous.
4	A. I can recall, but not enough to attest to it	4	Indeed, as Her Majesty herself said once, you
5	what it was that Mr Britto said. I can recall	5	know, "recollections may vary"; that doesn't
6	what I said enough to attest to it, and I	6	mean that they are wrong about what
7	produced a note of what I and Nick Pyle	7	happened on that day, but I am very clear
8	were saying as a result of that meeting, but I	8	about what I recall happened on that day.
9	mean, I would be delving into the realms of	9	Q. At C3988, we have a note that you
10	memory to tell you what Dr Britto said and I	10	prepared of the meeting. Am I correct that
11	am a little uncomfortable in saying that on	11	this note was prepared on 20 May, two days
12	oath and confirming that it is a hundred per	12	after - sorry, I will let you get to it.
13	cent the truth.	13	A. Yes. I would be happy if you tell me that
14	Q. You are on oath now.	14	that is what we have indicated and that's
15	A. I am, but what I am saying is, that I am	15	when it was sent.
16	telling you the impression of what he gave	16	Q. That is what the document seems to
17	me. I can't tell you exactly the words that he	17	show.
18	used. For example, I can recall Dr Britto	18	A. Yes.
19	saying at some stage in this process, whether	19	Q. Was this note prepared on the basis of
20	it was on that day or on later days, before the	20	any contemporaneous note, or were you
21	GPA process, or after the GPA process, or	21	relying on memory?
22	indeed in relation to the period after inquiry	22	A. I was relying on the fact that I had taken
23	evidence has been provided, that at very	23	into the room with His Excellency and Dr
24	different times when he was with Ian	24	Britto, I think, a print out of the email I had
25	McGrail he felt bullied in the way that Ian	25	sent the acting Governor, Mr Pyle, on the
	Page 5		Page 7
	1 иде 5		I uge /
1	McGrail dealt with him and that he felt as if	1	night of the 17th in preparation for this
1 2	McGrail dealt with him and that he felt as if his conversations with Ian McGrail were	1 2	night of the 17th in preparation for this meeting; that I had used that as my aide
		1	night of the 17th in preparation for this meeting; that I had used that as my aide memoire; that I had taken Dr Britto through
2	his conversations with Ian McGrail were	2	meeting; that I had used that as my aide
2 3	his conversations with Ian McGrail were being recorded. I can't tell you he told us	2 3	meeting; that I had used that as my aide memoire; that I had taken Dr Britto through
2 3 4	his conversations with Ian McGrail were being recorded. I can't tell you he told us that on that day, I can tell you he has said	2 3 4	meeting; that I had used that as my aide memoire; that I had taken Dr Britto through it at the Governor's invitation, and that is
2 3 4 5	his conversations with Ian McGrail were being recorded. I can't tell you he told us that on that day, I can tell you he has said that to me, but I don't know when, in the	2 3 4 5	meeting; that I had used that as my aide memoire; that I had taken Dr Britto through it at the Governor's invitation, and that is why I told you yesterday, I had used that as
2 3 4 5 6	his conversations with Ian McGrail were being recorded. I can't tell you he told us that on that day, I can tell you he has said that to me, but I don't know when, in the space of the last four years, he told me about	2 3 4 5 6	meeting; that I had used that as my aide memoire; that I had taken Dr Britto through it at the Governor's invitation, and that is why I told you yesterday, I had used that as the template for this note.
2 3 4 5 6 7	his conversations with Ian McGrail were being recorded. I can't tell you he told us that on that day, I can tell you he has said that to me, but I don't know when, in the space of the last four years, he told me about that. But I do believe in fact that it was	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>meeting; that I had used that as my aide</li> <li>memoire; that I had taken Dr Britto through</li> <li>it at the Governor's invitation, and that is</li> <li>why I told you yesterday, I had used that as</li> <li>the template for this note.</li> <li>Q. At C3991, there is the second paragraph,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	his conversations with Ian McGrail were being recorded. I can't tell you he told us that on that day, I can tell you he has said that to me, but I don't know when, in the space of the last four years, he told me about that. But I do believe in fact that it was before we saw that Ian McGrail had recorded	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>meeting; that I had used that as my aide</li> <li>memoire; that I had taken Dr Britto through</li> <li>it at the Governor's invitation, and that is</li> <li>why I told you yesterday, I had used that as</li> <li>the template for this note.</li> <li>Q. At C3991, there is the second paragraph,</li> <li>that is paragraph (c), there is reference to</li> <li>what appears to be the meeting of 12 May</li> <li>where you say the Chief Minister also shared</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	his conversations with Ian McGrail were being recorded. I can't tell you he told us that on that day, I can tell you he has said that to me, but I don't know when, in the space of the last four years, he told me about that. But I do believe in fact that it was before we saw that Ian McGrail had recorded a certain number of meetings. Q. Dr Britto's evidence to this inquiry was that he had no concerns in relation to Mr	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>meeting; that I had used that as my aide</li> <li>memoire; that I had taken Dr Britto through</li> <li>it at the Governor's invitation, and that is</li> <li>why I told you yesterday, I had used that as</li> <li>the template for this note.</li> <li>Q. At C3991, there is the second paragraph,</li> <li>that is paragraph (c), there is reference to</li> <li>what appears to be the meeting of 12 May</li> <li>where you say the Chief Minister also shared</li> <li>another event occurring last week which had</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	his conversations with Ian McGrail were being recorded. I can't tell you he told us that on that day, I can tell you he has said that to me, but I don't know when, in the space of the last four years, he told me about that. But I do believe in fact that it was before we saw that Ian McGrail had recorded a certain number of meetings. Q. Dr Britto's evidence to this inquiry was that he had no concerns in relation to Mr McGrail, so do you remember it differently	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>meeting; that I had used that as my aide</li> <li>memoire; that I had taken Dr Britto through</li> <li>it at the Governor's invitation, and that is</li> <li>why I told you yesterday, I had used that as</li> <li>the template for this note.</li> <li>Q. At C3991, there is the second paragraph,</li> <li>that is paragraph (c), there is reference to</li> <li>what appears to be the meeting of 12 May</li> <li>where you say the Chief Minister also shared</li> <li>another event occurring last week which had</li> <li>left him also in a situation where the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	his conversations with Ian McGrail were being recorded. I can't tell you he told us that on that day, I can tell you he has said that to me, but I don't know when, in the space of the last four years, he told me about that. But I do believe in fact that it was before we saw that Ian McGrail had recorded a certain number of meetings. Q. Dr Britto's evidence to this inquiry was that he had no concerns in relation to Mr McGrail, so do you remember it differently to how he remembers it?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>meeting; that I had used that as my aide</li> <li>memoire; that I had taken Dr Britto through</li> <li>it at the Governor's invitation, and that is</li> <li>why I told you yesterday, I had used that as</li> <li>the template for this note.</li> <li>Q. At C3991, there is the second paragraph,</li> <li>that is paragraph (c), there is reference to</li> <li>what appears to be the meeting of 12 May</li> <li>where you say the Chief Minister also shared</li> <li>another event occurring last week which had</li> <li>left him also in a situation where the</li> <li>Commissioner had expressly misled him, and</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	his conversations with Ian McGrail were being recorded. I can't tell you he told us that on that day, I can tell you he has said that to me, but I don't know when, in the space of the last four years, he told me about that. But I do believe in fact that it was before we saw that Ian McGrail had recorded a certain number of meetings. Q. Dr Britto's evidence to this inquiry was that he had no concerns in relation to Mr McGrail, so do you remember it differently to how he remembers it? A. Yes, I do. I remember the image very	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>meeting; that I had used that as my aide</li> <li>memoire; that I had taken Dr Britto through</li> <li>it at the Governor's invitation, and that is</li> <li>why I told you yesterday, I had used that as</li> <li>the template for this note.</li> <li>Q. At C3991, there is the second paragraph,</li> <li>that is paragraph (c), there is reference to</li> <li>what appears to be the meeting of 12 May</li> <li>where you say the Chief Minister also shared</li> <li>another event occurring last week which had</li> <li>left him also in a situation where the</li> <li>Commissioner had expressly misled him, and</li> <li>which left him unable to believe the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	his conversations with Ian McGrail were being recorded. I can't tell you he told us that on that day, I can tell you he has said that to me, but I don't know when, in the space of the last four years, he told me about that. But I do believe in fact that it was before we saw that Ian McGrail had recorded a certain number of meetings. Q. Dr Britto's evidence to this inquiry was that he had no concerns in relation to Mr McGrail, so do you remember it differently to how he remembers it? A. Yes, I do. I remember the image very vividly. We were sitting around the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>meeting; that I had used that as my aide</li> <li>memoire; that I had taken Dr Britto through</li> <li>it at the Governor's invitation, and that is</li> <li>why I told you yesterday, I had used that as</li> <li>the template for this note.</li> <li>Q. At C3991, there is the second paragraph,</li> <li>that is paragraph (c), there is reference to</li> <li>what appears to be the meeting of 12 May</li> <li>where you say the Chief Minister also shared</li> <li>another event occurring last week which had</li> <li>left him also in a situation where the</li> <li>Commissioner had expressly misled him, and</li> <li>which left him unable to believe the</li> <li>Commissioner. That is presumably a</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	his conversations with Ian McGrail were being recorded. I can't tell you he told us that on that day, I can tell you he has said that to me, but I don't know when, in the space of the last four years, he told me about that. But I do believe in fact that it was before we saw that Ian McGrail had recorded a certain number of meetings. Q. Dr Britto's evidence to this inquiry was that he had no concerns in relation to Mr McGrail, so do you remember it differently to how he remembers it? A. Yes, I do. I remember the image very vividly. We were sitting around the Governor's table having a discussion.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>meeting; that I had used that as my aide</li> <li>memoire; that I had taken Dr Britto through</li> <li>it at the Governor's invitation, and that is</li> <li>why I told you yesterday, I had used that as</li> <li>the template for this note.</li> <li>Q. At C3991, there is the second paragraph,</li> <li>that is paragraph (c), there is reference to</li> <li>what appears to be the meeting of 12 May</li> <li>where you say the Chief Minister also shared</li> <li>another event occurring last week which had</li> <li>left him also in a situation where the</li> <li>Commissioner had expressly misled him, and</li> <li>which left him unable to believe the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	his conversations with Ian McGrail were being recorded. I can't tell you he told us that on that day, I can tell you he has said that to me, but I don't know when, in the space of the last four years, he told me about that. But I do believe in fact that it was before we saw that Ian McGrail had recorded a certain number of meetings. Q. Dr Britto's evidence to this inquiry was that he had no concerns in relation to Mr McGrail, so do you remember it differently to how he remembers it? A. Yes, I do. I remember the image very vividly. We were sitting around the	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ \end{array} $	<ul> <li>meeting; that I had used that as my aide</li> <li>memoire; that I had taken Dr Britto through</li> <li>it at the Governor's invitation, and that is</li> <li>why I told you yesterday, I had used that as</li> <li>the template for this note.</li> <li>Q. At C3991, there is the second paragraph,</li> <li>that is paragraph (c), there is reference to</li> <li>what appears to be the meeting of 12 May</li> <li>where you say the Chief Minister also shared</li> <li>another event occurring last week which had</li> <li>left him also in a situation where the</li> <li>Commissioner had expressly misled him, and</li> <li>which left him unable to believe the</li> <li>Commissioner. That is presumably a</li> </ul>
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ \end{array} $	<ul> <li>his conversations with Ian McGrail were</li> <li>being recorded. I can't tell you he told us</li> <li>that on that day, I can tell you he has said</li> <li>that to me, but I don't know when, in the</li> <li>space of the last four years, he told me about</li> <li>that. But I do believe in fact that it was</li> <li>before we saw that Ian McGrail had recorded</li> <li>a certain number of meetings.</li> <li>Q. Dr Britto's evidence to this inquiry was</li> <li>that he had no concerns in relation to Mr</li> <li>McGrail, so do you remember it differently</li> <li>to how he remembers it?</li> <li>A. Yes, I do. I remember the image very</li> <li>vividly. We were sitting around the</li> <li>Governor's table having a discussion.</li> <li>Q. Do you accept that Dr Britto might have</li> <li>felt nervous or overwhelmed in the presence</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>meeting; that I had used that as my aide memoire; that I had taken Dr Britto through it at the Governor's invitation, and that is why I told you yesterday, I had used that as the template for this note.</li> <li>Q. At C3991, there is the second paragraph, that is paragraph (c), there is reference to what appears to be the meeting of 12 May where you say the Chief Minister also shared another event occurring last week which had left him also in a situation where the Commissioner had expressly misled him, and which left him unable to believe the Commissioner. That is presumably a reference to the meeting with Mr McGrail. Correct?</li> <li>A. That is actually a reference to the meeting</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>his conversations with Ian McGrail were</li> <li>being recorded. I can't tell you he told us</li> <li>that on that day, I can tell you he has said</li> <li>that to me, but I don't know when, in the</li> <li>space of the last four years, he told me about</li> <li>that. But I do believe in fact that it was</li> <li>before we saw that Ian McGrail had recorded</li> <li>a certain number of meetings.</li> <li>Q. Dr Britto's evidence to this inquiry was</li> <li>that he had no concerns in relation to Mr</li> <li>McGrail, so do you remember it differently</li> <li>to how he remembers it?</li> <li>A. Yes, I do. I remember the image very</li> <li>vividly. We were sitting around the</li> <li>Governor's table having a discussion.</li> <li>Q. Do you accept that Dr Britto might have</li> <li>felt nervous or overwhelmed in the presence</li> <li>of both you and the Governor?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>meeting; that I had used that as my aide memoire; that I had taken Dr Britto through it at the Governor's invitation, and that is why I told you yesterday, I had used that as the template for this note.</li> <li>Q. At C3991, there is the second paragraph, that is paragraph (c), there is reference to what appears to be the meeting of 12 May where you say the Chief Minister also shared another event occurring last week which had left him also in a situation where the Commissioner had expressly misled him, and which left him unable to believe the Commissioner. That is presumably a reference to the meeting with Mr McGrail. Correct?</li> <li>A. That is actually a reference to the meeting of 12 May with Mr McGrail where he lied to</li> </ul>
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	<ul> <li>his conversations with Ian McGrail were being recorded. I can't tell you he told us that on that day, I can tell you he has said that to me, but I don't know when, in the space of the last four years, he told me about that. But I do believe in fact that it was before we saw that Ian McGrail had recorded a certain number of meetings.</li> <li>Q. Dr Britto's evidence to this inquiry was that he had no concerns in relation to Mr McGrail, so do you remember it differently to how he remembers it?</li> <li>A. Yes, I do. I remember the image very vividly. We were sitting around the Governor's table having a discussion.</li> <li>Q. Do you accept that Dr Britto might have felt nervous or overwhelmed in the presence of both you and the Governor?</li> <li>A. Of course. Absolutely. I mean, I told</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\\end{array} $	<ul> <li>meeting; that I had used that as my aide</li> <li>memoire; that I had taken Dr Britto through</li> <li>it at the Governor's invitation, and that is</li> <li>why I told you yesterday, I had used that as</li> <li>the template for this note.</li> <li>Q. At C3991, there is the second paragraph,</li> <li>that is paragraph (c), there is reference to</li> <li>what appears to be the meeting of 12 May</li> <li>where you say the Chief Minister also shared</li> <li>another event occurring last week which had</li> <li>left him also in a situation where the</li> <li>Commissioner had expressly misled him, and</li> <li>which left him unable to believe the</li> <li>Commissioner. That is presumably a</li> <li>reference to the meeting with Mr McGrail.</li> <li>Correct?</li> <li>A. That is actually a reference to the meeting</li> <li>of 12 May with Mr McGrail where he lied to</li> <li>metwice.</li> </ul>
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	<ul> <li>his conversations with Ian McGrail were being recorded. I can't tell you he told us that on that day, I can tell you he has said that to me, but I don't know when, in the space of the last four years, he told me about that. But I do believe in fact that it was before we saw that Ian McGrail had recorded a certain number of meetings.</li> <li>Q. Dr Britto's evidence to this inquiry was that he had no concerns in relation to Mr McGrail, so do you remember it differently to how he remembers it?</li> <li>A. Yes, I do. I remember the image very vividly. We were sitting around the Governor's table having a discussion.</li> <li>Q. Do you accept that Dr Britto might have felt nervous or overwhelmed in the presence of both you and the Governor?</li> <li>A. Of course. Absolutely. I mean, I told you that even in the context of the meetings I</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	<ul> <li>meeting; that I had used that as my aide</li> <li>memoire; that I had taken Dr Britto through</li> <li>it at the Governor's invitation, and that is</li> <li>why I told you yesterday, I had used that as</li> <li>the template for this note.</li> <li>Q. At C3991, there is the second paragraph,</li> <li>that is paragraph (c), there is reference to</li> <li>what appears to be the meeting of 12 May</li> <li>where you say the Chief Minister also shared</li> <li>another event occurring last week which had</li> <li>left him also in a situation where the</li> <li>Commissioner had expressly misled him, and</li> <li>which left him unable to believe the</li> <li>Commissioner. That is presumably a</li> <li>reference to the meeting with Mr McGrail.</li> <li>Correct?</li> <li>A. That is actually a reference to the meeting</li> <li>of 12 May with Mr McGrail where he lied to</li> <li>me twice.</li> <li>Q. Did you explain to Dr Britto how Mr</li> </ul>
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ \end{array}$	<ul> <li>his conversations with Ian McGrail were</li> <li>being recorded. I can't tell you he told us</li> <li>that on that day, I can tell you he has said</li> <li>that to me, but I don't know when, in the</li> <li>space of the last four years, he told me about</li> <li>that. But I do believe in fact that it was</li> <li>before we saw that Ian McGrail had recorded</li> <li>a certain number of meetings.</li> <li>Q. Dr Britto's evidence to this inquiry was</li> <li>that he had no concerns in relation to Mr</li> <li>McGrail, so do you remember it differently</li> <li>to how he remembers it?</li> <li>A. Yes, I do. I remember the image very</li> <li>vividly. We were sitting around the</li> <li>Governor's table having a discussion.</li> <li>Q. Do you accept that Dr Britto might have</li> <li>felt nervous or overwhelmed in the presence</li> <li>of both you and the Governor?</li> <li>A. Of course. Absolutely. I mean, I told</li> <li>you that even in the context of the meetings I</li> <li>had with Mr McGrail at the Wessex Lounge,</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	<ul> <li>meeting; that I had used that as my aide</li> <li>memoire; that I had taken Dr Britto through</li> <li>it at the Governor's invitation, and that is</li> <li>why I told you yesterday, I had used that as</li> <li>the template for this note.</li> <li>Q. At C3991, there is the second paragraph,</li> <li>that is paragraph (c), there is reference to</li> <li>what appears to be the meeting of 12 May</li> <li>where you say the Chief Minister also shared</li> <li>another event occurring last week which had</li> <li>left him also in a situation where the</li> <li>Commissioner had expressly misled him, and</li> <li>which left him unable to believe the</li> <li>Commissioner. That is presumably a</li> <li>reference to the meeting with Mr McGrail.</li> <li>Correct?</li> <li>A. That is actually a reference to the meeting</li> <li>of 12 May with Mr McGrail where he lied to</li> <li>me twice.</li> <li>Q. Did you explain to Dr Britto how Mr</li> <li>McGrail had misled you?</li> </ul>
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ \end{array}$	<ul> <li>his conversations with Ian McGrail were</li> <li>being recorded. I can't tell you he told us</li> <li>that on that day, I can tell you he has said</li> <li>that to me, but I don't know when, in the</li> <li>space of the last four years, he told me about</li> <li>that. But I do believe in fact that it was</li> <li>before we saw that Ian McGrail had recorded</li> <li>a certain number of meetings.</li> <li>Q. Dr Britto's evidence to this inquiry was</li> <li>that he had no concerns in relation to Mr</li> <li>McGrail, so do you remember it differently</li> <li>to how he remembers it?</li> <li>A. Yes, I do. I remember the image very</li> <li>vividly. We were sitting around the</li> <li>Governor's table having a discussion.</li> <li>Q. Do you accept that Dr Britto might have</li> <li>felt nervous or overwhelmed in the presence</li> <li>of both you and the Governor?</li> <li>A. Of course. Absolutely. I mean, I told</li> <li>you that even in the context of the meetings I</li> <li>had with Mr McGrail at the Wessex Lounge,</li> <li>even the meeting I had with Mr McGrail on</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	<ul> <li>meeting; that I had used that as my aide memoire; that I had taken Dr Britto through it at the Governor's invitation, and that is why I told you yesterday, I had used that as the template for this note.</li> <li>Q. At C3991, there is the second paragraph, that is paragraph (c), there is reference to what appears to be the meeting of 12 May where you say the Chief Minister also shared another event occurring last week which had left him also in a situation where the Commissioner had expressly misled him, and which left him unable to believe the Commissioner. That is presumably a reference to the meeting with Mr McGrail. Correct?</li> <li>A. That is actually a reference to the meeting of 12 May with Mr McGrail where he lied to me twice.</li> <li>Q. Did you explain to Dr Britto how Mr McGrail had misled you?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	<ul> <li>his conversations with Ian McGrail were</li> <li>being recorded. I can't tell you he told us</li> <li>that on that day, I can tell you he has said</li> <li>that to me, but I don't know when, in the</li> <li>space of the last four years, he told me about</li> <li>that. But I do believe in fact that it was</li> <li>before we saw that Ian McGrail had recorded</li> <li>a certain number of meetings.</li> <li>Q. Dr Britto's evidence to this inquiry was</li> <li>that he had no concerns in relation to Mr</li> <li>McGrail, so do you remember it differently</li> <li>to how he remembers it?</li> <li>A. Yes, I do. I remember the image very</li> <li>vividly. We were sitting around the</li> <li>Governor's table having a discussion.</li> <li>Q. Do you accept that Dr Britto might have</li> <li>felt nervous or overwhelmed in the presence</li> <li>of both you and the Governor?</li> <li>A. Of course. Absolutely. I mean, I told</li> <li>you that even in the context of the meetings I</li> <li>had with Mr McGrail at the Wessex Lounge,</li> <li>even the meeting I had with Mr McGrail on</li> <li>12 May, and I absolutely accept that Dr</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	<ul> <li>meeting; that I had used that as my aide</li> <li>memoire; that I had taken Dr Britto through</li> <li>it at the Governor's invitation, and that is</li> <li>why I told you yesterday, I had used that as</li> <li>the template for this note.</li> <li>Q. At C3991, there is the second paragraph,</li> <li>that is paragraph (c), there is reference to</li> <li>what appears to be the meeting of 12 May</li> <li>where you say the Chief Minister also shared</li> <li>another event occurring last week which had</li> <li>left him also in a situation where the</li> <li>Commissioner had expressly misled him, and</li> <li>which left him unable to believe the</li> <li>Commissioner. That is presumably a</li> <li>reference to the meeting with Mr McGrail.</li> <li>Correct?</li> <li>A. That is actually a reference to the meeting</li> <li>of 12 May with Mr McGrail where he lied to</li> <li>metwice.</li> <li>Q. Did you explain to Dr Britto how Mr</li> <li>McGrail had misled you?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Did you set out the detail about Operation</li> </ul>
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ \end{array}$	<ul> <li>his conversations with Ian McGrail were</li> <li>being recorded. I can't tell you he told us</li> <li>that on that day, I can tell you he has said</li> <li>that to me, but I don't know when, in the</li> <li>space of the last four years, he told me about</li> <li>that. But I do believe in fact that it was</li> <li>before we saw that Ian McGrail had recorded</li> <li>a certain number of meetings.</li> <li>Q. Dr Britto's evidence to this inquiry was</li> <li>that he had no concerns in relation to Mr</li> <li>McGrail, so do you remember it differently</li> <li>to how he remembers it?</li> <li>A. Yes, I do. I remember the image very</li> <li>vividly. We were sitting around the</li> <li>Governor's table having a discussion.</li> <li>Q. Do you accept that Dr Britto might have</li> <li>felt nervous or overwhelmed in the presence</li> <li>of both you and the Governor?</li> <li>A. Of course. Absolutely. I mean, I told</li> <li>you that even in the context of the meetings I</li> <li>had with Mr McGrail at the Wessex Lounge,</li> <li>even the meeting I had with Mr McGrail on</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	<ul> <li>meeting; that I had used that as my aide memoire; that I had taken Dr Britto through it at the Governor's invitation, and that is why I told you yesterday, I had used that as the template for this note.</li> <li>Q. At C3991, there is the second paragraph, that is paragraph (c), there is reference to what appears to be the meeting of 12 May where you say the Chief Minister also shared another event occurring last week which had left him also in a situation where the Commissioner had expressly misled him, and which left him unable to believe the Commissioner. That is presumably a reference to the meeting with Mr McGrail. Correct?</li> <li>A. That is actually a reference to the meeting of 12 May with Mr McGrail where he lied to me twice.</li> <li>Q. Did you explain to Dr Britto how Mr McGrail had misled you?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	<ul> <li>his conversations with Ian McGrail were</li> <li>being recorded. I can't tell you he told us</li> <li>that on that day, I can tell you he has said</li> <li>that to me, but I don't know when, in the</li> <li>space of the last four years, he told me about</li> <li>that. But I do believe in fact that it was</li> <li>before we saw that Ian McGrail had recorded</li> <li>a certain number of meetings.</li> <li>Q. Dr Britto's evidence to this inquiry was</li> <li>that he had no concerns in relation to Mr</li> <li>McGrail, so do you remember it differently</li> <li>to how he remembers it?</li> <li>A. Yes, I do. I remember the image very</li> <li>vividly. We were sitting around the</li> <li>Governor's table having a discussion.</li> <li>Q. Do you accept that Dr Britto might have</li> <li>felt nervous or overwhelmed in the presence</li> <li>of both you and the Governor?</li> <li>A. Of course. Absolutely. I mean, I told</li> <li>you that even in the context of the meetings I</li> <li>had with Mr McGrail at the Wessex Lounge,</li> <li>even the meeting I had with Mr McGrail on</li> <li>12 May, and I absolutely accept that Dr</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	<ul> <li>meeting; that I had used that as my aide</li> <li>memoire; that I had taken Dr Britto through</li> <li>it at the Governor's invitation, and that is</li> <li>why I told you yesterday, I had used that as</li> <li>the template for this note.</li> <li>Q. At C3991, there is the second paragraph,</li> <li>that is paragraph (c), there is reference to</li> <li>what appears to be the meeting of 12 May</li> <li>where you say the Chief Minister also shared</li> <li>another event occurring last week which had</li> <li>left him also in a situation where the</li> <li>Commissioner had expressly misled him, and</li> <li>which left him unable to believe the</li> <li>Commissioner. That is presumably a</li> <li>reference to the meeting with Mr McGrail.</li> <li>Correct?</li> <li>A. That is actually a reference to the meeting</li> <li>of 12 May with Mr McGrail where he lied to</li> <li>me twice.</li> <li>Q. Did you explain to Dr Britto how Mr</li> <li>McGrail had misled you?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Did you set out the detail about Operation</li> </ul>

2 (Pages 5 to 8)

1			
	involvement?		there is precious little there, would you
2	A. I believe I did. I can't tell you in what	2	agree?
3	level of detail, but I believe I did.	3	A. Well, show me the rest of the note and
4	Q. Why did you not set that out in the note?	4	let's look at how much of the facts there are
5	A. Probably because I was needing to	5	in respect of the other matters. I think here,
6	prepare the note and get it out to Dr Britto as	6	what I am doing in this note and what I was
7	soon as possible. I think at one stage he was	7	doing in the meeting, was explaining
8	pressing me for it, and I was - I would have	8	consequence of facts in respect of
9	had to write a lot more, and I don't have a lot	9	confidence. So, I haven't got the full note,
10	of time to produce file notes etcetera. As you	10	and you have taken me to
11	can imagine, for me, having to produce the	11	Q. It is on
12	material that I had produced over those days	12	A. It is on the screen.
13	and start to actually deliver written work,	13	Q. On the screen. If we go to 3988, that is
14	when I rely principally on others to produce	14	the introductory wording.
15	written work as I go from meeting to	15	A. Yes.
16	meeting, required a lot of time to be spent,	16	Q. Then the second one, "The first criteria is
17	and I am sorry to refer to it again, but as you	17	efficiency"
18	know, in this period there was a lot going on.	18	A. Yes.
19	This is before New Year's eve agreement,	19	Q. And we have the HMIC FRS report there.
20	with a lot of negotiations going on. This is	20	A. Yes, and that does not set out all of the
21	still in the period of the beginning of the first	21	facts in the HMIC report, but it set out the
22	post-Covid lockdown. So, this is a very, very	22	consequence as far as I and Nick Pyle are
23	difficult time to be having to deal with	23	concerned.
24	everything else, and this, and to boot,	24	Q. It does refer to page 7 of the report.
25	produce a note.	25	Well, would you accept that there are more
20			
	Page 9		Page 11
1	Q. You did manage to produce a five page	1	specifics, for example, about the HMIC
2	note though and	2	report than there are about the incident that
3	A. Yes, well - it might have been six or	3	you say is the most important one in that
4	eight, if I had been required to put even more	4	note?
5	detail in it. This five page not is not a	5	A. In the way that does not affect the fact
6	transcript of what happened on the day. I	1	-
		6	that I referred to it fully, and explained it
		6 7	that I referred to it fully, and explained it fully, but of course, the HMIC report is a
7	mean, I did not adopt Mr McGrail's	7	fully, but of course, the HMIC report is a
7 8	mean, I did not adopt Mr McGrail's approach, which was to covertly record	7 8	fully, but of course, the HMIC report is a written document to which it is easy to cross
7 8 9	mean, I did not adopt Mr McGrail's approach, which was to covertly record without advising others that I was doing so,	7 8 9	fully, but of course, the HMIC report is a written document to which it is easy to cross refer. The other is something which I explain
7 8 9 10	mean, I did not adopt Mr McGrail's approach, which was to covertly record without advising others that I was doing so, in which case I might have had a more	7 8 9 10	fully, but of course, the HMIC report is a written document to which it is easy to cross refer. The other is something which I explain viva voce, and what is important is the
7 8 9 10 11	mean, I did not adopt Mr McGrail's approach, which was to covertly record without advising others that I was doing so, in which case I might have had a more detailed transcript of what happened. It is	7 8 9 10 11	fully, but of course, the HMIC report is a written document to which it is easy to cross refer. The other is something which I explain viva voce, and what is important is the consequence of that, and what this note is
7 8 9 10 11 12	mean, I did not adopt Mr McGrail's approach, which was to covertly record without advising others that I was doing so, in which case I might have had a more detailed transcript of what happened. It is not purporting to be a transcript.	7 8 9 10 11 12	fully, but of course, the HMIC report is a written document to which it is easy to cross refer. The other is something which I explain viva voce, and what is important is the consequence of that, and what this note is dealing with is what we were telling him
7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>mean, I did not adopt Mr McGrail's</li> <li>approach, which was to covertly record</li> <li>without advising others that I was doing so,</li> <li>in which case I might have had a more</li> <li>detailed transcript of what happened. It is</li> <li>not purporting to be a transcript.</li> <li>Q. This was, in your evidence, the most - by</li> </ul>	7 8 9 10 11 12 13	fully, but of course, the HMIC report is a written document to which it is easy to cross refer. The other is something which I explain viva voce, and what is important is the consequence of that, and what this note is dealing with is what we were telling him were the consequences of those facts when
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>mean, I did not adopt Mr McGrail's</li> <li>approach, which was to covertly record</li> <li>without advising others that I was doing so,</li> <li>in which case I might have had a more</li> <li>detailed transcript of what happened. It is</li> <li>not purporting to be a transcript.</li> <li>Q. This was, in your evidence, the most - by</li> <li>far, the overwhelmingly most important</li> </ul>	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	fully, but of course, the HMIC report is a written document to which it is easy to cross refer. The other is something which I explain viva voce, and what is important is the consequence of that, and what this note is dealing with is what we were telling him were the consequences of those facts when applied to the principles that we believed
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>mean, I did not adopt Mr McGrail's</li> <li>approach, which was to covertly record</li> <li>without advising others that I was doing so,</li> <li>in which case I might have had a more</li> <li>detailed transcript of what happened. It is</li> <li>not purporting to be a transcript.</li> <li>Q. This was, in your evidence, the most - by</li> <li>far, the overwhelmingly most important</li> <li>reason, and you give it four lines on the</li> </ul>	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	fully, but of course, the HMIC report is a written document to which it is easy to cross refer. The other is something which I explain viva voce, and what is important is the consequence of that, and what this note is dealing with is what we were telling him were the consequences of those facts when applied to the principles that we believed were relevant, the five principles that I think
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>mean, I did not adopt Mr McGrail's approach, which was to covertly record without advising others that I was doing so, in which case I might have had a more detailed transcript of what happened. It is not purporting to be a transcript.</li> <li>Q. This was, in your evidence, the most - by far, the overwhelmingly most important reason, and you give it four lines on the fourth page.</li> </ul>	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	fully, but of course, the HMIC report is a written document to which it is easy to cross refer. The other is something which I explain viva voce, and what is important is the consequence of that, and what this note is dealing with is what we were telling him were the consequences of those facts when applied to the principles that we believed were relevant, the five principles that I think I deal with in the note, and the effect of that
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>mean, I did not adopt Mr McGrail's approach, which was to covertly record without advising others that I was doing so, in which case I might have had a more detailed transcript of what happened. It is not purporting to be a transcript.</li> <li>Q. This was, in your evidence, the most - by far, the overwhelmingly most important reason, and you give it four lines on the fourth page.</li> <li>A. I am afraid that's not true.</li> </ul>	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	fully, but of course, the HMIC report is a written document to which it is easy to cross refer. The other is something which I explain viva voce, and what is important is the consequence of that, and what this note is dealing with is what we were telling him were the consequences of those facts when applied to the principles that we believed were relevant, the five principles that I think I deal with in the note, and the effect of that on our ability, respectively and separately, to
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>mean, I did not adopt Mr McGrail's approach, which was to covertly record without advising others that I was doing so, in which case I might have had a more detailed transcript of what happened. It is not purporting to be a transcript.</li> <li>Q. This was, in your evidence, the most - by far, the overwhelmingly most important reason, and you give it four lines on the fourth page.</li> <li>A. I am afraid that's not true.</li> <li>Q. This</li> </ul>	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	fully, but of course, the HMIC report is a written document to which it is easy to cross refer. The other is something which I explain viva voce, and what is important is the consequence of that, and what this note is dealing with is what we were telling him were the consequences of those facts when applied to the principles that we believed were relevant, the five principles that I think I deal with in the note, and the effect of that on our ability, respectively and separately, to have confidence in Ian McGrail. It is not
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>mean, I did not adopt Mr McGrail's approach, which was to covertly record without advising others that I was doing so, in which case I might have had a more detailed transcript of what happened. It is not purporting to be a transcript.</li> <li>Q. This was, in your evidence, the most - by far, the overwhelmingly most important reason, and you give it four lines on the fourth page.</li> <li>A. I am afraid that's not true.</li> <li>Q. This</li> <li>A. Because if you carry on reading, the next</li> </ul>	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	fully, but of course, the HMIC report is a written document to which it is easy to cross refer. The other is something which I explain viva voce, and what is important is the consequence of that, and what this note is dealing with is what we were telling him were the consequences of those facts when applied to the principles that we believed were relevant, the five principles that I think I deal with in the note, and the effect of that on our ability, respectively and separately, to have confidence in Ian McGrail. It is not always the case that the Governor and the
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>mean, I did not adopt Mr McGrail's approach, which was to covertly record without advising others that I was doing so, in which case I might have had a more detailed transcript of what happened. It is not purporting to be a transcript.</li> <li>Q. This was, in your evidence, the most - by far, the overwhelmingly most important reason, and you give it four lines on the fourth page.</li> <li>A. I am afraid that's not true.</li> <li>Q. This</li> <li>A. Because if you carry on reading, the next paragraph deals with it also.</li> </ul>	$\begin{array}{c} 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array}$	fully, but of course, the HMIC report is a written document to which it is easy to cross refer. The other is something which I explain viva voce, and what is important is the consequence of that, and what this note is dealing with is what we were telling him were the consequences of those facts when applied to the principles that we believed were relevant, the five principles that I think I deal with in the note, and the effect of that on our ability, respectively and separately, to have confidence in Ian McGrail. It is not always the case that the Governor and the Chief Minister are exactly ad idem, on the
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>mean, I did not adopt Mr McGrail's approach, which was to covertly record without advising others that I was doing so, in which case I might have had a more detailed transcript of what happened. It is not purporting to be a transcript.</li> <li>Q. This was, in your evidence, the most - by far, the overwhelmingly most important reason, and you give it four lines on the fourth page.</li> <li>A. I am afraid that's not true.</li> <li>Q. This</li> <li>A. Because if you carry on reading, the next paragraph deals with it also.</li> <li>Q. The next paragraph</li> </ul>	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	fully, but of course, the HMIC report is a written document to which it is easy to cross refer. The other is something which I explain viva voce, and what is important is the consequence of that, and what this note is dealing with is what we were telling him were the consequences of those facts when applied to the principles that we believed were relevant, the five principles that I think I deal with in the note, and the effect of that on our ability, respectively and separately, to have confidence in Ian McGrail. It is not always the case that the Governor and the Chief Minister are exactly ad idem, on the same page, in respect of matters, let alone
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>mean, I did not adopt Mr McGrail's approach, which was to covertly record without advising others that I was doing so, in which case I might have had a more detailed transcript of what happened. It is not purporting to be a transcript.</li> <li>Q. This was, in your evidence, the most - by far, the overwhelmingly most important reason, and you give it four lines on the fourth page.</li> <li>A. I am afraid that's not true.</li> <li>Q. This</li> <li>A. Because if you carry on reading, the next paragraph deals with it also.</li> <li>Q. The next paragraph</li> <li>A. So</li> </ul>	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	fully, but of course, the HMIC report is a written document to which it is easy to cross refer. The other is something which I explain viva voce, and what is important is the consequence of that, and what this note is dealing with is what we were telling him were the consequences of those facts when applied to the principles that we believed were relevant, the five principles that I think I deal with in the note, and the effect of that on our ability, respectively and separately, to have confidence in Ian McGrail. It is not always the case that the Governor and the Chief Minister are exactly ad idem, on the same page, in respect of matters, let alone matters as consequential as this.
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>mean, I did not adopt Mr McGrail's approach, which was to covertly record without advising others that I was doing so, in which case I might have had a more detailed transcript of what happened. It is not purporting to be a transcript.</li> <li>Q. This was, in your evidence, the most - by far, the overwhelmingly most important reason, and you give it four lines on the fourth page.</li> <li>A. I am afraid that's not true.</li> <li>Q. This</li> <li>A. Because if you carry on reading, the next paragraph deals with it also.</li> <li>Q. The next paragraph</li> <li>A. So</li> <li>Q explained why it is of concern</li> </ul>	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	fully, but of course, the HMIC report is a written document to which it is easy to cross refer. The other is something which I explain viva voce, and what is important is the consequence of that, and what this note is dealing with is what we were telling him were the consequences of those facts when applied to the principles that we believed were relevant, the five principles that I think I deal with in the note, and the effect of that on our ability, respectively and separately, to have confidence in Ian McGrail. It is not always the case that the Governor and the Chief Minister are exactly ad idem, on the same page, in respect of matters, let alone matters as consequential as this. A. But this is an informal record of a
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>mean, I did not adopt Mr McGrail's approach, which was to covertly record without advising others that I was doing so, in which case I might have had a more detailed transcript of what happened. It is not purporting to be a transcript.</li> <li>Q. This was, in your evidence, the most - by far, the overwhelmingly most important reason, and you give it four lines on the fourth page.</li> <li>A. I am afraid that's not true.</li> <li>Q. This</li> <li>A. Because if you carry on reading, the next paragraph deals with it also.</li> <li>Q. The next paragraph</li> <li>A. So</li> <li>Q explained why it is of concern</li> <li>A. Exactly.</li> </ul>	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	fully, but of course, the HMIC report is a written document to which it is easy to cross refer. The other is something which I explain viva voce, and what is important is the consequence of that, and what this note is dealing with is what we were telling him were the consequences of those facts when applied to the principles that we believed were relevant, the five principles that I think I deal with in the note, and the effect of that on our ability, respectively and separately, to have confidence in Ian McGrail. It is not always the case that the Governor and the Chief Minister are exactly ad idem, on the same page, in respect of matters, let alone matters as consequential as this. A. But this is an informal record of a meeting.
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>mean, I did not adopt Mr McGrail's approach, which was to covertly record without advising others that I was doing so, in which case I might have had a more detailed transcript of what happened. It is not purporting to be a transcript.</li> <li>Q. This was, in your evidence, the most - by far, the overwhelmingly most important reason, and you give it four lines on the fourth page.</li> <li>A. I am afraid that's not true.</li> <li>Q. This</li> <li>A. Because if you carry on reading, the next paragraph deals with it also.</li> <li>Q. The next paragraph</li> <li>A. So</li> <li>Q explained why it is of concern</li> </ul>	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	fully, but of course, the HMIC report is a written document to which it is easy to cross refer. The other is something which I explain viva voce, and what is important is the consequence of that, and what this note is dealing with is what we were telling him were the consequences of those facts when applied to the principles that we believed were relevant, the five principles that I think I deal with in the note, and the effect of that on our ability, respectively and separately, to have confidence in Ian McGrail. It is not always the case that the Governor and the Chief Minister are exactly ad idem, on the same page, in respect of matters, let alone matters as consequential as this. A. But this is an informal record of a
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>mean, I did not adopt Mr McGrail's approach, which was to covertly record without advising others that I was doing so, in which case I might have had a more detailed transcript of what happened. It is not purporting to be a transcript.</li> <li>Q. This was, in your evidence, the most - by far, the overwhelmingly most important reason, and you give it four lines on the fourth page.</li> <li>A. I am afraid that's not true.</li> <li>Q. This</li> <li>A. Because if you carry on reading, the next paragraph deals with it also.</li> <li>Q. The next paragraph</li> <li>A. So</li> <li>Q explained why it is of concern</li> <li>A. Exactly.</li> </ul>	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	fully, but of course, the HMIC report is a written document to which it is easy to cross refer. The other is something which I explain viva voce, and what is important is the consequence of that, and what this note is dealing with is what we were telling him were the consequences of those facts when applied to the principles that we believed were relevant, the five principles that I think I deal with in the note, and the effect of that on our ability, respectively and separately, to have confidence in Ian McGrail. It is not always the case that the Governor and the Chief Minister are exactly ad idem, on the same page, in respect of matters, let alone matters as consequential as this. A. But this is an informal record of a meeting.

3 (Pages 9 to 12)

1	MR SANTOS: Can we go to C4234, please?	1	the strongly advised language which the
1 2	This is an email from Mr Pyle to several	2	Attorney General later resiles from. By the
3	individuals at the FCO, and the second	$\begin{vmatrix} 2\\ 3 \end{vmatrix}$	time I am talking to Nick Pyle, I am talking
4	paragraph he says, "At my request, the CM	4	about: he lied to me because he said the DPP
5	set out the issues of concern, namely the	5	had advised to proceed by way of a search
6	damming HMIC report, the fatal collision,	6	warrant. I don't think, with Nick Pyle, I have
7	Police Federation allegations of bullying and	7	ever got to the stage with talking about
8	the mishandling of a high-profile ongoing	8	"strongly advised" and having to correct that.
9	investigation in which the Commissioner	9	This is a week and a half later.
10	apparently went against the advice of the	10	Q. I understand. I am just trying to get the
11	Attorney General and Director of Public	11	communications right. So your evidence is,
12	Prosecutions." Had the Attorney General	12	you told him that there was a lie about the
13	corrected his misquoting of the DPP by this	13	DPP having advised but you did not tell him
14	point to you?	14	whether the DPP had advised against, or had
15	A. Yes, he had.	15	not advised? That is your evidence?
16	Q. Had you corrected the position with the	16	A. No. Hang on. I told him - let's look at
17	Governor by this point?	17	what I told him. I told him: he told me, Ian
18	A. I don't think I ever communicated to the	18	McGrail told me that they had proceeded by
19	Governor the misquoted position.	19	way of search warrant because the DPP had
20	Q. Well, he seems to be quoting it to the	20	advised that they should. Right. I didn't say
21	FCO, so how did he learn of it?	21	to him, at any stage, because the DPP had
22	A. Well, the way that he is quoting it is	22	strongly advised that they should. Right. So,
23	incorrect.	23	that is my evidence. That's what I told Nick
24	Q. Well, it is incorrect in the sense that he	24	Pyle the first time that I had an opportunity to
25	says, "went against the advice of the	25	talk to him about it. The change in degree of
	Page 13		Page 15
	0		8
1		1	
1 2	Attorney General and Director of Public Prosecutions", but the	1 2	the position of the DPP, if I can describe it as that, which the Attorney General
	Attorney General and Director of Public		the position of the DPP, if I can describe it as
2	Attorney General and Director of Public Prosecutions", but the	2	the position of the DPP, if I can describe it as that, which the Attorney General
2 3	Attorney General and Director of Public Prosecutions", but the A. So	2 3	the position of the DPP, if I can describe it as that, which the Attorney General Communicates to me, because he feels he has
2 3 4	Attorney General and Director of Public Prosecutions", but the A. So Q part that refers to the Director of Public	2 3 4	the position of the DPP, if I can describe it as that, which the Attorney General Communicates to me, because he feels he has misquoted the DPP, is not something which I
2 3 4 5	Attorney General and Director of Public Prosecutions", but the A. So Q part that refers to the Director of Public Prosecutions is wholly consistent with Mr	2 3 4 5	the position of the DPP, if I can describe it as that, which the Attorney General Communicates to me, because he feels he has misquoted the DPP, is not something which I think is, in the context of my conversations
2 3 4 5 6	Attorney General and Director of Public Prosecutions", but the <b>A. So</b> Q part that refers to the Director of Public Prosecutions is wholly consistent with Mr Llamas' message to you.	2 3 4 5 6	the position of the DPP, if I can describe it as that, which the Attorney General Communicates to me, because he feels he has misquoted the DPP, is not something which I think is, in the context of my conversations with Nick Pyle, relevant because I can't recall
2 3 4 5 6 7	Attorney General and Director of Public Prosecutions", but the A. So Q part that refers to the Director of Public Prosecutions is wholly consistent with Mr Llamas' message to you. A. But I am unable to give evidence of why	2 3 4 5 6 7	the position of the DPP, if I can describe it as that, which the Attorney General Communicates to me, because he feels he has misquoted the DPP, is not something which I think is, in the context of my conversations with Nick Pyle, relevant because I can't recall using the "strongly advised" language with
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Attorney General and Director of Public Prosecutions", but the A. So Q part that refers to the Director of Public Prosecutions is wholly consistent with Mr Llamas' message to you. A. But I am unable to give evidence of why Nick Pyle is expressing it in that way. He	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	the position of the DPP, if I can describe it as that, which the Attorney General Communicates to me, because he feels he has misquoted the DPP, is not something which I think is, in the context of my conversations with Nick Pyle, relevant because I can't recall using the "strongly advised" language with Nick Pyle. Now
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Attorney General and Director of Public Prosecutions", but the A. So Q part that refers to the Director of Public Prosecutions is wholly consistent with Mr Llamas' message to you. A. But I am unable to give evidence of why Nick Pyle is expressing it in that way. He may have been left with that impression after	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	the position of the DPP, if I can describe it as that, which the Attorney General Communicates to me, because he feels he has misquoted the DPP, is not something which I think is, in the context of my conversations with Nick Pyle, relevant because I can't recall using the "strongly advised" language with Nick Pyle. Now Q. There is no reference to - I think there is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Attorney General and Director of Public Prosecutions", but the A. So Q part that refers to the Director of Public Prosecutions is wholly consistent with Mr Llamas' message to you. A. But I am unable to give evidence of why Nick Pyle is expressing it in that way. He may have been left with that impression after speaking	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	the position of the DPP, if I can describe it as that, which the Attorney General Communicates to me, because he feels he has misquoted the DPP, is not something which I think is, in the context of my conversations with Nick Pyle, relevant because I can't recall using the "strongly advised" language with Nick Pyle. Now Q. There is no reference to - I think there is some confusion. There is no reference to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Attorney General and Director of Public Prosecutions", but the A. So Q part that refers to the Director of Public Prosecutions is wholly consistent with Mr Llamas' message to you. A. But I am unable to give evidence of why Nick Pyle is expressing it in that way. He may have been left with that impression after speaking Q. My question to you was A to me. Q. Sorry, my question to you was not why	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	the position of the DPP, if I can describe it as that, which the Attorney General Communicates to me, because he feels he has misquoted the DPP, is not something which I think is, in the context of my conversations with Nick Pyle, relevant because I can't recall using the "strongly advised" language with Nick Pyle. Now Q. There is no reference to - I think there is some confusion. There is no reference to "strongly advised" to strong advice there. A. Yes. Q. The difference is between advising
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Attorney General and Director of Public Prosecutions", but the A. So Q part that refers to the Director of Public Prosecutions is wholly consistent with Mr Llamas' message to you. A. But I am unable to give evidence of why Nick Pyle is expressing it in that way. He may have been left with that impression after speaking Q. My question to you was A to me. Q. Sorry, my question to you was not why he said it in that way. My question to you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	the position of the DPP, if I can describe it as that, which the Attorney General Communicates to me, because he feels he has misquoted the DPP, is not something which I think is, in the context of my conversations with Nick Pyle, relevant because I can't recall using the "strongly advised" language with Nick Pyle. Now Q. There is no reference to - I think there is some confusion. There is no reference to "strongly advised" to strong advice there. A. Yes. Q. The difference is between advising against it and not advising at all. The
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Attorney General and Director of Public Prosecutions", but the A. So Q part that refers to the Director of Public Prosecutions is wholly consistent with Mr Llamas' message to you. A. But I am unable to give evidence of why Nick Pyle is expressing it in that way. He may have been left with that impression after speaking Q. My question to you was A to me. Q. Sorry, my question to you was not why he said it in that way. My question to you was whether you had corrected the position	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>the position of the DPP, if I can describe it as that, which the Attorney General</li> <li>Communicates to me, because he feels he has misquoted the DPP, is not something which I think is, in the context of my conversations with Nick Pyle, relevant because I can't recall using the "strongly advised" language with Nick Pyle. Now</li> <li>Q. There is no reference to - I think there is some confusion. There is no reference to "strongly advised" to strong advice there.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. The difference is between advising against it and not advising at all. The position that Mr Llamas reports to you about,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Attorney General and Director of Public Prosecutions", but the A. So Q part that refers to the Director of Public Prosecutions is wholly consistent with Mr Llamas' message to you. A. But I am unable to give evidence of why Nick Pyle is expressing it in that way. He may have been left with that impression after speaking Q. My question to you was A to me. Q. Sorry, my question to you was not why he said it in that way. My question to you was whether you had corrected the position with him?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	the position of the DPP, if I can describe it as that, which the Attorney General Communicates to me, because he feels he has misquoted the DPP, is not something which I think is, in the context of my conversations with Nick Pyle, relevant because I can't recall using the "strongly advised" language with Nick Pyle. Now Q. There is no reference to - I think there is some confusion. There is no reference to "strongly advised" to strong advice there. A. Yes. Q. The difference is between advising against it and not advising at all. The position that Mr Llamas reports to you about, is advising against
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Attorney General and Director of Public Prosecutions", but the A. So Q part that refers to the Director of Public Prosecutions is wholly consistent with Mr Llamas' message to you. A. But I am unable to give evidence of why Nick Pyle is expressing it in that way. He may have been left with that impression after speaking Q. My question to you was A to me. Q. Sorry, my question to you was not why he said it in that way. My question to you was whether you had corrected the position with him? A. I answered that question.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	the position of the DPP, if I can describe it as that, which the Attorney General Communicates to me, because he feels he has misquoted the DPP, is not something which I think is, in the context of my conversations with Nick Pyle, relevant because I can't recall using the "strongly advised" language with Nick Pyle. Now Q. There is no reference to - I think there is some confusion. There is no reference to "strongly advised" to strong advice there. A. Yes. Q. The difference is between advising against it and not advising at all. The position that Mr Llamas reports to you about, is advising against A. Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Attorney General and Director of Public Prosecutions", but the A. So Q part that refers to the Director of Public Prosecutions is wholly consistent with Mr Llamas' message to you. A. But I am unable to give evidence of why Nick Pyle is expressing it in that way. He may have been left with that impression after speaking Q. My question to you was A to me. Q. Sorry, my question to you was not why he said it in that way. My question to you was whether you had corrected the position with him? A. I answered that question. Q. Is it answer that you never spoke to him	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>the position of the DPP, if I can describe it as that, which the Attorney General</li> <li>Communicates to me, because he feels he has misquoted the DPP, is not something which I think is, in the context of my conversations with Nick Pyle, relevant because I can't recall using the "strongly advised" language with Nick Pyle. Now</li> <li>Q. There is no reference to - I think there is some confusion. There is no reference to "strongly advised" to strong advice there.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. The difference is between advising against it and not advising at all. The position that Mr Llamas reports to you about, is advising against</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q and his misquotation is on the basis that</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Attorney General and Director of Public Prosecutions", but the A. So Q part that refers to the Director of Public Prosecutions is wholly consistent with Mr Llamas' message to you. A. But I am unable to give evidence of why Nick Pyle is expressing it in that way. He may have been left with that impression after speaking Q. My question to you was A to me. Q. Sorry, my question to you was not why he said it in that way. My question to you was whether you had corrected the position with him? A. I answered that question. Q. Is it answer that you never spoke to him about that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>the position of the DPP, if I can describe it as that, which the Attorney General</li> <li>Communicates to me, because he feels he has misquoted the DPP, is not something which I think is, in the context of my conversations with Nick Pyle, relevant because I can't recall using the "strongly advised" language with Nick Pyle. Now</li> <li>Q. There is no reference to - I think there is some confusion. There is no reference to "strongly advised" to strong advice there.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. The difference is between advising against it and not advising at all. The position that Mr Llamas reports to you about, is advising against</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q and his misquotation is on the basis that the DPP did not advise against, but rather</li> </ul>
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array}$	Attorney General and Director of Public Prosecutions", but the A. So Q part that refers to the Director of Public Prosecutions is wholly consistent with Mr Llamas' message to you. A. But I am unable to give evidence of why Nick Pyle is expressing it in that way. He may have been left with that impression after speaking Q. My question to you was A to me. Q. Sorry, my question to you was not why he said it in that way. My question to you was whether you had corrected the position with him? A. I answered that question. Q. Is it answer that you never spoke to him about that A. I don't think I - sorry?	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\\end{array} $	<ul> <li>the position of the DPP, if I can describe it as that, which the Attorney General Communicates to me, because he feels he has misquoted the DPP, is not something which I think is, in the context of my conversations with Nick Pyle, relevant because I can't recall using the "strongly advised" language with Nick Pyle. Now</li> <li>Q. There is no reference to - I think there is some confusion. There is no reference to "strongly advised" to strong advice there.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. The difference is between advising against it and not advising at all. The position that Mr Llamas reports to you about, is advising against</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q and his misquotation is on the basis that the DPP did not advise.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Attorney General and Director of Public Prosecutions", but the A. So Q part that refers to the Director of Public Prosecutions is wholly consistent with Mr Llamas' message to you. A. But I am unable to give evidence of why Nick Pyle is expressing it in that way. He may have been left with that impression after speaking Q. My question to you was A to me. Q. Sorry, my question to you was not why he said it in that way. My question to you was whether you had corrected the position with him? A. I answered that question. Q. Is it answer that you never spoke to him about that A. I don't think I - sorry? Q. Is your evidence that you did not speak to	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	<ul> <li>the position of the DPP, if I can describe it as that, which the Attorney General</li> <li>Communicates to me, because he feels he has misquoted the DPP, is not something which I think is, in the context of my conversations with Nick Pyle, relevant because I can't recall using the "strongly advised" language with Nick Pyle. Now</li> <li>Q. There is no reference to - I think there is some confusion. There is no reference to "strongly advised" to strong advice there.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. The difference is between advising against it and not advising at all. The position that Mr Llamas reports to you about, is advising against</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q and his misquotation is on the basis that the DPP did not advise.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Attorney General and Director of Public Prosecutions", but the A. So Q part that refers to the Director of Public Prosecutions is wholly consistent with Mr Llamas' message to you. A. But I am unable to give evidence of why Nick Pyle is expressing it in that way. He may have been left with that impression after speaking Q. My question to you was A to me. Q. Sorry, my question to you was not why he said it in that way. My question to you was whether you had corrected the position with him? A. I answered that question. Q. Is it answer that you never spoke to him about that A. I don't think I - sorry? Q. Is your evidence that you did not speak to him about what the alleged lie was?	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	<ul> <li>the position of the DPP, if I can describe it as that, which the Attorney General</li> <li>Communicates to me, because he feels he has misquoted the DPP, is not something which I think is, in the context of my conversations with Nick Pyle, relevant because I can't recall using the "strongly advised" language with Nick Pyle. Now</li> <li>Q. There is no reference to - I think there is some confusion. There is no reference to "strongly advised" to strong advice there.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. The difference is between advising against it and not advising at all. The position that Mr Llamas reports to you about, is advising against</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q and his misquotation is on the basis that the DPP did not advise.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. But the Governor seems to be reporting</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Attorney General and Director of Public Prosecutions", but the A. So Q part that refers to the Director of Public Prosecutions is wholly consistent with Mr Llamas' message to you. A. But I am unable to give evidence of why Nick Pyle is expressing it in that way. He may have been left with that impression after speaking Q. My question to you was A to me. Q. Sorry, my question to you was not why he said it in that way. My question to you was whether you had corrected the position with him? A. I answered that question. Q. Is it answer that you never spoke to him about that A. I don't think I - sorry? Q. Is your evidence that you did not speak to him about what the alleged lie was? A. No, that is not my evidence. My	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	<ul> <li>the position of the DPP, if I can describe it as that, which the Attorney General</li> <li>Communicates to me, because he feels he has misquoted the DPP, is not something which I think is, in the context of my conversations with Nick Pyle, relevant because I can't recall using the "strongly advised" language with Nick Pyle. Now</li> <li>Q. There is no reference to - I think there is some confusion. There is no reference to "strongly advised" to strong advice there.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. The difference is between advising against it and not advising at all. The position that Mr Llamas reports to you about, is advising against</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q and his misquotation is on the basis that the DPP did not advise.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. But the Governor seems to be reporting to the FCO. The initial position reported by</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Attorney General and Director of Public Prosecutions", but the A. So Q part that refers to the Director of Public Prosecutions is wholly consistent with Mr Llamas' message to you. A. But I am unable to give evidence of why Nick Pyle is expressing it in that way. He may have been left with that impression after speaking Q. My question to you was A to me. Q. Sorry, my question to you was not why he said it in that way. My question to you was whether you had corrected the position with him? A. I answered that question. Q. Is it answer that you never spoke to him about that A. I don't think I - sorry? Q. Is your evidence that you did not speak to him about what the alleged lie was? A. No, that is not my evidence. My evidence is, and I hope I have corrected this	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	<ul> <li>the position of the DPP, if I can describe it as that, which the Attorney General Communicates to me, because he feels he has misquoted the DPP, is not something which I think is, in the context of my conversations with Nick Pyle, relevant because I can't recall using the "strongly advised" language with Nick Pyle. Now</li> <li>Q. There is no reference to - I think there is some confusion. There is no reference to "strongly advised" to strong advice there.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. The difference is between advising against it and not advising at all. The position that Mr Llamas reports to you about, is advising against</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q and his misquotation is on the basis that the DPP did not advise.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. But the Governor seems to be reporting to the FCO. The initial position reported by Mr Llamas - that is why I am just trying to</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Attorney General and Director of Public Prosecutions", but the A. So Q part that refers to the Director of Public Prosecutions is wholly consistent with Mr Llamas' message to you. A. But I am unable to give evidence of why Nick Pyle is expressing it in that way. He may have been left with that impression after speaking Q. My question to you was A to me. Q. Sorry, my question to you was not why he said it in that way. My question to you was whether you had corrected the position with him? A. I answered that question. Q. Is it answer that you never spoke to him about that A. I don't think I - sorry? Q. Is your evidence that you did not speak to him about what the alleged lie was? A. No, that is not my evidence. My	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	<ul> <li>the position of the DPP, if I can describe it as that, which the Attorney General</li> <li>Communicates to me, because he feels he has misquoted the DPP, is not something which I think is, in the context of my conversations with Nick Pyle, relevant because I can't recall using the "strongly advised" language with Nick Pyle. Now</li> <li>Q. There is no reference to - I think there is some confusion. There is no reference to "strongly advised" to strong advice there.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. The difference is between advising against it and not advising at all. The position that Mr Llamas reports to you about, is advising against</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q and his misquotation is on the basis that the DPP did not advise.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. But the Governor seems to be reporting to the FCO. The initial position reported by</li> </ul>

4 (Pages 13 to 16)

Page 16

1 reporting that to the FCO, and why --1 whether to exercise section 34? 2 2 A. But to the extent, as you can imagine, that A. He didn't have to make any decision 3 is more a question for him than it is for me. 3 there. We were sharing with him why we 4 4 Q. Thank you. thought they should engage that level of 5 A. It might be, but I am happy to assist you 5 scrutiny of the actions of the Commissioner, 6 6 and invite him to explain, but they were further if you feel that I can. 7 Q. I think we will move on. Your file note 7 perfectly free to do otherwise. Indeed, Mr 8 was later read out to the GPA by Dr Britto as 8 Britto is not - Dr Britto is not the GPA, he is 9 9 part of their meeting. Do you think that it the chairman of the GPA, so what was 10 10 provided sufficient detail in respect of your happening there was not a GPA process. It 11 11 primary reason for losing confidence in Mr was us informing the chair of the GPA. The 12 McGrail? 12 GPA process could only begin when Dr 13 A. I do. I believe it provided the key issue, 13 Britto met with the GPA and they started 14 14 which is that I have been misled by Mr their independent deliberations which would 15 15 McGrail, and the consequences of that key of course, have to reflect upon the things that 16 16 issue on my confidence. we had said. Q. If we go to C4234 - sorry, we are on 17 17 O. Dr Britto's evidence was that he 18 C4234. 18 interpreted this as you saying that he would 19 19 A. Correct. not be doing his duty if he did not invite Mr 20 20 McGrail to retire. Do you understand that he Q. The end of that paragraph Mr Pyle says, 21 "The CM reminded the chair that should this 21 might have interpreted it in that way? Do 22 22 not happen..." -- i.e, the section 34 calling you understand why he might have 23 23 upon the Commissioner to retire - "... should interpreted it like that? 24 this not happen, the Act gave the Governor 24 A. Absolutely. 25 25 powers to call for the resignation of the Q. If we go to B --Page 17 Page 19 1 Commissioner." Then jumping over about 1 A. I think it is important to understand the 2 five lines, "I said should the GPA determine 2 consequences of what was happening here. 3 3 that the call to retire was not appropriate, I The Governor, who is appointed by the 4 would consider using the powers available to 4 United Kingdom, the Chief Minister, who is 5 5 me under section 13.1(f) which allowed me directly elected by universal suffrage of the 6 to call for the resignation of the 6 people of Gibraltar, together have lost 7 7 Commissioner and that as things stood, I confidence in the senior law enforcement 8 8 would need strong and persuasive arguments official in Gibraltar for the reasons that we 9 9 not to do so. I said whilst I was not looking have set out. That is quite seminal, and that 10 10 to prejudge the deliberations of the GPA and is why we were communicating vehemently 11 was mindful that the Commissioner is 11 to the chairman of the GPA how we felt. For 12 allowed to make representations as section 12 the GPA process as you see, because 13 13 actually, you know, if has a life of its own, is 34 allows, the GPA should be in no doubt as 14 to the strength of my feelings. I concluded 14 a matter of the GPA. But their independence 15 15 by saying the powers I have under section does not preclude us from being forceful in

16 13.1(f) only come into play in default by the the expression of our views as to how we feel 17 authority and as such, the GPA was under about the Commissioner of Police. 18 some scrutiny." You would be aware - are Q. Can we go to B1426, please? Towards 19 you aware that under section 48 of the the bottom of the page there are messages on 20 20 May between you and the Chief Secretary constitution that the GPA has an obligation to 21 carry out its functions independently? Darren Grech, where you say, at 445, 22 "Darren. When Joey speaks tomorrow at the A. Of course, and I don't believe that this in 23 any way effects its independence. GPA he is going to explain my views on the 24 sensitive subject. Your support for me on Q. Do you think you gave Dr Britto a fair 25 opportunity to decide independently as to this key. I have grave grave concerns." Mr

Page 18

## 5 (Pages 17 to 20)

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 20

1	Grech responds, "I know, and they are my	1	you and Dr Britto at 11:58 where he says,
2	concerns too for whole range of reasons.	2	"Fabian. Could I possibly see you this
3	You have the support." He then reports to	3	afternoon when Ernest goes to see you at
4	you the following day, "Made my position	4	four, or around that time?" "Yes, sure, see
5	very clear this morning. His position	5	you then." "Thanks, see you at four". Then
6	untenable with a massive loss of confidence	6	he sends you some media, and you say, "Hi.
7	all over. Here is you need me, although" I	7	Yes, that is what you will in effect be doing.
8	will not go into the rest of that message. Did	8	You come back to us to seek our consent
9	you consider it was appropriate to seek to	9	after the representations have been received.
10	influence the actions of a GPA member?	10	I will write the sequencing down for you as I
11	A. I don't think I'm seeking to influence the	11	see it, if you wish. I am just going to finish a
12	actions of a GPA member by telling him how	12	note first." It appears from those messages
13	I feel.	13	that you had exchanges and made
14	Q. "Your support for me on this is key".	14	amendments to the first letter to Mr McGrail.
15	A. Absolutely it's key. He is my appointee	15	A. Yes.
16	in the GPA.	16	Q. Do you recall what those amendments
17	Q. Is he	17	were?
18	A. I told you what happened the very day I	18	A. It's impossible for me, without seeing the
19	became Chief Minister, the very day I	19	media, what it was. I don't know whether
20	became Chief minister in the context of the	20	there's been, in the other disclosure, if there
21	application process and the GPA then for	21	is any ability to get those, maybe from Joey's
22	Commissioner of Police.	22	devices.
23	Q. Was that exchange consistent with the	23	Q. I do not think we have been able to do so.
24	GPA exercising its functions independently?	24	A. I mean at that time, WhatsApp tended to
25	A. Yes, it was, and indeed with Darren	25	delete attachments, or indeed messages when
20			uciete actaciments, or macca messages when
	Page 21		Page 23
1	Crash it is avaraising his functions	1	you transformed phones which it descript do
1	Grech, it is exercising his functions	1	you transferred phones, which it doesn't do
2	independently in the fact that somebody is	2	now if you back-up, but at that time, it did.
2 3	independently in the fact that somebody is exercising their functions independently does	2 3	<b>now if you back-up, but at that time, it did.</b> Q. Do you agree that under section 34 the
2 3 4	independently in the fact that somebody is exercising their functions independently does not prevent somebody else from telling them	2 3 4	<b>now if you back-up, but at that time, it did.</b> Q. Do you agree that under section 34 the order of events is that the GPA seeks
2 3 4 5	independently in the fact that somebody is exercising their functions independently does not prevent somebody else from telling them their views as to why one or another better	2 3 4 5	<b>now if you back-up, but at that time, it did.</b> Q. Do you agree that under section 34 the order of events is that the GPA seeks representations, considers the
2 3 4 5 6	independently in the fact that somebody is exercising their functions independently does not prevent somebody else from telling them their views as to why one or another better course is to be preferred.	2 3 4 5 6	<b>now if you back-up, but at that time, it did.</b> Q. Do you agree that under section 34 the order of events is that the GPA seeks representations, considers the representations, then consults the Governor
2 3 4 5 6 7	independently in the fact that somebody is exercising their functions independently does not prevent somebody else from telling them their views as to why one or another better course is to be preferred. Q. The GPA met on the following day.	2 3 4 5 6 7	<b>now if you back-up, but at that time, it did.</b> Q. Do you agree that under section 34 the order of events is that the GPA seeks representations, considers the representations, then consults the Governor and the Chief Minister and obtains the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>independently in the fact that somebody is exercising their functions independently does not prevent somebody else from telling them their views as to why one or another better course is to be preferred.</li> <li>Q. The GPA met on the following day.</li> <li>When did you learn of the result of the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<b>now if you back-up, but at that time, it did.</b> Q. Do you agree that under section 34 the order of events is that the GPA seeks representations, considers the representations, then consults the Governor and the Chief Minister and obtains the agreement of at least one of them, and then
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul><li>independently in the fact that somebody is exercising their functions independently does not prevent somebody else from telling them their views as to why one or another better course is to be preferred.</li><li>Q. The GPA met on the following day.</li><li>When did you learn of the result of the meeting?</li></ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<b>now if you back-up, but at that time, it did.</b> Q. Do you agree that under section 34 the order of events is that the GPA seeks representations, considers the representations, then consults the Governor and the Chief Minister and obtains the agreement of at least one of them, and then the GPA invites the Commissioner of Police
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>independently in the fact that somebody is exercising their functions independently does not prevent somebody else from telling them their views as to why one or another better course is to be preferred.</li> <li>Q. The GPA met on the following day.</li> <li>When did you learn of the result of the meeting?</li> <li>A. I am unable to tell you that. I don't know</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<b>now if you back-up, but at that time, it did.</b> Q. Do you agree that under section 34 the order of events is that the GPA seeks representations, considers the representations, then consults the Governor and the Chief Minister and obtains the agreement of at least one of them, and then the GPA invites the Commissioner of Police to retire.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>independently in the fact that somebody is exercising their functions independently does not prevent somebody else from telling them their views as to why one or another better course is to be preferred.</li> <li>Q. The GPA met on the following day.</li> <li>When did you learn of the result of the meeting?</li> <li>A. I am unable to tell you that. I don't know when they finished and when they told me</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>now if you back-up, but at that time, it did.</li> <li>Q. Do you agree that under section 34 the order of events is that the GPA seeks representations, considers the representations, then consults the Governor and the Chief Minister and obtains the agreement of at least one of them, and then the GPA invites the Commissioner of Police to retire.</li> <li>A. Yes, and that if he - and that if they do,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>independently in the fact that somebody is exercising their functions independently does not prevent somebody else from telling them their views as to why one or another better course is to be preferred.</li> <li>Q. The GPA met on the following day.</li> <li>When did you learn of the result of the meeting?</li> <li>A. I am unable to tell you that. I don't know when they finished and when they told me but there may be a record.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>now if you back-up, but at that time, it did.</li> <li>Q. Do you agree that under section 34 the order of events is that the GPA seeks representations, considers the representations, then consults the Governor and the Chief Minister and obtains the agreement of at least one of them, and then the GPA invites the Commissioner of Police to retire.</li> <li>A. Yes, and that if he - and that if they do, he shall retire.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>independently in the fact that somebody is exercising their functions independently does not prevent somebody else from telling them their views as to why one or another better course is to be preferred.</li> <li>Q. The GPA met on the following day.</li> <li>When did you learn of the result of the meeting?</li> <li>A. I am unable to tell you that. I don't know when they finished and when they told me but there may be a record.</li> <li>Q. Do you remember who reported it to</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>now if you back-up, but at that time, it did.</li> <li>Q. Do you agree that under section 34 the order of events is that the GPA seeks representations, considers the representations, then consults the Governor and the Chief Minister and obtains the agreement of at least one of them, and then the GPA invites the Commissioner of Police to retire.</li> <li>A. Yes, and that if he - and that if they do, he shall retire.</li> <li>Q. The letter invites Mr McGrail to retire,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>independently in the fact that somebody is exercising their functions independently does not prevent somebody else from telling them their views as to why one or another better course is to be preferred.</li> <li>Q. The GPA met on the following day.</li> <li>When did you learn of the result of the meeting?</li> <li>A. I am unable to tell you that. I don't know when they finished and when they told me but there may be a record.</li> <li>Q. Do you remember who reported it to you?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>now if you back-up, but at that time, it did.</li> <li>Q. Do you agree that under section 34 the order of events is that the GPA seeks representations, considers the representations, then consults the Governor and the Chief Minister and obtains the agreement of at least one of them, and then the GPA invites the Commissioner of Police to retire.</li> <li>A. Yes, and that if he - and that if they do, he shall retire.</li> <li>Q. The letter invites Mr McGrail to retire, the first letter, but also invited</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>independently in the fact that somebody is exercising their functions independently does not prevent somebody else from telling them their views as to why one or another better course is to be preferred.</li> <li>Q. The GPA met on the following day.</li> <li>When did you learn of the result of the meeting?</li> <li>A. I am unable to tell you that. I don't know when they finished and when they told me but there may be a record.</li> <li>Q. Do you remember who reported it to you?</li> <li>A. Well, certainly you can see here that</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>now if you back-up, but at that time, it did.</li> <li>Q. Do you agree that under section 34 the order of events is that the GPA seeks representations, considers the representations, then consults the Governor and the Chief Minister and obtains the agreement of at least one of them, and then the GPA invites the Commissioner of Police to retire.</li> <li>A. Yes, and that if he - and that if they do, he shall retire.</li> <li>Q. The letter invites Mr McGrail to retire, the first letter, but also invited representations to allow the Governor, the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>independently in the fact that somebody is exercising their functions independently does not prevent somebody else from telling them their views as to why one or another better course is to be preferred.</li> <li>Q. The GPA met on the following day.</li> <li>When did you learn of the result of the meeting?</li> <li>A. I am unable to tell you that. I don't know when they finished and when they told me but there may be a record.</li> <li>Q. Do you remember who reported it to you?</li> <li>A. Well, certainly you can see here that Darren Grech reported something to me, if</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>now if you back-up, but at that time, it did.</li> <li>Q. Do you agree that under section 34 the order of events is that the GPA seeks representations, considers the representations, then consults the Governor and the Chief Minister and obtains the agreement of at least one of them, and then the GPA invites the Commissioner of Police to retire.</li> <li>A. Yes, and that if he - and that if they do, he shall retire.</li> <li>Q. The letter invites Mr McGrail to retire, the first letter, but also invited representations to allow the Governor, the Chief Minister and the authority to express a</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>independently in the fact that somebody is exercising their functions independently does not prevent somebody else from telling them their views as to why one or another better course is to be preferred.</li> <li>Q. The GPA met on the following day.</li> <li>When did you learn of the result of the meeting?</li> <li>A. I am unable to tell you that. I don't know when they finished and when they told me but there may be a record.</li> <li>Q. Do you remember who reported it to you?</li> <li>A. Well, certainly you can see here that Darren Grech reported something to me, if you call that a report. I mean, he certainly</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ \end{array} $	<ul> <li>now if you back-up, but at that time, it did.</li> <li>Q. Do you agree that under section 34 the order of events is that the GPA seeks representations, considers the representations, then consults the Governor and the Chief Minister and obtains the agreement of at least one of them, and then the GPA invites the Commissioner of Police to retire.</li> <li>A. Yes, and that if he - and that if they do, he shall retire.</li> <li>Q. The letter invites Mr McGrail to retire, the first letter, but also invited representations to allow the Governor, the Chief Minister and the authority to express a firm and final view. Was that, in your view,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>independently in the fact that somebody is exercising their functions independently does not prevent somebody else from telling them their views as to why one or another better course is to be preferred.</li> <li>Q. The GPA met on the following day.</li> <li>When did you learn of the result of the meeting?</li> <li>A. I am unable to tell you that. I don't know when they finished and when they told me but there may be a record.</li> <li>Q. Do you remember who reported it to you?</li> <li>A. Well, certainly you can see here that Darren Grech reported something to me, if you call that a report. I mean, he certainly told me, I wouldn't say its reporting, and I</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>now if you back-up, but at that time, it did.</li> <li>Q. Do you agree that under section 34 the order of events is that the GPA seeks representations, considers the representations, then consults the Governor and the Chief Minister and obtains the agreement of at least one of them, and then the GPA invites the Commissioner of Police to retire.</li> <li>A. Yes, and that if he - and that if they do, he shall retire.</li> <li>Q. The letter invites Mr McGrail to retire, the first letter, but also invited representations to allow the Governor, the Chief Minister and the authority to express a firm and final view. Was that, in your view, consistent with the scheme of section 34?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>independently in the fact that somebody is exercising their functions independently does not prevent somebody else from telling them their views as to why one or another better course is to be preferred.</li> <li>Q. The GPA met on the following day.</li> <li>When did you learn of the result of the meeting?</li> <li>A. I am unable to tell you that. I don't know when they finished and when they told me but there may be a record.</li> <li>Q. Do you remember who reported it to you?</li> <li>A. Well, certainly you can see here that Darren Grech reported something to me, if you call that a report. I mean, he certainly told me, I wouldn't say its reporting, and I don't know whether Dr Britto may have</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>now if you back-up, but at that time, it did.</li> <li>Q. Do you agree that under section 34 the order of events is that the GPA seeks representations, considers the representations, then consults the Governor and the Chief Minister and obtains the agreement of at least one of them, and then the GPA invites the Commissioner of Police to retire.</li> <li>A. Yes, and that if he - and that if they do, he shall retire.</li> <li>Q. The letter invites Mr McGrail to retire, the first letter, but also invited representations to allow the Governor, the Chief Minister and the authority to express a firm and final view. Was that, in your view, consistent with the scheme of section 34?</li> <li>A. Look, I don't think I'm here to give you</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>independently in the fact that somebody is exercising their functions independently does not prevent somebody else from telling them their views as to why one or another better course is to be preferred.</li> <li>Q. The GPA met on the following day.</li> <li>When did you learn of the result of the meeting?</li> <li>A. I am unable to tell you that. I don't know when they finished and when they told me but there may be a record.</li> <li>Q. Do you remember who reported it to you?</li> <li>A. Well, certainly you can see here that Darren Grech reported something to me, if you call that a report. I mean, he certainly told me, I wouldn't say its reporting, and I don't know whether Dr Britto may have communicated officially with the Governor</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array} $	<ul> <li>now if you back-up, but at that time, it did.</li> <li>Q. Do you agree that under section 34 the order of events is that the GPA seeks representations, considers the representations, then consults the Governor and the Chief Minister and obtains the agreement of at least one of them, and then the GPA invites the Commissioner of Police to retire.</li> <li>A. Yes, and that if he - and that if they do, he shall retire.</li> <li>Q. The letter invites Mr McGrail to retire, the first letter, but also invited representations to allow the Governor, the Chief Minister and the authority to express a firm and final view. Was that, in your view, consistent with the scheme of section 34?</li> <li>A. Look, I don't think I'm here to give you opinions as to whether letters were consistent</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>independently in the fact that somebody is exercising their functions independently does not prevent somebody else from telling them their views as to why one or another better course is to be preferred.</li> <li>Q. The GPA met on the following day.</li> <li>When did you learn of the result of the meeting?</li> <li>A. I am unable to tell you that. I don't know when they finished and when they told me but there may be a record.</li> <li>Q. Do you remember who reported it to you?</li> <li>A. Well, certainly you can see here that Darren Grech reported something to me, if you call that a report. I mean, he certainly told me, I wouldn't say its reporting, and I don't know whether Dr Britto may have communicated officially with the Governor and with me also. There may have been</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	<ul> <li>now if you back-up, but at that time, it did.</li> <li>Q. Do you agree that under section 34 the order of events is that the GPA seeks representations, considers the representations, then consults the Governor and the Chief Minister and obtains the agreement of at least one of them, and then the GPA invites the Commissioner of Police to retire.</li> <li>A. Yes, and that if he - and that if they do, he shall retire.</li> <li>Q. The letter invites Mr McGrail to retire, the first letter, but also invited representations to allow the Governor, the Chief Minister and the authority to express a firm and final view. Was that, in your view, consistent with the scheme of section 34?</li> <li>A. Look, I don't think I'm here to give you opinions as to whether letters were consistent with the statutory provisions. I would have</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>independently in the fact that somebody is exercising their functions independently does not prevent somebody else from telling them their views as to why one or another better course is to be preferred.</li> <li>Q. The GPA met on the following day.</li> <li>When did you learn of the result of the meeting?</li> <li>A. I am unable to tell you that. I don't know when they finished and when they told me but there may be a record.</li> <li>Q. Do you remember who reported it to you?</li> <li>A. Well, certainly you can see here that Darren Grech reported something to me, if you call that a report. I mean, he certainly told me, I wouldn't say its reporting, and I don't know whether Dr Britto may have communicated officially with the Governor and with me also. There may have been another meeting.</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	<ul> <li>now if you back-up, but at that time, it did.</li> <li>Q. Do you agree that under section 34 the order of events is that the GPA seeks representations, considers the representations, then consults the Governor and the Chief Minister and obtains the agreement of at least one of them, and then the GPA invites the Commissioner of Police to retire.</li> <li>A. Yes, and that if he - and that if they do, he shall retire.</li> <li>Q. The letter invites Mr McGrail to retire, the first letter, but also invited representations to allow the Governor, the Chief Minister and the authority to express a firm and final view. Was that, in your view, consistent with the scheme of section 34?</li> <li>A. Look, I don't think I'm here to give you opinions as to whether letters were consistent with the statutory provisions. I would have to consider that carefully as a lawyer. I was</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>independently in the fact that somebody is exercising their functions independently does not prevent somebody else from telling them their views as to why one or another better course is to be preferred.</li> <li>Q. The GPA met on the following day.</li> <li>When did you learn of the result of the meeting?</li> <li>A. I am unable to tell you that. I don't know when they finished and when they told me but there may be a record.</li> <li>Q. Do you remember who reported it to you?</li> <li>A. Well, certainly you can see here that Darren Grech reported something to me, if you call that a report. I mean, he certainly told me, I wouldn't say its reporting, and I don't know whether Dr Britto may have communicated officially with the Governor and with me also. There may have been another meeting.</li> <li>Q. If we go to B1436 now, please.</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	<ul> <li>now if you back-up, but at that time, it did.</li> <li>Q. Do you agree that under section 34 the order of events is that the GPA seeks representations, considers the representations, then consults the Governor and the Chief Minister and obtains the agreement of at least one of them, and then the GPA invites the Commissioner of Police to retire.</li> <li>A. Yes, and that if he - and that if they do, he shall retire.</li> <li>Q. The letter invites Mr McGrail to retire, the first letter, but also invited representations to allow the Governor, the Chief Minister and the authority to express a firm and final view. Was that, in your view, consistent with the scheme of section 34?</li> <li>A. Look, I don't think I'm here to give you opinions as to whether letters were consistent with the statutory provisions. I would have to consider that carefully as a lawyer. I was being asked by the GPA here to assist them</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>independently in the fact that somebody is exercising their functions independently does not prevent somebody else from telling them their views as to why one or another better course is to be preferred.</li> <li>Q. The GPA met on the following day.</li> <li>When did you learn of the result of the meeting?</li> <li>A. I am unable to tell you that. I don't know when they finished and when they told me but there may be a record.</li> <li>Q. Do you remember who reported it to you?</li> <li>A. Well, certainly you can see here that Darren Grech reported something to me, if you call that a report. I mean, he certainly told me, I wouldn't say its reporting, and I don't know whether Dr Britto may have communicated officially with the Governor and with me also. There may have been another meeting.</li> <li>Q. If we go to B1436 now, please.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	<ul> <li>now if you back-up, but at that time, it did.</li> <li>Q. Do you agree that under section 34 the order of events is that the GPA seeks representations, considers the representations, then consults the Governor and the Chief Minister and obtains the agreement of at least one of them, and then the GPA invites the Commissioner of Police to retire.</li> <li>A. Yes, and that if he - and that if they do, he shall retire.</li> <li>Q. The letter invites Mr McGrail to retire, the first letter, but also invited representations to allow the Governor, the Chief Minister and the authority to express a firm and final view. Was that, in your view, consistent with the scheme of section 34?</li> <li>A. Look, I don't think I'm here to give you opinions as to whether letters were consistent with the statutory provisions. I would have to consider that carefully as a lawyer. I was being asked by the GPA here to assist them with their language of their letter and that's</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>independently in the fact that somebody is exercising their functions independently does not prevent somebody else from telling them their views as to why one or another better course is to be preferred.</li> <li>Q. The GPA met on the following day.</li> <li>When did you learn of the result of the meeting?</li> <li>A. I am unable to tell you that. I don't know when they finished and when they told me but there may be a record.</li> <li>Q. Do you remember who reported it to you?</li> <li>A. Well, certainly you can see here that Darren Grech reported something to me, if you call that a report. I mean, he certainly told me, I wouldn't say its reporting, and I don't know whether Dr Britto may have communicated officially with the Governor and with me also. There may have been another meeting.</li> <li>Q. If we go to B1436 now, please.</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	<ul> <li>now if you back-up, but at that time, it did.</li> <li>Q. Do you agree that under section 34 the order of events is that the GPA seeks representations, considers the representations, then consults the Governor and the Chief Minister and obtains the agreement of at least one of them, and then the GPA invites the Commissioner of Police to retire.</li> <li>A. Yes, and that if he - and that if they do, he shall retire.</li> <li>Q. The letter invites Mr McGrail to retire, the first letter, but also invited representations to allow the Governor, the Chief Minister and the authority to express a firm and final view. Was that, in your view, consistent with the scheme of section 34?</li> <li>A. Look, I don't think I'm here to give you opinions as to whether letters were consistent with the statutory provisions. I would have to consider that carefully as a lawyer. I was being asked by the GPA here to assist them</li> </ul>

6 (Pages 21 to 24)

1	to the GPA.	1	the Governor and I felt, what the Governor
2	Q. If we go to B1437, please? There are	2	and I had discussed, what the Governor and I
3	further exchanges on 22 May, and there	3	had said together to Dr Britto, if we had not
4	looks to be - it looks like you have another	4	said in this letter that we had both already
5	meeting at 2pm. He says, "Can I see you	5	lost confidence and had simply put the case
6	today before close of play. I've given him	6	without that to allow Mr McGrail to reply,
7	letter but he's asking for details in writing	7	the allegation against us would be that we
8	alone about getting a lawyer etc, I need to	8	had failed to disclose that we had already
9	discuss a couple of issues he's raised, please."	9	reached the conclusion that we could not
10	You say, "Hi. Sure. Shall we meet at 2?"	10	have confidence in him. So, I think we were
11	"See you then, thanks". Then you say,	11	putting as much information as possible into
12	"Media is sent", "Please see main point I felt	12	the communication that was to go to Mr
13	were the most relevant to put in writing."	13	McGrail, to give him the benefit of all that
14	Was it to discuss the letter that you met with	14	information so that he understood the case he
15	Dr Britto on that day?	15	had to meet.
16	A. I think it's very likely it was. In fact, I	16	Q. The third - well, the second highlighted
17	think at this stage there is also a reference to	17	paragraph on the first page says,
18	my saying that he needs to have as much	18	"Additionally, the authority itself has agreed
19	information so that he can meet the case that	19	with the matters raised by the Governor and
20	he has to meet. At some point somewhere I	20	the Chief Minister." How did you consider
21	say that. It may be in one of the emails	21	yourself in a position to confirm what the
22	sending him the letters.	22	authority itself had agreed?
23	Q. It is on the following page. 1438, your	23	A. Because Mr Britto had told me.
24	third entry there	24	Q. If you can see
25	A. "I've added a little more so that he knows	25	A. You just took me a moment ago, by the
	Page 25		Page 27
	8		0
1	the case he has to meet." Yes.	1	way, to a WhatsApp message from the then
1 2	the case he has to meet." Yes. Q. Then	1 2	way, to a WhatsApp message from the then Chief Secretary which told me exactly that as
2	Q. Then	2	Chief Secretary which told me exactly that as
2 3	Q. Then A. "We must get it right as he deserves to be	2 3	Chief Secretary which told me exactly that as well, by the way.
2 3 4	Q. Then A. "We must get it right as he deserves to be given the picture he has to address."	2 3 4	Chief Secretary which told me exactly that as well, by the way. Q. Well, he
2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>Q. Then</li> <li>A. "We must get it right as he deserves to be given the picture he has to address."</li> <li>Q. Yes. The letter is a C4282.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5	Chief Secretary which told me exactly that as well, by the way. Q. Well, he A. He is said specifically, "Agreed. Totally
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>Q. Then</li> <li>A. "We must get it right as he deserves to be given the picture he has to address."</li> <li>Q. Yes. The letter is a C4282.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	Chief Secretary which told me exactly that as well, by the way. Q. Well, he A. He is said specifically, "Agreed. Totally untenable. Everyone agrees."
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>Q. Then</li> <li>A. "We must get it right as he deserves to be given the picture he has to address."</li> <li>Q. Yes. The letter is a C4282.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. I think I am right in saying that the parts</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>Chief Secretary which told me exactly that as well, by the way.</li> <li>Q. Well, he</li> <li>A. He is said specifically, "Agreed. Totally untenable. Everyone agrees."</li> <li>Q. Did you consider getting - advising Dr</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>Q. Then</li> <li>A. "We must get it right as he deserves to be given the picture he has to address."</li> <li>Q. Yes. The letter is a C4282.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. I think I am right in saying that the parts that are highlighted in yellow are the ones that you added. Is that correct?</li> <li>A. Added or amended?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>Chief Secretary which told me exactly that as well, by the way.</li> <li>Q. Well, he</li> <li>A. He is said specifically, "Agreed. Totally untenable. Everyone agrees."</li> <li>Q. Did you consider getting - advising Dr Britto to get independent legal advice, rather</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>Q. Then</li> <li>A. "We must get it right as he deserves to be given the picture he has to address."</li> <li>Q. Yes. The letter is a C4282.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. I think I am right in saying that the parts that are highlighted in yellow are the ones that you added. Is that correct?</li> <li>A. Added or amended?</li> <li>Q. Added or amended.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>Chief Secretary which told me exactly that as well, by the way.</li> <li>Q. Well, he</li> <li>A. He is said specifically, "Agreed. Totally untenable. Everyone agrees."</li> <li>Q. Did you consider getting - advising Dr Britto to get independent legal advice, rather than make those amendments yourself?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Q. Then</li> <li>A. "We must get it right as he deserves to be given the picture he has to address."</li> <li>Q. Yes. The letter is a C4282.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. I think I am right in saying that the parts that are highlighted in yellow are the ones that you added. Is that correct?</li> <li>A. Added or amended?</li> <li>Q. Added or amended.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Chief Secretary which told me exactly that as well, by the way.</li> <li>Q. Well, he</li> <li>A. He is said specifically, "Agreed. Totally untenable. Everyone agrees."</li> <li>Q. Did you consider getting - advising Dr Britto to get independent legal advice, rather than make those amendments yourself?</li> <li>A. I think at some stage he says to me he</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>Q. Then</li> <li>A. "We must get it right as he deserves to be given the picture he has to address."</li> <li>Q. Yes. The letter is a C4282.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. I think I am right in saying that the parts that are highlighted in yellow are the ones that you added. Is that correct?</li> <li>A. Added or amended?</li> <li>Q. Added or amended.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>Chief Secretary which told me exactly that as well, by the way.</li> <li>Q. Well, he</li> <li>A. He is said specifically, "Agreed. Totally untenable. Everyone agrees."</li> <li>Q. Did you consider getting - advising Dr Britto to get independent legal advice, rather than make those amendments yourself?</li> <li>A. I think at some stage he says to me he wants to get independent legal advice and I</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Q. Then</li> <li>A. "We must get it right as he deserves to be given the picture he has to address."</li> <li>Q. Yes. The letter is a C4282.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. I think I am right in saying that the parts that are highlighted in yellow are the ones that you added. Is that correct?</li> <li>A. Added or amended?</li> <li>Q. Added or amended.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Chief Secretary which told me exactly that as well, by the way.</li> <li>Q. Well, he</li> <li>A. He is said specifically, "Agreed. Totally untenable. Everyone agrees."</li> <li>Q. Did you consider getting - advising Dr Britto to get independent legal advice, rather than make those amendments yourself?</li> <li>A. I think at some stage he says to me he wants to get independent legal advice and I say he should go ahead and do so.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Q. Then</li> <li>A. "We must get it right as he deserves to be given the picture he has to address."</li> <li>Q. Yes. The letter is a C4282.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. I think I am right in saying that the parts that are highlighted in yellow are the ones that you added. Is that correct?</li> <li>A. Added or amended?</li> <li>Q. Added or amended.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. There are quite substantive additions to</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Chief Secretary which told me exactly that as well, by the way.</li> <li>Q. Well, he</li> <li>A. He is said specifically, "Agreed. Totally untenable. Everyone agrees."</li> <li>Q. Did you consider getting - advising Dr Britto to get independent legal advice, rather than make those amendments yourself?</li> <li>A. I think at some stage he says to me he wants to get independent legal advice and I say he should go ahead and do so.</li> <li>Q. That was after this letter though.</li> <li>A. It may be.</li> <li>Q. In your witness statement, paragraph 92,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Q. Then</li> <li>A. "We must get it right as he deserves to be given the picture he has to address."</li> <li>Q. Yes. The letter is a C4282.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. I think I am right in saying that the parts that are highlighted in yellow are the ones that you added. Is that correct?</li> <li>A. Added or amended?</li> <li>Q. Added or amended.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. There are quite substantive additions to the letter in those yellow areas. Do you think that that was consistent with the authority's independence?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Chief Secretary which told me exactly that as well, by the way.</li> <li>Q. Well, he</li> <li>A. He is said specifically, "Agreed. Totally untenable. Everyone agrees."</li> <li>Q. Did you consider getting - advising Dr Britto to get independent legal advice, rather than make those amendments yourself?</li> <li>A. I think at some stage he says to me he wants to get independent legal advice and I say he should go ahead and do so.</li> <li>Q. That was after this letter though.</li> <li>A. It may be.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Q. Then</li> <li>A. "We must get it right as he deserves to be given the picture he has to address."</li> <li>Q. Yes. The letter is a C4282.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. I think I am right in saying that the parts that are highlighted in yellow are the ones that you added. Is that correct?</li> <li>A. Added or amended?</li> <li>Q. Added or amended.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. There are quite substantive additions to the letter in those yellow areas. Do you think that that was consistent with the authority's</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Chief Secretary which told me exactly that as well, by the way.</li> <li>Q. Well, he</li> <li>A. He is said specifically, "Agreed. Totally untenable. Everyone agrees."</li> <li>Q. Did you consider getting - advising Dr Britto to get independent legal advice, rather than make those amendments yourself?</li> <li>A. I think at some stage he says to me he wants to get independent legal advice and I say he should go ahead and do so.</li> <li>Q. That was after this letter though.</li> <li>A. It may be.</li> <li>Q. In your witness statement, paragraph 92, A211</li> <li>A. Sorry? A-2-1</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q. Then</li> <li>A. "We must get it right as he deserves to be given the picture he has to address."</li> <li>Q. Yes. The letter is a C4282.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. I think I am right in saying that the parts that are highlighted in yellow are the ones that you added. Is that correct?</li> <li>A. Added or amended?</li> <li>Q. Added or amended.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. There are quite substantive additions to the letter in those yellow areas. Do you think that that was consistent with the authority's independence?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Chief Secretary which told me exactly that as well, by the way.</li> <li>Q. Well, he</li> <li>A. He is said specifically, "Agreed. Totally untenable. Everyone agrees."</li> <li>Q. Did you consider getting - advising Dr Britto to get independent legal advice, rather than make those amendments yourself?</li> <li>A. I think at some stage he says to me he wants to get independent legal advice and I say he should go ahead and do so.</li> <li>Q. That was after this letter though.</li> <li>A. It may be.</li> <li>Q. In your witness statement, paragraph 92, A211</li> <li>A. Sorry? A-2-1</li> <li>Q. 1-1. Just picking up paragraph 92 from</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Q. Then</li> <li>A. "We must get it right as he deserves to be given the picture he has to address."</li> <li>Q. Yes. The letter is a C4282.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. I think I am right in saying that the parts that are highlighted in yellow are the ones that you added. Is that correct?</li> <li>A. Added or amended?</li> <li>Q. Added or amended.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. There are quite substantive additions to the letter in those yellow areas. Do you think that that was consistent with the authority's independence?</li> <li>A. Well, if the authority independently asked me to provide them with that additional material, because I didn't ask them to ask me,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Chief Secretary which told me exactly that as well, by the way.</li> <li>Q. Well, he</li> <li>A. He is said specifically, "Agreed. Totally untenable. Everyone agrees."</li> <li>Q. Did you consider getting - advising Dr Britto to get independent legal advice, rather than make those amendments yourself?</li> <li>A. I think at some stage he says to me he wants to get independent legal advice and I say he should go ahead and do so.</li> <li>Q. That was after this letter though.</li> <li>A. It may be.</li> <li>Q. In your witness statement, paragraph 92, A211</li> <li>A. Sorry? A-2-1</li> <li>Q. 1-1. Just picking up paragraph 92 from half way down. You say, "As I said in the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Q. Then</li> <li>A. "We must get it right as he deserves to be given the picture he has to address."</li> <li>Q. Yes. The letter is a C4282.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. I think I am right in saying that the parts that are highlighted in yellow are the ones that you added. Is that correct?</li> <li>A. Added or amended?</li> <li>Q. Added or amended.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. There are quite substantive additions to the letter in those yellow areas. Do you think that that was consistent with the authority's independence?</li> <li>A. Well, if the authority independently asked me to provide them with that additional material, because I didn't ask them to ask me, they independently decided to ask me</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\\end{array} $	<ul> <li>Chief Secretary which told me exactly that as well, by the way.</li> <li>Q. Well, he</li> <li>A. He is said specifically, "Agreed. Totally untenable. Everyone agrees."</li> <li>Q. Did you consider getting - advising Dr Britto to get independent legal advice, rather than make those amendments yourself?</li> <li>A. I think at some stage he says to me he wants to get independent legal advice and I say he should go ahead and do so.</li> <li>Q. That was after this letter though.</li> <li>A. It may be.</li> <li>Q. In your witness statement, paragraph 92, A211</li> <li>A. Sorry? A-2-1</li> <li>Q. 1-1. Just picking up paragraph 92 from half way down. You say, "As I said in the exchange of WhatsApp messages at the time,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q. Then</li> <li>A. "We must get it right as he deserves to be given the picture he has to address."</li> <li>Q. Yes. The letter is a C4282.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. I think I am right in saying that the parts that are highlighted in yellow are the ones that you added. Is that correct?</li> <li>A. Added or amended?</li> <li>Q. Added or amended.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. There are quite substantive additions to the letter in those yellow areas. Do you think that that was consistent with the authority's independence?</li> <li>A. Well, if the authority independently asked me to provide them with that additional material, because I didn't ask them to ask me, they independently decided to ask me through their chair, to provide this material, I</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	<ul> <li>Chief Secretary which told me exactly that as well, by the way.</li> <li>Q. Well, he</li> <li>A. He is said specifically, "Agreed. Totally untenable. Everyone agrees."</li> <li>Q. Did you consider getting - advising Dr Britto to get independent legal advice, rather than make those amendments yourself?</li> <li>A. I think at some stage he says to me he wants to get independent legal advice and I say he should go ahead and do so.</li> <li>Q. That was after this letter though.</li> <li>A. It may be.</li> <li>Q. In your witness statement, paragraph 92, A211</li> <li>A. Sorry? A-2-1</li> <li>Q. 1-1. Just picking up paragraph 92 from half way down. You say, "As I said in the exchange of WhatsApp messages at the time, I believed it was important that the procedure</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q. Then</li> <li>A. "We must get it right as he deserves to be given the picture he has to address."</li> <li>Q. Yes. The letter is a C4282.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. I think I am right in saying that the parts that are highlighted in yellow are the ones that you added. Is that correct?</li> <li>A. Added or amended?</li> <li>Q. Added or amended.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. There are quite substantive additions to the letter in those yellow areas. Do you think that that was consistent with the authority's independence?</li> <li>A. Well, if the authority independently asked me to provide them with that additional material, because I didn't ask them to ask me, they independently decided to ask me through their chair, to provide this material, I do believe it is in keeping with the view that</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	<ul> <li>Chief Secretary which told me exactly that as well, by the way.</li> <li>Q. Well, he</li> <li>A. He is said specifically, "Agreed. Totally untenable. Everyone agrees."</li> <li>Q. Did you consider getting - advising Dr Britto to get independent legal advice, rather than make those amendments yourself?</li> <li>A. I think at some stage he says to me he wants to get independent legal advice and I say he should go ahead and do so.</li> <li>Q. That was after this letter though.</li> <li>A. It may be.</li> <li>Q. In your witness statement, paragraph 92, A211</li> <li>A. Sorry? A-2-1</li> <li>Q. 1-1. Just picking up paragraph 92 from half way down. You say, "As I said in the exchange of WhatsApp messages at the time, I believed it was important that the procedure was properly followed and that Mr McGrail</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. Then</li> <li>A. "We must get it right as he deserves to be given the picture he has to address."</li> <li>Q. Yes. The letter is a C4282.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. I think I am right in saying that the parts that are highlighted in yellow are the ones that you added. Is that correct?</li> <li>A. Added or amended?</li> <li>Q. Added or amended.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. There are quite substantive additions to the letter in those yellow areas. Do you think that that was consistent with the authority's independence?</li> <li>A. Well, if the authority independently asked me to provide them with that additional material, because I didn't ask them to ask me, they independently decided to ask me through their chair, to provide this material, I do believe it is in keeping with the view that they are independently pursuing this process.</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	<ul> <li>Chief Secretary which told me exactly that as well, by the way.</li> <li>Q. Well, he</li> <li>A. He is said specifically, "Agreed. Totally untenable. Everyone agrees."</li> <li>Q. Did you consider getting - advising Dr Britto to get independent legal advice, rather than make those amendments yourself?</li> <li>A. I think at some stage he says to me he wants to get independent legal advice and I say he should go ahead and do so.</li> <li>Q. That was after this letter though.</li> <li>A. It may be.</li> <li>Q. In your witness statement, paragraph 92, A211</li> <li>A. Sorry? A-2-1</li> <li>Q. 1-1. Just picking up paragraph 92 from half way down. You say, "As I said in the exchange of WhatsApp messages at the time, I believed it was important that the procedure was properly followed and that Mr McGrail had the information necessary for him to see</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Q. Then</li> <li>A. "We must get it right as he deserves to be given the picture he has to address."</li> <li>Q. Yes. The letter is a C4282.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. I think I am right in saying that the parts that are highlighted in yellow are the ones that you added. Is that correct?</li> <li>A. Added or amended?</li> <li>Q. Added or amended.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. There are quite substantive additions to the letter in those yellow areas. Do you think that that was consistent with the authority's independence?</li> <li>A. Well, if the authority independently asked me to provide them with that additional material, because I didn't ask them to ask me, they independently decided to ask me through their chair, to provide this material, I do believe it is in keeping with the view that they are independently pursuing this process. Additionally, for example, given the</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	<ul> <li>Chief Secretary which told me exactly that as well, by the way.</li> <li>Q. Well, he</li> <li>A. He is said specifically, "Agreed. Totally untenable. Everyone agrees."</li> <li>Q. Did you consider getting - advising Dr Britto to get independent legal advice, rather than make those amendments yourself?</li> <li>A. I think at some stage he says to me he wants to get independent legal advice and I say he should go ahead and do so.</li> <li>Q. That was after this letter though.</li> <li>A. It may be.</li> <li>Q. In your witness statement, paragraph 92, A211</li> <li>A. Sorry? A-2-1</li> <li>Q. 1-1. Just picking up paragraph 92 from half way down. You say, "As I said in the exchange of WhatsApp messages at the time, I believed it was important that the procedure was properly followed and that Mr McGrail had the information necessary for him to see the picture he had to address in responding to</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. Then</li> <li>A. "We must get it right as he deserves to be given the picture he has to address."</li> <li>Q. Yes. The letter is a C4282.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. I think I am right in saying that the parts that are highlighted in yellow are the ones that you added. Is that correct?</li> <li>A. Added or amended?</li> <li>Q. Added or amended.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. There are quite substantive additions to the letter in those yellow areas. Do you think that that was consistent with the authority's independence?</li> <li>A. Well, if the authority independently asked me to provide them with that additional material, because I didn't ask them to ask me, they independently decided to ask me through their chair, to provide this material, I do believe it is in keeping with the view that they are independently pursuing this process.</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	<ul> <li>Chief Secretary which told me exactly that as well, by the way.</li> <li>Q. Well, he</li> <li>A. He is said specifically, "Agreed. Totally untenable. Everyone agrees."</li> <li>Q. Did you consider getting - advising Dr Britto to get independent legal advice, rather than make those amendments yourself?</li> <li>A. I think at some stage he says to me he wants to get independent legal advice and I say he should go ahead and do so.</li> <li>Q. That was after this letter though.</li> <li>A. It may be.</li> <li>Q. In your witness statement, paragraph 92, A211</li> <li>A. Sorry? A-2-1</li> <li>Q. 1-1. Just picking up paragraph 92 from half way down. You say, "As I said in the exchange of WhatsApp messages at the time, I believed it was important that the procedure was properly followed and that Mr McGrail had the information necessary for him to see</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Q. Then</li> <li>A. "We must get it right as he deserves to be given the picture he has to address."</li> <li>Q. Yes. The letter is a C4282.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. I think I am right in saying that the parts that are highlighted in yellow are the ones that you added. Is that correct?</li> <li>A. Added or amended?</li> <li>Q. Added or amended.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. There are quite substantive additions to the letter in those yellow areas. Do you think that that was consistent with the authority's independence?</li> <li>A. Well, if the authority independently asked me to provide them with that additional material, because I didn't ask them to ask me, they independently decided to ask me through their chair, to provide this material, I do believe it is in keeping with the view that they are independently pursuing this process. Additionally, for example, given the</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	<ul> <li>Chief Secretary which told me exactly that as well, by the way.</li> <li>Q. Well, he</li> <li>A. He is said specifically, "Agreed. Totally untenable. Everyone agrees."</li> <li>Q. Did you consider getting - advising Dr Britto to get independent legal advice, rather than make those amendments yourself?</li> <li>A. I think at some stage he says to me he wants to get independent legal advice and I say he should go ahead and do so.</li> <li>Q. That was after this letter though.</li> <li>A. It may be.</li> <li>Q. In your witness statement, paragraph 92, A211</li> <li>A. Sorry? A-2-1</li> <li>Q. 1-1. Just picking up paragraph 92 from half way down. You say, "As I said in the exchange of WhatsApp messages at the time, I believed it was important that the procedure was properly followed and that Mr McGrail had the information necessary for him to see the picture he had to address in responding to</li> </ul>

7 (Pages 25 to 28)

1	do under section $34(2)$ . In this respect, by	1	matter that is perhaps probably better
2	adding allusion also to the views of the	2	addressed in the transcripts that he has
3	Attorney General, I ensured that in the letter	3	produced of the conversations he covertly
4	from the Authority to Mr McGrail he was	4	recorded.
5	aware that the events of the 12" May were	5	Q. You liken this to a VAR, but I do not
6	important in the context of the loss of	6	think it is a case of being wise after the event,
7	confidence in him." So, you thought it was	7	is it? This was your key issue and you only
8	important that Mr McGrail understood the	8	referred to it in the vaguest terms. Do you
9	allegations against him. Is that so that he	9	not
10	was able to make representations?	10	A. Well, I don't
11	A. As I expressly say, in order to ensure	11	Q think that you could have done more?
12	compliance with the statutory provisions of	12	A. I don't accept that I do, because you see,
13	section 34, which of course requires the	13	the key and fundamental issue is the
14	authority to be quorate when it kicks it off.	14	misleading. He could have misled me about
15	Q. Should you not have spelled out your	15	anything else about the price of eggs. It's the
16	complaint in relation to Operation Delhi and	16	misleading that's the issue, and we cannot -
17	12 May, rather than merely adding allusion	17	and I come back to the phrase I heard this
18	to the Attorney General's views?	18	morning which resonated with me so greatly
19	A. Well, I obviously didn't feel I should,	19	- we cannot in this country, have a situation
20	because I didn't.	20	where public officials lie to ministers.
21	Q. Do you reflect now - well, reflecting	21	Q. Can I take you to C4283. Which is the
22	now, do you think that you should have	22	second page of the letter.
23	spelled out your concerns as to 12 May?	23	A. C4-2
24	A. Well look, an inquiry of this sort is a little	24	Q. 8-3.
25	bit like a legal VAR. We are looking at	25	A. I don't have that, Mr Santos. I have got
			-
	Page 29		Page 31
		Î	
1	something that hannened in five seconds on	1	O It is one sentence. Lam going to show
1 2	something that happened in five seconds on the pitch, slowing it down and analysing	1	Q. It is one sentence. I am going to show
2	the pitch, slowing it down and analysing	2	you, if I can, show you on screen. The
2 3	the pitch, slowing it down and analysing every frame. If I could go back, would I add	2 3	you, if I can, show you on screen. The bottom of C4283. It is the first sentence of
2 3 4	the pitch, slowing it down and analysing every frame. If I could go back, would I add in detail, more detail about that? Well, the	2	you, if I can, show you on screen. The bottom of C4283. It is the first sentence of that last paragraph. "It was communicated to
2 3 4 5	the pitch, slowing it down and analysing every frame. If I could go back, would I add in detail, more detail about that? Well, the short answer is, to prevent you having to ask	2 3 4 5	you, if I can, show you on screen. The bottom of C4283. It is the first sentence of that last paragraph. "It was communicated to me that both the Governor and the Chief
2 3 4 5 6	the pitch, slowing it down and analysing every frame. If I could go back, would I add in detail, more detail about that? Well, the short answer is, to prevent you having to ask me that question, I would now conclude that	2 3 4	you, if I can, show you on screen. The bottom of C4283. It is the first sentence of that last paragraph. "It was communicated to me that both the Governor and the Chief Minister felt that their dealings with you have
2 3 4 5 6 7	the pitch, slowing it down and analysing every frame. If I could go back, would I add in detail, more detail about that? Well, the short answer is, to prevent you having to ask me that question, I would now conclude that perhaps I could have, but at the time I	2 3 4 5 6 7	you, if I can, show you on screen. The bottom of C4283. It is the first sentence of that last paragraph. "It was communicated to me that both the Governor and the Chief Minister felt that their dealings with you have left them with the sense that you are lacking
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	the pitch, slowing it down and analysing every frame. If I could go back, would I add in detail, more detail about that? Well, the short answer is, to prevent you having to ask me that question, I would now conclude that perhaps I could have, but at the time I thought it was sufficient for Mr McGrail,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	you, if I can, show you on screen. The bottom of C4283. It is the first sentence of that last paragraph. "It was communicated to me that both the Governor and the Chief Minister felt that their dealings with you have left them with the sense that you are lacking in both probity and integrity. The maritime
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	the pitch, slowing it down and analysing every frame. If I could go back, would I add in detail, more detail about that? Well, the short answer is, to prevent you having to ask me that question, I would now conclude that perhaps I could have, but at the time I thought it was sufficient for Mr McGrail, who certainly knew what the issues were	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	you, if I can, show you on screen. The bottom of C4283. It is the first sentence of that last paragraph. "It was communicated to me that both the Governor and the Chief Minister felt that their dealings with you have left them with the sense that you are lacking in both probity and integrity. The maritime incident is one case in point." That is the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	the pitch, slowing it down and analysing every frame. If I could go back, would I add in detail, more detail about that? Well, the short answer is, to prevent you having to ask me that question, I would now conclude that perhaps I could have, but at the time I thought it was sufficient for Mr McGrail, who certainly knew what the issues were because by this date, Mr McGrail certainly	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	you, if I can, show you on screen. The bottom of C4283. It is the first sentence of that last paragraph. "It was communicated to me that both the Governor and the Chief Minister felt that their dealings with you have left them with the sense that you are lacking in both probity and integrity. The maritime incident is one case in point." That is the extent of what you provide, if anything at all,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	the pitch, slowing it down and analysing every frame. If I could go back, would I add in detail, more detail about that? Well, the short answer is, to prevent you having to ask me that question, I would now conclude that perhaps I could have, but at the time I thought it was sufficient for Mr McGrail, who certainly knew what the issues were because by this date, Mr McGrail certainly knew how I felt, and the allusion itself was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	you, if I can, show you on screen. The bottom of C4283. It is the first sentence of that last paragraph. "It was communicated to me that both the Governor and the Chief Minister felt that their dealings with you have left them with the sense that you are lacking in both probity and integrity. The maritime incident is one case in point." That is the extent of what you provide, if anything at all, in relation to 12 May. Do you think that that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	the pitch, slowing it down and analysing every frame. If I could go back, would I add in detail, more detail about that? Well, the short answer is, to prevent you having to ask me that question, I would now conclude that perhaps I could have, but at the time I thought it was sufficient for Mr McGrail, who certainly knew what the issues were because by this date, Mr McGrail certainly knew how I felt, and the allusion itself was enough for Mr McGrail to know what it was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	you, if I can, show you on screen. The bottom of C4283. It is the first sentence of that last paragraph. "It was communicated to me that both the Governor and the Chief Minister felt that their dealings with you have left them with the sense that you are lacking in both probity and integrity. The maritime incident is one case in point." That is the extent of what you provide, if anything at all, in relation to 12 May. Do you think that that was sufficient for Mr McGrail to know the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	the pitch, slowing it down and analysing every frame. If I could go back, would I add in detail, more detail about that? Well, the short answer is, to prevent you having to ask me that question, I would now conclude that perhaps I could have, but at the time I thought it was sufficient for Mr McGrail, who certainly knew what the issues were because by this date, Mr McGrail certainly knew how I felt, and the allusion itself was enough for Mr McGrail to know what it was that I was referring to. At that time, I felt	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	you, if I can, show you on screen. The bottom of C4283. It is the first sentence of that last paragraph. "It was communicated to me that both the Governor and the Chief Minister felt that their dealings with you have left them with the sense that you are lacking in both probity and integrity. The maritime incident is one case in point." That is the extent of what you provide, if anything at all, in relation to 12 May. Do you think that that was sufficient for Mr McGrail to know the case he had to meet?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	the pitch, slowing it down and analysing every frame. If I could go back, would I add in detail, more detail about that? Well, the short answer is, to prevent you having to ask me that question, I would now conclude that perhaps I could have, but at the time I thought it was sufficient for Mr McGrail, who certainly knew what the issues were because by this date, Mr McGrail certainly knew how I felt, and the allusion itself was enough for Mr McGrail to know what it was that I was referring to. At that time, I felt that was sufficient.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	you, if I can, show you on screen. The bottom of C4283. It is the first sentence of that last paragraph. "It was communicated to me that both the Governor and the Chief Minister felt that their dealings with you have left them with the sense that you are lacking in both probity and integrity. The maritime incident is one case in point." That is the extent of what you provide, if anything at all, in relation to 12 May. Do you think that that was sufficient for Mr McGrail to know the case he had to meet? <b>A. You said that the bits I added were the</b>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	the pitch, slowing it down and analysing every frame. If I could go back, would I add in detail, more detail about that? Well, the short answer is, to prevent you having to ask me that question, I would now conclude that perhaps I could have, but at the time I thought it was sufficient for Mr McGrail, who certainly knew what the issues were because by this date, Mr McGrail certainly knew how I felt, and the allusion itself was enough for Mr McGrail to know what it was that I was referring to. At that time, I felt that was sufficient. Q. Did Mr McGrail know at this point that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>you, if I can, show you on screen. The bottom of C4283. It is the first sentence of that last paragraph. "It was communicated to me that both the Governor and the Chief Minister felt that their dealings with you have left them with the sense that you are lacking in both probity and integrity. The maritime incident is one case in point." That is the extent of what you provide, if anything at all, in relation to 12 May. Do you think that that was sufficient for Mr McGrail to know the case he had to meet?</li> <li>A. You said that the bits I added were the bits in yellow. So, that's not my sentence</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	the pitch, slowing it down and analysing every frame. If I could go back, would I add in detail, more detail about that? Well, the short answer is, to prevent you having to ask me that question, I would now conclude that perhaps I could have, but at the time I thought it was sufficient for Mr McGrail, who certainly knew what the issues were because by this date, Mr McGrail certainly knew how I felt, and the allusion itself was enough for Mr McGrail to know what it was that I was referring to. At that time, I felt that was sufficient. Q. Did Mr McGrail know at this point that the DPP had told the Attorney General that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>you, if I can, show you on screen. The bottom of C4283. It is the first sentence of that last paragraph. "It was communicated to me that both the Governor and the Chief Minister felt that their dealings with you have left them with the sense that you are lacking in both probity and integrity. The maritime incident is one case in point." That is the extent of what you provide, if anything at all, in relation to 12 May. Do you think that that was sufficient for Mr McGrail to know the case he had to meet?</li> <li>A. You said that the bits I added were the bits in yellow. So, that's not my sentence that you are asking me about.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	the pitch, slowing it down and analysing every frame. If I could go back, would I add in detail, more detail about that? Well, the short answer is, to prevent you having to ask me that question, I would now conclude that perhaps I could have, but at the time I thought it was sufficient for Mr McGrail, who certainly knew what the issues were because by this date, Mr McGrail certainly knew how I felt, and the allusion itself was enough for Mr McGrail to know what it was that I was referring to. At that time, I felt that was sufficient. Q. Did Mr McGrail know at this point that the DPP had told the Attorney General that he had strongly advised against - the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>you, if I can, show you on screen. The bottom of C4283. It is the first sentence of that last paragraph. "It was communicated to me that both the Governor and the Chief Minister felt that their dealings with you have left them with the sense that you are lacking in both probity and integrity. The maritime incident is one case in point." That is the extent of what you provide, if anything at all, in relation to 12 May. Do you think that that was sufficient for Mr McGrail to know the case he had to meet?</li> <li>A. You said that the bits I added were the bits in yellow. So, that's not my sentence that you are asking me about.</li> <li>Q. It is not that. It is a letter that you</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	the pitch, slowing it down and analysing every frame. If I could go back, would I add in detail, more detail about that? Well, the short answer is, to prevent you having to ask me that question, I would now conclude that perhaps I could have, but at the time I thought it was sufficient for Mr McGrail, who certainly knew what the issues were because by this date, Mr McGrail certainly knew how I felt, and the allusion itself was enough for Mr McGrail to know what it was that I was referring to. At that time, I felt that was sufficient. Q. Did Mr McGrail know at this point that the DPP had told the Attorney General that he had strongly advised against - the warrant.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>you, if I can, show you on screen. The bottom of C4283. It is the first sentence of that last paragraph. "It was communicated to me that both the Governor and the Chief Minister felt that their dealings with you have left them with the sense that you are lacking in both probity and integrity. The maritime incident is one case in point." That is the extent of what you provide, if anything at all, in relation to 12 May. Do you think that that was sufficient for Mr McGrail to know the case he had to meet?</li> <li>A. You said that the bits I added were the bits in yellow. So, that's not my sentence that you are asking me about.</li> <li>Q. It is not that. It is a letter that you reviewed and made copious amendments to.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>the pitch, slowing it down and analysing every frame. If I could go back, would I add in detail, more detail about that? Well, the short answer is, to prevent you having to ask me that question, I would now conclude that perhaps I could have, but at the time I thought it was sufficient for Mr McGrail, who certainly knew what the issues were because by this date, Mr McGrail certainly knew how I felt, and the allusion itself was enough for Mr McGrail to know what it was that I was referring to. At that time, I felt that was sufficient.</li> <li>Q. Did Mr McGrail know at this point that the DPP had told the Attorney General that he had strongly advised against - the warrant.</li> <li>A. I think - I think by this stage - remind me</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>you, if I can, show you on screen. The bottom of C4283. It is the first sentence of that last paragraph. "It was communicated to me that both the Governor and the Chief Minister felt that their dealings with you have left them with the sense that you are lacking in both probity and integrity. The maritime incident is one case in point." That is the extent of what you provide, if anything at all, in relation to 12 May. Do you think that that was sufficient for Mr McGrail to know the case he had to meet?</li> <li>A. You said that the bits I added were the bits in yellow. So, that's not my sentence that you are asking me about.</li> <li>Q. It is not that. It is a letter that you reviewed and made copious amendments to. Did you not think that you could add</li> </ul>
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array}$	<ul> <li>the pitch, slowing it down and analysing every frame. If I could go back, would I add in detail, more detail about that? Well, the short answer is, to prevent you having to ask me that question, I would now conclude that perhaps I could have, but at the time I thought it was sufficient for Mr McGrail, who certainly knew what the issues were because by this date, Mr McGrail certainly knew how I felt, and the allusion itself was enough for Mr McGrail to know what it was that I was referring to. At that time, I felt that was sufficient.</li> <li>Q. Did Mr McGrail know at this point that the DPP had told the Attorney General that he had strongly advised against - the warrant.</li> <li>A. I think - I think by this stage - remind me of the date?</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\\end{array} $	<ul> <li>you, if I can, show you on screen. The bottom of C4283. It is the first sentence of that last paragraph. "It was communicated to me that both the Governor and the Chief Minister felt that their dealings with you have left them with the sense that you are lacking in both probity and integrity. The maritime incident is one case in point." That is the extent of what you provide, if anything at all, in relation to 12 May. Do you think that that was sufficient for Mr McGrail to know the case he had to meet?</li> <li>A. You said that the bits I added were the bits in yellow. So, that's not my sentence that you are asking me about.</li> <li>Q. It is not that. It is a letter that you reviewed and made copious amendments to. Did you not think that you could add something that made the position clearer as</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>the pitch, slowing it down and analysing every frame. If I could go back, would I add in detail, more detail about that? Well, the short answer is, to prevent you having to ask me that question, I would now conclude that perhaps I could have, but at the time I thought it was sufficient for Mr McGrail, who certainly knew what the issues were because by this date, Mr McGrail certainly knew how I felt, and the allusion itself was enough for Mr McGrail to know what it was that I was referring to. At that time, I felt that was sufficient.</li> <li>Q. Did Mr McGrail know at this point that the DPP had told the Attorney General that he had strongly advised against - the warrant.</li> <li>A. I think - I think by this stage - remind me of the date?</li> <li>Q. 22 May.</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	<ul> <li>you, if I can, show you on screen. The bottom of C4283. It is the first sentence of that last paragraph. "It was communicated to me that both the Governor and the Chief Minister felt that their dealings with you have left them with the sense that you are lacking in both probity and integrity. The maritime incident is one case in point." That is the extent of what you provide, if anything at all, in relation to 12 May. Do you think that that was sufficient for Mr McGrail to know the case he had to meet?</li> <li>A. You said that the bits I added were the bits in yellow. So, that's not my sentence that you are asking me about.</li> <li>Q. It is not that. It is a letter that you reviewed and made copious amendments to. Did you not think that you could add something that made the position clearer as to 12 May?</li> </ul>
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ \end{array}$	<ul> <li>the pitch, slowing it down and analysing every frame. If I could go back, would I add in detail, more detail about that? Well, the short answer is, to prevent you having to ask me that question, I would now conclude that perhaps I could have, but at the time I thought it was sufficient for Mr McGrail, who certainly knew what the issues were because by this date, Mr McGrail certainly knew how I felt, and the allusion itself was enough for Mr McGrail to know what it was that I was referring to. At that time, I felt that was sufficient.</li> <li>Q. Did Mr McGrail know at this point that the DPP had told the Attorney General that he had strongly advised against - the warrant.</li> <li>A. I think - I think by this stage - remind me of the date?</li> <li>Q. 22 May.</li> <li>A. That that "strongly advised" had</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	<ul> <li>you, if I can, show you on screen. The bottom of C4283. It is the first sentence of that last paragraph. "It was communicated to me that both the Governor and the Chief Minister felt that their dealings with you have left them with the sense that you are lacking in both probity and integrity. The maritime incident is one case in point." That is the extent of what you provide, if anything at all, in relation to 12 May. Do you think that that was sufficient for Mr McGrail to know the case he had to meet?</li> <li>A. You said that the bits I added were the bits in yellow. So, that's not my sentence that you are asking me about.</li> <li>Q. It is not that. It is a letter that you reviewed and made copious amendments to. Did you not think that you could add something that made the position clearer as to 12 May?</li> <li>A. I don't think that Mr McGrail himself</li> </ul>
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ \end{array}$	<ul> <li>the pitch, slowing it down and analysing every frame. If I could go back, would I add in detail, more detail about that? Well, the short answer is, to prevent you having to ask me that question, I would now conclude that perhaps I could have, but at the time I thought it was sufficient for Mr McGrail, who certainly knew what the issues were because by this date, Mr McGrail certainly knew how I felt, and the allusion itself was enough for Mr McGrail to know what it was that I was referring to. At that time, I felt that was sufficient.</li> <li>Q. Did Mr McGrail know at this point that the DPP had told the Attorney General that he had strongly advised against - the warrant.</li> <li>A. I think - I think by this stage - remind me of the date?</li> <li>Q. 22 May.</li> <li>A. That that "strongly advised" had already been resolved, and whether Mr</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	<ul> <li>you, if I can, show you on screen. The bottom of C4283. It is the first sentence of that last paragraph. "It was communicated to me that both the Governor and the Chief Minister felt that their dealings with you have left them with the sense that you are lacking in both probity and integrity. The maritime incident is one case in point." That is the extent of what you provide, if anything at all, in relation to 12 May. Do you think that that was sufficient for Mr McGrail to know the case he had to meet?</li> <li>A. You said that the bits I added were the bits in yellow. So, that's not my sentence that you are asking me about.</li> <li>Q. It is not that. It is a letter that you reviewed and made copious amendments to. Did you not think that you could add something that made the position clearer as to 12 May?</li> <li>A. I don't think that Mr McGrail himself needed the position of 12 May to be made</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>the pitch, slowing it down and analysing every frame. If I could go back, would I add in detail, more detail about that? Well, the short answer is, to prevent you having to ask me that question, I would now conclude that perhaps I could have, but at the time I thought it was sufficient for Mr McGrail, who certainly knew what the issues were because by this date, Mr McGrail certainly knew how I felt, and the allusion itself was enough for Mr McGrail to know what it was that I was referring to. At that time, I felt that was sufficient.</li> <li>Q. Did Mr McGrail know at this point that the DPP had told the Attorney General that he had strongly advised against - the warrant.</li> <li>A. I think - I think by this stage - remind me of the date?</li> <li>Q. 22 May.</li> <li>A. That that "strongly advised" had already been resolved, and whether Mr McGrail was aware of it, not aware of it, had</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	<ul> <li>you, if I can, show you on screen. The bottom of C4283. It is the first sentence of that last paragraph. "It was communicated to me that both the Governor and the Chief Minister felt that their dealings with you have left them with the sense that you are lacking in both probity and integrity. The maritime incident is one case in point." That is the extent of what you provide, if anything at all, in relation to 12 May. Do you think that that was sufficient for Mr McGrail to know the case he had to meet?</li> <li>A. You said that the bits I added were the bits in yellow. So, that's not my sentence that you are asking me about.</li> <li>Q. It is not that. It is a letter that you reviewed and made copious amendments to. Did you not think that you could add something that made the position clearer as to 12 May?</li> <li>A. I don't think that Mr McGrail himself needed the position of 12 May to be made clearer. He was fully aware of that. I mean,</li> </ul>
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ \end{array}$	<ul> <li>the pitch, slowing it down and analysing every frame. If I could go back, would I add in detail, more detail about that? Well, the short answer is, to prevent you having to ask me that question, I would now conclude that perhaps I could have, but at the time I thought it was sufficient for Mr McGrail, who certainly knew what the issues were because by this date, Mr McGrail certainly knew how I felt, and the allusion itself was enough for Mr McGrail to know what it was that I was referring to. At that time, I felt that was sufficient.</li> <li>Q. Did Mr McGrail know at this point that the DPP had told the Attorney General that he had strongly advised against - the warrant.</li> <li>A. I think - I think by this stage - remind me of the date?</li> <li>Q. 22 May.</li> <li>A. That that "strongly advised" had already been resolved, and whether Mr</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	<ul> <li>you, if I can, show you on screen. The bottom of C4283. It is the first sentence of that last paragraph. "It was communicated to me that both the Governor and the Chief Minister felt that their dealings with you have left them with the sense that you are lacking in both probity and integrity. The maritime incident is one case in point." That is the extent of what you provide, if anything at all, in relation to 12 May. Do you think that that was sufficient for Mr McGrail to know the case he had to meet?</li> <li>A. You said that the bits I added were the bits in yellow. So, that's not my sentence that you are asking me about.</li> <li>Q. It is not that. It is a letter that you reviewed and made copious amendments to. Did you not think that you could add something that made the position clearer as to 12 May?</li> <li>A. I don't think that Mr McGrail himself needed the position of 12 May to be made</li> </ul>

8 (Pages 29 to 32)

1	asking me whether I have added too much	1	Q. On 22 May Mr Pyle sent another update
2	and now you are asking whether I didn't add	2	to the FCDO (it may still have been the FCO
3	enough.	3	at the point) and he says, "Very interesting.
4	(10.36)	4	It's the James Levy angle as well that is
5	Q. Well, it is because you seem to be	5	interesting. I'm also a touch nervous given
6	particularly coy about 12 May in	6	that the CM has firmly taken the lead on a
7	A. Coy?	7	competence that is more towards us that
8	Q your note and in the	8	them, but we've agreed this approach which
9	A. No, no, no, Mr Santos. I take you back to	9	on balance is right. It also raises issues about
10	one of the things I said yesterday. I didn't	10	the GPA, who should have been monitoring
11	feel that the information that had been shared	11	the CoP, but I can't see it ending well for
12	with me was privileged, that it was	12	anyone." Do you agree that you took the
13	confidential in any way, that it had been	13	lead on this issue?
14	shared on the basis of it being privileged or	14	A. Well, I suppose I took the lead in the
15	confidential in any way, and I was	15	meetings but, you know, different characters
16	evangelising to everyone I spoke to about the	16	behave in different ways, and anybody who
17	warrant, which was vox populi in Gibraltar.	17	knows me knows that I'm more, perhaps,
18	And therefore many people were talking to	18	vehement in the way that I address meetings,
19	me about the warrant, about Mr McGrail's	19	and those who know Nick Pyle know that he
20	misleading and lying, and the issues that	20	is more calmly and effectively persuasive,
21	surrounded that. So, I was not being coy	21	perhaps, than I am. But, that is a matter of
22	about it at all. Whether I added more or less	22	perception.
23	to the letter about that issue does not change	23	Q. Could we go to C4832, please.
24	the fact that I was not being coy about it, and	24	A. Yeah.
25		25	Q. Mr Pyle then sets out his view to the
	Page 33		Page 35
1	$\bigcirc$ Why do you not (2) anongolico about it in	1	ECO If we as to the bettern of the many first
1	Q. Why do you not (?) evangelise about it in	1	FCO. If we go to the bottom of the page first
2	the letter?	2	of all, he says in the second paragraph, "My
2 3	the letter? A. Well, why have to? As well, I mean, it's a	2 3	of all, he says in the second paragraph, "My instinct is to allow CoP time to work out a
2 3 4	the letter? A. Well, why have to? As well, I mean, it's a - it's an issue where you're asking me to go	2 3 4	of all, he says in the second paragraph, "My instinct is to allow CoP time to work out a deal, but this then means"
2 3 4 5	the letter? A. Well, why have to? As well, I mean, it's a it's an issue where you're asking me to go back into my mind on that day and say: why	2 3 4 5	of all, he says in the second paragraph, "My instinct is to allow CoP time to work out a deal, but this then means" A. Sorry, where are you? I can't
2 3 4 5 6	the letter? A. Well, why have to? As well, I mean, it's a - it's an issue where you're asking me to go back into my mind on that day and say: why didn't you add this or that? I mean, it's	2 3 4 5 6	of all, he says in the second paragraph, "My instinct is to allow CoP time to work out a deal, but this then means" <b>A. Sorry, where are you? I can't</b> Q. Sorry, apologies.
2 3 4 5 6 7	the letter? A. Well, why have to? As well, I mean, it's a - it's an issue where you're asking me to go back into my mind on that day and say: why didn't you add this or that? I mean, it's almost if I may say so with respect, you're	2 3 4 5 6 7	of all, he says in the second paragraph, "My instinct is to allow CoP time to work out a deal, but this then means" A. Sorry, where are you? I can't Q. Sorry, apologies. A. Second sentence of the final?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	the letter? A. Well, why have to? As well, I mean, it's a it's an issue where you're asking me to go back into my mind on that day and say: why didn't you add this or that? I mean, it's almost if I may say so with respect, you're asking me to draft by committee, except one	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>of all, he says in the second paragraph, "My instinct is to allow CoP time to work out a deal, but this then means"</li> <li>A. Sorry, where are you? I can't</li> <li>Q. Sorry, apologies.</li> <li>A. Second sentence of the final?</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	the letter? A. Well, why have to? As well, I mean, it's a it's an issue where you're asking me to go back into my mind on that day and say: why didn't you add this or that? I mean, it's almost if I may say so with respect, you're asking me to draft by committee, except one member of the committee pitches up four	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>of all, he says in the second paragraph, "My instinct is to allow CoP time to work out a deal, but this then means"</li> <li>A. Sorry, where are you? I can't</li> <li>Q. Sorry, apologies.</li> <li>A. Second sentence of the final?</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	the letter? A. Well, why have to? As well, I mean, it's a - it's an issue where you're asking me to go back into my mind on that day and say: why didn't you add this or that? I mean, it's almost if I may say so with respect, you're asking me to draft by committee, except one member of the committee pitches up four years after the event to suggest that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>of all, he says in the second paragraph, "My instinct is to allow CoP time to work out a deal, but this then means"</li> <li>A. Sorry, where are you? I can't</li> <li>Q. Sorry, apologies.</li> <li>A. Second sentence of the final?</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. "My instinct is to allow CoP time to work</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	the letter? A. Well, why have to? As well, I mean, it's a - it's an issue where you're asking me to go back into my mind on that day and say: why didn't you add this or that? I mean, it's almost if I may say so with respect, you're asking me to draft by committee, except one member of the committee pitches up four years after the event to suggest that something should or should not have gone in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>of all, he says in the second paragraph, "My instinct is to allow CoP time to work out a deal, but this then means"</li> <li>A. Sorry, where are you? I can't</li> <li>Q. Sorry, apologies.</li> <li>A. Second sentence of the final?</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. "My instinct is to allow CoP time to work out a deal, but this then means Sir David will</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	the letter? A. Well, why have to? As well, I mean, it's a it's an issue where you're asking me to go back into my mind on that day and say: why didn't you add this or that? I mean, it's almost if I may say so with respect, you're asking me to draft by committee, except one member of the committee pitches up four years after the event to suggest that something should or should not have gone in the letter. What about Mr Dr Britto and the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>of all, he says in the second paragraph, "My instinct is to allow CoP time to work out a deal, but this then means"</li> <li>A. Sorry, where are you? I can't</li> <li>Q. Sorry, apologies.</li> <li>A. Second sentence of the final?</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. "My instinct is to allow CoP time to work out a deal, but this then means Sir David will have arrived. What we don't want is CoP to</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	the letter? A. Well, why have to? As well, I mean, it's a - it's an issue where you're asking me to go back into my mind on that day and say: why didn't you add this or that? I mean, it's almost if I may say so with respect, you're asking me to draft by committee, except one member of the committee pitches up four years after the event to suggest that something should or should not have gone in the letter. What about Mr Dr Britto and the GPA: they produce the first draft, why didn't	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>of all, he says in the second paragraph, "My instinct is to allow CoP time to work out a deal, but this then means"</li> <li>A. Sorry, where are you? I can't</li> <li>Q. Sorry, apologies.</li> <li>A. Second sentence of the final?</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. "My instinct is to allow CoP time to work out a deal, but this then means Sir David will have arrived. What we don't want is CoP to withdraw his request and lobby Sir David to</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	the letter? A. Well, why have to? As well, I mean, it's a it's an issue where you're asking me to go back into my mind on that day and say: why didn't you add this or that? I mean, it's almost if I may say so with respect, you're asking me to draft by committee, except one member of the committee pitches up four years after the event to suggest that something should or should not have gone in the letter. What about Mr Dr Britto and the GPA: they produce the first draft, why didn't they put more in?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>of all, he says in the second paragraph, "My instinct is to allow CoP time to work out a deal, but this then means"</li> <li>A. Sorry, where are you? I can't</li> <li>Q. Sorry, apologies.</li> <li>A. Second sentence of the final?</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. "My instinct is to allow CoP time to work out a deal, but this then means Sir David will have arrived. What we don't want is CoP to withdraw his request and lobby Sir David to keep his position. That is at 11.35 on 7 June.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	the letter? A. Well, why have to? As well, I mean, it's a - it's an issue where you're asking me to go back into my mind on that day and say: why didn't you add this or that? I mean, it's almost if I may say so with respect, you're asking me to draft by committee, except one member of the committee pitches up four years after the event to suggest that something should or should not have gone in the letter. What about Mr Dr Britto and the GPA: they produce the first draft, why didn't they put more in? Q. (inaudible)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>of all, he says in the second paragraph, "My instinct is to allow CoP time to work out a deal, but this then means"</li> <li>A. Sorry, where are you? I can't</li> <li>Q. Sorry, apologies.</li> <li>A. Second sentence of the final?</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. "My instinct is to allow CoP time to work out a deal, but this then means Sir David will have arrived. What we don't want is CoP to withdraw his request and lobby Sir David to keep his position. That is at 11.35 on 7 June. And then if we go to 4845, this is the same</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	the letter? A. Well, why have to? As well, I mean, it's a - it's an issue where you're asking me to go back into my mind on that day and say: why didn't you add this or that? I mean, it's almost if I may say so with respect, you're asking me to draft by committee, except one member of the committee pitches up four years after the event to suggest that something should or should not have gone in the letter. What about Mr Dr Britto and the GPA: they produce the first draft, why didn't they put more in? Q. (inaudible) A. But at this date, a lot of these facts are not	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ \end{array} $	<ul> <li>of all, he says in the second paragraph, "My instinct is to allow CoP time to work out a deal, but this then means"</li> <li>A. Sorry, where are you? I can't</li> <li>Q. Sorry, apologies.</li> <li>A. Second sentence of the final?</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. "My instinct is to allow CoP time to work out a deal, but this then means Sir David will have arrived. What we don't want is CoP to withdraw his request and lobby Sir David to keep his position. That is at 11.35 on 7 June. And then if we go to 4845, this is the same evening on 7 June, and the first paragraph.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	the letter? A. Well, why have to? As well, I mean, it's a - it's an issue where you're asking me to go back into my mind on that day and say: why didn't you add this or that? I mean, it's almost if I may say so with respect, you're asking me to draft by committee, except one member of the committee pitches up four years after the event to suggest that something should or should not have gone in the letter. What about Mr Dr Britto and the GPA: they produce the first draft, why didn't they put more in? Q. (inaudible) A. But at this date, a lot of these facts are not in any way something that people are not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>of all, he says in the second paragraph, "My instinct is to allow CoP time to work out a deal, but this then means"</li> <li>A. Sorry, where are you? I can't</li> <li>Q. Sorry, apologies.</li> <li>A. Second sentence of the final?</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. "My instinct is to allow CoP time to work out a deal, but this then means Sir David will have arrived. What we don't want is CoP to withdraw his request and lobby Sir David to keep his position. That is at 11.35 on 7 June. And then if we go to 4845, this is the same evening on 7 June, and the first paragraph. He says, "I've just met with the AG and CM,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	the letter? A. Well, why have to? As well, I mean, it's a - it's an issue where you're asking me to go back into my mind on that day and say: why didn't you add this or that? I mean, it's almost if I may say so with respect, you're asking me to draft by committee, except one member of the committee pitches up four years after the event to suggest that something should or should not have gone in the letter. What about Mr Dr Britto and the GPA: they produce the first draft, why didn't they put more in? Q. (inaudible) A. But at this date, a lot of these facts are not in any way something that people are not talking about. I would be surprised if the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>of all, he says in the second paragraph, "My instinct is to allow CoP time to work out a deal, but this then means"</li> <li>A. Sorry, where are you? I can't</li> <li>Q. Sorry, apologies.</li> <li>A. Second sentence of the final?</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. "My instinct is to allow CoP time to work out a deal, but this then means Sir David will have arrived. What we don't want is CoP to withdraw his request and lobby Sir David to keep his position. That is at 11.35 on 7 June. And then if we go to 4845, this is the same evening on 7 June, and the first paragraph. He says, "I've just met with the AG and CM, we agreed that on balance we needed to</li> </ul>
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ \end{array} $	<ul> <li>the letter?</li> <li>A. Well, why have to? As well, I mean, it's a <ul> <li>it's an issue where you're asking me to go</li> <li>back into my mind on that day and say: why</li> <li>didn't you add this or that? I mean, it's</li> </ul> </li> <li>almost if I may say so with respect, you're</li> <li>asking me to draft by committee, except one</li> <li>member of the committee pitches up four</li> <li>years after the event to suggest that</li> <li>something should or should not have gone in</li> <li>the letter. What about Mr Dr Britto and the</li> <li>GPA: they produce the first draft, why didn't</li> <li>they put more in?</li> <li>Q. (inaudible)</li> </ul> <li>A. But at this date, a lot of these facts are not <ul> <li>in any way something that people are not</li> <li>talking about. I would be surprised if the</li> <li>members of the GPA were the only ones who</li> </ul> </li>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>of all, he says in the second paragraph, "My instinct is to allow CoP time to work out a deal, but this then means"</li> <li>A. Sorry, where are you? I can't</li> <li>Q. Sorry, apologies.</li> <li>A. Second sentence of the final?</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. "My instinct is to allow CoP time to work out a deal, but this then means Sir David will have arrived. What we don't want is CoP to withdraw his request and lobby Sir David to keep his position. That is at 11.35 on 7 June. And then if we go to 4845, this is the same evening on 7 June, and the first paragraph. He says, "I've just met with the AG and CM, we agreed that on balance we needed to protect Sir David, and felt that should CoP</li> </ul>
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array} $	the letter? A. Well, why have to? As well, I mean, it's a - it's an issue where you're asking me to go back into my mind on that day and say: why didn't you add this or that? I mean, it's almost if I may say so with respect, you're asking me to draft by committee, except one member of the committee pitches up four years after the event to suggest that something should or should not have gone in the letter. What about Mr Dr Britto and the GPA: they produce the first draft, why didn't they put more in? Q. (inaudible) A. But at this date, a lot of these facts are not in any way something that people are not talking about. I would be surprised if the members of the GPA were the only ones who were not aware of what had happened etc.	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\\end{array} $	of all, he says in the second paragraph, "My instinct is to allow CoP time to work out a deal, but this then means" <b>A. Sorry, where are you? I can't</b> Q. Sorry, apologies. <b>A. Second sentence of the final?</b> Q. Yes. <b>A. Yeah.</b> Q. "My instinct is to allow CoP time to work out a deal, but this then means Sir David will have arrived. What we don't want is CoP to withdraw his request and lobby Sir David to keep his position. That is at 11.35 on 7 June. And then if we go to 4845, this is the same evening on 7 June, and the first paragraph. He says, "I've just met with the AG and CM, we agreed that on balance we needed to protect Sir David, and felt that should CoP still be in office after his swearing in he
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	the letter? A. Well, why have to? As well, I mean, it's a - it's an issue where you're asking me to go back into my mind on that day and say: why didn't you add this or that? I mean, it's almost if I may say so with respect, you're asking me to draft by committee, except one member of the committee pitches up four years after the event to suggest that something should or should not have gone in the letter. What about Mr Dr Britto and the GPA: they produce the first draft, why didn't they put more in? Q. (inaudible) A. But at this date, a lot of these facts are not in any way something that people are not talking about. I would be surprised if the members of the GPA were the only ones who were not aware of what had happened etc. And certainly Mr McGrail, who is the person	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	<ul> <li>of all, he says in the second paragraph, "My instinct is to allow CoP time to work out a deal, but this then means"</li> <li>A. Sorry, where are you? I can't</li> <li>Q. Sorry, apologies.</li> <li>A. Second sentence of the final?</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. "My instinct is to allow CoP time to work out a deal, but this then means Sir David will have arrived. What we don't want is CoP to withdraw his request and lobby Sir David to keep his position. That is at 11.35 on 7 June. And then if we go to 4845, this is the same evening on 7 June, and the first paragraph. He says, "I've just met with the AG and CM, we agreed that on balance we needed to protect Sir David, and felt that should CoP still be in office after his swearing in he would more likely than not retract his request</li> </ul>
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ \end{array}$	the letter? A. Well, why have to? As well, I mean, it's a - it's an issue where you're asking me to go back into my mind on that day and say: why didn't you add this or that? I mean, it's almost if I may say so with respect, you're asking me to draft by committee, except one member of the committee pitches up four years after the event to suggest that something should or should not have gone in the letter. What about Mr Dr Britto and the GPA: they produce the first draft, why didn't they put more in? Q. (inaudible) A. But at this date, a lot of these facts are not in any way something that people are not talking about. I would be surprised if the members of the GPA were the only ones who were not aware of what had happened etc. And certainly Mr McGrail, who is the person to whom the letter is addressed and who has	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	<ul> <li>of all, he says in the second paragraph, "My instinct is to allow CoP time to work out a deal, but this then means"</li> <li>A. Sorry, where are you? I can't</li> <li>Q. Sorry, apologies.</li> <li>A. Second sentence of the final?</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. "My instinct is to allow CoP time to work out a deal, but this then means Sir David will have arrived. What we don't want is CoP to withdraw his request and lobby Sir David to keep his position. That is at 11.35 on 7 June. And then if we go to 4845, this is the same evening on 7 June, and the first paragraph. He says, "I've just met with the AG and CM, we agreed that on balance we needed to protect Sir David, and felt that should CoP still be in office after his swearing in he would more likely than not retract his request to retire and appeal to Sir David, thus taking</li> </ul>
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ \end{array}$	the letter? A. Well, why have to? As well, I mean, it's a - it's an issue where you're asking me to go back into my mind on that day and say: why didn't you add this or that? I mean, it's almost if I may say so with respect, you're asking me to draft by committee, except one member of the committee pitches up four years after the event to suggest that something should or should not have gone in the letter. What about Mr Dr Britto and the GPA: they produce the first draft, why didn't they put more in? Q. (inaudible) A. But at this date, a lot of these facts are not in any way something that people are not talking about. I would be surprised if the members of the GPA were the only ones who were not aware of what had happened etc. And certainly Mr McGrail, who is the person to whom the letter is addressed and who has to meet the case, is aware.	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	of all, he says in the second paragraph, "My instinct is to allow CoP time to work out a deal, but this then means" <b>A. Sorry, where are you? I can't</b> Q. Sorry, apologies. <b>A. Second sentence of the final?</b> Q. Yes. <b>A. Yeah.</b> Q. "My instinct is to allow CoP time to work out a deal, but this then means Sir David will have arrived. What we don't want is CoP to withdraw his request and lobby Sir David to keep his position. That is at 11.35 on 7 June. And then if we go to 4845, this is the same evening on 7 June, and the first paragraph. He says, "I've just met with the AG and CM, we agreed that on balance we needed to protect Sir David, and felt that should CoP still be in office after his swearing in he would more likely than not retract his request to retire and appeal to Sir David, thus taking us back to square one. This issue is also in
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	<ul> <li>the letter?</li> <li>A. Well, why have to? As well, I mean, it's a <ul> <li>it's an issue where you're asking me to go</li> <li>back into my mind on that day and say: why</li> <li>didn't you add this or that? I mean, it's</li> <li>almost if I may say so with respect, you're</li> <li>asking me to draft by committee, except one</li> <li>member of the committee pitches up four</li> <li>years after the event to suggest that</li> <li>something should or should not have gone in</li> <li>the letter. What about Mr Dr Britto and the</li> <li>GPA: they produce the first draft, why didn't</li> <li>they put more in?</li> <li>Q. (inaudible)</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. But at this date, a lot of these facts are not <ul> <li>in any way something that people are not</li> <li>talking about. I would be surprised if the</li> <li>members of the GPA were the only ones who</li> <li>were not aware of what had happened etc.</li> </ul> </li> <li>And certainly Mr McGrail, who is the person <ul> <li>to whom the letter is addressed and who has</li> <li>to meet the case, is aware.</li> <li>Q. Let us move to C4359 now, please.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	of all, he says in the second paragraph, "My instinct is to allow CoP time to work out a deal, but this then means" <b>A. Sorry, where are you? I can't</b> Q. Sorry, apologies. <b>A. Second sentence of the final?</b> Q. Yes. <b>A. Yeah.</b> Q. "My instinct is to allow CoP time to work out a deal, but this then means Sir David will have arrived. What we don't want is CoP to withdraw his request and lobby Sir David to keep his position. That is at 11.35 on 7 June. And then if we go to 4845, this is the same evening on 7 June, and the first paragraph. He says, "I've just met with the AG and CM, we agreed that on balance we needed to protect Sir David, and felt that should CoP still be in office after his swearing in he would more likely than not retract his request to retire and appeal to Sir David, thus taking us back to square one. This issue is also in the public domain, with rumours and
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ \end{array}$	the letter? A. Well, why have to? As well, I mean, it's a - it's an issue where you're asking me to go back into my mind on that day and say: why didn't you add this or that? I mean, it's almost if I may say so with respect, you're asking me to draft by committee, except one member of the committee pitches up four years after the event to suggest that something should or should not have gone in the letter. What about Mr Dr Britto and the GPA: they produce the first draft, why didn't they put more in? Q. (inaudible) A. But at this date, a lot of these facts are not in any way something that people are not talking about. I would be surprised if the members of the GPA were the only ones who were not aware of what had happened etc. And certainly Mr McGrail, who is the person to whom the letter is addressed and who has to meet the case, is aware.	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	of all, he says in the second paragraph, "My instinct is to allow CoP time to work out a deal, but this then means" <b>A. Sorry, where are you? I can't</b> Q. Sorry, apologies. <b>A. Second sentence of the final?</b> Q. Yes. <b>A. Yeah.</b> Q. "My instinct is to allow CoP time to work out a deal, but this then means Sir David will have arrived. What we don't want is CoP to withdraw his request and lobby Sir David to keep his position. That is at 11.35 on 7 June. And then if we go to 4845, this is the same evening on 7 June, and the first paragraph. He says, "I've just met with the AG and CM, we agreed that on balance we needed to protect Sir David, and felt that should CoP still be in office after his swearing in he would more likely than not retract his request to retire and appeal to Sir David, thus taking us back to square one. This issue is also in
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	<ul> <li>the letter?</li> <li>A. Well, why have to? As well, I mean, it's a <ul> <li>it's an issue where you're asking me to go</li> <li>back into my mind on that day and say: why</li> <li>didn't you add this or that? I mean, it's</li> <li>almost if I may say so with respect, you're</li> <li>asking me to draft by committee, except one</li> <li>member of the committee pitches up four</li> <li>years after the event to suggest that</li> <li>something should or should not have gone in</li> <li>the letter. What about Mr Dr Britto and the</li> <li>GPA: they produce the first draft, why didn't</li> <li>they put more in?</li> <li>Q. (inaudible)</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. But at this date, a lot of these facts are not <ul> <li>in any way something that people are not</li> <li>talking about. I would be surprised if the</li> <li>members of the GPA were the only ones who</li> <li>were not aware of what had happened etc.</li> </ul> </li> <li>And certainly Mr McGrail, who is the person <ul> <li>to whom the letter is addressed and who has</li> <li>to meet the case, is aware.</li> <li>Q. Let us move to C4359 now, please.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	of all, he says in the second paragraph, "My instinct is to allow CoP time to work out a deal, but this then means" <b>A. Sorry, where are you? I can't</b> Q. Sorry, apologies. <b>A. Second sentence of the final?</b> Q. Yes. <b>A. Yeah.</b> Q. "My instinct is to allow CoP time to work out a deal, but this then means Sir David will have arrived. What we don't want is CoP to withdraw his request and lobby Sir David to keep his position. That is at 11.35 on 7 June. And then if we go to 4845, this is the same evening on 7 June, and the first paragraph. He says, "I've just met with the AG and CM, we agreed that on balance we needed to protect Sir David, and felt that should CoP still be in office after his swearing in he would more likely than not retract his request to retire and appeal to Sir David, thus taking us back to square one. This issue is also in the public domain, with rumours and

www.epiqglobal.com Lower Ground Floor, 46 Chancery Lane casemanagers@epiqglobal.com London, WC2A 1JE

9 (Pages 33 to 36)

1	agreed we needed to stop this, and the only	1	think the legal fees claimed were higher than
2	way to do so to conclude proceedings before	2	I thought was reasonable. So, payment to the
3	Sir David's swearing in on Thursday. Did	3	end of the contract is not me involving
4	you persuade Mr Pyle, contrary to his	4	myself, as you have suggested, in pension
5	instinct, that the issue needed to be finalised	5	matters; it is that we would have had to pay
6	as soon as possible?	6	Ian McGrail I mean, from memory I don't
7	A. I don't believe I did. Where	7	know what the salary of the Commissioner of
8	Q. I am referring to the previous email,	8	Police is but I think it's about £140,000. I
9	where he said that his instinct was to allow	9	think at that stage he would have had over a
10	CoP time to work out a deal. But at the same	10	quarter of a million pounds if we paid out his
11	time, he was saying: we don't want him to	11	contract. This was not a situation where we
12	withdraw his request and lobby Sir David.	12	felt that we were doing anything other than
13	A. That's what he was saying, not just me, so	13	properly determining a contract.
14	I don't think I had to persuade him of	14	Q. So, is your evidence that you did not get
15	anything.	15	involved with the pension side of things
16	Q. If we	16	(inaudible).
17	A. I think he's setting out his thinking.	17	A. I think there was one element, which is
18	Q. At C4879 there is an email of the evening	18	that he wanted his pension to be tax free,
19	of 8 June, and the second paragraph says, "I	19	which would have required me (as Minister
20	then went to see the Chief Secretary, AG and	20	for Finance) to do things to bring that about.
21	CM. Whilst the AG and CM (?) thought we	21	The rate of the pension and all the rest of it:
22	should look to accommodate the	22	that's a matter for the auditor to work out, it's
23	Commissioner to some degree, the CM	23	got nothing to do with me. But also in
24	rejected all terms. The Chief Secretary	24	relation to anybody else, that has got nothing
25	confirmed this in writing to the	25	to do with me. The question is: if more has
	Page 37		Page 39
	Tage 57		1 age 59
1	Commissioner With the AG's support 1	1	to be given that has to come to me as
1 2	Commissioner. With the AG's support, I subsequently advised the CM to try and	1	to be given, that has to come to me as Minister for Finance and in the context of
2	subsequently advised the CM to try and	2	Minister for Finance, and in the context of
2 3	subsequently advised the CM to try and accommodate the Commissioner in some	2 3	Minister for Finance, and in the context of paying somebody a tax-free pension before
2 3 4	subsequently advised the CM to try and accommodate the Commissioner in some way." And then, "The CM is now prepared	2 3 4	Minister for Finance, and in the context of paying somebody a tax-free pension before the age of 60 that would I don't know
2 3 4 5	subsequently advised the CM to try and accommodate the Commissioner in some way." And then, "The CM is now prepared to make an offer." Why were you involving	2 3 4 5	Minister for Finance, and in the context of paying somebody a tax-free pension before the age of 60 that would I don't know whether it even potentially would have
2 3 4 5 6	subsequently advised the CM to try and accommodate the Commissioner in some way." And then, "The CM is now prepared to make an offer." Why were you involving yourself in the conversation about pension	2 3 4 5 6	Minister for Finance, and in the context of paying somebody a tax-free pension before the age of 60 that would I don't know whether it even potentially would have required me to take an amendment to the
2 3 4 5 6 7	subsequently advised the CM to try and accommodate the Commissioner in some way." And then, "The CM is now prepared to make an offer." Why were you involving yourself in the conversation about pension rights?	2 3 4 5 6 7	Minister for Finance, and in the context of paying somebody a tax-free pension before the age of 60 that would I don't know whether it even potentially would have required me to take an amendment to the House to permit it. But there may be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>subsequently advised the CM to try and accommodate the Commissioner in some way." And then, "The CM is now prepared to make an offer." Why were you involving yourself in the conversation about pension rights?</li> <li>A. This was not about pension rights. This</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Minister for Finance, and in the context of paying somebody a tax-free pension before the age of 60 that would I don't know whether it even potentially would have required me to take an amendment to the House to permit it. But there may be provision that enables us to do it some other
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>subsequently advised the CM to try and accommodate the Commissioner in some way." And then, "The CM is now prepared to make an offer." Why were you involving yourself in the conversation about pension rights?</li> <li>A. This was not about pension rights. This was the Commissioner's pension, as you</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Minister for Finance, and in the context of paying somebody a tax-free pension before the age of 60 that would I don't know whether it even potentially would have required me to take an amendment to the House to permit it. But there may be provision that enables us to do it some other way.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>subsequently advised the CM to try and accommodate the Commissioner in some way." And then, "The CM is now prepared to make an offer." Why were you involving yourself in the conversation about pension rights?</li> <li>A. This was not about pension rights. This was the Commissioner's pension, as you know, is the first child of the consolidated</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Minister for Finance, and in the context of paying somebody a tax-free pension before the age of 60 that would I don't know whether it even potentially would have required me to take an amendment to the House to permit it. But there may be provision that enables us to do it some other way. Q. Moving on to a new topic. Mr Morello
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>subsequently advised the CM to try and accommodate the Commissioner in some way." And then, "The CM is now prepared to make an offer." Why were you involving yourself in the conversation about pension rights?</li> <li>A. This was not about pension rights. This was the Commissioner's pension, as you know, is the first child of the consolidated fund, I think; it's not something on which I</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Minister for Finance, and in the context of paying somebody a tax-free pension before the age of 60 that would I don't know whether it even potentially would have required me to take an amendment to the House to permit it. But there may be provision that enables us to do it some other way. Q. Moving on to a new topic. Mr Morello came and gave evidence to the Inquiry, and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>subsequently advised the CM to try and accommodate the Commissioner in some way." And then, "The CM is now prepared to make an offer." Why were you involving yourself in the conversation about pension rights?</li> <li>A. This was not about pension rights. This was the Commissioner's pension, as you know, is the first child of the consolidated fund, I think; it's not something on which I need to or have any, you know, ability to</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Minister for Finance, and in the context of paying somebody a tax-free pension before the age of 60 that would I don't know whether it even potentially would have required me to take an amendment to the House to permit it. But there may be provision that enables us to do it some other way.</li> <li>Q. Moving on to a new topic. Mr Morello came and gave evidence to the Inquiry, and explained that he was approached by a</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>subsequently advised the CM to try and accommodate the Commissioner in some way." And then, "The CM is now prepared to make an offer." Why were you involving yourself in the conversation about pension rights?</li> <li>A. This was not about pension rights. This was the Commissioner's pension, as you know, is the first child of the consolidated fund, I think; it's not something on which I need to or have any, you know, ability to become involved. This was about the terms</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Minister for Finance, and in the context of paying somebody a tax-free pension before the age of 60 that would I don't know whether it even potentially would have required me to take an amendment to the House to permit it. But there may be provision that enables us to do it some other way.</li> <li>Q. Moving on to a new topic. Mr Morello came and gave evidence to the Inquiry, and explained that he was approached by a number of police officers with allegations</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	subsequently advised the CM to try and accommodate the Commissioner in some way." And then, "The CM is now prepared to make an offer." Why were you involving yourself in the conversation about pension rights? A. This was not about pension rights. This was the Commissioner's pension, as you know, is the first child of the consolidated fund, I think; it's not something on which I need to or have any, you know, ability to become involved. This was about the terms that have been offered, not about the pension	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Minister for Finance, and in the context of paying somebody a tax-free pension before the age of 60 that would I don't know whether it even potentially would have required me to take an amendment to the House to permit it. But there may be provision that enables us to do it some other way. Q. Moving on to a new topic. Mr Morello came and gave evidence to the Inquiry, and explained that he was approached by a number of police officers with allegations against Mr McGrail. His account is that first
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>subsequently advised the CM to try and accommodate the Commissioner in some way." And then, "The CM is now prepared to make an offer." Why were you involving yourself in the conversation about pension rights?</li> <li>A. This was not about pension rights. This was the Commissioner's pension, as you know, is the first child of the consolidated fund, I think; it's not something on which I need to or have any, you know, ability to become involved. This was about the terms that have been offered, not about the pension rights.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Minister for Finance, and in the context of paying somebody a tax-free pension before the age of 60 that would I don't know whether it even potentially would have required me to take an amendment to the House to permit it. But there may be provision that enables us to do it some other way. Q. Moving on to a new topic. Mr Morello came and gave evidence to the Inquiry, and explained that he was approached by a number of police officers with allegations against Mr McGrail. His account is that first of all they would explain the allegations to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>subsequently advised the CM to try and accommodate the Commissioner in some way." And then, "The CM is now prepared to make an offer." Why were you involving yourself in the conversation about pension rights?</li> <li>A. This was not about pension rights. This was the Commissioner's pension, as you know, is the first child of the consolidated fund, I think; it's not something on which I need to or have any, you know, ability to become involved. This was about the terms that have been offered, not about the pension rights.</li> <li>Q. What were the terms that were not</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Minister for Finance, and in the context of paying somebody a tax-free pension before the age of 60 that would I don't know whether it even potentially would have required me to take an amendment to the House to permit it. But there may be provision that enables us to do it some other way. Q. Moving on to a new topic. Mr Morello came and gave evidence to the Inquiry, and explained that he was approached by a number of police officers with allegations against Mr McGrail. His account is that first of all they would explain the allegations to him and Mr Crome, then Mr Crome would
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>subsequently advised the CM to try and accommodate the Commissioner in some way." And then, "The CM is now prepared to make an offer." Why were you involving yourself in the conversation about pension rights?</li> <li>A. This was not about pension rights. This was the Commissioner's pension, as you know, is the first child of the consolidated fund, I think; it's not something on which I need to or have any, you know, ability to become involved. This was about the terms that have been offered, not about the pension rights.</li> <li>Q. What were the terms that were not agreeable?</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ \end{array} $	<ul> <li>Minister for Finance, and in the context of paying somebody a tax-free pension before the age of 60 that would I don't know whether it even potentially would have required me to take an amendment to the House to permit it. But there may be provision that enables us to do it some other way.</li> <li>Q. Moving on to a new topic. Mr Morello came and gave evidence to the Inquiry, and explained that he was approached by a number of police officers with allegations against Mr McGrail. His account is that first of all they would explain the allegations to him and Mr Crome, then Mr Crome would report to you, and in response you would</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>subsequently advised the CM to try and accommodate the Commissioner in some way." And then, "The CM is now prepared to make an offer." Why were you involving yourself in the conversation about pension rights?</li> <li>A. This was not about pension rights. This was the Commissioner's pension, as you know, is the first child of the consolidated fund, I think; it's not something on which I need to or have any, you know, ability to become involved. This was about the terms that have been offered, not about the pension rights.</li> <li>Q. What were the terms that were not agreeable?</li> <li>A. So, first of all the I mean, perhaps you</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Minister for Finance, and in the context of paying somebody a tax-free pension before the age of 60 that would I don't know whether it even potentially would have required me to take an amendment to the House to permit it. But there may be provision that enables us to do it some other way.</li> <li>Q. Moving on to a new topic. Mr Morello came and gave evidence to the Inquiry, and explained that he was approached by a number of police officers with allegations against Mr McGrail. His account is that first of all they would explain the allegations to him and Mr Crome, then Mr Crome would report to you, and in response you would give a verbal assurance to that individual that</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>subsequently advised the CM to try and accommodate the Commissioner in some way." And then, "The CM is now prepared to make an offer." Why were you involving yourself in the conversation about pension rights?</li> <li>A. This was not about pension rights. This was the Commissioner's pension, as you know, is the first child of the consolidated fund, I think; it's not something on which I need to or have any, you know, ability to become involved. This was about the terms that have been offered, not about the pension rights.</li> <li>Q. What were the terms that were not agreeable?</li> <li>A. So, first of all the I mean, perhaps you should take me to it so that I (inaudible).</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Minister for Finance, and in the context of paying somebody a tax-free pension before the age of 60 that would I don't know whether it even potentially would have required me to take an amendment to the House to permit it. But there may be provision that enables us to do it some other way.</li> <li>Q. Moving on to a new topic. Mr Morello came and gave evidence to the Inquiry, and explained that he was approached by a number of police officers with allegations against Mr McGrail. His account is that first of all they would explain the allegations to him and Mr Crome, then Mr Crome would report to you, and in response you would give a verbal assurance to that individual that they would be given an alternative role if</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>subsequently advised the CM to try and accommodate the Commissioner in some way." And then, "The CM is now prepared to make an offer." Why were you involving yourself in the conversation about pension rights?</li> <li>A. This was not about pension rights. This was the Commissioner's pension, as you know, is the first child of the consolidated fund, I think; it's not something on which I need to or have any, you know, ability to become involved. This was about the terms that have been offered, not about the pension rights.</li> <li>Q. What were the terms that were not agreeable?</li> <li>A. So, first of all the I mean, perhaps you</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Minister for Finance, and in the context of paying somebody a tax-free pension before the age of 60 that would I don't know whether it even potentially would have required me to take an amendment to the House to permit it. But there may be provision that enables us to do it some other way.</li> <li>Q. Moving on to a new topic. Mr Morello came and gave evidence to the Inquiry, and explained that he was approached by a number of police officers with allegations against Mr McGrail. His account is that first of all they would explain the allegations to him and Mr Crome, then Mr Crome would report to you, and in response you would give a verbal assurance to that individual that</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>subsequently advised the CM to try and accommodate the Commissioner in some way." And then, "The CM is now prepared to make an offer." Why were you involving yourself in the conversation about pension rights?</li> <li>A. This was not about pension rights. This was the Commissioner's pension, as you know, is the first child of the consolidated fund, I think; it's not something on which I need to or have any, you know, ability to become involved. This was about the terms that have been offered, not about the pension rights.</li> <li>Q. What were the terms that were not agreeable?</li> <li>A. So, first of all the I mean, perhaps you should take me to it so that I (inaudible).</li> <li>Q. 4874.</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array} $	Minister for Finance, and in the context of paying somebody a tax-free pension before the age of 60 that would I don't know whether it even potentially would have required me to take an amendment to the House to permit it. But there may be provision that enables us to do it some other way. Q. Moving on to a new topic. Mr Morello came and gave evidence to the Inquiry, and explained that he was approached by a number of police officers with allegations against Mr McGrail. His account is that first of all they would explain the allegations to him and Mr Crome, then Mr Crome would report to you, and in response you would give a verbal assurance to that individual that they would be given an alternative role if their position became untenable as a result of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>subsequently advised the CM to try and accommodate the Commissioner in some way." And then, "The CM is now prepared to make an offer." Why were you involving yourself in the conversation about pension rights?</li> <li>A. This was not about pension rights. This was the Commissioner's pension, as you know, is the first child of the consolidated fund, I think; it's not something on which I need to or have any, you know, ability to become involved. This was about the terms that have been offered, not about the pension rights.</li> <li>Q. What were the terms that were not agreeable?</li> <li>A. So, first of all the I mean, perhaps you should take me to it so that I (inaudible).</li> <li>Q. 4874.</li> <li>A. I recall there was</li> <li>Q. It is the bottom of the</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	<ul> <li>Minister for Finance, and in the context of paying somebody a tax-free pension before the age of 60 that would I don't know whether it even potentially would have required me to take an amendment to the House to permit it. But there may be provision that enables us to do it some other way.</li> <li>Q. Moving on to a new topic. Mr Morello came and gave evidence to the Inquiry, and explained that he was approached by a number of police officers with allegations against Mr McGrail. His account is that first of all they would explain the allegations to him and Mr Crome, then Mr Crome would report to you, and in response you would give a verbal assurance to that individual that they would be given an alternative role if their position became untenable as a result of giving evidence to the Inquiry. Then a witness statement was drafted and signed,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>subsequently advised the CM to try and accommodate the Commissioner in some way." And then, "The CM is now prepared to make an offer." Why were you involving yourself in the conversation about pension rights?</li> <li>A. This was not about pension rights. This was the Commissioner's pension, as you know, is the first child of the consolidated fund, I think; it's not something on which I need to or have any, you know, ability to become involved. This was about the terms that have been offered, not about the pension rights.</li> <li>Q. What were the terms that were not agreeable?</li> <li>A. So, first of all the I mean, perhaps you should take me to it so that I (inaudible).</li> <li>Q. 4874.</li> <li>A. I recall there was</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	<ul> <li>Minister for Finance, and in the context of paying somebody a tax-free pension before the age of 60 that would I don't know whether it even potentially would have required me to take an amendment to the House to permit it. But there may be provision that enables us to do it some other way.</li> <li>Q. Moving on to a new topic. Mr Morello came and gave evidence to the Inquiry, and explained that he was approached by a number of police officers with allegations against Mr McGrail. His account is that first of all they would explain the allegations to him and Mr Crome, then Mr Crome would report to you, and in response you would give a verbal assurance to that individual that they would be given an alternative role if their position became untenable as a result of giving evidence to the Inquiry. Then a</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>subsequently advised the CM to try and accommodate the Commissioner in some way." And then, "The CM is now prepared to make an offer." Why were you involving yourself in the conversation about pension rights?</li> <li>A. This was not about pension rights. This was the Commissioner's pension, as you know, is the first child of the consolidated fund, I think; it's not something on which I need to or have any, you know, ability to become involved. This was about the terms that have been offered, not about the pension rights.</li> <li>Q. What were the terms that were not agreeable?</li> <li>A. So, first of all the I mean, perhaps you should take me to it so that I (inaudible).</li> <li>Q. 4874.</li> <li>A. I recall there was</li> <li>Q. It is the bottom of the</li> <li>A. Yes, exactly. Payment up to the end of</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	Minister for Finance, and in the context of paying somebody a tax-free pension before the age of 60 that would I don't know whether it even potentially would have required me to take an amendment to the House to permit it. But there may be provision that enables us to do it some other way. Q. Moving on to a new topic. Mr Morello came and gave evidence to the Inquiry, and explained that he was approached by a number of police officers with allegations against Mr McGrail. His account is that first of all they would explain the allegations to him and Mr Crome, then Mr Crome would report to you, and in response you would give a verbal assurance to that individual that they would be given an alternative role if their position became untenable as a result of giving evidence to the Inquiry. Then a witness statement was drafted and signed, and then a letter of assurance was given.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>subsequently advised the CM to try and accommodate the Commissioner in some way." And then, "The CM is now prepared to make an offer." Why were you involving yourself in the conversation about pension rights?</li> <li>A. This was not about pension rights. This was the Commissioner's pension, as you know, is the first child of the consolidated fund, I think; it's not something on which I need to or have any, you know, ability to become involved. This was about the terms that have been offered, not about the pension rights.</li> <li>Q. What were the terms that were not agreeable?</li> <li>A. So, first of all the I mean, perhaps you should take me to it so that I (inaudible).</li> <li>Q. 4874.</li> <li>A. I recall there was</li> <li>Q. It is the bottom of the</li> <li>A. Yes, exactly. Payment up to the end of the contract, that's what I was getting</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	Minister for Finance, and in the context of paying somebody a tax-free pension before the age of 60 that would I don't know whether it even potentially would have required me to take an amendment to the House to permit it. But there may be provision that enables us to do it some other way. Q. Moving on to a new topic. Mr Morello came and gave evidence to the Inquiry, and explained that he was approached by a number of police officers with allegations against Mr McGrail. His account is that first of all they would explain the allegations to him and Mr Crome, then Mr Crome would report to you, and in response you would give a verbal assurance to that individual that they would be given an alternative role if their position became untenable as a result of giving evidence to the Inquiry. Then a witness statement was drafted and signed, and then a letter of assurance was given. Does that general procedure accord with your

10 (Pages 37 to 40)

1	A. Not that I would have been familiar with	1	untenable, to protect those individuals from
2	the whole of that procedure. I know that	2	suffering detriment.
3	people would be referred as being potential	3	Q. Did you speak to any of the
4	whistleblowers, and that arose after the call	4	whistleblowers directly?
5	for evidence that the Inquiry made. What	5	A. I don't well, yes, I've spoken to one
6	gave rise to that was the Inquiry making a	6	person directly for sure, but I don't think that
7	call for evidence, and if people were to be	7	that person (without disclosing the gender)
8	whistleblowers then they needed to have that	8	was a whistleblower.
	•	9	Q. Did you ask Mr Ullger about the person -
9 10	protection. That status, to have that protection, sorry.	10	Q. Did you ask wi Oliger about the person -
	Q. If we go to C6932, please. This is one	10	-
11 12		11	A. That person
12	such letter, dated 9 February 2023. And	12	Q the relevant individual?
	paragraph two says so-and-so "is not yet of		A that person has also been in contact
14	retirement age, and consequently if her position became untenable would require	14	with His Excellency the Governor.
15	1 1	15	Q. Did you speak to Mr Ullger about the
16	redeployment into the wider public sector for	16	individuals' positions within the police?
17	re-employment with the Gibraltar	17	A. In some instances, yes; we had meetings
18	Development Corporation." And then they	18	about the subject.
19	seek approval of terms and conditions, which	19	Q. In Mr Morello's case, he gave evidence
20	you then appear to approve with your	20	that he was offered a pension not just at the
21	signature at the bottom of the page.	21	level of his 24 years' service, but he was
22	A. Yes, this was a written procedure that was	22	given one that was commensurate with 27
23	put in place when the numbers started to be	23	years of service. Was it your decision to
24	more than a few, so that there could be a	24	offer him that?
25	written record of how each individual had	25	A. I don't think it would have been my
	Page 41		Page 43
	0		
1	been dealt with.	1	decision, but there would have been the
2	Q. Did you make any enquiries as to the	2	requirement probably for my approval, or the
3	person's account before signing the letter?	3	approval of the Financial Secretary and
4	A. No, I wanted to obviously ensure that	4	certainly the approval of the Principal
5	they were within the whistleblowing class.	5	Auditor, because remember that the Principal
6	In some instances I was referred to more	6	Auditor worked out all pensions for all public
7	detail or less detail; this is something that	7	officers before they were paid.
8	was happening very incidentally. I have	8	Q. Did you feel comfortable approving that,
9	given a number of interviews to the media	9	effectively in exchange for his evidence to
10	about this, and explained that things were	10	the Inquiry?
11	coming to my office through my then	11	A. Nothing was transactional in any
12	Industrial Relations Officer, who was for that	12	instance, and it wouldn't be.
13	reason the pivot between me and the GPF in	13	Q. Do you know anything about the offer of
14	the same way as he was the pivot between	14	a cash reward referred to by Mr McGrail in
15	me and Unite the Union, and the GGCA, and	15	his evidence?
16	the Teacher's Union. This was the union of	16	A. No. That sounds like the wild west.
17	police officers, and Mr Crome is the pivot (or	17	Q. Do you agree that the provisions of the
18	was the pivot) for me in that respect.	18	Employment Act do not require
19	Q. Did you see any evidence as to whether	19	redeployment, but rather offer a remedy in
20	the whistleblower's position had become	20	the Employment Tribunal for compensation?
21	untenable, before signing those letters?	21	A. The provisions of the Employment Act
22	A. No, because the way that I think I	22	provide for compensation in the Employment
23	understood the provisions, or the way that the	23	Tribunal if the individual has not been
24	provisions had been understood, was that you	24	properly protected from suffering a
25	needed to act before positions became	25	detriment, but what the Act requires is that
	Page 42		Page 44

11 (Pages 41 to 44)

1	the employer set to provent the individual	1	THE CHAIRMAN: I would, yes.
2	the employer act to prevent the individual suffering a detriment. And if we don't do	1 2	MR NEISH: May I confer just one minute
2	that, then eventually an individual who has	$\begin{vmatrix} 2\\ 3 \end{vmatrix}$	with Dr Britto, with your leave, sir?
			THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, well of course.
4	suffered a detriment is potentially able to	4	
5	take us to the Employment Tribunal (or any	5	Questioned by MR NEISH
6	employer to the Employment Tribunal) and	6	Q. Good morning, Chief Minister.
7	there recover damages. But what the statute	7	A. Good morning, Mr Neish.
8	talks about is ensuring that employees do not	8	Q. I will try to be very brief with you, on
9	suffer detriment if they are whistleblowers.	9	really what is a peripheral matter, and that is
10	Q. Were you in fact seeking to encourage	10	the appointment process for the appointment
11	any allegations you could find of wrongdoing	11	of Mr McGrail. You said yesterday in
12	against Mr McGrail to be made to the	12	evidence that at one point you had exchanged
13	Inquiry?	13	emails with Mr Pyle, in the course of which
14	A. Far from it. In fact, what encouraged	14	Mr Pyle had said that the process was abject.
15	these allegations was the call for evidence by	15	You were asked why you think he said that,
16	the Inquiry itself. The relevance of those is a	16	and your explanation was this: "I think that
17	matter for the Inquiry.	17	he said to me that and I'm - talking from
18	Q. Do you consider it consistent with a fair	18	memory now, from a conversation. I think
19	and independent inquiry for a core	19	he said to me that the way that the whole
20	participant to be offering individuals new	20	thing had been handled was designed to
21	roles, in the light of that person giving	21	avoid the views of the Governor's
22	evidence in the inquiry against another core	22	representative on the GPA and the Chief
23	participant?	23	Minister's representative on the GPA being
24	A. Well, I consider that in Gibraltar we	24	given at the beginning of the process but
25	uphold the highest ethical standards; we	25	rather at the end once everyone had spoken
	Page 45		Page 47
1	unhold the seven principles of public life, but	1	so that our views did not carry as much
$\frac{1}{2}$	uphold the seven principles of public life, but we do it in a place where the degrees of	1	so that our views did not carry as much weight as they might otherwise have" Chief
2	we do it in a place where the degrees of	2	weight as they might otherwise have". Chief
2 3	we do it in a place where the degrees of separation are slightly different to the United	2 3	weight as they might otherwise have". Chief Minister, were you aware of the fact that the
2 3 4	we do it in a place where the degrees of separation are slightly different to the United Kingdom, where there are 60 million people	2 3 4	weight as they might otherwise have". Chief Minister, were you aware of the fact that the process had been agreed by all nine members
2 3 4 5	we do it in a place where the degrees of separation are slightly different to the United Kingdom, where there are 60 million people to choose from. And therefore, being very	2 3 4 5	weight as they might otherwise have". Chief Minister, were you aware of the fact that the process had been agreed by all nine members of the GPA?
2 3 4 5 6	we do it in a place where the degrees of separation are slightly different to the United Kingdom, where there are 60 million people to choose from. And therefore, being very mindful of what those red lines we were	2 3 4 5 6	weight as they might otherwise have". Chief Minister, were you aware of the fact that the process had been agreed by all nine members of the GPA? <b>A. The process</b>
2 3 4 5 6 7	we do it in a place where the degrees of separation are slightly different to the United Kingdom, where there are 60 million people to choose from. And therefore, being very mindful of what those red lines we were talking about yesterday provide for, that you	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>weight as they might otherwise have". Chief Minister, were you aware of the fact that the process had been agreed by all nine members of the GPA?</li> <li>A. The process Q. Yes, the appointment process.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	we do it in a place where the degrees of separation are slightly different to the United Kingdom, where there are 60 million people to choose from. And therefore, being very mindful of what those red lines we were talking about yesterday provide for, that you make the right decision and ensure that every	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>weight as they might otherwise have". Chief Minister, were you aware of the fact that the process had been agreed by all nine members of the GPA?</li> <li>A. The process Q. Yes, the appointment process.</li> <li>A at (?) the interview of the interview</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	we do it in a place where the degrees of separation are slightly different to the United Kingdom, where there are 60 million people to choose from. And therefore, being very mindful of what those red lines we were talking about yesterday provide for, that you make the right decision and ensure that every tribunal in Gibraltar has the information	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>weight as they might otherwise have". Chief Minister, were you aware of the fact that the process had been agreed by all nine members of the GPA?</li> <li>A. The process Q. Yes, the appointment process.</li> <li>A at (?) the interview of the interview stage for</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	we do it in a place where the degrees of separation are slightly different to the United Kingdom, where there are 60 million people to choose from. And therefore, being very mindful of what those red lines we were talking about yesterday provide for, that you make the right decision and ensure that every tribunal in Gibraltar has the information available to it, that any individual who	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>weight as they might otherwise have". Chief Minister, were you aware of the fact that the process had been agreed by all nine members of the GPA?</li> <li>A. The process Q. Yes, the appointment process.</li> <li>A at (?) the interview of the interview stage for Q. No, the whole process for when Mr</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	we do it in a place where the degrees of separation are slightly different to the United Kingdom, where there are 60 million people to choose from. And therefore, being very mindful of what those red lines we were talking about yesterday provide for, that you make the right decision and ensure that every tribunal in Gibraltar has the information available to it, that any individual who believes that they could be subject to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>weight as they might otherwise have". Chief Minister, were you aware of the fact that the process had been agreed by all nine members of the GPA?</li> <li>A. The process Q. Yes, the appointment process.</li> <li>A at (?) the interview of the interview stage for Q. No, the whole process for when Mr McGrail was appointed was agreed by all</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	we do it in a place where the degrees of separation are slightly different to the United Kingdom, where there are 60 million people to choose from. And therefore, being very mindful of what those red lines we were talking about yesterday provide for, that you make the right decision and ensure that every tribunal in Gibraltar has the information available to it, that any individual who believes that they could be subject to detriment as a result of wanting to provide	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>weight as they might otherwise have". Chief Minister, were you aware of the fact that the process had been agreed by all nine members of the GPA?</li> <li>A. The process Q. Yes, the appointment process.</li> <li>A at (?) the interview of the interview stage for Q. No, the whole process for when Mr McGrail was appointed was agreed by all nine members of the GPA.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	we do it in a place where the degrees of separation are slightly different to the United Kingdom, where there are 60 million people to choose from. And therefore, being very mindful of what those red lines we were talking about yesterday provide for, that you make the right decision and ensure that every tribunal in Gibraltar has the information available to it, that any individual who believes that they could be subject to detriment as a result of wanting to provide truthful evidence to a tribunal is able to give	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>weight as they might otherwise have". Chief Minister, were you aware of the fact that the process had been agreed by all nine members of the GPA?</li> <li>A. The process Q. Yes, the appointment process.</li> <li>A at (?) the interview of the interview stage for Q. No, the whole process for when Mr McGrail was appointed was agreed by all nine members of the GPA.</li> <li>A. I was not aware of that, and I am not</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	we do it in a place where the degrees of separation are slightly different to the United Kingdom, where there are 60 million people to choose from. And therefore, being very mindful of what those red lines we were talking about yesterday provide for, that you make the right decision and ensure that every tribunal in Gibraltar has the information available to it, that any individual who believes that they could be subject to detriment as a result of wanting to provide truthful evidence to a tribunal is able to give that evidence, and then that the tribunal	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>weight as they might otherwise have". Chief Minister, were you aware of the fact that the process had been agreed by all nine members of the GPA?</li> <li>A. The process Q. Yes, the appointment process.</li> <li>A at (?) the interview of the interview stage for Q. No, the whole process for when Mr McGrail was appointed was agreed by all nine members of the GPA.</li> <li>A. I was not aware of that, and I am not aware of it now. I you're telling me that it</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	we do it in a place where the degrees of separation are slightly different to the United Kingdom, where there are 60 million people to choose from. And therefore, being very mindful of what those red lines we were talking about yesterday provide for, that you make the right decision and ensure that every tribunal in Gibraltar has the information available to it, that any individual who believes that they could be subject to detriment as a result of wanting to provide truthful evidence to a tribunal is able to give that evidence, and then that the tribunal should be able to decide the relevance and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>weight as they might otherwise have". Chief Minister, were you aware of the fact that the process had been agreed by all nine members of the GPA?</li> <li>A. The process Q. Yes, the appointment process.</li> <li>A at (?) the interview of the interview stage for Q. No, the whole process for when Mr McGrail was appointed was agreed by all nine members of the GPA.</li> <li>A. I was not aware of that, and I am not aware of it now. I you're telling me that it was, and I when I reflected in my answer</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	we do it in a place where the degrees of separation are slightly different to the United Kingdom, where there are 60 million people to choose from. And therefore, being very mindful of what those red lines we were talking about yesterday provide for, that you make the right decision and ensure that every tribunal in Gibraltar has the information available to it, that any individual who believes that they could be subject to detriment as a result of wanting to provide truthful evidence to a tribunal is able to give that evidence, and then that the tribunal should be able to decide the relevance and credibility of that evidence.	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ \end{array} $	<ul> <li>weight as they might otherwise have". Chief Minister, were you aware of the fact that the process had been agreed by all nine members of the GPA?</li> <li>A. The process Q. Yes, the appointment process.</li> <li>A at (?) the interview of the interview stage for Q. No, the whole process for when Mr McGrail was appointed was agreed by all nine members of the GPA.</li> <li>A. I was not aware of that, and I am not aware of it now. I you're telling me that it was, and I when I reflected in my answer yesterday (as I as I think I say in the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	we do it in a place where the degrees of separation are slightly different to the United Kingdom, where there are 60 million people to choose from. And therefore, being very mindful of what those red lines we were talking about yesterday provide for, that you make the right decision and ensure that every tribunal in Gibraltar has the information available to it, that any individual who believes that they could be subject to detriment as a result of wanting to provide truthful evidence to a tribunal is able to give that evidence, and then that the tribunal should be able to decide the relevance and credibility of that evidence. Q. Thank you, Mr Picardo. I have no further	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ \end{array} $	<ul> <li>weight as they might otherwise have". Chief Minister, were you aware of the fact that the process had been agreed by all nine members of the GPA?</li> <li>A. The process Q. Yes, the appointment process.</li> <li>A at (?) the interview of the interview stage for Q. No, the whole process for when Mr McGrail was appointed was agreed by all nine members of the GPA.</li> <li>A. I was not aware of that, and I am not aware of it now. I you're telling me that it was, and I when I reflected in my answer yesterday (as I as I think I say in the preamble that you read) is what I had been</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	we do it in a place where the degrees of separation are slightly different to the United Kingdom, where there are 60 million people to choose from. And therefore, being very mindful of what those red lines we were talking about yesterday provide for, that you make the right decision and ensure that every tribunal in Gibraltar has the information available to it, that any individual who believes that they could be subject to detriment as a result of wanting to provide truthful evidence to a tribunal is able to give that evidence, and then that the tribunal should be able to decide the relevance and credibility of that evidence. Q. Thank you, Mr Picardo. I have no further questions. I believe that Mr Neish will have	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>weight as they might otherwise have". Chief Minister, were you aware of the fact that the process had been agreed by all nine members of the GPA?</li> <li>A. The process Q. Yes, the appointment process.</li> <li>A at (?) the interview of the interview stage for Q. No, the whole process for when Mr McGrail was appointed was agreed by all nine members of the GPA.</li> <li>A. I was not aware of that, and I am not aware of it now. I you're telling me that it was, and I when I reflected in my answer yesterday (as I as I think I say in the preamble that you read) is what I had been told by Mr Pyle.</li> </ul>
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\end{array} $	we do it in a place where the degrees of separation are slightly different to the United Kingdom, where there are 60 million people to choose from. And therefore, being very mindful of what those red lines we were talking about yesterday provide for, that you make the right decision and ensure that every tribunal in Gibraltar has the information available to it, that any individual who believes that they could be subject to detriment as a result of wanting to provide truthful evidence to a tribunal is able to give that evidence, and then that the tribunal should be able to decide the relevance and credibility of that evidence. Q. Thank you, Mr Picardo. I have no further questions. I believe that Mr Neish will have some questions for you now.	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\end{array} $	<ul> <li>weight as they might otherwise have". Chief Minister, were you aware of the fact that the process had been agreed by all nine members of the GPA?</li> <li>A. The process Q. Yes, the appointment process.</li> <li>A at (?) the interview of the interview stage for Q. No, the whole process for when Mr McGrail was appointed was agreed by all nine members of the GPA.</li> <li>A. I was not aware of that, and I am not aware of it now. I you're telling me that it was, and I when I reflected in my answer yesterday (as I as I think I say in the preamble that you read) is what I had been told by Mr Pyle.</li> <li>Q. Yes, and I am asking you what you were</li> </ul>
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array}$	<ul> <li>we do it in a place where the degrees of separation are slightly different to the United Kingdom, where there are 60 million people to choose from. And therefore, being very mindful of what those red lines we were talking about yesterday provide for, that you make the right decision and ensure that every tribunal in Gibraltar has the information available to it, that any individual who believes that they could be subject to detriment as a result of wanting to provide truthful evidence to a tribunal is able to give that evidence, and then that the tribunal should be able to decide the relevance and credibility of that evidence.</li> <li>Q. Thank you, Mr Picardo. I have no further questions. I believe that Mr Neish will have some questions for you now.</li> <li>A. Thank you very much.</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\\end{array} $	<ul> <li>weight as they might otherwise have". Chief Minister, were you aware of the fact that the process had been agreed by all nine members of the GPA?</li> <li>A. The process Q. Yes, the appointment process.</li> <li>A at (?) the interview of the interview stage for Q. No, the whole process for when Mr McGrail was appointed was agreed by all nine members of the GPA.</li> <li>A. I was not aware of that, and I am not aware of it now. I you're telling me that it was, and I when I reflected in my answer yesterday (as I as I think I say in the preamble that you read) is what I had been told by Mr Pyle.</li> <li>Q. Yes, and I am asking you what you were aware of. And are you aware that on 30 (?)</li> </ul>
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	<ul> <li>we do it in a place where the degrees of separation are slightly different to the United Kingdom, where there are 60 million people to choose from. And therefore, being very mindful of what those red lines we were talking about yesterday provide for, that you make the right decision and ensure that every tribunal in Gibraltar has the information available to it, that any individual who believes that they could be subject to detriment as a result of wanting to provide truthful evidence to a tribunal is able to give that evidence, and then that the tribunal should be able to decide the relevance and credibility of that evidence.</li> <li>Q. Thank you, Mr Picardo. I have no further questions. I believe that Mr Neish will have some questions for you now.</li> <li>A. Thank you very much.</li> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr Neish.</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	<ul> <li>weight as they might otherwise have". Chief Minister, were you aware of the fact that the process had been agreed by all nine members of the GPA?</li> <li>A. The process Q. Yes, the appointment process.</li> <li>A at (?) the interview of the interview stage for Q. No, the whole process for when Mr McGrail was appointed was agreed by all nine members of the GPA.</li> <li>A. I was not aware of that, and I am not aware of it now. I you're telling me that it was, and I when I reflected in my answer yesterday (as I as I think I say in the preamble that you read) is what I had been told by Mr Pyle.</li> <li>Q. Yes, and I am asking you what you were aware of. And are you aware that on 30 (?) November the candidates were interviewed</li> </ul>
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ \end{array}$	we do it in a place where the degrees of separation are slightly different to the United Kingdom, where there are 60 million people to choose from. And therefore, being very mindful of what those red lines we were talking about yesterday provide for, that you make the right decision and ensure that every tribunal in Gibraltar has the information available to it, that any individual who believes that they could be subject to detriment as a result of wanting to provide truthful evidence to a tribunal is able to give that evidence, and then that the tribunal should be able to decide the relevance and credibility of that evidence. Q. Thank you, Mr Picardo. I have no further questions. I believe that Mr Neish will have some questions for you now. A. Thank you very much. THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr Neish. MR NEISH: (inaudible)	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	<ul> <li>weight as they might otherwise have". Chief Minister, were you aware of the fact that the process had been agreed by all nine members of the GPA?</li> <li>A. The process Q. Yes, the appointment process.</li> <li>A at (?) the interview of the interview stage for Q. No, the whole process for when Mr McGrail was appointed was agreed by all nine members of the GPA.</li> <li>A. I was not aware of that, and I am not aware of it now. I you're telling me that it was, and I when I reflected in my answer yesterday (as I as I think I say in the preamble that you read) is what I had been told by Mr Pyle.</li> <li>Q. Yes, and I am asking you what you were aware of. And are you aware that on 30 (?) November the candidates were interviewed in depth by a panel consisting of Mr Gomez</li> </ul>
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ \end{array}$	we do it in a place where the degrees of separation are slightly different to the United Kingdom, where there are 60 million people to choose from. And therefore, being very mindful of what those red lines we were talking about yesterday provide for, that you make the right decision and ensure that every tribunal in Gibraltar has the information available to it, that any individual who believes that they could be subject to detriment as a result of wanting to provide truthful evidence to a tribunal is able to give that evidence, and then that the tribunal should be able to decide the relevance and credibility of that evidence. Q. Thank you, Mr Picardo. I have no further questions. I believe that Mr Neish will have some questions for you now. A. Thank you very much. THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr Neish. MR NEISH: (inaudible) THE CHAIRMAN: Sorry?	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	<ul> <li>weight as they might otherwise have". Chief Minister, were you aware of the fact that the process had been agreed by all nine members of the GPA?</li> <li>A. The process Q. Yes, the appointment process.</li> <li>A at (?) the interview of the interview stage for Q. No, the whole process for when Mr McGrail was appointed was agreed by all nine members of the GPA.</li> <li>A. I was not aware of that, and I am not aware of it now. I you're telling me that it was, and I when I reflected in my answer yesterday (as I as I think I say in the preamble that you read) is what I had been told by Mr Pyle.</li> <li>Q. Yes, and I am asking you what you were aware of. And are you aware that on 30 (?) November the candidates were interviewed in depth by a panel consisting of Mr Gomez (that is, the Chief Secretary), Reverend</li> </ul>
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	we do it in a place where the degrees of separation are slightly different to the United Kingdom, where there are 60 million people to choose from. And therefore, being very mindful of what those red lines we were talking about yesterday provide for, that you make the right decision and ensure that every tribunal in Gibraltar has the information available to it, that any individual who believes that they could be subject to detriment as a result of wanting to provide truthful evidence to a tribunal is able to give that evidence, and then that the tribunal should be able to decide the relevance and credibility of that evidence. Q. Thank you, Mr Picardo. I have no further questions. I believe that Mr Neish will have some questions for you now. A. Thank you very much. THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr Neish. MR NEISH: (inaudible) THE CHAIRMAN: Sorry? MR NEISH: Would you like me to start	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	<ul> <li>weight as they might otherwise have". Chief Minister, were you aware of the fact that the process had been agreed by all nine members of the GPA?</li> <li>A. The process Q. Yes, the appointment process.</li> <li>A at (?) the interview of the interview stage for Q. No, the whole process for when Mr McGrail was appointed was agreed by all nine members of the GPA.</li> <li>A. I was not aware of that, and I am not aware of it now. I you're telling me that it was, and I when I reflected in my answer yesterday (as I as I think I say in the preamble that you read) is what I had been told by Mr Pyle.</li> <li>Q. Yes, and I am asking you what you were aware of. And are you aware that on 30 (?) November the candidates were interviewed in depth by a panel consisting of Mr Gomez (that is, the Chief Secretary), Reverend Patron, Mr Pyle and Mr Gonçalves, in the</li> </ul>
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ \end{array}$	we do it in a place where the degrees of separation are slightly different to the United Kingdom, where there are 60 million people to choose from. And therefore, being very mindful of what those red lines we were talking about yesterday provide for, that you make the right decision and ensure that every tribunal in Gibraltar has the information available to it, that any individual who believes that they could be subject to detriment as a result of wanting to provide truthful evidence to a tribunal is able to give that evidence, and then that the tribunal should be able to decide the relevance and credibility of that evidence. Q. Thank you, Mr Picardo. I have no further questions. I believe that Mr Neish will have some questions for you now. A. Thank you very much. THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr Neish. MR NEISH: (inaudible) THE CHAIRMAN: Sorry?	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	<ul> <li>weight as they might otherwise have". Chief Minister, were you aware of the fact that the process had been agreed by all nine members of the GPA?</li> <li>A. The process Q. Yes, the appointment process.</li> <li>A at (?) the interview of the interview stage for Q. No, the whole process for when Mr McGrail was appointed was agreed by all nine members of the GPA.</li> <li>A. I was not aware of that, and I am not aware of it now. I you're telling me that it was, and I when I reflected in my answer yesterday (as I as I think I say in the preamble that you read) is what I had been told by Mr Pyle.</li> <li>Q. Yes, and I am asking you what you were aware of. And are you aware that on 30 (?) November the candidates were interviewed in depth by a panel consisting of Mr Gomez (that is, the Chief Secretary), Reverend</li> </ul>
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	we do it in a place where the degrees of separation are slightly different to the United Kingdom, where there are 60 million people to choose from. And therefore, being very mindful of what those red lines we were talking about yesterday provide for, that you make the right decision and ensure that every tribunal in Gibraltar has the information available to it, that any individual who believes that they could be subject to detriment as a result of wanting to provide truthful evidence to a tribunal is able to give that evidence, and then that the tribunal should be able to decide the relevance and credibility of that evidence. Q. Thank you, Mr Picardo. I have no further questions. I believe that Mr Neish will have some questions for you now. A. Thank you very much. THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr Neish. MR NEISH: (inaudible) THE CHAIRMAN: Sorry? MR NEISH: Would you like me to start	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	<ul> <li>weight as they might otherwise have". Chief Minister, were you aware of the fact that the process had been agreed by all nine members of the GPA?</li> <li>A. The process Q. Yes, the appointment process.</li> <li>A at (?) the interview of the interview stage for Q. No, the whole process for when Mr McGrail was appointed was agreed by all nine members of the GPA.</li> <li>A. I was not aware of that, and I am not aware of it now. I you're telling me that it was, and I when I reflected in my answer yesterday (as I as I think I say in the preamble that you read) is what I had been told by Mr Pyle.</li> <li>Q. Yes, and I am asking you what you were aware of. And are you aware that on 30 (?) November the candidates were interviewed in depth by a panel consisting of Mr Gomez (that is, the Chief Secretary), Reverend Patron, Mr Pyle and Mr Gonçalves, in the</li> </ul>

12 (Pages 45 to 48)

1 So, both the Chief Secretary and the Deputy 1 meeting of the GPA that was to happen the 2 2 Governor were members of the panel which following week, I believe, or that afternoon, 3 3 interviewed the candidates. Does that not in respect of the then appointment of a new 4 4 render a nonsense the suggestion that the Commissioner. 5 representatives of the Governor and the Chief 5 O. Yes. 6 Minister were denied a say in the process? 6 A. And my attitude was to say to that 7 7 A. That is one view that you express, but not individual: well, you're going to go to the 8 8 the view that was expressed to me by Nick interviews, you choose who you think is the 9 9 Pyle whilst he was Governor on what his right person to choose. 10 view was of what the process was, which is 10 Q. Yes. 11 11 what I reflected here yesterday. You might A. And that was my attitude also in the 12 say that what I reflected here yesterday was 12 context of Mr Ernest Gomez, who was my 13 hearsay, but it was exactly what Nick Pyle 13 Chief Secretary at that time, and that's why 14 14 told me that he felt. Perhaps it is something he will have voted whatever he felt, because 15 15 you should put to him. he was at the interview. 16 16 Q. Yes, I will do. The other point, and I Q. Yes, that is so far so good, as far as Mr 17 17 quote, also in relation to the appointment of Gomez is concerned. 18 Mr McGrail. You said yesterday, "And Ed 18 A. Yes. 19 Davis and I were very, very surprised, we 19 Q. But insofar as Mr Pyle is concerned, it is 20 20 discussed at the time, that it was Ian McGrail true that he wrote against Mr McGrail 21 who became commissioner and not Richard 21 because he favoured Mr Ullger, but are you 22 22 Ullger. And subsequently, when I discussed aware that Mr Pyle has stated in his affidavit 23 it with Nick Pyle it was clear that he was just 23 that he considered both Mr McGrail and Mr 24 24 as surprised." And then counsel asked you, Ullger to be suitable candidates? 25 25 "Why were you surprised?", "Because we A. I am not aware, because as I told the Page 49 Page 51 1 believed that the -- I believed, and it turned 1 tribunal I haven't had an opportunity to read 2 out Ed Davis also believed, and it turned out 2 all of the statements. But if I had read the 3 3 that Nick Pyle also believed, that Ian statements, Mr Neish, it would not have 4 McGrail should not be commissioner of 4 changed my evidence, because I'm telling 5 5 you what happened at the time and Nick Pyle police, because he did not have the 6 temperament to be commissioner of police 6 told me those things at the time, that's why 7 7 I'm reflecting that. Ed Davis told me those and he was not the right candidate." 8 8 Question, "What was that belief based on?", things at the time, and I said those things at 9 9 "On our experience of him at the time, what the time. And with the very greatest of 10 10 we'd seen -- what each of us had seen o him, respect, we have known each other many 11 and on the publicly available". So, that was 11 years, I am entitled to have held that view 12 your contemporaneous view at the time of 12 and to hold that view, and the fact that I was 13 the appointment process? 13 not the party that was carrying out the 14 A. Yes. It carried no weight of course, 14 interviews and that Ian McGrail did become 15 15 because Ian McGrail became Commissioner Commissioner of Police shows that that 16 16 of Police (inaudible). process was entirely independent of my 17 17 Q. Are you aware that the Chief Secretary views, not having watched him in interview. 18 18 voted in favour of Mr McGrail's Q. Thank you, Chief Minister. 19 19 appointment? A. Thank you very much indeed. 20 20 A. I am aware, yes. You will recall, Mr Questioned by MR CRUZ 21 21 Neish, that I told the Inquiry (I think now Q. Good morning. 22 twice) that one of the first things I was 22 A. Good morning. 23 23 consulted on when I became Chief Minister Q. Mr Picardo, I think it is fair to say that it 24 24 on 9 December 2011 was who the then is in your evidence that you seem to give a 25 Acting Chief Secretary should vote for at the 25 lot of importance to the rule of law.

Page 50

13 (Pages 49 to 52)

Page 52

1	A. A huge amount of importance to the rule	1	independence of the RGP, that is the point.
2	of law.	2	And Mr Lavarello in describing it said "The
3	Q. A huge amount of importance.	3	Authority is there to, I suppose, act as an
4	A. Before this case, during it, and I will	4	independent party so that the Chief Minister
5	after; I consider it's one of the thing that	5	and the Governor cannot exercise undue
6	marks us out from other nations around us.	6	influence over the Commissioner". Do you
7	Q. Yes. Unrecognisable as a nation if that is	7	agree with that statement?
8	offended in some way, shape or form.	8	A. I don't agree with that statement; I don't
9	A. Absolutely.	9	think that is the role of the GPA. The
10	Q. In your messages to Mr Pyle, you	10	Governor and the Chief Minister would not
11	mention that the Commissioner of Police is	11	be seeking to exercise undue influence over a
12	the head of an organisation that is	12	Commissioner, whether there was or was not
13	institutionally the guardian of the rule of law.	13	a GPA.
14	Do you remember that?	14	Q. Well, do you disagree that the GPA is a
15	A. Yes, it is; it is one of the guardians of the	15	buffer to undue influence from the Governor
16	rule of law, it is not the guardian of the rule	16	or the Chief Minister?
17	of law.	17	A. I might agree with you that one of the
18	Q. Of course.	18	effects of the GPA is to create a de facto
19	A. It's one of the guardians	19	buffer between a Governor and a Chief
20	Q. One.	20	Minister, but I think it's a it's a flawed legal
21	A of the rule of law.	21	analysis to believe that that is what the
22	Q. That would extend to, for example, the	22	statutory body that is the GPA is set up to be.
23	Police Authority?	23	Q. When my learned friend the Counsel to
24	A. The courts	24	the Inquiry referred you to the constitution, I
25	Q. Of course.	25	think section 48, about the independence of
	Page 53		Page 55
	1 420 55		
1	A and the Government. The Police	1	the GPA, is that not encompassed in that?
2	Authority, the Courts and the Government, to	2	A. The independence of the GPA does not go
3	name but a few.	3	to the GPA being a buffer between the police,
4	Q. Yes. The Governor?	4	the Governor and the Chief Minister. The
5	A. Absolutely.	5	independence of the GPA is something that is
6	Q. And yourself?	6	and has to be free-standing in order to ensure
7	A. Indeed, I'm also the Government.	7	that the GPA discharges its functions
8	Q. Yes. When asked about the role of the	8	independently of the Governor, the Chief
9	Gibraltar Police Authority Mr Gonçalves, a	9	Minister and the police. Because there must
10	former Chairman, explained it in these terms.	10	also not be any undue influence, of course,
11	I am going to ask you if you agree with this.	11	from the Commissioner or the senior ranks of
12	"The overarching mission statement, as it	12	the RGP in respect of the actions of the GPA,
13	were, was the safeguarding of the	13	you will agree.
14	independence of the RGP and to protect or	14	Q. Yes, I think that the buffer, as Mr
15	ensure the effectiveness, efficiency and	15	Gonçalves talked about, is a two-way street.
16	probity of RGP. High at the top of the	16	Yes, so we have had your answer
17	mission statement was our powers to call the	17	A. But I think it's a very it's a very I
18	Commissioner to account if the need arose."	18	don't think it's an analogy which is legally
19	Would you agree with that statement?	19	sound. Even though it may be de facto the
20	A. It's not my statement. It doesn't sound to	20	effect of one or one of the effects of the
21	me to be erroneous in any way, but I would	21	creation of a GPA, I don't think it's a legally
22	have to read it carefully to analyse it before I	22	sound analysis to refer to the GPA as a buffer.
23	could tell you that I wholeheartedly agree to	23	It has free-standing obligations
24	it without having the benefit of reading it.	24	Q. A buffer in the sense of independence, is
25	Q. Well I suppose the emphasis is on the	25	my point.
	Page 54		Page 56

14 (Pages 53 to 56)

1	A. No, independence is independence.		mean, you can check it in the break if you
2	Independence is not buttressed.	2	want.
3	Q. Alright Mr Picardo, we have had your	3	A. It may be that the Chief Justice
4	answer. Would you accept that whatever role	4	THE CHAIRMAN: They are both
5	or function you have, or the Governor had,	5	authoritative, Mr Cruz. I do not think this is
6	that (and I think you said this yesterday)	6	going to help us much.
7	operational control vest in the Commissioner	7	Q. Yes. No, exactly. And are you aware that
8	of Police and only in the Commissioner of	8	there were seven challenges, six of which
9	Police?	9	A. Sorry, was it the Chief Justice on appeal
10	A. Yes.	10	though, from
11	Q. Okay.	11	Q. No. It is a Chief Justice judicial review.
12	A. And everyone's entitled, also, to have	12	A. Okay. Well, maybe. The Appeal Court
13	views in that respect, because we're all	13	decision was certainly in the case of the
14	independent and we all have independent	14	coroner's inquest in respect of the maritime
15	views.	15	matter
16	Q. So, it is sort of the same question in a	16	Q. Yes, that is not what you gave evidence
17	different way, but perhaps this might be	17	on.
18	simpler to put. Would you recognise that an	18	A. Well, I think I did mention it yesterday as
19	important function of an independent GPA is	19	well.
20	to block abuse of power, and to hold the RGP	20	Q. Well, let us stick to this one. There were
21	and the Commissioner of Police to account?	21	seven challenges: six of which were
22	A. That could be one of the things that you	22	dismissed, one which succeeded.
23	could say the RGP sorry, the GPA could	23	THE CHAIRMAN: This is not going to
24	do, and that abuse of power could come from	24	help, Mr Cruz. I can read the judgement.
25	any direction.	25	Q. I understand, I just want to put to the
			<b>(</b> , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
	Page 57		Page 59
1		1	
1	Q. Indeed.	1	witness if he is aware that the benefit or the
2	A. It could come from below, as well as	2	validity of the warrant was not dismissed or
2 3	A. It could come from below, as well as from above. There is a proposed Complaints	2 3	validity of the warrant was not dismissed or in any way challenged. Well, it was
2 3 4	A. It could come from below, as well as from above. There is a proposed Complaints Board, also, that is designed to deal with	2 3 4	validity of the warrant was not dismissed or in any way challenged. Well, it was challenged but it was not deemed to be
2 3 4 5	A. It could come from below, as well as from above. There is a proposed Complaints Board, also, that is designed to deal with what you might call abuses of power by a	2 3 4 5	validity of the warrant was not dismissed or in any way challenged. Well, it was challenged but it was not deemed to be unlawful. Are you aware of that?
2 3 4 5 6	A. It could come from below, as well as from above. There is a proposed Complaints Board, also, that is designed to deal with what you might call abuses of power by a uniformed officer.	2 3 4 5 6	validity of the warrant was not dismissed or in any way challenged. Well, it was challenged but it was not deemed to be unlawful. Are you aware of that? <b>A. I've read the judgment, and I don't think</b>
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>A. It could come from below, as well as from above. There is a proposed Complaints Board, also, that is designed to deal with what you might call abuses of power by a uniformed officer.</li> <li>Q. Yes, there is. Moving on to Operation</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>validity of the warrant was not dismissed or</li> <li>in any way challenged. Well, it was</li> <li>challenged but it was not deemed to be</li> <li>unlawful. Are you aware of that?</li> <li>A. I've read the judgment, and I don't think</li> <li>it's helpful in the context of today that you</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>A. It could come from below, as well as from above. There is a proposed Complaints Board, also, that is designed to deal with what you might call abuses of power by a uniformed officer.</li> <li>Q. Yes, there is. Moving on to Operation Delhi. Well before I do, you gave some</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>validity of the warrant was not dismissed or</li> <li>in any way challenged. Well, it was</li> <li>challenged but it was not deemed to be</li> <li>unlawful. Are you aware of that?</li> <li>A. I've read the judgment, and I don't think</li> <li>it's helpful in the context of today that you</li> <li>carry out a viva examination of my</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A. It could come from below, as well as from above. There is a proposed Complaints Board, also, that is designed to deal with what you might call abuses of power by a uniformed officer.</li> <li>Q. Yes, there is. Moving on to Operation Delhi. Well before I do, you gave some evidence yesterday which I think is (I am</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>validity of the warrant was not dismissed or</li> <li>in any way challenged. Well, it was</li> <li>challenged but it was not deemed to be</li> <li>unlawful. Are you aware of that?</li> <li>A. I've read the judgment, and I don't think</li> <li>it's helpful in the context of today that you</li> <li>carry out a viva examination of my</li> <li>understanding of my judgment, but you're</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>A. It could come from below, as well as from above. There is a proposed Complaints Board, also, that is designed to deal with what you might call abuses of power by a uniformed officer.</li> <li>Q. Yes, there is. Moving on to Operation Delhi. Well before I do, you gave some evidence yesterday which I think is (I am sure inadvertently) incorrect, but perhaps we</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>validity of the warrant was not dismissed or</li> <li>in any way challenged. Well, it was</li> <li>challenged but it was not deemed to be</li> <li>unlawful. Are you aware of that?</li> <li>A. I've read the judgment, and I don't think</li> <li>it's helpful in the context of today that you</li> <li>carry out a viva examination of my</li> <li>understanding of my judgment, but you're</li> <li>right that the warrant is thrown out on its</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>A. It could come from below, as well as from above. There is a proposed Complaints Board, also, that is designed to deal with what you might call abuses of power by a uniformed officer.</li> <li>Q. Yes, there is. Moving on to Operation Delhi. Well before I do, you gave some evidence yesterday which I think is (I am sure inadvertently) incorrect, but perhaps we can address it. You mentioned a case, the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>validity of the warrant was not dismissed or in any way challenged. Well, it was challenged but it was not deemed to be unlawful. Are you aware of that?</li> <li>A. I've read the judgment, and I don't think it's helpful in the context of today that you carry out a viva examination of my understanding of my judgment, but you're right that the warrant is thrown out on its execution rather than its obtention, but the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>A. It could come from below, as well as from above. There is a proposed Complaints Board, also, that is designed to deal with what you might call abuses of power by a uniformed officer.</li> <li>Q. Yes, there is. Moving on to Operation Delhi. Well before I do, you gave some evidence yesterday which I think is (I am sure inadvertently) incorrect, but perhaps we can address it. You mentioned a case, the Veralls and Miles case that has had a recent</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>validity of the warrant was not dismissed or in any way challenged. Well, it was challenged but it was not deemed to be unlawful. Are you aware of that?</li> <li>A. I've read the judgment, and I don't think it's helpful in the context of today that you carry out a viva examination of my understanding of my judgment, but you're right that the warrant is thrown out on its execution rather than its obtention, but the facts are completely different.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A. It could come from below, as well as from above. There is a proposed Complaints Board, also, that is designed to deal with what you might call abuses of power by a uniformed officer.</li> <li>Q. Yes, there is. Moving on to Operation Delhi. Well before I do, you gave some evidence yesterday which I think is (I am sure inadvertently) incorrect, but perhaps we can address it. You mentioned a case, the Veralls and Miles case that has had a recent judgment. Now, this is a case that dealt with</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>validity of the warrant was not dismissed or in any way challenged. Well, it was challenged but it was not deemed to be unlawful. Are you aware of that?</li> <li>A. I've read the judgment, and I don't think it's helpful in the context of today that you carry out a viva examination of my understanding of my judgment, but you're right that the warrant is thrown out on its execution rather than its obtention, but the facts are completely different.</li> <li>Q. Right, thank you.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A. It could come from below, as well as from above. There is a proposed Complaints Board, also, that is designed to deal with what you might call abuses of power by a uniformed officer.</li> <li>Q. Yes, there is. Moving on to Operation Delhi. Well before I do, you gave some evidence yesterday which I think is (I am sure inadvertently) incorrect, but perhaps we can address it. You mentioned a case, the Veralls and Miles case that has had a recent judgment. Now, this is a case that dealt with similar issues: tension between search</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>validity of the warrant was not dismissed or in any way challenged. Well, it was challenged but it was not deemed to be unlawful. Are you aware of that?</li> <li>A. I've read the judgment, and I don't think it's helpful in the context of today that you carry out a viva examination of my understanding of my judgment, but you're right that the warrant is thrown out on its execution rather than its obtention, but the facts are completely different.</li> <li>Q. Right, thank you.</li> <li>A. But what I was talking about, you will</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>A. It could come from below, as well as from above. There is a proposed Complaints Board, also, that is designed to deal with what you might call abuses of power by a uniformed officer.</li> <li>Q. Yes, there is. Moving on to Operation Delhi. Well before I do, you gave some evidence yesterday which I think is (I am sure inadvertently) incorrect, but perhaps we can address it. You mentioned a case, the Veralls and Miles case that has had a recent judgment. Now, this is a case that dealt with similar issues: tension between search warrants and production orders. You said it</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>validity of the warrant was not dismissed or in any way challenged. Well, it was challenged but it was not deemed to be unlawful. Are you aware of that?</li> <li>A. I've read the judgment, and I don't think it's helpful in the context of today that you carry out a viva examination of my understanding of my judgment, but you're right that the warrant is thrown out on its execution rather than its obtention, but the facts are completely different.</li> <li>Q. Right, thank you.</li> <li>A. But what I was talking about, you will recall, Mr Cruz, was the exposure to damages</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>A. It could come from below, as well as from above. There is a proposed Complaints Board, also, that is designed to deal with what you might call abuses of power by a uniformed officer.</li> <li>Q. Yes, there is. Moving on to Operation Delhi. Well before I do, you gave some evidence yesterday which I think is (I am sure inadvertently) incorrect, but perhaps we can address it. You mentioned a case, the Veralls and Miles case that has had a recent judgment. Now, this is a case that dealt with similar issues: tension between search warrants and production orders. You said it was before the Court of Appeal, are you</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>validity of the warrant was not dismissed or in any way challenged. Well, it was challenged but it was not deemed to be unlawful. Are you aware of that?</li> <li>A. I've read the judgment, and I don't think it's helpful in the context of today that you carry out a viva examination of my understanding of my judgment, but you're right that the warrant is thrown out on its execution rather than its obtention, but the facts are completely different.</li> <li>Q. Right, thank you.</li> <li>A. But what I was talking about, you will recall, Mr Cruz, was the exposure to damages by the Exchequer as a result of a failure to</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A. It could come from below, as well as from above. There is a proposed Complaints Board, also, that is designed to deal with what you might call abuses of power by a uniformed officer.</li> <li>Q. Yes, there is. Moving on to Operation Delhi. Well before I do, you gave some evidence yesterday which I think is (I am sure inadvertently) incorrect, but perhaps we can address it. You mentioned a case, the Veralls and Miles case that has had a recent judgment. Now, this is a case that dealt with similar issues: tension between search warrants and production orders. You said it was before the Court of Appeal, are you aware that it was not? It was before the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>validity of the warrant was not dismissed or in any way challenged. Well, it was challenged but it was not deemed to be unlawful. Are you aware of that?</li> <li>A. I've read the judgment, and I don't think it's helpful in the context of today that you carry out a viva examination of my understanding of my judgment, but you're right that the warrant is thrown out on its execution rather than its obtention, but the facts are completely different.</li> <li>Q. Right, thank you.</li> <li>A. But what I was talking about, you will recall, Mr Cruz, was the exposure to damages by the Exchequer as a result of a failure to obtain or execute search warrants properly.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A. It could come from below, as well as from above. There is a proposed Complaints Board, also, that is designed to deal with what you might call abuses of power by a uniformed officer.</li> <li>Q. Yes, there is. Moving on to Operation Delhi. Well before I do, you gave some evidence yesterday which I think is (I am sure inadvertently) incorrect, but perhaps we can address it. You mentioned a case, the Veralls and Miles case that has had a recent judgment. Now, this is a case that dealt with similar issues: tension between search warrants and production orders. You said it was before the Court of Appeal, are you aware that it was not? It was before the Supreme Court. You said it twice. Maybe</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>validity of the warrant was not dismissed or in any way challenged. Well, it was challenged but it was not deemed to be unlawful. Are you aware of that?</li> <li>A. I've read the judgment, and I don't think it's helpful in the context of today that you carry out a viva examination of my understanding of my judgment, but you're right that the warrant is thrown out on its execution rather than its obtention, but the facts are completely different.</li> <li>Q. Right, thank you.</li> <li>A. But what I was talking about, you will recall, Mr Cruz, was the exposure to damages by the Exchequer as a result of a failure to obtain or execute search warrants properly.</li> <li>Q. And just having allowed you to clarify</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>A. It could come from below, as well as from above. There is a proposed Complaints Board, also, that is designed to deal with what you might call abuses of power by a uniformed officer.</li> <li>Q. Yes, there is. Moving on to Operation Delhi. Well before I do, you gave some evidence yesterday which I think is (I am sure inadvertently) incorrect, but perhaps we can address it. You mentioned a case, the Veralls and Miles case that has had a recent judgment. Now, this is a case that dealt with similar issues: tension between search warrants and production orders. You said it was before the Court of Appeal, are you aware that it was not? It was before the Supreme Court. You said it twice. Maybe you just did not read it.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>validity of the warrant was not dismissed or in any way challenged. Well, it was challenged but it was not deemed to be unlawful. Are you aware of that?</li> <li>A. I've read the judgment, and I don't think it's helpful in the context of today that you carry out a viva examination of my understanding of my judgment, but you're right that the warrant is thrown out on its execution rather than its obtention, but the facts are completely different.</li> <li>Q. Right, thank you.</li> <li>A. But what I was talking about, you will recall, Mr Cruz, was the exposure to damages by the Exchequer as a result of a failure to obtain or execute search warrants properly.</li> <li>Q. And just having allowed you to clarify that matter, can I ask you a question. Should</li> </ul>
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array}$	<ul> <li>A. It could come from below, as well as from above. There is a proposed Complaints Board, also, that is designed to deal with what you might call abuses of power by a uniformed officer.</li> <li>Q. Yes, there is. Moving on to Operation Delhi. Well before I do, you gave some evidence yesterday which I think is (I am sure inadvertently) incorrect, but perhaps we can address it. You mentioned a case, the Veralls and Miles case that has had a recent judgment. Now, this is a case that dealt with similar issues: tension between search warrants and production orders. You said it was before the Court of Appeal, are you aware that it was not? It was before the Supreme Court. You said it twice. Maybe you just did not read it.</li> <li>A. I believe that it was before the Court of</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\\end{array} $	<ul> <li>validity of the warrant was not dismissed or in any way challenged. Well, it was challenged but it was not deemed to be unlawful. Are you aware of that?</li> <li>A. I've read the judgment, and I don't think it's helpful in the context of today that you carry out a viva examination of my understanding of my judgment, but you're right that the warrant is thrown out on its execution rather than its obtention, but the facts are completely different.</li> <li>Q. Right, thank you.</li> <li>A. But what I was talking about, you will recall, Mr Cruz, was the exposure to damages by the Exchequer as a result of a failure to obtain or execute search warrants properly.</li> <li>Q. And just having allowed you to clarify that matter, can I ask you a question. Should Operation Delhi have been treated differently</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A. It could come from below, as well as from above. There is a proposed Complaints Board, also, that is designed to deal with what you might call abuses of power by a uniformed officer.</li> <li>Q. Yes, there is. Moving on to Operation Delhi. Well before I do, you gave some evidence yesterday which I think is (I am sure inadvertently) incorrect, but perhaps we can address it. You mentioned a case, the Veralls and Miles case that has had a recent judgment. Now, this is a case that dealt with similar issues: tension between search warrants and production orders. You said it was before the Court of Appeal, are you aware that it was not? It was before the Supreme Court. You said it twice. Maybe you just did not read it.</li> <li>A. I believe that it was before the Court of Appeal; I still take that view. If you like, in</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	<ul> <li>validity of the warrant was not dismissed or in any way challenged. Well, it was challenged but it was not deemed to be unlawful. Are you aware of that?</li> <li>A. I've read the judgment, and I don't think it's helpful in the context of today that you carry out a viva examination of my understanding of my judgment, but you're right that the warrant is thrown out on its execution rather than its obtention, but the facts are completely different.</li> <li>Q. Right, thank you.</li> <li>A. But what I was talking about, you will recall, Mr Cruz, was the exposure to damages by the Exchequer as a result of a failure to obtain or execute search warrants properly.</li> <li>Q. And just having allowed you to clarify that matter, can I ask you a question. Should Operation Delhi have been treated differently in constitutional terms because Mr Levy was</li> </ul>
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ \end{array}$	<ul> <li>A. It could come from below, as well as from above. There is a proposed Complaints Board, also, that is designed to deal with what you might call abuses of power by a uniformed officer.</li> <li>Q. Yes, there is. Moving on to Operation Delhi. Well before I do, you gave some evidence yesterday which I think is (I am sure inadvertently) incorrect, but perhaps we can address it. You mentioned a case, the Veralls and Miles case that has had a recent judgment. Now, this is a case that dealt with similar issues: tension between search warrants and production orders. You said it was before the Court of Appeal, are you aware that it was not? It was before the Supreme Court. You said it twice. Maybe you just did not read it.</li> <li>A. I believe that it was before the Court of Appeal; I still take that view. If you like, in the recess I will check and I will tell you</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	<ul> <li>validity of the warrant was not dismissed or in any way challenged. Well, it was challenged but it was not deemed to be unlawful. Are you aware of that?</li> <li>A. I've read the judgment, and I don't think it's helpful in the context of today that you carry out a viva examination of my understanding of my judgment, but you're right that the warrant is thrown out on its execution rather than its obtention, but the facts are completely different.</li> <li>Q. Right, thank you.</li> <li>A. But what I was talking about, you will recall, Mr Cruz, was the exposure to damages by the Exchequer as a result of a failure to obtain or execute search warrants properly.</li> <li>Q. And just having allowed you to clarify that matter, can I ask you a question. Should Operation Delhi have been treated differently in constitutional terms because Mr Levy was a suspect, or because of the Hassans</li> </ul>
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ \end{array}$	<ul> <li>A. It could come from below, as well as from above. There is a proposed Complaints Board, also, that is designed to deal with what you might call abuses of power by a uniformed officer.</li> <li>Q. Yes, there is. Moving on to Operation Delhi. Well before I do, you gave some evidence yesterday which I think is (I am sure inadvertently) incorrect, but perhaps we can address it. You mentioned a case, the Veralls and Miles case that has had a recent judgment. Now, this is a case that dealt with similar issues: tension between search warrants and production orders. You said it was before the Court of Appeal, are you aware that it was not? It was before the Supreme Court. You said it twice. Maybe you just did not read it.</li> <li>A. I believe that it was before the Court of Appeal; I still take that view. If you like, in the recess I will check and I will tell you whether it is or whether it isn't.</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	<ul> <li>validity of the warrant was not dismissed or in any way challenged. Well, it was challenged but it was not deemed to be unlawful. Are you aware of that?</li> <li>A. I've read the judgment, and I don't think it's helpful in the context of today that you carry out a viva examination of my understanding of my judgment, but you're right that the warrant is thrown out on its execution rather than its obtention, but the facts are completely different.</li> <li>Q. Right, thank you.</li> <li>A. But what I was talking about, you will recall, Mr Cruz, was the exposure to damages by the Exchequer as a result of a failure to obtain or execute search warrants properly.</li> <li>Q. And just having allowed you to clarify that matter, can I ask you a question. Should Operation Delhi have been treated differently in constitutional terms because Mr Levy was a suspect, or because of the Hassans connection?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>A. It could come from below, as well as from above. There is a proposed Complaints Board, also, that is designed to deal with what you might call abuses of power by a uniformed officer.</li> <li>Q. Yes, there is. Moving on to Operation Delhi. Well before I do, you gave some evidence yesterday which I think is (I am sure inadvertently) incorrect, but perhaps we can address it. You mentioned a case, the Veralls and Miles case that has had a recent judgment. Now, this is a case that dealt with similar issues: tension between search warrants and production orders. You said it was before the Court of Appeal, are you aware that it was not? It was before the Supreme Court. You said it twice. Maybe you just did not read it.</li> <li>A. I believe that it was before the Court of Appeal; I still take that view. If you like, in the recess I will check and I will tell you whether it is or whether it isn't.</li> <li>Q. It is a judicial review to the Supreme</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	<ul> <li>validity of the warrant was not dismissed or in any way challenged. Well, it was challenged but it was not deemed to be unlawful. Are you aware of that?</li> <li>A. I've read the judgment, and I don't think it's helpful in the context of today that you carry out a viva examination of my understanding of my judgment, but you're right that the warrant is thrown out on its execution rather than its obtention, but the facts are completely different.</li> <li>Q. Right, thank you.</li> <li>A. But what I was talking about, you will recall, Mr Cruz, was the exposure to damages by the Exchequer as a result of a failure to obtain or execute search warrants properly.</li> <li>Q. And just having allowed you to clarify that matter, can I ask you a question. Should Operation Delhi have been treated differently in constitutional terms because Mr Levy was a suspect, or because of the Hassans connection?</li> <li>A. Of course not, and it wasn't.</li> </ul>
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ \end{array}$	<ul> <li>A. It could come from below, as well as from above. There is a proposed Complaints Board, also, that is designed to deal with what you might call abuses of power by a uniformed officer.</li> <li>Q. Yes, there is. Moving on to Operation Delhi. Well before I do, you gave some evidence yesterday which I think is (I am sure inadvertently) incorrect, but perhaps we can address it. You mentioned a case, the Veralls and Miles case that has had a recent judgment. Now, this is a case that dealt with similar issues: tension between search warrants and production orders. You said it was before the Court of Appeal, are you aware that it was not? It was before the Supreme Court. You said it twice. Maybe you just did not read it.</li> <li>A. I believe that it was before the Court of Appeal; I still take that view. If you like, in the recess I will check and I will tell you whether it is or whether it isn't.</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	<ul> <li>validity of the warrant was not dismissed or in any way challenged. Well, it was challenged but it was not deemed to be unlawful. Are you aware of that?</li> <li>A. I've read the judgment, and I don't think it's helpful in the context of today that you carry out a viva examination of my understanding of my judgment, but you're right that the warrant is thrown out on its execution rather than its obtention, but the facts are completely different.</li> <li>Q. Right, thank you.</li> <li>A. But what I was talking about, you will recall, Mr Cruz, was the exposure to damages by the Exchequer as a result of a failure to obtain or execute search warrants properly.</li> <li>Q. And just having allowed you to clarify that matter, can I ask you a question. Should Operation Delhi have been treated differently in constitutional terms because Mr Levy was a suspect, or because of the Hassans connection?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>A. It could come from below, as well as from above. There is a proposed Complaints Board, also, that is designed to deal with what you might call abuses of power by a uniformed officer.</li> <li>Q. Yes, there is. Moving on to Operation Delhi. Well before I do, you gave some evidence yesterday which I think is (I am sure inadvertently) incorrect, but perhaps we can address it. You mentioned a case, the Veralls and Miles case that has had a recent judgment. Now, this is a case that dealt with similar issues: tension between search warrants and production orders. You said it was before the Court of Appeal, are you aware that it was not? It was before the Supreme Court. You said it twice. Maybe you just did not read it.</li> <li>A. I believe that it was before the Court of Appeal; I still take that view. If you like, in the recess I will check and I will tell you whether it is or whether it isn't.</li> <li>Q. It is a judicial review to the Supreme</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	<ul> <li>validity of the warrant was not dismissed or in any way challenged. Well, it was challenged but it was not deemed to be unlawful. Are you aware of that?</li> <li>A. I've read the judgment, and I don't think it's helpful in the context of today that you carry out a viva examination of my understanding of my judgment, but you're right that the warrant is thrown out on its execution rather than its obtention, but the facts are completely different.</li> <li>Q. Right, thank you.</li> <li>A. But what I was talking about, you will recall, Mr Cruz, was the exposure to damages by the Exchequer as a result of a failure to obtain or execute search warrants properly.</li> <li>Q. And just having allowed you to clarify that matter, can I ask you a question. Should Operation Delhi have been treated differently in constitutional terms because Mr Levy was a suspect, or because of the Hassans connection?</li> <li>A. Of course not, and it wasn't.</li> </ul>

15 (Pages 57 to 60)

1	consider. The DPP	1	the police are the ones who need to decide
2	A. No, this Inquiry is constituted to consider	2	for themselves whether they're going to go
3	the circumstances leading to the early	3	down the route of a search warrant or a
4	retirement of Ian McGrail.	4	production order, but that they may of their
5	Q. Yes. Issue five is a matter that they will	5	own volition seek guidance in cases which
6	look at. The DPP on Friday 26th made clear	6	may be borderline cases, about whether they
7	the distinction between what were operation	7	should go down one route or another.
8	matters and prosecutorial matters, and he was	8	Q. Okay. Now
9	very clear about that. That was also, when	9	A. You do recall, Mr Cruz, that it was Mr
10	put to him, confirmed by the Attorney	10	McGrail who first raised the issue of a search
11	General. Do you accept that: the difference	11	warrant with me, and it wasn't the one
12	between prosecutorial matters and	12	Q. Yes.
13	operational matters?	13	A in relation to James Levy that he
14	A. As I as I've told the tribunal, I haven't	14	subsequently raised with me on 12 March.
15	had an opportunity to read all the transcripts	15	He raised with me the issue of the search
16	or watch all of the evidence, so you will find	16	warrant that is the one referred to in the case
17	it difficult if not impossible to persuade me to	17	that is either in the Court of Appeal or before
18	agree to something that I have not had the	18	the Chief Justice
19	opportunity to read or watch.	19	Q. Yes.
20	Q. Well, it is not a difficult question. Do	20	A that you were that you referred me to
21	you accept that there is a difference between	21	a minute ago.
22	operational matters and prosecutorial	22	Q. I am sorry to cut across you, but time is
23	matters?	23	very limited. Yesterday, on numerous
24	A. Just because a question might be difficult	24	occasions (and it is indeed in your witness
25	might not mean I would not be able to	25	statement) you made accusations that the
	Page 61		Page 63
1	answer it of course but what I'm saving to	1	RGP's investigation and its process was an
1 2	answer it, of course, but what I'm saying to	1	RGP's investigation and its process was an abuse flimsy evidence, improperly obtained
2	you is that you've asked me to agree to the	2	abuse, flimsy evidence, improperly obtained.
2 3	you is that you've asked me to agree to the things said by the DPP and the AG.	2 3	abuse, flimsy evidence, improperly obtained. Do you recall all that?
2 3 4	you is that you've asked me to agree to the things said by the DPP and the AG. Q. No	2 3 4	<ul><li>abuse, flimsy evidence, improperly obtained.</li><li>Do you recall all that?</li><li>A. I do.</li></ul>
2 3 4 5	you is that you've asked me to agree to the things said by the DPP and the AG. Q. No A. Of course there are differences between	2 3 4 5	<ul><li>abuse, flimsy evidence, improperly obtained.</li><li>Do you recall all that?</li><li>A. I do.</li><li>Q. Yes. Are you aware that the DPP and his</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>you is that you've asked me to agree to the things said by the DPP and the AG.</li> <li>Q. No</li> <li>A. Of course there are differences between operation matters and prosecutorial matters, I</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	<ul><li>abuse, flimsy evidence, improperly obtained.</li><li>Do you recall all that?</li><li>A. I do.</li><li>Q. Yes. Are you aware that the DPP and his assistant Mr Zamitt had an opportunity to</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>you is that you've asked me to agree to the things said by the DPP and the AG.</li> <li>Q. No</li> <li>A. Of course there are differences between operation matters and prosecutorial matters, I have always understood that.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul><li>abuse, flimsy evidence, improperly obtained.</li><li>Do you recall all that?</li><li>A. I do.</li><li>Q. Yes. Are you aware that the DPP and his assistant Mr Zamitt had an opportunity to consider the charging advice and the</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>you is that you've asked me to agree to the things said by the DPP and the AG.</li> <li>Q. No</li> <li>A. Of course there are differences between operation matters and prosecutorial matters, I have always understood that.</li> <li>Q. You have always understood that, good.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul><li>abuse, flimsy evidence, improperly obtained.</li><li>Do you recall all that?</li><li>A. I do.</li><li>Q. Yes. Are you aware that the DPP and his assistant Mr Zamitt had an opportunity to consider the charging advice and the information before they discussed the matter</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>you is that you've asked me to agree to the things said by the DPP and the AG.</li> <li>Q. No</li> <li>A. Of course there are differences between operation matters and prosecutorial matters, I have always understood that.</li> <li>Q. You have always understood that, good.</li> <li>A. What did you say, sorry?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>abuse, flimsy evidence, improperly obtained.</li> <li>Do you recall all that?</li> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. Yes. Are you aware that the DPP and his assistant Mr Zamitt had an opportunity to consider the charging advice and the information before they discussed the matter with the RGP on 8 April 2020?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>you is that you've asked me to agree to the things said by the DPP and the AG.</li> <li>Q. No</li> <li>A. Of course there are differences between operation matters and prosecutorial matters, I have always understood that.</li> <li>Q. You have always understood that, good.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>abuse, flimsy evidence, improperly obtained.</li> <li>Do you recall all that?</li> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. Yes. Are you aware that the DPP and his assistant Mr Zamitt had an opportunity to consider the charging advice and the information before they discussed the matter with the RGP on 8 April 2020?</li> <li>A. Well, I told you I have not had an</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>you is that you've asked me to agree to the things said by the DPP and the AG.</li> <li>Q. No</li> <li>A. Of course there are differences between operation matters and prosecutorial matters, I have always understood that.</li> <li>Q. You have always understood that, good.</li> <li>A. What did you say, sorry?</li> <li>Q. I said, "You have always understood that,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>abuse, flimsy evidence, improperly obtained.</li> <li>Do you recall all that?</li> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. Yes. Are you aware that the DPP and his assistant Mr Zamitt had an opportunity to consider the charging advice and the information before they discussed the matter with the RGP on 8 April 2020?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>you is that you've asked me to agree to the things said by the DPP and the AG.</li> <li>Q. No</li> <li>A. Of course there are differences between operation matters and prosecutorial matters, I have always understood that.</li> <li>Q. You have always understood that, good.</li> <li>A. What did you say, sorry?</li> <li>Q. I said, "You have always understood that, good."</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>abuse, flimsy evidence, improperly obtained.</li> <li>Do you recall all that?</li> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. Yes. Are you aware that the DPP and his assistant Mr Zamitt had an opportunity to consider the charging advice and the information before they discussed the matter with the RGP on 8 April 2020?</li> <li>A. Well, I told you I have not had an opportunity to see all of the evidence, to watch all of the evidence or read all of the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>you is that you've asked me to agree to the things said by the DPP and the AG.</li> <li>Q. No</li> <li>A. Of course there are differences between operation matters and prosecutorial matters, I have always understood that.</li> <li>Q. You have always understood that, good.</li> <li>A. What did you say, sorry?</li> <li>Q. I said, "You have always understood that, good."</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>abuse, flimsy evidence, improperly obtained.</li> <li>Do you recall all that?</li> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. Yes. Are you aware that the DPP and his assistant Mr Zamitt had an opportunity to consider the charging advice and the information before they discussed the matter with the RGP on 8 April 2020?</li> <li>A. Well, I told you I have not had an opportunity to see all of the evidence, to</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>you is that you've asked me to agree to the things said by the DPP and the AG.</li> <li>Q. No</li> <li>A. Of course there are differences between operation matters and prosecutorial matters, I have always understood that.</li> <li>Q. You have always understood that, good.</li> <li>A. What did you say, sorry?</li> <li>Q. I said, "You have always understood that, good."</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. The DPP explained that search warrants</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>abuse, flimsy evidence, improperly obtained.</li> <li>Do you recall all that?</li> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. Yes. Are you aware that the DPP and his assistant Mr Zamitt had an opportunity to consider the charging advice and the information before they discussed the matter with the RGP on 8 April 2020?</li> <li>A. Well, I told you I have not had an opportunity to see all of the evidence, to watch all of the evidence or read all of the evidence, but I have read the public reports</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>you is that you've asked me to agree to the things said by the DPP and the AG.</li> <li>Q. No</li> <li>A. Of course there are differences between operation matters and prosecutorial matters, I have always understood that.</li> <li>Q. You have always understood that, good.</li> <li>A. What did you say, sorry?</li> <li>Q. I said, "You have always understood that, good."</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. The DPP explained that search warrants and interviews under caution would fall</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>abuse, flimsy evidence, improperly obtained.</li> <li>Do you recall all that?</li> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. Yes. Are you aware that the DPP and his assistant Mr Zamitt had an opportunity to consider the charging advice and the information before they discussed the matter with the RGP on 8 April 2020?</li> <li>A. Well, I told you I have not had an opportunity to see all of the evidence, to watch all of the evidence or read all of the evidence, but I have read the public reports that there have been, and I am aware from</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>you is that you've asked me to agree to the things said by the DPP and the AG.</li> <li>Q. No</li> <li>A. Of course there are differences between operation matters and prosecutorial matters, I have always understood that.</li> <li>Q. You have always understood that, good.</li> <li>A. What did you say, sorry?</li> <li>Q. I said, "You have always understood that, good."</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. The DPP explained that search warrants and interviews under caution would fall under operational matters, would you agree</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>abuse, flimsy evidence, improperly obtained.</li> <li>Do you recall all that?</li> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. Yes. Are you aware that the DPP and his assistant Mr Zamitt had an opportunity to consider the charging advice and the information before they discussed the matter with the RGP on 8 April 2020?</li> <li>A. Well, I told you I have not had an opportunity to see all of the evidence, to watch all of the evidence or read all of the evidence, but I have read the public reports that there have been, and I am aware from the public reports that that is the case.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>you is that you've asked me to agree to the things said by the DPP and the AG.</li> <li>Q. No</li> <li>A. Of course there are differences between operation matters and prosecutorial matters, I have always understood that.</li> <li>Q. You have always understood that, good.</li> <li>A. What did you say, sorry?</li> <li>Q. I said, "You have always understood that, good."</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. The DPP explained that search warrants and interviews under caution would fall under operational matters, would you agree with that?</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ \end{array} $	<ul> <li>abuse, flimsy evidence, improperly obtained.</li> <li>Do you recall all that?</li> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. Yes. Are you aware that the DPP and his assistant Mr Zamitt had an opportunity to consider the charging advice and the information before they discussed the matter with the RGP on 8 April 2020?</li> <li>A. Well, I told you I have not had an opportunity to see all of the evidence, to watch all of the evidence or read all of the evidence, but I have read the public reports that there have been, and I am aware from the public reports that that is the case.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And the DPP described the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>you is that you've asked me to agree to the things said by the DPP and the AG.</li> <li>Q. No</li> <li>A. Of course there are differences between operation matters and prosecutorial matters, I have always understood that.</li> <li>Q. You have always understood that, good.</li> <li>A. What did you say, sorry?</li> <li>Q. I said, "You have always understood that, good."</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. The DPP explained that search warrants and interviews under caution would fall under operational matters, would you agree with that?</li> <li>A. Not because the DPP might say it,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>abuse, flimsy evidence, improperly obtained.</li> <li>Do you recall all that?</li> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. Yes. Are you aware that the DPP and his assistant Mr Zamitt had an opportunity to consider the charging advice and the information before they discussed the matter with the RGP on 8 April 2020?</li> <li>A. Well, I told you I have not had an opportunity to see all of the evidence, to watch all of the evidence or read all of the evidence, but I have read the public reports that there have been, and I am aware from the public reports that that is the case.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And the DPP described the investigation as thorough and good, and the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>you is that you've asked me to agree to the things said by the DPP and the AG.</li> <li>Q. No</li> <li>A. Of course there are differences between operation matters and prosecutorial matters, I have always understood that.</li> <li>Q. You have always understood that, good.</li> <li>A. What did you say, sorry?</li> <li>Q. I said, "You have always understood that, good."</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. The DPP explained that search warrants and interviews under caution would fall under operational matters, would you agree with that?</li> <li>A. Not because the DPP might say it, although I have a very high regard for him. I think we would all understand that it's set out clearly in Archibald.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>abuse, flimsy evidence, improperly obtained.</li> <li>Do you recall all that?</li> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. Yes. Are you aware that the DPP and his assistant Mr Zamitt had an opportunity to consider the charging advice and the information before they discussed the matter with the RGP on 8 April 2020?</li> <li>A. Well, I told you I have not had an opportunity to see all of the evidence, to watch all of the evidence or read all of the evidence, but I have read the public reports that there have been, and I am aware from the public reports that that is the case.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And the DPP described the investigation as thorough and good, and the officers as good officers. Any reason to</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>you is that you've asked me to agree to the things said by the DPP and the AG.</li> <li>Q. No</li> <li>A. Of course there are differences between operation matters and prosecutorial matters, I have always understood that.</li> <li>Q. You have always understood that, good.</li> <li>A. What did you say, sorry?</li> <li>Q. I said, "You have always understood that, good."</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. The DPP explained that search warrants and interviews under caution would fall under operational matters, would you agree with that?</li> <li>A. Not because the DPP might say it, although I have a very high regard for him. I think we would all understand that it's set out</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\end{array} $	<ul> <li>abuse, flimsy evidence, improperly obtained. Do you recall all that?</li> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. Yes. Are you aware that the DPP and his assistant Mr Zamitt had an opportunity to consider the charging advice and the information before they discussed the matter with the RGP on 8 April 2020?</li> <li>A. Well, I told you I have not had an opportunity to see all of the evidence, to watch all of the evidence or read all of the evidence, but I have read the public reports that there have been, and I am aware from the public reports that that is the case.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And the DPP described the investigation as thorough and good, and the officers as good officers. Any reason to disagree with that?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>you is that you've asked me to agree to the things said by the DPP and the AG.</li> <li>Q. No</li> <li>A. Of course there are differences between operation matters and prosecutorial matters, I have always understood that.</li> <li>Q. You have always understood that, good.</li> <li>A. What did you say, sorry?</li> <li>Q. I said, "You have always understood that, good."</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. The DPP explained that search warrants and interviews under caution would fall under operational matters, would you agree with that?</li> <li>A. Not because the DPP might say it, although I have a very high regard for him. I think we would all understand that it's set out clearly in Archibald.</li> <li>Q. Right. He said he would not dream of telling the police what to do because they</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	<ul> <li>abuse, flimsy evidence, improperly obtained.</li> <li>Do you recall all that?</li> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. Yes. Are you aware that the DPP and his assistant Mr Zamitt had an opportunity to consider the charging advice and the information before they discussed the matter with the RGP on 8 April 2020?</li> <li>A. Well, I told you I have not had an opportunity to see all of the evidence, to watch all of the evidence or read all of the evidence, but I have read the public reports that there have been, and I am aware from the public reports that that is the case.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And the DPP described the investigation as thorough and good, and the officers as good officers. Any reason to disagree with that?</li> <li>A. How could I disagree with somebody else's view of it being his view. Whether it might be my view or not would only be</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>you is that you've asked me to agree to the things said by the DPP and the AG.</li> <li>Q. No</li> <li>A. Of course there are differences between operation matters and prosecutorial matters, I have always understood that.</li> <li>Q. You have always understood that, good.</li> <li>A. What did you say, sorry?</li> <li>Q. I said, "You have always understood that, good."</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. The DPP explained that search warrants and interviews under caution would fall under operational matters, would you agree with that?</li> <li>A. Not because the DPP might say it, although I have a very high regard for him. I think we would all understand that it's set out clearly in Archibald.</li> <li>Q. Right. He said he would not dream of telling the police what to do because they would have the evidential knowledge.</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	<ul> <li>abuse, flimsy evidence, improperly obtained. Do you recall all that?</li> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. Yes. Are you aware that the DPP and his assistant Mr Zamitt had an opportunity to consider the charging advice and the information before they discussed the matter with the RGP on 8 April 2020?</li> <li>A. Well, I told you I have not had an opportunity to see all of the evidence, to watch all of the evidence or read all of the evidence, but I have read the public reports that there have been, and I am aware from the public reports that that is the case.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And the DPP described the investigation as thorough and good, and the officers as good officers. Any reason to disagree with that?</li> <li>A. How could I disagree with somebody else's view of it being his view. Whether it might be my view or not would only be possible once I had reviewed all of the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>you is that you've asked me to agree to the things said by the DPP and the AG.</li> <li>Q. No</li> <li>A. Of course there are differences between operation matters and prosecutorial matters, I have always understood that.</li> <li>Q. You have always understood that, good.</li> <li>A. What did you say, sorry?</li> <li>Q. I said, "You have always understood that, good."</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. The DPP explained that search warrants and interviews under caution would fall under operational matters, would you agree with that?</li> <li>A. Not because the DPP might say it, although I have a very high regard for him. I think we would all understand that it's set out clearly in Archibald.</li> <li>Q. Right. He said he would not dream of telling the police what to do because they would have the evidential knowledge.</li> <li>Would you agree with that?</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	<ul> <li>abuse, flimsy evidence, improperly obtained. Do you recall all that?</li> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. Yes. Are you aware that the DPP and his assistant Mr Zamitt had an opportunity to consider the charging advice and the information before they discussed the matter with the RGP on 8 April 2020?</li> <li>A. Well, I told you I have not had an opportunity to see all of the evidence, to watch all of the evidence or read all of the evidence, but I have read the public reports that there have been, and I am aware from the public reports that that is the case.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And the DPP described the investigation as thorough and good, and the officers as good officers. Any reason to disagree with that?</li> <li>A. How could I disagree with somebody else's view of it being his view. Whether it might be my view or not would only be possible once I had reviewed all of the evidence and given you my view.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>you is that you've asked me to agree to the things said by the DPP and the AG.</li> <li>Q. No</li> <li>A. Of course there are differences between operation matters and prosecutorial matters, I have always understood that.</li> <li>Q. You have always understood that, good.</li> <li>A. What did you say, sorry?</li> <li>Q. I said, "You have always understood that, good."</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. The DPP explained that search warrants and interviews under caution would fall under operational matters, would you agree with that?</li> <li>A. Not because the DPP might say it, although I have a very high regard for him. I think we would all understand that it's set out clearly in Archibald.</li> <li>Q. Right. He said he would not dream of telling the police what to do because they would have the evidential knowledge.</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	<ul> <li>abuse, flimsy evidence, improperly obtained.</li> <li>Do you recall all that?</li> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. Yes. Are you aware that the DPP and his assistant Mr Zamitt had an opportunity to consider the charging advice and the information before they discussed the matter with the RGP on 8 April 2020?</li> <li>A. Well, I told you I have not had an opportunity to see all of the evidence, to watch all of the evidence or read all of the evidence, but I have read the public reports that there have been, and I am aware from the public reports that that is the case.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And the DPP described the investigation as thorough and good, and the officers as good officers. Any reason to disagree with that?</li> <li>A. How could I disagree with somebody else's view of it being his view. Whether it might be my view or not would only be possible once I had reviewed all of the</li> </ul>

16 (Pages 61 to 64)

14       going with your questioning.       14       I've given detailed evidence of why I felt I         15       Q. Well, my questioning       15       had to act in that way and indeed I refer you again to the fact that in relation to a mother search warrant, in relation to a much more igain to the search warrant in the bar, Mr McGrail had seen fit to come and brief me himself         16       A. And secondly, I'd been referred by Mr       16       had to act in that way and indeed I refer you again to the fact that in relation to a mother search warrant, in relation to a much more ignino member of the bar, Mr McGrail had seen fit to come and brief me himself         19       you had no evidential basis to form a view on 20       12 May, is that correct?       20         21       A. No, you're wrong.       21       jurisdictional consequences for the execution of a search warrant in the context of a legal practitioner. So I         22       Q. You had evidence given to you?       22       of a search warrant in the context of a legal practitioner. So I         24       based on that evidence, it was based on my 24       Q. I understand that         25       view of how you would deal with an 25       A say that the evidence points against         26       Page 65       Page 67         1       individual who holds privileged material in 2       Q. I understand that and I am not suggesting 3         3       Q. Yees.       A of what was very likely to be an 3 </th <th></th> <th></th> <th>1</th> <th></th>			1	
3       Magistrate, the evidence?       3       Q is it not really what happened, you         4       A. When?       4       were upset about a close friend being         5       Q. At any stage before 12 May.       5       uncomfortably disturbed and actually,         6       A. Of course not.       6       without any evidence, without information,         7       Q. You had not?       7       you took it upon yourself to question         8       A. No, but I had been referred by Mr       8       something which you had no evidential         9       McGrail to another search warrant that they       9       knowledge on? Is that not really what this respect         11       Q. Yes.       11       A. Absolutely not. That a friend might be         12       A. You might think that that was a little       12       irrelevant to my consideration in this respect         12       Q. Yes.       11       had to act in that way and indeed I refer you again to the fact that in relation to a much more         13       Ye you had no vidential basis to form a view on       10       again to the bar, Mr McGrail had seen fit no others, unless you had vidence, it was based on my         12       A. No, you're wrong.       12       jurior member of the bar, Mr McGrail had material in         2       Q. You had evidence, it was based on my       12	1	given by the DPP, or Mr Zamitt, or Mr	1	that you cannot necessarily control
4       A. When?       4       were upset about a close friend being         5       Q. At any stage before 12 May.       5       uncomfortably disturbed and actually,         6       A. Of course not.       6       without any evidence, without information,         7       Q. You had not?       7       9       wore going to be dealing with.       6         9       McGrail to another search warrant that they       10       happened?       1         10       Q. Yes.       11       Q. Yes.       14       A. Absolutely not. That a friend might be         11       Q. Yes.       11       A. You might think that that was a little       12       12       A. Absolutely not. That a friend might be         12       A. You might think that that was a little       12       12       a. Absolutely not. That a friend might be         11       Q. Yes.       14       A. And secondly, I'd been referred by Mr       15       had to act in that way and indeed I refer you         12       A. And secondly, I'd been referred by Mr       16       again to the fact that in relation to a much more         12       McGrail to this search warrant on 12 May.       is that correct?       10       because he understood the potential         12       Ma, is that correct?       12       because he understodo t	2	Richardson, or Mr Wyan, or the Stipendiary	2	A. Mm.
5       Q. At any stage before 12 May.       5       uncomfortably disturbed and actually,         6       A. Of course not.       6       without any evidence, without information,         7       Q. You had not?       6       without any evidence, without information,         9       McGrail to another search warrant that they       6       without any evidence, without information,         9       McGrail to another search warrant that they       9       something which you had no evidential         10       Q. Yes.       10       happened?         11       Q. Yes.       11       A. You might think that that was a little       12         12       A. You might think that that was a little       12       12       A. Absolutely not. That a friend might be         13       remarkable, given where you seem to be       14       I've given detailed evidence of why I fel I         14       I've given detailed evidence of why I fel I       14       I've given detailed evidence of why I fel I         16       A. And secondly, I'd been referred by Mr       16       again to the fact that in relation to another         17       McGrail to this search warrant on 12 May.       18       junior member of the bar, Mr McGrail had         19       you had vidence given to you?       22       A. I had a view, and the view I had w	3	Magistrate, the evidence?	3	Q is it not really what happened, you
6       A. Of course not.       6       without any evidence, without information,         7       Q. You had not?       something which you had no evidential         8       A. No, but I had been referred by Mr       something which you had no evidential         9       McGrait to a nother search warrant that they       something which you had no evidential         10       Q. Yes.       11       A. No but I had been referred by Mr         11       Q. Yes.       11       A. Absolutely not. That a friend might be         12       A. You might think that that was a little       11       nemofortably disturbed is absolutely         13       remarkable, given where you seem to be       13       irrelevant to my consideration in this respect         14       going with your questioning.       14       I've given detailed evidence of why I felt I         15       A. Adsecondly, I'd been referred by Mr       16       again to the fact that in relation to a much more         17       McGrait to nis search warrant on 12 May.       18       juinor member of the bar, Mr McGrait had         16       again to the fact that in relation to a much more       19       seen fit to come and brief me himself         20       You had evidence given to you?       23       A. I had a view, and the view I had was not       24       Q. I understand that?	4	A. When?	4	were upset about a close friend being
7       Q. You had not?       7       you took it upon yourself to question         8       A. No, but I had been referred by Mr       8       something which you had no evidential         9       McGrail to another search warrant that they       10       were going to be dealing with.       10         10       were going to be dealing with.       10       happened?         11       Q. Yes.       10       happened?         12       A. You might think that that was a little       11       irrelevant to my consideration in this respect         13       grean dusting of the backing with, your questioning.       14       14       12 ve given detailed evidence of why I felt I         14       Devel, my questioning       16       A. And secondly, I'd been referred by Mr       16       again to the fact that in relation to another         17       McGrail to this search warrant on 12 May.       18       juior member of the bar, Mr McGrail had         19       you had evidence given to you?       20       is that correct?       20         23       A. I had a view, and the view I had was not       23       practitioner. So I -       24         24       Dased on that evidence, it was based on my       25       you are filbustering, but we do need to         25       view of how you would deal with an </td <td>5</td> <td>Q. At any stage before 12 May.</td> <td>5</td> <td>uncomfortably disturbed and actually,</td>	5	Q. At any stage before 12 May.	5	uncomfortably disturbed and actually,
8       A. No, but I had been referred by Mr       8       something which you had no evidential         9       McGrail to another search warrant that they       8       something which you had no evidential         10       were going to be dealing with.       10       happened?         11       Q. Yes.       A. Absolutely not. That a friend might be         12       A. You might think that that was a little       12         13       remarkable, given where you seem to be       13       irrelevant to my consideration in this respect         14       going with your questioning       16       A. And secondly, I'd been referred by Mr       16       again to the fact that in relation to another         17       McGrail to this search warrant on 12 May.       17       search warrant, in relation to another         18       Q. Yes. So, my questioning is very simple:       18       jurisdictional consequences for the execution         10       12 May, is that correct?       20       because he understood the potential       jurisdictional consequences for the execution         21       A. No, you're wrong.       21       jurisdictional consequences for the execution         22       Q. You had evidence given to you?       22       a search warrant in the context of a legal         23       A. I hada a view, and the view I had was not	6	A. Of course not.	6	without any evidence, without information,
9       McGrail to another search warrant that they       9       knowledge on? Is that not really what         10       were going to be dealing with.       10       happened?         11       Q. Yes.       11       A. Absolutely not. That a friend might be         12       A. You might think that that was a little       12       uncomfortably disturbed is absolutely         13       remarkable, given where you seem to be       14       pregiong with your questioning.         14       going with your questioning.       14       Ive given detailed evidence of why I felt I         15       A. And secondly, I'd been referred by Mr       16       again to the fact that in relation to another         17       McGrail to this search warrant on 12 May.       17       search warrant, in relation to a much more         19       you had no evidential basis to form a view on       19       seen fit to come and brief me himself         20       No, you're wrong.       21       jurisdictional consequences for the execution         22       Q. You had evidence, it was based on my       24       Dased on that evidence, it was based on my       24         25       view of how you would deal with an       25       A say that the evidence points against         26       Page 65       Page 67         1       in	7	Q. You had not?	7	you took it upon yourself to question
10       were going to be dealing with.       10       happened?         11       Q. Yes.       A. You might think that that was a little       11         12       A. You might think that that was a little       12       A. Absolutely not. That a friend might be         13       remarkable, given where you seem to be       13       irrelevant to my consideration in this respect         14       going with your questioning.       14       Fve given detailed evidence of why I felt I         15       Q. Well, my questioning       15       had to act in that way and indeed I refer you again to the fact that in relation to anuch more import to a much more import to a nuch more import to a much more import to a search warrant in relation to a much more import to a search warrant import to a much more import to a search warrant import to a legal practitioner. So I -         23       A. I had a view, and the view I had was not a mate import wore given to you?       24       Decause he understood the potential import import wore given to you?         24       based on that evidence, it was based on my view of how you	8	A. No, but I had been referred by Mr	8	something which you had no evidential
11       Q. Yes.       11       A. Absolutely not. That a friend might be         12       A. You might think that that was a little       12       uncomfortably disturbed is absolutely         13       remarkable, given where you seem to be       13       irrelevant to my consideration in this respect         14       going with your questioning.       14       I've given detailed evidence of why I felt I         15       Q. Well, my questioning       16       A. And secondly, I'd been referred by Mr       16         16       A. And secondly, I'd been referred by Mr       16       again to the fact that in relation to a mother         17       McGrail to this search warrant on 12 May.       17       search warrant, in relation to a much more         19       you had no evidential basis to form a view on       19       seen fit to come and brief me himself         20       12 May, is that correct?       20       because he understood the potential       jurisdictional consequences for the execution         21       A. I had a view, and the view I had was not       23       practifioner. So I         24       based on that evidence, it was based on my       24       Q. I understand that         25       view of how you would deal with an       25       A say that the evidence points against         26       relation to	9	McGrail to another search warrant that they	9	knowledge on? Is that not really what
12       A. You might think that that was a little       12       uncomfortably disturbed is absolutely         13       remarkable, given where you seem to be       13       irrelevant to my consideration in this respect         14       going with your questioning.       14       17e given detailed evidence of why I felt I         15       Q. Well, my questioning       15       had to act in that way and indeed I refer you         16       A. And secondly, I'd been referred by Mr       16       again to the fact that in relation to a moth more         17       McGrail to this search warrant on 12 May.       18       guinto member of the bar, Mr McGrail had         19       you had no evidential basis to form a view on       19       seen fit to come and brief me himself         20       12 May, is that correct?       20       because he understood the potential         21       A. No, you're wrong.       21       jurisdictional consequences for the execution         23       A. I had a view, and the view I had was not       23       practitioner. So I         24       based on that evidence, it was based on my       24       Q. I understand that         25       view of how you would deal with an       25       Page 67         26       Page 67       20       Jurderstand that al I am not suggesting <tr< td=""><td>10</td><td>were going to be dealing with.</td><td>10</td><td>happened?</td></tr<>	10	were going to be dealing with.	10	happened?
13       remarkable, given where you seem to be       13       irrelevant to my consideration in this respect         14       going with your questioning.       14       I've given detailed evidence of why I felt I         15       Q. Well, my questioning       15       had to act in that way and indeed I refer you again to the fact that in relation to another         17       McGrail to this search warrant on 12 May.       16       again to the fact that in relation to another         18       Q. Yes. So, my questioning is very simple:       18       junior member of the bar, Mr McGrail had         20       12 May, is that correct?       20       because he understood the potential         21       A. No, you're wrong.       21       jurisdictional consequences for the execution         22       Q. You had evidence given to you?       22       practitioner. So I         23       A. I had a view, and the view I had was not       23       practition to others, unless you had evidence         25       view of how you would deal with an       25       Q. I understand that         24       A of what was very likely to be an       1       what you are proposing.         3       questand that, and       2       Q. I understand that and I am not suggesting you are filibustering, but we do need to progress and I only have a few minutes.	11	Q. Yes.	11	A. Absolutely not. That a friend might be
14       going with your questioning.       14       I've given detailed evidence of why I felt I         15       Q. Well, my questioning       15       had to act in that way and indeed I refer you again to the fact that in relation to a mother search warrant, in relation to a much more search warrant, in relation to a much more ipunor member of the bar, Mr McGrail had         16       A. And secondly, I'd been referred by Mr       16       had to act in that way and indeed I refer you again to the fact that in relation to a mother search warrant, in relation to a much more ipunor member of the bar, Mr McGrail had         19       you had no evidential basis to form a view on       19       seen fit to come and brief me himself         20       I2 May, is that correct?       20       because he understood the potential         21       A. No, you're wrong.       21       jurisdictional consequences for the execution         22       Q. You had evidence given to you?       22       of a search warrant in the context of a legal         23       A. I had a view, and the view I had was not       23       practitioner. So I         24       based on that evidence, it was based on my       24       Q. I understand that         25       view of how you would deal with an       25       A say that the evidence points against         26       Page 65       Page 67         1       individual who holds pri	12	A. You might think that that was a little	12	uncomfortably disturbed is absolutely
15       Q. Well, my questioning       15       had to act in that way and indeed I refer you again to the fact that in relation to another search warrant on 12 May.         16       A. And secondly, I'd been referred by Mr       16         17       McGrail to this search warrant on 12 May.       17         18       Q. Yes. So, my questioning is very simple:       18         19       you had no evidential basis to form a view on       19         20       12 May, is that correct?       20         21       A. No, you're wrong.       21         22       Q. You had evidence given to you?       22         23       A. I had a view, and the view I had was not       23         24       based on that evidence, it was based on my       24         25       view of how you would deal with an       25         26       Page 65       Page 67         1       individual who holds privileged material in       1       what you are proposing.         2       Q. Yes.       3       Q. I understand that and I am not suggesting you are filbustering, but we do need to progress and I only have a few minutes.         3       A of what was very likely to be an attempt to destroy (inaudible).       5       A. All I am trying to do is give full answers         6       Q. I understand that, and       6	13	remarkable, given where you seem to be	13	irrelevant to my consideration in this respect.
16A. And secondly, I'd been referred by Mr16again to the fact that in relation to another17McGrail to this search warrant on 12 May.17search warrant, in relation to a much more18Q. Yes. So, my questioning is very simple:18junior member of the bar, Mr McGrail had19you had no evidential basis to form a view on19seen fit to come and brief me himself2012 May, is that correct?20because he understood the potential21A. No, you're wrong.21jurisdictional consequences for the execution22Q. You had evidence given to you?2223A. I had a view, and the view I had was not2324based on that evidence, it was based on my2425view of how you would deal with an2526Page 65Page 671individual who holds privileged material in12relation to others, unless you had evidence23Q. Yes.3you are filibustering, but we do need to4A of what was very likely to be an45attempt to destroy (inaudible).56Q. I understand that, and67A. I say so with respect: the little I have8been able to see points me to bable to say9the things that I've said, because although I9the things that I've said, because although I10didn't have that evidence before 12 May11(which is when you've asked me the12question) I have	14	going with your questioning.	14	I've given detailed evidence of why I felt I
17McGrail to this search warrant on 12 May.17search warrant, in relation to a much more18Q. Yes. So, my questioning is very simple:18iunior member of the bar, Mr McGrail had19you had no evidential basis to form a view on19seen fit to come and brief me himself2012 May, is that correct?20because he understood the potential21A. No, you're wrong.21jurisdictional consequences for the execution22Q. You had evidence given to you?22of a search warrant in the context of a legal23A. I had a view, and the view I had was not23practitioner. So I24based on that evidence, it was based on my24Q. I understand that25view of how you would deal with an25A say that the evidence points against26Page 65Page 671individual who holds privileged material in1what you are proposing.3Q. Yes.3you are filibustering, but we do need to4A of what was very likely to be an4progress and I only have a few minutes.5attempt to destroy (inaudible).5A. All I am trying to do is give full answer:6Q. I understand that, and7A. I say so with respect: the little I have7A. I say so with respect: the little I have8won't be able to give you the this is9the things that I've said, because although I9an inquiry, it is not a trial.10didn't have that evidence before 12 May	15	Q. Well, my questioning	15	had to act in that way and indeed I refer you
18Q. Yes. So, my questioning is very simple:18junior member of the bar, Mr McGrail had seen fit to come and brief me himself19you had no evidential basis to form a view on19seen fit to come and brief me himself2012 May, is that correct?20because he understood the potential21A. No, you're wrong.21jurisdictional consequences for the execution22Q. You had evidence given to you?22of a search warrant in the context of a legal23A. I had a view, and the view I had was not23practitioner. So I -24based on that evidence, it was based on my24Q. I understand that25view of how you would deal with an25A say that the evidence points against26Page 65Page 671individual who holds privileged material in 21what you are proposing.2Q. Yes.3you are filibustering, but we do need to progress and I only have a few minutes.3attempt to destroy (inaudible).5A. All I am trying to do is give full answers6Q. I understand that, and6Q. Yes.7A. I say so with respect: the little I have 8888been able to see points me to be able to say 9949the things that I've said, because although I 1091010didn't have that evidence before 12 May10Q. I understand that. Given that the operational control was vested in the police, you have accepted that, given you had no <td>16</td> <td>A. And secondly, I'd been referred by Mr</td> <td>16</td> <td>again to the fact that in relation to another</td>	16	A. And secondly, I'd been referred by Mr	16	again to the fact that in relation to another
19you had no evidential basis to form a view on 12 May, is that correct?19seen fit to come and brief me himself because he understood the potential jurisdictional consequences for the execution of a search warrant in the context of a legal practitioner. So I21A. No, you're wrong.21jurisdictional consequences for the execution of a search warrant in the context of a legal practitioner. So I23A. I had a view, and the view I had was not based on that evidence, it was based on my view of how you would deal with an2324based on that evidence, it was based on my view of how you would deal with an2425view of how you would deal with an2526Page 65Page 671individual who holds privileged material in 212relation to others, unless you had evidence 32Q. I understand that and I am not suggesting you are filibustering, but we do need to progress and I only have a few minutes.5attempt to destroy (inaudible).5A. All I am trying to do is give full answers6Q. I understand that, and7A. I say so with respect: the little I have 888been able to see points me to be able to say 9910Q. I understand that. Given that the operational control was vested in the police, you have accepted that, given you had no10didn't have that evidence before 12 May10Q. I understand that. Given you had no11(which is when you've asked me the 1110operational control was vested in the police, you have accepted that, given you h	17	McGrail to this search warrant on 12 May.	17	search warrant, in relation to a much more
2012 May, is that correct?20because he understood the potential21A. No, you're wrong.21jurisdictional consequences for the execution22Q. You had evidence given to you?22of a search warrant in the context of a legal23A. I had a view, and the view I had was not23practitioner. So I24based on that evidence, it was based on my24Q. I understand that25view of how you would deal with an25A say that the evidence points againstPage 65Page 671individual who holds privileged material in2relation to others, unless you had evidence23Q. Yes.3you are filibustering, but we do need to4A of what was very likely to be an4progress and I only have a few minutes.5attempt to destroy (inaudible).5A. All I am trying to do is give full answers6Q. I understand that, and7A. I say so with respect: the little I have8been able to see points me to be able to say8won't be able to give you the this is9the things that I've said, because although I9an inquiry, it is not a trial.10didn't have that evidence before 12 May10Q. I understand that. Given that the11(which is when you've asked me the11operational control was vested in the police,12you have ascepted that, given you had no12	18		1	-
21A. No, you're wrong.21jurisdictional consequences for the execution22Q. You had evidence given to you?22of a search warrant in the context of a legal23A. I had a view, and the view I had was not2324based on that evidence, it was based on my2425view of how you would deal with an2426Page 65Q. I understand that27Page 65Page 671individual who holds privileged material in22Q. Yes.33Q. Yes.34A of what was very likely to be an45attempt to destroy (inaudible).56Q. I understand that, and67A. I say so with respect: the little I have88been able to see points me to be able to say99the things that I've said, because although I910didn't have that evidence before 12 May1011(which is when you've asked me the1112question) I have seen it now12	19		1	seen fit to come and brief me himself
22Q. You had evidence given to you?22of a search warrant in the context of a legal practitioner. So I23A. I had a view, and the view I had was not based on that evidence, it was based on my 2523of a search warrant in the context of a legal practitioner. So I24based on that evidence, it was based on my 2524Q. I understand that25view of how you would deal with an Page 6525A say that the evidence points against26Page 65Page 671individual who holds privileged material in 21what you are proposing.2Q. Yes.2Q. I understand that and I am not suggesting you are filibustering, but we do need to progress and I only have a few minutes.3Q. Yes.5A. All I am trying to do is give full answers6Q. I understand that, and6Q. Yes.7A. I say so with respect: the little I have 88won't be able to give you the this is an inquiry, it is not a trial.10didn't have that evidence before 12 May 1110Q. I understand that. Given that the operational control was vested in the police, you have accepted that, given you had no	20	12 May, is that correct?	20	because he understood the potential
23       A. I had a view, and the view I had was not       23       practitioner. So I         24       based on that evidence, it was based on my       24       Q. I understand that         25       view of how you would deal with an       25       A say that the evidence points against         25       Page 65       Page 67         1       individual who holds privileged material in       1       what you are proposing.         2       relation to others, unless you had evidence       2       Q. I understand that and I am not suggesting         3       Q. Yes.       3       you are filibustering, but we do need to         4       A of what was very likely to be an       4       progress and I only have a few minutes.         5       attempt to destroy (inaudible).       5       A. All I am trying to do is give full answers         6       Q. I understand that, and       6       Q. Yes.         7       A. I say so with respect: the little I have       7       A. If you want me to answer yes or no I         8       been able to see points me to be able to say       9       an inquiry, it is not a trial.         10       didn't have that evidence before 12 May       10       Q. I understand that. Given that the         11       (which is when you've asked me the       11	21	A. No, you're wrong.	21	jurisdictional consequences for the execution
24       based on that evidence, it was based on my       24       Q. I understand that         25       view of how you would deal with an       25       A say that the evidence points against         25       Page 65       Page 67         1       individual who holds privileged material in       1       what you are proposing.         2       relation to others, unless you had evidence       2       Q. I understand that and I am not suggesting         3       Q. Yes.       3       you are filibustering, but we do need to         4       A of what was very likely to be an       4       progress and I only have a few minutes.         5       attempt to destroy (inaudible).       5       A. All I am trying to do is give full answers         6       Q. I understand that, and       6       Q. Yes.         7       A. I say so with respect: the little I have       7       A. If you want me to answer yes or no I         8       been able to see points me to be able to say       9       an inquiry, it is not a trial.         10       didn't have that evidence before 12 May       10       Q. I understand that. Given that the         11       (which is when you've asked me the       11       operational control was vested in the police,         12       question) I have seen it now       <	22	Q. You had evidence given to you?	22	of a search warrant in the context of a legal
25       view of how you would deal with an       25       A say that the evidence points against         Page 65       Page 67         1       individual who holds privileged material in       1       what you are proposing.         2       relation to others, unless you had evidence       2       Q. I understand that and I am not suggesting         3       Q. Yes.       3       you are filibustering, but we do need to         4       A of what was very likely to be an       4       progress and I only have a few minutes.         5       attempt to destroy (inaudible).       5       A. All I am trying to do is give full answers         6       Q. I understand that, and       6       Q. Yes.         7       A. I say so with respect: the little I have       7       A. If you want me to answer yes or no I         8       been able to see points me to be able to say       9       an inquiry, it is not a trial.         10       didn't have that evidence before 12 May       10       Q. I understand that. Given that the         11       (which is when you've asked me the       11       operational control was vested in the police,         12       question) I have seen it now       12       you have accepted that, given you had no	23	A. I had a view, and the view I had was not	23	practitioner. So I
Page 65Page 671individual who holds privileged material in 21what you are proposing. 22relation to others, unless you had evidence 32Q. I understand that and I am not suggesting 33Q. Yes.3you are filibustering, but we do need to 44A of what was very likely to be an 54progress and I only have a few minutes.5attempt to destroy (inaudible).5A. All I am trying to do is give full answers6Q. I understand that, and6Q. Yes.7A. I say so with respect: the little I have 88won't be able to give you the this is 99the things that I've said, because although I 109an inquiry, it is not a trial.10didn't have that evidence before 12 May 1110Q. I understand that. Given that the operational control was vested in the police, 1212question) I have seen it now12you have accepted that, given you had no	24	based on that evidence, it was based on my	24	Q. I understand that
1individual who holds privileged material in 21what you are proposing.2relation to others, unless you had evidence 32Q. I understand that and I am not suggesting you are filibustering, but we do need to3Q. Yes.3you are filibustering, but we do need to4A of what was very likely to be an 54progress and I only have a few minutes.5attempt to destroy (inaudible).5A. All I am trying to do is give full answers6Q. I understand that, and6Q. Yes.7A. I say so with respect: the little I have7A. If you want me to answer yes or no I8been able to see points me to be able to say8won't be able to give you the this is9the things that I've said, because although I 109an inquiry, it is not a trial.10didn't have that evidence before 12 May10Q. I understand that. Given that the operational control was vested in the police, you have accepted that, given you had no	25	view of how you would deal with an	25	A say that the evidence points against
1individual who holds privileged material in 21what you are proposing.2relation to others, unless you had evidence 32Q. I understand that and I am not suggesting you are filibustering, but we do need to3Q. Yes.3you are filibustering, but we do need to4A of what was very likely to be an 54Progress and I only have a few minutes.5attempt to destroy (inaudible).5A. All I am trying to do is give full answers6Q. I understand that, and6Q. Yes.7A. I say so with respect: the little I have7A. If you want me to answer yes or no I8been able to see points me to be able to say8won't be able to give you the this is9the things that I've said, because although I 109an inquiry, it is not a trial.10didn't have that evidence before 12 May10Q. I understand that. Given that the operational control was vested in the police, you have accepted that, given you had no	1	D (5		D (7
2relation to others, unless you had evidence2Q. I understand that and I am not suggesting3Q. Yes.3you are filibustering, but we do need to4A of what was very likely to be an4progress and I only have a few minutes.5attempt to destroy (inaudible).5A. All I am trying to do is give full answers6Q. I understand that, and6Q. Yes.7A. I say so with respect: the little I have7A. If you want me to answer yes or no I8been able to see points me to be able to say8won't be able to give you the this is9the things that I've said, because although I9an inquiry, it is not a trial.10didn't have that evidence before 12 May10Q. I understand that. Given that the12question) I have seen it now12you have accepted that, given you had no		Page 65	<u> </u>	Page 67
2relation to others, unless you had evidence2Q. I understand that and I am not suggesting3Q. Yes.3you are filibustering, but we do need to4A of what was very likely to be an4progress and I only have a few minutes.5attempt to destroy (inaudible).5A. All I am trying to do is give full answers6Q. I understand that, and6Q. Yes.7A. I say so with respect: the little I have7A. If you want me to answer yes or no I8been able to see points me to be able to say8won't be able to give you the this is9the things that I've said, because although I9an inquiry, it is not a trial.10didn't have that evidence before 12 May10Q. I understand that. Given that the12question) I have seen it now12you have accepted that, given you had no	1	individual who holds privileged material in	1	what you are proposing
3Q. Yes.3you are filibustering, but we do need to4A of what was very likely to be an4progress and I only have a few minutes.5attempt to destroy (inaudible).5A. All I am trying to do is give full answers6Q. I understand that, and6Q. Yes.7A. I say so with respect: the little I have7A. If you want me to answer yes or no I8been able to see points me to be able to say8won't be able to give you the this is9the things that I've said, because although I9an inquiry, it is not a trial.10didn't have that evidence before 12 May10Q. I understand that. Given that the12question) I have seen it now12you have accepted that, given you had no			1	
4A of what was very likely to be an4progress and I only have a few minutes.5attempt to destroy (inaudible).5A. All I am trying to do is give full answers6Q. I understand that, and6Q. Yes.7A. I say so with respect: the little I have7A. If you want me to answer yes or no I8been able to see points me to be able to say8won't be able to give you the this is9the things that I've said, because although I9an inquiry, it is not a trial.10didn't have that evidence before 12 May10Q. I understand that. Given that the11(which is when you've asked me the11operational control was vested in the police,12question) I have seen it now12you have accepted that, given you had no		-		
5attempt to destroy (inaudible).5A. All I am trying to do is give full answers6Q. I understand that, and6Q. Yes.7A. I say so with respect: the little I have7A. If you want me to answer yes or no I8been able to see points me to be able to say8won't be able to give you the this is9the things that I've said, because although I9an inquiry, it is not a trial.10didn't have that evidence before 12 May10Q. I understand that. Given that the12question) I have seen it now12you have accepted that, given you had no			1	
6Q. I understand that, and6Q. Yes.7A. I say so with respect: the little I have7A. If you want me to answer yes or no I8been able to see points me to be able to say8won't be able to give you the this is9the things that I've said, because although I9an inquiry, it is not a trial.10didn't have that evidence before 12 May10Q. I understand that. Given that the11(which is when you've asked me the11operational control was vested in the police,12question) I have seen it now12you have accepted that, given you had no			1	
7A. I say so with respect: the little I have7A. If you want me to answer yes or no I8been able to see points me to be able to say8won't be able to give you the this is9the things that I've said, because although I9an inquiry, it is not a trial.10didn't have that evidence before 12 May10Q. I understand that. Given that the11(which is when you've asked me the11operational control was vested in the police,12question) I have seen it now12you have accepted that, given you had no				• • •
8been able to see points me to be able to say8won't be able to give you the this is9the things that I've said, because although I9an inquiry, it is not a trial.10didn't have that evidence before 12 May10Q. I understand that. Given that the11(which is when you've asked me the11operational control was vested in the police,12question) I have seen it now12you have accepted that, given you had no		-	1	
9the things that I've said, because although I9an inquiry, it is not a trial.10didn't have that evidence before 12 May10Q. I understand that. Given that the11(which is when you've asked me the11operational control was vested in the police,12question) I have seen it now12you have accepted that, given you had no				•
10didn't have that evidence before 12 May10Q. I understand that. Given that the11(which is when you've asked me the11operational control was vested in the police,12question) I have seen it now12you have accepted that, given you had no		· · ·		
11(which is when you've asked me the11operational control was vested in the police,12question) I have seen it now12you have accepted that, given you had no			1	
12 question) I have seen it now 12 you have accepted that, given you had no			1	-
		· ·	1	
1.5 Q. 165. [15] Evidential knowledge, you have accepted	13	Q. Yes.	13	evidential knowledge, you have accepted
14 A and that's why I've reached the 14 that, even if you had concerns, really was it		-		• • •
15 <b>conclusions: to share my view, now</b> 15 your business to get involved?		•	1	
16 Q. Now. 16 A. Was it my		-	1	-
17 A based on what was available. 17 Q. Your business to get involved?			1	•
18 Q. I am just talking about 12 May. Mr 18 A. Was it my business to receive			1	-
19 Picardo, on the basis of your evidence 19 a WhatsApp telling me? I mean, if I had				-
20 A. On 12 May, Mr Cruz, I didn't say to Mr 20 been told by			1	
21 McGrail: you didn't have evidence, you 21 Q. On a reputational basis alone you would				•
22 didn't have this. I've said that here. 22 say it is your business.		•	1	
23 (11.10) 23 A. On a what?				• •
24 Q. On 12 May when you get the WhatsApp 24 Q. On the reputational basis that you have			1	
25 you said yesterday that anger is an emotion 25 just alluded to you would say it is your			1	
	I			
Page 66 Page 68		Page 66		Page 68

Epiq Europe Ltd +44 (0) 207 404 1400 17 (Pages 65 to 68)

1	business.	1	way that you demonstrate that what you are
2	A. That's exactly the point, Mr Cruz. That's	2	saying is wholly incorrect is by using the
3	exactly the point.	3	characterisation that you have used in the
4	SIR PETER CARUANA: (Inaudible)	4	context of Dr Britto's in my view absolutely
5	arguing with the witness or asking questions	5	appropriate reference to the respect that he
6	and give him an opportunity to answer, but	6	has to the office of Governor, we should all
7	he cannot really do both.	7	have, and the respect that he has to the office
8	THE CHAIRMAN: No, I agree.	8	of Chief Minister, which everyone should
9	MR CRUZ: Understood. Yesterday you	9	have, and I have myself, because these are
10	said to the chairman in an exchange that you	10	important constitutional officers of state in
11	were not sure if Mr Levy was a suspect. But	11	Gibraltar. Far from being an assailant in
12	at the same time earlier you had said that	12	respect of the rule of law, I have made it one
13	when you realised it was a search warrant it	13	of my purposes to defend the rule of law in
14	had to be a suspect. Now, you were then	14	Gibraltar and to ensure that Gibraltar is
15	asked whether it was inappropriate if you had	15	a place that stands out as a beacon of the
16	known he was a suspect. I see that as	16	defence of the rule of law. So I don't accept
17	an inconsistent position. If you had	17	what you have said for one moment.
18	understood by the 12th, whether it had been	18	Q. Understood. One last point of
19	the WhatsApp or the subsequent meeting	19	clarification. You said yesterday that
20	with Mr McGrail or the conversation with	20	information in terms of the investigation that
21	Mr Levy, that it was a suspect, then given	21	the RGP refused to provide you with
22	your answer to the chairman, was it not	22	information. Just for your information, are
23	entirely inappropriate everything else you did	23	you aware that it was the DPP who refused
24	after that?	24	that information to be provided and actually
25	A. There was a lot of inconsistency in this	25	RGP were very happy for that information to
	·		·
	Page 69		Page 71
1		1	1 1.10
1	also on the part of the RGP. For example,	1	be provided?
2	the reference was to Mr Levy's search	2	A. In what case, Mr Cruz?
2 3	the reference was to Mr Levy's search warrant being obtained in the context of	2 3	<ul><li>A. In what case, Mr Cruz?</li><li>Q. We talked yesterday about the issue of</li></ul>
2 3 4	the reference was to Mr Levy's search warrant being obtained in the context of a case that does not name him as a defendant.	2 3 4	<ul><li>A. In what case, Mr Cruz?</li><li>Q. We talked yesterday about the issue of Mr Sanchez and the request for information</li></ul>
2 3 4 5	the reference was to Mr Levy's search warrant being obtained in the context of a case that does not name him as a defendant. If you are a suspect you are going to become	2 3 4 5	<ul><li>A. In what case, Mr Cruz?</li><li>Q. We talked yesterday about the issue of Mr Sanchez and the request for information and you suggested yesterday that the RGP</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6	the reference was to Mr Levy's search warrant being obtained in the context of a case that does not name him as a defendant. If you are a suspect you are going to become a defendant. So it is also of course possible	2 3 4 5 6	A. In what case, Mr Cruz? Q. We talked yesterday about the issue of Mr Sanchez and the request for information and you suggested yesterday that the RGP had refused to produce evidence. And I am
2 3 4 5 6 7	the reference was to Mr Levy's search warrant being obtained in the context of a case that does not name him as a defendant. If you are a suspect you are going to become a defendant. So it is also of course possible to execute search warrants against	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>A. In what case, Mr Cruz?</li> <li>Q. We talked yesterday about the issue of Mr Sanchez and the request for information and you suggested yesterday that the RGP had refused to produce evidence. And I am explaining to you that in fact the RGP did not</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	the reference was to Mr Levy's search warrant being obtained in the context of a case that does not name him as a defendant. If you are a suspect you are going to become a defendant. So it is also of course possible to execute search warrants against individuals to obtain evidence from them in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A. In what case, Mr Cruz? Q. We talked yesterday about the issue of Mr Sanchez and the request for information and you suggested yesterday that the RGP had refused to produce evidence. And I am explaining to you that in fact the RGP did not refuse
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	the reference was to Mr Levy's search warrant being obtained in the context of a case that does not name him as a defendant. If you are a suspect you are going to become a defendant. So it is also of course possible to execute search warrants against individuals to obtain evidence from them in respect of third parties, I assume. But it's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A. In what case, Mr Cruz?</li> <li>Q. We talked yesterday about the issue of Mr Sanchez and the request for information and you suggested yesterday that the RGP had refused to produce evidence. And I am explaining to you that in fact the RGP did not refuse THE CHAIRMAN: That sounds like you</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	the reference was to Mr Levy's search warrant being obtained in the context of a case that does not name him as a defendant. If you are a suspect you are going to become a defendant. So it is also of course possible to execute search warrants against individuals to obtain evidence from them in respect of third parties, I assume. But it's some time since I practised criminal law. So	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	A. In what case, Mr Cruz? Q. We talked yesterday about the issue of Mr Sanchez and the request for information and you suggested yesterday that the RGP had refused to produce evidence. And I am explaining to you that in fact the RGP did not refuse THE CHAIRMAN: That sounds like you giving evidence.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	the reference was to Mr Levy's search warrant being obtained in the context of a case that does not name him as a defendant. If you are a suspect you are going to become a defendant. So it is also of course possible to execute search warrants against individuals to obtain evidence from them in respect of third parties, I assume. But it's some time since I practised criminal law. So I don't necessarily agree with you that there	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>A. In what case, Mr Cruz?</li> <li>Q. We talked yesterday about the issue of Mr Sanchez and the request for information and you suggested yesterday that the RGP had refused to produce evidence. And I am explaining to you that in fact the RGP did not refuse THE CHAIRMAN: That sounds like you giving evidence.</li> <li>MR CRUZ: Sorry. In Mr Wyan's witness</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	the reference was to Mr Levy's search warrant being obtained in the context of a case that does not name him as a defendant. If you are a suspect you are going to become a defendant. So it is also of course possible to execute search warrants against individuals to obtain evidence from them in respect of third parties, I assume. But it's some time since I practised criminal law. So I don't necessarily agree with you that there is an inconsistency just in what I said. There	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>A. In what case, Mr Cruz?</li> <li>Q. We talked yesterday about the issue of Mr Sanchez and the request for information and you suggested yesterday that the RGP had refused to produce evidence. And I am explaining to you that in fact the RGP did not refuse THE CHAIRMAN: That sounds like you giving evidence.</li> <li>MR CRUZ: Sorry. In Mr Wyan's witness statement, his second witness statement, he</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	the reference was to Mr Levy's search warrant being obtained in the context of a case that does not name him as a defendant. If you are a suspect you are going to become a defendant. So it is also of course possible to execute search warrants against individuals to obtain evidence from them in respect of third parties, I assume. But it's some time since I practised criminal law. So I don't necessarily agree with you that there is an inconsistency just in what I said. There is also an inconsistency in what I was told by	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A. In what case, Mr Cruz?</li> <li>Q. We talked yesterday about the issue of Mr Sanchez and the request for information and you suggested yesterday that the RGP had refused to produce evidence. And I am explaining to you that in fact the RGP did not refuse THE CHAIRMAN: That sounds like you giving evidence.</li> <li>MR CRUZ: Sorry. In Mr Wyan's witness statement, his second witness statement, he makes the point with reference to exhibits</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	the reference was to Mr Levy's search warrant being obtained in the context of a case that does not name him as a defendant. If you are a suspect you are going to become a defendant. So it is also of course possible to execute search warrants against individuals to obtain evidence from them in respect of third parties, I assume. But it's some time since I practised criminal law. So I don't necessarily agree with you that there is an inconsistency just in what I said. There is also an inconsistency in what I was told by Mr McGrail.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A. In what case, Mr Cruz?</li> <li>Q. We talked yesterday about the issue of Mr Sanchez and the request for information and you suggested yesterday that the RGP had refused to produce evidence. And I am explaining to you that in fact the RGP did not refuse</li> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: That sounds like you giving evidence.</li> <li>MR CRUZ: Sorry. In Mr Wyan's witness statement, his second witness statement, he makes the point with reference to exhibits that it was the DPP who decided that no</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	the reference was to Mr Levy's search warrant being obtained in the context of a case that does not name him as a defendant. If you are a suspect you are going to become a defendant. So it is also of course possible to execute search warrants against individuals to obtain evidence from them in respect of third parties, I assume. But it's some time since I practised criminal law. So I don't necessarily agree with you that there is an inconsistency just in what I said. There is also an inconsistency in what I was told by Mr McGrail. Q. If I can just finish off by saying this to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>A. In what case, Mr Cruz?</li> <li>Q. We talked yesterday about the issue of Mr Sanchez and the request for information and you suggested yesterday that the RGP had refused to produce evidence. And I am explaining to you that in fact the RGP did not refuse</li> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: That sounds like you giving evidence.</li> <li>MR CRUZ: Sorry. In Mr Wyan's witness statement, his second witness statement, he makes the point with reference to exhibits that it was the DPP who decided that no evidence should be given to you or your</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	the reference was to Mr Levy's search warrant being obtained in the context of a case that does not name him as a defendant. If you are a suspect you are going to become a defendant. So it is also of course possible to execute search warrants against individuals to obtain evidence from them in respect of third parties, I assume. But it's some time since I practised criminal law. So I don't necessarily agree with you that there is an inconsistency just in what I said. There is also an inconsistency in what I was told by Mr McGrail. Q. If I can just finish off by saying this to you. Given the process that happened, and I	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ \end{array} $	<ul> <li>A. In what case, Mr Cruz?</li> <li>Q. We talked yesterday about the issue of Mr Sanchez and the request for information and you suggested yesterday that the RGP had refused to produce evidence. And I am explaining to you that in fact the RGP did not refuse THE CHAIRMAN: That sounds like you giving evidence.</li> <li>MR CRUZ: Sorry. In Mr Wyan's witness statement, his second witness statement, he makes the point with reference to exhibits that it was the DPP who decided that no evidence should be given to you or your government. Are you aware of that?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	the reference was to Mr Levy's search warrant being obtained in the context of a case that does not name him as a defendant. If you are a suspect you are going to become a defendant. So it is also of course possible to execute search warrants against individuals to obtain evidence from them in respect of third parties, I assume. But it's some time since I practised criminal law. So I don't necessarily agree with you that there is an inconsistency just in what I said. There is also an inconsistency in what I was told by Mr McGrail. Q. If I can just finish off by saying this to you. Given the process that happened, and I mean the process, the interaction with the	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ \end{array} $	<ul> <li>A. In what case, Mr Cruz?</li> <li>Q. We talked yesterday about the issue of Mr Sanchez and the request for information and you suggested yesterday that the RGP had refused to produce evidence. And I am explaining to you that in fact the RGP did not refuse THE CHAIRMAN: That sounds like you giving evidence.</li> <li>MR CRUZ: Sorry. In Mr Wyan's witness statement, his second witness statement, he makes the point with reference to exhibits that it was the DPP who decided that no evidence should be given to you or your government. Are you aware of that?</li> <li>A. I wasn't aware that because, as I have told</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>the reference was to Mr Levy's search warrant being obtained in the context of a case that does not name him as a defendant. If you are a suspect you are going to become a defendant. So it is also of course possible to execute search warrants against individuals to obtain evidence from them in respect of third parties, I assume. But it's some time since I practised criminal law. So I don't necessarily agree with you that there is an inconsistency just in what I said. There is also an inconsistency in what I was told by Mr McGrail.</li> <li>Q. If I can just finish off by saying this to you. Given the process that happened, and I mean the process, the interaction with the GPA after and the information that they were</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A. In what case, Mr Cruz?</li> <li>Q. We talked yesterday about the issue of Mr Sanchez and the request for information and you suggested yesterday that the RGP had refused to produce evidence. And I am explaining to you that in fact the RGP did not refuse THE CHAIRMAN: That sounds like you giving evidence.</li> <li>MR CRUZ: Sorry. In Mr Wyan's witness statement, his second witness statement, he makes the point with reference to exhibits that it was the DPP who decided that no evidence should be given to you or your government. Are you aware of that?</li> <li>A. I wasn't aware that because, as I have told you, I haven't read all of the witness</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>the reference was to Mr Levy's search warrant being obtained in the context of a case that does not name him as a defendant. If you are a suspect you are going to become a defendant. So it is also of course possible to execute search warrants against individuals to obtain evidence from them in respect of third parties, I assume. But it's some time since I practised criminal law. So I don't necessarily agree with you that there is an inconsistency just in what I said. There is also an inconsistency in what I was told by Mr McGrail.</li> <li>Q. If I can just finish off by saying this to you. Given the process that happened, and I mean the process, the interaction with the GPA after and the information that they were able to consider, and we heard evidence</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ \end{array} $	<ul> <li>A. In what case, Mr Cruz?</li> <li>Q. We talked yesterday about the issue of Mr Sanchez and the request for information and you suggested yesterday that the RGP had refused to produce evidence. And I am explaining to you that in fact the RGP did not refuse THE CHAIRMAN: That sounds like you giving evidence.</li> <li>MR CRUZ: Sorry. In Mr Wyan's witness statement, his second witness statement, he makes the point with reference to exhibits that it was the DPP who decided that no evidence should be given to you or your government. Are you aware of that?</li> <li>A. I wasn't aware that because, as I have told you, I haven't read all of the witness statements. I'm really unconcerned about</li> </ul>
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array}$	<ul> <li>the reference was to Mr Levy's search warrant being obtained in the context of a case that does not name him as a defendant. If you are a suspect you are going to become a defendant. So it is also of course possible to execute search warrants against individuals to obtain evidence from them in respect of third parties, I assume. But it's some time since I practised criminal law. So I don't necessarily agree with you that there is an inconsistency just in what I said. There is also an inconsistency in what I was told by Mr McGrail.</li> <li>Q. If I can just finish off by saying this to you. Given the process that happened, and I mean the process, the interaction with the GPA after and the information that they were able to consider, and we heard evidence about Mr Britto's reverence to the office of</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	<ul> <li>A. In what case, Mr Cruz?</li> <li>Q. We talked yesterday about the issue of Mr Sanchez and the request for information and you suggested yesterday that the RGP had refused to produce evidence. And I am explaining to you that in fact the RGP did not refuse THE CHAIRMAN: That sounds like you giving evidence.</li> <li>MR CRUZ: Sorry. In Mr Wyan's witness statement, his second witness statement, he makes the point with reference to exhibits that it was the DPP who decided that no evidence should be given to you or your government. Are you aware of that?</li> <li>A. I wasn't aware that because, as I have told you, I haven't read all of the witness statements. I'm really unconcerned about whether it was the RGP or the DPP. I mean,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>the reference was to Mr Levy's search warrant being obtained in the context of a case that does not name him as a defendant. If you are a suspect you are going to become a defendant. So it is also of course possible to execute search warrants against individuals to obtain evidence from them in respect of third parties, I assume. But it's some time since I practised criminal law. So I don't necessarily agree with you that there is an inconsistency just in what I said. There is also an inconsistency in what I was told by Mr McGrail.</li> <li>Q. If I can just finish off by saying this to you. Given the process that happened, and I mean the process, the interaction with the GPA after and the information that they were able to consider, and we heard evidence about Mr Britto's reverence to the office of Chief Minister and Governor, would it be fair</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	<ul> <li>A. In what case, Mr Cruz?</li> <li>Q. We talked yesterday about the issue of Mr Sanchez and the request for information and you suggested yesterday that the RGP had refused to produce evidence. And I am explaining to you that in fact the RGP did not refuse THE CHAIRMAN: That sounds like you giving evidence.</li> <li>MR CRUZ: Sorry. In Mr Wyan's witness statement, his second witness statement, he makes the point with reference to exhibits that it was the DPP who decided that no evidence should be given to you or your government. Are you aware of that?</li> <li>A. I wasn't aware that because, as I have told you, I haven't read all of the witness statements. I'm really unconcerned about whether it was the RGP or the DPP. I mean, given your example before, this was now</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>the reference was to Mr Levy's search warrant being obtained in the context of a case that does not name him as a defendant. If you are a suspect you are going to become a defendant. So it is also of course possible to execute search warrants against individuals to obtain evidence from them in respect of third parties, I assume. But it's some time since I practised criminal law. So I don't necessarily agree with you that there is an inconsistency just in what I said. There is also an inconsistency in what I was told by Mr McGrail.</li> <li>Q. If I can just finish off by saying this to you. Given the process that happened, and I mean the process, the interaction with the GPA after and the information that they were able to consider, and we heard evidence about Mr Britto's reverence to the office of Chief Minister and Governor, would it be fair to say that actually rather than facilitating</li> </ul>	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ \end{array}$	<ul> <li>A. In what case, Mr Cruz?</li> <li>Q. We talked yesterday about the issue of Mr Sanchez and the request for information and you suggested yesterday that the RGP had refused to produce evidence. And I am explaining to you that in fact the RGP did not refuse THE CHAIRMAN: That sounds like you giving evidence.</li> <li>MR CRUZ: Sorry. In Mr Wyan's witness statement, his second witness statement, he makes the point with reference to exhibits that it was the DPP who decided that no evidence should be given to you or your government. Are you aware of that?</li> <li>A. I wasn't aware that because, as I have told you, I haven't read all of the witness statements. I'm really unconcerned about whether it was the RGP or the DPP. I mean, given your example before, this was now passing from the operational to the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>the reference was to Mr Levy's search warrant being obtained in the context of a case that does not name him as a defendant. If you are a suspect you are going to become a defendant. So it is also of course possible to execute search warrants against individuals to obtain evidence from them in respect of third parties, I assume. But it's some time since I practised criminal law. So I don't necessarily agree with you that there is an inconsistency just in what I said. There is also an inconsistency in what I was told by Mr McGrail.</li> <li>Q. If I can just finish off by saying this to you. Given the process that happened, and I mean the process, the interaction with the GPA after and the information that they were able to consider, and we heard evidence about Mr Britto's reverence to the office of Chief Minister and Governor, would it be fair to say that actually rather than facilitating your guardianship of the rule of law you</li> </ul>	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ \end{array}$	<ul> <li>A. In what case, Mr Cruz?</li> <li>Q. We talked yesterday about the issue of Mr Sanchez and the request for information and you suggested yesterday that the RGP had refused to produce evidence. And I am explaining to you that in fact the RGP did not refuse THE CHAIRMAN: That sounds like you giving evidence.</li> <li>MR CRUZ: Sorry. In Mr Wyan's witness statement, his second witness statement, he makes the point with reference to exhibits that it was the DPP who decided that no evidence should be given to you or your government. Are you aware of that?</li> <li>A. I wasn't aware that because, as I have told you, I haven't read all of the witness statements. I'm really unconcerned about whether it was the RGP or the DPP. I mean, given your example before, this was now passing from the operational to the prosecutorial, from the inquiry stage to the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>the reference was to Mr Levy's search warrant being obtained in the context of a case that does not name him as a defendant. If you are a suspect you are going to become a defendant. So it is also of course possible to execute search warrants against individuals to obtain evidence from them in respect of third parties, I assume. But it's some time since I practised criminal law. So I don't necessarily agree with you that there is an inconsistency just in what I said. There is also an inconsistency in what I was told by Mr McGrail.</li> <li>Q. If I can just finish off by saying this to you. Given the process that happened, and I mean the process, the interaction with the GPA after and the information that they were able to consider, and we heard evidence about Mr Britto's reverence to the office of Chief Minister and Governor, would it be fair to say that actually rather than facilitating your guardianship of the rule of law you became an assailant?</li> </ul>	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	<ul> <li>A. In what case, Mr Cruz?</li> <li>Q. We talked yesterday about the issue of Mr Sanchez and the request for information and you suggested yesterday that the RGP had refused to produce evidence. And I am explaining to you that in fact the RGP did not refuse THE CHAIRMAN: That sounds like you giving evidence.</li> <li>MR CRUZ: Sorry. In Mr Wyan's witness statement, his second witness statement, he makes the point with reference to exhibits that it was the DPP who decided that no evidence should be given to you or your government. Are you aware of that?</li> <li>A. I wasn't aware that because, as I have told you, I haven't read all of the witness statements. I'm really unconcerned about whether it was the RGP or the DPP. I mean, given your example before, this was now passing from the operational to the prosecutorial, from the inquiry stage to the prosecution stage, and that's why it was so</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>the reference was to Mr Levy's search warrant being obtained in the context of a case that does not name him as a defendant. If you are a suspect you are going to become a defendant. So it is also of course possible to execute search warrants against individuals to obtain evidence from them in respect of third parties, I assume. But it's some time since I practised criminal law. So I don't necessarily agree with you that there is an inconsistency just in what I said. There is also an inconsistency in what I was told by Mr McGrail.</li> <li>Q. If I can just finish off by saying this to you. Given the process that happened, and I mean the process, the interaction with the GPA after and the information that they were able to consider, and we heard evidence about Mr Britto's reverence to the office of Chief Minister and Governor, would it be fair to say that actually rather than facilitating your guardianship of the rule of law you</li> </ul>	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ \end{array}$	<ul> <li>A. In what case, Mr Cruz?</li> <li>Q. We talked yesterday about the issue of Mr Sanchez and the request for information and you suggested yesterday that the RGP had refused to produce evidence. And I am explaining to you that in fact the RGP did not refuse THE CHAIRMAN: That sounds like you giving evidence.</li> <li>MR CRUZ: Sorry. In Mr Wyan's witness statement, his second witness statement, he makes the point with reference to exhibits that it was the DPP who decided that no evidence should be given to you or your government. Are you aware of that?</li> <li>A. I wasn't aware that because, as I have told you, I haven't read all of the witness statements. I'm really unconcerned about whether it was the RGP or the DPP. I mean, given your example before, this was now passing from the operational to the prosecutorial, from the inquiry stage to the</li> </ul>

18 (Pages 69 to 72)

1 and I was not alone in this, and for other 1 the page, and the meeting on 27 September, 2 2 cabinet members in particular, that we should right at the bottom of the screen. But if we 3 have that evidence. We were not interfacing 3 look up a little bit we can see that you 4 4 describe, it is a paragraph beginning: with the DPP. We were interfacing with the 5 Royal Gibraltar Police, I believe, through the 5 "A further meeting", now at the meeting, 6 6 another meeting on 13 August 2018 with you Commissioner at that time. So the 7 7 at Number 6 Convent Place, Philip Navas information did not come to us from the 8 8 and Jonathan Galliano, Bland's employees, RGP. And we were not told by the RGP that 9 we were being told ... I don't believe we were 9 and you say you believe that Mr John Paul 10 told, we might have been told by the RGP 10 Payas was also present at that meeting. Have 11 11 I got this right? John Paul Payas is, or at that we were not getting it from the DPP. least was then, another senior Bland 12 Q. Yes. 12 13 A. But that had a consequence and the 13 employee, OSG? 14 14 consequence was that absent that information A. Yes, so I understand. Q. So am I right in saying that there was the 15 15 we were not prepared to go forwards as 16 16 phone call on 21 July and then in August and a complainant. 17 17 Q. Understood. Mr Chairman, just for your September 2018 a total of three meetings 18 reference, it is A1034. I am not asking for it 18 between you and Mr Gaggero? 19 19 to be put up, Mark Wyan, paragraph 33 and A. At least, yes. 20 20 his exhibits MW74, 72 and 69 will clarify O. At least. 21 this issue, just for you to have in your own 21 A. And Mr Gaggero was, what I might say, 22 time that information. 22 Gibraltar's equivalent of a captain of 23 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you very 23 industry. He would expect to interface with 24 24 much. me, so would a number of others who would 25 25 MR CRUZ: Thank you very much. be regarded as Gibraltar's captains of Page 73 Page 75 1 THE CHAIRMAN: We will break now. Let 1 industry. 2 us try and start at 25 past. 2 Q. These meetings were at who's request, his 3 3 (11.17)or yours? 4 4 A. I don't have time to request meetings, (Adjourned for a short time) 5 5 even with captains of industry, unless I need (11.27)6 THE CHAIRMAN: One question? 6 them to do something for Gibraltar. They 7 Questioned by MR SAREEN 7 would always be at Mr Gaggero's request, I 8 8 believe. MR SAREEN: Just one subject and I will be 9 9 no more than two minutes, I guarantee it. Q. We have seen some text messages 10 10 Mr Picardo, I ask questions on behalf of the between you and James Levy on the subject 11 former Operation Delhi defendants. The 11 of NSCIS. 12 subject I would like to deal with is just your 12 A. Yes. 13 13 Q. In the summer of 2018 who did you contact with James Gaggero in the summer 14 of 2018. And I think on screen we have 14 interface with more on the subject of NSCIS? 15 15 Was it James Levy or James Gaggero? already, thank you Mr Triay, your statement 16 16 you made in the criminal proceedings in A. Um, in that period very likely James 17 17 June 2021. You told us yesterday that James Gaggero because this was what we might call 18 18 Gaggero would not expect to interface with the agreed transition or the agreed handover 19 19 anyone except you and you told us in some period which had been agreed between John 20 20 detail about the phone call when he called Perez, I would say, slash Tommy Cornelio. 21 21 you at home on the morning of Saturday, 21 But I would think John Perez was the person 22 22 July. And then if we scroll down a little on doing the agreeing. Um, and James Gaggero. 23 23 the page, you also referred relatively briefly MR SAREEN: I have no more questions and my two minutes is up. Thank you. 24 24 to the meeting on 3 September, which we see 25 described in the paragraph near the bottom of 25 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Yes,

Page 74

Page 76

19 (Pages 73 to 76)

1			
1	Mr Wagner. You will be able to pace		dealings I may have had with them in respect
2	yourself because lunchtime is about halfway	2	of this or any other matter.
3	through.	3	Q. Have you ever deliberately given a partial
4	Questioned by MR WAGNER	4	account of the truth to protect your private
5	MR WAGNER: Thank you. Good morning,	5	interests?
6	Mr Picardo. Is it right that before becoming	6	A. I have never done so.
7	Chief Minister you were a practising lawyer?	7	Q. You mentioned the quotation from Andy
8	A. I was.	8	Burnham, we cannot live a country where
9	Q. For about 20 years, is that right?	9	public officials lie to ministers. Do you
10	A. For, um, it's my 30th anniversary now.	10	agree we also cannot live in a country where
11	Um, I was called to the bar in	11	ministers lie to public officials?
12	November 1994. So I think I had been at the	12	A. I am very clear about that.
13	bar for just shy of 20 years when I became	13	Q. Sorry, what was the answer to the
14	Chief Minister.	14	question?
15	Q. And you are a King's Counsel now.	15	A. The answer is an obvious yes.
16	A. I am.	16	Q. I want to ask you about what you knew
17	Q. Are you familiar with the expression the	17	about Mr Levy and the Op Delhi
18	truth, the whole truth and nothing but the	18	investigation prior to 12 May 2020. And I
19	truth?	19	think it is right to say you did not know he
20	A. I've used it in relation to this matter, in	20	was suspected of any kind of criminal
21	Parliament and yesterday here.	21	offence prior to 12 May. Is that right?
22	Q. Have you always told this Inquiry the	22	A. Well, I think that in that respect, putting
23	truth?	23	yourself in your mind before 12 May, after
24	A. I have endeavoured to do so at every	24	12 May, it is all of course a morass of
25	stage. I set up this Inquiry in order to get to	25	information that you have in your mind, so if
	Dago 77		D 70
	Page 77		Page 79
1		1	
1	the truth.	1	you can assist me in any way with any
2	the truth. Q. You have endeavoured to do so. Sorry,	2	you can assist me in any way with any documentary evidence I would be grateful to
2 3	<b>the truth.</b> Q. You have endeavoured to do so. Sorry, have you always told the Inquiry the truth?	2 3	you can assist me in any way with any documentary evidence I would be grateful to you. But what has become clear, and I do
2 3 4	<ul><li>the truth.</li><li>Q. You have endeavoured to do so. Sorry, have you always told the Inquiry the truth?</li><li>A. I have always endeavoured to tell the</li></ul>	2 3 4	you can assist me in any way with any documentary evidence I would be grateful to you. But what has become clear, and I do not know whether I knew that before 12 May
2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>the truth.</li> <li>Q. You have endeavoured to do so. Sorry, have you always told the Inquiry the truth?</li> <li>A. I have always endeavoured to tell the Inquiry the truth, which is to say that I have</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5	you can assist me in any way with any documentary evidence I would be grateful to you. But what has become clear, and I do not know whether I knew that before 12 May or after 12 May, is that the DPP's view,
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>the truth.</li> <li>Q. You have endeavoured to do so. Sorry, have you always told the Inquiry the truth?</li> <li>A. I have always endeavoured to tell the Inquiry the truth, which is to say that I have always told the Inquiry that which I believe</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	you can assist me in any way with any documentary evidence I would be grateful to you. But what has become clear, and I do not know whether I knew that before 12 May or after 12 May, is that the DPP's view, which I think is the one that has been
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>the truth.</li> <li>Q. You have endeavoured to do so. Sorry, have you always told the Inquiry the truth?</li> <li>A. I have always endeavoured to tell the Inquiry the truth, which is to say that I have always told the Inquiry that which I believe to the best of my knowledge and belief is the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	you can assist me in any way with any documentary evidence I would be grateful to you. But what has become clear, and I do not know whether I knew that before 12 May or after 12 May, is that the DPP's view, which I think is the one that has been expressed most frequently, is this concept
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	the truth. Q. You have endeavoured to do so. Sorry, have you always told the Inquiry the truth? A. I have always endeavoured to tell the Inquiry the truth, which is to say that I have always told the Inquiry that which I believe to the best of my knowledge and belief is the truth.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	you can assist me in any way with any documentary evidence I would be grateful to you. But what has become clear, and I do not know whether I knew that before 12 May or after 12 May, is that the DPP's view, which I think is the one that has been expressed most frequently, is this concept that he had questions to answer. And neither
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>the truth.</li> <li>Q. You have endeavoured to do so. Sorry, have you always told the Inquiry the truth?</li> <li>A. I have always endeavoured to tell the Inquiry the truth, which is to say that I have always told the Inquiry that which I believe to the best of my knowledge and belief is the truth.</li> <li>Q. Have you always told this Inquiry the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	you can assist me in any way with any documentary evidence I would be grateful to you. But what has become clear, and I do not know whether I knew that before 12 May or after 12 May, is that the DPP's view, which I think is the one that has been expressed most frequently, is this concept that he had questions to answer. And neither to, as I said yesterday, neither fish nor foul,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>the truth.</li> <li>Q. You have endeavoured to do so. Sorry, have you always told the Inquiry the truth?</li> <li>A. I have always endeavoured to tell the Inquiry the truth, which is to say that I have always told the Inquiry that which I believe to the best of my knowledge and belief is the truth.</li> <li>Q. Have you always told this Inquiry the whole truth?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	you can assist me in any way with any documentary evidence I would be grateful to you. But what has become clear, and I do not know whether I knew that before 12 May or after 12 May, is that the DPP's view, which I think is the one that has been expressed most frequently, is this concept that he had questions to answer. And neither to, as I said yesterday, neither fish nor foul, neither suspect nor witness, you have just
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>the truth.</li> <li>Q. You have endeavoured to do so. Sorry, have you always told the Inquiry the truth?</li> <li>A. I have always endeavoured to tell the Inquiry the truth, which is to say that I have always told the Inquiry that which I believe to the best of my knowledge and belief is the truth.</li> <li>Q. Have you always told this Inquiry the whole truth?</li> <li>A. I have always sought to endeavour to tell</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	you can assist me in any way with any documentary evidence I would be grateful to you. But what has become clear, and I do not know whether I knew that before 12 May or after 12 May, is that the DPP's view, which I think is the one that has been expressed most frequently, is this concept that he had questions to answer. And neither to, as I said yesterday, neither fish nor foul, neither suspect nor witness, you have just questions and answers.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>the truth.</li> <li>Q. You have endeavoured to do so. Sorry, have you always told the Inquiry the truth?</li> <li>A. I have always endeavoured to tell the Inquiry the truth, which is to say that I have always told the Inquiry that which I believe to the best of my knowledge and belief is the truth.</li> <li>Q. Have you always told this Inquiry the whole truth?</li> <li>A. I have always sought to endeavour to tell this Inquiry the whole truth based on the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	you can assist me in any way with any documentary evidence I would be grateful to you. But what has become clear, and I do not know whether I knew that before 12 May or after 12 May, is that the DPP's view, which I think is the one that has been expressed most frequently, is this concept that he had questions to answer. And neither to, as I said yesterday, neither fish nor foul, neither suspect nor witness, you have just questions and answers. THE CHAIRMAN: Questions to answer
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>the truth.</li> <li>Q. You have endeavoured to do so. Sorry, have you always told the Inquiry the truth?</li> <li>A. I have always endeavoured to tell the Inquiry the truth, which is to say that I have always told the Inquiry that which I believe to the best of my knowledge and belief is the truth.</li> <li>Q. Have you always told this Inquiry the whole truth?</li> <li>A. I have always sought to endeavour to tell this Inquiry the whole truth based on the knowledge and belief that I have available to</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	you can assist me in any way with any documentary evidence I would be grateful to you. But what has become clear, and I do not know whether I knew that before 12 May or after 12 May, is that the DPP's view, which I think is the one that has been expressed most frequently, is this concept that he had questions to answer. And neither to, as I said yesterday, neither fish nor foul, neither suspect nor witness, you have just questions and answers. THE CHAIRMAN: Questions to answer under caution was the expression he used.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>the truth.</li> <li>Q. You have endeavoured to do so. Sorry, have you always told the Inquiry the truth?</li> <li>A. I have always endeavoured to tell the Inquiry the truth, which is to say that I have always told the Inquiry that which I believe to the best of my knowledge and belief is the truth.</li> <li>Q. Have you always told this Inquiry the whole truth?</li> <li>A. I have always sought to endeavour to tell this Inquiry the whole truth based on the knowledge and belief that I have available to me and the state of my memory.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	you can assist me in any way with any documentary evidence I would be grateful to you. But what has become clear, and I do not know whether I knew that before 12 May or after 12 May, is that the DPP's view, which I think is the one that has been expressed most frequently, is this concept that he had questions to answer. And neither to, as I said yesterday, neither fish nor foul, neither suspect nor witness, you have just questions and answers. THE CHAIRMAN: Questions to answer under caution was the expression he used. <b>A. Under caution.</b>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>the truth.</li> <li>Q. You have endeavoured to do so. Sorry, have you always told the Inquiry the truth?</li> <li>A. I have always endeavoured to tell the Inquiry the truth, which is to say that I have always told the Inquiry that which I believe to the best of my knowledge and belief is the truth.</li> <li>Q. Have you always told this Inquiry the whole truth?</li> <li>A. I have always sought to endeavour to tell this Inquiry the whole truth based on the knowledge and belief that I have available to me and the state of my memory.</li> <li>Q. Have you always told the Royal Gibraltar</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	you can assist me in any way with any documentary evidence I would be grateful to you. But what has become clear, and I do not know whether I knew that before 12 May or after 12 May, is that the DPP's view, which I think is the one that has been expressed most frequently, is this concept that he had questions to answer. And neither to, as I said yesterday, neither fish nor foul, neither suspect nor witness, you have just questions and answers. THE CHAIRMAN: Questions to answer under caution was the expression he used. <b>A. Under caution.</b> THE CHAIRMAN: As a suspect.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>the truth.</li> <li>Q. You have endeavoured to do so. Sorry, have you always told the Inquiry the truth?</li> <li>A. I have always endeavoured to tell the Inquiry the truth, which is to say that I have always told the Inquiry that which I believe to the best of my knowledge and belief is the truth.</li> <li>Q. Have you always told this Inquiry the whole truth?</li> <li>A. I have always sought to endeavour to tell this Inquiry the whole truth based on the knowledge and belief that I have available to me and the state of my memory.</li> <li>Q. Have you always told the Royal Gibraltar Police the whole truth?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	you can assist me in any way with any documentary evidence I would be grateful to you. But what has become clear, and I do not know whether I knew that before 12 May or after 12 May, is that the DPP's view, which I think is the one that has been expressed most frequently, is this concept that he had questions to answer. And neither to, as I said yesterday, neither fish nor foul, neither suspect nor witness, you have just questions and answers. THE CHAIRMAN: Questions to answer under caution was the expression he used. <b>A. Under caution.</b> THE CHAIRMAN: As a suspect. <b>A. Right.</b>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>the truth.</li> <li>Q. You have endeavoured to do so. Sorry, have you always told the Inquiry the truth?</li> <li>A. I have always endeavoured to tell the Inquiry the truth, which is to say that I have always told the Inquiry that which I believe to the best of my knowledge and belief is the truth.</li> <li>Q. Have you always told this Inquiry the whole truth?</li> <li>A. I have always sought to endeavour to tell this Inquiry the whole truth based on the knowledge and belief that I have available to me and the state of my memory.</li> <li>Q. Have you always told the Royal Gibraltar Police the whole truth?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	you can assist me in any way with any documentary evidence I would be grateful to you. But what has become clear, and I do not know whether I knew that before 12 May or after 12 May, is that the DPP's view, which I think is the one that has been expressed most frequently, is this concept that he had questions to answer. And neither to, as I said yesterday, neither fish nor foul, neither suspect nor witness, you have just questions and answers. THE CHAIRMAN: Questions to answer under caution was the expression he used. <b>A. Under caution.</b> THE CHAIRMAN: As a suspect. <b>A. Right.</b> MR WAGNER: If we can go to B3198.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>the truth.</li> <li>Q. You have endeavoured to do so. Sorry, have you always told the Inquiry the truth?</li> <li>A. I have always endeavoured to tell the Inquiry the truth, which is to say that I have always told the Inquiry that which I believe to the best of my knowledge and belief is the truth.</li> <li>Q. Have you always told this Inquiry the whole truth?</li> <li>A. I have always sought to endeavour to tell this Inquiry the whole truth based on the knowledge and belief that I have available to me and the state of my memory.</li> <li>Q. Have you always told the Royal Gibraltar Police the whole truth?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	you can assist me in any way with any documentary evidence I would be grateful to you. But what has become clear, and I do not know whether I knew that before 12 May or after 12 May, is that the DPP's view, which I think is the one that has been expressed most frequently, is this concept that he had questions to answer. And neither to, as I said yesterday, neither fish nor foul, neither suspect nor witness, you have just questions and answers. THE CHAIRMAN: Questions to answer under caution was the expression he used. <b>A. Under caution.</b> THE CHAIRMAN: As a suspect. <b>A. Right.</b> MR WAGNER: If we can go to B3198. This is an exhibit of Mark Wyan, one of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>the truth.</li> <li>Q. You have endeavoured to do so. Sorry, have you always told the Inquiry the truth?</li> <li>A. I have always endeavoured to tell the Inquiry the truth, which is to say that I have always told the Inquiry that which I believe to the best of my knowledge and belief is the truth.</li> <li>Q. Have you always told this Inquiry the whole truth?</li> <li>A. I have always sought to endeavour to tell this Inquiry the whole truth based on the knowledge and belief that I have available to me and the state of my memory.</li> <li>Q. Have you always told the Royal Gibraltar Police the whole truth?</li> <li>A. I have always endeavoured to tell the Royal Gibraltar Police the truth?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	you can assist me in any way with any documentary evidence I would be grateful to you. But what has become clear, and I do not know whether I knew that before 12 May or after 12 May, is that the DPP's view, which I think is the one that has been expressed most frequently, is this concept that he had questions to answer. And neither to, as I said yesterday, neither fish nor foul, neither suspect nor witness, you have just questions and answers. THE CHAIRMAN: Questions to answer under caution was the expression he used. <b>A. Under caution.</b> THE CHAIRMAN: As a suspect. <b>A. Right.</b> MR WAGNER: If we can go to B3198. This is an exhibit of Mark Wyan, one of the investigating officers in Op Delhi. This is his
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>the truth.</li> <li>Q. You have endeavoured to do so. Sorry, have you always told the Inquiry the truth?</li> <li>A. I have always endeavoured to tell the Inquiry the truth, which is to say that I have always told the Inquiry that which I believe to the best of my knowledge and belief is the truth.</li> <li>Q. Have you always told this Inquiry the whole truth?</li> <li>A. I have always sought to endeavour to tell this Inquiry the whole truth based on the knowledge and belief that I have available to me and the state of my memory.</li> <li>Q. Have you always told the Royal Gibraltar Police the whole truth?</li> <li>A. I have always endeavoured to tell the Royal Gibraltar Police the truth in relation to any matter on which they have required my</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\\end{array} $	you can assist me in any way with any documentary evidence I would be grateful to you. But what has become clear, and I do not know whether I knew that before 12 May or after 12 May, is that the DPP's view, which I think is the one that has been expressed most frequently, is this concept that he had questions to answer. And neither to, as I said yesterday, neither fish nor foul, neither suspect nor witness, you have just questions and answers. THE CHAIRMAN: Questions to answer under caution was the expression he used. <b>A. Under caution.</b> THE CHAIRMAN: As a suspect. <b>A. Right.</b> MR WAGNER: If we can go to B3198. This is an exhibit of Mark Wyan, one of the investigating officers in Op Delhi. This is his note of the meeting that the DPP had with the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>the truth.</li> <li>Q. You have endeavoured to do so. Sorry, have you always told the Inquiry the truth?</li> <li>A. I have always endeavoured to tell the Inquiry the truth, which is to say that I have always told the Inquiry that which I believe to the best of my knowledge and belief is the truth.</li> <li>Q. Have you always told this Inquiry the whole truth?</li> <li>A. I have always sought to endeavour to tell this Inquiry the whole truth?</li> <li>A. I have always sought to endeavour to tell this Inquiry the whole truth based on the knowledge and belief that I have available to me and the state of my memory.</li> <li>Q. Have you always told the Royal Gibraltar Police the whole truth?</li> <li>A. I have always endeavoured to tell the Royal Gibraltar Police the truth, the whole truth in relation to any matter on which they have required my assistance or co-operation.</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	you can assist me in any way with any documentary evidence I would be grateful to you. But what has become clear, and I do not know whether I knew that before 12 May or after 12 May, is that the DPP's view, which I think is the one that has been expressed most frequently, is this concept that he had questions to answer. And neither to, as I said yesterday, neither fish nor foul, neither suspect nor witness, you have just questions and answers. THE CHAIRMAN: Questions to answer under caution was the expression he used. <b>A. Under caution.</b> THE CHAIRMAN: As a suspect. <b>A. Right.</b> MR WAGNER: If we can go to B3198. This is an exhibit of Mark Wyan, one of the investigating officers in Op Delhi. This is his note of the meeting that the DPP had with the investigating officers.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>the truth.</li> <li>Q. You have endeavoured to do so. Sorry, have you always told the Inquiry the truth?</li> <li>A. I have always endeavoured to tell the Inquiry the truth, which is to say that I have always told the Inquiry that which I believe to the best of my knowledge and belief is the truth.</li> <li>Q. Have you always told this Inquiry the whole truth?</li> <li>A. I have always sought to endeavour to tell this Inquiry the whole truth?</li> <li>A. I have always sought to endeavour to tell this Inquiry the whole truth based on the knowledge and belief that I have available to me and the state of my memory.</li> <li>Q. Have you always told the Royal Gibraltar Police the whole truth?</li> <li>A. I have always endeavoured to tell the Royal Gibraltar Police the truth in relation to any matter on which they have required my assistance or co-operation.</li> <li>Q. Have you always told the Gibraltar Police</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	you can assist me in any way with any documentary evidence I would be grateful to you. But what has become clear, and I do not know whether I knew that before 12 May or after 12 May, is that the DPP's view, which I think is the one that has been expressed most frequently, is this concept that he had questions to answer. And neither to, as I said yesterday, neither fish nor foul, neither suspect nor witness, you have just questions and answers. THE CHAIRMAN: Questions to answer under caution was the expression he used. <b>A. Under caution.</b> THE CHAIRMAN: As a suspect. <b>A. Right.</b> MR WAGNER: If we can go to B3198. This is an exhibit of Mark Wyan, one of the investigating officers in Op Delhi. This is his note of the meeting that the DPP had with the investigating officers. <b>A. I do not have B3198.</b>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>the truth.</li> <li>Q. You have endeavoured to do so. Sorry, have you always told the Inquiry the truth?</li> <li>A. I have always endeavoured to tell the Inquiry the truth, which is to say that I have always told the Inquiry that which I believe to the best of my knowledge and belief is the truth.</li> <li>Q. Have you always told this Inquiry the whole truth?</li> <li>A. I have always sought to endeavour to tell this Inquiry the whole truth?</li> <li>A. I have always sought to endeavour to tell this Inquiry the whole truth based on the knowledge and belief that I have available to me and the state of my memory.</li> <li>Q. Have you always told the Royal Gibraltar Police the whole truth?</li> <li>A. I have always endeavoured to tell the Royal Gibraltar Police the truth in relation to any matter on which they have required my assistance or co-operation.</li> <li>Q. Have you always told the Gibraltar Police Authority the whole truth?</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	you can assist me in any way with any documentary evidence I would be grateful to you. But what has become clear, and I do not know whether I knew that before 12 May or after 12 May, is that the DPP's view, which I think is the one that has been expressed most frequently, is this concept that he had questions to answer. And neither to, as I said yesterday, neither fish nor foul, neither suspect nor witness, you have just questions and answers. THE CHAIRMAN: Questions to answer under caution was the expression he used. <b>A. Under caution.</b> THE CHAIRMAN: As a suspect. <b>A. Right.</b> MR WAGNER: If we can go to B3198. This is an exhibit of Mark Wyan, one of the investigating officers in Op Delhi. This is his note of the meeting that the DPP had with the investigating officers. <b>A. I do not have B3198.</b> Q. No, you do not. It is on the screen there
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>the truth.</li> <li>Q. You have endeavoured to do so. Sorry, have you always told the Inquiry the truth?</li> <li>A. I have always endeavoured to tell the Inquiry the truth, which is to say that I have always told the Inquiry that which I believe to the best of my knowledge and belief is the truth.</li> <li>Q. Have you always told this Inquiry the whole truth?</li> <li>A. I have always sought to endeavour to tell this Inquiry the whole truth?</li> <li>A. I have always sought to endeavour to tell this Inquiry the whole truth based on the knowledge and belief that I have available to me and the state of my memory.</li> <li>Q. Have you always told the Royal Gibraltar Police the whole truth?</li> <li>A. I have always endeavoured to tell the Royal Gibraltar Police the truth in relation to any matter on which they have required my assistance or co-operation.</li> <li>Q. Have you always told the Gibraltar Police</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	you can assist me in any way with any documentary evidence I would be grateful to you. But what has become clear, and I do not know whether I knew that before 12 May or after 12 May, is that the DPP's view, which I think is the one that has been expressed most frequently, is this concept that he had questions to answer. And neither to, as I said yesterday, neither fish nor foul, neither suspect nor witness, you have just questions and answers. THE CHAIRMAN: Questions to answer under caution was the expression he used. <b>A. Under caution.</b> THE CHAIRMAN: As a suspect. <b>A. Right.</b> MR WAGNER: If we can go to B3198. This is an exhibit of Mark Wyan, one of the investigating officers in Op Delhi. This is his note of the meeting that the DPP had with the investigating officers. <b>A. I do not have B3198.</b>

20 (Pages 77 to 80)

Page 80

1	final paragraph:	1	were sure the investigation would exonerate
2	"He agreed [that is the DPP] that Mr Levy	2	him, he must have said to you that he was
3	should be treated as a suspect as there were	3	concerned he was suspected of something.
4	questions which needed to be answered."	4	A. No, um, he was telling me that he
5	So I am not putting that on the screen	5	believed that this investigation was
6	because I am suggesting you knew about it, I	6	fundamentally flawed, that it was a case of
7	am just putting it on the screen to be clear	7	competition being elevated to a criminal
8	what the DPP advised from 8 April 2020.	8	conspiracy and that it was very unfair.
9	A. Can I read it? (Pause). Which part are	9	Q. Yes, but you would not have said, "I am
10	you saying relates to Mr Levy? The top part	10	sure the investigation will exonerate you,
11	or the bottom part?	11	James", unless he was saying to you, "I am
12	Q. The third paragraph that I just read out:	12	worried that they are going to accuse me of
13	"He agreed"	13	X, Y or Z."
14	A. Right.	14	A. No, I'm afraid that you are suggesting
15	Q that is the DPP "that Mr Levy should	15	that that is the only thing he could have said
16	be treated as a suspect."	16	to me for me to give this answer. He could
17	A. Yes. This is all in the context of this	17	have said things like, for example, "I think
18	offence, conspiracy to defraud, which we	18	they are going to want to talk to me." And I
19	were later told did not exist in law at the	19	could have said this too.
20	time.	20	Q. But if they wanted to talk to him it could
20	Q. Well, that is a moot point, Mr Picardo.	20	be in any capacity, as a witness or just as
22	That is not the	22	someone who had information. Why would
22	A. The Gibraltar Parliament (inaudible)	23	he need exoneration if that is all he was
23 24	legislated for it.	23	saying?
25	Q. That is not the point that the DPP was	25	A. Because exoneration is something that
23	Q. That is not the point that the DTT was	25	A. Decause exoneration is something that
	Page 81		Page 83
1	considering.	1	you talk about with somebody who you are
2	A. I'm sure it wasn't.	2	you talk about with somebody who you are convinced is not guilty of anything, whether
2 3	<ul><li>A. I'm sure it wasn't.</li><li>Q. About whether it was an offence or not.</li></ul>	2 3	you talk about with somebody who you are convinced is not guilty of anything, whether or not the police want to talk to them. But I
2 3 4	<ul><li>A. I'm sure it wasn't.</li><li>Q. About whether it was an offence or not.</li><li>The point is that the DPP advised Mr Levy</li></ul>	2 3 4	you talk about with somebody who you are convinced is not guilty of anything, whether or not the police want to talk to them. But I think you have set up your question, if I may
2 3 4 5	<ul><li>A. I'm sure it wasn't.</li><li>Q. About whether it was an offence or not.</li><li>The point is that the DPP advised Mr Levy was to be treated as a suspect from 8 April.</li></ul>	2 3 4 5	you talk about with somebody who you are convinced is not guilty of anything, whether or not the police want to talk to them. But I think you have set up your question, if I may say so with respect, a little unfairly. You
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>A. I'm sure it wasn't.</li> <li>Q. About whether it was an offence or not.</li> <li>The point is that the DPP advised Mr Levy was to be treated as a suspect from 8 April.</li> <li>Now, if we go to A233</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	you talk about with somebody who you are convinced is not guilty of anything, whether or not the police want to talk to them. But I think you have set up your question, if I may say so with respect, a little unfairly. You have suggested that the only thing he could
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>A. I'm sure it wasn't.</li> <li>Q. About whether it was an offence or not.</li> <li>The point is that the DPP advised Mr Levy was to be treated as a suspect from 8 April.</li> <li>Now, if we go to A233</li> <li>A. Sorry, you are saying he advised</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	you talk about with somebody who you are convinced is not guilty of anything, whether or not the police want to talk to them. But I think you have set up your question, if I may say so with respect, a little unfairly. You have suggested that the only thing he could have said to me to have elicited this response
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>A. I'm sure it wasn't.</li> <li>Q. About whether it was an offence or not.</li> <li>The point is that the DPP advised Mr Levy was to be treated as a suspect from 8 April.</li> <li>Now, if we go to A233</li> <li>A. Sorry, you are saying he advised</li> <li>Inspector Wyan or Chief Inspector Wyan.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	you talk about with somebody who you are convinced is not guilty of anything, whether or not the police want to talk to them. But I think you have set up your question, if I may say so with respect, a little unfairly. You have suggested that the only thing he could have said to me to have elicited this response is the thing that you have suggested and I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A. I'm sure it wasn't.</li> <li>Q. About whether it was an offence or not. The point is that the DPP advised Mr Levy was to be treated as a suspect from 8 April. Now, if we go to A233</li> <li>A. Sorry, you are saying he advised Inspector Wyan or Chief Inspector Wyan.</li> <li>Q. And Mr Richardson.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	you talk about with somebody who you are convinced is not guilty of anything, whether or not the police want to talk to them. But I think you have set up your question, if I may say so with respect, a little unfairly. You have suggested that the only thing he could have said to me to have elicited this response is the thing that you have suggested and I think that is not logically right.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>A. I'm sure it wasn't.</li> <li>Q. About whether it was an offence or not. The point is that the DPP advised Mr Levy was to be treated as a suspect from 8 April. Now, if we go to A233</li> <li>A. Sorry, you are saying he advised Inspector Wyan or Chief Inspector Wyan.</li> <li>Q. And Mr Richardson.</li> <li>A. And Mr Richardson, not me of course.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	you talk about with somebody who you are convinced is not guilty of anything, whether or not the police want to talk to them. But I think you have set up your question, if I may say so with respect, a little unfairly. You have suggested that the only thing he could have said to me to have elicited this response is the thing that you have suggested and I think that is not logically right. Q. No, I am suggesting the only thing
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>A. I'm sure it wasn't.</li> <li>Q. About whether it was an offence or not. The point is that the DPP advised Mr Levy was to be treated as a suspect from 8 April. Now, if we go to A233</li> <li>A. Sorry, you are saying he advised Inspector Wyan or Chief Inspector Wyan.</li> <li>Q. And Mr Richardson.</li> <li>A. And Mr Richardson, not me of course.</li> <li>Q. A233 and paragraph 5. This is your</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	you talk about with somebody who you are convinced is not guilty of anything, whether or not the police want to talk to them. But I think you have set up your question, if I may say so with respect, a little unfairly. You have suggested that the only thing he could have said to me to have elicited this response is the thing that you have suggested and I think that is not logically right. Q. No, I am suggesting the only thing logically he could have said to you, not the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>A. I'm sure it wasn't.</li> <li>Q. About whether it was an offence or not. The point is that the DPP advised Mr Levy was to be treated as a suspect from 8 April. Now, if we go to A233</li> <li>A. Sorry, you are saying he advised Inspector Wyan or Chief Inspector Wyan.</li> <li>Q. And Mr Richardson.</li> <li>A. And Mr Richardson, not me of course.</li> <li>Q. A233 and paragraph 5. This is your statement to the Inquiry, I think your third</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	you talk about with somebody who you are convinced is not guilty of anything, whether or not the police want to talk to them. But I think you have set up your question, if I may say so with respect, a little unfairly. You have suggested that the only thing he could have said to me to have elicited this response is the thing that you have suggested and I think that is not logically right. Q. No, I am suggesting the only thing logically he could have said to you, not the only thing he could have said to you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A. I'm sure it wasn't.</li> <li>Q. About whether it was an offence or not. The point is that the DPP advised Mr Levy was to be treated as a suspect from 8 April. Now, if we go to A233</li> <li>A. Sorry, you are saying he advised Inspector Wyan or Chief Inspector Wyan.</li> <li>Q. And Mr Richardson.</li> <li>A. And Mr Richardson, not me of course.</li> <li>Q. A233 and paragraph 5. This is your statement to the Inquiry, I think your third statement. You say there:</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	you talk about with somebody who you are convinced is not guilty of anything, whether or not the police want to talk to them. But I think you have set up your question, if I may say so with respect, a little unfairly. You have suggested that the only thing he could have said to me to have elicited this response is the thing that you have suggested and I think that is not logically right. Q. No, I am suggesting the only thing logically he could have said to you, not the only thing he could have said to you. A. And I don't agree.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A. I'm sure it wasn't.</li> <li>Q. About whether it was an offence or not. The point is that the DPP advised Mr Levy was to be treated as a suspect from 8 April. Now, if we go to A233</li> <li>A. Sorry, you are saying he advised Inspector Wyan or Chief Inspector Wyan.</li> <li>Q. And Mr Richardson.</li> <li>A. And Mr Richardson, not me of course.</li> <li>Q. A233 and paragraph 5. This is your statement to the Inquiry, I think your third statement. You say there: "I recall that I discussed with Mr Levy on</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	you talk about with somebody who you are convinced is not guilty of anything, whether or not the police want to talk to them. But I think you have set up your question, if I may say so with respect, a little unfairly. You have suggested that the only thing he could have said to me to have elicited this response is the thing that you have suggested and I think that is not logically right. Q. No, I am suggesting the only thing logically he could have said to you, not the only thing he could have said to you. A. And I don't agree. Q. C4748.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>A. I'm sure it wasn't.</li> <li>Q. About whether it was an offence or not. The point is that the DPP advised Mr Levy was to be treated as a suspect from 8 April. Now, if we go to A233</li> <li>A. Sorry, you are saying he advised Inspector Wyan or Chief Inspector Wyan.</li> <li>Q. And Mr Richardson.</li> <li>A. And Mr Richardson, not me of course.</li> <li>Q. A233 and paragraph 5. This is your statement to the Inquiry, I think your third statement. You say there: "I recall that I discussed with Mr Levy on a very large number of occasions the fact that</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	you talk about with somebody who you are convinced is not guilty of anything, whether or not the police want to talk to them. But I think you have set up your question, if I may say so with respect, a little unfairly. You have suggested that the only thing he could have said to me to have elicited this response is the thing that you have suggested and I think that is not logically right. Q. No, I am suggesting the only thing logically he could have said to you, not the only thing he could have said to you. A. And I don't agree. Q. C4748. A. Should I look for these in the bundle or
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>A. I'm sure it wasn't.</li> <li>Q. About whether it was an offence or not. The point is that the DPP advised Mr Levy was to be treated as a suspect from 8 April. Now, if we go to A233</li> <li>A. Sorry, you are saying he advised Inspector Wyan or Chief Inspector Wyan.</li> <li>Q. And Mr Richardson.</li> <li>A. And Mr Richardson, not me of course.</li> <li>Q. A233 and paragraph 5. This is your statement to the Inquiry, I think your third statement. You say there:</li> <li>"I recall that I discussed with Mr Levy on a very large number of occasions the fact that the RGP had suggested he might be a person</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ \end{array} $	<ul> <li>you talk about with somebody who you are convinced is not guilty of anything, whether or not the police want to talk to them. But I think you have set up your question, if I may say so with respect, a little unfairly. You have suggested that the only thing he could have said to me to have elicited this response is the thing that you have suggested and I think that is not logically right.</li> <li>Q. No, I am suggesting the only thing logically he could have said to you.</li> <li>A. And I don't agree.</li> <li>Q. No, no. That bundle there has been</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A. I'm sure it wasn't.</li> <li>Q. About whether it was an offence or not. The point is that the DPP advised Mr Levy was to be treated as a suspect from 8 April. Now, if we go to A233</li> <li>A. Sorry, you are saying he advised Inspector Wyan or Chief Inspector Wyan.</li> <li>Q. And Mr Richardson.</li> <li>A. And Mr Richardson, not me of course.</li> <li>Q. A233 and paragraph 5. This is your statement to the Inquiry, I think your third statement. You say there:</li> <li>"I recall that I discussed with Mr Levy on a very large number of occasions the fact that the RGP had suggested he might be a person of interest in the investigation. He raised this</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	you talk about with somebody who you are convinced is not guilty of anything, whether or not the police want to talk to them. But I think you have set up your question, if I may say so with respect, a little unfairly. You have suggested that the only thing he could have said to me to have elicited this response is the thing that you have suggested and I think that is not logically right. Q. No, I am suggesting the only thing logically he could have said to you, not the only thing he could have said to you. A. And I don't agree. Q. C4748. A. Should I look for these in the bundle or Q. No, no. That bundle there has been created by counsel to the Inquiry.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A. I'm sure it wasn't.</li> <li>Q. About whether it was an offence or not. The point is that the DPP advised Mr Levy was to be treated as a suspect from 8 April. Now, if we go to A233</li> <li>A. Sorry, you are saying he advised Inspector Wyan or Chief Inspector Wyan.</li> <li>Q. And Mr Richardson.</li> <li>A. And Mr Richardson, not me of course.</li> <li>Q. A233 and paragraph 5. This is your statement to the Inquiry, I think your third statement. You say there:</li> <li>"I recall that I discussed with Mr Levy on a very large number of occasions the fact that the RGP had suggested he might be a person of interest in the investigation. He raised this with me constantly. I constantly replied to</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>you talk about with somebody who you are convinced is not guilty of anything, whether or not the police want to talk to them. But I think you have set up your question, if I may say so with respect, a little unfairly. You have suggested that the only thing he could have said to me to have elicited this response is the thing that you have suggested and I think that is not logically right.</li> <li>Q. No, I am suggesting the only thing logically he could have said to you.</li> <li>A. And I don't agree.</li> <li>Q. C4748.</li> <li>A. Should I look for these in the bundle or Q. No, no. That bundle there has been created by counsel to the Inquiry.</li> <li>A. I see.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>A. I'm sure it wasn't.</li> <li>Q. About whether it was an offence or not. The point is that the DPP advised Mr Levy was to be treated as a suspect from 8 April. Now, if we go to A233</li> <li>A. Sorry, you are saying he advised Inspector Wyan or Chief Inspector Wyan.</li> <li>Q. And Mr Richardson.</li> <li>A. And Mr Richardson, not me of course.</li> <li>Q. A233 and paragraph 5. This is your statement to the Inquiry, I think your third statement. You say there:</li> <li>"I recall that I discussed with Mr Levy on a very large number of occasions the fact that the RGP had suggested he might be a person of interest in the investigation. He raised this with me constantly. I constantly replied to him I was sure the investigation would</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>you talk about with somebody who you are convinced is not guilty of anything, whether or not the police want to talk to them. But I think you have set up your question, if I may say so with respect, a little unfairly. You have suggested that the only thing he could have said to me to have elicited this response is the thing that you have suggested and I think that is not logically right.</li> <li>Q. No, I am suggesting the only thing logically he could have said to you.</li> <li>A. And I don't agree.</li> <li>Q. C4748.</li> <li>A. Should I look for these in the bundle orQ. No, no. That bundle there has been created by counsel to the Inquiry.</li> <li>A. I see.</li> <li>Q. It was I presume in the order of his</li> </ul>
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array}$	<ul> <li>A. I'm sure it wasn't.</li> <li>Q. About whether it was an offence or not. The point is that the DPP advised Mr Levy was to be treated as a suspect from 8 April. Now, if we go to A233</li> <li>A. Sorry, you are saying he advised Inspector Wyan or Chief Inspector Wyan.</li> <li>Q. And Mr Richardson.</li> <li>A. And Mr Richardson, not me of course.</li> <li>Q. A233 and paragraph 5. This is your statement to the Inquiry, I think your third statement. You say there:</li> <li>"I recall that I discussed with Mr Levy on a very large number of occasions the fact that the RGP had suggested he might be a person of interest in the investigation. He raised this with me constantly. I constantly replied to him I was sure the investigation would exonerate him."</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\\end{array} $	<ul> <li>you talk about with somebody who you are convinced is not guilty of anything, whether or not the police want to talk to them. But I think you have set up your question, if I may say so with respect, a little unfairly. You have suggested that the only thing he could have said to me to have elicited this response is the thing that you have suggested and I think that is not logically right.</li> <li>Q. No, I am suggesting the only thing logically he could have said to you.</li> <li>A. And I don't agree.</li> <li>Q. C4748.</li> <li>A. Should I look for these in the bundle or Q. No, no. That bundle there has been created by counsel to the Inquiry.</li> <li>A. I see.</li> <li>Q. It was I presume in the order of his questions.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A. I'm sure it wasn't.</li> <li>Q. About whether it was an offence or not. The point is that the DPP advised Mr Levy was to be treated as a suspect from 8 April. Now, if we go to A233</li> <li>A. Sorry, you are saying he advised Inspector Wyan or Chief Inspector Wyan.</li> <li>Q. And Mr Richardson.</li> <li>A. And Mr Richardson, not me of course.</li> <li>Q. A233 and paragraph 5. This is your statement to the Inquiry, I think your third statement. You say there: "I recall that I discussed with Mr Levy on a very large number of occasions the fact that the RGP had suggested he might be a person of interest in the investigation. He raised this with me constantly. I constantly replied to him I was sure the investigation would exonerate him."</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	<ul> <li>you talk about with somebody who you are convinced is not guilty of anything, whether or not the police want to talk to them. But I think you have set up your question, if I may say so with respect, a little unfairly. You have suggested that the only thing he could have said to me to have elicited this response is the thing that you have suggested and I think that is not logically right.</li> <li>Q. No, I am suggesting the only thing logically he could have said to you.</li> <li>A. And I don't agree.</li> <li>Q. C4748.</li> <li>A. Should I look for these in the bundle or Q. No, no. That bundle there has been created by counsel to the Inquiry.</li> <li>A. I see.</li> <li>Q. It was I presume in the order of his questions.</li> <li>A. So I will not have the written versions.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A. I'm sure it wasn't.</li> <li>Q. About whether it was an offence or not. The point is that the DPP advised Mr Levy was to be treated as a suspect from 8 April. Now, if we go to A233</li> <li>A. Sorry, you are saying he advised Inspector Wyan or Chief Inspector Wyan.</li> <li>Q. And Mr Richardson.</li> <li>A. And Mr Richardson, not me of course.</li> <li>Q. A233 and paragraph 5. This is your statement to the Inquiry, I think your third statement. You say there: "I recall that I discussed with Mr Levy on a very large number of occasions the fact that the RGP had suggested he might be a person of interest in the investigation. He raised this with me constantly. I constantly replied to him I was sure the investigation would exonerate him."</li> <li>Exonerate him from what?</li> <li>A. From any wrongdoing.</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	<ul> <li>you talk about with somebody who you are convinced is not guilty of anything, whether or not the police want to talk to them. But I think you have set up your question, if I may say so with respect, a little unfairly. You have suggested that the only thing he could have said to me to have elicited this response is the thing that you have suggested and I think that is not logically right.</li> <li>Q. No, I am suggesting the only thing logically he could have said to you.</li> <li>A. And I don't agree.</li> <li>Q. C4748.</li> <li>A. Should I look for these in the bundle orQ. No, no. That bundle there has been created by counsel to the Inquiry.</li> <li>A. I see.</li> <li>Q. It was I presume in the order of his questions.</li> <li>Q. You have whatever the other witness had,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>A. I'm sure it wasn't.</li> <li>Q. About whether it was an offence or not. The point is that the DPP advised Mr Levy was to be treated as a suspect from 8 April. Now, if we go to A233</li> <li>A. Sorry, you are saying he advised Inspector Wyan or Chief Inspector Wyan.</li> <li>Q. And Mr Richardson.</li> <li>A. And Mr Richardson, not me of course.</li> <li>Q. A233 and paragraph 5. This is your statement to the Inquiry, I think your third statement. You say there:</li> <li>"I recall that I discussed with Mr Levy on a very large number of occasions the fact that the RGP had suggested he might be a person of interest in the investigation. He raised this with me constantly. I constantly replied to him I was sure the investigation would exonerate him."</li> <li>Exonerate him from what?</li> <li>A. From any wrongdoing.</li> <li>Q. Do you accept that this, when you put</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	<ul> <li>you talk about with somebody who you are convinced is not guilty of anything, whether or not the police want to talk to them. But I think you have set up your question, if I may say so with respect, a little unfairly. You have suggested that the only thing he could have said to me to have elicited this response is the thing that you have suggested and I think that is not logically right.</li> <li>Q. No, I am suggesting the only thing logically he could have said to you.</li> <li>A. And I don't agree.</li> <li>Q. C4748.</li> <li>A. Should I look for these in the bundle orQ. No, no. That bundle there has been created by counsel to the Inquiry.</li> <li>A. I see.</li> <li>Q. It was I presume in the order of his questions.</li> <li>Q. You have whatever the other witness had, which is once you get to the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>A. I'm sure it wasn't.</li> <li>Q. About whether it was an offence or not. The point is that the DPP advised Mr Levy was to be treated as a suspect from 8 April. Now, if we go to A233</li> <li>A. Sorry, you are saying he advised Inspector Wyan or Chief Inspector Wyan.</li> <li>Q. And Mr Richardson.</li> <li>A. And Mr Richardson, not me of course.</li> <li>Q. A233 and paragraph 5. This is your statement to the Inquiry, I think your third statement. You say there:</li> <li>"I recall that I discussed with Mr Levy on a very large number of occasions the fact that the RGP had suggested he might be a person of interest in the investigation. He raised this with me constantly. I constantly replied to him I was sure the investigation would exonerate him."</li> <li>Exonerate him from what?</li> <li>A. From any wrongdoing.</li> <li>Q. Do you accept that this, when you put this in your statement that you recall telling</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	<ul> <li>you talk about with somebody who you are convinced is not guilty of anything, whether or not the police want to talk to them. But I think you have set up your question, if I may say so with respect, a little unfairly. You have suggested that the only thing he could have said to me to have elicited this response is the thing that you have suggested and I think that is not logically right.</li> <li>Q. No, I am suggesting the only thing logically he could have said to you, not the only thing he could have said to you.</li> <li>A. And I don't agree.</li> <li>Q. C4748.</li> <li>A. Should I look for these in the bundle orQ. No, no. That bundle there has been created by counsel to the Inquiry.</li> <li>A. I see.</li> <li>Q. It was I presume in the order of his questions.</li> <li>Q. You have whatever the other witness had, which is once you get to the cross-examination it is on the screen.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>A. I'm sure it wasn't.</li> <li>Q. About whether it was an offence or not. The point is that the DPP advised Mr Levy was to be treated as a suspect from 8 April. Now, if we go to A233</li> <li>A. Sorry, you are saying he advised Inspector Wyan or Chief Inspector Wyan.</li> <li>Q. And Mr Richardson.</li> <li>A. And Mr Richardson, not me of course.</li> <li>Q. A233 and paragraph 5. This is your statement to the Inquiry, I think your third statement. You say there:</li> <li>"I recall that I discussed with Mr Levy on a very large number of occasions the fact that the RGP had suggested he might be a person of interest in the investigation. He raised this with me constantly. I constantly replied to him I was sure the investigation would exonerate him."</li> <li>Exonerate him from what?</li> <li>A. From any wrongdoing.</li> <li>Q. Do you accept that this, when you put</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	<ul> <li>you talk about with somebody who you are convinced is not guilty of anything, whether or not the police want to talk to them. But I think you have set up your question, if I may say so with respect, a little unfairly. You have suggested that the only thing he could have said to me to have elicited this response is the thing that you have suggested and I think that is not logically right.</li> <li>Q. No, I am suggesting the only thing logically he could have said to you.</li> <li>A. And I don't agree.</li> <li>Q. C4748.</li> <li>A. Should I look for these in the bundle orQ. No, no. That bundle there has been created by counsel to the Inquiry.</li> <li>A. I see.</li> <li>Q. It was I presume in the order of his questions.</li> <li>Q. You have whatever the other witness had, which is once you get to the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>A. I'm sure it wasn't.</li> <li>Q. About whether it was an offence or not. The point is that the DPP advised Mr Levy was to be treated as a suspect from 8 April. Now, if we go to A233</li> <li>A. Sorry, you are saying he advised Inspector Wyan or Chief Inspector Wyan.</li> <li>Q. And Mr Richardson.</li> <li>A. And Mr Richardson, not me of course.</li> <li>Q. A233 and paragraph 5. This is your statement to the Inquiry, I think your third statement. You say there:</li> <li>"I recall that I discussed with Mr Levy on a very large number of occasions the fact that the RGP had suggested he might be a person of interest in the investigation. He raised this with me constantly. I constantly replied to him I was sure the investigation would exonerate him."</li> <li>Exonerate him from what?</li> <li>A. From any wrongdoing.</li> <li>Q. Do you accept that this, when you put this in your statement that you recall telling</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	<ul> <li>you talk about with somebody who you are convinced is not guilty of anything, whether or not the police want to talk to them. But I think you have set up your question, if I may say so with respect, a little unfairly. You have suggested that the only thing he could have said to me to have elicited this response is the thing that you have suggested and I think that is not logically right.</li> <li>Q. No, I am suggesting the only thing logically he could have said to you, not the only thing he could have said to you.</li> <li>A. And I don't agree.</li> <li>Q. C4748.</li> <li>A. Should I look for these in the bundle orQ. No, no. That bundle there has been created by counsel to the Inquiry.</li> <li>A. I see.</li> <li>Q. It was I presume in the order of his questions.</li> <li>Q. You have whatever the other witness had, which is once you get to the cross-examination it is on the screen.</li> </ul>

21 (Pages 81 to 84)

1	4	1	for stars lies on to simple. And contain here stin
1	the benefit of the written versions.		factually or logically. And certainly not in
2	Q. Some of them might be. Some of them	$\begin{vmatrix} 2 \\ 2 \end{vmatrix}$	law by the way.
3	might be there.	3	Q. Do you agree that at that time on 5 June it
4	A. Okay.	45	would benefit you for the GPA to think that
5	Q. So C748. If we just go to the top of this		when you called Mr McGrail into that
6	page so you can see what it is. This is the	6	meeting with the Attorney General you
7	letter of 5 June that you sent to the Gibraltar		simply did not know what was going on in
8	Police Authority. Do you recall this letter? I	8	this investigation?
9	think you said your lawyers drafted it.	9	A. No, I did not think it would benefit me. I
10	A. Yes, I do, 5 June.	10	think I would have been made to look like
11	Q. Presumably they drafted it on	11 12	a fool if I suggested that I was not aware
12	instructions.	12	what had happened on 12 May, how I had
13	A. Yes.	13	felt so misled by Mr McGrail and so let
14	Q. And you checked it before it was sent.	14	down. They had to be aware of that, of
15	A. Yes.	16	course they did.
16 17	Q. Now, at C748, the penultimate paragraph.	17	Q. But I am talking about what you knew
	So, just for context, you are responding now	18	about the investigation. Did you deliberately
18	to Mr McGrail's lawyer's letter of 29 May		exclude the fact that you knew about the
19	where the lawyers have said, and we will	19	investigation from Mr Levy to make it seem
20	come to it later, but they brought up Op	20	like you had not been aware and therefore
21	Delhi and they said this is the vanishing	21	make your actions seem less inappropriate?
22	reason, it is described as. And then you say:	22 23	A. Certainly not.
23	"The text message said the warrant obtained	23	Q. Is this an example of a statement you
24	and executed against Mr Levy was in relation	24	have made to a public official which is not the whole truth?
25	to the case against Perez, Cornelio and	25	the whole truin?
	Page 85		Page 87
	0		
1		1	
1	Sanchez. So when I expressed the view that	1	A. No, for the reasons I have already told
2	Sanchez. So when I expressed the view that I did nine minutes later at 12.34, I had no	2	A. No, for the reasons I have already told you, I did not agree with the premise of your
2 3	Sanchez. So when I expressed the view that I did nine minutes later at 12.34, I had no reason to believe the investigation was of	2 3	A. No, for the reasons I have already told you, I did not agree with the premise of your question. The second part is one with which
2 3 4	Sanchez. So when I expressed the view that I did nine minutes later at 12.34, I had no reason to believe the investigation was of Mr Levy."	2 3 4	A. No, for the reasons I have already told you, I did not agree with the premise of your question. The second part is one with which I also cannot agree.
2 3 4 5	Sanchez. So when I expressed the view that I did nine minutes later at 12.34, I had no reason to believe the investigation was of Mr Levy." But you did have reason to believe it was of	2 3 4 5	A. No, for the reasons I have already told you, I did not agree with the premise of your question. The second part is one with which I also cannot agree. Q. You said yesterday that Mr Levy was
2 3 4 5 6	Sanchez. So when I expressed the view that I did nine minutes later at 12.34, I had no reason to believe the investigation was of Mr Levy." But you did have reason to believe it was of Mr Levy because you had had constant	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>A. No, for the reasons I have already told you, I did not agree with the premise of your question. The second part is one with which I also cannot agree.</li> <li>Q. You said yesterday that Mr Levy was accusing Mr Richardson of having secured</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	Sanchez. So when I expressed the view that I did nine minutes later at 12.34, I had no reason to believe the investigation was of Mr Levy." But you did have reason to believe it was of Mr Levy because you had had constant conversations with him and told him he	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>A. No, for the reasons I have already told you, I did not agree with the premise of your question. The second part is one with which I also cannot agree.</li> <li>Q. You said yesterday that Mr Levy was accusing Mr Richardson of having secured future employment with Bland Limited on</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Sanchez. So when I expressed the view that I did nine minutes later at 12.34, I had no reason to believe the investigation was of Mr Levy." But you did have reason to believe it was of Mr Levy because you had had constant conversations with him and told him he would be exonerated. Is that not right?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>A. No, for the reasons I have already told you, I did not agree with the premise of your question. The second part is one with which I also cannot agree.</li> <li>Q. You said yesterday that Mr Levy was accusing Mr Richardson of having secured future employment with Bland Limited on very, very generous terms. Do you recall</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Sanchez. So when I expressed the view that I did nine minutes later at 12.34, I had no reason to believe the investigation was of Mr Levy." But you did have reason to believe it was of Mr Levy because you had had constant conversations with him and told him he would be exonerated. Is that not right? A. No, because I don't think that the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A. No, for the reasons I have already told you, I did not agree with the premise of your question. The second part is one with which I also cannot agree.</li> <li>Q. You said yesterday that Mr Levy was accusing Mr Richardson of having secured future employment with Bland Limited on very, very generous terms. Do you recall that?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Sanchez. So when I expressed the view that I did nine minutes later at 12.34, I had no reason to believe the investigation was of Mr Levy." But you did have reason to believe it was of Mr Levy because you had had constant conversations with him and told him he would be exonerated. Is that not right? A. No, because I don't think that the conversations were about investigation.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>A. No, for the reasons I have already told you, I did not agree with the premise of your question. The second part is one with which I also cannot agree.</li> <li>Q. You said yesterday that Mr Levy was accusing Mr Richardson of having secured future employment with Bland Limited on very, very generous terms. Do you recall that?</li> <li>A. I do and I also recall saying that I thought</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Sanchez. So when I expressed the view that I did nine minutes later at 12.34, I had no reason to believe the investigation was of Mr Levy." But you did have reason to believe it was of Mr Levy because you had had constant conversations with him and told him he would be exonerated. Is that not right? A. No, because I don't think that the conversations were about investigation. They were about the police wanting to talk to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>A. No, for the reasons I have already told you, I did not agree with the premise of your question. The second part is one with which I also cannot agree.</li> <li>Q. You said yesterday that Mr Levy was accusing Mr Richardson of having secured future employment with Bland Limited on very, very generous terms. Do you recall that?</li> <li>A. I do and I also recall saying that I thought that that was fanciful.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Sanchez. So when I expressed the view that I did nine minutes later at 12.34, I had no reason to believe the investigation was of Mr Levy." But you did have reason to believe it was of Mr Levy because you had had constant conversations with him and told him he would be exonerated. Is that not right? A. No, because I don't think that the conversations were about investigation. They were about the police wanting to talk to him. So I don't agree that you can bridge	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>A. No, for the reasons I have already told you, I did not agree with the premise of your question. The second part is one with which I also cannot agree.</li> <li>Q. You said yesterday that Mr Levy was accusing Mr Richardson of having secured future employment with Bland Limited on very, very generous terms. Do you recall that?</li> <li>A. I do and I also recall saying that I thought that that was fanciful.</li> <li>Q. I will come to that. That was</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Sanchez. So when I expressed the view that I did nine minutes later at 12.34, I had no reason to believe the investigation was of Mr Levy." But you did have reason to believe it was of Mr Levy because you had had constant conversations with him and told him he would be exonerated. Is that not right? A. No, because I don't think that the conversations were about investigation. They were about the police wanting to talk to him. So I don't agree that you can bridge from one thing to another in the way that you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A. No, for the reasons I have already told you, I did not agree with the premise of your question. The second part is one with which I also cannot agree.</li> <li>Q. You said yesterday that Mr Levy was accusing Mr Richardson of having secured future employment with Bland Limited on very, very generous terms. Do you recall that?</li> <li>A. I do and I also recall saying that I thought that that was fanciful.</li> <li>Q. I will come to that. That was an incredibly serious allegation, would you</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Sanchez. So when I expressed the view that I did nine minutes later at 12.34, I had no reason to believe the investigation was of Mr Levy." But you did have reason to believe it was of Mr Levy because you had had constant conversations with him and told him he would be exonerated. Is that not right? A. No, because I don't think that the conversations were about investigation. They were about the police wanting to talk to him. So I don't agree that you can bridge from one thing to another in the way that you are proposing. I think that is quite, also	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>A. No, for the reasons I have already told you, I did not agree with the premise of your question. The second part is one with which I also cannot agree.</li> <li>Q. You said yesterday that Mr Levy was accusing Mr Richardson of having secured future employment with Bland Limited on very, very generous terms. Do you recall that?</li> <li>A. I do and I also recall saying that I thought that that was fanciful.</li> <li>Q. I will come to that. That was</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Sanchez. So when I expressed the view that I did nine minutes later at 12.34, I had no reason to believe the investigation was of Mr Levy." But you did have reason to believe it was of Mr Levy because you had had constant conversations with him and told him he would be exonerated. Is that not right? A. No, because I don't think that the conversations were about investigation. They were about the police wanting to talk to him. So I don't agree that you can bridge from one thing to another in the way that you are proposing. I think that is quite, also again, not a logical consequence of what you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>A. No, for the reasons I have already told you, I did not agree with the premise of your question. The second part is one with which I also cannot agree.</li> <li>Q. You said yesterday that Mr Levy was accusing Mr Richardson of having secured future employment with Bland Limited on very, very generous terms. Do you recall that?</li> <li>A. I do and I also recall saying that I thought that that was fanciful.</li> <li>Q. I will come to that. That was an incredibly serious allegation, would you agree?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Sanchez. So when I expressed the view that I did nine minutes later at 12.34, I had no reason to believe the investigation was of Mr Levy." But you did have reason to believe it was of Mr Levy because you had had constant conversations with him and told him he would be exonerated. Is that not right? A. No, because I don't think that the conversations were about investigation. They were about the police wanting to talk to him. So I don't agree that you can bridge from one thing to another in the way that you are proposing. I think that is quite, also again, not a logical consequence of what you are saying.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A. No, for the reasons I have already told you, I did not agree with the premise of your question. The second part is one with which I also cannot agree.</li> <li>Q. You said yesterday that Mr Levy was accusing Mr Richardson of having secured future employment with Bland Limited on very, very generous terms. Do you recall that?</li> <li>A. I do and I also recall saying that I thought that that was fanciful.</li> <li>Q. I will come to that. That was an incredibly serious allegation, would you agree?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Sanchez. So when I expressed the view that I did nine minutes later at 12.34, I had no reason to believe the investigation was of Mr Levy." But you did have reason to believe it was of Mr Levy because you had had constant conversations with him and told him he would be exonerated. Is that not right? A. No, because I don't think that the conversations were about investigation. They were about the police wanting to talk to him. So I don't agree that you can bridge from one thing to another in the way that you are proposing. I think that is quite, also again, not a logical consequence of what you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>A. No, for the reasons I have already told you, I did not agree with the premise of your question. The second part is one with which I also cannot agree.</li> <li>Q. You said yesterday that Mr Levy was accusing Mr Richardson of having secured future employment with Bland Limited on very, very generous terms. Do you recall that?</li> <li>A. I do and I also recall saying that I thought that that was fanciful.</li> <li>Q. I will come to that. That was an incredibly serious allegation, would you agree?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. It would have been misconduct in public</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Sanchez. So when I expressed the view that I did nine minutes later at 12.34, I had no reason to believe the investigation was of Mr Levy." But you did have reason to believe it was of Mr Levy because you had had constant conversations with him and told him he would be exonerated. Is that not right? A. No, because I don't think that the conversations were about investigation. They were about the police wanting to talk to him. So I don't agree that you can bridge from one thing to another in the way that you are proposing. I think that is quite, also again, not a logical consequence of what you are saying. Q. Did the police want to talk to him	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ \end{array} $	<ul> <li>A. No, for the reasons I have already told you, I did not agree with the premise of your question. The second part is one with which I also cannot agree.</li> <li>Q. You said yesterday that Mr Levy was accusing Mr Richardson of having secured future employment with Bland Limited on very, very generous terms. Do you recall that?</li> <li>A. I do and I also recall saying that I thought that that was fanciful.</li> <li>Q. I will come to that. That was an incredibly serious allegation, would you agree?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. It would have been misconduct in public office.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Sanchez. So when I expressed the view that I did nine minutes later at 12.34, I had no reason to believe the investigation was of Mr Levy." But you did have reason to believe it was of Mr Levy because you had had constant conversations with him and told him he would be exonerated. Is that not right? A. No, because I don't think that the conversations were about investigation. They were about the police wanting to talk to him. So I don't agree that you can bridge from one thing to another in the way that you are proposing. I think that is quite, also again, not a logical consequence of what you are saying. Q. Did the police want to talk to him separately from the Op Delhi investigation	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A. No, for the reasons I have already told you, I did not agree with the premise of your question. The second part is one with which I also cannot agree.</li> <li>Q. You said yesterday that Mr Levy was accusing Mr Richardson of having secured future employment with Bland Limited on very, very generous terms. Do you recall that?</li> <li>A. I do and I also recall saying that I thought that that was fanciful.</li> <li>Q. I will come to that. That was an incredibly serious allegation, would you agree?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. It would have been misconduct in public office.</li> <li>A. Absolutely.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Sanchez. So when I expressed the view that I did nine minutes later at 12.34, I had no reason to believe the investigation was of Mr Levy." But you did have reason to believe it was of Mr Levy because you had had constant conversations with him and told him he would be exonerated. Is that not right? A. No, because I don't think that the conversations were about investigation. They were about the police wanting to talk to him. So I don't agree that you can bridge from one thing to another in the way that you are proposing. I think that is quite, also again, not a logical consequence of what you are saying. Q. Did the police want to talk to him separately from the Op Delhi investigation about something entirely unrelated?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>A. No, for the reasons I have already told you, I did not agree with the premise of your question. The second part is one with which I also cannot agree.</li> <li>Q. You said yesterday that Mr Levy was accusing Mr Richardson of having secured future employment with Bland Limited on very, very generous terms. Do you recall that?</li> <li>A. I do and I also recall saying that I thought that that was fanciful.</li> <li>Q. I will come to that. That was an incredibly serious allegation, would you agree?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. It would have been misconduct in public office.</li> <li>A. Absolutely.</li> <li>Q. And in fact the person making the offer</li> </ul>
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array}$	<ul> <li>Sanchez. So when I expressed the view that I did nine minutes later at 12.34, I had no reason to believe the investigation was of Mr Levy."</li> <li>But you did have reason to believe it was of Mr Levy because you had had constant conversations with him and told him he would be exonerated. Is that not right?</li> <li>A. No, because I don't think that the conversations were about investigation.</li> <li>They were about the police wanting to talk to him. So I don't agree that you can bridge from one thing to another in the way that you are proposing. I think that is quite, also again, not a logical consequence of what you are saying.</li> <li>Q. Did the police want to talk to him separately from the Op Delhi investigation about something entirely unrelated?</li> <li>A. The police wanting to talk to him does</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array} $	<ul> <li>A. No, for the reasons I have already told you, I did not agree with the premise of your question. The second part is one with which I also cannot agree.</li> <li>Q. You said yesterday that Mr Levy was accusing Mr Richardson of having secured future employment with Bland Limited on very, very generous terms. Do you recall that?</li> <li>A. I do and I also recall saying that I thought that that was fanciful.</li> <li>Q. I will come to that. That was an incredibly serious allegation, would you agree?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. It would have been misconduct in public office.</li> <li>A. Absolutely.</li> <li>Q. And in fact the person making the offer would potentially also be subject to criminal</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Sanchez. So when I expressed the view that I did nine minutes later at 12.34, I had no reason to believe the investigation was of Mr Levy."</li> <li>But you did have reason to believe it was of Mr Levy because you had had constant conversations with him and told him he would be exonerated. Is that not right?</li> <li>A. No, because I don't think that the conversations were about investigation.</li> <li>They were about the police wanting to talk to him. So I don't agree that you can bridge from one thing to another in the way that you are proposing. I think that is quite, also again, not a logical consequence of what you are saying.</li> <li>Q. Did the police want to talk to him separately from the Op Delhi investigation about something entirely unrelated?</li> <li>A. The police wanting to talk to him does not mean that there was an investigation of</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	<ul> <li>A. No, for the reasons I have already told you, I did not agree with the premise of your question. The second part is one with which I also cannot agree.</li> <li>Q. You said yesterday that Mr Levy was accusing Mr Richardson of having secured future employment with Bland Limited on very, very generous terms. Do you recall that?</li> <li>A. I do and I also recall saying that I thought that that was fanciful.</li> <li>Q. I will come to that. That was an incredibly serious allegation, would you agree?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. It would have been misconduct in public office.</li> <li>A. Absolutely.</li> <li>Q. And in fact the person making the offer would potentially also be subject to criminal sanctions.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Sanchez. So when I expressed the view that I did nine minutes later at 12.34, I had no reason to believe the investigation was of Mr Levy."</li> <li>But you did have reason to believe it was of Mr Levy because you had had constant conversations with him and told him he would be exonerated. Is that not right?</li> <li>A. No, because I don't think that the conversations were about investigation.</li> <li>They were about the police wanting to talk to him. So I don't agree that you can bridge from one thing to another in the way that you are proposing. I think that is quite, also again, not a logical consequence of what you are saying.</li> <li>Q. Did the police want to talk to him separately from the Op Delhi investigation about something entirely unrelated?</li> <li>A. The police wanting to talk to him does not mean that there was an investigation of Mr Levy. That is the point I am making to</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	<ul> <li>A. No, for the reasons I have already told you, I did not agree with the premise of your question. The second part is one with which I also cannot agree.</li> <li>Q. You said yesterday that Mr Levy was accusing Mr Richardson of having secured future employment with Bland Limited on very, very generous terms. Do you recall that?</li> <li>A. I do and I also recall saying that I thought that that was fanciful.</li> <li>Q. I will come to that. That was an incredibly serious allegation, would you agree?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. It would have been misconduct in public office.</li> <li>A. Absolutely.</li> <li>Q. And in fact the person making the offer would potentially also be subject to criminal sanctions.</li> <li>A. Quite right.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Sanchez. So when I expressed the view that I did nine minutes later at 12.34, I had no reason to believe the investigation was of Mr Levy."</li> <li>But you did have reason to believe it was of Mr Levy because you had had constant conversations with him and told him he would be exonerated. Is that not right?</li> <li>A. No, because I don't think that the conversations were about investigation.</li> <li>They were about the police wanting to talk to him. So I don't agree that you can bridge from one thing to another in the way that you are proposing. I think that is quite, also again, not a logical consequence of what you are saying.</li> <li>Q. Did the police want to talk to him separately from the Op Delhi investigation about something entirely unrelated?</li> <li>A. The police wanting to talk to him does not mean that there was an investigation of Mr Levy. That is the point I am making to you. That is what I am suggesting to you, is</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	<ul> <li>A. No, for the reasons I have already told you, I did not agree with the premise of your question. The second part is one with which I also cannot agree.</li> <li>Q. You said yesterday that Mr Levy was accusing Mr Richardson of having secured future employment with Bland Limited on very, very generous terms. Do you recall that?</li> <li>A. I do and I also recall saying that I thought that that was fanciful.</li> <li>Q. I will come to that. That was an incredibly serious allegation, would you agree?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. It would have been misconduct in public office.</li> <li>A. Absolutely.</li> <li>Q. And in fact the person making the offer would potentially also be subject to criminal sanctions.</li> <li>A. Quite right.</li> <li>Q. In that case Mr Gaggero, right?</li> </ul>

Page 88

22 (Pages 85 to 88)

1	Q. When you heard that allegation did you	1	A. No. I knew that there was
2	report it to the police?	2	correspondence and that therefore it would
3	A. No.	3	have content and I knew of course that it
4	Q. Why did you not report it to the police?	4	would relate to the search warrants because
5	A. Because it was fanciful.	5	that was, the search warrant, because that's
6	Q. Now, Mr Levy, you said many times	6	what it related to.
7	yesterday, is Gibraltar's most senior silk, the	7	Q. Did you think, did you sort of stop and
8	only star performer in Chambers and	8	pause for a moment and think
9	Partners. Why would he make such	9	A. I am going to turn
10	an accusation without basis?	10	Q. No, no.
11	A. Well, for the reasons that I think Mr Levy	11	A. I will get a crick in my neck.
12	very candidly told the Inquiry. You might	12	Q. Of course, and excuse me if I am not
13	have been here on the day that he said that he	13	always looking at you. Did it concern you
13	was severely affected by the execution of the	14	that Gibraltar's most senior silk, star
15	search warrant and that at that time he was, I	15	performer in Chambers and Partners, would
15	mean he didn't use these words, but I might	16	be making such a serious allegation without
10		17	basis?
	use these words, wasn't thinking straight. I		
18	think he used the particular words about his	18	A. At that time I understood that this very
19	state of mind at the time.	19	senior silk, who was finding himself in the
20	Q. Yes. Lots of people have spoken about	20	very difficult situation, for the reasons that
21	how emotional they were on the day. But	21	are obvious and which he explained to the
22	that	22	Inquiry in what I thought was a moment of
23	A. Emotions are normal things to have.	23	great candour, because when somebody
24	Q. They are.	24	explains how they are feeling and how their
25	A. We do not all work as automatons,	25	mental capacity is affected by something, I
	Page 89		Page 91
_			
1	however much we might wish to, when we	1	think it is worthy of respect and to take note
2	look at things four years later.	2	of.
2 3	<b>look at things four years later.</b> Q. One of the ways to mitigate against	2 3	<b>of.</b> Q. So you just put it down to, you put this
2 3 4	<b>look at things four years later.</b> Q. One of the ways to mitigate against emotional reactions is having lawyers. Is it	2 3 4	<b>of.</b> Q. So you just put it down to, you put this elaborate but false allegation down to
2 3	<b>look at things four years later.</b> Q. One of the ways to mitigate against emotional reactions is having lawyers. Is it not right that Hassans then accused	2 3 4 5	<b>of.</b> Q. So you just put it down to, you put this elaborate but false allegation down to emotions.
2 3 4 5 6	<b>look at things four years later.</b> Q. One of the ways to mitigate against emotional reactions is having lawyers. Is it not right that Hassans then accused Mr Richardson, without I do not think	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>of.</li> <li>Q. So you just put it down to, you put this elaborate but false allegation down to emotions.</li> <li>A. It was hardly elaborate, Mr Wagner. It</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5	<b>look at things four years later.</b> Q. One of the ways to mitigate against emotional reactions is having lawyers. Is it not right that Hassans then accused Mr Richardson, without I do not think particularisation of misfeasance, in their	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>of.</li> <li>Q. So you just put it down to, you put this elaborate but false allegation down to emotions.</li> <li>A. It was hardly elaborate, Mr Wagner. It was just a fanciful allegation.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6	<b>look at things four years later.</b> Q. One of the ways to mitigate against emotional reactions is having lawyers. Is it not right that Hassans then accused Mr Richardson, without I do not think particularisation of misfeasance, in their litigation letters to the RGP.	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>of.</li> <li>Q. So you just put it down to, you put this elaborate but false allegation down to emotions.</li> <li>A. It was hardly elaborate, Mr Wagner. It was just a fanciful allegation.</li> <li>Q. Did not concern you that Mr Levy may</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	<b>look at things four years later.</b> Q. One of the ways to mitigate against emotional reactions is having lawyers. Is it not right that Hassans then accused Mr Richardson, without I do not think particularisation of misfeasance, in their	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>of.</li> <li>Q. So you just put it down to, you put this elaborate but false allegation down to emotions.</li> <li>A. It was hardly elaborate, Mr Wagner. It was just a fanciful allegation.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<b>look at things four years later.</b> Q. One of the ways to mitigate against emotional reactions is having lawyers. Is it not right that Hassans then accused Mr Richardson, without I do not think particularisation of misfeasance, in their litigation letters to the RGP.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>of.</li> <li>Q. So you just put it down to, you put this elaborate but false allegation down to emotions.</li> <li>A. It was hardly elaborate, Mr Wagner. It was just a fanciful allegation.</li> <li>Q. Did not concern you that Mr Levy may not be completely on the level about other things?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>look at things four years later.</li> <li>Q. One of the ways to mitigate against emotional reactions is having lawyers. Is it not right that Hassans then accused Mr Richardson, without I do not think particularisation of misfeasance, in their litigation letters to the RGP.</li> <li>A. I don't know about that. I didn't see those.</li> <li>Q. Do you know about the fact that that</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>of.</li> <li>Q. So you just put it down to, you put this elaborate but false allegation down to emotions.</li> <li>A. It was hardly elaborate, Mr Wagner. It was just a fanciful allegation.</li> <li>Q. Did not concern you that Mr Levy may not be completely on the level about other things?</li> <li>A. Not at all. I mean, this is somebody who</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>look at things four years later.</li> <li>Q. One of the ways to mitigate against emotional reactions is having lawyers. Is it not right that Hassans then accused</li> <li>Mr Richardson, without I do not think particularisation of misfeasance, in their litigation letters to the RGP.</li> <li>A. I don't know about that. I didn't see those.</li> <li>Q. Do you know about the fact that that allegation was going to be made in the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>of.</li> <li>Q. So you just put it down to, you put this elaborate but false allegation down to emotions.</li> <li>A. It was hardly elaborate, Mr Wagner. It was just a fanciful allegation.</li> <li>Q. Did not concern you that Mr Levy may not be completely on the level about other things?</li> <li>A. Not at all. I mean, this is somebody who I have known for longer than I have been</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>look at things four years later.</li> <li>Q. One of the ways to mitigate against emotional reactions is having lawyers. Is it not right that Hassans then accused Mr Richardson, without I do not think particularisation of misfeasance, in their litigation letters to the RGP.</li> <li>A. I don't know about that. I didn't see those.</li> <li>Q. Do you know about the fact that that</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>of.</li> <li>Q. So you just put it down to, you put this elaborate but false allegation down to emotions.</li> <li>A. It was hardly elaborate, Mr Wagner. It was just a fanciful allegation.</li> <li>Q. Did not concern you that Mr Levy may not be completely on the level about other things?</li> <li>A. Not at all. I mean, this is somebody who</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>look at things four years later.</li> <li>Q. One of the ways to mitigate against emotional reactions is having lawyers. Is it not right that Hassans then accused</li> <li>Mr Richardson, without I do not think particularisation of misfeasance, in their litigation letters to the RGP.</li> <li>A. I don't know about that. I didn't see those.</li> <li>Q. Do you know about the fact that that allegation was going to be made in the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>of.</li> <li>Q. So you just put it down to, you put this elaborate but false allegation down to emotions.</li> <li>A. It was hardly elaborate, Mr Wagner. It was just a fanciful allegation.</li> <li>Q. Did not concern you that Mr Levy may not be completely on the level about other things?</li> <li>A. Not at all. I mean, this is somebody who I have known for longer than I have been</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>look at things four years later.</li> <li>Q. One of the ways to mitigate against emotional reactions is having lawyers. Is it not right that Hassans then accused</li> <li>Mr Richardson, without I do not think particularisation of misfeasance, in their litigation letters to the RGP.</li> <li>A. I don't know about that. I didn't see those.</li> <li>Q. Do you know about the fact that that allegation was going to be made in the Hassans letters?</li> <li>A. I know that there was correspondence. I don't recall what I knew was going to be in it,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>of.</li> <li>Q. So you just put it down to, you put this elaborate but false allegation down to emotions.</li> <li>A. It was hardly elaborate, Mr Wagner. It was just a fanciful allegation.</li> <li>Q. Did not concern you that Mr Levy may not be completely on the level about other things?</li> <li>A. Not at all. I mean, this is somebody who I have known for longer than I have been a member of the bar. He is well known to</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>look at things four years later.</li> <li>Q. One of the ways to mitigate against emotional reactions is having lawyers. Is it not right that Hassans then accused</li> <li>Mr Richardson, without I do not think particularisation of misfeasance, in their litigation letters to the RGP.</li> <li>A. I don't know about that. I didn't see those.</li> <li>Q. Do you know about the fact that that allegation was going to be made in the Hassans letters?</li> <li>A. I know that there was correspondence. I don't recall what I knew was going to be in it, but certainly, as I have said throughout, I</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>of.</li> <li>Q. So you just put it down to, you put this elaborate but false allegation down to emotions.</li> <li>A. It was hardly elaborate, Mr Wagner. It was just a fanciful allegation.</li> <li>Q. Did not concern you that Mr Levy may not be completely on the level about other things?</li> <li>A. Not at all. I mean, this is somebody who I have known for longer than I have been a member of the bar. He is well known to most people in Gibraltar. But I would ask</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>look at things four years later.</li> <li>Q. One of the ways to mitigate against emotional reactions is having lawyers. Is it not right that Hassans then accused</li> <li>Mr Richardson, without I do not think particularisation of misfeasance, in their litigation letters to the RGP.</li> <li>A. I don't know about that. I didn't see those.</li> <li>Q. Do you know about the fact that that allegation was going to be made in the Hassans letters?</li> <li>A. I know that there was correspondence. I don't recall what I knew was going to be in it,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>of.</li> <li>Q. So you just put it down to, you put this elaborate but false allegation down to emotions.</li> <li>A. It was hardly elaborate, Mr Wagner. It was just a fanciful allegation.</li> <li>Q. Did not concern you that Mr Levy may not be completely on the level about other things?</li> <li>A. Not at all. I mean, this is somebody who I have known for longer than I have been a member of the bar. He is well known to most people in Gibraltar. But I would ask you to perhaps particularise your question</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>look at things four years later.</li> <li>Q. One of the ways to mitigate against emotional reactions is having lawyers. Is it not right that Hassans then accused</li> <li>Mr Richardson, without I do not think particularisation of misfeasance, in their litigation letters to the RGP.</li> <li>A. I don't know about that. I didn't see those.</li> <li>Q. Do you know about the fact that that allegation was going to be made in the Hassans letters?</li> <li>A. I know that there was correspondence. I don't recall what I knew was going to be in it, but certainly, as I have said throughout, I</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>of.</li> <li>Q. So you just put it down to, you put this elaborate but false allegation down to emotions.</li> <li>A. It was hardly elaborate, Mr Wagner. It was just a fanciful allegation.</li> <li>Q. Did not concern you that Mr Levy may not be completely on the level about other things?</li> <li>A. Not at all. I mean, this is somebody who I have known for longer than I have been a member of the bar. He is well known to most people in Gibraltar. But I would ask you to perhaps particularise your question and tell me what on the level means in your</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>look at things four years later.</li> <li>Q. One of the ways to mitigate against emotional reactions is having lawyers. Is it not right that Hassans then accused</li> <li>Mr Richardson, without I do not think particularisation of misfeasance, in their litigation letters to the RGP.</li> <li>A. I don't know about that. I didn't see those.</li> <li>Q. Do you know about the fact that that allegation was going to be made in the Hassans letters?</li> <li>A. I know that there was correspondence. I don't recall what I knew was going to be in it, but certainly, as I have said throughout, I thought the allegation was fanciful. I thought</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ \end{array} $	<ul> <li>of.</li> <li>Q. So you just put it down to, you put this elaborate but false allegation down to emotions.</li> <li>A. It was hardly elaborate, Mr Wagner. It was just a fanciful allegation.</li> <li>Q. Did not concern you that Mr Levy may not be completely on the level about other things?</li> <li>A. Not at all. I mean, this is somebody who I have known for longer than I have been a member of the bar. He is well known to most people in Gibraltar. But I would ask you to perhaps particularise your question and tell me what on the level means in your lexicon. What is it that you are asking me?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>look at things four years later.</li> <li>Q. One of the ways to mitigate against emotional reactions is having lawyers. Is it not right that Hassans then accused Mr Richardson, without I do not think particularisation of misfeasance, in their litigation letters to the RGP.</li> <li>A. I don't know about that. I didn't see those.</li> <li>Q. Do you know about the fact that that allegation was going to be made in the Hassans letters?</li> <li>A. I know that there was correspondence. I don't recall what I knew was going to be in it, but certainly, as I have said throughout, I thought the allegation was fanciful. I thought it then and I think it now. Well, now I have</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>of.</li> <li>Q. So you just put it down to, you put this elaborate but false allegation down to emotions.</li> <li>A. It was hardly elaborate, Mr Wagner. It was just a fanciful allegation.</li> <li>Q. Did not concern you that Mr Levy may not be completely on the level about other things?</li> <li>A. Not at all. I mean, this is somebody who I have known for longer than I have been a member of the bar. He is well known to most people in Gibraltar. But I would ask you to perhaps particularise your question and tell me what on the level means in your lexicon. What is it that you are asking me?</li> <li>Q. If he was prepared to make what you</li> </ul>
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ \end{array} $	<ul> <li>look at things four years later.</li> <li>Q. One of the ways to mitigate against emotional reactions is having lawyers. Is it not right that Hassans then accused Mr Richardson, without I do not think particularisation of misfeasance, in their litigation letters to the RGP.</li> <li>A. I don't know about that. I didn't see those.</li> <li>Q. Do you know about the fact that that allegation was going to be made in the Hassans letters?</li> <li>A. I know that there was correspondence. I don't recall what I knew was going to be in it, but certainly, as I have said throughout, I thought the allegation was fanciful. I thought it then and I think it now. Well, now I have the benefit of hindsight and I am able to rely</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>of.</li> <li>Q. So you just put it down to, you put this elaborate but false allegation down to emotions.</li> <li>A. It was hardly elaborate, Mr Wagner. It was just a fanciful allegation.</li> <li>Q. Did not concern you that Mr Levy may not be completely on the level about other things?</li> <li>A. Not at all. I mean, this is somebody who I have known for longer than I have been a member of the bar. He is well known to most people in Gibraltar. But I would ask you to perhaps particularise your question and tell me what on the level means in your lexicon. What is it that you are asking me?</li> <li>Q. If he was prepared to make what you considered to be spurious but extremely</li> </ul>
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array}$	<ul> <li>look at things four years later.</li> <li>Q. One of the ways to mitigate against emotional reactions is having lawyers. Is it not right that Hassans then accused</li> <li>Mr Richardson, without I do not think particularisation of misfeasance, in their litigation letters to the RGP.</li> <li>A. I don't know about that. I didn't see those.</li> <li>Q. Do you know about the fact that that allegation was going to be made in the Hassans letters?</li> <li>A. I know that there was correspondence. I don't recall what I knew was going to be in it, but certainly, as I have said throughout, I thought the allegation was fanciful. I thought it then and I think it now. Well, now I have the benefit of hindsight and I am able to rely on the fact that it was fanciful because it</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array} $	<ul> <li>of.</li> <li>Q. So you just put it down to, you put this elaborate but false allegation down to emotions.</li> <li>A. It was hardly elaborate, Mr Wagner. It was just a fanciful allegation.</li> <li>Q. Did not concern you that Mr Levy may not be completely on the level about other things?</li> <li>A. Not at all. I mean, this is somebody who I have known for longer than I have been a member of the bar. He is well known to most people in Gibraltar. But I would ask you to perhaps particularise your question and tell me what on the level means in your lexicon. What is it that you are asking me?</li> <li>Q. If he was prepared to make what you considered to be spurious but extremely serious allegations against a police officer</li> </ul>
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	<ul> <li>look at things four years later.</li> <li>Q. One of the ways to mitigate against emotional reactions is having lawyers. Is it not right that Hassans then accused Mr Richardson, without I do not think particularisation of misfeasance, in their litigation letters to the RGP.</li> <li>A. I don't know about that. I didn't see those.</li> <li>Q. Do you know about the fact that that allegation was going to be made in the Hassans letters?</li> <li>A. I know that there was correspondence. I don't recall what I knew was going to be in it, but certainly, as I have said throughout, I thought the allegation was fanciful. I thought it then and I think it now. Well, now I have the benefit of hindsight and I am able to rely on the fact that it was fanciful because it didn't happen.</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	<ul> <li>of.</li> <li>Q. So you just put it down to, you put this elaborate but false allegation down to emotions.</li> <li>A. It was hardly elaborate, Mr Wagner. It was just a fanciful allegation.</li> <li>Q. Did not concern you that Mr Levy may not be completely on the level about other things?</li> <li>A. Not at all. I mean, this is somebody who I have known for longer than I have been a member of the bar. He is well known to most people in Gibraltar. But I would ask you to perhaps particularise your question and tell me what on the level means in your lexicon. What is it that you are asking me?</li> <li>Q. If he was prepared to make what you considered to be spurious but extremely serious allegations against a police officer who was investigating him, he might not be</li> </ul>
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ \end{array}$	<ul> <li>look at things four years later.</li> <li>Q. One of the ways to mitigate against emotional reactions is having lawyers. Is it not right that Hassans then accused Mr Richardson, without I do not think particularisation of misfeasance, in their litigation letters to the RGP.</li> <li>A. I don't know about that. I didn't see those.</li> <li>Q. Do you know about the fact that that allegation was going to be made in the Hassans letters?</li> <li>A. I know that there was correspondence. I don't recall what I knew was going to be in it, but certainly, as I have said throughout, I thought the allegation was fanciful. I thought it then and I think it now. Well, now I have the benefit of hindsight and I am able to rely on the fact that it was fanciful because it didn't happen.</li> <li>Q. You say you recall there was</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	<ul> <li>of.</li> <li>Q. So you just put it down to, you put this elaborate but false allegation down to emotions.</li> <li>A. It was hardly elaborate, Mr Wagner. It was just a fanciful allegation.</li> <li>Q. Did not concern you that Mr Levy may not be completely on the level about other things?</li> <li>A. Not at all. I mean, this is somebody who I have known for longer than I have been a member of the bar. He is well known to most people in Gibraltar. But I would ask you to perhaps particularise your question and tell me what on the level means in your lexicon. What is it that you are asking me?</li> <li>Q. If he was prepared to make what you considered to be spurious but extremely serious allegations against a police officer who was investigating him, he might not be as trustworthy as you first assumed.</li> </ul>
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ \end{array}$	<ul> <li>look at things four years later.</li> <li>Q. One of the ways to mitigate against emotional reactions is having lawyers. Is it not right that Hassans then accused Mr Richardson, without I do not think particularisation of misfeasance, in their litigation letters to the RGP.</li> <li>A. I don't know about that. I didn't see those.</li> <li>Q. Do you know about the fact that that allegation was going to be made in the Hassans letters?</li> <li>A. I know that there was correspondence. I don't recall what I knew was going to be in it, but certainly, as I have said throughout, I thought the allegation was fanciful. I thought it then and I think it now. Well, now I have the benefit of hindsight and I am able to rely on the fact that it was fanciful because it didn't happen.</li> <li>Q. You say you recall there was correspondence. You do not recall what you</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	<ul> <li>of.</li> <li>Q. So you just put it down to, you put this elaborate but false allegation down to emotions.</li> <li>A. It was hardly elaborate, Mr Wagner. It was just a fanciful allegation.</li> <li>Q. Did not concern you that Mr Levy may not be completely on the level about other things?</li> <li>A. Not at all. I mean, this is somebody who I have known for longer than I have been a member of the bar. He is well known to most people in Gibraltar. But I would ask you to perhaps particularise your question and tell me what on the level means in your lexicon. What is it that you are asking me?</li> <li>Q. If he was prepared to make what you considered to be spurious but extremely serious allegations against a police officer who was investigating him, he might not be as trustworthy as you first assumed.</li> <li>A. Not at all. I think that you judge what</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>look at things four years later.</li> <li>Q. One of the ways to mitigate against emotional reactions is having lawyers. Is it not right that Hassans then accused Mr Richardson, without I do not think particularisation of misfeasance, in their litigation letters to the RGP.</li> <li>A. I don't know about that. I didn't see those.</li> <li>Q. Do you know about the fact that that allegation was going to be made in the Hassans letters?</li> <li>A. I know that there was correspondence. I don't recall what I knew was going to be in it, but certainly, as I have said throughout, I thought the allegation was fanciful. I thought it then and I think it now. Well, now I have the benefit of hindsight and I am able to rely on the fact that it was fanciful because it didn't happen.</li> <li>Q. You say you recall there was correspondence. You do not recall what you knew was going to be in it. Did you know</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	<ul> <li>of.</li> <li>Q. So you just put it down to, you put this elaborate but false allegation down to emotions.</li> <li>A. It was hardly elaborate, Mr Wagner. It was just a fanciful allegation.</li> <li>Q. Did not concern you that Mr Levy may not be completely on the level about other things?</li> <li>A. Not at all. I mean, this is somebody who I have known for longer than I have been a member of the bar. He is well known to most people in Gibraltar. But I would ask you to perhaps particularise your question and tell me what on the level means in your lexicon. What is it that you are asking me?</li> <li>Q. If he was prepared to make what you considered to be spurious but extremely serious allegations against a police officer who was investigating him, he might not be as trustworthy as you first assumed.</li> <li>A. Not at all. I think that you judge what happened in that period by regard to what</li> </ul>

23 (Pages 89 to 92)

1			
	Mr Levy has very candidly explained how he	1	summer of 2018 when you gave your support
2	was feeling as a result of the abusive	2	to the new venture subject to the Op Delhi
3	execution of the search warrant.	3	founders regularising their position with
4	Q. I suppose you accept that when someone	4	Mr Gaggero. That is just in the sort of
5	is very emotionally affected they might make	5	middle of the paragraph. You then had
6	allegations which turn out to be spurious.	6	conversations with Mr Levy about Hassans
7	A. Exactly, and you do not judge them and	7	supporting Perez and Cornelio through
8	their record and their relationship with you or	8	an investment. You have been shown that
9	anything else based on what happens in that	9	already. You then describe the conversation
10	period of heightened emotions.	10	you had with Mr Gaggero on 21 July, if you
11	Q. Yes. And I suppose also do not judge the	11	could just go a little bit further down, please.
12	person against whom the allegations are	12	Which we have seen that you kept a note of.
13	being made.	13	And then just picking it up on the final
14	A. Exactly the point. That's why I have	14	paragraph of B1112, so just the bottom of
15	always maintained that I thought that the	15	this page. (Pause). There. You say:
16	allegation was fanciful.	16	"Additionally, as I set out above, given that
17	Q. I want to ask you a few questions, please,	17	the new entity that had been established by
18	about your statement to the police in 2021. If	18	Messrs Perez and Cornelio included
19	we can just pull up B1111, please, all the	19 20	an investment by the partners of Hassans
20	ones. You have been shown this a few times	20	Limited, of which I am a partner on
21	and I am going to take you to a couple of	21	sabbatical and of which I was aware, I therefore did not want to become involved in
22	sections that you have seen and a couple of	22	
23	sections that you have not. Presumably this	23	any aspect of a relationship between Bland
24 25	statement was made on the advice of	24	Limited and 36 North which were
25	lawyers.	25	contentious."
	Page 93		Page 95
1	A. This statement?	1	So very clear there you knew you had
2	Q. Yes.	2	
3	-		an interest volt therefore and not want to get
	A. No.		an interest, you therefore did not want to get involved in any of the contentious issues
	<b>A. No.</b> O. You just wrote it yourself.	3	involved in any of the contentious issues
4	Q. You just wrote it yourself.	3 4	involved in any of the contentious issues between you would let them fight it out for
4 5	Q. You just wrote it yourself. A. I didn't write it myself. Mr Wyan came	3 4 5	involved in any of the contentious issues between you would let them fight it out for themselves. That is the point there, is it not?
4 5 6	<ul><li>Q. You just wrote it yourself.</li><li>A. I didn't write it myself. Mr Wyan came to my office and we worked on it together.</li></ul>	3 4 5 6	<ul><li>involved in any of the contentious issues</li><li>between you would let them fight it out for</li><li>themselves. That is the point there, is it not?</li><li>A. Well, I mean, it is a characterisation of</li></ul>
4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>Q. You just wrote it yourself.</li> <li>A. I didn't write it myself. Mr Wyan came to my office and we worked on it together.</li> <li>Q. So you see you signed every page. I</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7	<ul><li>involved in any of the contentious issues</li><li>between you would let them fight it out for</li><li>themselves. That is the point there, is it not?</li><li>A. Well, I mean, it is a characterisation of</li><li>which I think is relatively accurate, but I</li></ul>
4 5 6	<ul><li>Q. You just wrote it yourself.</li><li>A. I didn't write it myself. Mr Wyan came to my office and we worked on it together.</li></ul>	3 4 5 6	<ul><li>involved in any of the contentious issues</li><li>between you would let them fight it out for</li><li>themselves. That is the point there, is it not?</li><li>A. Well, I mean, it is a characterisation of</li></ul>
4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>Q. You just wrote it yourself.</li> <li>A. I didn't write it myself. Mr Wyan came to my office and we worked on it together.</li> <li>Q. So you see you signed every page. I suppose you checked every word of it to make sure it was accurate.</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>involved in any of the contentious issues</li> <li>between you would let them fight it out for</li> <li>themselves. That is the point there, is it not?</li> <li>A. Well, I mean, it is a characterisation of</li> <li>which I think is relatively accurate, but I</li> <li>think there is a full statement which sets out</li> <li>exactly what I thought.</li> </ul>
4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q. You just wrote it yourself.</li> <li>A. I didn't write it myself. Mr Wyan came to my office and we worked on it together.</li> <li>Q. So you see you signed every page. I suppose you checked every word of it to make sure it was accurate.</li> <li>A. Insofar as one is able to ensure accuracy</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>involved in any of the contentious issues</li> <li>between you would let them fight it out for</li> <li>themselves. That is the point there, is it not?</li> <li>A. Well, I mean, it is a characterisation of</li> <li>which I think is relatively accurate, but I</li> <li>think there is a full statement which sets out</li> <li>exactly what I thought.</li> <li>Q. Then picking up at B1117, please. End</li> </ul>
4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>Q. You just wrote it yourself.</li> <li>A. I didn't write it myself. Mr Wyan came to my office and we worked on it together.</li> <li>Q. So you see you signed every page. I suppose you checked every word of it to make sure it was accurate.</li> <li>A. Insofar as one is able to ensure accuracy in anything that one checks. I mean, I look</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>involved in any of the contentious issues</li> <li>between you would let them fight it out for</li> <li>themselves. That is the point there, is it not?</li> <li>A. Well, I mean, it is a characterisation of</li> <li>which I think is relatively accurate, but I</li> <li>think there is a full statement which sets out</li> <li>exactly what I thought.</li> </ul>
4 5 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>Q. You just wrote it yourself.</li> <li>A. I didn't write it myself. Mr Wyan came to my office and we worked on it together.</li> <li>Q. So you see you signed every page. I suppose you checked every word of it to make sure it was accurate.</li> <li>A. Insofar as one is able to ensure accuracy</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>involved in any of the contentious issues</li> <li>between you would let them fight it out for themselves. That is the point there, is it not?</li> <li>A. Well, I mean, it is a characterisation of which I think is relatively accurate, but I think there is a full statement which sets out exactly what I thought.</li> <li>Q. Then picking up at B1117, please. End of the second paragraph, you say again,</li> </ul>
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Q. You just wrote it yourself.</li> <li>A. I didn't write it myself. Mr Wyan came to my office and we worked on it together.</li> <li>Q. So you see you signed every page. I suppose you checked every word of it to make sure it was accurate.</li> <li>A. Insofar as one is able to ensure accuracy in anything that one checks. I mean, I look back on these things now and I find syntax</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>involved in any of the contentious issues</li> <li>between you would let them fight it out for</li> <li>themselves. That is the point there, is it not?</li> <li>A. Well, I mean, it is a characterisation of</li> <li>which I think is relatively accurate, but I</li> <li>think there is a full statement which sets out</li> <li>exactly what I thought.</li> <li>Q. Then picking up at B1117, please. End</li> <li>of the second paragraph, you say again,</li> <li>sorry, this is, I think it is, seven lines up:</li> </ul>
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Q. You just wrote it yourself.</li> <li>A. I didn't write it myself. Mr Wyan came to my office and we worked on it together.</li> <li>Q. So you see you signed every page. I suppose you checked every word of it to make sure it was accurate.</li> <li>A. Insofar as one is able to ensure accuracy in anything that one checks. I mean, I look back on these things now and I find syntax errors which I am embarrassed about in</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>involved in any of the contentious issues</li> <li>between you would let them fight it out for</li> <li>themselves. That is the point there, is it not?</li> <li>A. Well, I mean, it is a characterisation of</li> <li>which I think is relatively accurate, but I</li> <li>think there is a full statement which sets out</li> <li>exactly what I thought.</li> <li>Q. Then picking up at B1117, please. End</li> <li>of the second paragraph, you say again,</li> <li>sorry, this is, I think it is, seven lines up:</li> <li>"Given in particular the interest that Hassans</li> </ul>
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Q. You just wrote it yourself.</li> <li>A. I didn't write it myself. Mr Wyan came to my office and we worked on it together.</li> <li>Q. So you see you signed every page. I suppose you checked every word of it to make sure it was accurate.</li> <li>A. Insofar as one is able to ensure accuracy in anything that one checks. I mean, I look back on these things now and I find syntax errors which I am embarrassed about in everything that I have written some years</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>involved in any of the contentious issues</li> <li>between you would let them fight it out for</li> <li>themselves. That is the point there, is it not?</li> <li>A. Well, I mean, it is a characterisation of</li> <li>which I think is relatively accurate, but I</li> <li>think there is a full statement which sets out</li> <li>exactly what I thought.</li> <li>Q. Then picking up at B1117, please. End</li> <li>of the second paragraph, you say again,</li> <li>sorry, this is, I think it is, seven lines up:</li> <li>"Given in particular the interest that Hassans</li> <li>Limited had in 36 North, I was not prepared</li> </ul>
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Q. You just wrote it yourself.</li> <li>A. I didn't write it myself. Mr Wyan came to my office and we worked on it together.</li> <li>Q. So you see you signed every page. I suppose you checked every word of it to make sure it was accurate.</li> <li>A. Insofar as one is able to ensure accuracy in anything that one checks. I mean, I look back on these things now and I find syntax errors which I am embarrassed about in everything that I have written some years ago.</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>involved in any of the contentious issues</li> <li>between you would let them fight it out for</li> <li>themselves. That is the point there, is it not?</li> <li>A. Well, I mean, it is a characterisation of</li> <li>which I think is relatively accurate, but I</li> <li>think there is a full statement which sets out</li> <li>exactly what I thought.</li> <li>Q. Then picking up at B1117, please. End</li> <li>of the second paragraph, you say again,</li> <li>sorry, this is, I think it is, seven lines up:</li> <li>"Given in particular the interest that Hassans</li> <li>Limited had in 36 North, I was not prepared</li> <li>to enter the fray of that commercial dispute</li> </ul>
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Q. You just wrote it yourself.</li> <li>A. I didn't write it myself. Mr Wyan came to my office and we worked on it together.</li> <li>Q. So you see you signed every page. I suppose you checked every word of it to make sure it was accurate.</li> <li>A. Insofar as one is able to ensure accuracy in anything that one checks. I mean, I look back on these things now and I find syntax errors which I am embarrassed about in everything that I have written some years ago.</li> <li>Q. I am not asking whether it was accurate.</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>involved in any of the contentious issues</li> <li>between you would let them fight it out for themselves. That is the point there, is it not?</li> <li>A. Well, I mean, it is a characterisation of which I think is relatively accurate, but I think there is a full statement which sets out exactly what I thought.</li> <li>Q. Then picking up at B1117, please. End of the second paragraph, you say again, sorry, this is, I think it is, seven lines up: "Given in particular the interest that Hassans Limited had in 36 North, I was not prepared to enter the fray of that commercial dispute as it was becoming more and more</li> </ul>
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Q. You just wrote it yourself.</li> <li>A. I didn't write it myself. Mr Wyan came to my office and we worked on it together.</li> <li>Q. So you see you signed every page. I suppose you checked every word of it to make sure it was accurate.</li> <li>A. Insofar as one is able to ensure accuracy in anything that one checks. I mean, I look back on these things now and I find syntax errors which I am embarrassed about in everything that I have written some years ago.</li> <li>Q. I am not asking whether it was accurate. I am asking whether you checked to make</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>involved in any of the contentious issues</li> <li>between you would let them fight it out for themselves. That is the point there, is it not?</li> <li>A. Well, I mean, it is a characterisation of which I think is relatively accurate, but I think there is a full statement which sets out exactly what I thought.</li> <li>Q. Then picking up at B1117, please. End of the second paragraph, you say again, sorry, this is, I think it is, seven lines up:</li> <li>"Given in particular the interest that Hassans Limited had in 36 North, I was not prepared to enter the fray of that commercial dispute as it was becoming more and more acrimonious."</li> </ul>
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q. You just wrote it yourself.</li> <li>A. I didn't write it myself. Mr Wyan came to my office and we worked on it together.</li> <li>Q. So you see you signed every page. I suppose you checked every word of it to make sure it was accurate.</li> <li>A. Insofar as one is able to ensure accuracy in anything that one checks. I mean, I look back on these things now and I find syntax errors which I am embarrassed about in everything that I have written some years ago.</li> <li>Q. I am not asking whether it was accurate. I am asking whether you checked to make sure it was accurate.</li> <li>A. Insofar as I was able to. This again was, as it is now of course, a very difficult period</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>involved in any of the contentious issues</li> <li>between you would let them fight it out for</li> <li>themselves. That is the point there, is it not?</li> <li>A. Well, I mean, it is a characterisation of</li> <li>which I think is relatively accurate, but I</li> <li>think there is a full statement which sets out</li> <li>exactly what I thought.</li> <li>Q. Then picking up at B1117, please. End</li> <li>of the second paragraph, you say again,</li> <li>sorry, this is, I think it is, seven lines up:</li> <li>"Given in particular the interest that Hassans</li> <li>Limited had in 36 North, I was not prepared</li> <li>to enter the fray of that commercial dispute</li> <li>as it was becoming more and more</li> <li>acrimonious."</li> <li>A. Sorry, I can't find that.</li> <li>Q. Sorry, it is right in the middle of the</li> <li>paragraph where the cross is on the right.</li> </ul>
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Q. You just wrote it yourself.</li> <li>A. I didn't write it myself. Mr Wyan came to my office and we worked on it together.</li> <li>Q. So you see you signed every page. I suppose you checked every word of it to make sure it was accurate.</li> <li>A. Insofar as one is able to ensure accuracy in anything that one checks. I mean, I look back on these things now and I find syntax errors which I am embarrassed about in everything that I have written some years ago.</li> <li>Q. I am not asking whether it was accurate.</li> <li>I am asking whether you checked to make sure it was accurate.</li> <li>A. Insofar as I was able to. This again was,</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>involved in any of the contentious issues</li> <li>between you would let them fight it out for themselves. That is the point there, is it not?</li> <li>A. Well, I mean, it is a characterisation of which I think is relatively accurate, but I think there is a full statement which sets out exactly what I thought.</li> <li>Q. Then picking up at B1117, please. End of the second paragraph, you say again, sorry, this is, I think it is, seven lines up:</li> <li>"Given in particular the interest that Hassans Limited had in 36 North, I was not prepared to enter the fray of that commercial dispute as it was becoming more and more acrimonious."</li> <li>A. Sorry, I can't find that.</li> <li>Q. Sorry, it is right in the middle of the paragraph where the cross is on the right. Can you see that?</li> </ul>
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q. You just wrote it yourself.</li> <li>A. I didn't write it myself. Mr Wyan came to my office and we worked on it together.</li> <li>Q. So you see you signed every page. I suppose you checked every word of it to make sure it was accurate.</li> <li>A. Insofar as one is able to ensure accuracy in anything that one checks. I mean, I look back on these things now and I find syntax errors which I am embarrassed about in everything that I have written some years ago.</li> <li>Q. I am not asking whether it was accurate. I am asking whether you checked to make sure it was accurate.</li> <li>A. Insofar as I was able to. This again was, as it is now of course, a very difficult period and discharging the office of Chief Minister means you cannot give anything as much</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>involved in any of the contentious issues</li> <li>between you would let them fight it out for themselves. That is the point there, is it not?</li> <li>A. Well, I mean, it is a characterisation of which I think is relatively accurate, but I think there is a full statement which sets out exactly what I thought.</li> <li>Q. Then picking up at B1117, please. End of the second paragraph, you say again, sorry, this is, I think it is, seven lines up:</li> <li>"Given in particular the interest that Hassans Limited had in 36 North, I was not prepared to enter the fray of that commercial dispute as it was becoming more and more acrimonious."</li> <li>A. Sorry, I can't find that.</li> <li>Q. Sorry, it is right in the middle of the paragraph where the cross is on the right. Can you see that?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. You just wrote it yourself.</li> <li>A. I didn't write it myself. Mr Wyan came to my office and we worked on it together.</li> <li>Q. So you see you signed every page. I suppose you checked every word of it to make sure it was accurate.</li> <li>A. Insofar as one is able to ensure accuracy in anything that one checks. I mean, I look back on these things now and I find syntax errors which I am embarrassed about in everything that I have written some years ago.</li> <li>Q. I am not asking whether it was accurate. I am asking whether you checked to make sure it was accurate.</li> <li>A. Insofar as I was able to. This again was, as it is now of course, a very difficult period and discharging the office of Chief Minister means you cannot give anything as much time as you would quite like to give it.</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>involved in any of the contentious issues</li> <li>between you would let them fight it out for themselves. That is the point there, is it not?</li> <li>A. Well, I mean, it is a characterisation of which I think is relatively accurate, but I think there is a full statement which sets out exactly what I thought.</li> <li>Q. Then picking up at B1117, please. End of the second paragraph, you say again, sorry, this is, I think it is, seven lines up: "Given in particular the interest that Hassans Limited had in 36 North, I was not prepared to enter the fray of that commercial dispute as it was becoming more and more acrimonious."</li> <li>A. Sorry, I can't find that.</li> <li>Q. Sorry, it is right in the middle of the paragraph where the cross is on the right. Can you see that?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. "Given in particular the interest that</li> </ul>
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Q. You just wrote it yourself.</li> <li>A. I didn't write it myself. Mr Wyan came to my office and we worked on it together.</li> <li>Q. So you see you signed every page. I suppose you checked every word of it to make sure it was accurate.</li> <li>A. Insofar as one is able to ensure accuracy in anything that one checks. I mean, I look back on these things now and I find syntax errors which I am embarrassed about in everything that I have written some years ago.</li> <li>Q. I am not asking whether it was accurate. I am asking whether you checked to make sure it was accurate.</li> <li>A. Insofar as I was able to. This again was, as it is now of course, a very difficult period and discharging the office of Chief Minister means you cannot give anything as much time as you would quite like to give it.</li> <li>Q. No. The bottom paragraph of B1111,</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	<ul> <li>involved in any of the contentious issues</li> <li>between you would let them fight it out for themselves. That is the point there, is it not?</li> <li>A. Well, I mean, it is a characterisation of which I think is relatively accurate, but I think there is a full statement which sets out exactly what I thought.</li> <li>Q. Then picking up at B1117, please. End of the second paragraph, you say again, sorry, this is, I think it is, seven lines up: "Given in particular the interest that Hassans Limited had in 36 North, I was not prepared to enter the fray of that commercial dispute as it was becoming more and more acrimonious."</li> <li>A. Sorry, I can't find that.</li> <li>Q. Sorry, it is right in the middle of the paragraph where the cross is on the right. Can you see that?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. "Given in particular the interest that Hassans Limited had in 36 North, I was not</li> </ul>
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. You just wrote it yourself.</li> <li>A. I didn't write it myself. Mr Wyan came to my office and we worked on it together.</li> <li>Q. So you see you signed every page. I suppose you checked every word of it to make sure it was accurate.</li> <li>A. Insofar as one is able to ensure accuracy in anything that one checks. I mean, I look back on these things now and I find syntax errors which I am embarrassed about in everything that I have written some years ago.</li> <li>Q. I am not asking whether it was accurate. I am asking whether you checked to make sure it was accurate.</li> <li>A. Insofar as I was able to. This again was, as it is now of course, a very difficult period and discharging the office of Chief Minister means you cannot give anything as much time as you would quite like to give it.</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>involved in any of the contentious issues</li> <li>between you would let them fight it out for themselves. That is the point there, is it not?</li> <li>A. Well, I mean, it is a characterisation of which I think is relatively accurate, but I think there is a full statement which sets out exactly what I thought.</li> <li>Q. Then picking up at B1117, please. End of the second paragraph, you say again, sorry, this is, I think it is, seven lines up: "Given in particular the interest that Hassans Limited had in 36 North, I was not prepared to enter the fray of that commercial dispute as it was becoming more and more acrimonious."</li> <li>A. Sorry, I can't find that.</li> <li>Q. Sorry, it is right in the middle of the paragraph where the cross is on the right. Can you see that?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. "Given in particular the interest that</li> </ul>
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Q. You just wrote it yourself.</li> <li>A. I didn't write it myself. Mr Wyan came to my office and we worked on it together.</li> <li>Q. So you see you signed every page. I suppose you checked every word of it to make sure it was accurate.</li> <li>A. Insofar as one is able to ensure accuracy in anything that one checks. I mean, I look back on these things now and I find syntax errors which I am embarrassed about in everything that I have written some years ago.</li> <li>Q. I am not asking whether it was accurate. I am asking whether you checked to make sure it was accurate.</li> <li>A. Insofar as I was able to. This again was, as it is now of course, a very difficult period and discharging the office of Chief Minister means you cannot give anything as much time as you would quite like to give it.</li> <li>Q. No. The bottom paragraph of B1111,</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	<ul> <li>involved in any of the contentious issues</li> <li>between you would let them fight it out for themselves. That is the point there, is it not?</li> <li>A. Well, I mean, it is a characterisation of which I think is relatively accurate, but I think there is a full statement which sets out exactly what I thought.</li> <li>Q. Then picking up at B1117, please. End of the second paragraph, you say again, sorry, this is, I think it is, seven lines up: "Given in particular the interest that Hassans Limited had in 36 North, I was not prepared to enter the fray of that commercial dispute as it was becoming more and more acrimonious."</li> <li>A. Sorry, I can't find that.</li> <li>Q. Sorry, it is right in the middle of the paragraph where the cross is on the right. Can you see that?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. "Given in particular the interest that Hassans Limited had in 36 North, I was not</li> </ul>

24 (Pages 93 to 96)

1	dispute as it was becoming more and more	1	North is upsetting a few people and
2	acrimonious."	2	presumably Bland. Is that fair? Is that a fair
		3	÷ •
3	So a similar statement. And then 1119. So		reflection of what those two messages are
4	the question being asked here is the defence	4	about?
5	is drawing our attention to a text message	5	A. Yes.
6	sent from Mr Cornelio to Mr Levy dated 30	6	Q. And you respond on 9 August 2018:
7	August 2018 in which he stated:	7	"Honestly, you were with me. Do you
8	"Yes, please tell him if we meet I will be able	8	imagine I would ever be on Gaggero's side?"
9	to discuss in person as I feel sometimes the	9	Would you agree that there you are
10	information he is getting is not correct. If he	10	expressing a clear view to Mr Levy that you
11	knew my solution in detail, it would make	11	would be favouring 36 North over Bland?
	•	11	-
12	any decision he makes easier also."		A. As to the tittle-tattle that he is referring to
13	And then seven lines down in the large	13	me, yes.
14	paragraph you say: "At that stage". I will just	14	Q. Well, it is not just tittle-tattle, it is the
15	wait for us to find it. Can you see there, it is	15	concern, it is relating the concern that Bland
16	where the cross is?	16	have about 36 North. Would you agree that
17	A. "I have no difficulty with either of the	17	you are expressing a view that you
18	two companies maintaining the platform."	18	A. I am afraid not, Mr Wagner. Nothing in
19	Q. Yes, so again you were and then you	19	the messages before relates to anything that
20	say, I have just lost it. Yes. "As stated	20	Mr Gaggero is alleged to have said.
20	previously, I did not want to become	20	Q. Yes.
22	involved in the commercial dispute." So you	22	A. It's all the other parties are alleged to be
23	were not expressing a preference. So would	23	saying. So there is no expression there about
24	you agree there are various statements made	24	Bland's taking one view and me taking the
25	there, including:	25	other. So I don't accept what you are saying.
	Page 97		Page 99
1	"I did not want to become involved in any	1	Q. There was only one issue at the time
2	aspect of the relationship between Bland	2	between Bland and 36 North, which was that
3	Limited and 36 North which were	3	36 North had left Bland and wanted to take
4	contentious. I repeatedly emphasised both	4	over the NSCIS contract. Is that not right?
5	my desire to assist both sides and given in	5	A. That is one way of looking at what was
6	particular the interest that Hassans had in 36	6	happening generally at the time.
7	North, I was not prepared to enter the fray of	7	Q. Yes.
8	the commercial dispute."	8	A. But not reflecting the messages that I was
9	Does that fairly reflect what you were trying	9	commenting on and your question is about
			J
10	to put across to the police?	10	my message which relates to the two
11	A. And not just the police. I think I said that	11	messages immediately above, not to what
12	elsewhere as well.	12	was happening generally at the time.
13	Q. You have. If we go to C7020, please. So	13	Q. Yes.
14	these are the text messages that your lawyers	14	A. So if you want the answers to be truthful
15	accidently did not provide to the Inquiry until	15	in the context of the question, then you have
16	a couple of days ago. And this is from 9	16	to go back to what the question was about,
17	August 2018. So this is about a month after	17	which was about those two previous
18	36 North has been well, after the founders	18	WhatsApps.
19	have left Bland. And James Levy, it looks	19	Q. Yes. And then you say
20	like, forwards you a couple of messages	20	A. And let me say that was not mentioned in
			•
21	because both of them refer to him in the third	21	those WhatsApps as somebody who was
22	person. So they probably, I assume, must be	22	saying anything.
23	forwarded. But I will give you a moment to	23	Q. And then you say on the 9th, the same
24	read them, but they are effectively saying,	24	day, 9 August, you say to Mr Levy:
25	people texting, somebody saying that 36	25	"Indeed, all that is clear in my head, but I
	Page 98		Page 100

25 (Pages 97 to 100)

1 1 want to support John and the programmer O. Yes. What did they want to do? 2 2 A. They wanted to strike out on their own into guy. I think Gaggero is riding their backs as 3 usual." 3 36 North. 4 4 Q. And do what? What was 36 North - what A. It's almost exactly what I had said to 5 James Gaggero himself. 5 was the opening gambit for 36 North, what 6 6 were they going to do? Q. Who is the programmer guy? Is that 7 7 A. The raison d'etre for 36 North was the Tommy Cornelio? 8 8 exploitation internationally of the NSCIS A. Who I have never met, as I have told the 9 9 tribunal. platform in order to use that platform to 10 10 Q. No, you said that. But are you, I think produce profit for Gibraltar, because in 36 11 you --11 North it would be clear beyond peradventure 12 A. I think you went in your opening 12 that it was 100% owned by the Gibraltarian 13 statement you say that I know all three of 13 taxpayer. 14 14 them and, you know, far from it. I knew Q. That may have been the long-term aim, but 15 15 the short-term aim was for the contract for the John who came to see me. I have never met 16 16 maintenance of NSCIS to be transferred to 36 Tommy Cornelio and the third person, whose 17 17 name I constantly forget, um, his name starts North, is that correct? 18 with an E and I think his surname starts with 18 A. No, you characterise it in that way. I 19 19 an A. would say that that would be, as I think I told 20 20 the inquiry in my evidence yesterday, that (11.56)21 21 would be the bread and butter of what NSCIS Q. Asquez. 22 22 did, or what 36 North did, but the reason for A. Yes, is not somebody I've ever met and 23 23 wouldn't recognise in the street. creating it as a separate entity, the reason why 24 24 they wanted to go, was to be able to exploit it Q. Well, you may not have met but, I mean, 25 25 you were in touch with him, were you not? internationally. I think in the discussions I've Page 101 Page 103 1 A. Yes, but you say in your opening that I 1 had with John Perez at the time, he was 2 knew them all and was meeting them all in my 2 sensing a reluctance from the point of view of 3 3 office. the Government to become involved in doing 4 4 that. Governments find it very difficult to Q. I am not sure that is what we said but, 5 5 anyway ... commercialise the things that they do. And 6 A. Well, have a look. 6 the reluctance from Blands to pick up and to 7 7 Q. Saying there, "I want to support John and do that, and he was saying, "We can do this 8 the programmer guy" - support them in what? 8 better on our own without having to carry 9 A. Support them in their new venture. It's 9 Blands." So, to bring it back to your question 10 10 exactly what I said to James Gaggero. It's and to that WhatsApp, what I am saying in that 11 exactly what James Gaggero was saying to 11 WhatsApp to James Levy in that exchange is 12 me. I mean, this is a reflection of what James 12 exactly the same thing that James Gaggero and 13 Gaggero was saving to me. He was saving to 13 I had discussed together on the phone on the 14 14 me, "They are saying in their discussions with 21st of July, and when he had come to see me 15 15 me, why should they, dealing just with the around that time. So, I don't see how - I can 16 16 NSCIS, have to carry the whole of the Bland see why - but I don't see how you can suggest 17 organisation ..." - because obviously the 17 it's sinister at all for me to be saying to Mr 18 income that they produce goes into the whole 18 Levy exactly the same thing that I was saying 19 19 of the Bland organisation - " ... when they can to Mr Gaggero. 20 do what they want to do? And I sympathize 20 Q. I am not suggesting it is sinister. I am 21 21 suggesting that it does not fit with the police with them and we've just got to agree the terms 2.2 22 of this divorce." statement you gave in which you said multiple 23 23 Q. What did they want to do? times, "I was not going to support either side." 24 24 A. That was James Gaggero, I'm talking A. No, I think you are conflating "support". 25 about, yes? 25 In other words, what I was saying was - and I

Page 102

26 (Pages 101 to 104)

Page 104

1			
1	think I have been explicit in this and that there	1	A. Let's go there.
2	is an element of mischief in the way that	2	Q. Were you concerned when the police
3	you're creating the question for me to answer:	3	obtained Mr Levy's phone on the 12th of May
4	if it came to a dispute between them, then I	4	that they would find text messages which
5	will not be backing either side. If what was	5	showed you were not neutral but intended to
6	happening was that one of them wanted to	6	support
7	leave and strike off on their own by way of	7	A. No.
8	agreement, I would be happy to see that	8	Q the Op Delhi founders in achieving what
9	happen. In particular, I was happy to see it	9	they wanted to achieve?
10	happen in a way that led to 100% ownership of	10	A. No, no, Mr Wagner, I work on the basis
11	the platform being confirmed to be with the	11	that what I say in writing, whether it's in a
12	taxpayer, a lower amount of maintenance	12	WhatsApp or in an email or a letter, is
13	payable per annum, etc., so there were	13	something that I'm happy for the world to see.
14	advantages to the taxpayer, and James	14	Q. Sure.
15	Gaggero was not adverse to that also, so long	15	A. And what I say, even if it's not in writing,
16	as certain things were dealt with at the time.	16	is something that I'm prepared to defend. That
17	So, I don't accept the characterisation that you	17	doesn't mean that I believe that I'm always
18	are giving of what I said in my statement being	18	right. It means that I'm prepared to defend
19	different to what I was saying in these	19	why I said, wrote or did something either to
20	messages.	20	the Royal Gibraltar Police, to this tribunal of
21	Q. You said in your statement, "I repeated	21	inquiry or indeed to any third party, whether or
22	emphasized both my desire to assist both sides	22	not they are constituted by law.
23	on the basis that Mr Gaggero had himself set	23	Q. But if you are happy to defend to anybody
24	out on the 21st of July" but here you are	24	what you said in those messages, why did you
25	saying, "Do you imagine I would ever be on	25	not disclose them to the police?
-			X
	Page 105		Page 107
1	Gaggero's side? Leave it with me." Is that not	1	A. What do you mean?
2	the complete opposite of what you told the	2	Q. Why did you not provide them? They
3	police?	3	were not provided with your witness
4	A. But not in the context of a dispute as to	4	statement. You provided other messages but
5	public asset like the NSCIS. This - remember		statement. Tou provided other messages out
	public asset like the 10010. This Temember	5	not these messages
6	that WhatsAnns are reflections of	5	not these messages. A I disclosed everything that was relevant at
6 7	that WhatsApps are reflections of	6	A. I disclosed everything that was relevant at
7	conversations, they are not official documents.	6 7	A. I disclosed everything that was relevant at the time.
7 8	conversations, they are not official documents. What I am saying to my very good friend and	6 7 8	<ul><li>A. I disclosed everything that was relevant at the time.</li><li>Q. So, are you saying they were not relevant?</li></ul>
7 8 9	conversations, they are not official documents. What I am saying to my very good friend and mentor is that I wouldn't be on James	6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A. I disclosed everything that was relevant at the time.</li> <li>Q. So, are you saying they were not relevant?</li> <li>A. I don't think these are relevant at all.</li> </ul>
7 8 9 10	conversations, they are not official documents. What I am saying to my very good friend and mentor is that I wouldn't be on James Gaggero's side - and neither, by the way,	6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>A. I disclosed everything that was relevant at the time.</li> <li>Q. So, are you saying they were not relevant?</li> <li>A. I don't think these are relevant at all.</li> <li>Remember that in this period, in August, I</li> </ul>
7 8 9 10 11	conversations, they are not official documents. What I am saying to my very good friend and mentor is that I wouldn't be on James Gaggero's side - and neither, by the way, would James Gaggero expect me to be on his	6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>A. I disclosed everything that was relevant at the time.</li> <li>Q. So, are you saying they were not relevant?</li> <li>A. I don't think these are relevant at all.</li> <li>Remember that in this period, in August, I don't think there's anything here that relates to</li> </ul>
7 8 9 10 11 12	conversations, they are not official documents. What I am saying to my very good friend and mentor is that I wouldn't be on James Gaggero's side - and neither, by the way, would James Gaggero expect me to be on his side - when it comes to an issue which is not a	6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>A. I disclosed everything that was relevant at the time.</li> <li>Q. So, are you saying they were not relevant?</li> <li>A. I don't think these are relevant at all.</li> <li>Remember that in this period, in August, I don't think there's anything here that relates to the issues in contention. I mean, are you</li> </ul>
7 8 9 10 11 12 13	conversations, they are not official documents. What I am saying to my very good friend and mentor is that I wouldn't be on James Gaggero's side - and neither, by the way, would James Gaggero expect me to be on his side - when it comes to an issue which is not a contentious issue like this. As I said and as	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A. I disclosed everything that was relevant at the time.</li> <li>Q. So, are you saying they were not relevant?</li> <li>A. I don't think these are relevant at all.</li> <li>Remember that in this period, in August, I don't think there's anything here that relates to the issues in contention. I mean, are you seriously telling me that the Royal Gibraltar</li> </ul>
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	conversations, they are not official documents. What I am saying to my very good friend and mentor is that I wouldn't be on James Gaggero's side - and neither, by the way, would James Gaggero expect me to be on his side - when it comes to an issue which is not a contentious issue like this. As I said and as you've seen in some of the exchanges, Mr	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A. I disclosed everything that was relevant at the time.</li> <li>Q. So, are you saying they were not relevant?</li> <li>A. I don't think these are relevant at all.</li> <li>Remember that in this period, in August, I don't think there's anything here that relates to the issues in contention. I mean, are you seriously telling me that the Royal Gibraltar Police are interested in what was said on a</li> </ul>
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	conversations, they are not official documents. What I am saying to my very good friend and mentor is that I wouldn't be on James Gaggero's side - and neither, by the way, would James Gaggero expect me to be on his side - when it comes to an issue which is not a contentious issue like this. As I said and as you've seen in some of the exchanges, Mr Gaggero and I come from different political	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>A. I disclosed everything that was relevant at the time.</li> <li>Q. So, are you saying they were not relevant?</li> <li>A. I don't think these are relevant at all.</li> <li>Remember that in this period, in August, I don't think there's anything here that relates to the issues in contention. I mean, are you seriously telling me that the Royal Gibraltar Police are interested in what was said on a Saturday night in Sotogrande at a dinner</li> </ul>
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	conversations, they are not official documents. What I am saying to my very good friend and mentor is that I wouldn't be on James Gaggero's side - and neither, by the way, would James Gaggero expect me to be on his side - when it comes to an issue which is not a contentious issue like this. As I said and as you've seen in some of the exchanges, Mr Gaggero and I come from different political and ideological traditions and that's no secret	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>A. I disclosed everything that was relevant at the time.</li> <li>Q. So, are you saying they were not relevant?</li> <li>A. I don't think these are relevant at all.</li> <li>Remember that in this period, in August, I don't think there's anything here that relates to the issues in contention. I mean, are you seriously telling me that the Royal Gibraltar Police are interested in what was said on a Saturday night in Sotogrande at a dinner party?</li> </ul>
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	conversations, they are not official documents. What I am saying to my very good friend and mentor is that I wouldn't be on James Gaggero's side - and neither, by the way, would James Gaggero expect me to be on his side - when it comes to an issue which is not a contentious issue like this. As I said and as you've seen in some of the exchanges, Mr Gaggero and I come from different political and ideological traditions and that's no secret and it's clear. So, I would never be expected to	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A. I disclosed everything that was relevant at the time.</li> <li>Q. So, are you saying they were not relevant?</li> <li>A. I don't think these are relevant at all.</li> <li>Remember that in this period, in August, I don't think there's anything here that relates to the issues in contention. I mean, are you seriously telling me that the Royal Gibraltar Police are interested in what was said on a Saturday night in Sotogrande at a dinner party?</li> <li>Q. Well, I suppose they never got to decide,</li> </ul>
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	conversations, they are not official documents. What I am saying to my very good friend and mentor is that I wouldn't be on James Gaggero's side - and neither, by the way, would James Gaggero expect me to be on his side - when it comes to an issue which is not a contentious issue like this. As I said and as you've seen in some of the exchanges, Mr Gaggero and I come from different political and ideological traditions and that's no secret and it's clear. So, I would never be expected to be on Mr Gaggero's side and neither would Mr	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A. I disclosed everything that was relevant at the time.</li> <li>Q. So, are you saying they were not relevant?</li> <li>A. I don't think these are relevant at all.</li> <li>Remember that in this period, in August, I don't think there's anything here that relates to the issues in contention. I mean, are you seriously telling me that the Royal Gibraltar Police are interested in what was said on a Saturday night in Sotogrande at a dinner party?</li> <li>Q. Well, I suppose they never got to decide, did they, because you did not provide the</li> </ul>
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	conversations, they are not official documents. What I am saying to my very good friend and mentor is that I wouldn't be on James Gaggero's side - and neither, by the way, would James Gaggero expect me to be on his side - when it comes to an issue which is not a contentious issue like this. As I said and as you've seen in some of the exchanges, Mr Gaggero and I come from different political and ideological traditions and that's no secret and it's clear. So, I would never be expected to be on Mr Gaggero's side and neither would Mr Gaggero expect me to be on his side. That's	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>A. I disclosed everything that was relevant at the time.</li> <li>Q. So, are you saying they were not relevant?</li> <li>A. I don't think these are relevant at all.</li> <li>Remember that in this period, in August, I don't think there's anything here that relates to the issues in contention. I mean, are you seriously telling me that the Royal Gibraltar Police are interested in what was said on a Saturday night in Sotogrande at a dinner party?</li> <li>Q. Well, I suppose they never got to decide, did they, because you did not provide the messages to them?</li> </ul>
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	conversations, they are not official documents. What I am saying to my very good friend and mentor is that I wouldn't be on James Gaggero's side - and neither, by the way, would James Gaggero expect me to be on his side - when it comes to an issue which is not a contentious issue like this. As I said and as you've seen in some of the exchanges, Mr Gaggero and I come from different political and ideological traditions and that's no secret and it's clear. So, I would never be expected to be on Mr Gaggero's side and neither would Mr Gaggero expect me to be on his side. That's not the potential commercial dispute which	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>A. I disclosed everything that was relevant at the time.</li> <li>Q. So, are you saying they were not relevant?</li> <li>A. I don't think these are relevant at all.</li> <li>Remember that in this period, in August, I don't think there's anything here that relates to the issues in contention. I mean, are you seriously telling me that the Royal Gibraltar Police are interested in what was said on a Saturday night in Sotogrande at a dinner party?</li> <li>Q. Well, I suppose they never got to decide, did they, because you did not provide the messages to them?</li> <li>A. But it's not something that would have</li> </ul>
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	conversations, they are not official documents. What I am saying to my very good friend and mentor is that I wouldn't be on James Gaggero's side - and neither, by the way, would James Gaggero expect me to be on his side - when it comes to an issue which is not a contentious issue like this. As I said and as you've seen in some of the exchanges, Mr Gaggero and I come from different political and ideological traditions and that's no secret and it's clear. So, I would never be expected to be on Mr Gaggero's side and neither would Mr Gaggero expect me to be on his side. That's not the potential commercial dispute which might arise which would then have put me in	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A. I disclosed everything that was relevant at the time.</li> <li>Q. So, are you saying they were not relevant?</li> <li>A. I don't think these are relevant at all.</li> <li>Remember that in this period, in August, I don't think there's anything here that relates to the issues in contention. I mean, are you seriously telling me that the Royal Gibraltar Police are interested in what was said on a Saturday night in Sotogrande at a dinner party?</li> <li>Q. Well, I suppose they never got to decide, did they, because you did not provide the messages to them?</li> <li>A. But it's not something that would have been in the scope of any criminal discovery</li> </ul>
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	conversations, they are not official documents. What I am saying to my very good friend and mentor is that I wouldn't be on James Gaggero's side - and neither, by the way, would James Gaggero expect me to be on his side - when it comes to an issue which is not a contentious issue like this. As I said and as you've seen in some of the exchanges, Mr Gaggero and I come from different political and ideological traditions and that's no secret and it's clear. So, I would never be expected to be on Mr Gaggero's side and neither would Mr Gaggero expect me to be on his side. That's not the potential commercial dispute which might arise which would then have put me in conflict and which I avoided, by the way,	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A. I disclosed everything that was relevant at the time.</li> <li>Q. So, are you saying they were not relevant?</li> <li>A. I don't think these are relevant at all.</li> <li>Remember that in this period, in August, I don't think there's anything here that relates to the issues in contention. I mean, are you seriously telling me that the Royal Gibraltar Police are interested in what was said on a Saturday night in Sotogrande at a dinner party?</li> <li>Q. Well, I suppose they never got to decide, did they, because you did not provide the messages to them?</li> <li>A. But it's not something that would have been in the scope of any criminal discovery exercise.</li> </ul>
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	conversations, they are not official documents. What I am saying to my very good friend and mentor is that I wouldn't be on James Gaggero's side - and neither, by the way, would James Gaggero expect me to be on his side - when it comes to an issue which is not a contentious issue like this. As I said and as you've seen in some of the exchanges, Mr Gaggero and I come from different political and ideological traditions and that's no secret and it's clear. So, I would never be expected to be on Mr Gaggero's side and neither would Mr Gaggero expect me to be on his side. That's not the potential commercial dispute which might arise which would then have put me in conflict and which I avoided, by the way, because when it did come, it came not	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>A. I disclosed everything that was relevant at the time.</li> <li>Q. So, are you saying they were not relevant?</li> <li>A. I don't think these are relevant at all.</li> <li>Remember that in this period, in August, I don't think there's anything here that relates to the issues in contention. I mean, are you seriously telling me that the Royal Gibraltar Police are interested in what was said on a Saturday night in Sotogrande at a dinner party?</li> <li>Q. Well, I suppose they never got to decide, did they, because you did not provide the messages to them?</li> <li>A. But it's not something that would have been in the scope of any criminal discovery exercise.</li> <li>Q. Do you have quite a narrow understanding</li> </ul>
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	conversations, they are not official documents. What I am saying to my very good friend and mentor is that I wouldn't be on James Gaggero's side - and neither, by the way, would James Gaggero expect me to be on his side - when it comes to an issue which is not a contentious issue like this. As I said and as you've seen in some of the exchanges, Mr Gaggero and I come from different political and ideological traditions and that's no secret and it's clear. So, I would never be expected to be on Mr Gaggero's side and neither would Mr Gaggero expect me to be on his side. That's not the potential commercial dispute which might arise which would then have put me in conflict and which I avoided, by the way, because when it did come, it came not commercially but because of the potential	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>A. I disclosed everything that was relevant at the time.</li> <li>Q. So, are you saying they were not relevant?</li> <li>A. I don't think these are relevant at all.</li> <li>Remember that in this period, in August, I don't think there's anything here that relates to the issues in contention. I mean, are you seriously telling me that the Royal Gibraltar Police are interested in what was said on a Saturday night in Sotogrande at a dinner party?</li> <li>Q. Well, I suppose they never got to decide, did they, because you did not provide the messages to them?</li> <li>A. But it's not something that would have been in the scope of any criminal discovery exercise.</li> <li>Q. Do you have quite a narrow understanding of relevance and scope when it comes to</li> </ul>
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	conversations, they are not official documents. What I am saying to my very good friend and mentor is that I wouldn't be on James Gaggero's side - and neither, by the way, would James Gaggero expect me to be on his side - when it comes to an issue which is not a contentious issue like this. As I said and as you've seen in some of the exchanges, Mr Gaggero and I come from different political and ideological traditions and that's no secret and it's clear. So, I would never be expected to be on Mr Gaggero's side and neither would Mr Gaggero expect me to be on his side. That's not the potential commercial dispute which might arise which would then have put me in conflict and which I avoided, by the way, because when it did come, it came not	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>A. I disclosed everything that was relevant at the time.</li> <li>Q. So, are you saying they were not relevant?</li> <li>A. I don't think these are relevant at all.</li> <li>Remember that in this period, in August, I don't think there's anything here that relates to the issues in contention. I mean, are you seriously telling me that the Royal Gibraltar Police are interested in what was said on a Saturday night in Sotogrande at a dinner party?</li> <li>Q. Well, I suppose they never got to decide, did they, because you did not provide the messages to them?</li> <li>A. But it's not something that would have been in the scope of any criminal discovery exercise.</li> <li>Q. Do you have quite a narrow understanding</li> </ul>

Page 108

27 (Pages 105 to 108)

1	A. I don't accept that that is a question that I	1	an example that is not the truth before anybody
2	have exposed myself to given the very broad	2	pretends that this is something that happened: I
3	approach I have taken to discovery and	3	could be saying to James Levy something
4	disclosure and the access I have given to my	4	about a Minister who is not performing and
5	legal team so that they, applying their own	5	who I am concerned about, right?
6	independent mind, could determine what	6	Q. Yes.
7	should or should not be disclosed.	7	A. And that would be something that the
8	Q. On the 12th of May 2020 you were	8	Royal Gibraltar Police would then see. I
9	concerned about the messages between you	9	wouldn't be worried or concerned in the
10	and Mr Levy which were on Mr Levy's phone	10	context of worry or concern in these
11	and which the RGP could now access, were	11	proceedings, in criminal proceedings, but I am
12	you not?	12	entitled to have my private conversations
13	A. No, I wasn't.	13	private, and so is James Levy. So, I don't
14	Q. You were not. Could you just go to A192,	14	agree with you, I don't agree with you that I
15	one of your statements, so you must have it in	15	was worried or concerned, but I was raising
16	front of you, paragraph 45?	16	the point, which is, I think, a fair point to raise.
17	A. Yes.	17	Remember, Gibraltar has a written
18	Q. You say there, "I recall telling Mr McGrail	18	Constitution that protects privacy.
19	that the communications devices of senior	19	Q. Yes, so you did not want the Royal
20	lawyers were likely to include legally	20	Gibraltar Police to have those messages but
21	privileged material" - you have already dealt	21	you were not concerned about them, is that
22	with that. "Additionally, there would be	22	fair?
23	personally sensitive information on such	23	A. It's not a question of whether I wanted
24	devices. I told Mr McGrail that there would	24	them to have them or not. It's about whether
25	be myriad unrelated conversations between Mr	25	they are entitled to have them in these
	Page 109		Page 111
	1 age 107		i age i i i
1			
1	Levy and me. For example, on matters outside	1	circumstances or not.
2	the RGP's interest but which would be	1 2	
	the RGP's interest but which would be		Q. What steps did you take to ensure that you
2		2	
2 3	the RGP's interest but which would be private." Do you now remember being	2 3	Q. What steps did you take to ensure that you were not swayed, even unintentionally, by not
2 3 4	the RGP's interest but which would be private." Do you now remember being concerned about your private messages on Mr	2 3 4	Q. What steps did you take to ensure that you were not swayed, even unintentionally, by not wanting the RGP to see your private messages
2 3 4 5	the RGP's interest but which would be private." Do you now remember being concerned about your private messages on Mr Levy's phone?	2 3 4 5	Q. What steps did you take to ensure that you were not swayed, even unintentionally, by not wanting the RGP to see your private messages with Mr Levy?
2 3 4 5 6	<ul><li>the RGP's interest but which would be</li><li>private." Do you now remember being</li><li>concerned about your private messages on Mr</li><li>Levy's phone?</li><li>A. No.</li></ul>	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>Q. What steps did you take to ensure that you were not swayed, even unintentionally, by not wanting the RGP to see your private messages with Mr Levy?</li> <li>A. None whatsoever.</li> <li>Q. I want to ask you now about transfer of</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>the RGP's interest but which would be</li> <li>private." Do you now remember being</li> <li>concerned about your private messages on Mr</li> <li>Levy's phone?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did you not write this statement?</li> <li>A. I did. It doesn't talk about being worried or</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>Q. What steps did you take to ensure that you were not swayed, even unintentionally, by not wanting the RGP to see your private messages with Mr Levy?</li> <li>A. None whatsoever.</li> <li>Q. I want to ask you now about transfer of business, a topic that I promised I would come</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>the RGP's interest but which would be</li> <li>private." Do you now remember being</li> <li>concerned about your private messages on Mr</li> <li>Levy's phone?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did you not write this statement?</li> <li>A. I did. It doesn't talk about being worried or</li> <li>concerned. I'm just saying that they're there.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>Q. What steps did you take to ensure that you were not swayed, even unintentionally, by not wanting the RGP to see your private messages with Mr Levy?</li> <li>A. None whatsoever.</li> <li>Q. I want to ask you now about transfer of business, a topic that I promised I would come to. So, just to be clear on what you have said</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>the RGP's interest but which would be</li> <li>private." Do you now remember being</li> <li>concerned about your private messages on Mr</li> <li>Levy's phone?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did you not write this statement?</li> <li>A. I did. It doesn't talk about being worried or</li> <li>concerned. I'm just saying that they're there.</li> <li>They are subject to privilege, they are my</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q. What steps did you take to ensure that you were not swayed, even unintentionally, by not wanting the RGP to see your private messages with Mr Levy?</li> <li>A. None whatsoever.</li> <li>Q. I want to ask you now about transfer of business, a topic that I promised I would come</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>the RGP's interest but which would be</li> <li>private." Do you now remember being</li> <li>concerned about your private messages on Mr</li> <li>Levy's phone?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did you not write this statement?</li> <li>A. I did. It doesn't talk about being worried or</li> <li>concerned. I'm just saying that they're there.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>Q. What steps did you take to ensure that you were not swayed, even unintentionally, by not wanting the RGP to see your private messages with Mr Levy?</li> <li>A. None whatsoever.</li> <li>Q. I want to ask you now about transfer of business, a topic that I promised I would come to. So, just to be clear on what you have said so far, in the summer of 2018 you assumed</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>the RGP's interest but which would be</li> <li>private." Do you now remember being</li> <li>concerned about your private messages on Mr</li> <li>Levy's phone?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did you not write this statement?</li> <li>A. I did. It doesn't talk about being worried or</li> <li>concerned. I'm just saying that they're there.</li> <li>They are subject to privilege, they are my</li> <li>private conversations. I might be talking to</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>Q. What steps did you take to ensure that you were not swayed, even unintentionally, by not wanting the RGP to see your private messages with Mr Levy?</li> <li>A. None whatsoever.</li> <li>Q. I want to ask you now about transfer of business, a topic that I promised I would come to. So, just to be clear on what you have said so far, in the summer of 2018 you assumed that the NSCIS business would be transferred</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>the RGP's interest but which would be</li> <li>private." Do you now remember being</li> <li>concerned about your private messages on Mr</li> <li>Levy's phone?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did you not write this statement?</li> <li>A. I did. It doesn't talk about being worried or</li> <li>concerned. I'm just saying that they're there.</li> <li>They are subject to privilege, they are my</li> <li>private conversations. I might be talking to</li> <li>him about matrimonial difficulties. That</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Q. What steps did you take to ensure that you were not swayed, even unintentionally, by not wanting the RGP to see your private messages with Mr Levy?</li> <li>A. None whatsoever.</li> <li>Q. I want to ask you now about transfer of business, a topic that I promised I would come to. So, just to be clear on what you have said so far, in the summer of 2018 you assumed that the NSCIS business would be transferred from Blands to 36 North, is that correct?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>the RGP's interest but which would be</li> <li>private." Do you now remember being</li> <li>concerned about your private messages on Mr</li> <li>Levy's phone?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did you not write this statement?</li> <li>A. I did. It doesn't talk about being worried or</li> <li>concerned. I'm just saying that they're there.</li> <li>They are subject to privilege, they are my</li> <li>private conversations. I might be talking to</li> <li>him about matrimonial difficulties. That</li> <li>doesn't mean I'm worried or concerned, Mr</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Q. What steps did you take to ensure that you were not swayed, even unintentionally, by not wanting the RGP to see your private messages with Mr Levy?</li> <li>A. None whatsoever.</li> <li>Q. I want to ask you now about transfer of business, a topic that I promised I would come to. So, just to be clear on what you have said so far, in the summer of 2018 you assumed that the NSCIS business would be transferred from Blands to 36 North, is that correct?</li> <li>A. By agreement.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>the RGP's interest but which would be</li> <li>private." Do you now remember being</li> <li>concerned about your private messages on Mr</li> <li>Levy's phone?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did you not write this statement?</li> <li>A. I did. It doesn't talk about being worried or</li> <li>concerned. I'm just saying that they're there.</li> <li>They are subject to privilege, they are my</li> <li>private conversations. I might be talking to</li> <li>him about matrimonial difficulties. That</li> <li>doesn't mean I'm worried or concerned, Mr</li> <li>Wagner.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Q. What steps did you take to ensure that you were not swayed, even unintentionally, by not wanting the RGP to see your private messages with Mr Levy?</li> <li>A. None whatsoever.</li> <li>Q. I want to ask you now about transfer of business, a topic that I promised I would come to. So, just to be clear on what you have said so far, in the summer of 2018 you assumed that the NSCIS business would be transferred from Blands to 36 North, is that correct?</li> <li>A. By agreement.</li> <li>Q. And you thought that it would happen by -</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>the RGP's interest but which would be</li> <li>private." Do you now remember being</li> <li>concerned about your private messages on Mr</li> <li>Levy's phone?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did you not write this statement?</li> <li>A. I did. It doesn't talk about being worried or</li> <li>concerned. I'm just saying that they're there.</li> <li>They are subject to privilege, they are my</li> <li>private conversations. I might be talking to</li> <li>him about matrimonial difficulties. That</li> <li>doesn't mean I'm worried or concerned, Mr</li> <li>Wagner.</li> <li>Q. Well, they are not.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Q. What steps did you take to ensure that you were not swayed, even unintentionally, by not wanting the RGP to see your private messages with Mr Levy?</li> <li>A. None whatsoever.</li> <li>Q. I want to ask you now about transfer of business, a topic that I promised I would come to. So, just to be clear on what you have said so far, in the summer of 2018 you assumed that the NSCIS business would be transferred from Blands to 36 North, is that correct?</li> <li>A. By agreement.</li> <li>Q. And you thought that it would happen by - it would be amicably agreed between Bland</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>the RGP's interest but which would be</li> <li>private." Do you now remember being</li> <li>concerned about your private messages on Mr</li> <li>Levy's phone?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did you not write this statement?</li> <li>A. I did. It doesn't talk about being worried or</li> <li>concerned. I'm just saying that they're there.</li> <li>They are subject to privilege, they are my</li> <li>private conversations. I might be talking to</li> <li>him about matrimonial difficulties. That</li> <li>doesn't mean I'm worried or concerned, Mr</li> <li>Wagner.</li> <li>Q. Well, they are not.</li> <li>A. They are private.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Q. What steps did you take to ensure that you were not swayed, even unintentionally, by not wanting the RGP to see your private messages with Mr Levy?</li> <li>A. None whatsoever.</li> <li>Q. I want to ask you now about transfer of business, a topic that I promised I would come to. So, just to be clear on what you have said so far, in the summer of 2018 you assumed that the NSCIS business would be transferred from Blands to 36 North, is that correct?</li> <li>A. By agreement.</li> <li>Q. And you thought that it would happen by - it would be amicably agreed between Bland and 36 North, that was the hope?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>the RGP's interest but which would be</li> <li>private." Do you now remember being</li> <li>concerned about your private messages on Mr</li> <li>Levy's phone?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did you not write this statement?</li> <li>A. I did. It doesn't talk about being worried or</li> <li>concerned. I'm just saying that they're there.</li> <li>They are subject to privilege, they are my</li> <li>private conversations. I might be talking to</li> <li>him about matrimonial difficulties. That</li> <li>doesn't mean I'm worried or concerned, Mr</li> <li>Wagner.</li> <li>Q. Well, they are not.</li> <li>A. They are private.</li> <li>Q. So, you just raised that issue as a matter of</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Q. What steps did you take to ensure that you were not swayed, even unintentionally, by not wanting the RGP to see your private messages with Mr Levy?</li> <li>A. None whatsoever.</li> <li>Q. I want to ask you now about transfer of business, a topic that I promised I would come to. So, just to be clear on what you have said so far, in the summer of 2018 you assumed that the NSCIS business would be transferred from Blands to 36 North, is that correct?</li> <li>A. By agreement.</li> <li>Q. And you thought that it would happen by - it would be amicably agreed between Bland and 36 North, that was the hope?</li> <li>A. No, I thought it had been amicably agreed</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>the RGP's interest but which would be</li> <li>private." Do you now remember being</li> <li>concerned about your private messages on Mr</li> <li>Levy's phone?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did you not write this statement?</li> <li>A. I did. It doesn't talk about being worried or</li> <li>concerned. I'm just saying that they're there.</li> <li>They are subject to privilege, they are my</li> <li>private conversations. I might be talking to</li> <li>him about matrimonial difficulties. That</li> <li>doesn't mean I'm worried or concerned, Mr</li> <li>Wagner.</li> <li>Q. Well, they are not.</li> <li>A. They are private.</li> <li>Q. So, you just raised that issue as a matter of interest, not as a matter of concern?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q. What steps did you take to ensure that you were not swayed, even unintentionally, by not wanting the RGP to see your private messages with Mr Levy?</li> <li>A. None whatsoever.</li> <li>Q. I want to ask you now about transfer of business, a topic that I promised I would come to. So, just to be clear on what you have said so far, in the summer of 2018 you assumed that the NSCIS business would be transferred from Blands to 36 North, is that correct?</li> <li>A. By agreement.</li> <li>Q. And you thought that it would happen by - it would be amicably agreed between Bland and 36 North, that was the hope?</li> <li>A. No, I thought it had been amicably agreed between Bland and 36 North and that the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>the RGP's interest but which would be</li> <li>private." Do you now remember being</li> <li>concerned about your private messages on Mr</li> <li>Levy's phone?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did you not write this statement?</li> <li>A. I did. It doesn't talk about being worried or</li> <li>concerned. I'm just saying that they're there.</li> <li>They are subject to privilege, they are my</li> <li>private conversations. I might be talking to</li> <li>him about matrimonial difficulties. That</li> <li>doesn't mean I'm worried or concerned, Mr</li> <li>Wagner.</li> <li>Q. Well, they are not.</li> <li>A. They are private.</li> <li>Q. So, you just raised that issue as a matter of</li> <li>interest, not as a matter of concern?</li> <li>A. No, because, as you will no doubt agree</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Q. What steps did you take to ensure that you were not swayed, even unintentionally, by not wanting the RGP to see your private messages with Mr Levy?</li> <li>A. None whatsoever.</li> <li>Q. I want to ask you now about transfer of business, a topic that I promised I would come to. So, just to be clear on what you have said so far, in the summer of 2018 you assumed that the NSCIS business would be transferred from Blands to 36 North, is that correct?</li> <li>A. By agreement.</li> <li>Q. And you thought that it would happen by - it would be amicably agreed between Bland and 36 North, that was the hope?</li> <li>A. No, I thought it had been amicably agreed between Bland and 36 North and that the mechanism of that would take shape also in an</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>the RGP's interest but which would be</li> <li>private." Do you now remember being</li> <li>concerned about your private messages on Mr</li> <li>Levy's phone?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did you not write this statement?</li> <li>A. I did. It doesn't talk about being worried or</li> <li>concerned. I'm just saying that they're there.</li> <li>They are subject to privilege, they are my</li> <li>private conversations. I might be talking to</li> <li>him about matrimonial difficulties. That</li> <li>doesn't mean I'm worried or concerned, Mr</li> <li>Wagner.</li> <li>Q. Well, they are not.</li> <li>A. They are private.</li> <li>Q. So, you just raised that issue as a matter of</li> <li>interest, not as a matter of concern?</li> <li>A. No, because, as you will no doubt agree</li> <li>with me, privacy is a human right and I don't</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Q. What steps did you take to ensure that you were not swayed, even unintentionally, by not wanting the RGP to see your private messages with Mr Levy?</li> <li>A. None whatsoever.</li> <li>Q. I want to ask you now about transfer of business, a topic that I promised I would come to. So, just to be clear on what you have said so far, in the summer of 2018 you assumed that the NSCIS business would be transferred from Blands to 36 North, is that correct?</li> <li>A. By agreement.</li> <li>Q. And you thought that it would happen by -it would be amicably agreed between Bland and 36 North, that was the hope?</li> <li>A. No, I thought it had been amicably agreed between Bland and 36 North and that the mechanism of that would take shape also in an amicable manner.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>the RGP's interest but which would be</li> <li>private." Do you now remember being</li> <li>concerned about your private messages on Mr</li> <li>Levy's phone?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did you not write this statement?</li> <li>A. I did. It doesn't talk about being worried or</li> <li>concerned. I'm just saying that they're there.</li> <li>They are subject to privilege, they are my</li> <li>private conversations. I might be talking to</li> <li>him about matrimonial difficulties. That</li> <li>doesn't mean I'm worried or concerned, Mr</li> <li>Wagner.</li> <li>Q. Well, they are not.</li> <li>A. They are private.</li> <li>Q. So, you just raised that issue as a matter of</li> <li>interest, not as a matter of concern?</li> <li>A. No, because, as you will no doubt agree</li> <li>with me, privacy is a human right and I don't</li> <li>have to be worried about something being</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q. What steps did you take to ensure that you were not swayed, even unintentionally, by not wanting the RGP to see your private messages with Mr Levy?</li> <li>A. None whatsoever.</li> <li>Q. I want to ask you now about transfer of business, a topic that I promised I would come to. So, just to be clear on what you have said so far, in the summer of 2018 you assumed that the NSCIS business would be transferred from Blands to 36 North, is that correct?</li> <li>A. By agreement.</li> <li>Q. And you thought that it would happen by -it would be amicably agreed between Bland and 36 North, that was the hope?</li> <li>A. No, I thought it had been amicably agreed between Bland and 36 North and that the mechanism of that would take shape also in an amicable manner.</li> <li>Q. Yes, but the mechanism of that could not</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>the RGP's interest but which would be</li> <li>private." Do you now remember being</li> <li>concerned about your private messages on Mr</li> <li>Levy's phone?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did you not write this statement?</li> <li>A. I did. It doesn't talk about being worried or</li> <li>concerned. I'm just saying that they're there.</li> <li>They are subject to privilege, they are my</li> <li>private conversations. I might be talking to</li> <li>him about matrimonial difficulties. That</li> <li>doesn't mean I'm worried or concerned, Mr</li> <li>Wagner.</li> <li>Q. Well, they are not.</li> <li>A. They are private.</li> <li>Q. So, you just raised that issue as a matter of</li> <li>interest, not as a matter of concern?</li> <li>A. No, because, as you will no doubt agree</li> <li>with me, privacy is a human right and I don't</li> <li>have to be worried about something being</li> <li>disclosed or concerned about it being disclosed</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q. What steps did you take to ensure that you were not swayed, even unintentionally, by not wanting the RGP to see your private messages with Mr Levy?</li> <li>A. None whatsoever.</li> <li>Q. I want to ask you now about transfer of business, a topic that I promised I would come to. So, just to be clear on what you have said so far, in the summer of 2018 you assumed that the NSCIS business would be transferred from Blands to 36 North, is that correct?</li> <li>A. By agreement.</li> <li>Q. And you thought that it would happen by - it would be amicably agreed between Bland and 36 North, that was the hope?</li> <li>A. No, I thought it had been amicably agreed between Bland and 36 North and that the mechanism of that would take shape also in an amicable manner.</li> <li>Q. Yes, but the mechanism of that could not be agreed between, could not solely be agreed</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>the RGP's interest but which would be</li> <li>private." Do you now remember being</li> <li>concerned about your private messages on Mr</li> <li>Levy's phone?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did you not write this statement?</li> <li>A. I did. It doesn't talk about being worried or</li> <li>concerned. I'm just saying that they're there.</li> <li>They are subject to privilege, they are my</li> <li>private conversations. I might be talking to</li> <li>him about matrimonial difficulties. That</li> <li>doesn't mean I'm worried or concerned, Mr</li> <li>Wagner.</li> <li>Q. Well, they are not.</li> <li>A. They are private.</li> <li>Q. So, you just raised that issue as a matter of</li> <li>interest, not as a matter of concern?</li> <li>A. No, because, as you will no doubt agree</li> <li>with me, privacy is a human right and I don't</li> <li>have to be worried about something being</li> <li>disclosed or concerned about it being disclosed</li> <li>to believe that it should remain private and</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. What steps did you take to ensure that you were not swayed, even unintentionally, by not wanting the RGP to see your private messages with Mr Levy?</li> <li>A. None whatsoever.</li> <li>Q. I want to ask you now about transfer of business, a topic that I promised I would come to. So, just to be clear on what you have said so far, in the summer of 2018 you assumed that the NSCIS business would be transferred from Blands to 36 North, is that correct?</li> <li>A. By agreement.</li> <li>Q. And you thought that it would happen by - it would be amicably agreed between Bland and 36 North, that was the hope?</li> <li>A. No, I thought it had been amicably agreed between Bland and 36 North and that the mechanism of that would take shape also in an amicable manner.</li> <li>Q. Yes, but the mechanism of that could not be agreed between Bland and 36 North, it would involve</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>the RGP's interest but which would be</li> <li>private." Do you now remember being</li> <li>concerned about your private messages on Mr</li> <li>Levy's phone?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did you not write this statement?</li> <li>A. I did. It doesn't talk about being worried or</li> <li>concerned. I'm just saying that they're there.</li> <li>They are subject to privilege, they are my</li> <li>private conversations. I might be talking to</li> <li>him about matrimonial difficulties. That</li> <li>doesn't mean I'm worried or concerned, Mr</li> <li>Wagner.</li> <li>Q. Well, they are not.</li> <li>A. They are private.</li> <li>Q. So, you just raised that issue as a matter of</li> <li>interest, not as a matter of concern?</li> <li>A. No, because, as you will no doubt agree</li> <li>with me, privacy is a human right and I don't</li> <li>have to be worried about something being</li> <li>disclosed or concerned about it being disclosed</li> <li>to believe that it should remain private and</li> <li>privileged. There could be other tittle-tattle,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Q. What steps did you take to ensure that you were not swayed, even unintentionally, by not wanting the RGP to see your private messages with Mr Levy?</li> <li>A. None whatsoever.</li> <li>Q. I want to ask you now about transfer of business, a topic that I promised I would come to. So, just to be clear on what you have said so far, in the summer of 2018 you assumed that the NSCIS business would be transferred from Blands to 36 North, is that correct?</li> <li>A. By agreement.</li> <li>Q. And you thought that it would happen by -it would be amicably agreed between Bland and 36 North, that was the hope?</li> <li>A. No, I thought it had been amicably agreed between Bland and 36 North and that the mechanism of that would take shape also in an amicable manner.</li> <li>Q. Yes, but the mechanism of that could not be agreed between, could not solely be agreed between Bland and 36 North, it would involve the Government, is that correct?</li> </ul>

28 (Pages 109 to 112)

1	technical level and I wanted it to involve the	1	agreement, is that fair?
2	Government also at a legal level.	2	A. Exactly. Hence my reference to
3	Q. Well, not just on a technical level because	3	Government lawyers who might start that
4	would not the Government, if there was some	4	process.
5	sort of contract, a maintenance contract or	5	Q. And would that process happen
6	whatever it was, with	6	automatically without anybody doing
7	A. There wasn't. There was no need to novate	7	anything?
8	in writing because there was nothing in	8	A. No, that process would have run its course,
9	writing.	9	it would have produced an agreement, that
10	Q. They would have to extricate themselves,	10	agreement would then have had to have been
11	assuming there was some sort of non-in	11	approved.
12	writing agreement, they would have to, the	12	Q. Who would have produced the agreement?
13	Government would have to figure out how to	13	A. Well, I indicated in the early stages of this,
14	extricate themselves from that agreement,	14	although it then didn't fly, that two Crown
15	would you agree?	15	counsel, that counsel for the inquiry referred
16	A. Well, I would agree except that the process	16	me to yesterday, in one particular message, I
17	was obviously made a lot easier by the fact	17	believe with Mr Sanchez, and I believe I
18	that there was nothing in writing because there	18	referred to Mr DeVincenzi and Mr Fa, should
19	was no notice to provide, there was no	19	start that process. They might not have been
20	novation to create. So, that process would	20	the ones
21	require, as I think I later indicate, and I was	21	Q. You told them to start the process? You
22	taken to yesterday by counsel for the inquiry,	22	asked them start the process? Whatever
23	the involvement of Government lawyers to	23	language we use.
24	ensure that, at least when we started again with	24	A. Well, I used language which was in writing
25	the new entity, we didn't have some of the	25	and which I was referred to yesterday by CTI
	Page 113		Page 115
1	problems we've had with Bland Limited about	1	that said. "Refer to them."
1 2	problems we've had with Bland Limited about intellectual property.	1 2	<b>that said, "Refer to them."</b> O. Yes, and for that contract to be signed, you
2	intellectual property.	2	Q. Yes, and for that contract to be signed, you
2 3	<b>intellectual property.</b> Q. Exactly. So, with the new entity, you	2 3	Q. Yes, and for that contract to be signed, you would have to agree for it to be signed?
2 3 4	<b>intellectual property.</b> Q. Exactly. So, with the new entity, you would have to enter into a contract?	2 3 4	<ul><li>Q. Yes, and for that contract to be signed, you would have to agree for it to be signed?</li><li>A. Well, it might potentially have been</li></ul>
2 3 4 5	<ul><li>intellectual property.</li><li>Q. Exactly. So, with the new entity, you would have to enter into a contract?</li><li>A. But that's not extricating.</li></ul>	2 3 4 5	<ul><li>Q. Yes, and for that contract to be signed, you would have to agree for it to be signed?</li><li>A. Well, it might potentially have been brought to me, but when produced that would</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>intellectual property.</li> <li>Q. Exactly. So, with the new entity, you would have to enter into a contract?</li> <li>A. But that's not extricating.</li> <li>Q. Leaving aside whether it is extricating or</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>Q. Yes, and for that contract to be signed, you would have to agree for it to be signed?</li> <li>A. Well, it might potentially have been brought to me, but when produced that would have gone directly to the Chief Secretary, who</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>intellectual property.</li> <li>Q. Exactly. So, with the new entity, you would have to enter into a contract?</li> <li>A. But that's not extricating.</li> <li>Q. Leaving aside whether it is extricating or coming out of or whatever.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>Q. Yes, and for that contract to be signed, you would have to agree for it to be signed?</li> <li>A. Well, it might potentially have been brought to me, but when produced that would have gone directly to the Chief Secretary, who is the person who signs contracts for the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>intellectual property.</li> <li>Q. Exactly. So, with the new entity, you would have to enter into a contract?</li> <li>A. But that's not extricating.</li> <li>Q. Leaving aside whether it is extricating or coming out of or whatever.</li> <li>A. That's establishment, yes.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>Q. Yes, and for that contract to be signed, you would have to agree for it to be signed?</li> <li>A. Well, it might potentially have been brought to me, but when produced that would have gone directly to the Chief Secretary, who is the person who signs contracts for the Government.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>intellectual property.</li> <li>Q. Exactly. So, with the new entity, you would have to enter into a contract?</li> <li>A. But that's not extricating.</li> <li>Q. Leaving aside whether it is extricating or coming out of or whatever.</li> <li>A. That's establishment, yes.</li> <li>Q. You would have to create, you would have</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q. Yes, and for that contract to be signed, you would have to agree for it to be signed?</li> <li>A. Well, it might potentially have been brought to me, but when produced that would have gone directly to the Chief Secretary, who is the person who signs contracts for the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>intellectual property.</li> <li>Q. Exactly. So, with the new entity, you would have to enter into a contract?</li> <li>A. But that's not extricating.</li> <li>Q. Leaving aside whether it is extricating or coming out of or whatever.</li> <li>A. That's establishment, yes.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>Q. Yes, and for that contract to be signed, you would have to agree for it to be signed?</li> <li>A. Well, it might potentially have been brought to me, but when produced that would have gone directly to the Chief Secretary, who is the person who signs contracts for the Government.</li> <li>Q. Yes, but you were overseeing that process, is that fair?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>intellectual property.</li> <li>Q. Exactly. So, with the new entity, you would have to enter into a contract?</li> <li>A. But that's not extricating.</li> <li>Q. Leaving aside whether it is extricating or coming out of or whatever.</li> <li>A. That's establishment, yes.</li> <li>Q. You would have to create, you would have to have a new agreement with 36 North, is that correct?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q. Yes, and for that contract to be signed, you would have to agree for it to be signed?</li> <li>A. Well, it might potentially have been brought to me, but when produced that would have gone directly to the Chief Secretary, who is the person who signs contracts for the Government.</li> <li>Q. Yes, but you were overseeing that process,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>intellectual property.</li> <li>Q. Exactly. So, with the new entity, you would have to enter into a contract?</li> <li>A. But that's not extricating.</li> <li>Q. Leaving aside whether it is extricating or coming out of or whatever.</li> <li>A. That's establishment, yes.</li> <li>Q. You would have to create, you would have to have a new agreement with 36 North, is that correct?</li> <li>A. You would have to, if you wished to deal</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>Q. Yes, and for that contract to be signed, you would have to agree for it to be signed?</li> <li>A. Well, it might potentially have been brought to me, but when produced that would have gone directly to the Chief Secretary, who is the person who signs contracts for the Government.</li> <li>Q. Yes, but you were overseeing that process, is that fair?</li> <li>A. No, I wasn't overseeing that process.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>intellectual property.</li> <li>Q. Exactly. So, with the new entity, you would have to enter into a contract?</li> <li>A. But that's not extricating.</li> <li>Q. Leaving aside whether it is extricating or coming out of or whatever.</li> <li>A. That's establishment, yes.</li> <li>Q. You would have to create, you would have to have a new agreement with 36 North, is that correct?</li> <li>A. You would have to, if you wished to deal with all of the loose ends, establish an</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Q. Yes, and for that contract to be signed, you would have to agree for it to be signed?</li> <li>A. Well, it might potentially have been brought to me, but when produced that would have gone directly to the Chief Secretary, who is the person who signs contracts for the Government.</li> <li>Q. Yes, but you were overseeing that process, is that fair?</li> <li>A. No, I wasn't overseeing that process.</li> <li>Q. You</li> <li>A. I don't oversee that process, ever.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>intellectual property.</li> <li>Q. Exactly. So, with the new entity, you would have to enter into a contract?</li> <li>A. But that's not extricating.</li> <li>Q. Leaving aside whether it is extricating or coming out of or whatever.</li> <li>A. That's establishment, yes.</li> <li>Q. You would have to create, you would have to have a new agreement with 36 North, is that correct?</li> <li>A. You would have to, if you wished to deal with all of the loose ends, establish an agreement with 36 North, but I would have to</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Q. Yes, and for that contract to be signed, you would have to agree for it to be signed?</li> <li>A. Well, it might potentially have been brought to me, but when produced that would have gone directly to the Chief Secretary, who is the person who signs contracts for the Government.</li> <li>Q. Yes, but you were overseeing that process, is that fair?</li> <li>A. No, I wasn't overseeing that process.</li> <li>Q. You</li> <li>A. I don't oversee that process, ever.</li> <li>Q. You provided the instruction to the Crown</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>intellectual property.</li> <li>Q. Exactly. So, with the new entity, you would have to enter into a contract?</li> <li>A. But that's not extricating.</li> <li>Q. Leaving aside whether it is extricating or coming out of or whatever.</li> <li>A. That's establishment, yes.</li> <li>Q. You would have to create, you would have to have a new agreement with 36 North, is that correct?</li> <li>A. You would have to, if you wished to deal with all of the loose ends, establish an agreement with 36 North, but I would have to point out to you that it was also possible to</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Q. Yes, and for that contract to be signed, you would have to agree for it to be signed?</li> <li>A. Well, it might potentially have been brought to me, but when produced that would have gone directly to the Chief Secretary, who is the person who signs contracts for the Government.</li> <li>Q. Yes, but you were overseeing that process, is that fair?</li> <li>A. No, I wasn't overseeing that process.</li> <li>Q. You</li> <li>A. I don't oversee that process, ever.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>intellectual property.</li> <li>Q. Exactly. So, with the new entity, you would have to enter into a contract?</li> <li>A. But that's not extricating.</li> <li>Q. Leaving aside whether it is extricating or coming out of or whatever.</li> <li>A. That's establishment, yes.</li> <li>Q. You would have to create, you would have to have a new agreement with 36 North, is that correct?</li> <li>A. You would have to, if you wished to deal with all of the loose ends, establish an agreement with 36 North, but I would have to point out to you that it was also possible to continue with 36 North as we had done until</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Q. Yes, and for that contract to be signed, you would have to agree for it to be signed?</li> <li>A. Well, it might potentially have been brought to me, but when produced that would have gone directly to the Chief Secretary, who is the person who signs contracts for the Government.</li> <li>Q. Yes, but you were overseeing that process, is that fair?</li> <li>A. No, I wasn't overseeing that process.</li> <li>Q. You</li> <li>A. I don't oversee that process, ever.</li> <li>Q. You provided the instruction to the Crown counsel, did you not?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>intellectual property.</li> <li>Q. Exactly. So, with the new entity, you would have to enter into a contract?</li> <li>A. But that's not extricating.</li> <li>Q. Leaving aside whether it is extricating or coming out of or whatever.</li> <li>A. That's establishment, yes.</li> <li>Q. You would have to create, you would have to have a new agreement with 36 North, is that correct?</li> <li>A. You would have to, if you wished to deal with all of the loose ends, establish an agreement with 36 North, but I would have to point out to you that it was also possible to continue with 36 North as we had done until that date with Bland Limited without anything</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Q. Yes, and for that contract to be signed, you would have to agree for it to be signed?</li> <li>A. Well, it might potentially have been brought to me, but when produced that would have gone directly to the Chief Secretary, who is the person who signs contracts for the Government.</li> <li>Q. Yes, but you were overseeing that process, is that fair?</li> <li>A. No, I wasn't overseeing that process.</li> <li>Q. You</li> <li>A. I don't oversee that process, ever.</li> <li>Q. You provided the instruction to the Crown counsel, did you not?</li> <li>A. No, I provided that Crown counsel should</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>intellectual property.</li> <li>Q. Exactly. So, with the new entity, you would have to enter into a contract?</li> <li>A. But that's not extricating.</li> <li>Q. Leaving aside whether it is extricating or coming out of or whatever.</li> <li>A. That's establishment, yes.</li> <li>Q. You would have to create, you would have to have a new agreement with 36 North, is that correct?</li> <li>A. You would have to, if you wished to deal with all of the loose ends, establish an agreement with 36 North, but I would have to point out to you that it was also possible to continue with 36 North as we had done until that date with Bland Limited without anything in writing.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Q. Yes, and for that contract to be signed, you would have to agree for it to be signed?</li> <li>A. Well, it might potentially have been brought to me, but when produced that would have gone directly to the Chief Secretary, who is the person who signs contracts for the Government.</li> <li>Q. Yes, but you were overseeing that process, is that fair?</li> <li>A. No, I wasn't overseeing that process.</li> <li>Q. You</li> <li>A. I don't oversee that process, ever.</li> <li>Q. You provided the instruction to the Crown counsel, did you not?</li> <li>A. No, I provided that Crown counsel should be instructed. I did not instruct the Crown</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>intellectual property.</li> <li>Q. Exactly. So, with the new entity, you would have to enter into a contract?</li> <li>A. But that's not extricating.</li> <li>Q. Leaving aside whether it is extricating or coming out of or whatever.</li> <li>A. That's establishment, yes.</li> <li>Q. You would have to create, you would have to have a new agreement with 36 North, is that correct?</li> <li>A. You would have to, if you wished to deal with all of the loose ends, establish an agreement with 36 North, but I would have to point out to you that it was also possible to continue with 36 North as we had done until that date with Bland Limited without anything in writing.</li> <li>Q. Well, whether or not it was in writing</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q. Yes, and for that contract to be signed, you would have to agree for it to be signed?</li> <li>A. Well, it might potentially have been brought to me, but when produced that would have gone directly to the Chief Secretary, who is the person who signs contracts for the Government.</li> <li>Q. Yes, but you were overseeing that process, is that fair?</li> <li>A. No, I wasn't overseeing that process.</li> <li>Q. You</li> <li>A. I don't oversee that process, ever.</li> <li>Q. You provided the instruction to the Crown counsel, did you not?</li> <li>A. No, I provided that Crown counsel should be instructed. I did not instruct the Crown counsel.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>intellectual property.</li> <li>Q. Exactly. So, with the new entity, you would have to enter into a contract?</li> <li>A. But that's not extricating.</li> <li>Q. Leaving aside whether it is extricating or coming out of or whatever.</li> <li>A. That's establishment, yes.</li> <li>Q. You would have to create, you would have to have a new agreement with 36 North, is that correct?</li> <li>A. You would have to, if you wished to deal with all of the loose ends, establish an agreement with 36 North, but I would have to point out to you that it was also possible to continue with 36 North as we had done until that date with Bland Limited without anything in writing.</li> <li>Q. Well, whether or not it was in writing</li> <li>A. My preference was not that. My</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Q. Yes, and for that contract to be signed, you would have to agree for it to be signed?</li> <li>A. Well, it might potentially have been brought to me, but when produced that would have gone directly to the Chief Secretary, who is the person who signs contracts for the Government.</li> <li>Q. Yes, but you were overseeing that process, is that fair?</li> <li>A. No, I wasn't overseeing that process.</li> <li>Q. You</li> <li>A. I don't oversee that process, ever.</li> <li>Q. You provided the instruction to the Crown counsel, did you not?</li> <li>A. No, I provided that Crown counsel should be instructed. I did not instruct the Crown counsel.</li> <li>Q. And did you indicate your view that this is</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>intellectual property.</li> <li>Q. Exactly. So, with the new entity, you would have to enter into a contract?</li> <li>A. But that's not extricating.</li> <li>Q. Leaving aside whether it is extricating or coming out of or whatever.</li> <li>A. That's establishment, yes.</li> <li>Q. You would have to create, you would have to have a new agreement with 36 North, is that correct?</li> <li>A. You would have to, if you wished to deal with all of the loose ends, establish an agreement with 36 North, but I would have to point out to you that it was also possible to continue with 36 North as we had done until that date with Bland Limited without anything in writing.</li> <li>Q. Well, whether or not it was in writing</li> <li>A. My preference was not that. My preference was to establish something.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Q. Yes, and for that contract to be signed, you would have to agree for it to be signed?</li> <li>A. Well, it might potentially have been brought to me, but when produced that would have gone directly to the Chief Secretary, who is the person who signs contracts for the Government.</li> <li>Q. Yes, but you were overseeing that process, is that fair?</li> <li>A. No, I wasn't overseeing that process.</li> <li>Q. You</li> <li>A. I don't oversee that process, ever.</li> <li>Q. You provided the instruction to the Crown counsel, did you not?</li> <li>A. No, I provided that Crown counsel should be instructed. I did not instruct the Crown counsel.</li> <li>Q. And did you indicate your view that this is the way things should proceed, that there</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>intellectual property.</li> <li>Q. Exactly. So, with the new entity, you would have to enter into a contract?</li> <li>A. But that's not extricating.</li> <li>Q. Leaving aside whether it is extricating or coming out of or whatever.</li> <li>A. That's establishment, yes.</li> <li>Q. You would have to create, you would have to have a new agreement with 36 North, is that correct?</li> <li>A. You would have to, if you wished to deal with all of the loose ends, establish an agreement with 36 North, but I would have to point out to you that it was also possible to continue with 36 North as we had done until that date with Bland Limited without anything in writing.</li> <li>Q. Well, whether or not it was in writing</li> <li>A. My preference was not that. My preference was to establish something.</li> <li>Q. Of course. So, your preference was to</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q. Yes, and for that contract to be signed, you would have to agree for it to be signed?</li> <li>A. Well, it might potentially have been brought to me, but when produced that would have gone directly to the Chief Secretary, who is the person who signs contracts for the Government.</li> <li>Q. Yes, but you were overseeing that process, is that fair?</li> <li>A. No, I wasn't overseeing that process.</li> <li>Q. You</li> <li>A. I don't oversee that process, ever.</li> <li>Q. You provided the instruction to the Crown counsel, did you not?</li> <li>A. No, I provided that Crown counsel should be instructed. I did not instruct the Crown counsel.</li> <li>Q. And did you indicate your view that this is the way things should proceed, that there should be an amicable transfer of Bland to 36</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>intellectual property.</li> <li>Q. Exactly. So, with the new entity, you would have to enter into a contract?</li> <li>A. But that's not extricating.</li> <li>Q. Leaving aside whether it is extricating or coming out of or whatever.</li> <li>A. That's establishment, yes.</li> <li>Q. You would have to create, you would have to have a new agreement with 36 North, is that correct?</li> <li>A. You would have to, if you wished to deal with all of the loose ends, establish an agreement with 36 North, but I would have to point out to you that it was also possible to continue with 36 North as we had done until that date with Bland Limited without anything in writing.</li> <li>Q. Well, whether or not it was in writing</li> <li>A. My preference was not that. My preference was to establish something.</li> <li>Q. Of course. So, your preference was to have a solid, clear agreement that would avoid</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q. Yes, and for that contract to be signed, you would have to agree for it to be signed?</li> <li>A. Well, it might potentially have been brought to me, but when produced that would have gone directly to the Chief Secretary, who is the person who signs contracts for the Government.</li> <li>Q. Yes, but you were overseeing that process, is that fair?</li> <li>A. No, I wasn't overseeing that process.</li> <li>Q. You</li> <li>A. I don't oversee that process, ever.</li> <li>Q. You provided the instruction to the Crown counsel, did you not?</li> <li>A. No, I provided that Crown counsel should be instructed. I did not instruct the Crown counsel.</li> <li>Q. And did you indicate your view that this is the way things should proceed, that there should be an amicable transfer of Bland to 36 North?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>intellectual property.</li> <li>Q. Exactly. So, with the new entity, you would have to enter into a contract?</li> <li>A. But that's not extricating.</li> <li>Q. Leaving aside whether it is extricating or coming out of or whatever.</li> <li>A. That's establishment, yes.</li> <li>Q. You would have to create, you would have to have a new agreement with 36 North, is that correct?</li> <li>A. You would have to, if you wished to deal with all of the loose ends, establish an agreement with 36 North, but I would have to point out to you that it was also possible to continue with 36 North as we had done until that date with Bland Limited without anything in writing.</li> <li>Q. Well, whether or not it was in writing</li> <li>A. My preference was not that. My preference was to establish something.</li> <li>Q. Of course. So, your preference was to have a solid, clear agreement that would avoid the difficulties you were having at that stage</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. Yes, and for that contract to be signed, you would have to agree for it to be signed?</li> <li>A. Well, it might potentially have been brought to me, but when produced that would have gone directly to the Chief Secretary, who is the person who signs contracts for the Government.</li> <li>Q. Yes, but you were overseeing that process, is that fair?</li> <li>A. No, I wasn't overseeing that process.</li> <li>Q. You</li> <li>A. I don't oversee that process, ever.</li> <li>Q. You provided the instruction to the Crown counsel, did you not?</li> <li>A. No, I provided that Crown counsel should be instructed. I did not instruct the Crown counsel.</li> <li>Q. And did you indicate your view that this is the way things should proceed, that there should be an amicable transfer of Bland to 36 North?</li> <li>A. No, I indicated that that's what had been</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>intellectual property.</li> <li>Q. Exactly. So, with the new entity, you would have to enter into a contract?</li> <li>A. But that's not extricating.</li> <li>Q. Leaving aside whether it is extricating or coming out of or whatever.</li> <li>A. That's establishment, yes.</li> <li>Q. You would have to create, you would have to have a new agreement with 36 North, is that correct?</li> <li>A. You would have to, if you wished to deal with all of the loose ends, establish an agreement with 36 North, but I would have to point out to you that it was also possible to continue with 36 North as we had done until that date with Bland Limited without anything in writing.</li> <li>Q. Well, whether or not it was in writing</li> <li>A. My preference was not that. My preference was to establish something.</li> <li>Q. Of course. So, your preference was to have a solid, clear agreement that stage with Bland about there not being an</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Q. Yes, and for that contract to be signed, you would have to agree for it to be signed?</li> <li>A. Well, it might potentially have been brought to me, but when produced that would have gone directly to the Chief Secretary, who is the person who signs contracts for the Government.</li> <li>Q. Yes, but you were overseeing that process, is that fair?</li> <li>A. No, I wasn't overseeing that process.</li> <li>Q. You</li> <li>A. I don't oversee that process, ever.</li> <li>Q. You provided the instruction to the Crown counsel, did you not?</li> <li>A. No, I provided that Crown counsel should be instructed. I did not instruct the Crown counsel.</li> <li>Q. And did you indicate your view that this is the way things should proceed, that there should be an amicable transfer of Bland to 36 North?</li> <li>A. No, I indicated that that's what had been indicated to me.</li> <li>Q. Well, it was not up to Bland and 36 North,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>intellectual property.</li> <li>Q. Exactly. So, with the new entity, you would have to enter into a contract?</li> <li>A. But that's not extricating.</li> <li>Q. Leaving aside whether it is extricating or coming out of or whatever.</li> <li>A. That's establishment, yes.</li> <li>Q. You would have to create, you would have to have a new agreement with 36 North, is that correct?</li> <li>A. You would have to, if you wished to deal with all of the loose ends, establish an agreement with 36 North, but I would have to point out to you that it was also possible to continue with 36 North as we had done until that date with Bland Limited without anything in writing.</li> <li>Q. Well, whether or not it was in writing</li> <li>A. My preference was not that. My preference was to establish something.</li> <li>Q. Of course. So, your preference was to have a solid, clear agreement that would avoid the difficulties you were having at that stage</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Q. Yes, and for that contract to be signed, you would have to agree for it to be signed?</li> <li>A. Well, it might potentially have been brought to me, but when produced that would have gone directly to the Chief Secretary, who is the person who signs contracts for the Government.</li> <li>Q. Yes, but you were overseeing that process, is that fair?</li> <li>A. No, I wasn't overseeing that process.</li> <li>Q. You</li> <li>A. I don't oversee that process, ever.</li> <li>Q. You provided the instruction to the Crown counsel, did you not?</li> <li>A. No, I provided that Crown counsel should be instructed. I did not instruct the Crown counsel.</li> <li>Q. And did you indicate your view that this is the way things should proceed, that there should be an amicable transfer of Bland to 36 North?</li> <li>A. No, I indicated that that's what had been indicated to me.</li> </ul>

29 (Pages 113 to 116)

30 (Pages 117 to 120)

1	it was up to the Government. So, did you	1	Q. I understand.
2	agree with that?	2	A. As long as they agreed that they wanted to
3	A. No, it was only up to Bland and 36 North.	3	do it, it seemed like a good idea to me.
4	If they did not agree to do this amicably, it	4	Q. Okay. And was not the upshot of that that
5	couldn't happen amicably.	5	your Government would be transferring the
6	Q. No, but if they did agree, do you agree that	6	NSCIS business, the maintenance business,
7	you then had also to agree?	7	away from a company which Hassans knew
8	A. Not necessarily me or just me. The	8	you did not part own to a company, 36 North,
9	Government, that is to say the wider institution	9	which you did part own?
10	of Government, as the counterparty to the non-	10	A. So, what was going to happen was that one
11	agreement, would have had to agree. In this	11	company would by agreement permit those
12	context, what I think it is important that you	12	that had worked within it to go and strike out
13	should reflect on is that, I think there was	13	on their own and that company also had an
14	evidence before the tribunal, or at least I recall	14	investment in it from Hassans, as angel
15	from the time, that this meant, first of all, that	15	investors, as they do in many other entities,
16	the Government was favourably going to	16	and I, because I'm a partner on sabbatical at
17	resolve this issue as to ownership of the	17	Hassans, had a small indirect financial interest
18	intellectual property in respect of NSCIS, and	18	in it.
19	would have a lower annual cost of	19	Q. 2.94%, is that correct?
20	maintenance of NSCIS, and potentially would	20	A. It may be. You are much better versed in
21	also have the benefit of the exploitation for the	21	what my interest in Astelon, I think it's called,
22	taxpayer of the NSCIS internationally.	22	is than I am.
23	Q. Yes, and you fairly said yesterday, well,	23	Q. Correct. But just to be clear, do you own
24	that was something that you were going to do	24	any part of Bland?
25	that would benefit Gibraltar.	25	A. Bland is a family-owned company.
			<b>D</b>
	Page 117		Page 119
1	A. I was going to do?	1	O. Is the answer Yes or No?
1 2	<b>A. I was going to do?</b> O. That the Government was going to do.	1	Q. Is the answer Yes or No? A. Lam not a relative of Mr Gaggero and
2	Q. That the Government was going to do.	2	A. I am not a relative of Mr Gaggero and
2 3	Q. That the Government was going to do. You are the Chief Minister. Was that not the	2 3	A. I am not a relative of Mr Gaggero and therefore I am not a part-owner of Bland.
2 3 4	Q. That the Government was going to do. You are the Chief Minister. Was that not the decision?	2 3 4	<ul><li>A. I am not a relative of Mr Gaggero and therefore I am not a part-owner of Bland.</li><li>Q. You are not a part-owner. Are you</li></ul>
2 3 4 5	<ul><li>Q. That the Government was going to do.</li><li>You are the Chief Minister. Was that not the decision?</li><li>A. Well, I was not going to be doing any of</li></ul>	2 3	A. I am not a relative of Mr Gaggero and therefore I am not a part-owner of Bland.
2 3 4	Q. That the Government was going to do. You are the Chief Minister. Was that not the decision?	2 3 4 5	<ul><li>A. I am not a relative of Mr Gaggero and therefore I am not a part-owner of Bland.</li><li>Q. You are not a part-owner. Are you beneficially or were you at the time a part-owner of 36 North?</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>Q. That the Government was going to do.</li> <li>You are the Chief Minister. Was that not the decision?</li> <li>A. Well, I was not going to be doing any of this. I was going to be allowing others to be doing this.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>A. I am not a relative of Mr Gaggero and therefore I am not a part-owner of Bland.</li> <li>Q. You are not a part-owner. Are you beneficially or were you at the time a part-owner of 36 North?</li> <li>A. In the way that you have now set out by</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>Q. That the Government was going to do.</li> <li>You are the Chief Minister. Was that not the decision?</li> <li>A. Well, I was not going to be doing any of this. I was going to be allowing others to be</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	<ul><li>A. I am not a relative of Mr Gaggero and therefore I am not a part-owner of Bland.</li><li>Q. You are not a part-owner. Are you beneficially or were you at the time a part-owner of 36 North?</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>Q. That the Government was going to do.</li> <li>You are the Chief Minister. Was that not the decision?</li> <li>A. Well, I was not going to be doing any of this. I was going to be allowing others to be doing this.</li> <li>Q. You were going to be allowing them to do</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>A. I am not a relative of Mr Gaggero and therefore I am not a part-owner of Bland.</li> <li>Q. You are not a part-owner. Are you beneficially or were you at the time a part-owner of 36 North?</li> <li>A. In the way that you have now set out by owning 2.94% of Astelon, that owned I don't</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q. That the Government was going to do.</li> <li>You are the Chief Minister. Was that not the decision?</li> <li>A. Well, I was not going to be doing any of this. I was going to be allowing others to be doing this.</li> <li>Q. You were going to be allowing them to do it?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A. I am not a relative of Mr Gaggero and therefore I am not a part-owner of Bland.</li> <li>Q. You are not a part-owner. Are you beneficially or were you at the time a part-owner of 36 North?</li> <li>A. In the way that you have now set out by owning 2.94% of Astelon, that owned I don't know how much of 36 North?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>Q. That the Government was going to do.</li> <li>You are the Chief Minister. Was that not the decision?</li> <li>A. Well, I was not going to be doing any of this. I was going to be allowing others to be doing this.</li> <li>Q. You were going to be allowing them to do it?</li> <li>A. I was asked whether I believed this would</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>A. I am not a relative of Mr Gaggero and therefore I am not a part-owner of Bland.</li> <li>Q. You are not a part-owner. Are you beneficially or were you at the time a part-owner of 36 North?</li> <li>A. In the way that you have now set out by owning 2.94% of Astelon, that owned I don't know how much of 36 North?</li> <li>Q. One third.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>Q. That the Government was going to do.</li> <li>You are the Chief Minister. Was that not the decision?</li> <li>A. Well, I was not going to be doing any of this. I was going to be allowing others to be doing this.</li> <li>Q. You were going to be allowing them to do it?</li> <li>A. I was asked whether I believed this would be a good idea.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>A. I am not a relative of Mr Gaggero and therefore I am not a part-owner of Bland.</li> <li>Q. You are not a part-owner. Are you beneficially or were you at the time a part-owner of 36 North?</li> <li>A. In the way that you have now set out by owning 2.94% of Astelon, that owned I don't know how much of 36 North?</li> <li>Q. One third.</li> <li>A. So, I was a 2.94% owner of thirty three and</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Q. That the Government was going to do.</li> <li>You are the Chief Minister. Was that not the decision?</li> <li>A. Well, I was not going to be doing any of this. I was going to be allowing others to be doing this.</li> <li>Q. You were going to be allowing them to do it?</li> <li>A. I was asked whether I believed this would be a good idea.</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>A. I am not a relative of Mr Gaggero and therefore I am not a part-owner of Bland.</li> <li>Q. You are not a part-owner. Are you beneficially or were you at the time a part-owner of 36 North?</li> <li>A. In the way that you have now set out by owning 2.94% of Astelon, that owned I don't know how much of 36 North?</li> <li>Q. One third.</li> <li>A. So, I was a 2.94% owner of thirty three and a third percent in 36 North - something that's</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Q. That the Government was going to do.</li> <li>You are the Chief Minister. Was that not the decision?</li> <li>A. Well, I was not going to be doing any of this. I was going to be allowing others to be doing this.</li> <li>Q. You were going to be allowing them to do it?</li> <li>A. I was asked whether I believed this would be a good idea.</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. And my view was that, so long as it</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A. I am not a relative of Mr Gaggero and therefore I am not a part-owner of Bland.</li> <li>Q. You are not a part-owner. Are you beneficially or were you at the time a part-owner of 36 North?</li> <li>A. In the way that you have now set out by owning 2.94% of Astelon, that owned I don't know how much of 36 North?</li> <li>Q. One third.</li> <li>A. So, I was a 2.94% owner of thirty three and a third percent in 36 North - something that's never been hidden.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Q. That the Government was going to do.</li> <li>You are the Chief Minister. Was that not the decision?</li> <li>A. Well, I was not going to be doing any of this. I was going to be allowing others to be doing this.</li> <li>Q. You were going to be allowing them to do it?</li> <li>A. I was asked whether I believed this would be a good idea.</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. And my view was that, so long as it continued to be amicable between Bland and</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A. I am not a relative of Mr Gaggero and therefore I am not a part-owner of Bland.</li> <li>Q. You are not a part-owner. Are you beneficially or were you at the time a part-owner of 36 North?</li> <li>A. In the way that you have now set out by owning 2.94% of Astelon, that owned I don't know how much of 36 North?</li> <li>Q. One third.</li> <li>A. So, I was a 2.94% owner of thirty three and a third percent in 36 North - something that's never been hidden.</li> <li>Q. But Hassans, your firm, owned a third of</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Q. That the Government was going to do.</li> <li>You are the Chief Minister. Was that not the decision?</li> <li>A. Well, I was not going to be doing any of this. I was going to be allowing others to be doing this.</li> <li>Q. You were going to be allowing them to do it?</li> <li>A. I was asked whether I believed this would be a good idea.</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. And my view was that, so long as it continued to be amicable between Bland and 36 North, it seemed like a very good idea for</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>A. I am not a relative of Mr Gaggero and therefore I am not a part-owner of Bland.</li> <li>Q. You are not a part-owner. Are you beneficially or were you at the time a part-owner of 36 North?</li> <li>A. In the way that you have now set out by owning 2.94% of Astelon, that owned I don't know how much of 36 North?</li> <li>Q. One third.</li> <li>A. So, I was a 2.94% owner of thirty three and a third percent in 36 North - something that's never been hidden.</li> <li>Q. But Hassans, your firm, owned a third of 36 North beneficially, is that correct?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Q. That the Government was going to do.</li> <li>You are the Chief Minister. Was that not the decision?</li> <li>A. Well, I was not going to be doing any of this. I was going to be allowing others to be doing this.</li> <li>Q. You were going to be allowing them to do it?</li> <li>A. I was asked whether I believed this would be a good idea.</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. And my view was that, so long as it continued to be amicable between Bland and 36 North, it seemed like a very good idea for the list of reasons I have given you, which</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>A. I am not a relative of Mr Gaggero and therefore I am not a part-owner of Bland.</li> <li>Q. You are not a part-owner. Are you beneficially or were you at the time a part-owner of 36 North?</li> <li>A. In the way that you have now set out by owning 2.94% of Astelon, that owned I don't know how much of 36 North?</li> <li>Q. One third.</li> <li>A. So, I was a 2.94% owner of thirty three and a third percent in 36 North - something that's never been hidden.</li> <li>Q. But Hassans, your firm, owned a third of 36 North beneficially, is that correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, but my interest is not in that of</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Q. That the Government was going to do.</li> <li>You are the Chief Minister. Was that not the decision?</li> <li>A. Well, I was not going to be doing any of this. I was going to be allowing others to be doing this.</li> <li>Q. You were going to be allowing them to do it?</li> <li>A. I was asked whether I believed this would be a good idea.</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. And my view was that, so long as it continued to be amicable between Bland and 36 North, it seemed like a very good idea for the list of reasons I have given you, which were in part also the issues in dispute between Bland and the Government of Gibraltar as to intellectual properties.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A. I am not a relative of Mr Gaggero and therefore I am not a part-owner of Bland.</li> <li>Q. You are not a part-owner. Are you beneficially or were you at the time a part-owner of 36 North?</li> <li>A. In the way that you have now set out by owning 2.94% of Astelon, that owned I don't know how much of 36 North?</li> <li>Q. One third.</li> <li>A. So, I was a 2.94% owner of thirty three and a third percent in 36 North - something that's never been hidden.</li> <li>Q. But Hassans, your firm, owned a third of 36 North beneficially, is that correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, but my interest is not in that of Hassans, it is in 2.94 because it's actually</li> </ul>
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array}$	<ul> <li>Q. That the Government was going to do.</li> <li>You are the Chief Minister. Was that not the decision?</li> <li>A. Well, I was not going to be doing any of this. I was going to be allowing others to be doing this.</li> <li>Q. You were going to be allowing them to do it?</li> <li>A. I was asked whether I believed this would be a good idea.</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. And my view was that, so long as it continued to be amicable between Bland and 36 North, it seemed like a very good idea for the list of reasons I have given you, which were in part also the issues in dispute between Bland and the Government of Gibraltar as to intellectual properties.</li> <li>Q. So, you were asked for a view and you</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A. I am not a relative of Mr Gaggero and therefore I am not a part-owner of Bland.</li> <li>Q. You are not a part-owner. Are you beneficially or were you at the time a part-owner of 36 North?</li> <li>A. In the way that you have now set out by owning 2.94% of Astelon, that owned I don't know how much of 36 North?</li> <li>Q. One third.</li> <li>A. So, I was a 2.94% owner of thirty three and a third percent in 36 North - something that's never been hidden.</li> <li>Q. But Hassans, your firm, owned a third of 36 North beneficially, is that correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, but my interest is not in that of Hassans, it is in 2.94 because it's actually broken down by partners, you've helpfully</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q. That the Government was going to do.</li> <li>You are the Chief Minister. Was that not the decision?</li> <li>A. Well, I was not going to be doing any of this. I was going to be allowing others to be doing this.</li> <li>Q. You were going to be allowing them to do it?</li> <li>A. I was asked whether I believed this would be a good idea.</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. And my view was that, so long as it continued to be amicable between Bland and 36 North, it seemed like a very good idea for the list of reasons I have given you, which were in part also the issues in dispute between Bland and the Government of Gibraltar as to intellectual properties.</li> <li>Q. So, you were asked for a view and you gave it, and your view was positive?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>A. I am not a relative of Mr Gaggero and therefore I am not a part-owner of Bland.</li> <li>Q. You are not a part-owner. Are you beneficially or were you at the time a part-owner of 36 North?</li> <li>A. In the way that you have now set out by owning 2.94% of Astelon, that owned I don't know how much of 36 North?</li> <li>Q. One third.</li> <li>A. So, I was a 2.94% owner of thirty three and a third percent in 36 North - something that's never been hidden.</li> <li>Q. But Hassans, your firm, owned a third of 36 North beneficially, is that correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, but my interest is not in that of Hassans, it is in 2.94 because it's actually broken down by partners, you've helpfully reminded me.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q. That the Government was going to do.</li> <li>You are the Chief Minister. Was that not the decision?</li> <li>A. Well, I was not going to be doing any of this. I was going to be allowing others to be doing this.</li> <li>Q. You were going to be allowing them to do it?</li> <li>A. I was asked whether I believed this would be a good idea.</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. And my view was that, so long as it continued to be amicable between Bland and 36 North, it seemed like a very good idea for the list of reasons I have given you, which were in part also the issues in dispute between Bland and the Government of Gibraltar as to intellectual properties.</li> <li>Q. So, you were asked for a view and you gave it, and your view was positive?</li> <li>A. I was asked for a view and the view I gave</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>A. I am not a relative of Mr Gaggero and therefore I am not a part-owner of Bland.</li> <li>Q. You are not a part-owner. Are you beneficially or were you at the time a part-owner of 36 North?</li> <li>A. In the way that you have now set out by owning 2.94% of Astelon, that owned I don't know how much of 36 North?</li> <li>Q. One third.</li> <li>A. So, I was a 2.94% owner of thirty three and a third percent in 36 North - something that's never been hidden.</li> <li>Q. But Hassans, your firm, owned a third of 36 North beneficially, is that correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, but my interest is not in that of Hassans, it is in 2.94 because it's actually broken down by partners, you've helpfully reminded me.</li> <li>Q. All I am trying to establish is, the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. That the Government was going to do.</li> <li>You are the Chief Minister. Was that not the decision?</li> <li>A. Well, I was not going to be doing any of this. I was going to be allowing others to be doing this.</li> <li>Q. You were going to be allowing them to do it?</li> <li>A. I was asked whether I believed this would be a good idea.</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. And my view was that, so long as it continued to be amicable between Bland and 36 North, it seemed like a very good idea for the list of reasons I have given you, which were in part also the issues in dispute between Bland and the Government of Gibraltar as to intellectual properties.</li> <li>Q. So, you were asked for a view and you gave it, and your view was positive?</li> <li>A. I was asked for a view and the view I gave was that, so long as it was something that they</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A. I am not a relative of Mr Gaggero and therefore I am not a part-owner of Bland.</li> <li>Q. You are not a part-owner. Are you beneficially or were you at the time a part-owner of 36 North?</li> <li>A. In the way that you have now set out by owning 2.94% of Astelon, that owned I don't know how much of 36 North?</li> <li>Q. One third.</li> <li>A. So, I was a 2.94% owner of thirty three and a third percent in 36 North - something that's never been hidden.</li> <li>Q. But Hassans, your firm, owned a third of 36 North beneficially, is that correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, but my interest is not in that of Hassans, it is in 2.94 because it's actually broken down by partners, you've helpfully reminded me.</li> <li>Q. All I am trying to establish is, the Government was transferring the business</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Q. That the Government was going to do.</li> <li>You are the Chief Minister. Was that not the decision?</li> <li>A. Well, I was not going to be doing any of this. I was going to be allowing others to be doing this.</li> <li>Q. You were going to be allowing them to do it?</li> <li>A. I was asked whether I believed this would be a good idea.</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. And my view was that, so long as it continued to be amicable between Bland and 36 North, it seemed like a very good idea for the list of reasons I have given you, which were in part also the issues in dispute between Bland and the Government of Gibraltar as to intellectual properties.</li> <li>Q. So, you were asked for a view and you gave it, and your view was positive?</li> <li>A. I was asked for a view and the view I gave was that, so long as it was something that they agreed - remember that they were coming to</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A. I am not a relative of Mr Gaggero and therefore I am not a part-owner of Bland.</li> <li>Q. You are not a part-owner. Are you beneficially or were you at the time a part-owner of 36 North?</li> <li>A. In the way that you have now set out by owning 2.94% of Astelon, that owned I don't know how much of 36 North?</li> <li>Q. One third.</li> <li>A. So, I was a 2.94% owner of thirty three and a third percent in 36 North - something that's never been hidden.</li> <li>Q. But Hassans, your firm, owned a third of 36 North beneficially, is that correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, but my interest is not in that of Hassans, it is in 2.94 because it's actually broken down by partners, you've helpfully reminded me.</li> <li>Q. All I am trying to establish is, the Government was transferring the business from the company you did not part-own to the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. That the Government was going to do.</li> <li>You are the Chief Minister. Was that not the decision?</li> <li>A. Well, I was not going to be doing any of this. I was going to be allowing others to be doing this.</li> <li>Q. You were going to be allowing them to do it?</li> <li>A. I was asked whether I believed this would be a good idea.</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. And my view was that, so long as it continued to be amicable between Bland and 36 North, it seemed like a very good idea for the list of reasons I have given you, which were in part also the issues in dispute between Bland and the Government of Gibraltar as to intellectual properties.</li> <li>Q. So, you were asked for a view and you gave it, and your view was positive?</li> <li>A. I was asked for a view and the view I gave was that, so long as it was something that they</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>A. I am not a relative of Mr Gaggero and therefore I am not a part-owner of Bland.</li> <li>Q. You are not a part-owner. Are you beneficially or were you at the time a part-owner of 36 North?</li> <li>A. In the way that you have now set out by owning 2.94% of Astelon, that owned I don't know how much of 36 North?</li> <li>Q. One third.</li> <li>A. So, I was a 2.94% owner of thirty three and a third percent in 36 North - something that's never been hidden.</li> <li>Q. But Hassans, your firm, owned a third of 36 North beneficially, is that correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, but my interest is not in that of Hassans, it is in 2.94 because it's actually broken down by partners, you've helpfully reminded me.</li> <li>Q. All I am trying to establish is, the Government was transferring the business from the company you did not part-own?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Q. That the Government was going to do.</li> <li>You are the Chief Minister. Was that not the decision?</li> <li>A. Well, I was not going to be doing any of this. I was going to be allowing others to be doing this.</li> <li>Q. You were going to be allowing them to do it?</li> <li>A. I was asked whether I believed this would be a good idea.</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. And my view was that, so long as it continued to be amicable between Bland and 36 North, it seemed like a very good idea for the list of reasons I have given you, which were in part also the issues in dispute between Bland and the Government of Gibraltar as to intellectual properties.</li> <li>Q. So, you were asked for a view and you gave it, and your view was positive?</li> <li>A. I was asked for a view and the view I gave was that, so long as it was something that they agreed - remember that they were coming to</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>A. I am not a relative of Mr Gaggero and therefore I am not a part-owner of Bland.</li> <li>Q. You are not a part-owner. Are you beneficially or were you at the time a part-owner of 36 North?</li> <li>A. In the way that you have now set out by owning 2.94% of Astelon, that owned I don't know how much of 36 North?</li> <li>Q. One third.</li> <li>A. So, I was a 2.94% owner of thirty three and a third percent in 36 North - something that's never been hidden.</li> <li>Q. But Hassans, your firm, owned a third of 36 North beneficially, is that correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, but my interest is not in that of Hassans, it is in 2.94 because it's actually broken down by partners, you've helpfully reminded me.</li> <li>Q. All I am trying to establish is, the Government was transferring the business from the company you did not part-own to the company that you did part-own?</li> <li>A. No, that's not right. That's not right. You</li> </ul>

		1	
1	Government was transferring a business from	1	THE CHAIRMAN: 14 and above is
2	a company I didn't own to one that I partly	2	questionable, but I am delighted to see you.
3	owned. Which, of course, you're trying to do	3	MR WAGNER: I will not ask them to put
4	for reasons that I fully understand in keeping	4	their hands up.
5	with your instructions. But what I am trying to	5	A. I do not know who is going to scare them
6	get through to you is that what was presented	6	more, you or me.
7	to me was not that the Government should do	7	Q. You said yesterday in your evidence that
8	anything but that it was going to be agreed	8	the investment in 36 North had two years,
9	between Blands and those people who were	9	sorry, had two years before - so, this is from
10	leaving that they were going to do this, that	10	May, you are talking about May 2020 here,
11	they were going to do this. And when it's first	11	"From two years before already been resolved
12	presented to me, it is not presented to me as	12	by me giving the contract to Bland."
13	something in respect of which Hassans will	13	A. I think I said two years, and maybe I then
14	have an interest. And I believe that comes	14	went on to say a year and a half.
15	later when the investor becomes Hassans. Not	15	Q. I was about to read that, "A year and a half
16	at my request or as a result of any of my doing.	16	before this, I had already resolved the issue of
17	So, I don't accept the characterisation that you	17	that conflict against my financial interest."
18	are trying to put, although, of course, I fully	18	You said you resolved the issue. So, it was
19	understand why you are trying to put it.	19	your decision?
20	Q. How can it be appropriate for a	20	A. Of course it was, and you know that it was
20	Government Minister to be involved in the	20	because I have given evidence that when
22	transfer of a Government contract to a	22	James Gaggero came to tell me about the
23	company that he part-owns?	23	potential sabotage, I made the decision then.
24	A. Well, I don't think that that is a fair	24	Probably not a decision I could have made if I
25	characterisation of what I was doing. The	25	was making it in the other direction because
20	characterisation of what I was doing. The	25	was making it in the other uncetion because
	Page 121		Page 123
1	contract was being transferred. When the	1	then I would have been making a decision to
2	contract was produced, it would have gone to	2	favour myself. I don't think there's any rule
2 3	contract was produced, it would have gone to the Chief Secretary, it would have gone	2 3	favour myself. I don't think there's any rule requiring you not to make a decision that
2 3 4	contract was produced, it would have gone to the Chief Secretary, it would have gone through the usual process of approval and it	2 3 4	favour myself. I don't think there's any rule requiring you not to make a decision that doesn't favour you.
2 3 4 5	contract was produced, it would have gone to the Chief Secretary, it would have gone through the usual process of approval and it would not have come to me because I had an	2 3 4 5	<ul><li>favour myself. I don't think there's any rule</li><li>requiring you not to make a decision that</li><li>doesn't favour you.</li><li>Q. No, the rule is that you, if you have an</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6	contract was produced, it would have gone to the Chief Secretary, it would have gone through the usual process of approval and it would not have come to me because I had an interest in 36 North.	2 3 4 5 6	<ul><li>favour myself. I don't think there's any rule requiring you not to make a decision that doesn't favour you.</li><li>Q. No, the rule is that you, if you have an interest, you either dispose of the interest or</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	contract was produced, it would have gone to the Chief Secretary, it would have gone through the usual process of approval and it would not have come to me because I had an interest in 36 North. Q. Did you exclude yourself directly from	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul><li>favour myself. I don't think there's any rule requiring you not to make a decision that doesn't favour you.</li><li>Q. No, the rule is that you, if you have an interest, you either dispose of the interest or you dispose of the decision-making ability.</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul><li>contract was produced, it would have gone to the Chief Secretary, it would have gone through the usual process of approval and it would not have come to me because I had an interest in 36 North.</li><li>Q. Did you exclude yourself directly from that?</li></ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul><li>favour myself. I don't think there's any rule requiring you not to make a decision that doesn't favour you.</li><li>Q. No, the rule is that you, if you have an interest, you either dispose of the interest or you dispose of the decision-making ability.</li><li>You didn't do either of those things, did you?</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>contract was produced, it would have gone to the Chief Secretary, it would have gone through the usual process of approval and it would not have come to me because I had an interest in 36 North.</li> <li>Q. Did you exclude yourself directly from that?</li> <li>A. I had not reached the stage when exclusion</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>favour myself. I don't think there's any rule requiring you not to make a decision that doesn't favour you.</li> <li>Q. No, the rule is that you, if you have an interest, you either dispose of the interest or you dispose of the decision-making ability. You didn't do either of those things, did you?</li> <li>A. We're both referring to it as a rule. It's</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>contract was produced, it would have gone to the Chief Secretary, it would have gone through the usual process of approval and it would not have come to me because I had an interest in 36 North.</li> <li>Q. Did you exclude yourself directly from that?</li> <li>A. I had not reached the stage when exclusion would have had to occur. That would have</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>favour myself. I don't think there's any rule requiring you not to make a decision that doesn't favour you.</li> <li>Q. No, the rule is that you, if you have an interest, you either dispose of the interest or you dispose of the decision-making ability. You didn't do either of those things, did you?</li> <li>A. We're both referring to it as a rule. It's actually not a rule of law.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>contract was produced, it would have gone to the Chief Secretary, it would have gone through the usual process of approval and it would not have come to me because I had an interest in 36 North.</li> <li>Q. Did you exclude yourself directly from that?</li> <li>A. I had not reached the stage when exclusion would have had to occur. That would have happened later.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>favour myself. I don't think there's any rule requiring you not to make a decision that doesn't favour you.</li> <li>Q. No, the rule is that you, if you have an interest, you either dispose of the interest or you dispose of the decision-making ability.</li> <li>You didn't do either of those things, did you?</li> <li>A. We're both referring to it as a rule. It's actually not a rule of law.</li> <li>Q. It is certainly not a rule for your</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>contract was produced, it would have gone to the Chief Secretary, it would have gone through the usual process of approval and it would not have come to me because I had an interest in 36 North.</li> <li>Q. Did you exclude yourself directly from that?</li> <li>A. I had not reached the stage when exclusion would have had to occur. That would have happened later.</li> <li>Q. You said in your evidence yesterday</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>favour myself. I don't think there's any rule requiring you not to make a decision that doesn't favour you.</li> <li>Q. No, the rule is that you, if you have an interest, you either dispose of the interest or you dispose of the decision-making ability.</li> <li>You didn't do either of those things, did you?</li> <li>A. We're both referring to it as a rule. It's actually not a rule of law.</li> <li>Q. It is certainly not a rule for your</li> <li>A. It certainly is, Mr Wagner, and I don't</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>contract was produced, it would have gone to the Chief Secretary, it would have gone through the usual process of approval and it would not have come to me because I had an interest in 36 North.</li> <li>Q. Did you exclude yourself directly from that?</li> <li>A. I had not reached the stage when exclusion would have had to occur. That would have happened later.</li> <li>Q. You said in your evidence yesterday THE CHAIRMAN: I am not sure this is a</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>favour myself. I don't think there's any rule requiring you not to make a decision that doesn't favour you.</li> <li>Q. No, the rule is that you, if you have an interest, you either dispose of the interest or you dispose of the decision-making ability.</li> <li>You didn't do either of those things, did you?</li> <li>A. We're both referring to it as a rule. It's actually not a rule of law.</li> <li>Q. It is certainly not a rule for your</li> <li>A. It certainly is, Mr Wagner, and I don't accept what you are suggesting in that regard.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>contract was produced, it would have gone to the Chief Secretary, it would have gone through the usual process of approval and it would not have come to me because I had an interest in 36 North.</li> <li>Q. Did you exclude yourself directly from that?</li> <li>A. I had not reached the stage when exclusion would have had to occur. That would have happened later.</li> <li>Q. You said in your evidence yesterday</li> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: I am not sure this is a good idea</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>favour myself. I don't think there's any rule requiring you not to make a decision that doesn't favour you.</li> <li>Q. No, the rule is that you, if you have an interest, you either dispose of the interest or you dispose of the decision-making ability.</li> <li>You didn't do either of those things, did you?</li> <li>A. We're both referring to it as a rule. It's actually not a rule of law.</li> <li>Q. It is certainly not a rule for your</li> <li>A. It certainly is, Mr Wagner, and I don't accept what you are suggesting in that regard.</li> <li>Q. I</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>contract was produced, it would have gone to the Chief Secretary, it would have gone through the usual process of approval and it would not have come to me because I had an interest in 36 North.</li> <li>Q. Did you exclude yourself directly from that?</li> <li>A. I had not reached the stage when exclusion would have had to occur. That would have happened later.</li> <li>Q. You said in your evidence yesterday THE CHAIRMAN: I am not sure this is a good idea MR SANTOS: I understand the rules in</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>favour myself. I don't think there's any rule requiring you not to make a decision that doesn't favour you.</li> <li>Q. No, the rule is that you, if you have an interest, you either dispose of the interest or you dispose of the decision-making ability.</li> <li>You didn't do either of those things, did you?</li> <li>A. We're both referring to it as a rule. It's actually not a rule of law.</li> <li>Q. It is certainly not a rule for your</li> <li>A. It certainly is, Mr Wagner, and I don't accept what you are suggesting in that regard.</li> <li>Q. I</li> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: If you can speak one at a</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>contract was produced, it would have gone to the Chief Secretary, it would have gone through the usual process of approval and it would not have come to me because I had an interest in 36 North.</li> <li>Q. Did you exclude yourself directly from that?</li> <li>A. I had not reached the stage when exclusion would have had to occur. That would have happened later.</li> <li>Q. You said in your evidence yesterday</li> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: I am not sure this is a good idea</li> <li>MR SANTOS: I understand the rules in Gibraltar are that children from the age of 14</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>favour myself. I don't think there's any rule requiring you not to make a decision that doesn't favour you.</li> <li>Q. No, the rule is that you, if you have an interest, you either dispose of the interest or you dispose of the decision-making ability.</li> <li>You didn't do either of those things, did you?</li> <li>A. We're both referring to it as a rule. It's actually not a rule of law.</li> <li>Q. It is certainly not a rule for your</li> <li>A. It certainly is, Mr Wagner, and I don't accept what you are suggesting in that regard.</li> <li>Q. I</li> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: If you can speak one at a time?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>contract was produced, it would have gone to the Chief Secretary, it would have gone through the usual process of approval and it would not have come to me because I had an interest in 36 North.</li> <li>Q. Did you exclude yourself directly from that?</li> <li>A. I had not reached the stage when exclusion would have had to occur. That would have happened later.</li> <li>Q. You said in your evidence yesterday THE CHAIRMAN: I am not sure this is a good idea</li> <li>MR SANTOS: I understand the rules in Gibraltar are that children from the age of 14 can attend.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>favour myself. I don't think there's any rule requiring you not to make a decision that doesn't favour you.</li> <li>Q. No, the rule is that you, if you have an interest, you either dispose of the interest or you dispose of the decision-making ability. You didn't do either of those things, did you?</li> <li>A. We're both referring to it as a rule. It's actually not a rule of law.</li> <li>Q. It is certainly not a rule for your</li> <li>A. It certainly is, Mr Wagner, and I don't accept what you are suggesting in that regard.</li> <li>Q. I</li> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: If you can speak one at a time?</li> <li>MR WAGNER: Sorry, yes.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>contract was produced, it would have gone to the Chief Secretary, it would have gone through the usual process of approval and it would not have come to me because I had an interest in 36 North.</li> <li>Q. Did you exclude yourself directly from that?</li> <li>A. I had not reached the stage when exclusion would have had to occur. That would have happened later.</li> <li>Q. You said in your evidence yesterday</li> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: I am not sure this is a good idea</li> <li>MR SANTOS: I understand the rules in Gibraltar are that children from the age of 14 can attend.</li> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: That is why I asked their</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>favour myself. I don't think there's any rule requiring you not to make a decision that doesn't favour you.</li> <li>Q. No, the rule is that you, if you have an interest, you either dispose of the interest or you dispose of the decision-making ability. You didn't do either of those things, did you?</li> <li>A. We're both referring to it as a rule. It's actually not a rule of law.</li> <li>Q. It is certainly not a rule for your</li> <li>A. It certainly is, Mr Wagner, and I don't accept what you are suggesting in that regard.</li> <li>Q. I</li> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: If you can speak one at a time?</li> <li>MR WAGNER: Sorry, yes.</li> <li>A. So, as far as I'm concerned, the decision I</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>contract was produced, it would have gone to the Chief Secretary, it would have gone through the usual process of approval and it would not have come to me because I had an interest in 36 North.</li> <li>Q. Did you exclude yourself directly from that?</li> <li>A. I had not reached the stage when exclusion would have had to occur. That would have happened later.</li> <li>Q. You said in your evidence yesterday THE CHAIRMAN: I am not sure this is a good idea MR SANTOS: I understand the rules in Gibraltar are that children from the age of 14 can attend.</li> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: That is why I asked their age.</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ \end{array} $	<ul> <li>favour myself. I don't think there's any rule requiring you not to make a decision that doesn't favour you.</li> <li>Q. No, the rule is that you, if you have an interest, you either dispose of the interest or you dispose of the decision-making ability.</li> <li>You didn't do either of those things, did you?</li> <li>A. We're both referring to it as a rule. It's actually not a rule of law.</li> <li>Q. It is certainly not a rule for your</li> <li>A. It certainly is, Mr Wagner, and I don't accept what you are suggesting in that regard.</li> <li>Q. I</li> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: If you can speak one at a time?</li> <li>MR WAGNER: Sorry, yes.</li> <li>A. So, as far as I'm concerned, the decision I was able to make, which would not offend</li> </ul>
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array}$	<ul> <li>contract was produced, it would have gone to the Chief Secretary, it would have gone through the usual process of approval and it would not have come to me because I had an interest in 36 North.</li> <li>Q. Did you exclude yourself directly from that?</li> <li>A. I had not reached the stage when exclusion would have had to occur. That would have happened later.</li> <li>Q. You said in your evidence yesterday</li> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: I am not sure this is a good idea</li> <li>MR SANTOS: I understand the rules in Gibraltar are that children from the age of 14 can attend.</li> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: That is why I asked their age.</li> <li>MR SANTOS: Do we know what their age</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array} $	<ul> <li>favour myself. I don't think there's any rule requiring you not to make a decision that doesn't favour you.</li> <li>Q. No, the rule is that you, if you have an interest, you either dispose of the interest or you dispose of the decision-making ability. You didn't do either of those things, did you?</li> <li>A. We're both referring to it as a rule. It's actually not a rule of law.</li> <li>Q. It is certainly not a rule for your</li> <li>A. It certainly is, Mr Wagner, and I don't accept what you are suggesting in that regard.</li> <li>Q. I</li> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: If you can speak one at a time?</li> <li>MR WAGNER: Sorry, yes.</li> <li>A. So, as far as I'm concerned, the decision I was able to make, which would not offend any, let's loosely call it a rule with a small "r",</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>contract was produced, it would have gone to the Chief Secretary, it would have gone through the usual process of approval and it would not have come to me because I had an interest in 36 North.</li> <li>Q. Did you exclude yourself directly from that?</li> <li>A. I had not reached the stage when exclusion would have had to occur. That would have happened later.</li> <li>Q. You said in your evidence yesterday</li> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: I am not sure this is a good idea</li> <li>MR SANTOS: I understand the rules in Gibraltar are that children from the age of 14 can attend.</li> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: That is why I asked their age.</li> <li>MR SANTOS: Do we know what their age is? I think we will get it established. Can we</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	<ul> <li>favour myself. I don't think there's any rule requiring you not to make a decision that doesn't favour you.</li> <li>Q. No, the rule is that you, if you have an interest, you either dispose of the interest or you dispose of the decision-making ability. You didn't do either of those things, did you?</li> <li>A. We're both referring to it as a rule. It's actually not a rule of law.</li> <li>Q. It is certainly not a rule for your</li> <li>A. It certainly is, Mr Wagner, and I don't accept what you are suggesting in that regard.</li> <li>Q. I</li> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: If you can speak one at a time?</li> <li>MR WAGNER: Sorry, yes.</li> <li>A. So, as far as I'm concerned, the decision I was able to make, which would not offend any, let's loosely call it a rule with a small "r", in respect of conflicts of interest, integrity,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>contract was produced, it would have gone to the Chief Secretary, it would have gone through the usual process of approval and it would not have come to me because I had an interest in 36 North.</li> <li>Q. Did you exclude yourself directly from that?</li> <li>A. I had not reached the stage when exclusion would have had to occur. That would have happened later.</li> <li>Q. You said in your evidence yesterday</li> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: I am not sure this is a good idea</li> <li>MR SANTOS: I understand the rules in Gibraltar are that children from the age of 14 can attend.</li> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: That is why I asked their age.</li> <li>MR SANTOS: Do we know what their age is? I think we will get it established. Can we nod if they are 14 and above? Yes.</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	<ul> <li>favour myself. I don't think there's any rule requiring you not to make a decision that doesn't favour you.</li> <li>Q. No, the rule is that you, if you have an interest, you either dispose of the interest or you dispose of the decision-making ability. You didn't do either of those things, did you?</li> <li>A. We're both referring to it as a rule. It's actually not a rule of law.</li> <li>Q. It is certainly not a rule for your</li> <li>A. It certainly is, Mr Wagner, and I don't accept what you are suggesting in that regard.</li> <li>Q. I</li> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: If you can speak one at a time?</li> <li>MR WAGNER: Sorry, yes.</li> <li>A. So, as far as I'm concerned, the decision I was able to make, which would not offend any, let's loosely call it a rule with a small "r", in respect of conflicts of interest, integrity, probity or selflessness, and would not offend</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>contract was produced, it would have gone to the Chief Secretary, it would have gone through the usual process of approval and it would not have come to me because I had an interest in 36 North.</li> <li>Q. Did you exclude yourself directly from that?</li> <li>A. I had not reached the stage when exclusion would have had to occur. That would have happened later.</li> <li>Q. You said in your evidence yesterday</li> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: I am not sure this is a good idea</li> <li>MR SANTOS: I understand the rules in Gibraltar are that children from the age of 14 can attend.</li> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: That is why I asked their age.</li> <li>MR SANTOS: Do we know what their age is? I think we will get it established. Can we nod if they are 14 and above? Yes.</li> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: 14 and above is fine.</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	<ul> <li>favour myself. I don't think there's any rule requiring you not to make a decision that doesn't favour you.</li> <li>Q. No, the rule is that you, if you have an interest, you either dispose of the interest or you dispose of the decision-making ability. You didn't do either of those things, did you?</li> <li>A. We're both referring to it as a rule. It's actually not a rule of law.</li> <li>Q. It is certainly not a rule for your</li> <li>A. It certainly is, Mr Wagner, and I don't accept what you are suggesting in that regard.</li> <li>Q. I</li> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: If you can speak one at a time?</li> <li>MR WAGNER: Sorry, yes.</li> <li>A. So, as far as I'm concerned, the decision I was able to make, which would not offend any, let's loosely call it a rule with a small "r", in respect of conflicts of interest, integrity, probity or selflessness, and would not offend any of the Nolan principles, is a decision not to</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>contract was produced, it would have gone to the Chief Secretary, it would have gone through the usual process of approval and it would not have come to me because I had an interest in 36 North.</li> <li>Q. Did you exclude yourself directly from that?</li> <li>A. I had not reached the stage when exclusion would have had to occur. That would have happened later.</li> <li>Q. You said in your evidence yesterday</li> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: I am not sure this is a good idea</li> <li>MR SANTOS: I understand the rules in Gibraltar are that children from the age of 14 can attend.</li> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: That is why I asked their age.</li> <li>MR SANTOS: Do we know what their age is? I think we will get it established. Can we nod if they are 14 and above? Yes.</li> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: 14 and above is fine.</li> <li>MR SANTOS: In that case, as long as they</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	<ul> <li>favour myself. I don't think there's any rule requiring you not to make a decision that doesn't favour you.</li> <li>Q. No, the rule is that you, if you have an interest, you either dispose of the interest or you dispose of the decision-making ability. You didn't do either of those things, did you?</li> <li>A. We're both referring to it as a rule. It's actually not a rule of law.</li> <li>Q. It is certainly not a rule for your</li> <li>A. It certainly is, Mr Wagner, and I don't accept what you are suggesting in that regard.</li> <li>Q. I</li> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: If you can speak one at a time?</li> <li>MR WAGNER: Sorry, yes.</li> <li>A. So, as far as I'm concerned, the decision I was able to make, which would not offend any, let's loosely call it a rule with a small "r", in respect of conflicts of interest, integrity, probity or selflessness, and would not offend any of the Nolan principles, is a decision that I felt</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>contract was produced, it would have gone to the Chief Secretary, it would have gone through the usual process of approval and it would not have come to me because I had an interest in 36 North.</li> <li>Q. Did you exclude yourself directly from that?</li> <li>A. I had not reached the stage when exclusion would have had to occur. That would have happened later.</li> <li>Q. You said in your evidence yesterday</li> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: I am not sure this is a good idea</li> <li>MR SANTOS: I understand the rules in Gibraltar are that children from the age of 14 can attend.</li> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: That is why I asked their age.</li> <li>MR SANTOS: Do we know what their age is? I think we will get it established. Can we nod if they are 14 and above? Yes.</li> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: 14 and above is fine.</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	<ul> <li>favour myself. I don't think there's any rule requiring you not to make a decision that doesn't favour you.</li> <li>Q. No, the rule is that you, if you have an interest, you either dispose of the interest or you dispose of the decision-making ability. You didn't do either of those things, did you?</li> <li>A. We're both referring to it as a rule. It's actually not a rule of law.</li> <li>Q. It is certainly not a rule for your</li> <li>A. It certainly is, Mr Wagner, and I don't accept what you are suggesting in that regard.</li> <li>Q. I</li> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: If you can speak one at a time?</li> <li>MR WAGNER: Sorry, yes.</li> <li>A. So, as far as I'm concerned, the decision I was able to make, which would not offend any, let's loosely call it a rule with a small "r", in respect of conflicts of interest, integrity, probity or selflessness, and would not offend any of the Nolan principles, is a decision not to</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>contract was produced, it would have gone to the Chief Secretary, it would have gone through the usual process of approval and it would not have come to me because I had an interest in 36 North.</li> <li>Q. Did you exclude yourself directly from that?</li> <li>A. I had not reached the stage when exclusion would have had to occur. That would have happened later.</li> <li>Q. You said in your evidence yesterday</li> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: I am not sure this is a good idea</li> <li>MR SANTOS: I understand the rules in Gibraltar are that children from the age of 14 can attend.</li> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: That is why I asked their age.</li> <li>MR SANTOS: Do we know what their age is? I think we will get it established. Can we nod if they are 14 and above? Yes.</li> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: 14 and above is fine.</li> <li>MR SANTOS: In that case, as long as they</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	<ul> <li>favour myself. I don't think there's any rule requiring you not to make a decision that doesn't favour you.</li> <li>Q. No, the rule is that you, if you have an interest, you either dispose of the interest or you dispose of the decision-making ability. You didn't do either of those things, did you?</li> <li>A. We're both referring to it as a rule. It's actually not a rule of law.</li> <li>Q. It is certainly not a rule for your</li> <li>A. It certainly is, Mr Wagner, and I don't accept what you are suggesting in that regard.</li> <li>Q. I</li> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: If you can speak one at a time?</li> <li>MR WAGNER: Sorry, yes.</li> <li>A. So, as far as I'm concerned, the decision I was able to make, which would not offend any, let's loosely call it a rule with a small "r", in respect of conflicts of interest, integrity, probity or selflessness, and would not offend any of the Nolan principles, is a decision that I felt</li> </ul>

www.epiqglobal.com Lower Ground Floor, 46 Chancery Lane casemanagers@epiqglobal.com London, WC2A 1JE

31 (Pages 121 to 124)

1	the contract should not go to the entity where I	1	statement to the Royal Gibraltar Police. So,
2	would have had a conflict if I had favoured it.	2	you were asked here, page number 12, "The
3	Q. Yes, and you made that decision because	3	defence have argued that you authorised Mr
4	Mr Gaggero told you that he suspected that the	4	Cornelio to access the NSCIS platform after
5	NSCIS system was being sabotaged, is that	5	August 2018. Did you authorise Mr Cornelio
6	right?	6	to access the NSCIS platform at any time
7	A. Before he had even referred the matter to	7	between 31st of August and the 4th of
8	the Royal Gibraltar Police, something which	8	December?" and this is the answer: "No
9	he said to me - he asked me, "Do you think I	9	express authority was given by me, at least that
10	should refer it to the Royal Gibraltar Police?"	10	I can recall or I can find recorded in writing,
11	and I said, "Look, I think you should if you	11	for Mr Cornelio to access the NSCIS platform
12	think you must."	12	at any time after the termination of his
13	Q. Why did you not refer it to the Royal	13	arrangement for accessing with or through
14	Gibraltar Police?	14	Bland. I do not believe that any other
15	A. Well, because at that stage I was not the	15	communication from me can be considered to
16	person who dealt with the NSCIS platform. I	16	be ostensible authority from me for anyone to
17	referred it to those in my office who dealt with	17	access the system, although I am unable to
18	the NSCIS platform. I was attended by a	18	comment on whether a communication from
19	private secretary at that meeting, I believe the	19	me could legitimately be interpreted in a
20	private secretary has given evidence of what	20	manner that could be considered to convey
21	transpired at the meeting, and I took action	21	such ostensible or implied authority." Is that a
22	consequent on that also in respect of my office	22	somewhat long way of saying you could not
23	and who had access to it.	23	discount having given Tommy Cornelio
24	Q. Were you shocked to learn that the NSCIS	24	authority to access the system?
25	system had allegedly been sabotaged?	25	A. No.
	Page 125		Page 127
		1	
1	A. I was shocked to learn that that was	1	Q. How is that not? You say there, "I cannot
2			
	potentially the case, yes.	2	recall or find in writing" but you cannot
3	Q. Were you very concerned?	3	recall or find in writing" but you cannot account for, "A communication from me
3 4	<ul><li>Q. Were you very concerned?</li><li>A. I was very concerned.</li></ul>	3 4	recall or find in writing" but you cannot account for, "A communication from me legitimately being interpreted in a manner that
3 4 5	<ul><li>Q. Were you very concerned?</li><li>A. I was very concerned.</li><li>Q. How did you express your concern to the</li></ul>	3 4 5	recall or find in writing" but you cannot account for, "A communication from me legitimately being interpreted in a manner that could be considered to convey such ostensible
3 4 5 6	<ul><li>Q. Were you very concerned?</li><li>A. I was very concerned.</li><li>Q. How did you express your concern to the people in your office? Did you say to them,</li></ul>	3 4 5 6	recall or find in writing" but you cannot account for, "A communication from me legitimately being interpreted in a manner that could be considered to convey such ostensible or implied authority." Is that not just a way of
3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>Q. Were you very concerned?</li> <li>A. I was very concerned.</li> <li>Q. How did you express your concern to the people in your office? Did you say to them,</li> <li>"We must get to the bottom of this and report</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7	recall or find in writing" but you cannot account for, "A communication from me legitimately being interpreted in a manner that could be considered to convey such ostensible or implied authority." Is that not just a way of saying, "I don't really know. Maybe
3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>Q. Were you very concerned?</li> <li>A. I was very concerned.</li> <li>Q. How did you express your concern to the people in your office? Did you say to them, "We must get to the bottom of this and report it to the police"?</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8	recall or find in writing" but you cannot account for, "A communication from me legitimately being interpreted in a manner that could be considered to convey such ostensible or implied authority." Is that not just a way of saying, "I don't really know. Maybe something I said could have been interpreted
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q. Were you very concerned?</li> <li>A. I was very concerned.</li> <li>Q. How did you express your concern to the people in your office? Did you say to them,</li> <li>"We must get to the bottom of this and report it to the police"?</li> <li>A. I said to the people in my office that I</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9	recall or find in writing" but you cannot account for, "A communication from me legitimately being interpreted in a manner that could be considered to convey such ostensible or implied authority." Is that not just a way of saying, "I don't really know. Maybe something I said could have been interpreted as that"?
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>Q. Were you very concerned?</li> <li>A. I was very concerned.</li> <li>Q. How did you express your concern to the people in your office? Did you say to them,</li> <li>"We must get to the bottom of this and report it to the police"?</li> <li>A. I said to the people in my office that I wanted to deal with the issue, and you'll be</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	recall or find in writing" but you cannot account for, "A communication from me legitimately being interpreted in a manner that could be considered to convey such ostensible or implied authority." Is that not just a way of saying, "I don't really know. Maybe something I said could have been interpreted as that"? A. For the reason that is set out in the next
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>Q. Were you very concerned?</li> <li>A. I was very concerned.</li> <li>Q. How did you express your concern to the people in your office? Did you say to them, "We must get to the bottom of this and report it to the police"?</li> <li>A. I said to the people in my office that I wanted to deal with the issue, and you'll be able to refer to the part of my statement where</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	recall or find in writing" but you cannot account for, "A communication from me legitimately being interpreted in a manner that could be considered to convey such ostensible or implied authority." Is that not just a way of saying, "I don't really know. Maybe something I said could have been interpreted as that"? A. For the reason that is set out in the next paragraph, that I wasn't the gatekeeper, but the
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Q. Were you very concerned?</li> <li>A. I was very concerned.</li> <li>Q. How did you express your concern to the people in your office? Did you say to them,</li> <li>"We must get to the bottom of this and report it to the police"?</li> <li>A. I said to the people in my office that I wanted to deal with the issue, and you'll be able to refer to the part of my statement where I address that or to the statement of my private</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>recall or find in writing" but you cannot account for, "A communication from me legitimately being interpreted in a manner that could be considered to convey such ostensible or implied authority." Is that not just a way of saying, "I don't really know. Maybe something I said could have been interpreted as that"?</li> <li>A. For the reason that is set out in the next paragraph, that I wasn't the gatekeeper, but the person who was was Caine Sanchez, and you</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Q. Were you very concerned?</li> <li>A. I was very concerned.</li> <li>Q. How did you express your concern to the people in your office? Did you say to them,</li> <li>"We must get to the bottom of this and report it to the police"?</li> <li>A. I said to the people in my office that I wanted to deal with the issue, and you'll be able to refer to the part of my statement where I address that or to the statement of my private secretary who was with me at the time, which</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>recall or find in writing" but you cannot account for, "A communication from me legitimately being interpreted in a manner that could be considered to convey such ostensible or implied authority." Is that not just a way of saying, "I don't really know. Maybe something I said could have been interpreted as that"?</li> <li>A. For the reason that is set out in the next paragraph, that I wasn't the gatekeeper, but the person who was was Caine Sanchez, and you have seen that there is a lot of exchanges</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Q. Were you very concerned?</li> <li>A. I was very concerned.</li> <li>Q. How did you express your concern to the people in your office? Did you say to them,</li> <li>"We must get to the bottom of this and report it to the police"?</li> <li>A. I said to the people in my office that I wanted to deal with the issue, and you'll be able to refer to the part of my statement where I address that or to the statement of my private secretary who was with me at the time, which sets out the actions that were taken consequent</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	recall or find in writing" but you cannot account for, "A communication from me legitimately being interpreted in a manner that could be considered to convey such ostensible or implied authority." Is that not just a way of saying, "I don't really know. Maybe something I said could have been interpreted as that"? A. For the reason that is set out in the next paragraph, that I wasn't the gatekeeper, but the person who was was Caine Sanchez, and you have seen that there is a lot of exchanges between me and Caine Sanchez, and my
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Q. Were you very concerned?</li> <li>A. I was very concerned.</li> <li>Q. How did you express your concern to the people in your office? Did you say to them,</li> <li>"We must get to the bottom of this and report it to the police"?</li> <li>A. I said to the people in my office that I wanted to deal with the issue, and you'll be able to refer to the part of my statement where I address that or to the statement of my private secretary who was with me at the time, which sets out the actions that were taken consequent on that, which were based on the fact that Mr</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	recall or find in writing" but you cannot account for, "A communication from me legitimately being interpreted in a manner that could be considered to convey such ostensible or implied authority." Is that not just a way of saying, "I don't really know. Maybe something I said could have been interpreted as that"? A. For the reason that is set out in the next paragraph, that I wasn't the gatekeeper, but the person who was was Caine Sanchez, and you have seen that there is a lot of exchanges between me and Caine Sanchez, and my concern was that, although Caine Sanchez was
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Q. Were you very concerned?</li> <li>A. I was very concerned.</li> <li>Q. How did you express your concern to the people in your office? Did you say to them,</li> <li>"We must get to the bottom of this and report it to the police"?</li> <li>A. I said to the people in my office that I wanted to deal with the issue, and you'll be able to refer to the part of my statement where I address that or to the statement of my private secretary who was with me at the time, which sets out the actions that were taken consequent on that, which were based on the fact that Mr Gaggero had told us that he was reporting the</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	recall or find in writing" but you cannot account for, "A communication from me legitimately being interpreted in a manner that could be considered to convey such ostensible or implied authority." Is that not just a way of saying, "I don't really know. Maybe something I said could have been interpreted as that"? A. For the reason that is set out in the next paragraph, that I wasn't the gatekeeper, but the person who was was Caine Sanchez, and you have seen that there is a lot of exchanges between me and Caine Sanchez, and my concern was that, although Caine Sanchez was the gatekeeper, he also wasn't the technical
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Q. Were you very concerned?</li> <li>A. I was very concerned.</li> <li>Q. How did you express your concern to the people in your office? Did you say to them,</li> <li>"We must get to the bottom of this and report it to the police"?</li> <li>A. I said to the people in my office that I wanted to deal with the issue, and you'll be able to refer to the part of my statement where I address that or to the statement of my private secretary who was with me at the time, which sets out the actions that were taken consequent on that, which were based on the fact that Mr Gaggero had told us that he was reporting the matter to the police also.</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	recall or find in writing" but you cannot account for, "A communication from me legitimately being interpreted in a manner that could be considered to convey such ostensible or implied authority." Is that not just a way of saying, "I don't really know. Maybe something I said could have been interpreted as that"? A. For the reason that is set out in the next paragraph, that I wasn't the gatekeeper, but the person who was was Caine Sanchez, and you have seen that there is a lot of exchanges between me and Caine Sanchez, and my concern was that, although Caine Sanchez was the gatekeeper, he also wasn't the technical guy, so I may have said something to Caine
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q. Were you very concerned?</li> <li>A. I was very concerned.</li> <li>Q. How did you express your concern to the people in your office? Did you say to them,</li> <li>"We must get to the bottom of this and report it to the police"?</li> <li>A. I said to the people in my office that I wanted to deal with the issue, and you'll be able to refer to the part of my statement where I address that or to the statement of my private secretary who was with me at the time, which sets out the actions that were taken consequent on that, which were based on the fact that Mr Gaggero had told us that he was reporting the matter to the police also.</li> <li>Q. If we can just go to B1120, please.</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	recall or find in writing" but you cannot account for, "A communication from me legitimately being interpreted in a manner that could be considered to convey such ostensible or implied authority." Is that not just a way of saying, "I don't really know. Maybe something I said could have been interpreted as that"? A. For the reason that is set out in the next paragraph, that I wasn't the gatekeeper, but the person who was was Caine Sanchez, and you have seen that there is a lot of exchanges between me and Caine Sanchez, and my concern was that, although Caine Sanchez was the gatekeeper, he also wasn't the technical guy, so I may have said something to Caine which Caine may then have instrumentalised
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Q. Were you very concerned?</li> <li>A. I was very concerned.</li> <li>Q. How did you express your concern to the people in your office? Did you say to them,</li> <li>"We must get to the bottom of this and report it to the police"?</li> <li>A. I said to the people in my office that I wanted to deal with the issue, and you'll be able to refer to the part of my statement where I address that or to the statement of my private secretary who was with me at the time, which sets out the actions that were taken consequent on that, which were based on the fact that Mr Gaggero had told us that he was reporting the matter to the police also.</li> <li>Q. If we can just go to B1120, please.</li> <li>A. And, indeed, if I may, I think by May '19</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	recall or find in writing" but you cannot account for, "A communication from me legitimately being interpreted in a manner that could be considered to convey such ostensible or implied authority." Is that not just a way of saying, "I don't really know. Maybe something I said could have been interpreted as that"? A. For the reason that is set out in the next paragraph, that I wasn't the gatekeeper, but the person who was was Caine Sanchez, and you have seen that there is a lot of exchanges between me and Caine Sanchez, and my concern was that, although Caine Sanchez was the gatekeeper, he also wasn't the technical guy, so I may have said something to Caine which Caine may then have instrumentalised through Cornelio. That's what I am saying
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Q. Were you very concerned?</li> <li>A. I was very concerned.</li> <li>Q. How did you express your concern to the people in your office? Did you say to them,</li> <li>"We must get to the bottom of this and report it to the police"?</li> <li>A. I said to the people in my office that I wanted to deal with the issue, and you'll be able to refer to the part of my statement where I address that or to the statement of my private secretary who was with me at the time, which sets out the actions that were taken consequent on that, which were based on the fact that Mr Gaggero had told us that he was reporting the matter to the police also.</li> <li>Q. If we can just go to B1120, please.</li> <li>A. And, indeed, if I may, I think by May '19 the meeting with Mr McGrail, the first meeting</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	recall or find in writing" but you cannot account for, "A communication from me legitimately being interpreted in a manner that could be considered to convey such ostensible or implied authority." Is that not just a way of saying, "I don't really know. Maybe something I said could have been interpreted as that"? A. For the reason that is set out in the next paragraph, that I wasn't the gatekeeper, but the person who was was Caine Sanchez, and you have seen that there is a lot of exchanges between me and Caine Sanchez, and my concern was that, although Caine Sanchez was the gatekeeper, he also wasn't the technical guy, so I may have said something to Caine which Caine may then have instrumentalised through Cornelio. That's what I am saying there.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q. Were you very concerned?</li> <li>A. I was very concerned.</li> <li>Q. How did you express your concern to the people in your office? Did you say to them,</li> <li>"We must get to the bottom of this and report it to the police"?</li> <li>A. I said to the people in my office that I wanted to deal with the issue, and you'll be able to refer to the part of my statement where I address that or to the statement of my private secretary who was with me at the time, which sets out the actions that were taken consequent on that, which were based on the fact that Mr Gaggero had told us that he was reporting the matter to the police also.</li> <li>Q. If we can just go to B1120, please.</li> <li>A. And, indeed, if I may, I think by May '19 the meeting with Mr McGrail, the first meeting with Mr McGrail on the subject, deals with</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	recall or find in writing" but you cannot account for, "A communication from me legitimately being interpreted in a manner that could be considered to convey such ostensible or implied authority." Is that not just a way of saying, "I don't really know. Maybe something I said could have been interpreted as that"? A. For the reason that is set out in the next paragraph, that I wasn't the gatekeeper, but the person who was was Caine Sanchez, and you have seen that there is a lot of exchanges between me and Caine Sanchez, and my concern was that, although Caine Sanchez was the gatekeeper, he also wasn't the technical guy, so I may have said something to Caine which Caine may then have instrumentalised through Cornelio. That's what I am saying there. Q. So, you were concerned that
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q. Were you very concerned?</li> <li>A. I was very concerned.</li> <li>Q. How did you express your concern to the people in your office? Did you say to them,</li> <li>"We must get to the bottom of this and report it to the police"?</li> <li>A. I said to the people in my office that I wanted to deal with the issue, and you'll be able to refer to the part of my statement where I address that or to the statement of my private secretary who was with me at the time, which sets out the actions that were taken consequent on that, which were based on the fact that Mr Gaggero had told us that he was reporting the matter to the police also.</li> <li>Q. If we can just go to B1120, please.</li> <li>A. And, indeed, if I may, I think by May '19 the meeting with Mr McGrail, the first meeting with Mr McGrail on the subject, deals with exactly this issue and the Government's own</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	recall or find in writing" but you cannot account for, "A communication from me legitimately being interpreted in a manner that could be considered to convey such ostensible or implied authority." Is that not just a way of saying, "I don't really know. Maybe something I said could have been interpreted as that"? A. For the reason that is set out in the next paragraph, that I wasn't the gatekeeper, but the person who was was Caine Sanchez, and you have seen that there is a lot of exchanges between me and Caine Sanchez, and my concern was that, although Caine Sanchez was the gatekeeper, he also wasn't the technical guy, so I may have said something to Caine which Caine may then have instrumentalised through Cornelio. That's what I am saying there. Q. So, you were concerned that A. Not concerned.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. Were you very concerned?</li> <li>A. I was very concerned.</li> <li>Q. How did you express your concern to the people in your office? Did you say to them,</li> <li>"We must get to the bottom of this and report it to the police"?</li> <li>A. I said to the people in my office that I wanted to deal with the issue, and you'll be able to refer to the part of my statement where I address that or to the statement of my private secretary who was with me at the time, which sets out the actions that were taken consequent on that, which were based on the fact that Mr Gaggero had told us that he was reporting the matter to the police also.</li> <li>Q. If we can just go to B1120, please.</li> <li>A. And, indeed, if I may, I think by May '19 the meeting with Mr McGrail on the subject, deals with exactly this issue and the Government's own potential to be a complainant. Where do you</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	recall or find in writing" but you cannot account for, "A communication from me legitimately being interpreted in a manner that could be considered to convey such ostensible or implied authority." Is that not just a way of saying, "I don't really know. Maybe something I said could have been interpreted as that"? A. For the reason that is set out in the next paragraph, that I wasn't the gatekeeper, but the person who was was Caine Sanchez, and you have seen that there is a lot of exchanges between me and Caine Sanchez, and my concern was that, although Caine Sanchez was the gatekeeper, he also wasn't the technical guy, so I may have said something to Caine which Caine may then have instrumentalised through Cornelio. That's what I am saying there. Q. So, you were concerned that A. Not concerned. Q you might have said something to Caine
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Q. Were you very concerned?</li> <li>A. I was very concerned.</li> <li>Q. How did you express your concern to the people in your office? Did you say to them,</li> <li>"We must get to the bottom of this and report it to the police"?</li> <li>A. I said to the people in my office that I wanted to deal with the issue, and you'll be able to refer to the part of my statement where I address that or to the statement of my private secretary who was with me at the time, which sets out the actions that were taken consequent on that, which were based on the fact that Mr Gaggero had told us that he was reporting the matter to the police also.</li> <li>Q. If we can just go to B1120, please.</li> <li>A. And, indeed, if I may, I think by May '19 the meeting with Mr McGrail, the first meeting with Mr McGrail on the subject, deals with exactly this issue and the Government's own potential to be a complainant. Where do you want me to go?</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>recall or find in writing" but you cannot account for, "A communication from me legitimately being interpreted in a manner that could be considered to convey such ostensible or implied authority." Is that not just a way of saying, "I don't really know. Maybe something I said could have been interpreted as that"?</li> <li>A. For the reason that is set out in the next paragraph, that I wasn't the gatekeeper, but the person who was was Caine Sanchez, and you have seen that there is a lot of exchanges between me and Caine Sanchez, and my concern was that, although Caine Sanchez was the gatekeeper, he also wasn't the technical guy, so I may have said something to Caine which Caine may then have instrumentalised through Cornelio. That's what I am saying there.</li> <li>Q. So, you were concerned that</li> <li>A. Not concerned.</li> <li>Q you might have said something to Caine which would have been instrumentalised into</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. Were you very concerned?</li> <li>A. I was very concerned.</li> <li>Q. How did you express your concern to the people in your office? Did you say to them,</li> <li>"We must get to the bottom of this and report it to the police"?</li> <li>A. I said to the people in my office that I wanted to deal with the issue, and you'll be able to refer to the part of my statement where I address that or to the statement of my private secretary who was with me at the time, which sets out the actions that were taken consequent on that, which were based on the fact that Mr Gaggero had told us that he was reporting the matter to the police also.</li> <li>Q. If we can just go to B1120, please.</li> <li>A. And, indeed, if I may, I think by May '19 the meeting with Mr McGrail on the subject, deals with exactly this issue and the Government's own potential to be a complainant. Where do you</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	recall or find in writing" but you cannot account for, "A communication from me legitimately being interpreted in a manner that could be considered to convey such ostensible or implied authority." Is that not just a way of saying, "I don't really know. Maybe something I said could have been interpreted as that"? A. For the reason that is set out in the next paragraph, that I wasn't the gatekeeper, but the person who was was Caine Sanchez, and you have seen that there is a lot of exchanges between me and Caine Sanchez, and my concern was that, although Caine Sanchez was the gatekeeper, he also wasn't the technical guy, so I may have said something to Caine which Caine may then have instrumentalised through Cornelio. That's what I am saying there. Q. So, you were concerned that A. Not concerned. Q you might have said something to Caine
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Q. Were you very concerned?</li> <li>A. I was very concerned.</li> <li>Q. How did you express your concern to the people in your office? Did you say to them,</li> <li>"We must get to the bottom of this and report it to the police"?</li> <li>A. I said to the people in my office that I wanted to deal with the issue, and you'll be able to refer to the part of my statement where I address that or to the statement of my private secretary who was with me at the time, which sets out the actions that were taken consequent on that, which were based on the fact that Mr Gaggero had told us that he was reporting the matter to the police also.</li> <li>Q. If we can just go to B1120, please.</li> <li>A. And, indeed, if I may, I think by May '19 the meeting with Mr McGrail, the first meeting with Mr McGrail on the subject, deals with exactly this issue and the Government's own potential to be a complainant. Where do you want me to go?</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>recall or find in writing" but you cannot account for, "A communication from me legitimately being interpreted in a manner that could be considered to convey such ostensible or implied authority." Is that not just a way of saying, "I don't really know. Maybe something I said could have been interpreted as that"?</li> <li>A. For the reason that is set out in the next paragraph, that I wasn't the gatekeeper, but the person who was was Caine Sanchez, and you have seen that there is a lot of exchanges between me and Caine Sanchez, and my concern was that, although Caine Sanchez was the gatekeeper, he also wasn't the technical guy, so I may have said something to Caine which Caine may then have instrumentalised through Cornelio. That's what I am saying there.</li> <li>Q. So, you were concerned that</li> <li>A. Not concerned.</li> <li>Q you might have said something to Caine which would have been instrumentalised into</li> </ul>

www.epiqglobal.com Lower Ground Floor, 46 Chancery Lane casemanagers@epiqglobal.com London, WC2A 1JE

32 (Pages 125 to 128)

1	A. I don't use the word "concern" in that	1	Gaggero has said to the police and what they
2	paragraph.	2	are asking me about.
3	Q. No, you do not.	3	Q. Well, he said you
4	A. What I am alluding to is that the potential	4	A. The defence has argued that, "You
5	is that I might have said something to Caine	5	authorised Mr Cornelio."
6	about making sure that things work, which	6	Q. Correct.
7	Caine might have interpreted as, "Let me go	7	A. I am very clear, I am very clear that I did
8	and get on with making it work" and that	8	not authorise Mr Cornelio directly because I
9	might have been, instead of through Galliano	9	don't know him.
10	at Blands, might have been through Cornelio	10	Q. But you may have
11	ex of Blands. That's what I am alluding to.	11	A. I have not met him.
12	I'm not concerned about it because I don't	12	Q. You may have indirectly?
13	think I have any reason to be concerned.	13	A. I have not, and the point I am making in
14	Q. No, but when you found out from Mr	14	answer to that specific question is: first of all -
15	Gaggero that Tommy Cornelio was suspected	15	and you paraphrased, so please allow me to
16	of sabotaging the system, did you not worry	16	paraphrase - first of all, I haven't given direct
17	that you may have given him access without	17	authority.
18	Bland knowing?	18	Q. Yes.
19	A. You are constantly using the words	19	A. But I do not believe that I have given
20	"worry" and "concern" and I don't necessarily	20	ostensible authority, either. In the context of
21	agree with those terms being applied.	21	ostensible authority, I was thinking about
22	Q. I am just asking whether you were worried.	22	Caine Sanchez, who was the gatekeeper, not in
23	A. And what I want to be clear about is, if you	23	my department, in another department but
24	look at the meetings with Mr Gaggero, before	24	reporting to me also on this subject, and
25	the meeting in relation to the alleged sabotage,	25	making sure that I expressed that clearly.
23	the meeting in relation to the uneged subourge,	20	maning sure that I expressed that clearly.
	Page 129		Page 131
1	I think there's another meeting where we talk	1	Q. Yes, but you had questions to answer in
2	about access to the system, etc. and me	2	this investigation, did you not?
2 3	about access to the system, etc. and me preventing access to the system. I mean, this	2 3	this investigation, did you not? A. I don't think I had questions to answer,
2 3 4	about access to the system, etc. and me preventing access to the system. I mean, this happened some time ago. It might have been	2 3 4	this investigation, did you not? A. I don't think I had questions to answer, simply because the defence had alleged that I
2 3 4 5	about access to the system, etc. and me preventing access to the system. I mean, this happened some time ago. It might have been the same meeting. But I recall that there were	2 3 4 5	this investigation, did you not? A. I don't think I had questions to answer, simply because the defence had alleged that I had been involved in granting authority.
2 3 4 5 6	about access to the system, etc. and me preventing access to the system. I mean, this happened some time ago. It might have been the same meeting. But I recall that there were various meetings with Mr Gaggero and I think	2 3 4 5 6	this investigation, did you not? A. I don't think I had questions to answer, simply because the defence had alleged that I had been involved in granting authority. That's not having questions to answer; that's
2 3 4 5 6 7	about access to the system, etc. and me preventing access to the system. I mean, this happened some time ago. It might have been the same meeting. But I recall that there were various meetings with Mr Gaggero and I think one of them was about access to the system,	2 3 4 5 6 7	this investigation, did you not? A. I don't think I had questions to answer, simply because the defence had alleged that I had been involved in granting authority. That's not having questions to answer; that's information to provide which may be relevant
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	about access to the system, etc. and me preventing access to the system. I mean, this happened some time ago. It might have been the same meeting. But I recall that there were various meetings with Mr Gaggero and I think one of them was about access to the system, and in that meeting I think I said to my private	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	this investigation, did you not? A. I don't think I had questions to answer, simply because the defence had alleged that I had been involved in granting authority. That's not having questions to answer; that's information to provide which may be relevant to the police investigation. Questions to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	about access to the system, etc. and me preventing access to the system. I mean, this happened some time ago. It might have been the same meeting. But I recall that there were various meetings with Mr Gaggero and I think one of them was about access to the system, and in that meeting I think I said to my private secretary, "Make sure, make sure from today	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	this investigation, did you not? A. I don't think I had questions to answer, simply because the defence had alleged that I had been involved in granting authority. That's not having questions to answer; that's information to provide which may be relevant to the police investigation. Questions to answer sounds very pejorative and designed to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	about access to the system, etc. and me preventing access to the system. I mean, this happened some time ago. It might have been the same meeting. But I recall that there were various meetings with Mr Gaggero and I think one of them was about access to the system, and in that meeting I think I said to my private secretary, "Make sure, make sure from today that there is no access to the system other than	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	this investigation, did you not? A. I don't think I had questions to answer, simply because the defence had alleged that I had been involved in granting authority. That's not having questions to answer; that's information to provide which may be relevant to the police investigation. Questions to answer sounds very pejorative and designed to suggest that one is the subject of questions for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	about access to the system, etc. and me preventing access to the system. I mean, this happened some time ago. It might have been the same meeting. But I recall that there were various meetings with Mr Gaggero and I think one of them was about access to the system, and in that meeting I think I said to my private secretary, "Make sure, make sure from today that there is no access to the system other than through those that"	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	this investigation, did you not? A. I don't think I had questions to answer, simply because the defence had alleged that I had been involved in granting authority. That's not having questions to answer; that's information to provide which may be relevant to the police investigation. Questions to answer sounds very pejorative and designed to suggest that one is the subject of questions for a purpose that would appear from the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	about access to the system, etc. and me preventing access to the system. I mean, this happened some time ago. It might have been the same meeting. But I recall that there were various meetings with Mr Gaggero and I think one of them was about access to the system, and in that meeting I think I said to my private secretary, "Make sure, make sure from today that there is no access to the system other than through those that" Q. That is the end of that period in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	this investigation, did you not? A. I don't think I had questions to answer, simply because the defence had alleged that I had been involved in granting authority. That's not having questions to answer; that's information to provide which may be relevant to the police investigation. Questions to answer sounds very pejorative and designed to suggest that one is the subject of questions for a purpose that would appear from the construction to be criminal, and I don't believe
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	about access to the system, etc. and me preventing access to the system. I mean, this happened some time ago. It might have been the same meeting. But I recall that there were various meetings with Mr Gaggero and I think one of them was about access to the system, and in that meeting I think I said to my private secretary, "Make sure, make sure from today that there is no access to the system other than through those that" Q. That is the end of that period in the question, is it not, that is the 4th of October	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	this investigation, did you not? A. I don't think I had questions to answer, simply because the defence had alleged that I had been involved in granting authority. That's not having questions to answer; that's information to provide which may be relevant to the police investigation. Questions to answer sounds very pejorative and designed to suggest that one is the subject of questions for a purpose that would appear from the construction to be criminal, and I don't believe that I would ever put myself in such a position.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	about access to the system, etc. and me preventing access to the system. I mean, this happened some time ago. It might have been the same meeting. But I recall that there were various meetings with Mr Gaggero and I think one of them was about access to the system, and in that meeting I think I said to my private secretary, "Make sure, make sure from today that there is no access to the system other than through those that" Q. That is the end of that period in the question, is it not, that is the 4th of October 2018 when you made the position clear? They	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	this investigation, did you not? A. I don't think I had questions to answer, simply because the defence had alleged that I had been involved in granting authority. That's not having questions to answer; that's information to provide which may be relevant to the police investigation. Questions to answer sounds very pejorative and designed to suggest that one is the subject of questions for a purpose that would appear from the construction to be criminal, and I don't believe that I would ever put myself in such a position. Q. Well, "Questions to answer" is just the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	about access to the system, etc. and me preventing access to the system. I mean, this happened some time ago. It might have been the same meeting. But I recall that there were various meetings with Mr Gaggero and I think one of them was about access to the system, and in that meeting I think I said to my private secretary, "Make sure, make sure from today that there is no access to the system other than through those that" Q. That is the end of that period in the question, is it not, that is the 4th of October 2018 when you made the position clear? They are asking you about that period between the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	this investigation, did you not? A. I don't think I had questions to answer, simply because the defence had alleged that I had been involved in granting authority. That's not having questions to answer; that's information to provide which may be relevant to the police investigation. Questions to answer sounds very pejorative and designed to suggest that one is the subject of questions for a purpose that would appear from the construction to be criminal, and I don't believe that I would ever put myself in such a position. Q. Well, "Questions to answer" is just the expression that you used yesterday in a non-
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>about access to the system, etc. and me</li> <li>preventing access to the system. I mean, this</li> <li>happened some time ago. It might have been</li> <li>the same meeting. But I recall that there were</li> <li>various meetings with Mr Gaggero and I think</li> <li>one of them was about access to the system,</li> <li>and in that meeting I think I said to my private</li> <li>secretary, "Make sure, make sure from today</li> <li>that there is no access to the system other than</li> <li>through those that"</li> <li>Q. That is the end of that period in the</li> <li>question, is it not, that is the 4th of October</li> <li>2018 when you made the position clear? They</li> <li>are asking you about that period between the</li> <li>31st of August to the 4th of October. James</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>this investigation, did you not?</li> <li>A. I don't think I had questions to answer, simply because the defence had alleged that I had been involved in granting authority.</li> <li>That's not having questions to answer; that's information to provide which may be relevant to the police investigation. Questions to answer sounds very pejorative and designed to suggest that one is the subject of questions for a purpose that would appear from the construction to be criminal, and I don't believe that I would ever put myself in such a position.</li> <li>Q. Well, "Questions to answer" is just the expression that you used yesterday in a non- pejorative way about Mr Levy, so I was just</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	about access to the system, etc. and me preventing access to the system. I mean, this happened some time ago. It might have been the same meeting. But I recall that there were various meetings with Mr Gaggero and I think one of them was about access to the system, and in that meeting I think I said to my private secretary, "Make sure, make sure from today that there is no access to the system other than through those that" Q. That is the end of that period in the question, is it not, that is the 4th of October 2018 when you made the position clear? They are asking you about that period between the 31st of August to the 4th of October. James Gaggero comes to you and says, "I'm	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>this investigation, did you not?</li> <li>A. I don't think I had questions to answer, simply because the defence had alleged that I had been involved in granting authority.</li> <li>That's not having questions to answer; that's information to provide which may be relevant to the police investigation. Questions to answer sounds very pejorative and designed to suggest that one is the subject of questions for a purpose that would appear from the construction to be criminal, and I don't believe that I would ever put myself in such a position.</li> <li>Q. Well, "Questions to answer" is just the expression that you used yesterday in a non- pejorative way about Mr Levy, so I was just reflecting it back.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	about access to the system, etc. and me preventing access to the system. I mean, this happened some time ago. It might have been the same meeting. But I recall that there were various meetings with Mr Gaggero and I think one of them was about access to the system, and in that meeting I think I said to my private secretary, "Make sure, make sure from today that there is no access to the system other than through those that" Q. That is the end of that period in the question, is it not, that is the 4th of October 2018 when you made the position clear? They are asking you about that period between the 31st of August to the 4th of October. James Gaggero comes to you and says, "I'm concerned that Tommy Cornelio has been	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>this investigation, did you not?</li> <li>A. I don't think I had questions to answer, simply because the defence had alleged that I had been involved in granting authority.</li> <li>That's not having questions to answer; that's information to provide which may be relevant to the police investigation. Questions to answer sounds very pejorative and designed to suggest that one is the subject of questions for a purpose that would appear from the construction to be criminal, and I don't believe that I would ever put myself in such a position.</li> <li>Q. Well, "Questions to answer" is just the expression that you used yesterday in a non- pejorative way about Mr Levy, so I was just reflecting it back.</li> <li>A. No, questions to answer is what I said the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	about access to the system, etc. and me preventing access to the system. I mean, this happened some time ago. It might have been the same meeting. But I recall that there were various meetings with Mr Gaggero and I think one of them was about access to the system, and in that meeting I think I said to my private secretary, "Make sure, make sure from today that there is no access to the system other than through those that" Q. That is the end of that period in the question, is it not, that is the 4th of October 2018 when you made the position clear? They are asking you about that period between the 31st of August to the 4th of October. James Gaggero comes to you and says, "I'm concerned that Tommy Cornelio has been sabotaging the system." You are here being	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>this investigation, did you not?</li> <li>A. I don't think I had questions to answer, simply because the defence had alleged that I had been involved in granting authority.</li> <li>That's not having questions to answer; that's information to provide which may be relevant to the police investigation. Questions to answer sounds very pejorative and designed to suggest that one is the subject of questions for a purpose that would appear from the construction to be criminal, and I don't believe that I would ever put myself in such a position.</li> <li>Q. Well, "Questions to answer" is just the expression that you used yesterday in a non- pejorative way about Mr Levy, so I was just reflecting it back.</li> <li>A. No, questions to answer is what I said the DPP had said about Mr Levy. I was adopting</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>about access to the system, etc. and me</li> <li>preventing access to the system. I mean, this</li> <li>happened some time ago. It might have been</li> <li>the same meeting. But I recall that there were</li> <li>various meetings with Mr Gaggero and I think</li> <li>one of them was about access to the system,</li> <li>and in that meeting I think I said to my private</li> <li>secretary, "Make sure, make sure from today</li> <li>that there is no access to the system other than</li> <li>through those that"</li> <li>Q. That is the end of that period in the</li> <li>question, is it not, that is the 4th of October</li> <li>2018 when you made the position clear? They</li> <li>are asking you about that period between the</li> <li>31st of August to the 4th of October. James</li> <li>Gaggero comes to you and says, "I'm</li> <li>concerned that Tommy Cornelio has been</li> <li>sabotaging the system." You are here being</li> <li>asked by the police, because of what he said,</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\\end{array} $	<ul> <li>this investigation, did you not?</li> <li>A. I don't think I had questions to answer, simply because the defence had alleged that I had been involved in granting authority.</li> <li>That's not having questions to answer; that's information to provide which may be relevant to the police investigation. Questions to answer sounds very pejorative and designed to suggest that one is the subject of questions for a purpose that would appear from the construction to be criminal, and I don't believe that I would ever put myself in such a position.</li> <li>Q. Well, "Questions to answer" is just the expression that you used yesterday in a non- pejorative way about Mr Levy, so I was just reflecting it back.</li> <li>A. No, questions to answer is what I said the DPP had said about Mr Levy. I was adopting somebody else's phraseology, and you're free</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	about access to the system, etc. and me preventing access to the system. I mean, this happened some time ago. It might have been the same meeting. But I recall that there were various meetings with Mr Gaggero and I think one of them was about access to the system, and in that meeting I think I said to my private secretary, "Make sure, make sure from today that there is no access to the system other than through those that" Q. That is the end of that period in the question, is it not, that is the 4th of October 2018 when you made the position clear? They are asking you about that period between the 31st of August to the 4th of October. James Gaggero comes to you and says, "I'm concerned that Tommy Cornelio has been sabotaging the system." You are here being asked by the police, because of what he said, "The Chief Minister gave me access" or,	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	<ul> <li>this investigation, did you not?</li> <li>A. I don't think I had questions to answer, simply because the defence had alleged that I had been involved in granting authority.</li> <li>That's not having questions to answer; that's information to provide which may be relevant to the police investigation. Questions to answer sounds very pejorative and designed to suggest that one is the subject of questions for a purpose that would appear from the construction to be criminal, and I don't believe that I would ever put myself in such a position.</li> <li>Q. Well, "Questions to answer" is just the expression that you used yesterday in a non- pejorative way about Mr Levy, so I was just reflecting it back.</li> <li>A. No, questions to answer is what I said the DPP had said about Mr Levy. I was adopting somebody else's phraseology, and you're free to adopt my adoption of somebody else's</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	about access to the system, etc. and me preventing access to the system. I mean, this happened some time ago. It might have been the same meeting. But I recall that there were various meetings with Mr Gaggero and I think one of them was about access to the system, and in that meeting I think I said to my private secretary, "Make sure, make sure from today that there is no access to the system other than through those that" Q. That is the end of that period in the question, is it not, that is the 4th of October 2018 when you made the position clear? They are asking you about that period between the 31st of August to the 4th of October. James Gaggero comes to you and says, "I'm concerned that Tommy Cornelio has been sabotaging the system." You are here being asked by the police, because of what he said, "The Chief Minister gave me access" or, "Knew that I had access" - are you not worried	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	<ul> <li>this investigation, did you not?</li> <li>A. I don't think I had questions to answer, simply because the defence had alleged that I had been involved in granting authority. That's not having questions to answer; that's information to provide which may be relevant to the police investigation. Questions to answer sounds very pejorative and designed to suggest that one is the subject of questions for a purpose that would appear from the construction to be criminal, and I don't believe that I would ever put myself in such a position.</li> <li>Q. Well, "Questions to answer" is just the expression that you used yesterday in a non-pejorative way about Mr Levy, so I was just reflecting it back.</li> <li>A. No, questions to answer is what I said the DPP had said about Mr Levy. I was adopting somebody else's phraseology, and you're free to adopt my adoption of somebody else's phraseology, but let's be clear, it's not mine.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	about access to the system, etc. and me preventing access to the system. I mean, this happened some time ago. It might have been the same meeting. But I recall that there were various meetings with Mr Gaggero and I think one of them was about access to the system, and in that meeting I think I said to my private secretary, "Make sure, make sure from today that there is no access to the system other than through those that" Q. That is the end of that period in the question, is it not, that is the 4th of October 2018 when you made the position clear? They are asking you about that period between the 31st of August to the 4th of October. James Gaggero comes to you and says, "I'm concerned that Tommy Cornelio has been sabotaging the system." You are here being asked by the police, because of what he said, "The Chief Minister gave me access" or, "Knew that I had access" - are you not worried at this stage, "Oh, my goodness, I may have	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	<ul> <li>this investigation, did you not?</li> <li>A. I don't think I had questions to answer, simply because the defence had alleged that I had been involved in granting authority. That's not having questions to answer; that's information to provide which may be relevant to the police investigation. Questions to answer sounds very pejorative and designed to suggest that one is the subject of questions for a purpose that would appear from the construction to be criminal, and I don't believe that I would ever put myself in such a position.</li> <li>Q. Well, "Questions to answer" is just the expression that you used yesterday in a non-pejorative way about Mr Levy, so I was just reflecting it back.</li> <li>A. No, questions to answer is what I said the DPP had said about Mr Levy. I was adopting somebody else's phraseology, but let's be clear, it's not mine.</li> <li>Q. If we can just go to C7021, please. These</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	about access to the system, etc. and me preventing access to the system. I mean, this happened some time ago. It might have been the same meeting. But I recall that there were various meetings with Mr Gaggero and I think one of them was about access to the system, and in that meeting I think I said to my private secretary, "Make sure, make sure from today that there is no access to the system other than through those that" Q. That is the end of that period in the question, is it not, that is the 4th of October 2018 when you made the position clear? They are asking you about that period between the 31st of August to the 4th of October. James Gaggero comes to you and says, "I'm concerned that Tommy Cornelio has been sabotaging the system." You are here being asked by the police, because of what he said, "The Chief Minister gave me access" or, "Knew that I had access" - are you not worried at this stage, "Oh, my goodness, I may have inadvertently assisted a saboteur"?	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	<ul> <li>this investigation, did you not?</li> <li>A. I don't think I had questions to answer, simply because the defence had alleged that I had been involved in granting authority.</li> <li>That's not having questions to answer; that's information to provide which may be relevant to the police investigation. Questions to answer sounds very pejorative and designed to suggest that one is the subject of questions for a purpose that would appear from the construction to be criminal, and I don't believe that I would ever put myself in such a position.</li> <li>Q. Well, "Questions to answer" is just the expression that you used yesterday in a non- pejorative way about Mr Levy, so I was just reflecting it back.</li> <li>A. No, questions to answer is what I said the DPP had said about Mr Levy. I was adopting somebody else's phraseology, and you're free to adopt my adoption of somebody else's phraseology, but let's be clear, it's not mine.</li> <li>Q. If we can just go to C7021, please. These are the messages which your lawyers provided</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	about access to the system, etc. and me preventing access to the system. I mean, this happened some time ago. It might have been the same meeting. But I recall that there were various meetings with Mr Gaggero and I think one of them was about access to the system, and in that meeting I think I said to my private secretary, "Make sure, make sure from today that there is no access to the system other than through those that" Q. That is the end of that period in the question, is it not, that is the 4th of October 2018 when you made the position clear? They are asking you about that period between the 31st of August to the 4th of October. James Gaggero comes to you and says, "I'm concerned that Tommy Cornelio has been sabotaging the system." You are here being asked by the police, because of what he said, "The Chief Minister gave me access" or, "Knew that I had access" - are you not worried at this stage, "Oh, my goodness, I may have	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	<ul> <li>this investigation, did you not?</li> <li>A. I don't think I had questions to answer, simply because the defence had alleged that I had been involved in granting authority. That's not having questions to answer; that's information to provide which may be relevant to the police investigation. Questions to answer sounds very pejorative and designed to suggest that one is the subject of questions for a purpose that would appear from the construction to be criminal, and I don't believe that I would ever put myself in such a position.</li> <li>Q. Well, "Questions to answer" is just the expression that you used yesterday in a non-pejorative way about Mr Levy, so I was just reflecting it back.</li> <li>A. No, questions to answer is what I said the DPP had said about Mr Levy. I was adopting somebody else's phraseology, but let's be clear, it's not mine.</li> <li>Q. If we can just go to C7021, please. These</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	about access to the system, etc. and me preventing access to the system. I mean, this happened some time ago. It might have been the same meeting. But I recall that there were various meetings with Mr Gaggero and I think one of them was about access to the system, and in that meeting I think I said to my private secretary, "Make sure, make sure from today that there is no access to the system other than through those that" Q. That is the end of that period in the question, is it not, that is the 4th of October 2018 when you made the position clear? They are asking you about that period between the 31st of August to the 4th of October. James Gaggero comes to you and says, "I'm concerned that Tommy Cornelio has been sabotaging the system." You are here being asked by the police, because of what he said, "The Chief Minister gave me access" or, "Knew that I had access" - are you not worried at this stage, "Oh, my goodness, I may have inadvertently assisted a saboteur"?	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	<ul> <li>this investigation, did you not?</li> <li>A. I don't think I had questions to answer, simply because the defence had alleged that I had been involved in granting authority.</li> <li>That's not having questions to answer; that's information to provide which may be relevant to the police investigation. Questions to answer sounds very pejorative and designed to suggest that one is the subject of questions for a purpose that would appear from the construction to be criminal, and I don't believe that I would ever put myself in such a position.</li> <li>Q. Well, "Questions to answer" is just the expression that you used yesterday in a non- pejorative way about Mr Levy, so I was just reflecting it back.</li> <li>A. No, questions to answer is what I said the DPP had said about Mr Levy. I was adopting somebody else's phraseology, and you're free to adopt my adoption of somebody else's phraseology, but let's be clear, it's not mine.</li> <li>Q. If we can just go to C7021, please. These are the messages which your lawyers provided</li> </ul>

www.epiqglobal.com Lower Ground Floor, 46 Chancery Lane casemanagers@epiqglobal.com London, WC2A 1JE

33 (Pages 129 to 132)

1	message there, you have seen it, I think you	1	A. I don't, I don't think that my conflict of
2	have already been shown it, 30th of August	2	interest ended. That's not how I think I would
3	2018, James Levy saying to you, "You should	3	describe it. I would say that the conflict of
4	know I have spoken to Tommy. Despite his	4	interest never materialised for management
5	letter to James Gaggero, he will continue	5	because the contract with 36 North was not
6	ensuring that the system is kept going until a	6	created, therefore it didn't get to the stage
7	solution is found acceptable for the	7	where, you know, that had to be approved,
8	Government." This is one of the questions that	8	which would have required my declaration and
9	you were asked to answer by the RGP, was	9	all the rest of it. I had resolved that issue ever
10	about this text message. Do you accept that in	10	becoming one by making the decision that the
11	this text message Mr Levy is telling you that,	11	contract should stay with Bland because of the
12	despite what James Gaggero has been told by	12	allegation that was made by Mr Gaggero about
13	Tommy Cornelio, Tommy Cornelio is	13	the sabotage.
14	retaining access to the NSCIS system?	14	Q. Sorry, the question was: did you dispose of
15	A. That's what it says, but it doesn't talk about	15	your interest in 36 North in September 2018?
16	access.	16	A. That is a question which requires only a
17	Q. Well, how could he continue ensuring the	17	factual answer, not whether it was right or not,
18	system is kept going without having access?	18	and the answer is No.
19	A. By supporting Galliano and others at Bland	19	Q. Do you know when you no longer had an
20	who would then have access, for example.	20	ownership stake indirectly in 36 North?
21	Q. Is that really what you took from it, that	21	A. No, but I do know that that ownership
22	Tommy Cornelio would be giving a sort of	22	stake was undone by the partners of Hassans.
23	moral and technical support to other people?	23	Q. Later?
24	A. I don't think moral support is relevant. It	24	A. I believe so.
25	would be technical support because he had	25	(12.31)
	Page 133		Page 135
	1 480 100		1 480 100
1	created the platform.	1	Q. Yes. Would you agree that, whilst you had
1 2	<b>created the platform.</b> Q. He did not just create it, he maintained the	12	Q. Yes. Would you agree that, whilst you had an ownership stake, if the founders of 36
	-		
2	Q. He did not just create it, he maintained the	2	an ownership stake, if the founders of 36
2 3	Q. He did not just create it, he maintained the platform, did he not?	2 3	an ownership stake, if the founders of 36 North were being investigated, possibly
2 3 4	<ul><li>Q. He did not just create it, he maintained the platform, did he not?</li><li>A. Maintained and established.</li></ul>	2 3 4	an ownership stake, if the founders of 36 North were being investigated, possibly charged, even convicted of serious criminal
2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>Q. He did not just create it, he maintained the platform, did he not?</li> <li>A. Maintained and established.</li> <li>Q. And you knew that he maintained the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5	an ownership stake, if the founders of 36 North were being investigated, possibly charged, even convicted of serious criminal offences, you would have an interest in that
2 3 4 5 6	<ul><li>Q. He did not just create it, he maintained the platform, did he not?</li><li>A. Maintained and established.</li><li>Q. And you knew that he maintained the platform?</li></ul>	2 3 4 5 6	an ownership stake, if the founders of 36 North were being investigated, possibly charged, even convicted of serious criminal offences, you would have an interest in that investigation, charge and prosecution?
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>Q. He did not just create it, he maintained the platform, did he not?</li> <li>A. Maintained and established.</li> <li>Q. And you knew that he maintained the platform?</li> <li>A. I think I know that now, I don't know how</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	an ownership stake, if the founders of 36 North were being investigated, possibly charged, even convicted of serious criminal offences, you would have an interest in that investigation, charge and prosecution? <b>A. No.</b>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>Q. He did not just create it, he maintained the platform, did he not?</li> <li>A. Maintained and established.</li> <li>Q. And you knew that he maintained the platform?</li> <li>A. I think I know that now, I don't know how much I knew then.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>an ownership stake, if the founders of 36</li> <li>North were being investigated, possibly</li> <li>charged, even convicted of serious criminal</li> <li>offences, you would have an interest in that</li> <li>investigation, charge and prosecution?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: Do you mean a financial</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q. He did not just create it, he maintained the platform, did he not?</li> <li>A. Maintained and established.</li> <li>Q. And you knew that he maintained the platform?</li> <li>A. I think I know that now, I don't know how much I knew then.</li> <li>Q. Was this question about who gave access</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	an ownership stake, if the founders of 36 North were being investigated, possibly charged, even convicted of serious criminal offences, you would have an interest in that investigation, charge and prosecution? <b>A. No.</b> THE CHAIRMAN: Do you mean a financial interest or
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>Q. He did not just create it, he maintained the platform, did he not?</li> <li>A. Maintained and established.</li> <li>Q. And you knew that he maintained the platform?</li> <li>A. I think I know that now, I don't know how much I knew then.</li> <li>Q. Was this question about who gave access and whether you gave access to the NSCIS</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>an ownership stake, if the founders of 36</li> <li>North were being investigated, possibly charged, even convicted of serious criminal offences, you would have an interest in that investigation, charge and prosecution?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: Do you mean a financial interest or</li> <li>MR WAGNER: (To the witness): Well, a</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>Q. He did not just create it, he maintained the platform, did he not?</li> <li>A. Maintained and established.</li> <li>Q. And you knew that he maintained the platform?</li> <li>A. I think I know that now, I don't know how much I knew then.</li> <li>Q. Was this question about who gave access and whether you gave access to the NSCIS system at the time it was being allegedly</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>an ownership stake, if the founders of 36</li> <li>North were being investigated, possibly charged, even convicted of serious criminal offences, you would have an interest in that investigation, charge and prosecution?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: Do you mean a financial interest or</li> <li>MR WAGNER: (To the witness): Well, a financial interest because if 36 North</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Q. He did not just create it, he maintained the platform, did he not?</li> <li>A. Maintained and established.</li> <li>Q. And you knew that he maintained the platform?</li> <li>A. I think I know that now, I don't know how much I knew then.</li> <li>Q. Was this question about who gave access and whether you gave access to the NSCIS system at the time it was being allegedly sabotaged, was that part of the reason you</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>an ownership stake, if the founders of 36</li> <li>North were being investigated, possibly</li> <li>charged, even convicted of serious criminal</li> <li>offences, you would have an interest in that</li> <li>investigation, charge and prosecution?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: Do you mean a financial</li> <li>interest or</li> <li>MR WAGNER: (To the witness): Well, a</li> <li>financial interest because if 36 North</li> <li>founders were do you agree that if they</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Q. He did not just create it, he maintained the platform, did he not?</li> <li>A. Maintained and established.</li> <li>Q. And you knew that he maintained the platform?</li> <li>A. I think I know that now, I don't know how much I knew then.</li> <li>Q. Was this question about who gave access and whether you gave access to the NSCIS system at the time it was being allegedly sabotaged, was that part of the reason you were worried about Mr Levy's phone being</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>an ownership stake, if the founders of 36</li> <li>North were being investigated, possibly</li> <li>charged, even convicted of serious criminal</li> <li>offences, you would have an interest in that</li> <li>investigation, charge and prosecution?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: Do you mean a financial</li> <li>interest or</li> <li>MR WAGNER: (To the witness): Well, a</li> <li>financial interest because if 36 North</li> <li>founders were do you agree that if they</li> <li>were prosecuted and convicted, 36 North</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Q. He did not just create it, he maintained the platform, did he not?</li> <li>A. Maintained and established.</li> <li>Q. And you knew that he maintained the platform?</li> <li>A. I think I know that now, I don't know how much I knew then.</li> <li>Q. Was this question about who gave access and whether you gave access to the NSCIS system at the time it was being allegedly sabotaged, was that part of the reason you were worried about Mr Levy's phone being with the RGP?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>an ownership stake, if the founders of 36</li> <li>North were being investigated, possibly</li> <li>charged, even convicted of serious criminal</li> <li>offences, you would have an interest in that</li> <li>investigation, charge and prosecution?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: Do you mean a financial</li> <li>interest or</li> <li>MR WAGNER: (To the witness): Well, a</li> <li>financial interest because if 36 North</li> <li>founders were do you agree that if they</li> <li>were prosecuted and convicted, 36 North</li> <li>probably would not survive, would it?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Q. He did not just create it, he maintained the platform, did he not?</li> <li>A. Maintained and established.</li> <li>Q. And you knew that he maintained the platform?</li> <li>A. I think I know that now, I don't know how much I knew then.</li> <li>Q. Was this question about who gave access and whether you gave access to the NSCIS system at the time it was being allegedly sabotaged, was that part of the reason you were worried about Mr Levy's phone being with the RGP?</li> <li>A. I have told you already that I wasn't</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>an ownership stake, if the founders of 36</li> <li>North were being investigated, possibly charged, even convicted of serious criminal offences, you would have an interest in that investigation, charge and prosecution?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: Do you mean a financial interest or</li> <li>MR WAGNER: (To the witness): Well, a financial interest because if 36 North founders were do you agree that if they were prosecuted and convicted, 36 North probably would not survive, would it?</li> <li>A. I didn't have an interest in the sense of</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Q. He did not just create it, he maintained the platform, did he not?</li> <li>A. Maintained and established.</li> <li>Q. And you knew that he maintained the platform?</li> <li>A. I think I know that now, I don't know how much I knew then.</li> <li>Q. Was this question about who gave access and whether you gave access to the NSCIS system at the time it was being allegedly sabotaged, was that part of the reason you were worried about Mr Levy's phone being with the RGP?</li> <li>A. I have told you already that I wasn't worried about the phone being with the RGP for reasons related to communications with</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ \end{array} $	<ul> <li>an ownership stake, if the founders of 36</li> <li>North were being investigated, possibly</li> <li>charged, even convicted of serious criminal</li> <li>offences, you would have an interest in that</li> <li>investigation, charge and prosecution?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: Do you mean a financial</li> <li>interest or</li> <li>MR WAGNER: (To the witness): Well, a</li> <li>financial interest because if 36 North</li> <li>founders were do you agree that if they</li> <li>were prosecuted and convicted, 36 North</li> <li>probably would not survive, would it?</li> <li>A. I didn't have an interest in the sense of</li> <li>being interested in protecting although I had</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Q. He did not just create it, he maintained the platform, did he not?</li> <li>A. Maintained and established.</li> <li>Q. And you knew that he maintained the platform?</li> <li>A. I think I know that now, I don't know how much I knew then.</li> <li>Q. Was this question about who gave access and whether you gave access to the NSCIS system at the time it was being allegedly sabotaged, was that part of the reason you were worried about Mr Levy's phone being with the RGP?</li> <li>A. I have told you already that I wasn't worried about the phone being with the RGP</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>an ownership stake, if the founders of 36</li> <li>North were being investigated, possibly</li> <li>charged, even convicted of serious criminal</li> <li>offences, you would have an interest in that</li> <li>investigation, charge and prosecution?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: Do you mean a financial</li> <li>interest or</li> <li>MR WAGNER: (To the witness): Well, a</li> <li>financial interest because if 36 North</li> <li>founders were do you agree that if they</li> <li>were prosecuted and convicted, 36 North</li> <li>probably would not survive, would it?</li> <li>A. I didn't have an interest in the sense of</li> <li>being interested in protecting although I had</li> <li>a stake for reasons of a factual and</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q. He did not just create it, he maintained the platform, did he not?</li> <li>A. Maintained and established.</li> <li>Q. And you knew that he maintained the platform?</li> <li>A. I think I know that now, I don't know how much I knew then.</li> <li>Q. Was this question about who gave access and whether you gave access to the NSCIS system at the time it was being allegedly sabotaged, was that part of the reason you were worried about Mr Levy's phone being with the RGP?</li> <li>A. I have told you already that I wasn't worried about the phone being with the RGP for reasons related to communications with me. I'm happy to repeat that if you like. I was not worried about the phone being with the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>an ownership stake, if the founders of 36</li> <li>North were being investigated, possibly</li> <li>charged, even convicted of serious criminal</li> <li>offences, you would have an interest in that</li> <li>investigation, charge and prosecution?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: Do you mean a financial</li> <li>interest or</li> <li>MR WAGNER: (To the witness): Well, a</li> <li>financial interest because if 36 North</li> <li>founders were do you agree that if they</li> <li>were prosecuted and convicted, 36 North</li> <li>probably would not survive, would it?</li> <li>A. I didn't have an interest in the sense of</li> <li>being interested in protecting although I had</li> <li>a stake for reasons of a factual and</li> <li>Q. I am not asking you about what was in</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Q. He did not just create it, he maintained the platform, did he not?</li> <li>A. Maintained and established.</li> <li>Q. And you knew that he maintained the platform?</li> <li>A. I think I know that now, I don't know how much I knew then.</li> <li>Q. Was this question about who gave access and whether you gave access to the NSCIS system at the time it was being allegedly sabotaged, was that part of the reason you were worried about Mr Levy's phone being with the RGP?</li> <li>A. I have told you already that I wasn't worried about the phone being with the RGP for reasons related to communications with me. I'm happy to repeat that if you like. I was</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>an ownership stake, if the founders of 36</li> <li>North were being investigated, possibly charged, even convicted of serious criminal offences, you would have an interest in that investigation, charge and prosecution?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: Do you mean a financial interest or</li> <li>MR WAGNER: (To the witness): Well, a financial interest because if 36 North founders were do you agree that if they were prosecuted and convicted, 36 North probably would not survive, would it?</li> <li>A. I didn't have an interest in the sense of being interested in protecting although I had a stake for reasons of a factual and</li> <li>Q. I am not asking you about what was in your head</li> </ul>
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array}$	<ul> <li>Q. He did not just create it, he maintained the platform, did he not?</li> <li>A. Maintained and established.</li> <li>Q. And you knew that he maintained the platform?</li> <li>A. I think I know that now, I don't know how much I knew then.</li> <li>Q. Was this question about who gave access and whether you gave access to the NSCIS system at the time it was being allegedly sabotaged, was that part of the reason you were worried about Mr Levy's phone being with the RGP?</li> <li>A. I have told you already that I wasn't worried about the phone being with the RGP for reasons related to communications with me. I'm happy to repeat that if you like. I was not worried about the phone being with the RGP because of any communications between</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\\end{array} $	<ul> <li>an ownership stake, if the founders of 36</li> <li>North were being investigated, possibly charged, even convicted of serious criminal offences, you would have an interest in that investigation, charge and prosecution?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: Do you mean a financial interest or</li> <li>MR WAGNER: (To the witness): Well, a financial interest because if 36 North founders were do you agree that if they were prosecuted and convicted, 36 North probably would not survive, would it?</li> <li>A. I didn't have an interest in the sense of being interested in protecting although I had a stake for reasons of a factual and</li> <li>Q. I am not asking you about what was in your head</li> <li>A. I didn't protect the stake.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q. He did not just create it, he maintained the platform, did he not?</li> <li>A. Maintained and established.</li> <li>Q. And you knew that he maintained the platform?</li> <li>A. I think I know that now, I don't know how much I knew then.</li> <li>Q. Was this question about who gave access and whether you gave access to the NSCIS system at the time it was being allegedly sabotaged, was that part of the reason you were worried about Mr Levy's phone being with the RGP?</li> <li>A. I have told you already that I wasn't worried about the phone being with the RGP for reasons related to communications with me. I'm happy to repeat that if you like. I was not worried about the phone being with the RGP because of any communications between James Levy and me.</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	<ul> <li>an ownership stake, if the founders of 36</li> <li>North were being investigated, possibly charged, even convicted of serious criminal offences, you would have an interest in that investigation, charge and prosecution?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: Do you mean a financial interest or</li> <li>MR WAGNER: (To the witness): Well, a financial interest because if 36 North founders were do you agree that if they were prosecuted and convicted, 36 North probably would not survive, would it?</li> <li>A. I didn't have an interest in the sense of being interested in protecting although I had a stake for reasons of a factual and</li> <li>Q. I am not asking you about the sort of "I'm</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q. He did not just create it, he maintained the platform, did he not?</li> <li>A. Maintained and established.</li> <li>Q. And you knew that he maintained the platform?</li> <li>A. I think I know that now, I don't know how much I knew then.</li> <li>Q. Was this question about who gave access and whether you gave access to the NSCIS system at the time it was being allegedly sabotaged, was that part of the reason you were worried about Mr Levy's phone being with the RGP?</li> <li>A. I have told you already that I wasn't worried about the phone being with the RGP for reasons related to communications with me. I'm happy to repeat that if you like. I was not worried about the phone being with the RGP because of any communications between James Levy and me.</li> <li>Q. You said that your conflict of interest</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	<ul> <li>an ownership stake, if the founders of 36</li> <li>North were being investigated, possibly charged, even convicted of serious criminal offences, you would have an interest in that investigation, charge and prosecution?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: Do you mean a financial interest or</li> <li>MR WAGNER: (To the witness): Well, a financial interest because if 36 North founders were do you agree that if they were prosecuted and convicted, 36 North probably would not survive, would it?</li> <li>A. I didn't have an interest in the sense of being interested in protecting although I had a stake for reasons of a factual andQ. I am not asking you about what was in your head</li> <li>A. I didn't protect the stake.</li> <li>Q. I am not asking you about the sort of "I'm interested in X," I am asking about conflict</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. He did not just create it, he maintained the platform, did he not?</li> <li>A. Maintained and established.</li> <li>Q. And you knew that he maintained the platform?</li> <li>A. I think I know that now, I don't know how much I knew then.</li> <li>Q. Was this question about who gave access and whether you gave access to the NSCIS system at the time it was being allegedly sabotaged, was that part of the reason you were worried about Mr Levy's phone being with the RGP?</li> <li>A. I have told you already that I wasn't worried about the phone being with the RGP for reasons related to communications with me. I'm happy to repeat that if you like. I was not worried about the phone being with the RGP because of any communications between James Levy and me.</li> <li>Q. You said that your conflict of interest ended when the contract was kept with Bland</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	<ul> <li>an ownership stake, if the founders of 36</li> <li>North were being investigated, possibly charged, even convicted of serious criminal offences, you would have an interest in that investigation, charge and prosecution?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: Do you mean a financial interest or</li> <li>MR WAGNER: (To the witness): Well, a financial interest because if 36 North founders were do you agree that if they were prosecuted and convicted, 36 North probably would not survive, would it?</li> <li>A. I didn't have an interest in the sense of being interested in protecting although I had a stake for reasons of a factual and</li> <li>Q. I am not asking you about the sort of "I'm interested in X," I am asking about conflict of interest, so it is just an objective question.</li> </ul>
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	<ul> <li>Q. He did not just create it, he maintained the platform, did he not?</li> <li>A. Maintained and established.</li> <li>Q. And you knew that he maintained the platform?</li> <li>A. I think I know that now, I don't know how much I knew then.</li> <li>Q. Was this question about who gave access and whether you gave access to the NSCIS system at the time it was being allegedly sabotaged, was that part of the reason you were worried about Mr Levy's phone being with the RGP?</li> <li>A. I have told you already that I wasn't worried about the phone being with the RGP for reasons related to communications with me. I'm happy to repeat that if you like. I was not worried about the phone being with the RGP because of any communications between James Levy and me.</li> <li>Q. You said that your conflict of interest ended when the contract was kept with Bland in September 2018. At that point did you</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	<ul> <li>an ownership stake, if the founders of 36</li> <li>North were being investigated, possibly charged, even convicted of serious criminal offences, you would have an interest in that investigation, charge and prosecution?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: Do you mean a financial interest or</li> <li>MR WAGNER: (To the witness): Well, a financial interest because if 36 North founders were do you agree that if they were prosecuted and convicted, 36 North probably would not survive, would it?</li> <li>A. I didn't have an interest in the sense of being interested in protecting although I had a stake for reasons of a factual and</li> <li>Q. I am not asking you about the sort of "I'm interested in X," I am asking about conflict of interest, so it is just an objective question. Do you agree that while you had a stake in</li> </ul>

34 (Pages 133 to 136)

1	succeeding, if I can put it like that?	1	have suggested that I had no choice. I could
2	A. Insofar as I had also on the day that I	2	have made another decision.
3	made the decision that it should not succeed	3	Q. Yes, you could and
4	in taking the maintenance contract, because	4	A. I could have said
5	selflessly and with integrity I made the	5	Q it would have been the wrong
6	decision that was right for the people of	6	decision?
7	Gibraltar and not for the company in which I	7	A. Well, perhaps not, hear me out. I could
8	held a stake that the agreement should stay	8	have said, "I want the government's ITLD
9	with Bland, the agreement such as it may be.	9	department, the information technology and
10	Q. You had just found out that it was they	10	logistics department to immediately take over
11	were potentially sabotaging Gibraltar's	11	the system." Indeed I could even have asked
12	national security system. It was not you	12	that they sequester it. I could have signed a
13	were not deciding any more between 36	13	notice under the Civil Contingencies Act, in
14	North and Bland; you had no choice, did	14	my view, taking over the system and,
15	you?	15	therefore, there were other decisions I could
16	A. Well, you say "found out," I mean, to an	16	have made, not just the one that you say I had
17	extent in doing so, you are falling into the	17	to make which is the one I did make and we
18	-	18	have just agreed is the right one but you said
19	Q. Allegedly, I said.	19	I had no choice; I did have a choice and I
20	A. Well, you are falling into the same trap	20	decided it should stay with Bland because
21	that I fell which was simply to say that with	21	they had been operating it with Mr Cornelio
22	the bold allegation it was enough for me not	22	there and Mr (Inaudible) there and they had
23	to want to take a risk, despite the fact that I	23	also been maintaining it afterwards and in
24	had a stake in 36 North and that I was	24	that meeting James Gaggero gave me an
25	making the decision based on my application	25	undertaking and it is important that you
	Page 137		Page 139
1	of the principles of selflessness and integrity	1	reflect on the fact that I said that he was one
2	and my concern for the public interest of	2	of Gibraltar's captains of industry, there are
2 3	and my concern for the public interest of Gibraltar and the taxpayer in Gibraltar but in	2 3	of Gibraltar's captains of industry, there are not many James Gaggeros or James Levys,
2 3 4	and my concern for the public interest of Gibraltar and the taxpayer in Gibraltar but in particular the national security of Gibraltar	2 3 4	of Gibraltar's captains of industry, there are not many James Gaggeros or James Levys, there were a few of them, you have to have
2 3 4 5	and my concern for the public interest of Gibraltar and the taxpayer in Gibraltar but in particular the national security of Gibraltar that there should be no risks taken and the	2 3 4 5	of Gibraltar's captains of industry, there are not many James Gaggeros or James Levys, there were a few of them, you have to have specific regard to them. He gave me his
2 3 4 5 6	and my concern for the public interest of Gibraltar and the taxpayer in Gibraltar but in particular the national security of Gibraltar that there should be no risks taken and the contract should stay with Bland.	2 3 4 5 6	of Gibraltar's captains of industry, there are not many James Gaggeros or James Levys, there were a few of them, you have to have specific regard to them. He gave me his undertaking that they would be able to
2 3 4 5 6 7	and my concern for the public interest of Gibraltar and the taxpayer in Gibraltar but in particular the national security of Gibraltar that there should be no risks taken and the contract should stay with Bland. Q. It was the right decision to take, was it	2 3 4 5 6 7	of Gibraltar's captains of industry, there are not many James Gaggeros or James Levys, there were a few of them, you have to have specific regard to them. He gave me his undertaking that they would be able to maintain the system and they would stop all
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	and my concern for the public interest of Gibraltar and the taxpayer in Gibraltar but in particular the national security of Gibraltar that there should be no risks taken and the contract should stay with Bland. Q. It was the right decision to take, was it not?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	of Gibraltar's captains of industry, there are not many James Gaggeros or James Levys, there were a few of them, you have to have specific regard to them. He gave me his undertaking that they would be able to maintain the system and they would stop all the problems that the sabotage had created.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>and my concern for the public interest of</li> <li>Gibraltar and the taxpayer in Gibraltar but in</li> <li>particular the national security of Gibraltar</li> <li>that there should be no risks taken and the</li> <li>contract should stay with Bland.</li> <li>Q. It was the right decision to take, was it</li> <li>not?</li> <li>A. Thank you.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	of Gibraltar's captains of industry, there are not many James Gaggeros or James Levys, there were a few of them, you have to have specific regard to them. He gave me his undertaking that they would be able to maintain the system and they would stop all the problems that the sabotage had created. Q. Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>and my concern for the public interest of</li> <li>Gibraltar and the taxpayer in Gibraltar but in</li> <li>particular the national security of Gibraltar</li> <li>that there should be no risks taken and the</li> <li>contract should stay with Bland.</li> <li>Q. It was the right decision to take, was it</li> <li>not?</li> <li>A. Thank you.</li> <li>Q. Once you found out that the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	of Gibraltar's captains of industry, there are not many James Gaggeros or James Levys, there were a few of them, you have to have specific regard to them. He gave me his undertaking that they would be able to maintain the system and they would stop all the problems that the sabotage had created. Q. Yes. A. That is why I made that decision,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>and my concern for the public interest of</li> <li>Gibraltar and the taxpayer in Gibraltar but in</li> <li>particular the national security of Gibraltar</li> <li>that there should be no risks taken and the</li> <li>contract should stay with Bland.</li> <li>Q. It was the right decision to take, was it</li> <li>not?</li> <li>A. Thank you.</li> <li>Q. Once you found out that the</li> <li>A. Thank you for saying that, Mr Wagner,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	of Gibraltar's captains of industry, there are not many James Gaggeros or James Levys, there were a few of them, you have to have specific regard to them. He gave me his undertaking that they would be able to maintain the system and they would stop all the problems that the sabotage had created. Q. Yes. A. That is why I made that decision, otherwise I might have made the other
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>and my concern for the public interest of</li> <li>Gibraltar and the taxpayer in Gibraltar but in</li> <li>particular the national security of Gibraltar</li> <li>that there should be no risks taken and the</li> <li>contract should stay with Bland.</li> <li>Q. It was the right decision to take, was it</li> <li>not?</li> <li>A. Thank you.</li> <li>Q. Once you found out that the</li> <li>A. Thank you for saying that, Mr Wagner,</li> <li>because you have not said that before.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	of Gibraltar's captains of industry, there are not many James Gaggeros or James Levys, there were a few of them, you have to have specific regard to them. He gave me his undertaking that they would be able to maintain the system and they would stop all the problems that the sabotage had created. Q. Yes. A. That is why I made that decision, otherwise I might have made the other decision I have referred you to, which was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>and my concern for the public interest of</li> <li>Gibraltar and the taxpayer in Gibraltar but in</li> <li>particular the national security of Gibraltar</li> <li>that there should be no risks taken and the</li> <li>contract should stay with Bland.</li> <li>Q. It was the right decision to take, was it</li> <li>not?</li> <li>A. Thank you.</li> <li>Q. Once you found out that the</li> <li>A. Thank you for saying that, Mr Wagner,</li> <li>because you have not said that before.</li> <li>Q. I am asking the question and I am asking</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	of Gibraltar's captains of industry, there are not many James Gaggeros or James Levys, there were a few of them, you have to have specific regard to them. He gave me his undertaking that they would be able to maintain the system and they would stop all the problems that the sabotage had created. Q. Yes. A. That is why I made that decision, otherwise I might have made the other decision I have referred you to, which was not to give it to 36 North but to give it to the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>and my concern for the public interest of</li> <li>Gibraltar and the taxpayer in Gibraltar but in</li> <li>particular the national security of Gibraltar</li> <li>that there should be no risks taken and the</li> <li>contract should stay with Bland.</li> <li>Q. It was the right decision to take, was it</li> <li>not?</li> <li>A. Thank you.</li> <li>Q. Once you found out that the</li> <li>A. Thank you for saying that, Mr Wagner,</li> <li>because you have not said that before.</li> <li>Q. I am asking the question and I am asking</li> <li>you is this why you are saying it is right,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	of Gibraltar's captains of industry, there are not many James Gaggeros or James Levys, there were a few of them, you have to have specific regard to them. He gave me his undertaking that they would be able to maintain the system and they would stop all the problems that the sabotage had created. Q. Yes. A. That is why I made that decision, otherwise I might have made the other decision I have referred you to, which was not to give it to 36 North but to give it to the ITLD.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>and my concern for the public interest of</li> <li>Gibraltar and the taxpayer in Gibraltar but in</li> <li>particular the national security of Gibraltar</li> <li>that there should be no risks taken and the</li> <li>contract should stay with Bland.</li> <li>Q. It was the right decision to take, was it</li> <li>not?</li> <li>A. Thank you.</li> <li>Q. Once you found out that the</li> <li>A. Thank you for saying that, Mr Wagner,</li> <li>because you have not said that before.</li> <li>Q. I am asking the question and I am asking</li> <li>you is this why you are saying it is right,</li> <li>because, once you found out this company</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	of Gibraltar's captains of industry, there are not many James Gaggeros or James Levys, there were a few of them, you have to have specific regard to them. He gave me his undertaking that they would be able to maintain the system and they would stop all the problems that the sabotage had created. Q. Yes. A. That is why I made that decision, otherwise I might have made the other decision I have referred you to, which was not to give it to 36 North but to give it to the ITLD. Q. Yes, and would you agree that going
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>and my concern for the public interest of</li> <li>Gibraltar and the taxpayer in Gibraltar but in</li> <li>particular the national security of Gibraltar</li> <li>that there should be no risks taken and the</li> <li>contract should stay with Bland.</li> <li>Q. It was the right decision to take, was it</li> <li>not?</li> <li>A. Thank you.</li> <li>Q. Once you found out that the</li> <li>A. Thank you for saying that, Mr Wagner,</li> <li>because you have not said that before.</li> <li>Q. I am asking the question and I am asking</li> <li>you is this why you are saying it is right,</li> <li>because, once you found out this company</li> <li>and its founders are possibly sabotaging the</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ \end{array} $	of Gibraltar's captains of industry, there are not many James Gaggeros or James Levys, there were a few of them, you have to have specific regard to them. He gave me his undertaking that they would be able to maintain the system and they would stop all the problems that the sabotage had created. Q. Yes. A. That is why I made that decision, otherwise I might have made the other decision I have referred you to, which was not to give it to 36 North but to give it to the ITLD. Q. Yes, and would you agree that going forward after that, because you still had a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>and my concern for the public interest of</li> <li>Gibraltar and the taxpayer in Gibraltar but in</li> <li>particular the national security of Gibraltar</li> <li>that there should be no risks taken and the</li> <li>contract should stay with Bland.</li> <li>Q. It was the right decision to take, was it</li> <li>not?</li> <li>A. Thank you.</li> <li>Q. Once you found out that the</li> <li>A. Thank you for saying that, Mr Wagner,</li> <li>because you have not said that before.</li> <li>Q. I am asking the question and I am asking</li> <li>you is this why you are saying it is right,</li> <li>because, once you found out this company</li> <li>and its founders are possibly sabotaging the</li> <li>very system which they are asking to be</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	of Gibraltar's captains of industry, there are not many James Gaggeros or James Levys, there were a few of them, you have to have specific regard to them. He gave me his undertaking that they would be able to maintain the system and they would stop all the problems that the sabotage had created. Q. Yes. A. That is why I made that decision, otherwise I might have made the other decision I have referred you to, which was not to give it to 36 North but to give it to the ITLD. Q. Yes, and would you agree that going forward after that, because you still had a stake in the business, if the business failed
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>and my concern for the public interest of</li> <li>Gibraltar and the taxpayer in Gibraltar but in</li> <li>particular the national security of Gibraltar</li> <li>that there should be no risks taken and the</li> <li>contract should stay with Bland.</li> <li>Q. It was the right decision to take, was it</li> <li>not?</li> <li>A. Thank you.</li> <li>Q. Once you found out that the</li> <li>A. Thank you for saying that, Mr Wagner,</li> <li>because you have not said that before.</li> <li>Q. I am asking the question and I am asking</li> <li>you is this why you are saying it is right,</li> <li>because, once you found out this company</li> <li>and its founders are possibly sabotaging the</li> <li>very system which they are asking to be</li> <li>given the opportunity to maintain, you had</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>of Gibraltar's captains of industry, there are not many James Gaggeros or James Levys, there were a few of them, you have to have specific regard to them. He gave me his undertaking that they would be able to maintain the system and they would stop all the problems that the sabotage had created. Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. That is why I made that decision, otherwise I might have made the other decision I have referred you to, which was not to give it to 36 North but to give it to the ITLD.</li> <li>Q. Yes, and would you agree that going forward after that, because you still had a stake in the business, if the business failed that would negatively impact on you?</li> </ul>
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ \end{array} $	<ul> <li>and my concern for the public interest of</li> <li>Gibraltar and the taxpayer in Gibraltar but in</li> <li>particular the national security of Gibraltar</li> <li>that there should be no risks taken and the</li> <li>contract should stay with Bland.</li> <li>Q. It was the right decision to take, was it</li> <li>not?</li> <li>A. Thank you.</li> <li>Q. Once you found out that the</li> <li>A. Thank you for saying that, Mr Wagner,</li> <li>because you have not said that before.</li> <li>Q. I am asking the question and I am asking</li> <li>you is this why you are saying it is right,</li> <li>because, once you found out this company</li> <li>and its founders are possibly sabotaging the</li> <li>very system which they are asking to be</li> <li>given the opportunity to maintain, you had</li> <li>no choice but to say that it will stay with</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>of Gibraltar's captains of industry, there are not many James Gaggeros or James Levys, there were a few of them, you have to have specific regard to them. He gave me his undertaking that they would be able to maintain the system and they would stop all the problems that the sabotage had created. Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. That is why I made that decision, otherwise I might have made the other decision I have referred you to, which was not to give it to 36 North but to give it to the ITLD.</li> <li>Q. Yes, and would you agree that going forward after that, because you still had a stake in the business, if the business failed that would negatively impact on you?</li> <li>A. I never focused it that way at all.</li> </ul>
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array}$	<ul> <li>and my concern for the public interest of Gibraltar and the taxpayer in Gibraltar but in particular the national security of Gibraltar that there should be no risks taken and the contract should stay with Bland.</li> <li>Q. It was the right decision to take, was it not?</li> <li>A. Thank you.</li> <li>Q. Once you found out that the</li> <li>A. Thank you for saying that, Mr Wagner, because you have not said that before.</li> <li>Q. I am asking the question and I am asking you is this why you are saying it is right, because, once you found out this company and its founders are possibly sabotaging the very system which they are asking to be given the opportunity to maintain, you had no choice but to say that it will stay with Bland</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\\end{array} $	of Gibraltar's captains of industry, there are not many James Gaggeros or James Levys, there were a few of them, you have to have specific regard to them. He gave me his undertaking that they would be able to maintain the system and they would stop all the problems that the sabotage had created. Q. Yes. A. That is why I made that decision, otherwise I might have made the other decision I have referred you to, which was not to give it to 36 North but to give it to the ITLD. Q. Yes, and would you agree that going forward after that, because you still had a stake in the business, if the business failed that would negatively impact on you? A. I never focused it that way at all. Q. I am asking you the question whether you
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	<ul> <li>and my concern for the public interest of Gibraltar and the taxpayer in Gibraltar but in particular the national security of Gibraltar that there should be no risks taken and the contract should stay with Bland.</li> <li>Q. It was the right decision to take, was it not?</li> <li>A. Thank you.</li> <li>Q. Once you found out that the</li> <li>A. Thank you for saying that, Mr Wagner, because you have not said that before.</li> <li>Q. I am asking the question and I am asking you is this why you are saying it is right, because, once you found out this company and its founders are possibly sabotaging the very system which they are asking to be given the opportunity to maintain, you had no choice but to say that it will stay with Bland</li> <li>A. No.</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	<ul> <li>of Gibraltar's captains of industry, there are not many James Gaggeros or James Levys, there were a few of them, you have to have specific regard to them. He gave me his undertaking that they would be able to maintain the system and they would stop all the problems that the sabotage had created. Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. That is why I made that decision, otherwise I might have made the other decision I have referred you to, which was not to give it to 36 North but to give it to the ITLD.</li> <li>Q. Yes, and would you agree that going forward after that, because you still had a stake in the business, if the business failed that would negatively impact on you?</li> <li>A. I never focused it that way at all.</li> <li>Q. I am asking you the question whether you agree that if the business failed</li> </ul>
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ \end{array}$	<ul> <li>and my concern for the public interest of Gibraltar and the taxpayer in Gibraltar but in particular the national security of Gibraltar that there should be no risks taken and the contract should stay with Bland.</li> <li>Q. It was the right decision to take, was it not?</li> <li>A. Thank you.</li> <li>Q. Once you found out that the</li> <li>A. Thank you for saying that, Mr Wagner, because you have not said that before.</li> <li>Q. I am asking the question and I am asking you is this why you are saying it is right, because, once you found out this company and its founders are possibly sabotaging the very system which they are asking to be given the opportunity to maintain, you had no choice but to say that it will stay with Bland</li> <li>Q because you cannot trust the</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	<ul> <li>of Gibraltar's captains of industry, there are not many James Gaggeros or James Levys, there were a few of them, you have to have specific regard to them. He gave me his undertaking that they would be able to maintain the system and they would stop all the problems that the sabotage had created. Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. That is why I made that decision, otherwise I might have made the other decision I have referred you to, which was not to give it to 36 North but to give it to the ITLD.</li> <li>Q. Yes, and would you agree that going forward after that, because you still had a stake in the business, if the business failed that would negatively impact on you?</li> <li>A. I never focused it that way at all.</li> <li>Q. I am asking you the question whether you agree that if the business failed</li> <li>A. No, I didn't</li> </ul>
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ \end{array}$	<ul> <li>and my concern for the public interest of Gibraltar and the taxpayer in Gibraltar but in particular the national security of Gibraltar that there should be no risks taken and the contract should stay with Bland.</li> <li>Q. It was the right decision to take, was it not?</li> <li>A. Thank you.</li> <li>Q. Once you found out that the</li> <li>A. Thank you for saying that, Mr Wagner, because you have not said that before.</li> <li>Q. I am asking the question and I am asking you is this why you are saying it is right, because, once you found out this company and its founders are possibly sabotaging the very system which they are asking to be given the opportunity to maintain, you had no choice but to say that it will stay with Bland</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q because you cannot trust the</li> <li>A. No, I am afraid you are wrong.</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	<ul> <li>of Gibraltar's captains of industry, there are not many James Gaggeros or James Levys, there were a few of them, you have to have specific regard to them. He gave me his undertaking that they would be able to maintain the system and they would stop all the problems that the sabotage had created. Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. That is why I made that decision, otherwise I might have made the other decision I have referred you to, which was not to give it to 36 North but to give it to the ITLD.</li> <li>Q. Yes, and would you agree that going forward after that, because you still had a stake in the business, if the business failed that would negatively impact on you?</li> <li>A. I never focused it that way at all.</li> <li>Q. I am asking you the question whether you agree that if the business failed</li> <li>A. No, I didn't</li> <li>Q it would negatively impact on you?</li> </ul>
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	<ul> <li>and my concern for the public interest of</li> <li>Gibraltar and the taxpayer in Gibraltar but in</li> <li>particular the national security of Gibraltar</li> <li>that there should be no risks taken and the</li> <li>contract should stay with Bland.</li> <li>Q. It was the right decision to take, was it</li> <li>not?</li> <li>A. Thank you.</li> <li>Q. Once you found out that the</li> <li>A. Thank you for saying that, Mr Wagner,</li> <li>because you have not said that before.</li> <li>Q. I am asking the question and I am asking</li> <li>you is this why you are saying it is right,</li> <li>because, once you found out this company</li> <li>and its founders are possibly sabotaging the</li> <li>very system which they are asking to be</li> <li>given the opportunity to maintain, you had</li> <li>no choice but to say that it will stay with</li> <li>Bland</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q because you cannot trust the</li> <li>A. No, I am afraid you are wrong.</li> <li>Q. So what was the reason you decided</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	<ul> <li>of Gibraltar's captains of industry, there are not many James Gaggeros or James Levys, there were a few of them, you have to have specific regard to them. He gave me his undertaking that they would be able to maintain the system and they would stop all the problems that the sabotage had created. Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. That is why I made that decision, otherwise I might have made the other decision I have referred you to, which was not to give it to 36 North but to give it to the ITLD.</li> <li>Q. Yes, and would you agree that going forward after that, because you still had a stake in the business, if the business failed that would negatively impact on you?</li> <li>A. I never focused it that way at all.</li> <li>Q. I am asking you the question whether you agree that if the business failed</li> <li>A. No, I didn't</li> <li>Q it would negatively impact on you?</li> </ul>
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ \end{array}$	<ul> <li>and my concern for the public interest of Gibraltar and the taxpayer in Gibraltar but in particular the national security of Gibraltar that there should be no risks taken and the contract should stay with Bland.</li> <li>Q. It was the right decision to take, was it not?</li> <li>A. Thank you.</li> <li>Q. Once you found out that the</li> <li>A. Thank you for saying that, Mr Wagner, because you have not said that before.</li> <li>Q. I am asking the question and I am asking you is this why you are saying it is right, because, once you found out this company and its founders are possibly sabotaging the very system which they are asking to be given the opportunity to maintain, you had no choice but to say that it will stay with Bland</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q because you cannot trust the</li> <li>A. No, I am afraid you are wrong.</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	<ul> <li>of Gibraltar's captains of industry, there are not many James Gaggeros or James Levys, there were a few of them, you have to have specific regard to them. He gave me his undertaking that they would be able to maintain the system and they would stop all the problems that the sabotage had created. Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. That is why I made that decision, otherwise I might have made the other decision I have referred you to, which was not to give it to 36 North but to give it to the ITLD.</li> <li>Q. Yes, and would you agree that going forward after that, because you still had a stake in the business, if the business failed that would negatively impact on you?</li> <li>A. I never focused it that way at all.</li> <li>Q. I am asking you the question whether you agree that if the business failed</li> <li>A. No, I didn't</li> <li>Q it would negatively impact on you?</li> </ul>

35 (Pages 137 to 140)

1	A. I don't agree. Look, you know, I'm in my	1	driving seat of approving that contract and
2	early 50s, through Hassans and not through	2	then at that moment I would have had to deal
3	Hassans, I have minor stakes in businesses, I	3	with issues relating to declarations of
4	am wealthier than I ever wanted to be as a	4	interest.
5	result of honestly discharging my profession	5	Q. I just want to get whether it was a
6	as a lawyer and the distinction of being Chief	6	financial you agree that it was a financial
7	Minister, I don't concern myself with 2.94	7	interest, you agreed the financial interest
8	per cent of a business I was never interested	8	would increase, you are
9	in, that I was told we had and whether we	9	A. But
10	might lose it or not re the fact that when the	10	Q. Just bear with me, your interest would
11	time came, it was not for a scintilla of a	11	increase if the business succeeded, would
12	moment a consideration in my mind, right	12	you agree that your financial interest would
13	as I think you have agreed.	13	decrease if the business failed?
14	Q. Did you say that you are wealthy because	14	A. Mr Wagner, how do you think we need
15	you are Chief Minister?	15	an inquiry for these things? I am very happy
16	A. No, I said I am wealthy because of my	16	to suggest to you that not only would it, in
17	work as a lawyer, no wealthier than you,	17	the hypothesis that you set out, have been
18	probably less, and because of my salary as	18	worth less, it actually was worth less as a
19	Chief Minister which, although it is not as	19	result of the decisions I made and the actions
20	much as I might have made before, is more	20	I took long before the investigation began in
20	than I expected I would ever receive in	20	2018.
22	remuneration when I left university 30 years	22	Q. Would the business be more likely to fail
23	ago. I don't need 2.94 per cent of Astelon in	23	if its founders were prosecuted and convicted
23	order to feel wealthy or not. That is the point.	23	of criminal offences relating to the business?
25	Q. I think we are on two different	25	A. That didn't really come up for
23	Q. I think we die on two different	25	A. That thus t really come up for
	Page 141		Page 143
1	A You are the one who is making	1	consideration because the business had failed
1 2	A. You are the one who is making something of me being interested in this and	1	consideration because the business had failed even before the matter had been reported to
2	something of me being interested in this and	2	even before the matter had been reported to
2 3	something of me being interested in this and I was not interested in this.	2 3	even before the matter had been reported to the Royal Gibraltar Police, so I know what
2 3 4	<ul><li>something of me being interested in this and</li><li>I was not interested in this.</li><li>Q. No, no, no, if I have not been clear I</li></ul>	2 3 4	even before the matter had been reported to the Royal Gibraltar Police, so I know what you are trying to do, it's a with very great
2 3 4 5	<ul><li>something of me being interested in this and I was not interested in this.</li><li>Q. No, no, no, if I have not been clear I apologise. I am not asking whether you as</li></ul>	2 3 4 5	even before the matter had been reported to the Royal Gibraltar Police, so I know what you are trying to do, it's a with very great respect, I understand why you are trying to
2 3 4 5 6	<ul><li>something of me being interested in this and I was not interested in this.</li><li>Q. No, no, no, if I have not been clear I apologise. I am not asking whether you as Fabian Picardo with your assets that you</li></ul>	2 3 4 5 6	even before the matter had been reported to the Royal Gibraltar Police, so I know what you are trying to do, it's a with very great respect, I understand why you are trying to do it and I respect that, but it doesn't fall for
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul><li>something of me being interested in this and I was not interested in this.</li><li>Q. No, no, no, if I have not been clear I apologise. I am not asking whether you as Fabian Picardo with your assets that you have got were particularly interested in that</li></ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	even before the matter had been reported to the Royal Gibraltar Police, so I know what you are trying to do, it's a with very great respect, I understand why you are trying to do it and I respect that, but it doesn't fall for consideration because I made the decision
2 3 4 5 6	<ul><li>something of me being interested in this and I was not interested in this.</li><li>Q. No, no, no, if I have not been clear I apologise. I am not asking whether you as Fabian Picardo with your assets that you have got were particularly interested in that 2.94 per cent, I am asking from the</li></ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	even before the matter had been reported to the Royal Gibraltar Police, so I know what you are trying to do, it's a with very great respect, I understand why you are trying to do it and I respect that, but it doesn't fall for consideration because I made the decision that what you have said repeatedly was the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>something of me being interested in this and I was not interested in this.</li> <li>Q. No, no, no, if I have not been clear I apologise. I am not asking whether you as Fabian Picardo with your assets that you have got were particularly interested in that 2.94 per cent, I am asking from the perspective of, say the ministerial code that</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	even before the matter had been reported to the Royal Gibraltar Police, so I know what you are trying to do, it's a with very great respect, I understand why you are trying to do it and I respect that, but it doesn't fall for consideration because I made the decision that what you have said repeatedly was the key thing in your view that NSCIS was set up
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>something of me being interested in this and I was not interested in this.</li> <li>Q. No, no, no, if I have not been clear I apologise. I am not asking whether you as Fabian Picardo with your assets that you have got were particularly interested in that 2.94 per cent, I am asking from the perspective of, say the ministerial code that talks about financial interests, did you have a</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	even before the matter had been reported to the Royal Gibraltar Police, so I know what you are trying to do, it's a with very great respect, I understand why you are trying to do it and I respect that, but it doesn't fall for consideration because I made the decision that what you have said repeatedly was the key thing in your view that NSCIS was set up to do, which was to get the maintenance
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	something of me being interested in this and I was not interested in this. Q. No, no, no, if I have not been clear I apologise. I am not asking whether you as Fabian Picardo with your assets that you have got were particularly interested in that 2.94 per cent, I am asking from the perspective of, say the ministerial code that talks about financial interests, did you have a financial interest in 36 North at the time?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	even before the matter had been reported to the Royal Gibraltar Police, so I know what you are trying to do, it's a with very great respect, I understand why you are trying to do it and I respect that, but it doesn't fall for consideration because I made the decision that what you have said repeatedly was the key thing in your view that NSCIS was set up to do, which was to get the maintenance contract from the government, it wasn't from
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>something of me being interested in this and I was not interested in this.</li> <li>Q. No, no, no, if I have not been clear I apologise. I am not asking whether you as Fabian Picardo with your assets that you have got were particularly interested in that 2.94 per cent, I am asking from the perspective of, say the ministerial code that talks about financial interests, did you have a financial interest in 36 North at the time?</li> <li>A. I had a financial stake, as we have</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	even before the matter had been reported to the Royal Gibraltar Police, so I know what you are trying to do, it's a with very great respect, I understand why you are trying to do it and I respect that, but it doesn't fall for consideration because I made the decision that what you have said repeatedly was the key thing in your view that NSCIS was set up to do, which was to get the maintenance contract from the government, it wasn't from my view, should not go to NSCIS to 36
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>something of me being interested in this and I was not interested in this.</li> <li>Q. No, no, no, if I have not been clear I apologise. I am not asking whether you as Fabian Picardo with your assets that you have got were particularly interested in that 2.94 per cent, I am asking from the perspective of, say the ministerial code that talks about financial interests, did you have a financial interest in 36 North at the time?</li> <li>A. I had a financial stake, as we have already set out.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	even before the matter had been reported to the Royal Gibraltar Police, so I know what you are trying to do, it's a with very great respect, I understand why you are trying to do it and I respect that, but it doesn't fall for consideration because I made the decision that what you have said repeatedly was the key thing in your view that NSCIS was set up to do, which was to get the maintenance contract from the government, it wasn't from my view, should not go to NSCIS to 36 North as from September, October 2019 and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>something of me being interested in this and I was not interested in this.</li> <li>Q. No, no, no, if I have not been clear I apologise. I am not asking whether you as Fabian Picardo with your assets that you have got were particularly interested in that 2.94 per cent, I am asking from the perspective of, say the ministerial code that talks about financial interests, did you have a financial interest in 36 North at the time?</li> <li>A. I had a financial stake, as we have</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	even before the matter had been reported to the Royal Gibraltar Police, so I know what you are trying to do, it's a with very great respect, I understand why you are trying to do it and I respect that, but it doesn't fall for consideration because I made the decision that what you have said repeatedly was the key thing in your view that NSCIS was set up to do, which was to get the maintenance contract from the government, it wasn't from my view, should not go to NSCIS to 36 North as from September, October 2019 and so, therefore, at that meeting when we talk
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>something of me being interested in this and I was not interested in this.</li> <li>Q. No, no, no, if I have not been clear I apologise. I am not asking whether you as Fabian Picardo with your assets that you have got were particularly interested in that 2.94 per cent, I am asking from the perspective of, say the ministerial code that talks about financial interests, did you have a financial interest in 36 North at the time?</li> <li>A. I had a financial stake, as we have already set out.</li> <li>Q. Right, if 36 North succeeded would that</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	even before the matter had been reported to the Royal Gibraltar Police, so I know what you are trying to do, it's a with very great respect, I understand why you are trying to do it and I respect that, but it doesn't fall for consideration because I made the decision that what you have said repeatedly was the key thing in your view that NSCIS was set up to do, which was to get the maintenance contract from the government, it wasn't from my view, should not go to NSCIS to 36 North as from September, October 2019 and so, therefore, at that meeting when we talk about James Gaggero referring the matter to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>something of me being interested in this and I was not interested in this.</li> <li>Q. No, no, no, if I have not been clear I apologise. I am not asking whether you as Fabian Picardo with your assets that you have got were particularly interested in that 2.94 per cent, I am asking from the perspective of, say the ministerial code that talks about financial interests, did you have a financial interest in 36 North at the time?</li> <li>A. I had a financial stake, as we have already set out.</li> <li>Q. Right, if 36 North succeeded would that financial interest be worth more than if it failed?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	even before the matter had been reported to the Royal Gibraltar Police, so I know what you are trying to do, it's a with very great respect, I understand why you are trying to do it and I respect that, but it doesn't fall for consideration because I made the decision that what you have said repeatedly was the key thing in your view that NSCIS was set up to do, which was to get the maintenance contract from the government, it wasn't from my view, should not go to NSCIS to 36 North as from September, October 2019 and so, therefore, at that meeting when we talk about James Gaggero referring the matter to the Royal Gibraltar Police, et cetera, et
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>something of me being interested in this and I was not interested in this.</li> <li>Q. No, no, no, if I have not been clear I apologise. I am not asking whether you as Fabian Picardo with your assets that you have got were particularly interested in that 2.94 per cent, I am asking from the perspective of, say the ministerial code that talks about financial interests, did you have a financial interest in 36 North at the time?</li> <li>A. I had a financial stake, as we have already set out.</li> <li>Q. Right, if 36 North succeeded would that financial interest be worth more than if it failed?</li> <li>A. I fit established its business and managed</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	even before the matter had been reported to the Royal Gibraltar Police, so I know what you are trying to do, it's a with very great respect, I understand why you are trying to do it and I respect that, but it doesn't fall for consideration because I made the decision that what you have said repeatedly was the key thing in your view that NSCIS was set up to do, which was to get the maintenance contract from the government, it wasn't from my view, should not go to NSCIS to 36 North as from September, October 2019 and so, therefore, at that meeting when we talk about James Gaggero referring the matter to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>something of me being interested in this and I was not interested in this.</li> <li>Q. No, no, no, if I have not been clear I apologise. I am not asking whether you as Fabian Picardo with your assets that you have got were particularly interested in that 2.94 per cent, I am asking from the perspective of, say the ministerial code that talks about financial interests, did you have a financial interest in 36 North at the time?</li> <li>A. I had a financial stake, as we have already set out.</li> <li>Q. Right, if 36 North succeeded would that financial interest be worth more than if it failed?</li> <li>A. If it established its business and managed to exploit it in the way that it had, it would</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	even before the matter had been reported to the Royal Gibraltar Police, so I know what you are trying to do, it's a with very great respect, I understand why you are trying to do it and I respect that, but it doesn't fall for consideration because I made the decision that what you have said repeatedly was the key thing in your view that NSCIS was set up to do, which was to get the maintenance contract from the government, it wasn't from my view, should not go to NSCIS to 36 North as from September, October 2019 and so, therefore, at that meeting when we talk about James Gaggero referring the matter to the Royal Gibraltar Police, et cetera, et cetera, all the matters relating to prosecution are after I have made the decision that in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>something of me being interested in this and I was not interested in this.</li> <li>Q. No, no, no, if I have not been clear I apologise. I am not asking whether you as Fabian Picardo with your assets that you have got were particularly interested in that 2.94 per cent, I am asking from the perspective of, say the ministerial code that talks about financial interests, did you have a financial interest in 36 North at the time?</li> <li>A. I had a financial stake, as we have already set out.</li> <li>Q. Right, if 36 North succeeded would that financial interest be worth more than if it failed?</li> <li>A. I fit established its business and managed</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	even before the matter had been reported to the Royal Gibraltar Police, so I know what you are trying to do, it's a with very great respect, I understand why you are trying to do it and I respect that, but it doesn't fall for consideration because I made the decision that what you have said repeatedly was the key thing in your view that NSCIS was set up to do, which was to get the maintenance contract from the government, it wasn't from my view, should not go to NSCIS to 36 North as from September, October 2019 and so, therefore, at that meeting when we talk about James Gaggero referring the matter to the Royal Gibraltar Police, et cetera, et cetera, all the matters relating to prosecution
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>something of me being interested in this and I was not interested in this.</li> <li>Q. No, no, no, if I have not been clear I apologise. I am not asking whether you as Fabian Picardo with your assets that you have got were particularly interested in that 2.94 per cent, I am asking from the perspective of, say the ministerial code that talks about financial interests, did you have a financial interest in 36 North at the time?</li> <li>A. I had a financial stake, as we have already set out.</li> <li>Q. Right, if 36 North succeeded would that financial interest be worth more than if it failed?</li> <li>A. If it established its business and managed to exploit it in the way that it had, it would have led to</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	even before the matter had been reported to the Royal Gibraltar Police, so I know what you are trying to do, it's a with very great respect, I understand why you are trying to do it and I respect that, but it doesn't fall for consideration because I made the decision that what you have said repeatedly was the key thing in your view that NSCIS was set up to do, which was to get the maintenance contract from the government, it wasn't from my view, should not go to NSCIS to 36 North as from September, October 2019 and so, therefore, at that meeting when we talk about James Gaggero referring the matter to the Royal Gibraltar Police, et cetera, et cetera, all the matters relating to prosecution are after I have made the decision that in your analysis is the one that damns 36 North
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array}$	<ul> <li>something of me being interested in this and I was not interested in this.</li> <li>Q. No, no, no, if I have not been clear I apologise. I am not asking whether you as Fabian Picardo with your assets that you have got were particularly interested in that 2.94 per cent, I am asking from the perspective of, say the ministerial code that talks about financial interests, did you have a financial interest in 36 North at the time?</li> <li>A. I had a financial stake, as we have already set out.</li> <li>Q. Right, if 36 North succeeded would that financial interest be worth more than if it failed?</li> <li>A. If it established its business and managed to exploit it in the way that it had, it would have led to the growth of the value of that stake</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	even before the matter had been reported to the Royal Gibraltar Police, so I know what you are trying to do, it's a with very great respect, I understand why you are trying to do it and I respect that, but it doesn't fall for consideration because I made the decision that what you have said repeatedly was the key thing in your view that NSCIS was set up to do, which was to get the maintenance contract from the government, it wasn't from my view, should not go to NSCIS to 36 North as from September, October 2019 and so, therefore, at that meeting when we talk about James Gaggero referring the matter to the Royal Gibraltar Police, et cetera, et cetera, all the matters relating to prosecution are after I have made the decision that in your analysis is the one that damns 36 North to failure.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>something of me being interested in this and I was not interested in this.</li> <li>Q. No, no, no, if I have not been clear I apologise. I am not asking whether you as Fabian Picardo with your assets that you have got were particularly interested in that 2.94 per cent, I am asking from the perspective of, say the ministerial code that talks about financial interests, did you have a financial interest in 36 North at the time?</li> <li>A. I had a financial stake, as we have already set out.</li> <li>Q. Right, if 36 North succeeded would that financial interest be worth more than if it failed?</li> <li>A. If it established its business and managed to exploit it in the way that it had, it would have been potentially it would have led to the growth of the value of that stakeQ. Yes.,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	even before the matter had been reported to the Royal Gibraltar Police, so I know what you are trying to do, it's a with very great respect, I understand why you are trying to do it and I respect that, but it doesn't fall for consideration because I made the decision that what you have said repeatedly was the key thing in your view that NSCIS was set up to do, which was to get the maintenance contract from the government, it wasn't from my view, should not go to NSCIS to 36 North as from September, October 2019 and so, therefore, at that meeting when we talk about James Gaggero referring the matter to the Royal Gibraltar Police, et cetera, et cetera, all the matters relating to prosecution are after I have made the decision that in your analysis is the one that damns 36 North to failure. Q. But before you disposed of your
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>something of me being interested in this and I was not interested in this.</li> <li>Q. No, no, no, if I have not been clear I apologise. I am not asking whether you as Fabian Picardo with your assets that you have got were particularly interested in that 2.94 per cent, I am asking from the perspective of, say the ministerial code that talks about financial interests, did you have a financial interest in 36 North at the time?</li> <li>A. I had a financial stake, as we have already set out.</li> <li>Q. Right, if 36 North succeeded would that financial interest be worth more than if it failed?</li> <li>A. If it established its business and managed to exploit it in the way that it had, it would have been potentially it would have led to the growth of the value of that stake Q. Yes.,</li> <li>A and indeed of the value to the taxpayer</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	even before the matter had been reported to the Royal Gibraltar Police, so I know what you are trying to do, it's a with very great respect, I understand why you are trying to do it and I respect that, but it doesn't fall for consideration because I made the decision that what you have said repeatedly was the key thing in your view that NSCIS was set up to do, which was to get the maintenance contract from the government, it wasn't from my view, should not go to NSCIS to 36 North as from September, October 2019 and so, therefore, at that meeting when we talk about James Gaggero referring the matter to the Royal Gibraltar Police, et cetera, et cetera, all the matters relating to prosecution are after I have made the decision that in your analysis is the one that damns 36 North to failure. Q. But before you disposed of your ownership stake in 36 North?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>something of me being interested in this and I was not interested in this.</li> <li>Q. No, no, no, if I have not been clear I apologise. I am not asking whether you as Fabian Picardo with your assets that you have got were particularly interested in that 2.94 per cent, I am asking from the perspective of, say the ministerial code that talks about financial interests, did you have a financial interest in 36 North at the time?</li> <li>A. I had a financial stake, as we have already set out.</li> <li>Q. Right, if 36 North succeeded would that financial interest be worth more than if it failed?</li> <li>A. If it established its business and managed to exploit it in the way that it had, it would have been potentially it would have led to the growth of the value of that stake Q. Yes.,</li> <li>A and indeed of the value to the taxpayer also of the NSCIS and had the moment for</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	even before the matter had been reported to the Royal Gibraltar Police, so I know what you are trying to do, it's a with very great respect, I understand why you are trying to do it and I respect that, but it doesn't fall for consideration because I made the decision that what you have said repeatedly was the key thing in your view that NSCIS was set up to do, which was to get the maintenance contract from the government, it wasn't from my view, should not go to NSCIS to 36 North as from September, October 2019 and so, therefore, at that meeting when we talk about James Gaggero referring the matter to the Royal Gibraltar Police, et cetera, et cetera, all the matters relating to prosecution are after I have made the decision that in your analysis is the one that damns 36 North to failure. Q. But before you disposed of your ownership stake in 36 North? A. Look, I didn't do anything to dispose of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>something of me being interested in this and I was not interested in this.</li> <li>Q. No, no, no, if I have not been clear I apologise. I am not asking whether you as Fabian Picardo with your assets that you have got were particularly interested in that 2.94 per cent, I am asking from the perspective of, say the ministerial code that talks about financial interests, did you have a financial interest in 36 North at the time?</li> <li>A. I had a financial stake, as we have already set out.</li> <li>Q. Right, if 36 North succeeded would that financial interest be worth more than if it failed?</li> <li>A. If it established its business and managed to exploit it in the way that it had, it would have been potentially it would have led to the growth of the value of that stake Q. Yes.,</li> <li>A and indeed of the value to the taxpayer also of the NSCIS and had the moment for that to happen had come, then the Chief</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>even before the matter had been reported to the Royal Gibraltar Police, so I know what you are trying to do, it's a with very great respect, I understand why you are trying to do it and I respect that, but it doesn't fall for consideration because I made the decision that what you have said repeatedly was the key thing in your view that NSCIS was set up to do, which was to get the maintenance contract from the government, it wasn't from my view, should not go to NSCIS to 36 North as from September, October 2019 and so, therefore, at that meeting when we talk about James Gaggero referring the matter to the Royal Gibraltar Police, et cetera, et cetera, all the matters relating to prosecution are after I have made the decision that in your analysis is the one that damns 36 North to failure.</li> <li>Q. But before you disposed of your ownership stake in 36 North?</li> <li>A. Look, I didn't do anything to dispose of my ownership stake.</li> </ul>

36 (Pages 141 to 144)

1	A. If you will allow me, I didn't do anything	1	A. Well, your tone is hardly anything other
2	to dispose of my ownership stake in 36 North	2	than accusatory.
3	and neither did I do anything to acquire an	3	Q. Did you recall your meeting at Mr Levy's
4	ownership stake in 36 North. I was told	4	home on 17 May before you drafted this
5	about these things because I don't involve	5	statement?
6	myself the investments that Hassans make. I	6	A. No, because no meeting happened at Mr
7	was properly told about this one because it	7	Levy's home on 17 May. A meeting
8	was going to interact with a government	8	happened at my home
9	activity.	9	Q. Sorry, at your home, did you recall that
10	Q. Can we go to A234, please	10	meeting before you drafted the statement?
11	A. In the witness bundle?	11	A. No, I confess I didn't recall that meeting.
12	Q. Yes, the witness statement, this is your	12	Q. That meeting had just completely gone
13	third affidavit dated 15 November 2023.	13	from your memory?
14	A. A234?	14	A. If I had to recall every time I have spoken
15	Q. You produced this statement a year and	15	to James Levy, met James Levy and in
16	half or so after the Inquiry started its work.	16	particular met him on a Sunday, I would be
17	You agreed with Mr Santos yesterday that	17	- I would spend the rest of my days and
18	you did not reveal in this statement your	18	would not finished by the time I died at 120.
19	meeting with the suspect Mr Levy on 17 May	19	Q. But these were extraordinary events, were
20	2020. Is that correct?	20	they not?
21	A. Yes, I don't think it requires me to agree	21	A. Yes, but that meeting in particular was
22	whether something is or is not in a statement.	22	not about the only thing other than, as I
23	It either is or it is not.	23	have said already, principally Mr Levy
24	Q. And you did not reveal in this statement	24	resigning as Chairman of Community Care
25	any of your meetings or calls with the	25	Trust, a hugely important local charity which
			Trase, a hagery important rotal charty white
	Page 145		Page 147
			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
1	suspect's lawyer, Mr Baglietto. Is that	1	hold or held at that time in the region of
2	correct?	2	£100,000 million of money that had been
2 3	correct? A. If they are not in the statement, then I did	2 3	£100,000 million of money that had been donated to the charity by the Gibraltar
2 3 4	correct? A. If they are not in the statement, then I did not refer to them but I think subsequently we	2 3 4	£100,000 million of money that had been donated to the charity by the Gibraltar Parliament, through a vote of the Gibraltar
2 3 4 5	correct? A. If they are not in the statement, then I did not refer to them but I think subsequently we have.	2 3 4 5	£100,000 million of money that had been donated to the charity by the Gibraltar Parliament, through a vote of the Gibraltar Parliament.
2 3 4 5 6	<ul><li>correct?</li><li>A. If they are not in the statement, then I did not refer to them but I think subsequently we have.</li><li>Q. They are not.</li></ul>	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>£100,000 million of money that had been donated to the charity by the Gibraltar Parliament, through a vote of the Gibraltar Parliament.</li> <li>Q. Not about anything principally, so you</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. If they are not in the statement, then I did not refer to them but I think subsequently we have.</li> <li>Q. They are not.</li> <li>A. I think there were a number of different</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>£100,000 million of money that had been donated to the charity by the Gibraltar Parliament, through a vote of the Gibraltar Parliament.</li> <li>Q. Not about anything principally, so you said you accept that it was about</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. If they are not in the statement, then I did not refer to them but I think subsequently we have.</li> <li>Q. They are not.</li> <li>A. I think there were a number of different statements from different parties that have</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>£100,000 million of money that had been donated to the charity by the Gibraltar</li> <li>Parliament, through a vote of the Gibraltar</li> <li>Parliament.</li> <li>Q. Not about anything principally, so you said you accept that it was about</li> <li>A. It was about other matters.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. If they are not in the statement, then I did not refer to them but I think subsequently we have.</li> <li>Q. They are not.</li> <li>A. I think there were a number of different statements from different parties that have resulted in disclosure coming, I think, at</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>£100,000 million of money that had been donated to the charity by the Gibraltar</li> <li>Parliament, through a vote of the Gibraltar</li> <li>Parliament.</li> <li>Q. Not about anything principally, so you said you accept that it was about</li> <li>A. It was about other matters.</li> <li>Q. There were other matters discussed?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. If they are not in the statement, then I did not refer to them but I think subsequently we have.</li> <li>Q. They are not.</li> <li>A. I think there were a number of different statements from different parties that have resulted in disclosure coming, I think, at different stages, as documents have emerged</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>£100,000 million of money that had been donated to the charity by the Gibraltar Parliament, through a vote of the Gibraltar Parliament.</li> <li>Q. Not about anything principally, so you said you accept that it was about</li> <li>A. It was about other matters.</li> <li>Q. There were other matters discussed?</li> <li>A. Of course but, as I have told you, around</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. If they are not in the statement, then I did not refer to them but I think subsequently we have.</li> <li>Q. They are not.</li> <li>A. I think there were a number of different statements from different parties that have resulted in disclosure coming, I think, at different stages, as documents have emerged as memories have been jogged. I think your</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>£100,000 million of money that had been donated to the charity by the Gibraltar Parliament, through a vote of the Gibraltar Parliament.</li> <li>Q. Not about anything principally, so you said you accept that it was about</li> <li>A. It was about other matters.</li> <li>Q. There were other matters discussed?</li> <li>A. Of course but, as I have told you, around that time I was discussing other matters and</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. If they are not in the statement, then I did not refer to them but I think subsequently we have.</li> <li>Q. They are not.</li> <li>A. I think there were a number of different statements from different parties that have resulted in disclosure coming, I think, at different stages, as documents have emerged as memories have been jogged. I think your client has sworn six.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>£100,000 million of money that had been donated to the charity by the Gibraltar</li> <li>Parliament, through a vote of the Gibraltar</li> <li>Parliament.</li> <li>Q. Not about anything principally, so you said you accept that it was about</li> <li>A. It was about other matters.</li> <li>Q. There were other matters discussed?</li> <li>A. Of course but, as I have told you, around that time I was discussing other matters and in particular such with all and sundry. I</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. If they are not in the statement, then I did not refer to them but I think subsequently we have.</li> <li>Q. They are not.</li> <li>A. I think there were a number of different statements from different parties that have resulted in disclosure coming, I think, at different stages, as documents have emerged as memories have been jogged. I think your client has sworn six.</li> <li>Q. On your meeting sorry, you did not</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>£100,000 million of money that had been donated to the charity by the Gibraltar Parliament, through a vote of the Gibraltar Parliament.</li> <li>Q. Not about anything principally, so you said you accept that it was about</li> <li>A. It was about other matters.</li> <li>Q. There were other matters discussed?</li> <li>A. Of course but, as I have told you, around that time I was discussing other matters and in particular such with all and sundry. I had absolutely I make absolutely no</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. If they are not in the statement, then I did not refer to them but I think subsequently we have.</li> <li>Q. They are not.</li> <li>A. I think there were a number of different statements from different parties that have resulted in disclosure coming, I think, at different stages, as documents have emerged as memories have been jogged. I think your client has sworn six.</li> <li>Q. On your meeting sorry, you did not reveal in this statement your meeting with the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>£100,000 million of money that had been donated to the charity by the Gibraltar Parliament, through a vote of the Gibraltar Parliament.</li> <li>Q. Not about anything principally, so you said you accept that it was about</li> <li>A. It was about other matters.</li> <li>Q. There were other matters discussed?</li> <li>A. Of course but, as I have told you, around that time I was discussing other matters and in particular such with all and sundry. I had absolutely I make absolutely no qualms about that, Mr Wagner.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. If they are not in the statement, then I did not refer to them but I think subsequently we have.</li> <li>Q. They are not.</li> <li>A. I think there were a number of different statements from different parties that have resulted in disclosure coming, I think, at different stages, as documents have emerged as memories have been jogged. I think your client has sworn six.</li> <li>Q. On your meeting sorry, you did not reveal in this statement your meeting with the suspect's son, did you?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>£100,000 million of money that had been donated to the charity by the Gibraltar Parliament, through a vote of the Gibraltar Parliament.</li> <li>Q. Not about anything principally, so you said you accept that it was about</li> <li>A. It was about other matters.</li> <li>Q. There were other matters discussed?</li> <li>A. Of course but, as I have told you, around that time I was discussing other matters and in particular such with all and sundry. I had absolutely I make absolutely no qualms about that, Mr Wagner.</li> <li>Q. You have not provided any evidence that</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. If they are not in the statement, then I did not refer to them but I think subsequently we have.</li> <li>Q. They are not.</li> <li>A. I think there were a number of different statements from different parties that have resulted in disclosure coming, I think, at different stages, as documents have emerged as memories have been jogged. I think your client has sworn six.</li> <li>Q. On your meeting sorry, you did not reveal in this statement your meeting with the suspect's son, did you?</li> <li>A. Well, I didn't recall the meeting with the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>£100,000 million of money that had been donated to the charity by the Gibraltar Parliament, through a vote of the Gibraltar Parliament.</li> <li>Q. Not about anything principally, so you said you accept that it was about</li> <li>A. It was about other matters.</li> <li>Q. There were other matters discussed?</li> <li>A. Of course but, as I have told you, around that time I was discussing other matters and in particular such with all and sundry. I had absolutely I make absolutely no qualms about that, Mr Wagner.</li> <li>Q. You have not provided any evidence that you were discussing those matter with</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. If they are not in the statement, then I did not refer to them but I think subsequently we have.</li> <li>Q. They are not.</li> <li>A. I think there were a number of different statements from different parties that have resulted in disclosure coming, I think, at different stages, as documents have emerged as memories have been jogged. I think your client has sworn six.</li> <li>Q. On your meeting sorry, you did not reveal in this statement your meeting with the suspect's son, did you?</li> <li>A. Well, I didn't recall the meeting with the suspect's son until I was referred to it</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>£100,000 million of money that had been donated to the charity by the Gibraltar Parliament, through a vote of the Gibraltar Parliament.</li> <li>Q. Not about anything principally, so you said you accept that it was about</li> <li>A. It was about other matters.</li> <li>Q. There were other matters discussed?</li> <li>A. Of course but, as I have told you, around that time I was discussing other matters and in particular such with all and sundry. I had absolutely I make absolutely no qualms about that, Mr Wagner.</li> <li>Q. You have not provided any evidence that you were discussing those matter with anyone except for</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. If they are not in the statement, then I did not refer to them but I think subsequently we have.</li> <li>Q. They are not.</li> <li>A. I think there were a number of different statements from different parties that have resulted in disclosure coming, I think, at different stages, as documents have emerged as memories have been jogged. I think your client has sworn six.</li> <li>Q. On your meeting sorry, you did not reveal in this statement your meeting with the suspect's son, did you?</li> <li>A. Well, I didn't recall the meeting with the suspect's son until I was referred to it yesterday. I said yesterday that I couldn't</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>£100,000 million of money that had been donated to the charity by the Gibraltar Parliament, through a vote of the Gibraltar Parliament.</li> <li>Q. Not about anything principally, so you said you accept that it was about</li> <li>A. It was about other matters.</li> <li>Q. There were other matters discussed?</li> <li>A. Of course but, as I have told you, around that time I was discussing other matters and in particular such with all and sundry. I had absolutely I make absolutely no qualms about that, Mr Wagner.</li> <li>Q. You have not provided any evidence that you were discussing those matter with anyone except for</li> <li>A. Well, because it doesn't</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. If they are not in the statement, then I did not refer to them but I think subsequently we have.</li> <li>Q. They are not.</li> <li>A. I think there were a number of different statements from different parties that have resulted in disclosure coming, I think, at different stages, as documents have emerged as memories have been jogged. I think your client has sworn six.</li> <li>Q. On your meeting sorry, you did not reveal in this statement your meeting with the suspect's son, did you?</li> <li>A. Well, I didn't recall the meeting with the suspect's son until I was referred to it yesterday. I said yesterday that I couldn't recall it but that I preferred his memory of</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>£100,000 million of money that had been donated to the charity by the Gibraltar Parliament, through a vote of the Gibraltar Parliament.</li> <li>Q. Not about anything principally, so you said you accept that it was about</li> <li>A. It was about other matters.</li> <li>Q. There were other matters discussed?</li> <li>A. Of course but, as I have told you, around that time I was discussing other matters and in particular such with all and sundry. I had absolutely I make absolutely no qualms about that, Mr Wagner.</li> <li>Q. You have not provided any evidence that you were discussing those matter with anyone except for</li> <li>Q Mr Baglietto, vis a vis the Attorney</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. If they are not in the statement, then I did not refer to them but I think subsequently we have.</li> <li>Q. They are not.</li> <li>A. I think there were a number of different statements from different parties that have resulted in disclosure coming, I think, at different stages, as documents have emerged as memories have been jogged. I think your client has sworn six.</li> <li>Q. On your meeting sorry, you did not reveal in this statement your meeting with the suspect's son, did you?</li> <li>A. Well, I didn't recall the meeting with the suspect's son until I was referred to it yesterday. I said yesterday that I couldn't recall it but that I preferred his memory of what may have happened to mine.</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	<ul> <li>£100,000 million of money that had been donated to the charity by the Gibraltar Parliament, through a vote of the Gibraltar Parliament.</li> <li>Q. Not about anything principally, so you said you accept that it was about</li> <li>A. It was about other matters.</li> <li>Q. There were other matters discussed?</li> <li>A. Of course but, as I have told you, around that time I was discussing other matters and in particular such with all and sundry. I had absolutely I make absolutely no qualms about that, Mr Wagner.</li> <li>Q. You have not provided any evidence that you were discussing those matter with anyone except for</li> <li>A. Well, because it doesn't</li> <li>Q Mr Baglietto, vis a vis the Attorney General, is that not right, and</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. If they are not in the statement, then I did not refer to them but I think subsequently we have.</li> <li>Q. They are not.</li> <li>A. I think there were a number of different statements from different parties that have resulted in disclosure coming, I think, at different stages, as documents have emerged as memories have been jogged. I think your client has sworn six.</li> <li>Q. On your meeting sorry, you did not reveal in this statement your meeting with the suspect's son, did you?</li> <li>A. Well, I didn't recall the meeting with the suspect's son until I was referred to it yesterday. I said yesterday that I couldn't recall it but that I preferred his memory of what may have happened to mine.</li> <li>Q. Did you</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	<ul> <li>£100,000 million of money that had been donated to the charity by the Gibraltar Parliament, through a vote of the Gibraltar Parliament.</li> <li>Q. Not about anything principally, so you said you accept that it was about</li> <li>A. It was about other matters.</li> <li>Q. There were other matters discussed?</li> <li>A. Of course but, as I have told you, around that time I was discussing other matters and in particular such with all and sundry. I had absolutely I make absolutely no qualms about that, Mr Wagner.</li> <li>Q. You have not provided any evidence that you were discussing those matter with anyone except for</li> <li>A. Well, because it doesn't</li> <li>A. Well, I mean if the Inquiry would like me</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. If they are not in the statement, then I did not refer to them but I think subsequently we have.</li> <li>Q. They are not.</li> <li>A. I think there were a number of different statements from different parties that have resulted in disclosure coming, I think, at different stages, as documents have emerged as memories have been jogged. I think your client has sworn six.</li> <li>Q. On your meeting sorry, you did not reveal in this statement your meeting with the suspect's son, did you?</li> <li>A. Well, I didn't recall the meeting with the suspect's son until I was referred to it yesterday. I said yesterday that I couldn't recall it but that I preferred his memory of what may have happened to mine.</li> <li>Q. Did you</li> <li>A. So I can't I don't think I can be</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	<ul> <li>£100,000 million of money that had been donated to the charity by the Gibraltar Parliament, through a vote of the Gibraltar Parliament.</li> <li>Q. Not about anything principally, so you said you accept that it was about</li> <li>A. It was about other matters.</li> <li>Q. There were other matters discussed?</li> <li>A. Of course but, as I have told you, around that time I was discussing other matters and in particular such with all and sundry. I had absolutely I make absolutely no qualms about that, Mr Wagner.</li> <li>Q. You have not provided any evidence that you were discussing those matter with anyone except for</li> <li>A. Well, because it doesn't</li> <li>Q Mr Baglietto, vis a vis the Attorney General, is that not right, and</li> <li>A. Well, I mean if the Inquiry would like me to trawl through my statements and my</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. If they are not in the statement, then I did not refer to them but I think subsequently we have.</li> <li>Q. They are not.</li> <li>A. I think there were a number of different statements from different parties that have resulted in disclosure coming, I think, at different stages, as documents have emerged as memories have been jogged. I think your client has sworn six.</li> <li>Q. On your meeting sorry, you did not reveal in this statement your meeting with the suspect's son, did you?</li> <li>A. Well, I didn't recall the meeting with the suspect's son until I was referred to it yesterday. I said yesterday that I couldn't recall it but that I preferred his memory of what may have happened to mine.</li> <li>Q. Did you</li> <li>A. So I can't I don't think I can be accused of not revealing something that I</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	<ul> <li>£100,000 million of money that had been donated to the charity by the Gibraltar Parliament, through a vote of the Gibraltar Parliament.</li> <li>Q. Not about anything principally, so you said you accept that it was about</li> <li>A. It was about other matters.</li> <li>Q. There were other matters discussed?</li> <li>A. Of course but, as I have told you, around that time I was discussing other matters and in particular such with all and sundry. I had absolutely I make absolutely no qualms about that, Mr Wagner.</li> <li>Q. You have not provided any evidence that you were discussing those matter with anyone except for</li> <li>A. Well, because it doesn't</li> <li>Q Mr Baglietto, vis a vis the Attorney General, is that not right, and</li> <li>A. Well, I mean if the Inquiry would like me to trawl through my statements and my memory to see whether I discussed with Mr</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. If they are not in the statement, then I did not refer to them but I think subsequently we have.</li> <li>Q. They are not.</li> <li>A. I think there were a number of different statements from different parties that have resulted in disclosure coming, I think, at different stages, as documents have emerged as memories have been jogged. I think your client has sworn six.</li> <li>Q. On your meeting sorry, you did not reveal in this statement your meeting with the suspect's son, did you?</li> <li>A. Well, I didn't recall the meeting with the suspect's son until I was referred to it yesterday. I said yesterday that I couldn't recall it but that I preferred his memory of what may have happened to mine.</li> <li>Q. Did you</li> <li>A. So I can't I don't think I can be accused of not revealing something that I even now say I cannot recall.</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	<ul> <li>£100,000 million of money that had been donated to the charity by the Gibraltar Parliament, through a vote of the Gibraltar Parliament.</li> <li>Q. Not about anything principally, so you said you accept that it was about A. It was about other matters.</li> <li>Q. There were other matters discussed?</li> <li>A. Of course but, as I have told you, around that time I was discussing other matters and in particular such with all and sundry. I had absolutely I make absolutely no qualms about that, Mr Wagner.</li> <li>Q. You have not provided any evidence that you were discussing those matter with anyone except for</li> <li>A. Well, because it doesn't</li> <li>Q Mr Baglietto, vis a vis the Attorney General, is that not right, and</li> <li>A. Well, I mean if the Inquiry would like me to trawl through my statements and my memory to see whether I discussed with Mr Smith down Main Street the issue of the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. If they are not in the statement, then I did not refer to them but I think subsequently we have.</li> <li>Q. They are not.</li> <li>A. I think there were a number of different statements from different parties that have resulted in disclosure coming, I think, at different stages, as documents have emerged as memories have been jogged. I think your client has sworn six.</li> <li>Q. On your meeting sorry, you did not reveal in this statement your meeting with the suspect's son, did you?</li> <li>A. Well, I didn't recall the meeting with the suspect's son until I was referred to it yesterday. I said yesterday that I couldn't recall it but that I preferred his memory of what may have happened to mine.</li> <li>Q. Did you</li> <li>A. So I can't I don't think I can be accused of not revealing something that I</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	<ul> <li>£100,000 million of money that had been donated to the charity by the Gibraltar Parliament, through a vote of the Gibraltar Parliament.</li> <li>Q. Not about anything principally, so you said you accept that it was about</li> <li>A. It was about other matters.</li> <li>Q. There were other matters discussed?</li> <li>A. Of course but, as I have told you, around that time I was discussing other matters and in particular such with all and sundry. I had absolutely I make absolutely no qualms about that, Mr Wagner.</li> <li>Q. You have not provided any evidence that you were discussing those matter with anyone except for</li> <li>A. Well, because it doesn't</li> <li>Q Mr Baglietto, vis a vis the Attorney General, is that not right, and</li> <li>A. Well, I mean if the Inquiry would like me to trawl through my statements and my memory to see whether I discussed with Mr</li> </ul>

37 (Pages 145 to 148)

1			
	I may not be able to remember all of them	1	were, you did not have to reveal any of that
2	but I will remember some of them and the list	2	information because there was no objective
3	will be longer than your arm and mine	3	record?
4	because this, as I have said for shorthand,	4	A. No, not at all, but it is true, and I put it to
5	was vox populi in town and, therefore, I	5	you that it is common, that memories being
6	would have been discussing it with a very	6	what memories are, these days we are greatly
7	many great people, probably in the Spanish	7	assisted either by electronic communications
8	language using phraseology which would be	8	or other documents in remembering things
9	very understandable to people saying, in our	9	and being able to reconstruct things that
10	lexicon [Spanish spoken]. It is in short	10	happened and, therefore, when we go back
11	terms, it is an abuse what has happened.	11	and look at things, you say, "Ah, there's a
12	Right. This was what I was discussing	12	reference to something that happened," you
13	permanently and I cannot, therefore, tell you	13	think about that, try and find whether there's
14	that I feel it is somehow in appropriate for	14	an entry in a diary, "Oh, yes, I now
15	me not to have recalled that meeting when I	15	remember," and then try and reconstruct that.
16	prepared this statement. If I had, given my	16	That's how memories are assisted. That's
17	obligations, which I continue to believe I	17	why we go back to these messages. I would
18	carry, even as Chief Minister, as an officer of	18	have thought that you will agree that it is
19	the court, and although this tribunal is not a	19	very common that that should be the case.
20	court, it is a properly established Gibraltar	20	When I signed this statement, I was, as one
20	tribunal, I would have definitely referred it to	20	of His Majesty's counsel for Gibraltar, very
22	the tribunal in this statement or in any other.	22	clear in my mind that the time was going to
23	Q. At paragraph 11 you say, "My frequent	23	come when all of my WhatsApp and all of
23	conversations with Mr Levy about the search	24	my emails and all of my documents were
25	warrants were mostly telephonic and, as I	25	going to be trawled and provided to the
23	warrants were mostly telephonic and, as i	2.5	going to be trawicu and provided to the
	Page 149		Page 151
1	have alwaydy acid there are no manual.	1	
1	have already said, there are no records		Inquiry, so it's not as if I didn't expect that
2	beyond those already disclosed. There is no	23	that was going to happen and for that reason I
3	breakdown on the number of dates or times		
4			fundamentally disagree with the basis on
5	of these conversations as there were and are	4	which you have formulated that question and
5	still many of them. There were no meetings	4 5	which you have formulated that question and my answer to it is, no.
6	still many of them. There were no meetings in my office such as may have resulted in a	4 5 6	<ul><li>which you have formulated that question and my answer to it is, no.</li><li>Q. Why, over a year after a year and a</li></ul>
6 7	still many of them. There were no meetings in my office such as may have resulted in a note of it." That final line, is that not	4 5 6 7	<ul><li>which you have formulated that question and my answer to it is, no.</li><li>Q. Why, over a year after a year and a half after the Inquiry first asked you for an</li></ul>
6 7 8	still many of them. There were no meetings in my office such as may have resulted in a note of it." That final line, is that not somewhat odd language?	4 5 6 7 8	<ul><li>which you have formulated that question and my answer to it is, no.</li><li>Q. Why, over a year after a year and a half after the Inquiry first asked you for an account of what happened had you not</li></ul>
6 7 8 9	<ul><li>still many of them. There were no meetings</li><li>in my office such as may have resulted in a</li><li>note of it." That final line, is that not</li><li>somewhat odd language?</li><li>A. No, it is not, it is designed to deal in</li></ul>	4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul><li>which you have formulated that question and my answer to it is, no.</li><li>Q. Why, over a year after a year and a half after the Inquiry first asked you for an account of what happened had you not trawled your WhatsApp and emails?</li></ul>
6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>still many of them. There were no meetings</li> <li>in my office such as may have resulted in a</li> <li>note of it." That final line, is that not</li> <li>somewhat odd language?</li> <li>A. No, it is not, it is designed to deal in</li> <li>particular with I think the Inquiry's particular</li> </ul>	4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>which you have formulated that question and my answer to it is, no.</li> <li>Q. Why, over a year after a year and a half after the Inquiry first asked you for an account of what happened had you not trawled your WhatsApp and emails?</li> <li>A. For a very simple reason; it is impossible</li> </ul>
6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>still many of them. There were no meetings</li> <li>in my office such as may have resulted in a</li> <li>note of it." That final line, is that not</li> <li>somewhat odd language?</li> <li>A. No, it is not, it is designed to deal in</li> <li>particular with I think the Inquiry's particular</li> <li>call for evidence for any notes or official</li> </ul>	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>which you have formulated that question and my answer to it is, no.</li> <li>Q. Why, over a year after a year and a half after the Inquiry first asked you for an account of what happened had you not trawled your WhatsApp and emails?</li> <li>A. For a very simple reason; it is impossible for me, impossible for me, to discharge the</li> </ul>
6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>still many of them. There were no meetings</li> <li>in my office such as may have resulted in a</li> <li>note of it." That final line, is that not</li> <li>somewhat odd language?</li> <li>A. No, it is not, it is designed to deal in</li> <li>particular with I think the Inquiry's particular</li> <li>call for evidence for any notes or official</li> <li>records. There are no official records of</li> </ul>	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>which you have formulated that question and my answer to it is, no.</li> <li>Q. Why, over a year after a year and a half after the Inquiry first asked you for an account of what happened had you not trawled your WhatsApp and emails?</li> <li>A. For a very simple reason; it is impossible for me, impossible for me, to discharge the functions of my office, which are more</li> </ul>
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>still many of them. There were no meetings</li> <li>in my office such as may have resulted in a</li> <li>note of it." That final line, is that not</li> <li>somewhat odd language?</li> <li>A. No, it is not, it is designed to deal in</li> <li>particular with I think the Inquiry's particular</li> <li>call for evidence for any notes or official</li> <li>records. There are no official records of</li> <li>meetings I had at my home. It is not 10</li> </ul>	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>which you have formulated that question and my answer to it is, no.</li> <li>Q. Why, over a year after a year and a half after the Inquiry first asked you for an account of what happened had you not trawled your WhatsApp and emails?</li> <li>A. For a very simple reason; it is impossible for me, impossible for me, to discharge the functions of my office, which are more important even than this Inquiry, and stop</li> </ul>
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>still many of them. There were no meetings</li> <li>in my office such as may have resulted in a</li> <li>note of it." That final line, is that not</li> <li>somewhat odd language?</li> <li>A. No, it is not, it is designed to deal in</li> <li>particular with I think the Inquiry's particular</li> <li>call for evidence for any notes or official</li> <li>records. There are no official records of</li> <li>meetings I had at my home. It is not 10</li> <li>Downing Street, it is not an official</li> </ul>	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>which you have formulated that question and my answer to it is, no.</li> <li>Q. Why, over a year after a year and a half after the Inquiry first asked you for an account of what happened had you not trawled your WhatsApp and emails?</li> <li>A. For a very simple reason; it is impossible for me, impossible for me, to discharge the functions of my office, which are more important even than this Inquiry, and stop and trawl through all my emails, all my</li> </ul>
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>still many of them. There were no meetings</li> <li>in my office such as may have resulted in a</li> <li>note of it." That final line, is that not</li> <li>somewhat odd language?</li> <li>A. No, it is not, it is designed to deal in</li> <li>particular with I think the Inquiry's particular</li> <li>call for evidence for any notes or official</li> <li>records. There are no official records of</li> <li>meetings I had at my home. It is not 10</li> <li>Downing Street, it is not an official</li> <li>residence, and there would be official records</li> </ul>	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>which you have formulated that question and my answer to it is, no.</li> <li>Q. Why, over a year after a year and a half after the Inquiry first asked you for an account of what happened had you not trawled your WhatsApp and emails?</li> <li>A. For a very simple reason; it is impossible for me, impossible for me, to discharge the functions of my office, which are more important even than this Inquiry, and stop and trawl through all my emails, all my WhatsApp and all other communications. It</li> </ul>
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>still many of them. There were no meetings</li> <li>in my office such as may have resulted in a</li> <li>note of it." That final line, is that not</li> <li>somewhat odd language?</li> <li>A. No, it is not, it is designed to deal in</li> <li>particular with I think the Inquiry's particular</li> <li>call for evidence for any notes or official</li> <li>records. There are no official records of</li> <li>meetings I had at my home. It is not 10</li> <li>Downing Street, it is not an official</li> <li>residence, and there would be official records</li> <li>of meetings that I have in my office or at</li> </ul>	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>which you have formulated that question and my answer to it is, no.</li> <li>Q. Why, over a year after a year and a half after the Inquiry first asked you for an account of what happened had you not trawled your WhatsApp and emails?</li> <li>A. For a very simple reason; it is impossible for me, impossible for me, to discharge the functions of my office, which are more important even than this Inquiry, and stop and trawl through all my emails, all my WhatsApp and all other communications. It is just absolutely impossible. I have had to</li> </ul>
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>still many of them. There were no meetings</li> <li>in my office such as may have resulted in a</li> <li>note of it." That final line, is that not</li> <li>somewhat odd language?</li> <li>A. No, it is not, it is designed to deal in</li> <li>particular with I think the Inquiry's particular</li> <li>call for evidence for any notes or official</li> <li>records. There are no official records of</li> <li>meetings I had at my home. It is not 10</li> <li>Downing Street, it is not an official</li> <li>residence, and there would be official records</li> <li>of meetings that I have in my office or at</li> <li>least there would be an entry in a diary. That</li> </ul>	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>which you have formulated that question and my answer to it is, no.</li> <li>Q. Why, over a year after a year and a half after the Inquiry first asked you for an account of what happened had you not trawled your WhatsApp and emails?</li> <li>A. For a very simple reason; it is impossible for me, impossible for me, to discharge the functions of my office, which are more important even than this Inquiry, and stop and trawl through all my emails, all my WhatsApp and all other communications. It is just absolutely impossible. I have had to do it with the assistance of counsel and</li> </ul>
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	still many of them. There were no meetings in my office such as may have resulted in a note of it." That final line, is that not somewhat odd language? A. No, it is not, it is designed to deal in particular with I think the Inquiry's particular call for evidence for any notes or official records. There are no official records of meetings I had at my home. It is not 10 Downing Street, it is not an official residence, and there would be official records of meetings that I have in my office or at least there would be an entry in a diary. That is why the language is there, it's for that	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>which you have formulated that question and my answer to it is, no.</li> <li>Q. Why, over a year after a year and a half after the Inquiry first asked you for an account of what happened had you not trawled your WhatsApp and emails?</li> <li>A. For a very simple reason; it is impossible for me, impossible for me, to discharge the functions of my office, which are more important even than this Inquiry, and stop and trawl through all my emails, all my WhatsApp and all other communications. It is just absolutely impossible. I have had to do it with the assistance of counsel and solicitors.</li> </ul>
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>still many of them. There were no meetings in my office such as may have resulted in a note of it." That final line, is that not somewhat odd language?</li> <li>A. No, it is not, it is designed to deal in particular with I think the Inquiry's particular call for evidence for any notes or official records. There are no official records of meetings I had at my home. It is not 10 Downing Street, it is not an official records of meetings that I have in my office or at least there would be an entry in a diary. That is why the language is there, it's for that reason.</li> </ul>	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>which you have formulated that question and my answer to it is, no.</li> <li>Q. Why, over a year after a year and a half after the Inquiry first asked you for an account of what happened had you not trawled your WhatsApp and emails?</li> <li>A. For a very simple reason; it is impossible for me, impossible for me, to discharge the functions of my office, which are more important even than this Inquiry, and stop and trawl through all my emails, all my WhatsApp and all other communications. It is just absolutely impossible. I have had to do it with the assistance of counsel and solicitors.</li> <li>Q. But Mr Levy was not Mr Smith on Main</li> </ul>
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>still many of them. There were no meetings in my office such as may have resulted in a note of it." That final line, is that not somewhat odd language?</li> <li>A. No, it is not, it is designed to deal in particular with I think the Inquiry's particular call for evidence for any notes or official records. There are no official records of meetings I had at my home. It is not 10 Downing Street, it is not an official residence, and there would be official records of meetings that I have in my office or at least there would be an entry in a diary. That is why the language is there, it's for that reason.</li> <li>Q. Is the reason that you use that language</li> </ul>	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>which you have formulated that question and my answer to it is, no.</li> <li>Q. Why, over a year after a year and a half after the Inquiry first asked you for an account of what happened had you not trawled your WhatsApp and emails?</li> <li>A. For a very simple reason; it is impossible for me, impossible for me, to discharge the functions of my office, which are more important even than this Inquiry, and stop and trawl through all my emails, all my WhatsApp and all other communications. It is just absolutely impossible. I have had to do it with the assistance of counsel and solicitors.</li> <li>Q. But Mr Levy was not Mr Smith on Main Street, was he? Is that not just a</li> </ul>
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>still many of them. There were no meetings in my office such as may have resulted in a note of it." That final line, is that not somewhat odd language?</li> <li>A. No, it is not, it is designed to deal in particular with I think the Inquiry's particular call for evidence for any notes or official records. There are no official records of meetings I had at my home. It is not 10 Downing Street, it is not an official residence, and there would be official records of meetings that I have in my office or at least there would be an entry in a diary. That is why the language is there, it's for that reason.</li> <li>Q. Is the reason that you use that language and you did not reveal any of your calls or</li> </ul>	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>which you have formulated that question and my answer to it is, no.</li> <li>Q. Why, over a year after a year and a half after the Inquiry first asked you for an account of what happened had you not trawled your WhatsApp and emails?</li> <li>A. For a very simple reason; it is impossible for me, impossible for me, to discharge the functions of my office, which are more important even than this Inquiry, and stop and trawl through all my emails, all my WhatsApp and all other communications. It is just absolutely impossible. I have had to do it with the assistance of counsel and solicitors.</li> <li>Q. But Mr Levy was not Mr Smith on Main Street, was he? Is that not just a disingenuous way of explaining why you did</li> </ul>
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>still many of them. There were no meetings</li> <li>in my office such as may have resulted in a</li> <li>note of it." That final line, is that not</li> <li>somewhat odd language?</li> <li>A. No, it is not, it is designed to deal in</li> <li>particular with I think the Inquiry's particular</li> <li>call for evidence for any notes or official</li> <li>records. There are no official records of</li> <li>meetings I had at my home. It is not 10</li> <li>Downing Street, it is not an official</li> <li>residence, and there would be official records</li> <li>of meetings that I have in my office or at</li> <li>least there would be an entry in a diary. That</li> <li>is why the language is there, it's for that</li> <li>reason.</li> <li>Q. Is the reason that you use that language</li> <li>and you did not reveal any of your calls or</li> <li>conversations with the suspect or the</li> </ul>	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>which you have formulated that question and my answer to it is, no.</li> <li>Q. Why, over a year after a year and a half after the Inquiry first asked you for an account of what happened had you not trawled your WhatsApp and emails?</li> <li>A. For a very simple reason; it is impossible for me, impossible for me, to discharge the functions of my office, which are more important even than this Inquiry, and stop and trawl through all my emails, all my WhatsApp and all other communications. It is just absolutely impossible. I have had to do it with the assistance of counsel and solicitors.</li> <li>Q. But Mr Levy was not Mr Smith on Main Street, was he? Is that not just a disingenuous way of explaining why you did not provide the relevant information?</li> </ul>
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>still many of them. There were no meetings</li> <li>in my office such as may have resulted in a</li> <li>note of it." That final line, is that not</li> <li>somewhat odd language?</li> <li>A. No, it is not, it is designed to deal in</li> <li>particular with I think the Inquiry's particular</li> <li>call for evidence for any notes or official</li> <li>records. There are no official records of</li> <li>meetings I had at my home. It is not 10</li> <li>Downing Street, it is not an official</li> <li>residence, and there would be official records</li> <li>of meetings that I have in my office or at</li> <li>least there would be an entry in a diary. That</li> <li>is why the language is there, it's for that</li> <li>reason.</li> <li>Q. Is the reason that you use that language</li> <li>and you did not reveal any of your calls or</li> <li>conversations with the suspect or the</li> <li>suspect's lawyer or the suspect's son, that it</li> </ul>	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>which you have formulated that question and my answer to it is, no.</li> <li>Q. Why, over a year after a year and a half after the Inquiry first asked you for an account of what happened had you not trawled your WhatsApp and emails?</li> <li>A. For a very simple reason; it is impossible for me, impossible for me, to discharge the functions of my office, which are more important even than this Inquiry, and stop and trawl through all my emails, all my WhatsApp and all other communications. It is just absolutely impossible. I have had to do it with the assistance of counsel and solicitors.</li> <li>Q. But Mr Levy was not Mr Smith on Main Street, was he? Is that not just a disingenuous way of explaining why you did not provide the relevant information?</li> <li>A. It is not disingenuous. I have not been</li> </ul>
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>still many of them. There were no meetings</li> <li>in my office such as may have resulted in a</li> <li>note of it." That final line, is that not</li> <li>somewhat odd language?</li> <li>A. No, it is not, it is designed to deal in</li> <li>particular with I think the Inquiry's particular</li> <li>call for evidence for any notes or official</li> <li>records. There are no official records of</li> <li>meetings I had at my home. It is not 10</li> <li>Downing Street, it is not an official</li> <li>residence, and there would be official records</li> <li>of meetings that I have in my office or at</li> <li>least there would be an entry in a diary. That</li> <li>is why the language is there, it's for that</li> <li>reason.</li> <li>Q. Is the reason that you use that language</li> <li>and you did not reveal any of your calls or</li> <li>conversations with the suspect or the</li> <li>suspect's lawyer or the suspect's son, that it</li> <li>was only later you were asked to provide</li> </ul>	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>which you have formulated that question and my answer to it is, no.</li> <li>Q. Why, over a year after a year and a half after the Inquiry first asked you for an account of what happened had you not trawled your WhatsApp and emails?</li> <li>A. For a very simple reason; it is impossible for me, impossible for me, to discharge the functions of my office, which are more important even than this Inquiry, and stop and trawl through all my emails, all my WhatsApp and all other communications. It is just absolutely impossible. I have had to do it with the assistance of counsel and solicitors.</li> <li>Q. But Mr Levy was not Mr Smith on Main Street, was he? Is that not just a disingenuous way of explaining why you did not provide the relevant information?</li> <li>A. It is not disingenuous. I have not been disingenuous in anything I have said to this</li> </ul>
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>still many of them. There were no meetings</li> <li>in my office such as may have resulted in a</li> <li>note of it." That final line, is that not</li> <li>somewhat odd language?</li> <li>A. No, it is not, it is designed to deal in</li> <li>particular with I think the Inquiry's particular</li> <li>call for evidence for any notes or official</li> <li>records. There are no official records of</li> <li>meetings I had at my home. It is not 10</li> <li>Downing Street, it is not an official</li> <li>residence, and there would be official records</li> <li>of meetings that I have in my office or at</li> <li>least there would be an entry in a diary. That</li> <li>is why the language is there, it's for that</li> <li>reason.</li> <li>Q. Is the reason that you use that language</li> <li>and you did not reveal any of your calls or</li> <li>conversations with the suspect or the</li> <li>suspect's lawyer or the suspect's son, that it</li> </ul>	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>which you have formulated that question and my answer to it is, no.</li> <li>Q. Why, over a year after a year and a half after the Inquiry first asked you for an account of what happened had you not trawled your WhatsApp and emails?</li> <li>A. For a very simple reason; it is impossible for me, impossible for me, to discharge the functions of my office, which are more important even than this Inquiry, and stop and trawl through all my emails, all my WhatsApp and all other communications. It is just absolutely impossible. I have had to do it with the assistance of counsel and solicitors.</li> <li>Q. But Mr Levy was not Mr Smith on Main Street, was he? Is that not just a disingenuous way of explaining why you did not provide the relevant information?</li> <li>A. It is not disingenuous. I have not been</li> </ul>
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>still many of them. There were no meetings</li> <li>in my office such as may have resulted in a</li> <li>note of it." That final line, is that not</li> <li>somewhat odd language?</li> <li>A. No, it is not, it is designed to deal in</li> <li>particular with I think the Inquiry's particular</li> <li>call for evidence for any notes or official</li> <li>records. There are no official records of</li> <li>meetings I had at my home. It is not 10</li> <li>Downing Street, it is not an official</li> <li>residence, and there would be official records</li> <li>of meetings that I have in my office or at</li> <li>least there would be an entry in a diary. That</li> <li>is why the language is there, it's for that</li> <li>reason.</li> <li>Q. Is the reason that you use that language</li> <li>and you did not reveal any of your calls or</li> <li>conversations with the suspect or the</li> <li>suspect's lawyer or the suspect's son, that it</li> <li>was only later you were asked to provide</li> </ul>	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>which you have formulated that question and my answer to it is, no.</li> <li>Q. Why, over a year after a year and a half after the Inquiry first asked you for an account of what happened had you not trawled your WhatsApp and emails?</li> <li>A. For a very simple reason; it is impossible for me, impossible for me, to discharge the functions of my office, which are more important even than this Inquiry, and stop and trawl through all my emails, all my WhatsApp and all other communications. It is just absolutely impossible. I have had to do it with the assistance of counsel and solicitors.</li> <li>Q. But Mr Levy was not Mr Smith on Main Street, was he? Is that not just a disingenuous way of explaining why you did not provide the relevant information?</li> <li>A. It is not disingenuous. I have not been disingenuous in anything I have said to this</li> </ul>

www.epiqglobal.com Lower Ground Floor, 46 Chancery Lane casemanagers@epiqglobal.com London, WC2A 1JE

38 (Pages 149 to 152)

1	keeping to the oath I took at the beginning of	1	at the very least and I think you said that you
2	these proceedings and, as I have said before	2	would have had a number of calls with Mr
3	in the statements I have made about how I	3	Baglietto?
4	will deal with this Inquiry, and making sure	4	A. A myriad.
5	we get to the truth, the whole truth and	5	Q. A myriad, yes, and you met with both Mr
6	nothing but the truth and I am grateful to all	6	Baglietto and Mr Levy on the 17th, where, if
7	parties involved in this process, yourself and	7	you go to A1448
8	Ms Gallagher included and counsel for Mr	8	A. I don't think I have that.
9	McGrail included, for the process that is	9	Q. Paragraph 17, "At the meeting with Mr
10	enabling us to ensure that all of the	10	Levy, I remember I discussed again how
11	information is before the Chairman,	11	legally improper it had been in our view for
12	including information which has come out	12	the RGP to have proceeded by way of search
13	later in the day because it is in the nature of	13	warrant and not production order, how
14	the work that we do when we are dealing	14	outraged I was by the fact that I believed that
15	with civil proceedings of this sort that	15	Mr McGrail had lied to me about the advice
16	documents jog memories and enable us to	16	he had had in respect of my subsequent
17	provide more evidence. I daresay the same	17	complete loss of confidence in him," and
18	has happened to your client. He forgot to	18	then you say that the key issue was the
19	include in his first statement the transcripts of	19	charity, and also at 14 above, you say, "I
20	the conversations he had recorded.	20	believe I would have shared with Mr
21	THE CHAIRMAN: (To the witness): No, I	21	Baglietto the fact that I was very open with
22	do not think he did. I think he took a	22	GPA and the then Governor and that Mr
23	deliberate decision not to reveal them.	23	McGrail no longer enjoyed my confidence
24	A. Ah, well, even worse. I took no	24	and my views as to the mechanisms to see
25	deliberate decision not to refer to Mr Levy	25	Mr McGrail removed and the consequences
	D 450		D 455
	Page 153		Page 155
1	and my meeting with him at home.	1	thereof" Is it fair to say that during this
1 2	and my meeting with him at home. MR WAGNER: (To the witness): If we can	1	thereof." Is it fair to say that during this period you proposed a number of ideas to Mr
2	MR WAGNER: (To the witness): If we can	2	period you proposed a number of ideas to Mr
	MR WAGNER: (To the witness): If we can go to B1418	2 3	period you proposed a number of ideas to Mr Baglietto about points that could be made
2 3	MR WAGNER: (To the witness): If we can go to B1418 A. In my statement?	2 3 4	period you proposed a number of ideas to Mr Baglietto about points that could be made against the search warrant?
2 3 4	<ul><li>MR WAGNER: (To the witness): If we can go to B1418</li><li>A. In my statement?</li><li>Q. No, this is the text messages between you</li></ul>	2 3	<ul><li>period you proposed a number of ideas to Mr</li><li>Baglietto about points that could be made</li><li>against the search warrant?</li><li>A. Yes, as you can see, I was very concerned</li></ul>
2 3 4 5	MR WAGNER: (To the witness): If we can go to B1418 A. In my statement?	2 3 4 5	period you proposed a number of ideas to Mr Baglietto about points that could be made against the search warrant?
2 3 4 5 6	<ul><li>MR WAGNER: (To the witness): If we can go to B1418</li><li>A. In my statement?</li><li>Q. No, this is the text messages between you and Mr Llamas. You have been taken</li></ul>	2 3 4 5 6	<ul><li>period you proposed a number of ideas to Mr</li><li>Baglietto about points that could be made</li><li>against the search warrant?</li><li>A. Yes, as you can see, I was very concerned</li><li>about how disgracefully I believed Mr</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>MR WAGNER: (To the witness): If we can go to B1418</li> <li>A. In my statement?</li> <li>Q. No, this is the text messages between you and Mr Llamas. You have been taken already to this section, it is right to say, is it</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>period you proposed a number of ideas to Mr</li> <li>Baglietto about points that could be made against the search warrant?</li> <li>A. Yes, as you can see, I was very concerned about how disgracefully I believed Mr</li> <li>McGrail had behaved with me in my office,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>MR WAGNER: (To the witness): If we can go to B1418</li> <li>A. In my statement?</li> <li>Q. No, this is the text messages between you and Mr Llamas. You have been taken already to this section, it is right to say, is it not, that you highlighted to Mr Llamas the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>period you proposed a number of ideas to Mr Baglietto about points that could be made against the search warrant?</li> <li>A. Yes, as you can see, I was very concerned about how disgracefully I believed Mr McGrail had behaved with me in my office, how much of an abuse I believed that the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>MR WAGNER: (To the witness): If we can go to B1418</li> <li>A. In my statement?</li> <li>Q. No, this is the text messages between you and Mr Llamas. You have been taken already to this section, it is right to say, is it not, that you highlighted to Mr Llamas the Constitutional powers that he had to take</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>period you proposed a number of ideas to Mr Baglietto about points that could be made against the search warrant?</li> <li>A. Yes, as you can see, I was very concerned about how disgracefully I believed Mr McGrail had behaved with me in my office, how much of an abuse I believed that the search warrant was for all the reasons I have</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>MR WAGNER: (To the witness): If we can go to B1418</li> <li>A. In my statement?</li> <li>Q. No, this is the text messages between you and Mr Llamas. You have been taken already to this section, it is right to say, is it not, that you highlighted to Mr Llamas the Constitutional powers that he had to take over the search warrant potentially from the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>period you proposed a number of ideas to Mr Baglietto about points that could be made against the search warrant?</li> <li>A. Yes, as you can see, I was very concerned about how disgracefully I believed Mr McGrail had behaved with me in my office, how much of an abuse I believed that the search warrant was for all the reasons I have already given in detail and in that context I</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>MR WAGNER: (To the witness): If we can go to B1418</li> <li>A. In my statement?</li> <li>Q. No, this is the text messages between you and Mr Llamas. You have been taken already to this section, it is right to say, is it not, that you highlighted to Mr Llamas the Constitutional powers that he had to take over the search warrant potentially from the police and to discontinue it?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>period you proposed a number of ideas to Mr Baglietto about points that could be made against the search warrant?</li> <li>A. Yes, as you can see, I was very concerned about how disgracefully I believed Mr McGrail had behaved with me in my office, how much of an abuse I believed that the search warrant was for all the reasons I have already given in detail and in that context I was discussing with Lewis Baglietto the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>MR WAGNER: (To the witness): If we can go to B1418</li> <li>A. In my statement?</li> <li>Q. No, this is the text messages between you and Mr Llamas. You have been taken already to this section, it is right to say, is it not, that you highlighted to Mr Llamas the Constitutional powers that he had to take over the search warrant potentially from the police and to discontinue it?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And you were in at a similar time you were in regular communications with both</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>period you proposed a number of ideas to Mr Baglietto about points that could be made against the search warrant?</li> <li>A. Yes, as you can see, I was very concerned about how disgracefully I believed Mr McGrail had behaved with me in my office, how much of an abuse I believed that the search warrant was for all the reasons I have already given in detail and in that context I was discussing with Lewis Baglietto the certain options that I believed he should</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>MR WAGNER: (To the witness): If we can go to B1418</li> <li>A. In my statement?</li> <li>Q. No, this is the text messages between you and Mr Llamas. You have been taken already to this section, it is right to say, is it not, that you highlighted to Mr Llamas the Constitutional powers that he had to take over the search warrant potentially from the police and to discontinue it?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And you were in at a similar time you were in regular communications with both Mr Baglietto and Mr Levy, including - and</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	period you proposed a number of ideas to Mr Baglietto about points that could be made against the search warrant? A. Yes, as you can see, I was very concerned about how disgracefully I believed Mr McGrail had behaved with me in my office, how much of an abuse I believed that the search warrant was for all the reasons I have already given in detail and in that context I was discussing with Lewis Baglietto the certain options that I believed he should pursue; for example, the application for the return of the phone, et cetera, but simply sharing ideas with him. I have known him,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>MR WAGNER: (To the witness): If we can go to B1418</li> <li>A. In my statement?</li> <li>Q. No, this is the text messages between you and Mr Llamas. You have been taken already to this section, it is right to say, is it not, that you highlighted to Mr Llamas the Constitutional powers that he had to take over the search warrant potentially from the police and to discontinue it?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And you were in at a similar time you were in regular communications with both Mr Baglietto and Mr Levy, including - and this is the current list - the call with Mr Levy</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>period you proposed a number of ideas to Mr Baglietto about points that could be made against the search warrant?</li> <li>A. Yes, as you can see, I was very concerned about how disgracefully I believed Mr McGrail had behaved with me in my office, how much of an abuse I believed that the search warrant was for all the reasons I have already given in detail and in that context I was discussing with Lewis Baglietto the certain options that I believed he should pursue; for example, the application for the return of the phone, et cetera, but simply</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>MR WAGNER: (To the witness): If we can go to B1418</li> <li>A. In my statement?</li> <li>Q. No, this is the text messages between you and Mr Llamas. You have been taken already to this section, it is right to say, is it not, that you highlighted to Mr Llamas the Constitutional powers that he had to take over the search warrant potentially from the police and to discontinue it?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And you were in at a similar time you were in regular communications with both Mr Baglietto and Mr Levy, including - and this is the current list - the call with Mr Levy on 12 May whilst he was on his way to the</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ \end{array} $	period you proposed a number of ideas to Mr Baglietto about points that could be made against the search warrant? A. Yes, as you can see, I was very concerned about how disgracefully I believed Mr McGrail had behaved with me in my office, how much of an abuse I believed that the search warrant was for all the reasons I have already given in detail and in that context I was discussing with Lewis Baglietto the certain options that I believed he should pursue; for example, the application for the return of the phone, et cetera, but simply sharing ideas with him. I have known him,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>MR WAGNER: (To the witness): If we can go to B1418</li> <li>A. In my statement?</li> <li>Q. No, this is the text messages between you and Mr Llamas. You have been taken already to this section, it is right to say, is it not, that you highlighted to Mr Llamas the Constitutional powers that he had to take over the search warrant potentially from the police and to discontinue it?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And you were in at a similar time you were in regular communications with both Mr Baglietto and Mr Levy, including - and this is the current list - the call with Mr Levy on 12 May whilst he was on his way to the office, is that correct?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	period you proposed a number of ideas to Mr Baglietto about points that could be made against the search warrant? A. Yes, as you can see, I was very concerned about how disgracefully I believed Mr McGrail had behaved with me in my office, how much of an abuse I believed that the search warrant was for all the reasons I have already given in detail and in that context I was discussing with Lewis Baglietto the certain options that I believed he should pursue; for example, the application for the return of the phone, et cetera, but simply sharing ideas with him. I have known him, as he has said, for very, many years. We are close personal friends. These days we don't see each other as much as we would but I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>MR WAGNER: (To the witness): If we can go to B1418</li> <li>A. In my statement?</li> <li>Q. No, this is the text messages between you and Mr Llamas. You have been taken already to this section, it is right to say, is it not, that you highlighted to Mr Llamas the Constitutional powers that he had to take over the search warrant potentially from the police and to discontinue it?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And you were in at a similar time you were in regular communications with both Mr Baglietto and Mr Levy, including - and this is the current list - the call with Mr Levy on 12 May whilst he was on his way to the office, is that correct?</li> <li>A. That's what has been suggested, yes. As</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	period you proposed a number of ideas to Mr Baglietto about points that could be made against the search warrant? A. Yes, as you can see, I was very concerned about how disgracefully I believed Mr McGrail had behaved with me in my office, how much of an abuse I believed that the search warrant was for all the reasons I have already given in detail and in that context I was discussing with Lewis Baglietto the certain options that I believed he should pursue; for example, the application for the return of the phone, et cetera, but simply sharing ideas with him. I have known him, as he has said, for very, many years. We are close personal friends. These days we don't see each other as much as we would but I would consider him one of my closest friends
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array}$	<ul> <li>MR WAGNER: (To the witness): If we can go to B1418</li> <li>A. In my statement?</li> <li>Q. No, this is the text messages between you and Mr Llamas. You have been taken already to this section, it is right to say, is it not, that you highlighted to Mr Llamas the Constitutional powers that he had to take over the search warrant potentially from the police and to discontinue it?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And you were in at a similar time you were in regular communications with both Mr Baglietto and Mr Levy, including - and this is the current list - the call with Mr Levy on 12 May whilst he was on his way to the office, is that correct?</li> <li>A. That's what has been suggested, yes. As you know, there are no call records which</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array} $	period you proposed a number of ideas to Mr Baglietto about points that could be made against the search warrant? A. Yes, as you can see, I was very concerned about how disgracefully I believed Mr McGrail had behaved with me in my office, how much of an abuse I believed that the search warrant was for all the reasons I have already given in detail and in that context I was discussing with Lewis Baglietto the certain options that I believed he should pursue; for example, the application for the return of the phone, et cetera, but simply sharing ideas with him. I have known him, as he has said, for very, many years. We are close personal friends. These days we don't see each other as much as we would but I would consider him one of my closest friends and also a mentor for me in the law. He
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	<ul> <li>MR WAGNER: (To the witness): If we can go to B1418</li> <li>A. In my statement?</li> <li>Q. No, this is the text messages between you and Mr Llamas. You have been taken already to this section, it is right to say, is it not, that you highlighted to Mr Llamas the Constitutional powers that he had to take over the search warrant potentially from the police and to discontinue it?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And you were in at a similar time you were in regular communications with both Mr Baglietto and Mr Levy, including - and this is the current list - the call with Mr Levy on 12 May whilst he was on his way to the office, is that correct?</li> <li>A. That's what has been suggested, yes. As you know, there are no call records which indicate that but I recall a call and yesterday</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	period you proposed a number of ideas to Mr Baglietto about points that could be made against the search warrant? A. Yes, as you can see, I was very concerned about how disgracefully I believed Mr McGrail had behaved with me in my office, how much of an abuse I believed that the search warrant was for all the reasons I have already given in detail and in that context I was discussing with Lewis Baglietto the certain options that I believed he should pursue; for example, the application for the return of the phone, et cetera, but simply sharing ideas with him. I have known him, as he has said, for very, many years. We are close personal friends. These days we don't see each other as much as we would but I would consider him one of my closest friends and also a mentor for me in the law. He always made it fun.
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ \end{array}$	<ul> <li>MR WAGNER: (To the witness): If we can go to B1418</li> <li>A. In my statement?</li> <li>Q. No, this is the text messages between you and Mr Llamas. You have been taken already to this section, it is right to say, is it not, that you highlighted to Mr Llamas the Constitutional powers that he had to take over the search warrant potentially from the police and to discontinue it?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And you were in at a similar time you were in regular communications with both Mr Baglietto and Mr Levy, including - and this is the current list - the call with Mr Levy on 12 May whilst he was on his way to the office, is that correct?</li> <li>A. That's what has been suggested, yes. As you know, there are no call records which indicate that but I recall a call and yesterday in the discussion with Counsel to the Inquiry,</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	<ul> <li>period you proposed a number of ideas to Mr Baglietto about points that could be made against the search warrant?</li> <li>A. Yes, as you can see, I was very concerned about how disgracefully I believed Mr McGrail had behaved with me in my office, how much of an abuse I believed that the search warrant was for all the reasons I have already given in detail and in that context I was discussing with Lewis Baglietto the certain options that I believed he should pursue; for example, the application for the return of the phone, et cetera, but simply sharing ideas with him. I have known him, as he has said, for very, many years. We are close personal friends. These days we don't see each other as much as we would but I would consider him one of my closest friends and also a mentor for me in the law. He always made it fun.</li> <li>Q. You were not sharing it with him because</li> </ul>
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ \end{array}$	<ul> <li>MR WAGNER: (To the witness): If we can go to B1418</li> <li>A. In my statement?</li> <li>Q. No, this is the text messages between you and Mr Llamas. You have been taken already to this section, it is right to say, is it not, that you highlighted to Mr Llamas the Constitutional powers that he had to take over the search warrant potentially from the police and to discontinue it?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And you were in at a similar time you were in regular communications with both Mr Baglietto and Mr Levy, including - and this is the current list - the call with Mr Levy on 12 May whilst he was on his way to the office, is that correct?</li> <li>A. That's what has been suggested, yes. As you know, there are no call records which indicate that but I recall a call and yesterday in the discussion with Counsel to the Inquiry, we agreed it was likely to have happened in</li> </ul>	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ \end{array}$	<ul> <li>period you proposed a number of ideas to Mr Baglietto about points that could be made against the search warrant?</li> <li>A. Yes, as you can see, I was very concerned about how disgracefully I believed Mr McGrail had behaved with me in my office, how much of an abuse I believed that the search warrant was for all the reasons I have already given in detail and in that context I was discussing with Lewis Baglietto the certain options that I believed he should pursue; for example, the application for the return of the phone, et cetera, but simply sharing ideas with him. I have known him, as he has said, for very, many years. We are close personal friends. These days we don't see each other as much as we would but I would consider him one of my closest friends and also a mentor for me in the law. He always made it fun.</li> <li>Q. You were not sharing it with him because he was your friend, you were sharing it with</li> </ul>
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	<ul> <li>MR WAGNER: (To the witness): If we can go to B1418</li> <li>A. In my statement?</li> <li>Q. No, this is the text messages between you and Mr Llamas. You have been taken already to this section, it is right to say, is it not, that you highlighted to Mr Llamas the Constitutional powers that he had to take over the search warrant potentially from the police and to discontinue it?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And you were in at a similar time you were in regular communications with both Mr Baglietto and Mr Levy, including - and this is the current list - the call with Mr Levy on 12 May whilst he was on his way to the office, is that correct?</li> <li>A. That's what has been suggested, yes. As you know, there are no call records which indicate that but I recall a call and yesterday in the discussion with Counsel to the Inquiry, we agreed it was likely to have happened in that period.</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	<ul> <li>period you proposed a number of ideas to Mr Baglietto about points that could be made against the search warrant?</li> <li>A. Yes, as you can see, I was very concerned about how disgracefully I believed Mr McGrail had behaved with me in my office, how much of an abuse I believed that the search warrant was for all the reasons I have already given in detail and in that context I was discussing with Lewis Baglietto the certain options that I believed he should pursue; for example, the application for the return of the phone, et cetera, but simply sharing ideas with him. I have known him, as he has said, for very, many years. We are close personal friends. These days we don't see each other as much as we would but I would consider him one of my closest friends and also a mentor for me in the law. He always made it fun.</li> <li>Q. You were not sharing it with him because he was your friend, you were sharing it with him because you hoped to help Mr Levy?</li> </ul>
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ \end{array}$	<ul> <li>MR WAGNER: (To the witness): If we can go to B1418</li> <li>A. In my statement?</li> <li>Q. No, this is the text messages between you and Mr Llamas. You have been taken already to this section, it is right to say, is it not, that you highlighted to Mr Llamas the Constitutional powers that he had to take over the search warrant potentially from the police and to discontinue it?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And you were in at a similar time you were in regular communications with both Mr Baglietto and Mr Levy, including - and this is the current list - the call with Mr Levy on 12 May whilst he was on his way to the office, is that correct?</li> <li>A. That's what has been suggested, yes. As you know, there are no call records which indicate that but I recall a call and yesterday in the discussion with Counsel to the Inquiry, we agreed it was likely to have happened in</li> </ul>	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ \end{array}$	<ul> <li>period you proposed a number of ideas to Mr Baglietto about points that could be made against the search warrant?</li> <li>A. Yes, as you can see, I was very concerned about how disgracefully I believed Mr McGrail had behaved with me in my office, how much of an abuse I believed that the search warrant was for all the reasons I have already given in detail and in that context I was discussing with Lewis Baglietto the certain options that I believed he should pursue; for example, the application for the return of the phone, et cetera, but simply sharing ideas with him. I have known him, as he has said, for very, many years. We are close personal friends. These days we don't see each other as much as we would but I would consider him one of my closest friends and also a mentor for me in the law. He always made it fun.</li> <li>Q. You were not sharing it with him because he was your friend, you were sharing it with</li> </ul>
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	<ul> <li>MR WAGNER: (To the witness): If we can go to B1418</li> <li>A. In my statement?</li> <li>Q. No, this is the text messages between you and Mr Llamas. You have been taken already to this section, it is right to say, is it not, that you highlighted to Mr Llamas the Constitutional powers that he had to take over the search warrant potentially from the police and to discontinue it?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And you were in at a similar time you were in regular communications with both Mr Baglietto and Mr Levy, including - and this is the current list - the call with Mr Levy on 12 May whilst he was on his way to the office, is that correct?</li> <li>A. That's what has been suggested, yes. As you know, there are no call records which indicate that but I recall a call and yesterday in the discussion with Counsel to the Inquiry, we agreed it was likely to have happened in that period.</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	<ul> <li>period you proposed a number of ideas to Mr Baglietto about points that could be made against the search warrant?</li> <li>A. Yes, as you can see, I was very concerned about how disgracefully I believed Mr McGrail had behaved with me in my office, how much of an abuse I believed that the search warrant was for all the reasons I have already given in detail and in that context I was discussing with Lewis Baglietto the certain options that I believed he should pursue; for example, the application for the return of the phone, et cetera, but simply sharing ideas with him. I have known him, as he has said, for very, many years. We are close personal friends. These days we don't see each other as much as we would but I would consider him one of my closest friends and also a mentor for me in the law. He always made it fun.</li> <li>Q. You were not sharing it with him because he was your friend, you were sharing it with him because you hoped to help Mr Levy?</li> </ul>

39 (Pages 153 to 156)

		1	
1	Q. Mr Levy?	1	Q. I am not asking if they were good ideas, I
2	A. Yes.	2	am just proposing that you were making
3	Q. So would it be fair to say that in those	3	A. I am putting it in the context of my
4	discussions you were	4	research. I mean, I didn't go into Archbold
5	A. When I say "friend," you have got to	5	and check the foot notes to see how it might
6	understand that I have the highest regard for	6	have been done, that was a matter for his
7	this man for reasons which are professional	7	counsel.
8	and which are institutional and which relate	8	Q. If we can go to A224, please, this is your
9	to the jurisdiction. I think "friend" is a word	9	second statement and at paragraph 10.1
10	which makes it seem a little cheap.	10	sorry, paragraph 10, this is your responsive
10	Q. A very good friend	10	statement, the second statement, it is A224
12	A. And with jurisdictional concerns arising	11	statement, the second statement, it is A224
12	from the consequences on Mr Levy, friend or	12	 A. I have it.
13	-	1	
	otherwise as I expressed in the context of my	14	Q. You say, "Mr McGrail says he is under threat of litigation mounted by Hassans in
15 16	discussions, whether it had been somebody	15	e ,
	else who I might not regard as a friend	16	relation to James Levy, warrant devices"
17	because of the jurisdictional consequences.	17	A. Where are you?
18	Q. I will ask you about that concept of	18	Q. At paragraph 10.
19	jurisdictional consequences after lunch, I	19	A. Yes, it says IM.
20	think, but just going finishing off this	20	Q. Yes, " with whom I knew he was in
21	topic, would it be fair to say that you were in	21	contact. The intended insinuation appears to
22	discussions with Mr Baglietto and Mr Levy	22	be that I was in cahoots with Mr Levy in
23	about how to support Mr Levy's claims	23	relation to the threat by him to litigate against
24	against the search warrant?	24	Mr McGrail in relation to the warrant issues.
25	A. I wouldn't say I was in discussions	25	I respond as follows," and then "I recall I had
	Page 157		Page 159
	1 420 137		1 age 157
	1 age 137		1 age 157
1	because Mr Baglietto was his counsel or at	1	communications with Mr Levy about these
1 2		1 2	communications with Mr Levy about these claims. He was incensed about what had
	because Mr Baglietto was his counsel or at	1	communications with Mr Levy about these claims. He was incensed about what had occurred and was very clear in his view that
2	because Mr Baglietto was his counsel or at least his solicitor on the record but that it was	2	communications with Mr Levy about these claims. He was incensed about what had occurred and was very clear in his view that damages claims would be made against the
2 3	because Mr Baglietto was his counsel or at least his solicitor on the record but that it was talking to them about it and, you know,	2 3	communications with Mr Levy about these claims. He was incensed about what had occurred and was very clear in his view that
2 3 4	because Mr Baglietto was his counsel or at least his solicitor on the record but that it was talking to them about it and, you know, therefore having discussions in the non-legal	2 3 4	communications with Mr Levy about these claims. He was incensed about what had occurred and was very clear in his view that damages claims would be made against the
2 3 4 5	because Mr Baglietto was his counsel or at least his solicitor on the record but that it was talking to them about it and, you know, therefore having discussions in the non-legal sense of the word, I was not his counsel, I	2 3 4 5	communications with Mr Levy about these claims. He was incensed about what had occurred and was very clear in his view that damages claims would be made against the Government for the RGP's failures under Mr McGrail's leadership. None of these communications in any way amounted to be
2 3 4 5 6	because Mr Baglietto was his counsel or at least his solicitor on the record but that it was talking to them about it and, you know, therefore having discussions in the non-legal sense of the word, I was not his counsel, I was not his solicitor.	2 3 4 5 6	communications with Mr Levy about these claims. He was incensed about what had occurred and was very clear in his view that damages claims would be made against the Government for the RGP's failures under Mr McGrail's leadership. None of these
2 3 4 5 6 7	because Mr Baglietto was his counsel or at least his solicitor on the record but that it was talking to them about it and, you know, therefore having discussions in the non-legal sense of the word, I was not his counsel, I was not his solicitor. Q. I am sorry, I did not know there was a	2 3 4 5 6 7	communications with Mr Levy about these claims. He was incensed about what had occurred and was very clear in his view that damages claims would be made against the Government for the RGP's failures under Mr McGrail's leadership. None of these communications in any way amounted to be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	because Mr Baglietto was his counsel or at least his solicitor on the record but that it was talking to them about it and, you know, therefore having discussions in the non-legal sense of the word, I was not his counsel, I was not his solicitor. Q. I am sorry, I did not know there was a legal definition of discussions, I just mean a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	communications with Mr Levy about these claims. He was incensed about what had occurred and was very clear in his view that damages claims would be made against the Government for the RGP's failures under Mr McGrail's leadership. None of these communications in any way amounted to be encouraging, supporting or otherwise
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	because Mr Baglietto was his counsel or at least his solicitor on the record but that it was talking to them about it and, you know, therefore having discussions in the non-legal sense of the word, I was not his counsel, I was not his solicitor. Q. I am sorry, I did not know there was a legal definition of discussions, I just mean a conversations?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	communications with Mr Levy about these claims. He was incensed about what had occurred and was very clear in his view that damages claims would be made against the Government for the RGP's failures under Mr McGrail's leadership. None of these communications in any way amounted to be encouraging, supporting or otherwise promoting Mr Levy's claims." Is that not the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>because Mr Baglietto was his counsel or at least his solicitor on the record but that it was talking to them about it and, you know, therefore having discussions in the non-legal sense of the word, I was not his counsel, I was not his solicitor.</li> <li>Q. I am sorry, I did not know there was a legal definition of discussions, I just mean a conversations?</li> <li>A. Well, yes, there is a legal definition of</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	communications with Mr Levy about these claims. He was incensed about what had occurred and was very clear in his view that damages claims would be made against the Government for the RGP's failures under Mr McGrail's leadership. None of these communications in any way amounted to be encouraging, supporting or otherwise promoting Mr Levy's claims." Is that not the opposite of what was happening at the time?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>because Mr Baglietto was his counsel or at least his solicitor on the record but that it was talking to them about it and, you know, therefore having discussions in the non-legal sense of the word, I was not his counsel, I was not his solicitor.</li> <li>Q. I am sorry, I did not know there was a legal definition of discussions, I just mean a conversations?</li> <li>A. Well, yes, there is a legal definition of discussion, in my view, it is advice and I want to make clear that I was not advising.</li> <li>Q. No, but you were talking about how to</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	communications with Mr Levy about these claims. He was incensed about what had occurred and was very clear in his view that damages claims would be made against the Government for the RGP's failures under Mr McGrail's leadership. None of these communications in any way amounted to be encouraging, supporting or otherwise promoting Mr Levy's claims." Is that not the opposite of what was happening at the time? <b>A. No.</b>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>because Mr Baglietto was his counsel or at least his solicitor on the record but that it was talking to them about it and, you know, therefore having discussions in the non-legal sense of the word, I was not his counsel, I was not his solicitor.</li> <li>Q. I am sorry, I did not know there was a legal definition of discussions, I just mean a conversations?</li> <li>A. Well, yes, there is a legal definition of discussion, in my view, it is advice and I want to make clear that I was not advising.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	communications with Mr Levy about these claims. He was incensed about what had occurred and was very clear in his view that damages claims would be made against the Government for the RGP's failures under Mr McGrail's leadership. None of these communications in any way amounted to be encouraging, supporting or otherwise promoting Mr Levy's claims." Is that not the opposite of what was happening at the time? <b>A. No.</b> Q. Had you squared with what you were
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>because Mr Baglietto was his counsel or at least his solicitor on the record but that it was talking to them about it and, you know, therefore having discussions in the non-legal sense of the word, I was not his counsel, I was not his solicitor.</li> <li>Q. I am sorry, I did not know there was a legal definition of discussions, I just mean a conversations?</li> <li>A. Well, yes, there is a legal definition of discussion, in my view, it is advice and I want to make clear that I was not advising.</li> <li>Q. No, but you were talking about how to</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	communications with Mr Levy about these claims. He was incensed about what had occurred and was very clear in his view that damages claims would be made against the Government for the RGP's failures under Mr McGrail's leadership. None of these communications in any way amounted to be encouraging, supporting or otherwise promoting Mr Levy's claims." Is that not the opposite of what was happening at the time? <b>A. No.</b> Q. Had you squared with what you were doing
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>because Mr Baglietto was his counsel or at least his solicitor on the record but that it was talking to them about it and, you know, therefore having discussions in the non-legal sense of the word, I was not his counsel, I was not his solicitor.</li> <li>Q. I am sorry, I did not know there was a legal definition of discussions, I just mean a conversations?</li> <li>A. Well, yes, there is a legal definition of discussion, in my view, it is advice and I want to make clear that I was not advising.</li> <li>Q. No, but you were talking about how to support Mr Levy's claims against the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	communications with Mr Levy about these claims. He was incensed about what had occurred and was very clear in his view that damages claims would be made against the Government for the RGP's failures under Mr McGrail's leadership. None of these communications in any way amounted to be encouraging, supporting or otherwise promoting Mr Levy's claims." Is that not the opposite of what was happening at the time? <b>A. No.</b> Q. Had you squared with what you were doing <b>A. [Over speaking] encouraging, supporting</b>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>because Mr Baglietto was his counsel or at least his solicitor on the record but that it was talking to them about it and, you know, therefore having discussions in the non-legal sense of the word, I was not his counsel, I was not his solicitor.</li> <li>Q. I am sorry, I did not know there was a legal definition of discussions, I just mean a conversations?</li> <li>A. Well, yes, there is a legal definition of discussion, in my view, it is advice and I want to make clear that I was not advising.</li> <li>Q. No, but you were talking about how to support Mr Levy's claims against the warrant?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	communications with Mr Levy about these claims. He was incensed about what had occurred and was very clear in his view that damages claims would be made against the Government for the RGP's failures under Mr McGrail's leadership. None of these communications in any way amounted to be encouraging, supporting or otherwise promoting Mr Levy's claims." Is that not the opposite of what was happening at the time? <b>A. No.</b> Q. Had you squared with what you were doing <b>A. [Over speaking] encouraging, supporting or otherwise promoting, that is almost like</b>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>because Mr Baglietto was his counsel or at least his solicitor on the record but that it was talking to them about it and, you know, therefore having discussions in the non-legal sense of the word, I was not his counsel, I was not his solicitor.</li> <li>Q. I am sorry, I did not know there was a legal definition of discussions, I just mean a conversations?</li> <li>A. Well, yes, there is a legal definition of discussion, in my view, it is advice and I want to make clear that I was not advising.</li> <li>Q. No, but you were talking about how to support Mr Levy's claims against the warrant?</li> <li>A. I was talking with Mr Baglietto and Mr</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ \end{array} $	<ul> <li>communications with Mr Levy about these claims. He was incensed about what had occurred and was very clear in his view that damages claims would be made against the Government for the RGP's failures under Mr McGrail's leadership. None of these communications in any way amounted to be encouraging, supporting or otherwise promoting Mr Levy's claims." Is that not the opposite of what was happening at the time?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Had you squared with what you were doing</li> <li>A. [Over speaking] encouraging, supporting or otherwise promoting a cheer leader for, "Come on, do it, you</li> </ul>
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ \end{array} $	<ul> <li>because Mr Baglietto was his counsel or at least his solicitor on the record but that it was talking to them about it and, you know, therefore having discussions in the non-legal sense of the word, I was not his counsel, I was not his solicitor.</li> <li>Q. I am sorry, I did not know there was a legal definition of discussions, I just mean a conversations?</li> <li>A. Well, yes, there is a legal definition of discussion, in my view, it is advice and I want to make clear that I was not advising.</li> <li>Q. No, but you were talking about how to support Mr Levy's claims against the warrant?</li> <li>A. I was talking with Mr Baglietto and Mr Levy about how disgraceful I thought it was</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>communications with Mr Levy about these claims. He was incensed about what had occurred and was very clear in his view that damages claims would be made against the Government for the RGP's failures under Mr McGrail's leadership. None of these communications in any way amounted to be encouraging, supporting or otherwise promoting Mr Levy's claims." Is that not the opposite of what was happening at the time?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Had you squared with what you were doing</li> <li>A. [Over speaking] encouraging, supporting or otherwise promoting. That is almost like being a cheer leader for, "Come on, do it, you must do it." That is not what I was doing. I</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>because Mr Baglietto was his counsel or at least his solicitor on the record but that it was talking to them about it and, you know, therefore having discussions in the non-legal sense of the word, I was not his counsel, I was not his solicitor.</li> <li>Q. I am sorry, I did not know there was a legal definition of discussions, I just mean a conversations?</li> <li>A. Well, yes, there is a legal definition of discussion, in my view, it is advice and I want to make clear that I was not advising.</li> <li>Q. No, but you were talking about how to support Mr Levy's claims against the warrant?</li> <li>A. I was talking with Mr Baglietto and Mr Levy about how disgraceful I thought it was and these were my ideas of what you might</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>communications with Mr Levy about these claims. He was incensed about what had occurred and was very clear in his view that damages claims would be made against the Government for the RGP's failures under Mr McGrail's leadership. None of these communications in any way amounted to be encouraging, supporting or otherwise promoting Mr Levy's claims." Is that not the opposite of what was happening at the time?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Had you squared with what you were doing</li> <li>A. [Over speaking] encouraging, supporting or otherwise promoting, that is almost like being a cheer leader for, "Come on, do it, you must do it." That is not what I was doing. I was having a discussion with friends about</li> </ul>
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\end{array} $	<ul> <li>because Mr Baglietto was his counsel or at least his solicitor on the record but that it was talking to them about it and, you know, therefore having discussions in the non-legal sense of the word, I was not his counsel, I was not his solicitor.</li> <li>Q. I am sorry, I did not know there was a legal definition of discussions, I just mean a conversations?</li> <li>A. Well, yes, there is a legal definition of discussion, in my view, it is advice and I want to make clear that I was not advising.</li> <li>Q. No, but you were talking about how to support Mr Levy's claims against the warrant?</li> <li>A. I was talking with Mr Baglietto and Mr Levy about how disgraceful I thought it was and these were my ideas of what you might do. It is hardly the most sophisticated ideas.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>communications with Mr Levy about these claims. He was incensed about what had occurred and was very clear in his view that damages claims would be made against the Government for the RGP's failures under Mr McGrail's leadership. None of these communications in any way amounted to be encouraging, supporting or otherwise promoting Mr Levy's claims." Is that not the opposite of what was happening at the time?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Had you squared with what you were doing</li> <li>A. [Over speaking] encouraging, supporting or otherwise promoting, that is almost like being a cheer leader for, "Come on, do it, you must do it." That is not what I was doing. I was having a discussion with friends about what had happened. I didn't say, "You must</li> </ul>
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	<ul> <li>because Mr Baglietto was his counsel or at least his solicitor on the record but that it was talking to them about it and, you know, therefore having discussions in the non-legal sense of the word, I was not his counsel, I was not his solicitor.</li> <li>Q. I am sorry, I did not know there was a legal definition of discussions, I just mean a conversations?</li> <li>A. Well, yes, there is a legal definition of discussion, in my view, it is advice and I want to make clear that I was not advising.</li> <li>Q. No, but you were talking about how to support Mr Levy's claims against the warrant?</li> <li>A. I was talking with Mr Baglietto and Mr Levy about how disgraceful I thought it was and these were my ideas of what you might do. It is hardly the most sophisticated ideas. I mean, the application for the return of the</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array} $	<ul> <li>communications with Mr Levy about these claims. He was incensed about what had occurred and was very clear in his view that damages claims would be made against the Government for the RGP's failures under Mr McGrail's leadership. None of these communications in any way amounted to be encouraging, supporting or otherwise promoting Mr Levy's claims." Is that not the opposite of what was happening at the time?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Had you squared with what you were doing</li> <li>A. [Over speaking] encouraging, supporting or otherwise promoting, that is almost like being a cheer leader for, "Come on, do it, you must do it." That is not what I was doing. I was having a discussion with friends about what had happened. I didn't say, "You must do it." I didn't say, "You have to do it, come</li> </ul>
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	<ul> <li>because Mr Baglietto was his counsel or at least his solicitor on the record but that it was talking to them about it and, you know, therefore having discussions in the non-legal sense of the word, I was not his counsel, I was not his solicitor.</li> <li>Q. I am sorry, I did not know there was a legal definition of discussions, I just mean a conversations?</li> <li>A. Well, yes, there is a legal definition of discussion, in my view, it is advice and I want to make clear that I was not advising.</li> <li>Q. No, but you were talking about how to support Mr Levy's claims against the warrant?</li> <li>A. I was talking with Mr Baglietto and Mr Levy about how disgraceful I thought it was and these were my ideas of what you might do. It is hardly the most sophisticated ideas. I mean, the application for the return of the phone was something I learned in the first</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	<ul> <li>communications with Mr Levy about these claims. He was incensed about what had occurred and was very clear in his view that damages claims would be made against the Government for the RGP's failures under Mr McGrail's leadership. None of these communications in any way amounted to be encouraging, supporting or otherwise promoting Mr Levy's claims." Is that not the opposite of what was happening at the time?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Had you squared with what you were doing</li> <li>A. [Over speaking] encouraging, supporting or otherwise promoting, that is almost like being a cheer leader for, "Come on, do it, you must do it." That is not what I was doing. I was having a discussion with friends about what had happened. I didn't say, "You must do it." I didn't say, "You have to do it, come on, make sure that you file it before nine</li> </ul>
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ \end{array}$	<ul> <li>because Mr Baglietto was his counsel or at least his solicitor on the record but that it was talking to them about it and, you know, therefore having discussions in the non-legal sense of the word, I was not his counsel, I was not his solicitor.</li> <li>Q. I am sorry, I did not know there was a legal definition of discussions, I just mean a conversations?</li> <li>A. Well, yes, there is a legal definition of discussion, in my view, it is advice and I want to make clear that I was not advising.</li> <li>Q. No, but you were talking about how to support Mr Levy's claims against the warrant?</li> <li>A. I was talking with Mr Baglietto and Mr Levy about how disgraceful I thought it was and these were my ideas of what you might do. It is hardly the most sophisticated ideas. I mean, the application for the return of the phone was something I learned in the first week that I came back from university and</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>communications with Mr Levy about these claims. He was incensed about what had occurred and was very clear in his view that damages claims would be made against the Government for the RGP's failures under Mr McGrail's leadership. None of these communications in any way amounted to be encouraging, supporting or otherwise promoting Mr Levy's claims." Is that not the opposite of what was happening at the time?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Had you squared with what you were doing</li> <li>A. [Over speaking] encouraging, supporting or otherwise promoting, that is almost like being a cheer leader for, "Come on, do it, you must do it." That is not what I was doing. I was having a discussion with friends about what had happened. I didn't say, "You must do it." I didn't say, "You have to do it, come on, make sure that you file it before nine o'clock tomorrow." I don't accept that I was</li> </ul>
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ \end{array}$	<ul> <li>because Mr Baglietto was his counsel or at least his solicitor on the record but that it was talking to them about it and, you know, therefore having discussions in the non-legal sense of the word, I was not his counsel, I was not his solicitor.</li> <li>Q. I am sorry, I did not know there was a legal definition of discussions, I just mean a conversations?</li> <li>A. Well, yes, there is a legal definition of discussion, in my view, it is advice and I want to make clear that I was not advising.</li> <li>Q. No, but you were talking about how to support Mr Levy's claims against the warrant?</li> <li>A. I was talking with Mr Baglietto and Mr Levy about how disgraceful I thought it was and these were my ideas of what you might do. It is hardly the most sophisticated ideas.</li> <li>I mean, the application for the return of the phone was something I learned in the first week that I came back from university and was thrown in at the deep end in the</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	<ul> <li>communications with Mr Levy about these claims. He was incensed about what had occurred and was very clear in his view that damages claims would be made against the Government for the RGP's failures under Mr McGrail's leadership. None of these communications in any way amounted to be encouraging, supporting or otherwise promoting Mr Levy's claims." Is that not the opposite of what was happening at the time?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Had you squared with what you were doing</li> <li>A. [Over speaking] encouraging, supporting or otherwise promoting, that is almost like being a cheer leader for, "Come on, do it, you must do it." That is not what I was doing. I was having a discussion with friends about what had happened. I didn't say, "You must do it." I didn't say, "You have to do it, come on, make sure that you file it before nine o'clock tomorrow." I don't accept that I was encouraging, supporting or otherwise</li> </ul>

40 (Pages 157 to 160)

Page 160

1 he has said, was in a very difficult position 2 and in a very difficult mental state at the 3 time. But having those discussions does not, 4 in my view, vitiate what I have said here 5 which remains true. 6 Q. Is that sentence a complete reversal of 7 what the true position was ----8 A. No. 9 Q. --- which was that you were offering not 10 just support but you were offering legal ideas 11 for them to put in their letters to the RGP? 12 A. We were having those --- I don't know 13 whether those ideas made it into the letter to 14 the RGP. 15 Q. You were offering ideas that they could 16 use in the letters? 17 A. Yes, in a discussion with friends. I told 18 you specifically ----19 Q. A discussion with friends? 20 A. Well, you accepted that it was a 21 discussion with friends a moment ago ----22 Q. It is not for me to accept anything ----23 A. Well, let's be very clear, let's be very 24 clear, this was not legal advice. It was not 25 legal advice. This was far too serious for me

## Page 161

1 to take the view that I could have given, even 1 2 from a capacity of not being in practice as a 2 3 3 lawyer, detailed legal advice. I would have 4 known that I would have had to go to 4 5 5 Archbold and check every single footnote on 6 search warrants and the grant of them in 6 7 7 order to be able to properly advise, so I was 8 8 giving very high level ideas which did not 9 9 amount to encouraging, supporting or 10 10 otherwise promoting Mr Levy's claims. I 11 11 don't accept that I have in any way failed in 12 my duty of candour to the tribunal by setting 12 13 13 this out in this way because I still believe it is 14 14 true. 15 15 Q. Is this not just another example of you 16 16 not giving the whole truth to the Inquiry? 17 17 A. No, it's another example of my ensuring 18 that I give the Inquiry the truth, the whole 18 19 19 truth and nothing but the truth, although that 20 20 is sometimes relatively complex given how 21 21 much an excess of facts there is here that we 22 22 are all trying to trawl through in order to get 23 to the truth of the subject matter of this 23 24 24 Inquiry. 25 Q. I have just one more quick matter before -25 Page 162

1	I note the time, sir. A188, please
2	A. Is this an exhibit to my first statement?
3	Q. No, it is A188, it should be your first
4	statement.
5	A. I have got it now, yes.
6	Q. You say in 31, "This is the criminal
7	investigation referred to by Mr McGrail' s
8	lawyers in the email of 5 June 2020. I have
9	never interfered in any police investigation,
10	still less sought or tried to divert its course,
11	and I certainly did not do so in this case."
12	You have admitted that you angrily
13	criticised the Commissioner of Police about
14	an ongoing police operation. Is that correct?
15	A. Yes, an operation not an investigation.
16	Q. So that is your answer, is it, that because
17	you were criticising for an operation and not
18	an investigation, that is how you can square
19	what you did with this statement that you
20	never interfered with an investigation?
21	A. Absolutely. I never asked them not to
22	carry out the investigation into Perez and
23	Corneli, I never asked them to stop the
24	investigation of James Levy, I never asked
25	them to stop any investigation whatsoever. I

## Page 163

just happen to believe, then as I do now, that a search warrant was the wrong way to go about getting particular evidence in that investigation. Q. What did you ----A. They are two completely different aspects. Q. What did you hope to achieve? When you called Mr McGrail into your office on 12 May, what were you hoping would be the outcome of that meeting? A. I have already given evidence in that respect in my statement and here. I was very clear that the issue for me was the jurisdictional risk which he himself had alluded to when he had come to brief me in respect of the other search warrant that he briefed me on which was in relation to a much more junior member of the Bar. Q. We are just about to get to lunch, I want to stick very specifically on this meeting. What did you hope to achieve in that meeting? What did you hope Mr McGrail would come out thinking differently than when he came in?

Page 164

41 (Pages 161 to 164)

Lower Ground Floor, 46 Chancery Lane www.epiqglobal.com casemanagers@epiqglobal.com London, WC2A 1JE

1	A. I didn't necessarily expect that. I might	1	him answering the question.
2	have left that meeting thinking differently.	2	MR WAGNER: No, I cannot.
3	So I expected to understand why in the	3	THE CHAIRMAN: Most importantly, you
4	context of this more senior member of the	4	asked him that in the course of one and a half
5	Bar it was appropriate to go by way of search	5	hours.
6	warrant rather than by way of a production	6	THE WITNESS: It is uncomfortable for
7	order.	7	you to hear but there were two lies; the first
8	Q. Yes	8	that the Attorney General had advised that
9	A. And he might simply have said to me,	9	the warrant should be obtained, it should
10	"Well, Chief Minister, I am sorry to have to	10	proceed by way of search warrant which the
11	tell you, I know that he is a very good friend	11	Attorney General very quickly said was not
12	of yours and you have a very high regard for	12	true and, second, that he had been advised by
13	him, and so do many other people, but we	13	the DPP to proceed by way of search warrant
14	were convinced that he was going to destroy	14	and that is what led to my loss of confidence.
15	evidence unless we went down the route of	15	If Ian McGrail had not lied to me, if he had
16	the search warrant."	16	simply said this was the decision that the
17	THE CHAIRMAN: (To the witness): That	17	police took, that it is the decision the police
18	is precisely what was said in the application	18	are entitled to take and he stood by it, then
19	at the magistrates' court.	19	that would have been it on that day, full stop,
20	A. Yes, but the question is about what was	20	but that's not what he did. He lied to me.
21	said to me in the meeting of 12 May. What	21	MR WAGNER: (To the witness): But you
22	was I expecting	22	wanted information? That is why you called
23	MR WAGNER: (To the witness): No, what	23	the meeting?
24	were you hoping would be the outcome of	24	A. In exactly the same way as he had given
25	that meeting?	25	me information about another search warrant
	Page 165		Page 167
1	A. I wasn't hoping there would be an	1	in relation to a more junior member of the
1 2	A. I wasn't hoping there would be an outcome other than my having the	1 2	in relation to a more junior member of the Bar.
	A. I wasn't hoping there would be an outcome other than my having the information, as I have told you, of why in	1 2 3	-
2	outcome other than my having the	2	Bar.
2 3	outcome other than my having the information, as I have told you, of why in	2 3	<b>Bar.</b> MR WAGNER: Yes, thank you. I am happy
2 3 4	outcome other than my having the information, as I have told you, of why in relation to this more senior member of the	2 3 4	<b>Bar.</b> MR WAGNER: Yes, thank you. I am happy to stop there.
2 3 4 5	outcome other than my having the information, as I have told you, of why in relation to this more senior member of the Bar the thing that I had been told was so	2 3 4 5	<b>Bar.</b> MR WAGNER: Yes, thank you. I am happy to stop there. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you very
2 3 4 5 6	outcome other than my having the information, as I have told you, of why in relation to this more senior member of the Bar the thing that I had been told was so sensitive about a more junior member of the Bar was appropriate. Q. You just wanted information? That is	2 3 4 5 6	<b>Bar.</b> MR WAGNER: Yes, thank you. I am happy to stop there. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you very much. One o'clock, please.
2 3 4 5 6 7	outcome other than my having the information, as I have told you, of why in relation to this more senior member of the Bar the thing that I had been told was so sensitive about a more junior member of the Bar was appropriate. Q. You just wanted information? That is what your answer is, you were hoping to get	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Bar. MR WAGNER: Yes, thank you. I am happy to stop there. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you very much. One o'clock, please. (13.04) (The short adjournment) (14.00)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	outcome other than my having the information, as I have told you, of why in relation to this more senior member of the Bar the thing that I had been told was so sensitive about a more junior member of the Bar was appropriate. Q. You just wanted information? That is what your answer is, you were hoping to get your hope for that meeting was to get	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Bar. MR WAGNER: Yes, thank you. I am happy to stop there. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you very much. One o'clock, please. (13.04) (The short adjournment) (14.00) THE CHAIRMAN: We are five minutes late
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>outcome other than my having the information, as I have told you, of why in relation to this more senior member of the Bar the thing that I had been told was so sensitive about a more junior member of the Bar was appropriate.</li> <li>Q. You just wanted information? That is what your answer is, you were hoping to get your hope for that meeting was to get information from Mr McGrail? Is that fair?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Bar. MR WAGNER: Yes, thank you. I am happy to stop there. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you very much. One o'clock, please. (13.04) (The short adjournment) (14.00) THE CHAIRMAN: We are five minutes late starting so I think it is only fair to give you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>outcome other than my having the information, as I have told you, of why in relation to this more senior member of the Bar the thing that I had been told was so sensitive about a more junior member of the Bar was appropriate.</li> <li>Q. You just wanted information? That is what your answer is, you were hoping to get your hope for that meeting was to get information from Mr McGrail? Is that fair?</li> <li>A. Absolutely.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Bar. MR WAGNER: Yes, thank you. I am happy to stop there. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you very much. One o'clock, please. (13.04) (The short adjournment) (14.00) THE CHAIRMAN: We are five minutes late starting so I think it is only fair to give you another five minutes to yes, quarter past 3.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	outcome other than my having the information, as I have told you, of why in relation to this more senior member of the Bar the thing that I had been told was so sensitive about a more junior member of the Bar was appropriate. Q. You just wanted information? That is what your answer is, you were hoping to get your hope for that meeting was to get information from Mr McGrail? Is that fair? A. Absolutely. Q. All right.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Bar. MR WAGNER: Yes, thank you. I am happy to stop there. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you very much. One o'clock, please. (13.04) (The short adjournment) (14.00) THE CHAIRMAN: We are five minutes late starting so I think it is only fair to give you another five minutes to yes, quarter past 3. MR WAGNER: Thank you. Just to tie up
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>outcome other than my having the information, as I have told you, of why in relation to this more senior member of the Bar the thing that I had been told was so sensitive about a more junior member of the Bar was appropriate.</li> <li>Q. You just wanted information? That is what your answer is, you were hoping to get your hope for that meeting was to get information from Mr McGrail? Is that fair?</li> <li>A. Absolutely.</li> <li>Q. All right.</li> <li>A. Information as to why on earth they had</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Bar. MR WAGNER: Yes, thank you. I am happy to stop there. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you very much. One o'clock, please. (13.04) (The short adjournment) (14.00) THE CHAIRMAN: We are five minutes late starting so I think it is only fair to give you another five minutes to yes, quarter past 3. MR WAGNER: Thank you. Just to tie up one of the points we were discussing before
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>outcome other than my having the information, as I have told you, of why in relation to this more senior member of the Bar the thing that I had been told was so sensitive about a more junior member of the Bar was appropriate.</li> <li>Q. You just wanted information? That is what your answer is, you were hoping to get your hope for that meeting was to get information from Mr McGrail? Is that fair?</li> <li>A. Absolutely.</li> <li>Q. All right.</li> <li>A. Information as to why on earth they had decided it was appropriate to go by way of</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Bar. MR WAGNER: Yes, thank you. I am happy to stop there. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you very much. One o'clock, please. (13.04) (The short adjournment) (14.00) THE CHAIRMAN: We are five minutes late starting so I think it is only fair to give you another five minutes to yes, quarter past 3. MR WAGNER: Thank you. Just to tie up one of the points we were discussing before lunch, you said that sending ideas about legal
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>outcome other than my having the information, as I have told you, of why in relation to this more senior member of the Bar the thing that I had been told was so sensitive about a more junior member of the Bar was appropriate.</li> <li>Q. You just wanted information? That is what your answer is, you were hoping to get your hope for that meeting was to get information from Mr McGrail? Is that fair?</li> <li>A. Absolutely.</li> <li>Q. All right.</li> <li>A. Information as to why on earth they had decided it was appropriate to go by way of search warrant rather than production order.</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ \end{array} $	<ul> <li>Bar.</li> <li>MR WAGNER: Yes, thank you. I am happy to stop there.</li> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you very much. One o'clock, please.</li> <li>(13.04)</li> <li>(The short adjournment)</li> <li>(14.00)</li> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: We are five minutes late starting so I think it is only fair to give you another five minutes to yes, quarter past 3.</li> <li>MR WAGNER: Thank you. Just to tie up one of the points we were discussing before lunch, you said that sending ideas about legal options to Mr Levy's lawyer was not</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>outcome other than my having the information, as I have told you, of why in relation to this more senior member of the Bar the thing that I had been told was so sensitive about a more junior member of the Bar was appropriate.</li> <li>Q. You just wanted information? That is what your answer is, you were hoping to get your hope for that meeting was to get information from Mr McGrail? Is that fair?</li> <li>A. Absolutely.</li> <li>Q. All right.</li> <li>A. Information as to why on earth they had decided it was appropriate to go by way of search warrant rather than production order.</li> <li>I think I have been explicit about that and</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ \end{array} $	<ul> <li>Bar.</li> <li>MR WAGNER: Yes, thank you. I am happy to stop there.</li> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you very much. One o'clock, please.</li> <li>(13.04)</li> <li>(The short adjournment)</li> <li>(14.00)</li> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: We are five minutes late starting so I think it is only fair to give you another five minutes to yes, quarter past 3.</li> <li>MR WAGNER: Thank you. Just to tie up one of the points we were discussing before lunch, you said that sending ideas about legal options to Mr Levy's lawyer was not promoting Mr Levy's claims. Is that right?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>outcome other than my having the information, as I have told you, of why in relation to this more senior member of the Bar the thing that I had been told was so sensitive about a more junior member of the Bar was appropriate.</li> <li>Q. You just wanted information? That is what your answer is, you were hoping to get your hope for that meeting was to get information from Mr McGrail? Is that fair?</li> <li>A. Absolutely.</li> <li>Q. All right.</li> <li>A. Information as to why on earth they had decided it was appropriate to go by way of search warrant rather than production order.</li> <li>I think I have been explicit about that and then what happens is that the answers that I</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Bar.</li> <li>MR WAGNER: Yes, thank you. I am happy to stop there.</li> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you very much. One o'clock, please.</li> <li>(13.04)</li> <li>(The short adjournment)</li> <li>(14.00)</li> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: We are five minutes late starting so I think it is only fair to give you another five minutes to yes, quarter past 3.</li> <li>MR WAGNER: Thank you. Just to tie up one of the points we were discussing before lunch, you said that sending ideas about legal options to Mr Levy's lawyer was not promoting Mr Levy's claims. Is that right?</li> <li>A. I took a point that it wasn't within the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>outcome other than my having the information, as I have told you, of why in relation to this more senior member of the Bar the thing that I had been told was so sensitive about a more junior member of the Bar was appropriate.</li> <li>Q. You just wanted information? That is what your answer is, you were hoping to get your hope for that meeting was to get information from Mr McGrail? Is that fair?</li> <li>A. Absolutely.</li> <li>Q. All right.</li> <li>A. Information as to why on earth they had decided it was appropriate to go by way of search warrant rather than production order.</li> <li>I think I have been explicit about that and then what happens is that the answers that I am given are untruthful, they are in fact lies</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\end{array} $	<ul> <li>Bar.</li> <li>MR WAGNER: Yes, thank you. I am happy to stop there.</li> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you very much. One o'clock, please.</li> <li>(13.04)</li> <li>(The short adjournment)</li> <li>(14.00)</li> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: We are five minutes late starting so I think it is only fair to give you another five minutes to yes, quarter past 3.</li> <li>MR WAGNER: Thank you. Just to tie up one of the points we were discussing before lunch, you said that sending ideas about legal options to Mr Levy's lawyer was not promoting Mr Levy's claims. Is that right?</li> <li>A. I took a point that it wasn't within the terms of the sentence that you had referred</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>outcome other than my having the information, as I have told you, of why in relation to this more senior member of the Bar the thing that I had been told was so sensitive about a more junior member of the Bar was appropriate.</li> <li>Q. You just wanted information? That is what your answer is, you were hoping to get your hope for that meeting was to get information from Mr McGrail? Is that fair?</li> <li>A. Absolutely.</li> <li>Q. All right.</li> <li>A. Information as to why on earth they had decided it was appropriate to go by way of search warrant rather than production order.</li> <li>I think I have been explicit about that and then what happens is that the answers that I am given are untruthful, they are in fact lies and not just one, but two.</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	<ul> <li>Bar.</li> <li>MR WAGNER: Yes, thank you. I am happy to stop there.</li> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you very much. One o'clock, please.</li> <li>(13.04)</li> <li>(The short adjournment)</li> <li>(14.00)</li> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: We are five minutes late starting so I think it is only fair to give you another five minutes to yes, quarter past 3.</li> <li>MR WAGNER: Thank you. Just to tie up one of the points we were discussing before lunch, you said that sending ideas about legal options to Mr Levy's claims. Is that right?</li> <li>A. I took a point that it wasn't within the terms of the sentence that you had referred me to in my statement. I forget which it was.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>outcome other than my having the information, as I have told you, of why in relation to this more senior member of the Bar the thing that I had been told was so sensitive about a more junior member of the Bar was appropriate.</li> <li>Q. You just wanted information? That is what your answer is, you were hoping to get your hope for that meeting was to get information from Mr McGrail? Is that fair?</li> <li>A. Absolutely.</li> <li>Q. All right.</li> <li>A. Information as to why on earth they had decided it was appropriate to go by way of search warrant rather than production order.</li> <li>I think I have been explicit about that and then what happens is that the answers that I am given are untruthful, they are in fact lies and not just one, but two.</li> <li>Q. You have said that many, many times.</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	<ul> <li>Bar.</li> <li>MR WAGNER: Yes, thank you. I am happy to stop there.</li> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you very much. One o'clock, please.</li> <li>(13.04)</li> <li>(The short adjournment)</li> <li>(14.00)</li> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: We are five minutes late starting so I think it is only fair to give you another five minutes to yes, quarter past 3.</li> <li>MR WAGNER: Thank you. Just to tie up one of the points we were discussing before lunch, you said that sending ideas about legal options to Mr Levy's lawyer was not promoting Mr Levy's claims. Is that right?</li> <li>A. I took a point that it wasn't within the terms of the sentence that you had referred me to in my statement. I forget which it was.</li> <li>Q. At the time in mid May when you were</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>outcome other than my having the information, as I have told you, of why in relation to this more senior member of the Bar the thing that I had been told was so sensitive about a more junior member of the Bar was appropriate.</li> <li>Q. You just wanted information? That is what your answer is, you were hoping to get  your hope for that meeting was to get information from Mr McGrail? Is that fair?</li> <li>A. Absolutely.</li> <li>Q. All right.</li> <li>A. Information as to why on earth they had decided it was appropriate to go by way of search warrant rather than production order.</li> <li>I think I have been explicit about that and then what happens is that the answers that I am given are untruthful, they are in fact lies and not just one, but two.</li> <li>Q. You have said that many, many times.</li> <li>A. First, that the Attorney General had</li> </ul>	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ \end{array}$	<ul> <li>Bar.</li> <li>MR WAGNER: Yes, thank you. I am happy to stop there.</li> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you very much. One o'clock, please.</li> <li>(13.04)</li> <li>(The short adjournment)</li> <li>(14.00)</li> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: We are five minutes late starting so I think it is only fair to give you another five minutes to yes, quarter past 3.</li> <li>MR WAGNER: Thank you. Just to tie up one of the points we were discussing before lunch, you said that sending ideas about legal options to Mr Levy's lawyer was not promoting Mr Levy's claims. Is that right?</li> <li>A. I took a point that it wasn't within the terms of the sentence that you had referred me to in my statement. I forget which it was.</li> <li>Q. At the time in mid May when you were sending those options to Mr Baglietto, you</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>outcome other than my having the information, as I have told you, of why in relation to this more senior member of the Bar the thing that I had been told was so sensitive about a more junior member of the Bar was appropriate.</li> <li>Q. You just wanted information? That is what your answer is, you were hoping to get your hope for that meeting was to get information from Mr McGrail? Is that fair?</li> <li>A. Absolutely.</li> <li>Q. All right.</li> <li>A. Information as to why on earth they had decided it was appropriate to go by way of search warrant rather than production order.</li> <li>I think I have been explicit about that and then what happens is that the answers that I am given are untruthful, they are in fact lies and not just one, but two.</li> <li>Q. You have said that many, many times.</li> <li>A. First, that the Attorney General had advised in that respect and second I know</li> </ul>	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ \end{array}$	<ul> <li>Bar.</li> <li>MR WAGNER: Yes, thank you. I am happy to stop there.</li> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you very much. One o'clock, please.</li> <li>(13.04)</li> <li>(The short adjournment)</li> <li>(14.00)</li> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: We are five minutes late starting so I think it is only fair to give you another five minutes to yes, quarter past 3.</li> <li>MR WAGNER: Thank you. Just to tie up one of the points we were discussing before lunch, you said that sending ideas about legal options to Mr Levy's lawyer was not promoting Mr Levy's claims. Is that right?</li> <li>A. I took a point that it wasn't within the terms of the sentence that you had referred me to in my statement. I forget which it was.</li> <li>Q. At the time in mid May when you were sending those options to Mr Levy was</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>outcome other than my having the information, as I have told you, of why in relation to this more senior member of the Bar the thing that I had been told was so sensitive about a more junior member of the Bar was appropriate.</li> <li>Q. You just wanted information? That is what your answer is, you were hoping to get  your hope for that meeting was to get information from Mr McGrail? Is that fair?</li> <li>A. Absolutely.</li> <li>Q. All right.</li> <li>A. Information as to why on earth they had decided it was appropriate to go by way of search warrant rather than production order.</li> <li>I think I have been explicit about that and then what happens is that the answers that I am given are untruthful, they are in fact lies and not just one, but two.</li> <li>Q. You have said that many, many times.</li> <li>A. First, that the Attorney General had advised in that respect and second I know it is uncomfortable for you to hear but</li> </ul>	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	<ul> <li>Bar.</li> <li>MR WAGNER: Yes, thank you. I am happy to stop there.</li> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you very much. One o'clock, please.</li> <li>(13.04)</li> <li>(The short adjournment)</li> <li>(14.00)</li> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: We are five minutes late starting so I think it is only fair to give you another five minutes to yes, quarter past 3.</li> <li>MR WAGNER: Thank you. Just to tie up one of the points we were discussing before lunch, you said that sending ideas about legal options to Mr Levy's lawyer was not promoting Mr Levy's claims. Is that right?</li> <li>A. I took a point that it wasn't within the terms of the sentence that you had referred me to in my statement. I forget which it was.</li> <li>Q. At the time in mid May when you were sending those options to Mr Levy was a suspect. Is that right?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>outcome other than my having the information, as I have told you, of why in relation to this more senior member of the Bar the thing that I had been told was so sensitive about a more junior member of the Bar was appropriate.</li> <li>Q. You just wanted information? That is what your answer is, you were hoping to get your hope for that meeting was to get information from Mr McGrail? Is that fair?</li> <li>A. Absolutely.</li> <li>Q. All right.</li> <li>A. Information as to why on earth they had decided it was appropriate to go by way of search warrant rather than production order.</li> <li>I think I have been explicit about that and then what happens is that the answers that I am given are untruthful, they are in fact lies and not just one, but two.</li> <li>Q. You have said that many, many times.</li> <li>A. First, that the Attorney General had advised in that respect and second I know</li> </ul>	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ \end{array}$	<ul> <li>Bar.</li> <li>MR WAGNER: Yes, thank you. I am happy to stop there.</li> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you very much. One o'clock, please.</li> <li>(13.04)</li> <li>(The short adjournment)</li> <li>(14.00)</li> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: We are five minutes late starting so I think it is only fair to give you another five minutes to yes, quarter past 3.</li> <li>MR WAGNER: Thank you. Just to tie up one of the points we were discussing before lunch, you said that sending ideas about legal options to Mr Levy's lawyer was not promoting Mr Levy's claims. Is that right?</li> <li>A. I took a point that it wasn't within the terms of the sentence that you had referred me to in my statement. I forget which it was.</li> <li>Q. At the time in mid May when you were sending those options to Mr Levy was</li> </ul>

www.epiqglobal.com Lower Ground Floor, 46 Chancery Lane casemanagers@epiqglobal.com London, WC2A 1JE

42 (Pages 165 to 168)

1	· · · · · · · · · · ·	1	
1	time which was that he had had a search		at the time. Although you did say to your
2	warrant executed in respect of him and that	2	credit that you thought that was debatable.
3	there were questions that he had to answer.	3	Although my rejoinder to that was that the
4	Q. Mr Baglietto must have told you in one of	4	Gibraltar Parliament had been asked to
5	your myriad conversations that Mr Levy was	5	legislate in that respect.
6	a suspect.	6	Q. I did not say whether it was debatable or
7	A. You're making an assumption about the		not, but it is being debated. But the point is
8	things that Mr Baglietto would have said	8	at the very least would you accept that by
9 10	during the course of those meetings. I can't	9 10	mid May you knew he could be a suspect?
10	recall it in order to be able to give you truthful evidence that he did or that he did	10	A. I knew by then that the search warrant had been executed in respect of him, and I
12	not.	12	have told you about what I think about who
12	Q. No. Did Mr Levy tell you he was	13	search warrants are executed against.
13	suspected of criminal offences?	14	Q. Looking back, would you do anything
15	A. I believe that he may have said words that	15	differently now to avoid the impression that
16	suggested that he felt it was grossly unfair	16	you were supporting the criminal suspect in
17	that there was any suggestion that he might	17	his claims against the police?
18	have been involved in anything that was	18	A. I don't think I ever gave the impression
19	criminal.	19	that I was supporting a criminal suspect in
20	Q. So he said to you words to the effect of	20	respect of his claims against the police.
21	sorry, he said to you something which made	21	Q. Yes.
22	you realise he was suspected of criminal	22	A. But in any event when I look back upon
23	behaviour.	23	my life there are many things that I would do
24	A. No, he said the things I have told you he	24	differently. No doubt there are things that I
25	said to me.	25	would probably do differently with the basis
	Page 169		Page 171
	1 480 107		I use I / I
			0
1	Q. Yes, but if he said to you, "It is absurd	1	of advice perhaps composure, not just in
1 2	Q. Yes, but if he said to you, "It is absurd that I could be accused of any criminal	1 2	
			of advice perhaps composure, not just in
2	that I could be accused of any criminal	2	of advice perhaps composure, not just in relation to this matter but in relation to many.
2 3	that I could be accused of any criminal offence", you knew that he was accused of	2 3	of advice perhaps composure, not just in relation to this matter but in relation to many. Q. But in relation to this matter would you do anything differently when you look back at those messages and the meetings? When
2 3 4	<ul><li>that I could be accused of any criminal offence", you knew that he was accused of some sort of criminal offence. Is that fair?</li><li>A. He was never accused of any criminal offence.</li></ul>	2 3 4 5 6	of advice perhaps composure, not just in relation to this matter but in relation to many. Q. But in relation to this matter would you do anything differently when you look back at those messages and the meetings? When you recall the meetings with Mr Baglietto
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul><li>that I could be accused of any criminal offence", you knew that he was accused of some sort of criminal offence. Is that fair?</li><li>A. He was never accused of any criminal offence.</li><li>Q. Suspected. Do you agree?</li></ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	of advice perhaps composure, not just in relation to this matter but in relation to many. Q. But in relation to this matter would you do anything differently when you look back at those messages and the meetings? When you recall the meetings with Mr Baglietto and Mr Levy, would you do anything
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>that I could be accused of any criminal offence", you knew that he was accused of some sort of criminal offence. Is that fair?</li> <li>A. He was never accused of any criminal offence.</li> <li>Q. Suspected. Do you agree?</li> <li>A. I don't necessarily agree with your</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	of advice perhaps composure, not just in relation to this matter but in relation to many. Q. But in relation to this matter would you do anything differently when you look back at those messages and the meetings? When you recall the meetings with Mr Baglietto and Mr Levy, would you do anything differently?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>that I could be accused of any criminal offence", you knew that he was accused of some sort of criminal offence. Is that fair?</li> <li>A. He was never accused of any criminal offence.</li> <li>Q. Suspected. Do you agree?</li> <li>A. I don't necessarily agree with your characterisation.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	of advice perhaps composure, not just in relation to this matter but in relation to many. Q. But in relation to this matter would you do anything differently when you look back at those messages and the meetings? When you recall the meetings with Mr Baglietto and Mr Levy, would you do anything differently? A. I don't think it's fair to expect me to give
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>that I could be accused of any criminal offence", you knew that he was accused of some sort of criminal offence. Is that fair?</li> <li>A. He was never accused of any criminal offence.</li> <li>Q. Suspected. Do you agree?</li> <li>A. I don't necessarily agree with your characterisation.</li> <li>Q. So you are saying you did not know he</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	of advice perhaps composure, not just in relation to this matter but in relation to many. Q. But in relation to this matter would you do anything differently when you look back at those messages and the meetings? When you recall the meetings with Mr Baglietto and Mr Levy, would you do anything differently? A. I don't think it's fair to expect me to give you an answer in respect of the myriad
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>that I could be accused of any criminal offence", you knew that he was accused of some sort of criminal offence. Is that fair?</li> <li>A. He was never accused of any criminal offence.</li> <li>Q. Suspected. Do you agree?</li> <li>A. I don't necessarily agree with your characterisation.</li> <li>Q. So you are saying you did not know he was suspected of a criminal offence.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	of advice perhaps composure, not just in relation to this matter but in relation to many. Q. But in relation to this matter would you do anything differently when you look back at those messages and the meetings? When you recall the meetings with Mr Baglietto and Mr Levy, would you do anything differently? A. I don't think it's fair to expect me to give you an answer in respect of the myriad number of messages and events that occurred
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>that I could be accused of any criminal offence", you knew that he was accused of some sort of criminal offence. Is that fair?</li> <li>A. He was never accused of any criminal offence.</li> <li>Q. Suspected. Do you agree?</li> <li>A. I don't necessarily agree with your characterisation.</li> <li>Q. So you are saying you did not know he was suspected of a criminal offence.</li> <li>A. No, I'm telling you that I knew that the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>of advice perhaps composure, not just in relation to this matter but in relation to many.</li> <li>Q. But in relation to this matter would you do anything differently when you look back at those messages and the meetings? When you recall the meetings with Mr Baglietto and Mr Levy, would you do anything differently?</li> <li>A. I don't think it's fair to expect me to give you an answer in respect of the myriad number of messages and events that occurred without, which is obviously not possible,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>that I could be accused of any criminal offence", you knew that he was accused of some sort of criminal offence. Is that fair?</li> <li>A. He was never accused of any criminal offence.</li> <li>Q. Suspected. Do you agree?</li> <li>A. I don't necessarily agree with your characterisation.</li> <li>Q. So you are saying you did not know he was suspected of a criminal offence.</li> <li>A. No, I'm telling you that I knew that the police wanted to interrogate his devices and</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>of advice perhaps composure, not just in relation to this matter but in relation to many.</li> <li>Q. But in relation to this matter would you do anything differently when you look back at those messages and the meetings? When you recall the meetings with Mr Baglietto and Mr Levy, would you do anything differently?</li> <li>A. I don't think it's fair to expect me to give you an answer in respect of the myriad number of messages and events that occurred without, which is obviously not possible, taking me to each of them asking me whether</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>that I could be accused of any criminal offence", you knew that he was accused of some sort of criminal offence. Is that fair?</li> <li>A. He was never accused of any criminal offence.</li> <li>Q. Suspected. Do you agree?</li> <li>A. I don't necessarily agree with your characterisation.</li> <li>Q. So you are saying you did not know he was suspected of a criminal offence.</li> <li>A. No, I'm telling you that I knew that the police wanted to interrogate his devices and there had to be a reason for that.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>of advice perhaps composure, not just in relation to this matter but in relation to many.</li> <li>Q. But in relation to this matter would you do anything differently when you look back at those messages and the meetings? When you recall the meetings with Mr Baglietto and Mr Levy, would you do anything differently?</li> <li>A. I don't think it's fair to expect me to give you an answer in respect of the myriad number of messages and events that occurred without, which is obviously not possible, taking me to each of them asking me whether I would change any of them with the benefit</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>that I could be accused of any criminal offence", you knew that he was accused of some sort of criminal offence. Is that fair?</li> <li>A. He was never accused of any criminal offence.</li> <li>Q. Suspected. Do you agree?</li> <li>A. I don't necessarily agree with your characterisation.</li> <li>Q. So you are saying you did not know he was suspected of a criminal offence.</li> <li>A. No, I'm telling you that I knew that the police wanted to interrogate his devices and there had to be a reason for that.</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	of advice perhaps composure, not just in relation to this matter but in relation to many. Q. But in relation to this matter would you do anything differently when you look back at those messages and the meetings? When you recall the meetings with Mr Baglietto and Mr Levy, would you do anything differently? A. I don't think it's fair to expect me to give you an answer in respect of the myriad number of messages and events that occurred without, which is obviously not possible, taking me to each of them asking me whether I would change any of them with the benefit of hindsight. Hindsight, as we all know, is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>that I could be accused of any criminal offence", you knew that he was accused of some sort of criminal offence. Is that fair?</li> <li>A. He was never accused of any criminal offence.</li> <li>Q. Suspected. Do you agree?</li> <li>A. I don't necessarily agree with your characterisation.</li> <li>Q. So you are saying you did not know he was suspected of a criminal offence.</li> <li>A. No, I'm telling you that I knew that the police wanted to interrogate his devices and there had to be a reason for that.</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. And that his view was that that was</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>of advice perhaps composure, not just in relation to this matter but in relation to many.</li> <li>Q. But in relation to this matter would you do anything differently when you look back at those messages and the meetings? When you recall the meetings with Mr Baglietto and Mr Levy, would you do anything differently?</li> <li>A. I don't think it's fair to expect me to give you an answer in respect of the myriad number of messages and events that occurred without, which is obviously not possible, taking me to each of them asking me whether I would change any of them with the benefit of hindsight. Hindsight, as we all know, is 20/20 vision. We are here to look at what</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>that I could be accused of any criminal offence", you knew that he was accused of some sort of criminal offence. Is that fair?</li> <li>A. He was never accused of any criminal offence.</li> <li>Q. Suspected. Do you agree?</li> <li>A. I don't necessarily agree with your characterisation.</li> <li>Q. So you are saying you did not know he was suspected of a criminal offence.</li> <li>A. No, I'm telling you that I knew that the police wanted to interrogate his devices and there had to be a reason for that.</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. And that his view was that that was entirely misconceived and I think the way</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	of advice perhaps composure, not just in relation to this matter but in relation to many. Q. But in relation to this matter would you do anything differently when you look back at those messages and the meetings? When you recall the meetings with Mr Baglietto and Mr Levy, would you do anything differently? A. I don't think it's fair to expect me to give you an answer in respect of the myriad number of messages and events that occurred without, which is obviously not possible, taking me to each of them asking me whether I would change any of them with the benefit of hindsight. Hindsight, as we all know, is 20/20 vision. We are here to look at what happened not at what should have happened.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>that I could be accused of any criminal offence", you knew that he was accused of some sort of criminal offence. Is that fair?</li> <li>A. He was never accused of any criminal offence.</li> <li>Q. Suspected. Do you agree?</li> <li>A. I don't necessarily agree with your characterisation.</li> <li>Q. So you are saying you did not know he was suspected of a criminal offence.</li> <li>A. No, I'm telling you that I knew that the police wanted to interrogate his devices and there had to be a reason for that.</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. And that his view was that that was entirely misconceived and I think the way that he has expressed it here is the way that</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	of advice perhaps composure, not just in relation to this matter but in relation to many. Q. But in relation to this matter would you do anything differently when you look back at those messages and the meetings? When you recall the meetings with Mr Baglietto and Mr Levy, would you do anything differently? A. I don't think it's fair to expect me to give you an answer in respect of the myriad number of messages and events that occurred without, which is obviously not possible, taking me to each of them asking me whether I would change any of them with the benefit of hindsight. Hindsight, as we all know, is 20/20 vision. We are here to look at what happened not at what should have happened. That is a matter for submission from you and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>that I could be accused of any criminal offence", you knew that he was accused of some sort of criminal offence. Is that fair?</li> <li>A. He was never accused of any criminal offence.</li> <li>Q. Suspected. Do you agree?</li> <li>A. I don't necessarily agree with your characterisation.</li> <li>Q. So you are saying you did not know he was suspected of a criminal offence.</li> <li>A. No, I'm telling you that I knew that the police wanted to interrogate his devices and there had to be a reason for that.</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. And that his view was that that was entirely misconceived and I think the way that he has expressed it here is the way that he expressed it to me and to others, namely</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	of advice perhaps composure, not just in relation to this matter but in relation to many. Q. But in relation to this matter would you do anything differently when you look back at those messages and the meetings? When you recall the meetings with Mr Baglietto and Mr Levy, would you do anything differently? A. I don't think it's fair to expect me to give you an answer in respect of the myriad number of messages and events that occurred without, which is obviously not possible, taking me to each of them asking me whether I would change any of them with the benefit of hindsight. Hindsight, as we all know, is 20/20 vision. We are here to look at what happened not at what should have happened. That is a matter for submission from you and other counsel. But my evidence and the
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array}$	<ul> <li>that I could be accused of any criminal offence", you knew that he was accused of some sort of criminal offence. Is that fair?</li> <li>A. He was never accused of any criminal offence.</li> <li>Q. Suspected. Do you agree?</li> <li>A. I don't necessarily agree with your characterisation.</li> <li>Q. So you are saying you did not know he was suspected of a criminal offence.</li> <li>A. No, I'm telling you that I knew that the police wanted to interrogate his devices and there had to be a reason for that.</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. And that his view was that that was entirely misconceived and I think the way that he has expressed it here is the way that he knew that this was fundamentally flawed. And</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array} $	of advice perhaps composure, not just in relation to this matter but in relation to many. Q. But in relation to this matter would you do anything differently when you look back at those messages and the meetings? When you recall the meetings with Mr Baglietto and Mr Levy, would you do anything differently? A. I don't think it's fair to expect me to give you an answer in respect of the myriad number of messages and events that occurred without, which is obviously not possible, taking me to each of them asking me whether I would change any of them with the benefit of hindsight. Hindsight, as we all know, is 20/20 vision. We are here to look at what happened not at what should have happened. That is a matter for submission from you and other counsel. But my evidence and the evidence of my witness is about what
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>that I could be accused of any criminal offence", you knew that he was accused of some sort of criminal offence. Is that fair?</li> <li>A. He was never accused of any criminal offence.</li> <li>Q. Suspected. Do you agree?</li> <li>A. I don't necessarily agree with your characterisation.</li> <li>Q. So you are saying you did not know he was suspected of a criminal offence.</li> <li>A. No, I'm telling you that I knew that the police wanted to interrogate his devices and there had to be a reason for that.</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. And that his view was that that was entirely misconceived and I think the way that he has expressed it here is the way that he is fundamentally flawed. And indeed when we looked at the letter that you</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	of advice perhaps composure, not just in relation to this matter but in relation to many. Q. But in relation to this matter would you do anything differently when you look back at those messages and the meetings? When you recall the meetings with Mr Baglietto and Mr Levy, would you do anything differently? A. I don't think it's fair to expect me to give you an answer in respect of the myriad number of messages and events that occurred without, which is obviously not possible, taking me to each of them asking me whether I would change any of them with the benefit of hindsight. Hindsight, as we all know, is 20/20 vision. We are here to look at what happened not at what should have happened. That is a matter for submission from you and other counsel. But my evidence and the evidence of my witness is about what happened rather than about what should have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>that I could be accused of any criminal offence", you knew that he was accused of some sort of criminal offence. Is that fair?</li> <li>A. He was never accused of any criminal offence.</li> <li>Q. Suspected. Do you agree?</li> <li>A. I don't necessarily agree with your characterisation.</li> <li>Q. So you are saying you did not know he was suspected of a criminal offence.</li> <li>A. No, I'm telling you that I knew that the police wanted to interrogate his devices and there had to be a reason for that.</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. And that his view was that that was entirely misconceived and I think the way that he has expressed it here is the way that he expressed it to me and to others, namely that this was fundamentally flawed. And indeed when we looked at the letter that you referred me to earlier, I believe it was you</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	of advice perhaps composure, not just in relation to this matter but in relation to many. Q. But in relation to this matter would you do anything differently when you look back at those messages and the meetings? When you recall the meetings with Mr Baglietto and Mr Levy, would you do anything differently? A. I don't think it's fair to expect me to give you an answer in respect of the myriad number of messages and events that occurred without, which is obviously not possible, taking me to each of them asking me whether I would change any of them with the benefit of hindsight. Hindsight, as we all know, is 20/20 vision. We are here to look at what happened not at what should have happened. That is a matter for submission from you and other counsel. But my evidence and the evidence of my witness is about what happened.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>that I could be accused of any criminal offence", you knew that he was accused of some sort of criminal offence. Is that fair?</li> <li>A. He was never accused of any criminal offence.</li> <li>Q. Suspected. Do you agree?</li> <li>A. I don't necessarily agree with your characterisation.</li> <li>Q. So you are saying you did not know he was suspected of a criminal offence.</li> <li>A. No, I'm telling you that I knew that the police wanted to interrogate his devices and there had to be a reason for that.</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. And that his view was that that was entirely misconceived and I think the way that he has expressed it here is the way that he expressed it to me and to others, namely that this was fundamentally flawed. And indeed when we looked at the letter that you referred me to earlier, I believe it was you that referred me to it, it referred to</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	of advice perhaps composure, not just in relation to this matter but in relation to many. Q. But in relation to this matter would you do anything differently when you look back at those messages and the meetings? When you recall the meetings with Mr Baglietto and Mr Levy, would you do anything differently? A. I don't think it's fair to expect me to give you an answer in respect of the myriad number of messages and events that occurred without, which is obviously not possible, taking me to each of them asking me whether I would change any of them with the benefit of hindsight. Hindsight, as we all know, is 20/20 vision. We are here to look at what happened not at what should have happened. That is a matter for submission from you and other counsel. But my evidence and the evidence of my witness is about what happened rather than about what should have happened. Q. The 12 May meeting, you called that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>that I could be accused of any criminal offence", you knew that he was accused of some sort of criminal offence. Is that fair?</li> <li>A. He was never accused of any criminal offence.</li> <li>Q. Suspected. Do you agree?</li> <li>A. I don't necessarily agree with your characterisation.</li> <li>Q. So you are saying you did not know he was suspected of a criminal offence.</li> <li>A. No, I'm telling you that I knew that the police wanted to interrogate his devices and there had to be a reason for that.</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. And that his view was that that was entirely misconceived and I think the way that he has expressed it here is the way that he expressed it to me and to others, namely that this was fundamentally flawed. And indeed when we looked at the letter that you referred me to earlier, I believe it was you</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	of advice perhaps composure, not just in relation to this matter but in relation to many. Q. But in relation to this matter would you do anything differently when you look back at those messages and the meetings? When you recall the meetings with Mr Baglietto and Mr Levy, would you do anything differently? A. I don't think it's fair to expect me to give you an answer in respect of the myriad number of messages and events that occurred without, which is obviously not possible, taking me to each of them asking me whether I would change any of them with the benefit of hindsight. Hindsight, as we all know, is 20/20 vision. We are here to look at what happened not at what should have happened. That is a matter for submission from you and other counsel. But my evidence and the evidence of my witness is about what happened.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>that I could be accused of any criminal offence", you knew that he was accused of some sort of criminal offence. Is that fair?</li> <li>A. He was never accused of any criminal offence.</li> <li>Q. Suspected. Do you agree?</li> <li>A. I don't necessarily agree with your characterisation.</li> <li>Q. So you are saying you did not know he was suspected of a criminal offence.</li> <li>A. No, I'm telling you that I knew that the police wanted to interrogate his devices and there had to be a reason for that.</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. And that his view was that that was entirely misconceived and I think the way that he has expressed it here is the way that he expressed it to me and to others, namely that this was fundamentally flawed. And indeed when we looked at the letter that you referred me to earlier, I believe it was you that referred me to it, it referred to a conspiracy to defraud, was an offence</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	of advice perhaps composure, not just in relation to this matter but in relation to many. Q. But in relation to this matter would you do anything differently when you look back at those messages and the meetings? When you recall the meetings with Mr Baglietto and Mr Levy, would you do anything differently? A. I don't think it's fair to expect me to give you an answer in respect of the myriad number of messages and events that occurred without, which is obviously not possible, taking me to each of them asking me whether I would change any of them with the benefit of hindsight. Hindsight, as we all know, is 20/20 vision. We are here to look at what happened not at what should have happened. That is a matter for submission from you and other counsel. But my evidence and the evidence of my witness is about what happened. Q. The 12 May meeting, you called that meeting, did you not?

Epiq Europe Ltd +44 (0) 207 404 1400

www.epiqglobal.com Lower Ground Floor, 46 Chancery Lane casemanagers@epiqglobal.com London, WC2A 1JE

43 (Pages 169 to 172)

1	call for a meeting.	1	Q. Was that upsetting to you?
2	Q. Yes. It was not a preplanned meeting.	2	A. I think I've not hidden the fact that it was.
3	A. No.	3	Q. And you were also very angry. Is that
4	Q. It was arranged spontaneously when you	4	fair?
5	found out that Mr McGrail was at 6 Convent	5	A. No, I don't think that's fair because, you
6	Place. Is that right?	6	see, I have said in evidence that I was angry
7	A. My call was not spontaneous. In other	7	and you have translated that into my being
8	words, the "I want to speak to Ian McGrail"	8	very angry. I would rather stick with my
9	had nothing to do with the fact that he was in	9	version about how I felt rather than yours. I
10	Convent Place. He was in Convent Place	10	was angry, not very angry.
11	when I said I wanted to speak to him. I think	11	Q. So you were upset and you were angry.
12	the call went out from one of my secretaries	12	Yes?
13	to him and he said, I believe, to them he was	13	A. How many times would you like me to
14	here. He says, "Do you want him to come	14	repeat it?
15	up?" And I think that's when I said yes.	15	Q. I am just asking the question. You were
16	Q. But you in your text message said: "I am	16	upset and angry. Is that fair?
17	going to say no more because Mr Levy is	17	A. I was upset in the sense that I was angry.
18	a friend."	18	There was not a different level of upset other
19	A. Yes.	19	than anger.
20	Q. So it must have been when you found out	20	Q. Yes. You said before you wanted
21	Mr McGrail was in the building, it must have	21	information. Did you know at that stage that
22	been spontaneous that you said, "Well, bring	22	Mr McGrail was not leading the
23	him up, I want to talk to him."	23	investigation?
24	A. That's the point I'm making to you.	24	A. Um, I didn't expect that Mr McGrail
25	Q. Yes.	25	would be leading the investigation. He was
-			······································
	Page 173		Page 175
		1	
1	A I think I said I would like to talk to Ian	1	the Commissioner of Police
1	A. I think I said I would like to talk to Ian McCrail and when my switchboard in the	1	<b>the Commissioner of Police.</b>
2	McGrail and when my switchboard, in the	2	Q. So if you wanted information about the
2 3	McGrail and when my switchboard, in the context of Gibraltar it's hardly a switchboard,	2 3	Q. So if you wanted information about the investigation did you invite the officer in
2 3 4	McGrail and when my switchboard, in the context of Gibraltar it's hardly a switchboard, it's my secretary, sought to raise Ian McGrail	2 3 4	Q. So if you wanted information about the investigation did you invite the officer in charge, Mr Richardson
2 3 4 5	McGrail and when my switchboard, in the context of Gibraltar it's hardly a switchboard, it's my secretary, sought to raise Ian McGrail on the phone, I believe he would have said to	2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>Q. So if you wanted information about the investigation did you invite the officer in charge, Mr Richardson</li> <li>A. I never would do that because that would</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6	McGrail and when my switchboard, in the context of Gibraltar it's hardly a switchboard, it's my secretary, sought to raise Ian McGrail on the phone, I believe he would have said to him or to her, "I'm actually in number 6	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>Q. So if you wanted information about the investigation did you invite the officer in charge, Mr Richardson</li> <li>A. I never would do that because that would be to try to put my hand into the action of the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	McGrail and when my switchboard, in the context of Gibraltar it's hardly a switchboard, it's my secretary, sought to raise Ian McGrail on the phone, I believe he would have said to him or to her, "I'm actually in number 6 Convent Place." And they asked me, "Would	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>Q. So if you wanted information about the investigation did you invite the officer in charge, Mr Richardson</li> <li>A. I never would do that because that would be to try to put my hand into the action of the RGP and its investigation, which I would</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	McGrail and when my switchboard, in the context of Gibraltar it's hardly a switchboard, it's my secretary, sought to raise Ian McGrail on the phone, I believe he would have said to him or to her, "I'm actually in number 6 Convent Place." And they asked me, "Would you like him to come up?" So it was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>Q. So if you wanted information about the investigation did you invite the officer in charge, Mr Richardson</li> <li>A. I never would do that because that would be to try to put my hand into the action of the RGP and its investigation, which I would never do, and I have consistently said outside</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	McGrail and when my switchboard, in the context of Gibraltar it's hardly a switchboard, it's my secretary, sought to raise Ian McGrail on the phone, I believe he would have said to him or to her, "I'm actually in number 6 Convent Place." And they asked me, "Would you like him to come up?" So it was spontaneous in that sense.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q. So if you wanted information about the investigation did you invite the officer in charge, Mr Richardson</li> <li>A. I never would do that because that would be to try to put my hand into the action of the RGP and its investigation, which I would never do, and I have consistently said outside of here and here that I would not do. I was</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	McGrail and when my switchboard, in the context of Gibraltar it's hardly a switchboard, it's my secretary, sought to raise Ian McGrail on the phone, I believe he would have said to him or to her, "I'm actually in number 6 Convent Place." And they asked me, "Would you like him to come up?" So it was spontaneous in that sense. Q. It was a heat of the moment meeting. Is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>Q. So if you wanted information about the investigation did you invite the officer in charge, Mr Richardson</li> <li>A. I never would do that because that would be to try to put my hand into the action of the RGP and its investigation, which I would never do, and I have consistently said outside of here and here that I would not do. I was seeking information only about the warrant.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	McGrail and when my switchboard, in the context of Gibraltar it's hardly a switchboard, it's my secretary, sought to raise Ian McGrail on the phone, I believe he would have said to him or to her, "I'm actually in number 6 Convent Place." And they asked me, "Would you like him to come up?" So it was spontaneous in that sense. Q. It was a heat of the moment meeting. Is that fair?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>Q. So if you wanted information about the investigation did you invite the officer in charge, Mr Richardson</li> <li>A. I never would do that because that would be to try to put my hand into the action of the RGP and its investigation, which I would never do, and I have consistently said outside of here and here that I would not do. I was seeking information only about the warrant. I had repeatedly told you that's what I was</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	McGrail and when my switchboard, in the context of Gibraltar it's hardly a switchboard, it's my secretary, sought to raise Ian McGrail on the phone, I believe he would have said to him or to her, "I'm actually in number 6 Convent Place." And they asked me, "Would you like him to come up?" So it was spontaneous in that sense. Q. It was a heat of the moment meeting. Is that fair? A. Well, yes, I suppose you could describe it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Q. So if you wanted information about the investigation did you invite the officer in charge, Mr Richardson</li> <li>A. I never would do that because that would be to try to put my hand into the action of the RGP and its investigation, which I would never do, and I have consistently said outside of here and here that I would not do. I was seeking information only about the warrant. I had repeatedly told you that's what I was seeking before the lunch break and I was</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	McGrail and when my switchboard, in the context of Gibraltar it's hardly a switchboard, it's my secretary, sought to raise Ian McGrail on the phone, I believe he would have said to him or to her, "I'm actually in number 6 Convent Place." And they asked me, "Would you like him to come up?" So it was spontaneous in that sense. Q. It was a heat of the moment meeting. Is that fair? A. Well, yes, I suppose you could describe it in that way. But it was not a meeting that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Q. So if you wanted information about the investigation did you invite the officer in charge, Mr Richardson</li> <li>A. I never would do that because that would be to try to put my hand into the action of the RGP and its investigation, which I would never do, and I have consistently said outside of here and here that I would not do. I was seeking information only about the warrant. I had repeatedly told you that's what I was seeking before the lunch break and I was seeking it from the person that I would</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	McGrail and when my switchboard, in the context of Gibraltar it's hardly a switchboard, it's my secretary, sought to raise Ian McGrail on the phone, I believe he would have said to him or to her, "I'm actually in number 6 Convent Place." And they asked me, "Would you like him to come up?" So it was spontaneous in that sense. Q. It was a heat of the moment meeting. Is that fair? A. Well, yes, I suppose you could describe it in that way. But it was not a meeting that was sought in the heat of the moment. It was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Q. So if you wanted information about the investigation did you invite the officer in charge, Mr Richardson</li> <li>A. I never would do that because that would be to try to put my hand into the action of the RGP and its investigation, which I would never do, and I have consistently said outside of here and here that I would not do. I was seeking information only about the warrant. I had repeatedly told you that's what I was seeking before the lunch break and I was seeking it from the person that I would interface with in the RGP in respect of all</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	McGrail and when my switchboard, in the context of Gibraltar it's hardly a switchboard, it's my secretary, sought to raise Ian McGrail on the phone, I believe he would have said to him or to her, "I'm actually in number 6 Convent Place." And they asked me, "Would you like him to come up?" So it was spontaneous in that sense. Q. It was a heat of the moment meeting. Is that fair? A. Well, yes, I suppose you could describe it in that way. But it was not a meeting that was sought in the heat of the moment. It was a phone call that I was seeking. It happened	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Q. So if you wanted information about the investigation did you invite the officer in charge, Mr Richardson</li> <li>A. I never would do that because that would be to try to put my hand into the action of the RGP and its investigation, which I would never do, and I have consistently said outside of here and here that I would not do. I was seeking information only about the warrant. I had repeatedly told you that's what I was seeking it from the person that I would interface with in the RGP in respect of all matters, in this case the Commissioner of</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	McGrail and when my switchboard, in the context of Gibraltar it's hardly a switchboard, it's my secretary, sought to raise Ian McGrail on the phone, I believe he would have said to him or to her, "I'm actually in number 6 Convent Place." And they asked me, "Would you like him to come up?" So it was spontaneous in that sense. Q. It was a heat of the moment meeting. Is that fair? A. Well, yes, I suppose you could describe it in that way. But it was not a meeting that was sought in the heat of the moment. It was a phone call that I was seeking. It happened to be a meeting by happenstance because he	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Q. So if you wanted information about the investigation did you invite the officer in charge, Mr Richardson</li> <li>A. I never would do that because that would be to try to put my hand into the action of the RGP and its investigation, which I would never do, and I have consistently said outside of here and here that I would not do. I was seeking information only about the warrant. I had repeatedly told you that's what I was seeking before the lunch break and I was seeking it from the person that I would interface with in the RGP in respect of all matters, in this case the Commissioner of Police. So to give you an idea from where I</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	McGrail and when my switchboard, in the context of Gibraltar it's hardly a switchboard, it's my secretary, sought to raise Ian McGrail on the phone, I believe he would have said to him or to her, "I'm actually in number 6 Convent Place." And they asked me, "Would you like him to come up?" So it was spontaneous in that sense. Q. It was a heat of the moment meeting. Is that fair? A. Well, yes, I suppose you could describe it in that way. But it was not a meeting that was sought in the heat of the moment. It was a phone call that I was seeking. It happened to be a meeting by happenstance because he was in number 6 Convent Place, not at New	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Q. So if you wanted information about the investigation did you invite the officer in charge, Mr Richardson</li> <li>A. I never would do that because that would be to try to put my hand into the action of the RGP and its investigation, which I would never do, and I have consistently said outside of here and here that I would not do. I was seeking information only about the warrant. I had repeatedly told you that's what I was seeking before the lunch break and I was seeking it from the person that I would interface with in the RGP in respect of all matters, in this case the Commissioner of Police. So to give you an idea from where I sit in the hierarchy of Gibraltar politics, you</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	McGrail and when my switchboard, in the context of Gibraltar it's hardly a switchboard, it's my secretary, sought to raise Ian McGrail on the phone, I believe he would have said to him or to her, "I'm actually in number 6 Convent Place." And they asked me, "Would you like him to come up?" So it was spontaneous in that sense. Q. It was a heat of the moment meeting. Is that fair? A. Well, yes, I suppose you could describe it in that way. But it was not a meeting that was sought in the heat of the moment. It was a phone call that I was seeking. It happened to be a meeting by happenstance because he was in number 6 Convent Place, not at New Mole House.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q. So if you wanted information about the investigation did you invite the officer in charge, Mr Richardson</li> <li>A. I never would do that because that would be to try to put my hand into the action of the RGP and its investigation, which I would never do, and I have consistently said outside of here and here that I would not do. I was seeking information only about the warrant. I had repeatedly told you that's what I was seeking it from the person that I would interface with in the RGP in respect of all matters, in this case the Commissioner of Police. So to give you an idea from where I sit in the hierarchy of Gibraltar politics, you would not expect me to be engaging other</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	McGrail and when my switchboard, in the context of Gibraltar it's hardly a switchboard, it's my secretary, sought to raise Ian McGrail on the phone, I believe he would have said to him or to her, "I'm actually in number 6 Convent Place." And they asked me, "Would you like him to come up?" So it was spontaneous in that sense. Q. It was a heat of the moment meeting. Is that fair? A. Well, yes, I suppose you could describe it in that way. But it was not a meeting that was sought in the heat of the moment. It was a phone call that I was seeking. It happened to be a meeting by happenstance because he was in number 6 Convent Place, not at New Mole House. Q. When you spoke to Mr Levy on that day	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Q. So if you wanted information about the investigation did you invite the officer in charge, Mr Richardson</li> <li>A. I never would do that because that would be to try to put my hand into the action of the RGP and its investigation, which I would never do, and I have consistently said outside of here and here that I would not do. I was seeking information only about the warrant. I had repeatedly told you that's what I was seeking it from the person that I would interface with in the RGP in respect of all matters, in this case the Commissioner of Police. So to give you an idea from where I sit in the hierarchy of Gibraltar politics, you would not expect me to be engaging other than with the heads of the different</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>McGrail and when my switchboard, in the context of Gibraltar it's hardly a switchboard, it's my secretary, sought to raise Ian McGrail on the phone, I believe he would have said to him or to her, "I'm actually in number 6</li> <li>Convent Place." And they asked me, "Would you like him to come up?" So it was spontaneous in that sense.</li> <li>Q. It was a heat of the moment meeting. Is that fair?</li> <li>A. Well, yes, I suppose you could describe it in that way. But it was not a meeting that was sought in the heat of the moment. It was a phone call that I was seeking. It happened to be a meeting by happenstance because he was in number 6 Convent Place, not at New Mole House.</li> <li>Q. When you spoke to Mr Levy on that day do you remember him being upset?</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array} $	<ul> <li>Q. So if you wanted information about the investigation did you invite the officer in charge, Mr Richardson</li> <li>A. I never would do that because that would be to try to put my hand into the action of the RGP and its investigation, which I would never do, and I have consistently said outside of here and here that I would not do. I was seeking information only about the warrant. I had repeatedly told you that's what I was seeking it from the person that I would interface with in the RGP in respect of all matters, in this case the Commissioner of Police. So to give you an idea from where I sit in the hierarchy of Gibraltar politics, you would not expect me to be engaging other than with the heads of the different organisations that I deal with. In the context</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>McGrail and when my switchboard, in the context of Gibraltar it's hardly a switchboard, it's my secretary, sought to raise Ian McGrail on the phone, I believe he would have said to him or to her, "I'm actually in number 6</li> <li>Convent Place." And they asked me, "Would you like him to come up?" So it was spontaneous in that sense.</li> <li>Q. It was a heat of the moment meeting. Is that fair?</li> <li>A. Well, yes, I suppose you could describe it in that way. But it was not a meeting that was sought in the heat of the moment. It was a phone call that I was seeking. It happened to be a meeting by happenstance because he was in number 6 Convent Place, not at New Mole House.</li> <li>Q. When you spoke to Mr Levy on that day do you remember him being upset?</li> <li>A. Of course I do.</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	<ul> <li>Q. So if you wanted information about the investigation did you invite the officer in charge, Mr Richardson</li> <li>A. I never would do that because that would be to try to put my hand into the action of the RGP and its investigation, which I would never do, and I have consistently said outside of here and here that I would not do. I was seeking information only about the warrant. I had repeatedly told you that's what I was seeking it from the person that I would interface with in the RGP in respect of all matters, in this case the Commissioner of Police. So to give you an idea from where I sit in the hierarchy of Gibraltar politics, you would not expect me to be engaging other than with the heads of the different organisations that I deal with. In the context of my office, for example, if I want to know</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>McGrail and when my switchboard, in the context of Gibraltar it's hardly a switchboard, it's my secretary, sought to raise Ian McGrail on the phone, I believe he would have said to him or to her, "I'm actually in number 6</li> <li>Convent Place." And they asked me, "Would you like him to come up?" So it was spontaneous in that sense.</li> <li>Q. It was a heat of the moment meeting. Is that fair?</li> <li>A. Well, yes, I suppose you could describe it in that way. But it was not a meeting that was sought in the heat of the moment. It was a phone call that I was seeking. It happened to be a meeting by happenstance because he was in number 6 Convent Place, not at New Mole House.</li> <li>Q. When you spoke to Mr Levy on that day do you remember him being upset?</li> <li>A. Of course I do.</li> <li>Q. You do remember him being upset.</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	<ul> <li>Q. So if you wanted information about the investigation did you invite the officer in charge, Mr Richardson</li> <li>A. I never would do that because that would be to try to put my hand into the action of the RGP and its investigation, which I would never do, and I have consistently said outside of here and here that I would not do. I was seeking information only about the warrant. I had repeatedly told you that's what I was seeking it from the person that I would interface with in the RGP in respect of all matters, in this case the Commissioner of Police. So to give you an idea from where I sit in the hierarchy of Gibraltar politics, you would not expect me to be engaging other than with the heads of the different organisations that I deal with. In the context of my office, for example, if I want to know something about a project or development, I</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>McGrail and when my switchboard, in the context of Gibraltar it's hardly a switchboard, it's my secretary, sought to raise Ian McGrail on the phone, I believe he would have said to him or to her, "I'm actually in number 6</li> <li>Convent Place." And they asked me, "Would you like him to come up?" So it was spontaneous in that sense.</li> <li>Q. It was a heat of the moment meeting. Is that fair?</li> <li>A. Well, yes, I suppose you could describe it in that way. But it was not a meeting that was sought in the heat of the moment. It was a phone call that I was seeking. It happened to be a meeting by happenstance because he was in number 6 Convent Place, not at New Mole House.</li> <li>Q. When you spoke to Mr Levy on that day do you remember him being upset?</li> <li>A. Of course I do.</li> <li>Q. You do remember him being upset.</li> <li>A. Just like any innocent person about to</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	<ul> <li>Q. So if you wanted information about the investigation did you invite the officer in charge, Mr Richardson</li> <li>A. I never would do that because that would be to try to put my hand into the action of the RGP and its investigation, which I would never do, and I have consistently said outside of here and here that I would not do. I was seeking information only about the warrant. I had repeatedly told you that's what I was seeking before the lunch break and I was seeking it from the person that I would interface with in the RGP in respect of all matters, in this case the Commissioner of Police. So to give you an idea from where I sit in the hierarchy of Gibraltar politics, you would not expect me to be engaging other than with the heads of the different organisations that I deal with. In the context of my office, for example, if I want to know something about a project or development, I don't tend to call the person who is on the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>McGrail and when my switchboard, in the context of Gibraltar it's hardly a switchboard, it's my secretary, sought to raise Ian McGrail on the phone, I believe he would have said to him or to her, "I'm actually in number 6</li> <li>Convent Place." And they asked me, "Would you like him to come up?" So it was spontaneous in that sense.</li> <li>Q. It was a heat of the moment meeting. Is that fair?</li> <li>A. Well, yes, I suppose you could describe it in that way. But it was not a meeting that was sought in the heat of the moment. It was a phone call that I was seeking. It happened to be a meeting by happenstance because he was in number 6 Convent Place, not at New Mole House.</li> <li>Q. When you spoke to Mr Levy on that day do you remember him being upset?</li> <li>A. Of course I do.</li> <li>Q. You do remember him being upset.</li> <li>A. Just like any innocent person about to have a search warrant executed in respect of</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	<ul> <li>Q. So if you wanted information about the investigation did you invite the officer in charge, Mr Richardson</li> <li>A. I never would do that because that would be to try to put my hand into the action of the RGP and its investigation, which I would never do, and I have consistently said outside of here and here that I would not do. I was seeking information only about the warrant. I had repeatedly told you that's what I was seeking before the lunch break and I was seeking it from the person that I would interface with in the RGP in respect of all matters, in this case the Commissioner of Police. So to give you an idea from where I sit in the hierarchy of Gibraltar politics, you would not expect me to be engaging other than with the heads of the different organisations that I deal with. In the context of my office, for example, if I want to know something about a project or development, I don't tend to call the person who is on the ground dealing with that project. I call the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>McGrail and when my switchboard, in the context of Gibraltar it's hardly a switchboard, it's my secretary, sought to raise Ian McGrail on the phone, I believe he would have said to him or to her, "I'm actually in number 6</li> <li>Convent Place." And they asked me, "Would you like him to come up?" So it was spontaneous in that sense.</li> <li>Q. It was a heat of the moment meeting. Is that fair?</li> <li>A. Well, yes, I suppose you could describe it in that way. But it was not a meeting that was sought in the heat of the moment. It was a phone call that I was seeking. It happened to be a meeting by happenstance because he was in number 6 Convent Place, not at New Mole House.</li> <li>Q. When you spoke to Mr Levy on that day do you remember him being upset?</li> <li>A. Of course I do.</li> <li>Q. You do remember him being upset.</li> <li>A. Just like any innocent person about to</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	<ul> <li>Q. So if you wanted information about the investigation did you invite the officer in charge, Mr Richardson</li> <li>A. I never would do that because that would be to try to put my hand into the action of the RGP and its investigation, which I would never do, and I have consistently said outside of here and here that I would not do. I was seeking information only about the warrant. I had repeatedly told you that's what I was seeking before the lunch break and I was seeking it from the person that I would interface with in the RGP in respect of all matters, in this case the Commissioner of Police. So to give you an idea from where I sit in the hierarchy of Gibraltar politics, you would not expect me to be engaging other than with the heads of the different organisations that I deal with. In the context of my office, for example, if I want to know something about a project or development, I don't tend to call the person who is on the</li> </ul>

44 (Pages 173 to 176)

1		1	
1	have contact with the individuals who have		warrant against James Levy?"
2	the information.	2	Q. Yes. So you were not asking for, the
3	Q. You deal with	3	meeting was not about information. It was
4	A. So in the context of the Royal Gibraltar	4	about to express your view of disapproval to
5	Police and an action that they had	5	the Commissioner of Police
6	undertaken, the logical thing for me to do is	6	A. No.
7	to, and the natural thing for me to do, before	7	Q about the search warrant.
8	and after 12 May, is to call the Commissioner	8	A. No. I have started my answer to you by
9	of Police. In this case in particular for one	9	saying that I asked him what on earth had
10	reason, because he had texted me moments	10	happened that had led to them deciding to
11	earlier.	11	proceed by way of search warrant. Look, if
12	Q. So you knew that the Commissioner of	12	there's a recording of that conversation, as I
13	Police would not be in charge of the	13	deeply suspect there might be, I would be
14	investigation. Did you give him	14	delighted for all of us if we could hear it.
15	an opportunity to provide you a briefing in	15	Q. After the meeting, when you had calmed
16	advance of that meeting?	16	down, did you give Mr McGrail the
17	A. Yes. Not in advance of that meeting. I	17	opportunity to provide a prepared briefing?
18	enabled him to provide me a briefing when I	18	A. After the meeting Mr McGrail had plenty
19	asked him what had happened and why they	19	of opportunity to provide a prepared briefing
20	had proceeded by way of search warrant.	20	should he have wished to.
21	Q. Did you, when you invited him to that	21	Q. Did you ask him to?
22	meeting, had you said to him, "I want some	22	A. After the meeting
23	information about this, please go and find out	23	Q. Yes.
24	from the officer in charge what happened and	24	A Mr McGrail had plenty of opportunities
25	then come to me with a briefing"?	25	to provide me with a briefing. I cannot recall
	Page 177		Page 179
	1 age 177		I age 1/9
1	A. I don't understand why it is that you're	1	exactly how we ended the meeting and
1 2	A. I don't understand why it is that you're asking me about something that we both	1 2	exactly how we ended the meeting and whether at the end of the meeting I might
_			
2	asking me about something that we both	2	whether at the end of the meeting I might
2 3	asking me about something that we both know didn't happen because we know the	2 3	whether at the end of the meeting I might have left open the possibility that he could do
2 3 4	asking me about something that we both know didn't happen because we know the chronology of those facts. In other words,	2 3 4	whether at the end of the meeting I might have left open the possibility that he could do that. But the door was certainly not closed to
2 3 4 5	asking me about something that we both know didn't happen because we know the chronology of those facts. In other words, we know that what happened was that he sent	2 3 4 5	whether at the end of the meeting I might have left open the possibility that he could do that. But the door was certainly not closed to him doing so and he chose not to do so.
2 3 4 5 6	asking me about something that we both know didn't happen because we know the chronology of those facts. In other words, we know that what happened was that he sent me a message. After that I asked to speak to	2 3 4 5 6	whether at the end of the meeting I might have left open the possibility that he could do that. But the door was certainly not closed to him doing so and he chose not to do so. Q. There is no evidence that you asked him
2 3 4 5 6 7	asking me about something that we both know didn't happen because we know the chronology of those facts. In other words, we know that what happened was that he sent me a message. After that I asked to speak to him. Because he was in number 6 he	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul><li>whether at the end of the meeting I might have left open the possibility that he could do that. But the door was certainly not closed to him doing so and he chose not to do so.</li><li>Q. There is no evidence that you asked him for a briefing after that meeting. So unless</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	asking me about something that we both know didn't happen because we know the chronology of those facts. In other words, we know that what happened was that he sent me a message. After that I asked to speak to him. Because he was in number 6 he suggested or asked whether I wished him to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>whether at the end of the meeting I might have left open the possibility that he could do that. But the door was certainly not closed to him doing so and he chose not to do so.</li> <li>Q. There is no evidence that you asked him for a briefing after that meeting. So unless you are saying you did, I am just asking you</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	asking me about something that we both know didn't happen because we know the chronology of those facts. In other words, we know that what happened was that he sent me a message. After that I asked to speak to him. Because he was in number 6 he suggested or asked whether I wished him to come up to have that discussion, and that's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>whether at the end of the meeting I might have left open the possibility that he could do that. But the door was certainly not closed to him doing so and he chose not to do so.</li> <li>Q. There is no evidence that you asked him for a briefing after that meeting. So unless you are saying you did, I am just asking you did you remember asking him for any kind of</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	asking me about something that we both know didn't happen because we know the chronology of those facts. In other words, we know that what happened was that he sent me a message. After that I asked to speak to him. Because he was in number 6 he suggested or asked whether I wished him to come up to have that discussion, and that's what happened. So self-evidently there isn't	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>whether at the end of the meeting I might have left open the possibility that he could do that. But the door was certainly not closed to him doing so and he chose not to do so.</li> <li>Q. There is no evidence that you asked him for a briefing after that meeting. So unless you are saying you did, I am just asking you did you remember asking him for any kind of briefing?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	asking me about something that we both know didn't happen because we know the chronology of those facts. In other words, we know that what happened was that he sent me a message. After that I asked to speak to him. Because he was in number 6 he suggested or asked whether I wished him to come up to have that discussion, and that's what happened. So self-evidently there isn't in the space of those minutes me seeking a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>whether at the end of the meeting I might have left open the possibility that he could do that. But the door was certainly not closed to him doing so and he chose not to do so.</li> <li>Q. There is no evidence that you asked him for a briefing after that meeting. So unless you are saying you did, I am just asking you did you remember asking him for any kind of briefing?</li> <li>A. No, I didn't ask him for a briefing after</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	asking me about something that we both know didn't happen because we know the chronology of those facts. In other words, we know that what happened was that he sent me a message. After that I asked to speak to him. Because he was in number 6 he suggested or asked whether I wished him to come up to have that discussion, and that's what happened. So self-evidently there isn't in the space of those minutes me seeking a briefing in writing ahead of a meeting. You	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>whether at the end of the meeting I might have left open the possibility that he could do that. But the door was certainly not closed to him doing so and he chose not to do so.</li> <li>Q. There is no evidence that you asked him for a briefing after that meeting. So unless you are saying you did, I am just asking you did you remember asking him for any kind of briefing?</li> <li>A. No, I didn't ask him for a briefing after the meeting. The meeting was to ask him what had happened and why. And in that</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	asking me about something that we both know didn't happen because we know the chronology of those facts. In other words, we know that what happened was that he sent me a message. After that I asked to speak to him. Because he was in number 6 he suggested or asked whether I wished him to come up to have that discussion, and that's what happened. So self-evidently there isn't in the space of those minutes me seeking a briefing in writing ahead of a meeting. You know that and if what you want me to do is to say that it didn't happen because we both	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>whether at the end of the meeting I might have left open the possibility that he could do that. But the door was certainly not closed to him doing so and he chose not to do so.</li> <li>Q. There is no evidence that you asked him for a briefing after that meeting. So unless you are saying you did, I am just asking you did you remember asking him for any kind of briefing?</li> <li>A. No, I didn't ask him for a briefing after the meeting. The meeting was to ask him</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	asking me about something that we both know didn't happen because we know the chronology of those facts. In other words, we know that what happened was that he sent me a message. After that I asked to speak to him. Because he was in number 6 he suggested or asked whether I wished him to come up to have that discussion, and that's what happened. So self-evidently there isn't in the space of those minutes me seeking a briefing in writing ahead of a meeting. You know that and if what you want me to do is to say that it didn't happen because we both know it didn't happen, then the answer is it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>whether at the end of the meeting I might have left open the possibility that he could do that. But the door was certainly not closed to him doing so and he chose not to do so.</li> <li>Q. There is no evidence that you asked him for a briefing after that meeting. So unless you are saying you did, I am just asking you did you remember asking him for any kind of briefing?</li> <li>A. No, I didn't ask him for a briefing after the meeting. The meeting was to ask him what had happened and why. And in that meeting, as you will recall I told you before lunch, instead of telling me the things that it</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	asking me about something that we both know didn't happen because we know the chronology of those facts. In other words, we know that what happened was that he sent me a message. After that I asked to speak to him. Because he was in number 6 he suggested or asked whether I wished him to come up to have that discussion, and that's what happened. So self-evidently there isn't in the space of those minutes me seeking a briefing in writing ahead of a meeting. You know that and if what you want me to do is to say that it didn't happen, then the answer is it didn't happen.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>whether at the end of the meeting I might have left open the possibility that he could do that. But the door was certainly not closed to him doing so and he chose not to do so.</li> <li>Q. There is no evidence that you asked him for a briefing after that meeting. So unless you are saying you did, I am just asking you did you remember asking him for any kind of briefing?</li> <li>A. No, I didn't ask him for a briefing after the meeting. The meeting was to ask him what had happened and why. And in that meeting, as you will recall I told you before lunch, instead of telling me the things that it is now apparent from the evidence that we</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	asking me about something that we both know didn't happen because we know the chronology of those facts. In other words, we know that what happened was that he sent me a message. After that I asked to speak to him. Because he was in number 6 he suggested or asked whether I wished him to come up to have that discussion, and that's what happened. So self-evidently there isn't in the space of those minutes me seeking a briefing in writing ahead of a meeting. You know that and if what you want me to do is to say that it didn't happen because we both know it didn't happen, then the answer is it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>whether at the end of the meeting I might have left open the possibility that he could do that. But the door was certainly not closed to him doing so and he chose not to do so.</li> <li>Q. There is no evidence that you asked him for a briefing after that meeting. So unless you are saying you did, I am just asking you did you remember asking him for any kind of briefing?</li> <li>A. No, I didn't ask him for a briefing after the meeting. The meeting was to ask him what had happened and why. And in that meeting, as you will recall I told you before lunch, instead of telling me the things that it</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>asking me about something that we both know didn't happen because we know the chronology of those facts. In other words, we know that what happened was that he sent me a message. After that I asked to speak to him. Because he was in number 6 he suggested or asked whether I wished him to come up to have that discussion, and that's what happened. So self-evidently there isn't in the space of those minutes me seeking a briefing in writing ahead of a meeting. You know that and if what you want me to do is to say that it didn't happen, then the answer is it didn't happen.</li> <li>Q. No. Did you start the meeting by saying</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>whether at the end of the meeting I might have left open the possibility that he could do that. But the door was certainly not closed to him doing so and he chose not to do so.</li> <li>Q. There is no evidence that you asked him for a briefing after that meeting. So unless you are saying you did, I am just asking you did you remember asking him for any kind of briefing?</li> <li>A. No, I didn't ask him for a briefing after the meeting. The meeting was to ask him what had happened and why. And in that meeting, as you will recall I told you before lunch, instead of telling me the things that it is now apparent from the evidence that we have seen in the context of this inquiry trawling for the information that there was</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>asking me about something that we both know didn't happen because we know the chronology of those facts. In other words, we know that what happened was that he sent me a message. After that I asked to speak to him. Because he was in number 6 he suggested or asked whether I wished him to come up to have that discussion, and that's what happened. So self-evidently there isn't in the space of those minutes me seeking a briefing in writing ahead of a meeting. You know that and if what you want me to do is to say that it didn't happen because we both know it didn't happen, then the answer is it didn't happen.</li> <li>Q. No. Did you start the meeting by saying to Mr McGrail, "Please could you explain</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>whether at the end of the meeting I might have left open the possibility that he could do that. But the door was certainly not closed to him doing so and he chose not to do so.</li> <li>Q. There is no evidence that you asked him for a briefing after that meeting. So unless you are saying you did, I am just asking you did you remember asking him for any kind of briefing?</li> <li>A. No, I didn't ask him for a briefing after the meeting. The meeting was to ask him what had happened and why. And in that meeting, as you will recall I told you before lunch, instead of telling me the things that it is now apparent from the evidence that we have seen in the context of this inquiry</li> </ul>
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\end{array} $	<ul> <li>asking me about something that we both know didn't happen because we know the chronology of those facts. In other words, we know that what happened was that he sent me a message. After that I asked to speak to him. Because he was in number 6 he suggested or asked whether I wished him to come up to have that discussion, and that's what happened. So self-evidently there isn't in the space of those minutes me seeking a briefing in writing ahead of a meeting. You know that and if what you want me to do is to say that it didn't happen because we both know it didn't happen, then the answer is it didn't happen.</li> <li>Q. No. Did you start the meeting by saying to Mr McGrail, "Please could you explain what has happened?"</li> <li>A. Not in so many words, but yes.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>whether at the end of the meeting I might have left open the possibility that he could do that. But the door was certainly not closed to him doing so and he chose not to do so.</li> <li>Q. There is no evidence that you asked him for a briefing after that meeting. So unless you are saying you did, I am just asking you did you remember asking him for any kind of briefing?</li> <li>A. No, I didn't ask him for a briefing after the meeting. The meeting was to ask him what had happened and why. And in that meeting, as you will recall I told you before lunch, instead of telling me the things that it is now apparent from the evidence that we have seen in the context of this inquiry trawling for the information that there was a chief inspector or detective chief inspector who had believed that Mr Levy would</li> </ul>
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array}$	<ul> <li>asking me about something that we both know didn't happen because we know the chronology of those facts. In other words, we know that what happened was that he sent me a message. After that I asked to speak to him. Because he was in number 6 he suggested or asked whether I wished him to come up to have that discussion, and that's what happened. So self-evidently there isn't in the space of those minutes me seeking a briefing in writing ahead of a meeting. You know that and if what you want me to do is to say that it didn't happen because we both know it didn't happen, then the answer is it didn't happen.</li> <li>Q. No. Did you start the meeting by saying to Mr McGrail, "Please could you explain what has happened?"</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array} $	<ul> <li>whether at the end of the meeting I might have left open the possibility that he could do that. But the door was certainly not closed to him doing so and he chose not to do so.</li> <li>Q. There is no evidence that you asked him for a briefing after that meeting. So unless you are saying you did, I am just asking you did you remember asking him for any kind of briefing?</li> <li>A. No, I didn't ask him for a briefing after the meeting. The meeting was to ask him what had happened and why. And in that meeting, as you will recall I told you before lunch, instead of telling me the things that it is now apparent from the evidence that we have seen in the context of this inquiry trawling for the information that there was a chief inspector or detective chief inspector who had believed that Mr Levy would destroy evidence, although that is challenged.</li> </ul>
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	<ul> <li>asking me about something that we both know didn't happen because we know the chronology of those facts. In other words, we know that what happened was that he sent me a message. After that I asked to speak to him. Because he was in number 6 he suggested or asked whether I wished him to come up to have that discussion, and that's what happened. So self-evidently there isn't in the space of those minutes me seeking a briefing in writing ahead of a meeting. You know that and if what you want me to do is to say that it didn't happen because we both know it didn't happen, then the answer is it didn't happen.</li> <li>Q. No. Did you start the meeting by saying to Mr McGrail, "Please could you explain what has happened?"</li> <li>A. Not in so many words, but yes.</li> <li>Q. Did you start the meeting by criticising the RGP and Mr McGrail?</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	<ul> <li>whether at the end of the meeting I might have left open the possibility that he could do that. But the door was certainly not closed to him doing so and he chose not to do so.</li> <li>Q. There is no evidence that you asked him for a briefing after that meeting. So unless you are saying you did, I am just asking you did you remember asking him for any kind of briefing?</li> <li>A. No, I didn't ask him for a briefing after the meeting. The meeting was to ask him what had happened and why. And in that meeting, as you will recall I told you before lunch, instead of telling me the things that it is now apparent from the evidence that we have seen in the context of this inquiry trawling for the information that there was a chief inspector or detective chief inspector who had believed that Mr Levy would destroy evidence, although that is challenged. What is apparent is that, instead of telling me</li> </ul>
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ \end{array}$	<ul> <li>asking me about something that we both know didn't happen because we know the chronology of those facts. In other words, we know that what happened was that he sent me a message. After that I asked to speak to him. Because he was in number 6 he suggested or asked whether I wished him to come up to have that discussion, and that's what happened. So self-evidently there isn't in the space of those minutes me seeking a briefing in writing ahead of a meeting. You know that and if what you want me to do is to say that it didn't happen because we both know it didn't happen, then the answer is it didn't happen.</li> <li>Q. No. Did you start the meeting by saying to Mr McGrail, "Please could you explain what has happened?"</li> <li>A. Not in so many words, but yes.</li> <li>Q. Did you start the meeting by criticising the RGP and Mr McGrail?</li> <li>A. I asked the question, "What on earth</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	<ul> <li>whether at the end of the meeting I might have left open the possibility that he could do that. But the door was certainly not closed to him doing so and he chose not to do so.</li> <li>Q. There is no evidence that you asked him for a briefing after that meeting. So unless you are saying you did, I am just asking you did you remember asking him for any kind of briefing?</li> <li>A. No, I didn't ask him for a briefing after the meeting. The meeting was to ask him what had happened and why. And in that meeting, as you will recall I told you before lunch, instead of telling me the things that it is now apparent from the evidence that we have seen in the context of this inquiry trawling for the information that there was a chief inspector or detective chief inspector who had believed that Mr Levy would destroy evidence, although that is challenged. What is apparent is that, instead of telling me that, Mr McGrail, and I think it is his</li> </ul>
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ \end{array}$	<ul> <li>asking me about something that we both know didn't happen because we know the chronology of those facts. In other words, we know that what happened was that he sent me a message. After that I asked to speak to him. Because he was in number 6 he suggested or asked whether I wished him to come up to have that discussion, and that's what happened. So self-evidently there isn't in the space of those minutes me seeking a briefing in writing ahead of a meeting. You know that and if what you want me to do is to say that it didn't happen because we both know it didn't happen, then the answer is it didn't happen.</li> <li>Q. No. Did you start the meeting by saying to Mr McGrail, "Please could you explain what has happened?"</li> <li>A. Not in so many words, but yes.</li> <li>Q. Did you start the meeting by criticising the RGP and Mr McGrail?</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	<ul> <li>whether at the end of the meeting I might have left open the possibility that he could do that. But the door was certainly not closed to him doing so and he chose not to do so.</li> <li>Q. There is no evidence that you asked him for a briefing after that meeting. So unless you are saying you did, I am just asking you did you remember asking him for any kind of briefing?</li> <li>A. No, I didn't ask him for a briefing after the meeting. The meeting was to ask him what had happened and why. And in that meeting, as you will recall I told you before lunch, instead of telling me the things that it is now apparent from the evidence that we have seen in the context of this inquiry trawling for the information that there was a chief inspector or detective chief inspector who had believed that Mr Levy would destroy evidence, although that is challenged. What is apparent is that, instead of telling me</li> </ul>
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	<ul> <li>asking me about something that we both know didn't happen because we know the chronology of those facts. In other words, we know that what happened was that he sent me a message. After that I asked to speak to him. Because he was in number 6 he suggested or asked whether I wished him to come up to have that discussion, and that's what happened. So self-evidently there isn't in the space of those minutes me seeking a briefing in writing ahead of a meeting. You know that and if what you want me to do is to say that it didn't happen because we both know it didn't happen, then the answer is it didn't happen.</li> <li>Q. No. Did you start the meeting by saying to Mr McGrail, "Please could you explain what has happened?"</li> <li>A. Not in so many words, but yes.</li> <li>Q. Did you start the meeting by criticising the RGP and Mr McGrail?</li> <li>A. I asked the question, "What on earth (perhaps not in those terms) had happened</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	<ul> <li>whether at the end of the meeting I might have left open the possibility that he could do that. But the door was certainly not closed to him doing so and he chose not to do so.</li> <li>Q. There is no evidence that you asked him for a briefing after that meeting. So unless you are saying you did, I am just asking you did you remember asking him for any kind of briefing?</li> <li>A. No, I didn't ask him for a briefing after the meeting. The meeting was to ask him what had happened and why. And in that meeting, as you will recall I told you before lunch, instead of telling me the things that it is now apparent from the evidence that we have seen in the context of this inquiry trawling for the information that there was a chief inspector or detective chief inspector who had believed that Mr Levy would destroy evidence, although that is challenged. What is apparent is that, instead of telling me that, Mr McGrail, and I think it is his evidence also, told me first that the Attorney</li> </ul>

45 (Pages 177 to 180)

1	way of search warrant and, second, that the	1	been to try and understand why on earth they
2	DPP had advised that they should go by way	2	had decided to go by way of search warrant
3	of search warrant. I can't overemphasise to	3	against James Levy.
4	you enough the importance of that. Because	4	Q. But his advice was the core of your
5	if all that had happened is that Mr McGrail	5	concern about what Mr McGrail had told
6	had told me the facts, that is to say, look,	6	you. Did you not contact the DPP to verify
7	Paul Richardson believed that James would	7	what your concern was?
8	destroy those statements, those exchanges of	8	A. No, because my concern after the
9	information, whatever information he had, if	9	meeting on the 12th was not about the search
10	he had gone by way of production order, then	10	warrant. I had expressed my concerns about
11	if he had said that, then Mr McGrail might	11	that to the Commissioner of Police. My
12	still be Commissioner of Police today. But	12	concern after the meeting on the 12th was
13	he didn't say that. He lied to me. And that's	13	about the fact that I had been misled. Let me
14	why he is not the Commissioner of Police	14	be very clear with you, Mr Wagner. I have
15	today.	15	been clear already and I will be clear again. I
16	Q. What right did you have as the Chief	16	didn't interfere with this investigation. It
17	Minister to ask for information in a criminal	17	continued after 12 May and it continued after
18	investigation about your good friend?	18	Ian McGrail was no longer Commissioner of
19	A. Exactly the same right I had to receive	19	Police. I was not interested in any way
20	information from the Commissioner of Police	20	interfering with the investigation in respect
21	on the execution of a search warrant in	21	of any of the Operation Delhi defendants or
22	respect of a more junior member of the bar	22	anybody else including Mr Levy if he had
23	who was not my friend, and indeed the same	23	become a defendant. I was very interested in
24	right I had, which was none, to be told by the	24	knowing at that time why they had gone by
25	Commissioner of Police about the execution	25	way of search warrant and why I had been
	Page 181		Page 183
1		1	
1	of a search warrant in respect of a person		told at that late stage, when I had been told
2	who happened to be my friend. And I	$\begin{vmatrix} 2 \\ 2 \end{vmatrix}$	much earlier in respect of another nor junior member of the bar. That is what I was
3	suppose the same right that Mr Gaggero had	3	
4	to be told before those individuals had been	4	inquiring about on 12 May. After that
5	arrested that they were going to be arrested	5	meeting on 12 May, because of the first lie
6 7	on that day by the selfsame Commissioner of	6	about the Attorney General, and the second
7	<b>Police.</b> Q. Did you ask the DPP for a briefing	78	thing about the DPP which the Attorney
8 9	following the meeting?		General believed was not true, the Attorney General went off and confirmed to me that I
		10	
10 11	A. I think the DPP has been very clear about	10	had been lied to also about the DPP issue. So
11	the fact that I have hardly been in contact with him in the time that he has been in his	11	after 12 May my issue with Ian McGrail has
		12	nothing to do with the substance of a search warrant. So I had asked him to be briefed
13	post.		
14 15	Q. Is it yes or no? Did you ask the DPP for a briefing after the meeting?	14 15	<b>about it. I had asked him about why he lied.</b> Q. You thought after that meeting that
15	A. For the reasons that DPP has given in his	15	Mr McGrail had lied to you about being
17	very clear evidence, the answer is no.	17	advised by the DPP. Correct?
1/	•	18	A. About being advised by the DPP to go by
	() No	10	A. About being advised by the D11 to go by
18	Q. No. A And neither do I think that in any way		way of search warrant
18 19	A. And neither do I think that in any way	19	way of search warrant.
18 19 20	A. And neither do I think that in any way reflects against the fact that what I was trying	19 20	Q. Yes. Did you check with the DPP
18 19 20 21	A. And neither do I think that in any way reflects against the fact that what I was trying to do that day in the meeting of the 12th	19 20 21	Q. Yes. Did you check with the DPP yourself whether that was correct?
18 19 20 21 22	A. And neither do I think that in any way reflects against the fact that what I was trying to do that day in the meeting of the 12th when Mr McGrail came to see me, because	19 20 21 22	<ul><li>Q. Yes. Did you check with the DPP yourself whether that was correct?</li><li>A. No, I didn't.</li></ul>
18 19 20 21 22 23	A. And neither do I think that in any way reflects against the fact that what I was trying to do that day in the meeting of the 12th when Mr McGrail came to see me, because he happened to be at number 6 Convent	19 20 21 22 23	<ul><li>Q. Yes. Did you check with the DPP yourself whether that was correct?</li><li>A. No, I didn't.</li><li>Q. No.</li></ul>
18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. And neither do I think that in any way reflects against the fact that what I was trying to do that day in the meeting of the 12th when Mr McGrail came to see me, because he happened to be at number 6 Convent Place, what I would have done on the phone,	19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Q. Yes. Did you check with the DPP yourself whether that was correct?</li> <li>A. No, I didn't.</li> <li>Q. No.</li> <li>A. No. For a reason that I know you fully</li> </ul>
18 19 20 21 22 23	A. And neither do I think that in any way reflects against the fact that what I was trying to do that day in the meeting of the 12th when Mr McGrail came to see me, because he happened to be at number 6 Convent	19 20 21 22 23	<ul><li>Q. Yes. Did you check with the DPP yourself whether that was correct?</li><li>A. No, I didn't.</li><li>Q. No.</li></ul>
18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. And neither do I think that in any way reflects against the fact that what I was trying to do that day in the meeting of the 12th when Mr McGrail came to see me, because he happened to be at number 6 Convent Place, what I would have done on the phone,	19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Q. Yes. Did you check with the DPP yourself whether that was correct?</li> <li>A. No, I didn't.</li> <li>Q. No.</li> <li>A. No. For a reason that I know you fully</li> </ul>

46 (Pages 181 to 184)

1 briefed on the papers in this proceeding, 1 A. Only by Mr McGrail I assume. 2 2 which is that I asked the Attorney General to Q. Well, also by Mr Pyle. 3 3 A. By who? go and check that because in the same way as 4 4 Q. By Mr Pyle. I wouldn't call a superintendent in the Royal 5 Gibraltar Police for anything, I would call the 5 A. Well, by Mr Pyle who says I am angry 6 6 about what happened, when I was -head of an organisation, the head of the 7 government's law officers in the Attorney 7 Q. He said you had the bit between your 8 General and I asked him to check with the 8 teeth. 9 9 A. It I had not conveyed my emotion to DPP. 10 10 Q. And he gave you the wrong information. Mr Pyle you would be asking me the 11 A. Yes. And quickly redressed that. 11 question now about why I had hidden how I 12 Q. We will come to that. 12 felt. 13 A. The inaccuracy in the information that he 13 Q. You did not take any kind of notes of that 14 14 provided, however, did not go to the issue of meeting, did you? 15 15 whether what Mr McGrail had told me was A. I don't take notes in meeting because I am 16 16 a principal in meetings and so I tend not to true or not. It went to the degree to which 17 17 what he had told me was true or not, but not take notes. Others take notes. 18 to whether what he had told me was true or 18 Q. No, but you did not ask any others to take 19 not. And that is an issue that I think you will 19 notes, did you? 20 20 find it difficult to shift me or anybody else A. At what meeting? 21 on, looking at my view of what happened on 21 Q. At the 12 May meeting. 22 22 A. That was not a sit down meeting, as you that day. 23 23 Q. Did you consider whether the know, Mr Wagner. That was an impromptu 24 24 spontaneous, emotional and angry meeting meeting that happened by happenstance. It 25 25 may have led you to some misunderstanding would have been a telephone conversation if Page 185 Page 187 1 between you and the Commissioner? 1 it had not been that Mr McGrail happened to 2 A. Yes, I did, on a number of occasions. 2 be in number 6 and not New Mole House. 3 3 And I have searched my conscience and my Q. It was a very important meeting, was it 4 4 soul in that respect because these are not? 5 5 consequential actions that we took thereafter. A. It was a meeting for me to find something 6 This was not something to be done simply in 6 out in order to be able to deal with the 7 7 anger and anger dies town and then it's time potential consequences for the jurisdiction. 8 8 Q. Have you ever before that meeting called for quiet reflection and consideration and I 9 9 had the time for that. And indeed 48 hours in the Commissioner of Police and angrily 10 10 later, when I was much calmer, I opened my criticised him in relation to an operational 11 11 brief on references to Gibraltar in the decision? 12 international press, as I do every morning, 12 A. Yes. 13 13 and the first thing I see is that I have also Q. You have. 14 been failed by the Commissioner of Police 14 A. Twice, I think. 15 15 Q. So it is the third time you had ever done because claims have been filed in respect of 16 16 deaths at sea which I have not been made it. 17 aware of by the Commissioner of Police. 17 A. Yes. 18 Q. You said for the first time yesterday in 18 O. Now, Mr McGrail took a note of this 19 19 your evidence that you believed meeting, B75. He wrote an email to himself 20 20 Mr McGrail's temperament was of concern to that day. 21 21 you and others. A. Right, let us be very clear about the fact 22 22 A. Only because it's the first time I have that he did not take a note in that meeting. 23 ever been asked about his appointment. 23 He was standing up and speaking to me. 24 24 Q. But is it not you who have been described Q. On 75, please, B75. (Pause). Sorry, 76. 25 repeatedly in this Inquiry as acting in anger? 25 A. I don't have it here. Page 186 Page 188

47 (Pages 185 to 188)

1	Q. It would be on the screen. (Pause).	1	implausible?
2	A little bit further. (Pause). So if you just	2	A. Yes, of course.
3	look there, this is at the top, the second line:	3	Q. And did you not think: maybe I have just
4	"I advised that the warrant had been signed	4	got the wrong end of the stick here. Maybe
5	by a judge who was satisfied that this was the	5	Mr McGrail in this angry exchange was just
6	likely method we had to resort to in order to	6	saying something like the AG's chambers, or
7	recover the material which could hold	7	whatever it was?
8	evidence and all the grounds to deal with JL	8	A. No, I didn't believe that.
9	had been consulted with the DPP."	9	Q. You saw just thought the
10	Do you accept that that language, "all the	10	Commissioner
11	grounds to deal with JL had been consulted	11	A. I thought Mr McGrail is sembling when
12	with the DPP", could well have been what	12	he was with me in order to mislead me.
12	Mr McGrail said to you which led to	13	That's the conclusion I came to once I
13	a misunderstanding?	14	considered it. And indeed when I heard the
14	A. No.	15	additional five minutes of the recording that
		16	0
16 17	Q. You say it is impossible that those were the words he used?		Mr McGrail carried out the following day
17		17	and I hear him sitting in the car, forgetting
18	A. I do not recall those words being the	18	that he himself was recording himself. And
19	words used. I recall the words being used	19	here he has explained to Mr Richardson the
20	being he has advised that we should go by	20	things that he said, I said and he said, etc, I
21	way of search warrant. As I say, if there is	21	am reinforced in my view that my
22	a recording of that meeting the sooner that	22	recollection is correct and this is
23	we all hear it the better.	23	a self-serving note made by Mr McGrail at
24	Q. You can take it from me there is not one.	24	sometime thereafter.
25	A. Well, you have not been told that there is	25	Q. But Mr McGrail did not know by this
	Page 189		Page 191
	0		0
1	one.	1	stage that you had any concerns about him
2	Q. Mr McGrail knew at the time, he has	2	lying to you, did he? This is on the day of 12
3	given evidence, that the DPP would not have	3	May.
4	advised on the search warrant and the DPP	4	A. Well, this is allegedly on the day.
5	has given exactly the same evidence that he	5	Q. Well, it is emailed to himself and the
6	just simply would not advise on operational	6	Inquiry has the emails.
7	matters. Did you know that at the time, that	7	A. I think he would have known. Just
8	the DPP did not advise on operational	8	correct me if I am wrong, if it is emailed on
9	matters?	9	the 12th, it is emailed late on the 12th. Is that
10	A. I knew at the time that these decisions	10	right?
11	were for the RGP. That's why I was	11	Q. Yes, about 10 in the evening.
12			
	•	12	A. Yes and is it not the case that the
13	surprised to be told that the DPP had advised		A. Yes and is it not the case that the
13 14	surprised to be told that the DPP had advised that they would go by way of search warrant.	12	· •
14	surprised to be told that the DPP had advised	12 13 14	A. Yes and is it not the case that the Attorney General was pursuing whether or not Mr McGrail had lied to me that afternoon
14 15	surprised to be told that the DPP had advised that they would go by way of search warrant. As surprised as I had been a moment earlier when the Commissioner had told me that the	12 13 14 15	A. Yes and is it not the case that the Attorney General was pursuing whether or not Mr McGrail had lied to me that afternoon and that that was a very live issue at that
14 15 16	surprised to be told that the DPP had advised that they would go by way of search warrant. As surprised as I had been a moment earlier when the Commissioner had told me that the Attorney General had advised that they go by	12 13 14 15 16	A. Yes and is it not the case that the Attorney General was pursuing whether or not Mr McGrail had lied to me that afternoon and that that was a very live issue at that time?
14 15 16 17	surprised to be told that the DPP had advised that they would go by way of search warrant. As surprised as I had been a moment earlier when the Commissioner had told me that the Attorney General had advised that they go by way of search warrant, which the Attorney	12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A. Yes and is it not the case that the Attorney General was pursuing whether or not Mr McGrail had lied to me that afternoon and that that was a very live issue at that time?</li> <li>Q. He spoke to him</li> </ul>
14 15 16 17 18	surprised to be told that the DPP had advised that they would go by way of search warrant. As surprised as I had been a moment earlier when the Commissioner had told me that the Attorney General had advised that they go by way of search warrant, which the Attorney General in front of Mr McGrail quickly said	12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A. Yes and is it not the case that the Attorney General was pursuing whether or not Mr McGrail had lied to me that afternoon and that that was a very live issue at that time?</li> <li>Q. He spoke to him A. So I don't agree with you.</li> </ul>
14 15 16 17 18 19	surprised to be told that the DPP had advised that they would go by way of search warrant. As surprised as I had been a moment earlier when the Commissioner had told me that the Attorney General had advised that they go by way of search warrant, which the Attorney General in front of Mr McGrail quickly said was not true and was not the case.	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>A. Yes and is it not the case that the Attorney General was pursuing whether or not Mr McGrail had lied to me that afternoon and that that was a very live issue at that time?</li> <li>Q. He spoke to him A. So I don't agree with you.</li> <li>Q on the 13th.</li> </ul>
14 15 16 17 18 19 20	surprised to be told that the DPP had advised that they would go by way of search warrant. As surprised as I had been a moment earlier when the Commissioner had told me that the Attorney General had advised that they go by way of search warrant, which the Attorney General in front of Mr McGrail quickly said was not true and was not the case. Q. But why, did you not think to yourself in	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>A. Yes and is it not the case that the Attorney General was pursuing whether or not Mr McGrail had lied to me that afternoon and that that was a very live issue at that time?</li> <li>Q. He spoke to him</li> <li>A. So I don't agree with you.</li> <li>Q on the 13th.</li> <li>A. That is why I definitely don't agree with</li> </ul>
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	surprised to be told that the DPP had advised that they would go by way of search warrant. As surprised as I had been a moment earlier when the Commissioner had told me that the Attorney General had advised that they go by way of search warrant, which the Attorney General in front of Mr McGrail quickly said was not true and was not the case. Q. But why, did you not think to yourself in the cold reflection after the meeting: why	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A. Yes and is it not the case that the Attorney General was pursuing whether or not Mr McGrail had lied to me that afternoon and that that was a very live issue at that time?</li> <li>Q. He spoke to him</li> <li>A. So I don't agree with you.</li> <li>Q on the 13th.</li> <li>A. That is why I definitely don't agree with you that by then Mr McGrail did not know</li> </ul>
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	surprised to be told that the DPP had advised that they would go by way of search warrant. As surprised as I had been a moment earlier when the Commissioner had told me that the Attorney General had advised that they go by way of search warrant, which the Attorney General in front of Mr McGrail quickly said was not true and was not the case. Q. But why, did you not think to yourself in the cold reflection after the meeting: why would Mr McGrail lie about what the	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A. Yes and is it not the case that the Attorney General was pursuing whether or not Mr McGrail had lied to me that afternoon and that that was a very live issue at that time?</li> <li>Q. He spoke to him</li> <li>A. So I don't agree with you.</li> <li>Q on the 13th.</li> <li>A. That is why I definitely don't agree with you that by then Mr McGrail did not know that I believed that he had lied.</li> </ul>
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	surprised to be told that the DPP had advised that they would go by way of search warrant. As surprised as I had been a moment earlier when the Commissioner had told me that the Attorney General had advised that they go by way of search warrant, which the Attorney General in front of Mr McGrail quickly said was not true and was not the case. Q. But why, did you not think to yourself in the cold reflection after the meeting: why would Mr McGrail lie about what the Attorney General had said to him while he	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>A. Yes and is it not the case that the Attorney General was pursuing whether or not Mr McGrail had lied to me that afternoon and that that was a very live issue at that time?</li> <li>Q. He spoke to him</li> <li>A. So I don't agree with you.</li> <li>Q on the 13th.</li> <li>A. That is why I definitely don't agree with you that by then Mr McGrail did not know that I believed that he had lied.</li> <li>Q. That is wrong. The Attorney General</li> </ul>
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	surprised to be told that the DPP had advised that they would go by way of search warrant. As surprised as I had been a moment earlier when the Commissioner had told me that the Attorney General had advised that they go by way of search warrant, which the Attorney General in front of Mr McGrail quickly said was not true and was not the case. Q. But why, did you not think to yourself in the cold reflection after the meeting: why would Mr McGrail lie about what the Attorney General had said to him while he was standing there in front of the Attorney	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>A. Yes and is it not the case that the Attorney General was pursuing whether or not Mr McGrail had lied to me that afternoon and that that was a very live issue at that time?</li> <li>Q. He spoke to him</li> <li>A. So I don't agree with you.</li> <li>Q on the 13th.</li> <li>A. That is why I definitely don't agree with you that by then Mr McGrail did not know that I believed that he had lied.</li> <li>Q. That is wrong. The Attorney General was speaking to Mr McGrail on the 13th.</li> </ul>
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	surprised to be told that the DPP had advised that they would go by way of search warrant. As surprised as I had been a moment earlier when the Commissioner had told me that the Attorney General had advised that they go by way of search warrant, which the Attorney General in front of Mr McGrail quickly said was not true and was not the case. Q. But why, did you not think to yourself in the cold reflection after the meeting: why would Mr McGrail lie about what the Attorney General had said to him while he	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>A. Yes and is it not the case that the Attorney General was pursuing whether or not Mr McGrail had lied to me that afternoon and that that was a very live issue at that time?</li> <li>Q. He spoke to him</li> <li>A. So I don't agree with you.</li> <li>Q on the 13th.</li> <li>A. That is why I definitely don't agree with you that by then Mr McGrail did not know that I believed that he had lied.</li> <li>Q. That is wrong. The Attorney General</li> </ul>
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	surprised to be told that the DPP had advised that they would go by way of search warrant. As surprised as I had been a moment earlier when the Commissioner had told me that the Attorney General had advised that they go by way of search warrant, which the Attorney General in front of Mr McGrail quickly said was not true and was not the case. Q. But why, did you not think to yourself in the cold reflection after the meeting: why would Mr McGrail lie about what the Attorney General had said to him while he was standing there in front of the Attorney	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>A. Yes and is it not the case that the Attorney General was pursuing whether or not Mr McGrail had lied to me that afternoon and that that was a very live issue at that time?</li> <li>Q. He spoke to him</li> <li>A. So I don't agree with you.</li> <li>Q on the 13th.</li> <li>A. That is why I definitely don't agree with you that by then Mr McGrail did not know that I believed that he had lied.</li> <li>Q. That is wrong. The Attorney General was speaking to Mr McGrail on the 13th.</li> </ul>

www.epiqglobal.com Lower Ground Floor, 46 Chancery Lane casemanagers@epiqglobal.com London, WC2A 1JE

48 (Pages 189 to 192)

1	recorded on the 13th. That does not mean	1	my presence, that he misled me. And he did
2	that they didn't also speak during the course	2	not thereafter seek to undo the lie that he had
3	of the 12th.	3	told me. Lies, sorry, lies that he had told me.
4	Q. Well, you can take it from me there is	4	Q. Did this situation not happen in fact
5	absolutely no evidence that they did.	5	because you had inappropriately called him
6	THE CHAIRMAN: Taking it from you	6	in for an angry confrontation in a matter
7	rather sounds like you giving evidence,	7	which you had no statutory or jurisdictional
8	which is not (inaudible).	8	ambit over?
9	MR WAGNER: No, fair enough. Did you	9	A. But, you see, the whole premise of that
10	not think, well, why would Mr McGrail tell	10	question is based on it being inappropriate
11	me the DPP's advice on the warrant if the AG	11	for me to talk with the Commissioner of
12	or I can just simply ask the DPP and I will	12	Police about a search warrant when in fact
13	find out that it is not true. Did you not think	13	the Police Commissioner is the man who has
14	is that not implausible as well, that the	14	himself come to see me about another search
15	Commissioner of Police would say that even	15	warrant in respect of another barrister and he
16	in a heated meeting?	16	has sent me the message about this search
17	A. Well, Mr Wagner, that doesn't hold any	17	warrant. So I don't accept your
18	water in the context of the phrase that you are	18	characterisation of why this meeting comes
19	actually referring me to, which is that he told	19	about or the fact that it was inappropriate,
20	me that the matter had been consulted with	20	given the potential jurisdictional
21	the DPP and the whole theory behind your	21	consequences of this particular search
22	question is that they did not have to and it	22	warrant.
23	would be surprising for him to have	23	Q. Is it right that you did not write down
24	mentioned him.	24 25	what you thought the Commissioner of Police had said until four weeks later?
25	Q. No, I am asking you what was said, not	25	Police had said until four weeks later?
	Page 193		Page 195
1	what that means. I was asking you is it	1	A. It is very likely that I didn't until, with the
2	plausible that that was what was said to you	2	assistance of my counsel, I prepared the
3	and when you wrote it down eventually you	3	response to the GPA letter.
4	had misremembered it.	4	Q. And that is at C4734, please. (Pause).
5	A. And I am saying to you it is not what	5	A. Four seven?
6	happened. What happened, I remember as if	6	Q. C4
7	it were yesterday what happened and I will	7	A. Three four?
8	always remember what Ian McGrail said on	8	Q. In fact, you have already been shown it
9	that day because it was consequential. Now,	9	and you have seen it, but you accept that that
10	you heard Dr Britto say that he is somebody	10	is the first time, four weeks later, that you
11	who does not like confrontation. I know	11	wrote down what happened, with your
12	Dr Britto since I was 12 years old and I fully	12	lawyer.
13	understand that that is exactly how he is.	13	A. It's very likely, yes, but, you know, I
14	None of the rest of us like confrontation. I	14	don't have to write things down to remember
15	didn't want a confrontation with Ian McGrail.	15	them and sometimes when I write them down
16	I didn't want to have to use the powers that	16	they may not be the most accurate record.
17	are provided for in section 15 of the Police	17	My recollection, I know this is the accurate
18	Act to seek information about deaths at sea,	18	record.
19	which is something that I should be receiving	19	Q. Yes. If we can just go further down the
20	anyway. These circumstances appertained	20	page. The next page. Sorry, further on.
21	because of what happened on the 12th and	21	Keep going, there. Sorry, it is the next
22	the way that your client dealt with me in my	22	paragraph. Next page, sorry. I didn't put the
23	office in a way that was in my view	23	right reference in. And further down.
24	intentionally designed to mislead or at the	24	(Pause). Yes, keep going. And keep going.
25	very least, because he became so nervous in	25	(Pause). There. B, all the above, and just go
	Page 194		Page 196

49 (Pages 193 to 196)

1	down that paragraph:	1	nos mintió a los dos", is that "he lied to us
2	"As in May, since this day, as the COP well	2	both"?
3	knows, there are a lot of reasons why I	3	A. That's very good, I didn't know you spoke
4	further lost confidence in him by virtue of the	4	the language.
5	criminal investigation. I have not lost	5	Q. Yes I have seen that text (inaudible).
6	confidence in him because he has obtained	6	A. That means that he has lied to us both.
7	a search warrant in circumstances which I	7	Q. Yes, exactly. Mr Llamas says, "He
8	believe are inappropriate. There is the reason	8	certainly gave us the impression the search
9	the criminal investigation, the primary reason	9	warrant decision was sanctioned by the
10	is the COP has clearly lied to me. During the	10	DPP." Why did you not text back to say:
11	meeting which I refer to above the COP	11	Michael, he did not just give us the
12	states to me in explicit terms in response to	12	impression, he stated to me in explicit terms
13	my concerns about the propriety of the	13	that he has obtained the search warrant
14	warrant that he had obtained and executed	14	against Mr Levy in reliance of legal advice
15	a search warrant against Mr Levy in reliance	15	from the DPP?
16	on legal advice from the DPP. He confirmed	16	A. Because I didn't have to, because Michael
17	it was appropriate to seek such a warrant and	17	Llamas was there.
18	proceed in that way."	18	Q. "gave us the impression". Do you know
19	Do you accept that Mr McGrail will not have	19	that Mr Llamas did not support, in his letter
20	told you that he obtained the warrant?	20	to the GPA, that Mr McGrail had lied to you
21	(Pause).	21	in the meeting?
22	A. Yes, that is a characterisation of him as	22	A. I can't recall the terms of Mr Llamas's
23	the RGP.	23	letter, that's his letter, and it's not Mr
24	Q. Yes, and do you accept that he would not	24	Llamas's confidence in the Commissioner of
25	have told you that he executed a search	25	Police that's relevant in this case.
	Page 197		Page 199
1	warrant?	1	Q. But were not
1 2	warrant? A. It is personification in the letter, yes,	1 2	Q. But were not A. Mr Llamas is the Attorney General; the
	A. It is personification in the letter, yes, absolutely.		-
2	A. It is personification in the letter, yes,	2	A. Mr Llamas is the Attorney General; the
2 3	<ul><li>A. It is personification in the letter, yes, absolutely.</li><li>Q. So you accept that bit of the letter is inaccurate.</li></ul>	2 3	A. Mr Llamas is the Attorney General; the Police Act does not refer to the GPA having to consult with the Attorney General in any respect.
2 3 4	<ul> <li>A. It is personification in the letter, yes, absolutely.</li> <li>Q. So you accept that bit of the letter is inaccurate.</li> <li>A. No, I'm saying it is personification.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	<ul><li>A. Mr Llamas is the Attorney General; the Police Act does not refer to the GPA having to consult with the Attorney General in any respect.</li><li>Q. Were you not all represented by the same</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>A. It is personification in the letter, yes, absolutely.</li> <li>Q. So you accept that bit of the letter is inaccurate.</li> <li>A. No, I'm saying it is personification.</li> <li>Q. And that second part: "In reliance on</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul><li>A. Mr Llamas is the Attorney General; the Police Act does not refer to the GPA having to consult with the Attorney General in any respect.</li><li>Q. Were you not all represented by the same lawyer at that point?</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>A. It is personification in the letter, yes, absolutely.</li> <li>Q. So you accept that bit of the letter is inaccurate.</li> <li>A. No, I'm saying it is personification.</li> <li>Q. And that second part: "In reliance on legal advice from the DPP who confirmed it</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>A. Mr Llamas is the Attorney General; the Police Act does not refer to the GPA having to consult with the Attorney General in any respect.</li> <li>Q. Were you not all represented by the same lawyer at that point?</li> <li>A. We were.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A. It is personification in the letter, yes, absolutely.</li> <li>Q. So you accept that bit of the letter is inaccurate.</li> <li>A. No, I'm saying it is personification.</li> <li>Q. And that second part: "In reliance on legal advice from the DPP who confirmed it was appropriate to seek such a warrant and</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>A. Mr Llamas is the Attorney General; the Police Act does not refer to the GPA having to consult with the Attorney General in any respect.</li> <li>Q. Were you not all represented by the same lawyer at that point?</li> <li>A. We were.</li> <li>Q. And were those letters not coordinated?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>A. It is personification in the letter, yes, absolutely.</li> <li>Q. So you accept that bit of the letter is inaccurate.</li> <li>A. No, I'm saying it is personification.</li> <li>Q. And that second part: "In reliance on legal advice from the DPP who confirmed it was appropriate to seek such a warrant and proceed in that way", that was the only time,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>A. Mr Llamas is the Attorney General; the Police Act does not refer to the GPA having to consult with the Attorney General in any respect.</li> <li>Q. Were you not all represented by the same lawyer at that point?</li> <li>A. We were.</li> <li>Q. And were those letters not coordinated?</li> <li>A. They were written by the same lawyer, I</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>A. It is personification in the letter, yes, absolutely.</li> <li>Q. So you accept that bit of the letter is inaccurate.</li> <li>A. No, I'm saying it is personification.</li> <li>Q. And that second part: "In reliance on legal advice from the DPP who confirmed it was appropriate to seek such a warrant and proceed in that way", that was the only time, or you say that was the first time you had</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>A. Mr Llamas is the Attorney General; the Police Act does not refer to the GPA having to consult with the Attorney General in any respect.</li> <li>Q. Were you not all represented by the same lawyer at that point?</li> <li>A. We were.</li> <li>Q. And were those letters not coordinated?</li> <li>A. They were written by the same lawyer, I don't think that they were coordinated.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>A. It is personification in the letter, yes, absolutely.</li> <li>Q. So you accept that bit of the letter is inaccurate.</li> <li>A. No, I'm saying it is personification.</li> <li>Q. And that second part: "In reliance on legal advice from the DPP who confirmed it was appropriate to seek such a warrant and proceed in that way", that was the only time, or you say that was the first time you had written that down?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>A. Mr Llamas is the Attorney General; the Police Act does not refer to the GPA having to consult with the Attorney General in any respect.</li> <li>Q. Were you not all represented by the same lawyer at that point?</li> <li>A. We were.</li> <li>Q. And were those letters not coordinated?</li> <li>A. They were written by the same lawyer, I don't think that they were coordinated.</li> <li>Coordination implies that we were trying to</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A. It is personification in the letter, yes, absolutely.</li> <li>Q. So you accept that bit of the letter is inaccurate.</li> <li>A. No, I'm saying it is personification.</li> <li>Q. And that second part: "In reliance on legal advice from the DPP who confirmed it was appropriate to seek such a warrant and proceed in that way", that was the only time, or you say that was the first time you had</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A. Mr Llamas is the Attorney General; the Police Act does not refer to the GPA having to consult with the Attorney General in any respect.</li> <li>Q. Were you not all represented by the same lawyer at that point?</li> <li>A. We were.</li> <li>Q. And were those letters not coordinated?</li> <li>A. They were written by the same lawyer, I don't think that they were coordinated.</li> <li>Coordination implies that we were trying to ensure that they said the same thing. We</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A. It is personification in the letter, yes, absolutely.</li> <li>Q. So you accept that bit of the letter is inaccurate.</li> <li>A. No, I'm saying it is personification.</li> <li>Q. And that second part: "In reliance on legal advice from the DPP who confirmed it was appropriate to seek such a warrant and proceed in that way", that was the only time, or you say that was the first time you had written that down?</li> <li>A. Yes, I didn't write it down though, as you know.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A. Mr Llamas is the Attorney General; the Police Act does not refer to the GPA having to consult with the Attorney General in any respect.</li> <li>Q. Were you not all represented by the same lawyer at that point?</li> <li>A. We were.</li> <li>Q. And were those letters not coordinated?</li> <li>A. They were written by the same lawyer, I don't think that they were coordinated.</li> <li>Coordination implies that we were trying to ensure that they said the same thing. We weren't trying to do that; we were both trying</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>A. It is personification in the letter, yes, absolutely.</li> <li>Q. So you accept that bit of the letter is inaccurate.</li> <li>A. No, I'm saying it is personification.</li> <li>Q. And that second part: "In reliance on legal advice from the DPP who confirmed it was appropriate to seek such a warrant and proceed in that way", that was the only time, or you say that was the first time you had written that down?</li> <li>A. Yes, I didn't write it down though, as you know.</li> <li>Q. No.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>A. Mr Llamas is the Attorney General; the Police Act does not refer to the GPA having to consult with the Attorney General in any respect.</li> <li>Q. Were you not all represented by the same lawyer at that point?</li> <li>A. We were.</li> <li>Q. And were those letters not coordinated?</li> <li>A. They were written by the same lawyer, I don't think that they were coordinated.</li> <li>Coordination implies that we were trying to ensure that they said the same thing. We weren't trying to do that; we were both trying to reflect accurately (or all three of us,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>A. It is personification in the letter, yes, absolutely.</li> <li>Q. So you accept that bit of the letter is inaccurate.</li> <li>A. No, I'm saying it is personification.</li> <li>Q. And that second part: "In reliance on legal advice from the DPP who confirmed it was appropriate to seek such a warrant and proceed in that way", that was the only time, or you say that was the first time you had written that down?</li> <li>A. Yes, I didn't write it down though, as you know.</li> <li>Q. No.</li> <li>A. It was written down by my lawyers.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>A. Mr Llamas is the Attorney General; the Police Act does not refer to the GPA having to consult with the Attorney General in any respect.</li> <li>Q. Were you not all represented by the same lawyer at that point?</li> <li>A. We were.</li> <li>Q. And were those letters not coordinated?</li> <li>A. They were written by the same lawyer, I don't think that they were coordinated.</li> <li>Coordination implies that we were trying to ensure that they said the same thing. We weren't trying to do that; we were both trying to reflect accurately (or all three of us, because I think there was also the question of</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A. It is personification in the letter, yes, absolutely.</li> <li>Q. So you accept that bit of the letter is inaccurate.</li> <li>A. No, I'm saying it is personification.</li> <li>Q. And that second part: "In reliance on legal advice from the DPP who confirmed it was appropriate to seek such a warrant and proceed in that way", that was the only time, or you say that was the first time you had written that down?</li> <li>A. Yes, I didn't write it down though, as you know.</li> <li>Q. No.</li> <li>A. It was written down by my lawyers.</li> <li>Q. On instructions, yes.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A. Mr Llamas is the Attorney General; the Police Act does not refer to the GPA having to consult with the Attorney General in any respect.</li> <li>Q. Were you not all represented by the same lawyer at that point?</li> <li>A. We were.</li> <li>Q. And were those letters not coordinated?</li> <li>A. They were written by the same lawyer, I don't think that they were coordinated.</li> <li>Coordination implies that we were trying to ensure that they said the same thing. We weren't trying to do that; we were both trying to reflect accurately (or all three of us, because I think there was also the question of the Governor at the time), all three of us were</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A. It is personification in the letter, yes, absolutely.</li> <li>Q. So you accept that bit of the letter is inaccurate.</li> <li>A. No, I'm saying it is personification.</li> <li>Q. And that second part: "In reliance on legal advice from the DPP who confirmed it was appropriate to seek such a warrant and proceed in that way", that was the only time, or you say that was the first time you had written that down?</li> <li>A. Yes, I didn't write it down though, as you know.</li> <li>Q. No.</li> <li>A. It was written down by my lawyers.</li> <li>Q. On instructions, yes.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A. Mr Llamas is the Attorney General; the Police Act does not refer to the GPA having to consult with the Attorney General in any respect.</li> <li>Q. Were you not all represented by the same lawyer at that point?</li> <li>A. We were.</li> <li>Q. And were those letters not coordinated?</li> <li>A. They were written by the same lawyer, I don't think that they were coordinated.</li> <li>Coordination implies that we were trying to ensure that they said the same thing. We weren't trying to do that; we were both trying to reflect accurately (or all three of us, because I think there was also the question of the Governor at the time), all three of us were trying to reflect accurately what we believed</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>A. It is personification in the letter, yes, absolutely.</li> <li>Q. So you accept that bit of the letter is inaccurate.</li> <li>A. No, I'm saying it is personification.</li> <li>Q. And that second part: "In reliance on legal advice from the DPP who confirmed it was appropriate to seek such a warrant and proceed in that way", that was the only time, or you say that was the first time you had written that down?</li> <li>A. Yes, I didn't write it down though, as you know.</li> <li>Q. No.</li> <li>A. It was written down by my lawyers.</li> <li>Q. On instructions, yes.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>(14.30)</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>A. Mr Llamas is the Attorney General; the Police Act does not refer to the GPA having to consult with the Attorney General in any respect.</li> <li>Q. Were you not all represented by the same lawyer at that point?</li> <li>A. We were.</li> <li>Q. And were those letters not coordinated?</li> <li>A. They were written by the same lawyer, I don't think that they were coordinated.</li> <li>Coordination implies that we were trying to ensure that they said the same thing. We weren't trying to do that; we were both trying to reflect accurately (or all three of us, because I think there was also the question of the Governor at the time), all three of us were trying to reflect accurately what we believed we should reply to the scurrilous (if I may</li> </ul>
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array}$	<ul> <li>A. It is personification in the letter, yes, absolutely.</li> <li>Q. So you accept that bit of the letter is inaccurate.</li> <li>A. No, I'm saying it is personification.</li> <li>Q. And that second part: "In reliance on legal advice from the DPP who confirmed it was appropriate to seek such a warrant and proceed in that way", that was the only time, or you say that was the first time you had written that down?</li> <li>A. Yes, I didn't write it down though, as you know.</li> <li>Q. No.</li> <li>A. It was written down by my lawyers.</li> <li>Q. On instructions, yes.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>(14.30)</li> <li>Q. So B1417. There. This is the mistake</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\\end{array} $	<ul> <li>A. Mr Llamas is the Attorney General; the Police Act does not refer to the GPA having to consult with the Attorney General in any respect.</li> <li>Q. Were you not all represented by the same lawyer at that point?</li> <li>A. We were.</li> <li>Q. And were those letters not coordinated?</li> <li>A. They were written by the same lawyer, I don't think that they were coordinated.</li> <li>Coordination implies that we were trying to ensure that they said the same thing. We weren't trying to do that; we were both trying to reflect accurately (or all three of us, because I think there was also the question of the Governor at the time), all three of us were trying to reflect accurately what we believed we should reply to the scurrilous (if I may call it that) letter which had come in from</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A. It is personification in the letter, yes, absolutely.</li> <li>Q. So you accept that bit of the letter is inaccurate.</li> <li>A. No, I'm saying it is personification.</li> <li>Q. And that second part: "In reliance on legal advice from the DPP who confirmed it was appropriate to seek such a warrant and proceed in that way", that was the only time, or you say that was the first time you had written that down?</li> <li>A. Yes, I didn't write it down though, as you know.</li> <li>Q. No.</li> <li>A. It was written down by my lawyers.</li> <li>Q. On instructions, yes.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>(14.30)</li> <li>Q. So B1417. There. This is the mistake that Mr Llamas makes, "Spoke with the DPP,</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	<ul> <li>A. Mr Llamas is the Attorney General; the Police Act does not refer to the GPA having to consult with the Attorney General in any respect.</li> <li>Q. Were you not all represented by the same lawyer at that point?</li> <li>A. We were.</li> <li>Q. And were those letters not coordinated?</li> <li>A. They were written by the same lawyer, I don't think that they were coordinated.</li> <li>Coordination implies that we were trying to ensure that they said the same thing. We weren't trying to do that; we were both trying to reflect accurately (or all three of us, because I think there was also the question of the Governor at the time), all three of us were trying to reflect accurately what we believed we should reply to the scurrilous (if I may call it that) letter which had come in from Gomez &amp; Co in the guise of being Mr</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A. It is personification in the letter, yes, absolutely.</li> <li>Q. So you accept that bit of the letter is inaccurate.</li> <li>A. No, I'm saying it is personification.</li> <li>Q. And that second part: "In reliance on legal advice from the DPP who confirmed it was appropriate to seek such a warrant and proceed in that way", that was the only time, or you say that was the first time you had written that down?</li> <li>A. Yes, I didn't write it down though, as you know.</li> <li>Q. No.</li> <li>A. It was written down by my lawyers.</li> <li>Q. On instructions, yes.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>(14.30)</li> <li>Q. So B1417. There. This is the mistake that Mr Llamas makes, "Spoke with the DPP, he's categorical that whilst he told the RGP</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	<ul> <li>A. Mr Llamas is the Attorney General; the Police Act does not refer to the GPA having to consult with the Attorney General in any respect.</li> <li>Q. Were you not all represented by the same lawyer at that point?</li> <li>A. We were.</li> <li>Q. And were those letters not coordinated?</li> <li>A. They were written by the same lawyer, I don't think that they were coordinated.</li> <li>Coordination implies that we were trying to ensure that they said the same thing. We weren't trying to do that; we were both trying to reflect accurately (or all three of us, because I think there was also the question of the Governor at the time), all three of us were trying to reflect accurately what we believed we should reply to the scurrilous (if I may call it that) letter which had come in from Gomez &amp; Co in the guise of being Mr McGrail's representations.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>A. It is personification in the letter, yes, absolutely.</li> <li>Q. So you accept that bit of the letter is inaccurate.</li> <li>A. No, I'm saying it is personification.</li> <li>Q. And that second part: "In reliance on legal advice from the DPP who confirmed it was appropriate to seek such a warrant and proceed in that way", that was the only time, or you say that was the first time you had written that down?</li> <li>A. Yes, I didn't write it down though, as you know.</li> <li>Q. On instructions, yes.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>(14.30)</li> <li>Q. So B1417. There. This is the mistake that Mr Llamas makes, "Spoke with the DPP, he's categorical that whilst he told the RGP that an interview with JL would likely be</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	<ul> <li>A. Mr Llamas is the Attorney General; the Police Act does not refer to the GPA having to consult with the Attorney General in any respect.</li> <li>Q. Were you not all represented by the same lawyer at that point?</li> <li>A. We were.</li> <li>Q. And were those letters not coordinated?</li> <li>A. They were written by the same lawyer, I don't think that they were coordinated.</li> <li>Coordination implies that we were trying to ensure that they said the same thing. We weren't trying to do that; we were both trying to reflect accurately (or all three of us, because I think there was also the question of the Governor at the time), all three of us were trying to reflect accurately what we believed we should reply to the scurrilous (if I may call it that) letter which had come in from Gomez &amp; Co in the guise of being Mr McGrail's representations.</li> <li>Q. Is it not of concern to you that of the two</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>A. It is personification in the letter, yes, absolutely.</li> <li>Q. So you accept that bit of the letter is inaccurate.</li> <li>A. No, I'm saying it is personification.</li> <li>Q. And that second part: "In reliance on legal advice from the DPP who confirmed it was appropriate to seek such a warrant and proceed in that way", that was the only time, or you say that was the first time you had written that down?</li> <li>A. Yes, I didn't write it down though, as you know.</li> <li>Q. No.</li> <li>A. It was written down by my lawyers.</li> <li>Q. On instructions, yes.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>(14.30)</li> <li>Q. So B1417. There. This is the mistake that Mr Llamas makes, "Spoke with the DPP, he's categorical that whilst he told the RGP that an interview with JL would likely be necessary he strongly advised against a</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	<ul> <li>A. Mr Llamas is the Attorney General; the Police Act does not refer to the GPA having to consult with the Attorney General in any respect.</li> <li>Q. Were you not all represented by the same lawyer at that point?</li> <li>A. We were.</li> <li>Q. And were those letters not coordinated?</li> <li>A. They were written by the same lawyer, I don't think that they were coordinated.</li> <li>Coordination implies that we were trying to ensure that they said the same thing. We weren't trying to do that; we were both trying to reflect accurately (or all three of us, because I think there was also the question of the Governor at the time), all three of us were trying to reflect accurately what we believed we should reply to the scurrilous (if I may call it that) letter which had come in from Gomez &amp; Co in the guise of being Mr McGrail's representations.</li> <li>Q. Is it not of concern to you that of the two other people who were in the meeting apart</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>A. It is personification in the letter, yes, absolutely.</li> <li>Q. So you accept that bit of the letter is inaccurate.</li> <li>A. No, I'm saying it is personification.</li> <li>Q. And that second part: "In reliance on legal advice from the DPP who confirmed it was appropriate to seek such a warrant and proceed in that way", that was the only time, or you say that was the first time you had written that down?</li> <li>A. Yes, I didn't write it down though, as you know.</li> <li>Q. On instructions, yes.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>(14.30)</li> <li>Q. So B1417. There. This is the mistake that Mr Llamas makes, "Spoke with the DPP, he's categorical that whilst he told the RGP that an interview with JL would likely be</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	<ul> <li>A. Mr Llamas is the Attorney General; the Police Act does not refer to the GPA having to consult with the Attorney General in any respect.</li> <li>Q. Were you not all represented by the same lawyer at that point?</li> <li>A. We were.</li> <li>Q. And were those letters not coordinated?</li> <li>A. They were written by the same lawyer, I don't think that they were coordinated.</li> <li>Coordination implies that we were trying to ensure that they said the same thing. We weren't trying to do that; we were both trying to reflect accurately (or all three of us, because I think there was also the question of the Governor at the time), all three of us were trying to reflect accurately what we believed we should reply to the scurrilous (if I may call it that) letter which had come in from Gomez &amp; Co in the guise of being Mr McGrail's representations.</li> <li>Q. Is it not of concern to you that of the two</li> </ul>

www.epiqglobal.com Lower Ground Floor, 46 Chancery Lane casemanagers@epiqglobal.com London, WC2A 1JE

50 (Pages 197 to 200)

1	neither of them at this stage seem to be	1	Attorney General wasn't asking him
2	supporting what you so clearly remembered	2	questions, I was. But that reference by the
3	on 5 June?	3	Attorney General in the letter of 5 June is not
4	A. No, it is not a concern of mine. I think	4	to the events of 12 May in my office. And
5	that the Attorney General actually does share	5	so, the failure for him to say that the CoP lied
6	my view that I was misled, and I am not	6	to him is not a failure of support by the
7	going to be concerned or (to use the other	7	Attorney General to my contention of what
8	word that you constantly try to persuade me	8	happened on 12 May.
9	use) worried in that respect, because I have a	9	Q. Did you ask him
10	very clear recollection of what happened on	10	A. Your chronology is completely wrong in
10	that day. I have a very clear recollection of	10	that respect.
11	the things that Ian McGrail said, and as a	11	Q. Did you ask him to include that point in
12	5	12	his letter and he refused?
	result I have a very clear recollection of the fact that I was lied to not once but twice.		
14		14	A. No, I didn't ask him to include anything
15	And the first lie was, if I may say so, the	15	in his letter. He had discussions with lawyers
16	most the most nonsensical thing to have	16	to put what he felt was appropriate in his
17	said, because the Attorney General was	17	letter
18	actually in the room with us.	18	Q. Yes.
19	Q. Of course, it was nonsensical which	19	A I had discussions with lawyers to
20	implies	20	discuss what was appropriate for me to put in
21	A. And Michael Llamas himself said	21	my letter.
22	Q (inaudible) that you misunderstood.	22	Q. Yes.
23	A. No, because Michael Llamas himself said	23	A. I did not first of all, I did not ask him to
24	(I would say got up, but we were all standing	24	put it in, and second, I did not ask him and he
25	up): that's not true, Ian. So he said it with the	25	refused. So, you're wrong on both counts.
	Page 201		Page 203
	1 age 201		1 age 203
1	Attorney General in the room, and the	1	Q. I was asking a question
1 2	Attorney General in the room, and the Attorney General had to say to him that it		Q. I was asking a question A. Well
	Attorney General in the room, and the Attorney General had to say to him that it was not true.	2	A. Well
2	Attorney General had to say to him that it		<ul><li><b>A. Well</b></li><li>Q I was not putting a proposition.</li></ul>
2 3	Attorney General had to say to him that it was not true.	2 3 4	A. Well
2 3 4	Attorney General had to say to him that it was not true. Q. But the Attorney General did not Well,	2 3	<ul> <li>A. Well</li> <li>Q I was not putting a proposition.</li> <li>A. Well, in the event that you would believe that the answer was going to be positive to</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5	<ul><li>Attorney General had to say to him that it was not true.</li><li>Q. But the Attorney General did not Well, I will show you. C4732. This is his letter to</li></ul>	2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>A. Well</li> <li>Q I was not putting a proposition.</li> <li>A. Well, in the event that you would believe that the answer was going to be positive to either of them, you are wrong.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6	<ul><li>Attorney General had to say to him that it was not true.</li><li>Q. But the Attorney General did not Well, I will show you. C4732. This is his letter to the GPA on 5 June, same lawyers as you.</li></ul>	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>A. Well</li> <li>Q I was not putting a proposition.</li> <li>A. Well, in the event that you would believe that the answer was going to be positive to</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul><li>Attorney General had to say to him that it was not true.</li><li>Q. But the Attorney General did not Well, I will show you. C4732. This is his letter to the GPA on 5 June, same lawyers as you.</li><li>"Contrary to what the letter says", that is Mr</li></ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>A. Well</li> <li>Q I was not putting a proposition.</li> <li>A. Well, in the event that you would believe that the answer was going to be positive to either of them, you are wrong.</li> <li>Q. B1417, just to go back to those messages</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul><li>Attorney General had to say to him that it was not true.</li><li>Q. But the Attorney General did not Well, I will show you. C4732. This is his letter to the GPA on 5 June, same lawyers as you.</li><li>"Contrary to what the letter says", that is Mr McGrail's letter, "I've never said the CoP lied</li></ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>A. Well</li> <li>Q I was not putting a proposition.</li> <li>A. Well, in the event that you would believe that the answer was going to be positive to either of them, you are wrong.</li> <li>Q. B1417, just to go back to those messages please. "Spoken to the DPP, he's categorical</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Attorney General had to say to him that it was not true. Q. But the Attorney General did not Well, I will show you. C4732. This is his letter to the GPA on 5 June, same lawyers as you. "Contrary to what the letter says", that is Mr McGrail's letter, "I've never said the CoP lied to me". I will ask you again: does it not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A. Well</li> <li>Q I was not putting a proposition.</li> <li>A. Well, in the event that you would believe that the answer was going to be positive to either of them, you are wrong.</li> <li>Q. B1417, just to go back to those messages please. "Spoken to the DPP, he's categorical that whilst he told the RGP that an interview with JL would likely be necessary he</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Attorney General had to say to him that it was not true. Q. But the Attorney General did not Well, I will show you. C4732. This is his letter to the GPA on 5 June, same lawyers as you. "Contrary to what the letter says", that is Mr McGrail's letter, "I've never said the CoP lied to me". I will ask you again: does it not concern you that the other two people in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>A. Well</li> <li>Q I was not putting a proposition.</li> <li>A. Well, in the event that you would believe that the answer was going to be positive to either of them, you are wrong.</li> <li>Q. B1417, just to go back to those messages please. "Spoken to the DPP, he's categorical that whilst he told the RGP that an interview with JL would likely be necessary he strongly advised against a search warrant." I</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Attorney General had to say to him that it was not true. Q. But the Attorney General did not Well, I will show you. C4732. This is his letter to the GPA on 5 June, same lawyers as you. "Contrary to what the letter says", that is Mr McGrail's letter, "I've never said the CoP lied to me". I will ask you again: does it not concern you that the other two people in the meeting, at that relevant time were not saying	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>A. Well</li> <li>Q I was not putting a proposition.</li> <li>A. Well, in the event that you would believe that the answer was going to be positive to either of them, you are wrong.</li> <li>Q. B1417, just to go back to those messages please. "Spoken to the DPP, he's categorical that whilst he told the RGP that an interview with JL would likely be necessary he</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Attorney General had to say to him that it was not true. Q. But the Attorney General did not Well, I will show you. C4732. This is his letter to the GPA on 5 June, same lawyers as you. "Contrary to what the letter says", that is Mr McGrail's letter, "I've never said the CoP lied to me". I will ask you again: does it not concern you that the other two people in the meeting, at that relevant time were not saying what you were saying?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>A. Well</li> <li>Q I was not putting a proposition.</li> <li>A. Well, in the event that you would believe that the answer was going to be positive to either of them, you are wrong.</li> <li>Q. B1417, just to go back to those messages please. "Spoken to the DPP, he's categorical that whilst he told the RGP that an interview with JL would likely be necessary he strongly advised against a search warrant." I think your evidence now is that that was later</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Attorney General had to say to him that it was not true.</li> <li>Q. But the Attorney General did not Well, I will show you. C4732. This is his letter to the GPA on 5 June, same lawyers as you.</li> <li>"Contrary to what the letter says", that is Mr McGrail's letter, "I've never said the CoP lied to me". I will ask you again: does it not concern you that the other two people in the meeting, at that relevant time were not saying what you were saying?</li> <li>A. No, and I'm I must tell you I think this</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A. Well</li> <li>Q I was not putting a proposition.</li> <li>A. Well, in the event that you would believe that the answer was going to be positive to either of them, you are wrong.</li> <li>Q. B1417, just to go back to those messages please. "Spoken to the DPP, he's categorical that whilst he told the RGP that an interview with JL would likely be necessary he strongly advised against a search warrant." I think your evidence now is that that was later corrected, and you think within I think you</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Attorney General had to say to him that it was not true.</li> <li>Q. But the Attorney General did not Well, I will show you. C4732. This is his letter to the GPA on 5 June, same lawyers as you.</li> <li>"Contrary to what the letter says", that is Mr McGrail's letter, "I've never said the CoP lied to me". I will ask you again: does it not concern you that the other two people in the meeting, at that relevant time were not saying what you were saying?</li> <li>A. No, and I'm I must tell you I think this entirely disingenuous, with respect, because</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A. Well</li> <li>Q I was not putting a proposition.</li> <li>A. Well, in the event that you would believe that the answer was going to be positive to either of them, you are wrong.</li> <li>Q. B1417, just to go back to those messages please. "Spoken to the DPP, he's categorical that whilst he told the RGP that an interview with JL would likely be necessary he strongly advised against a search warrant." I think your evidence now is that that was later corrected, and you think within I think you said 24 to 48 hours?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Attorney General had to say to him that it was not true.</li> <li>Q. But the Attorney General did not Well, I will show you. C4732. This is his letter to the GPA on 5 June, same lawyers as you.</li> <li>"Contrary to what the letter says", that is Mr McGrail's letter, "I've never said the CoP lied to me". I will ask you again: does it not concern you that the other two people in the meeting, at that relevant time were not saying what you were saying?</li> <li>A. No, and I'm I must tell you I think this entirely disingenuous, with respect, because the alleged dispute in respect of Mr Llamas</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>A. Well</li> <li>Q I was not putting a proposition.</li> <li>A. Well, in the event that you would believe that the answer was going to be positive to either of them, you are wrong.</li> <li>Q. B1417, just to go back to those messages please. "Spoken to the DPP, he's categorical that whilst he told the RGP that an interview with JL would likely be necessary he strongly advised against a search warrant." I think your evidence now is that that was later corrected, and you think within I think you said 24 to 48 hours?</li> <li>A. I think so.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Attorney General had to say to him that it was not true.</li> <li>Q. But the Attorney General did not Well, I will show you. C4732. This is his letter to the GPA on 5 June, same lawyers as you.</li> <li>"Contrary to what the letter says", that is Mr McGrail's letter, "I've never said the CoP lied to me". I will ask you again: does it not concern you that the other two people in the meeting, at that relevant time were not saying what you were saying?</li> <li>A. No, and I'm I must tell you I think this entirely disingenuous, with respect, because the alleged dispute in respect of Mr Llamas and Mr McGrail is not in the meeting of 12</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ \end{array} $	<ul> <li>A. Well</li> <li>Q I was not putting a proposition.</li> <li>A. Well, in the event that you would believe that the answer was going to be positive to either of them, you are wrong.</li> <li>Q. B1417, just to go back to those messages please. "Spoken to the DPP, he's categorical that whilst he told the RGP that an interview with JL would likely be necessary he strongly advised against a search warrant." I think your evidence now is that that was later corrected, and you think within I think you said 24 to 48 hours?</li> <li>A. I think so.</li> <li>Q. You think so. So, by 14 May?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Attorney General had to say to him that it was not true.</li> <li>Q. But the Attorney General did not Well, I will show you. C4732. This is his letter to the GPA on 5 June, same lawyers as you.</li> <li>"Contrary to what the letter says", that is Mr McGrail's letter, "I've never said the CoP lied to me". I will ask you again: does it not concern you that the other two people in the meeting, at that relevant time were not saying what you were saying?</li> <li>A. No, and I'm I must tell you I think this entirely disingenuous, with respect, because the alleged dispute in respect of Mr Llamas and Mr McGrail is not in the meeting of 12 May. So, when Mr Llamas is saying that he</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ \end{array} $	<ul> <li>A. Well</li> <li>Q I was not putting a proposition.</li> <li>A. Well, in the event that you would believe that the answer was going to be positive to either of them, you are wrong.</li> <li>Q. B1417, just to go back to those messages please. "Spoken to the DPP, he's categorical that whilst he told the RGP that an interview with JL would likely be necessary he strongly advised against a search warrant." I think your evidence now is that that was later corrected, and you think within I think you said 24 to 48 hours?</li> <li>A. I think so.</li> <li>Q. You think so.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Attorney General had to say to him that it was not true.</li> <li>Q. But the Attorney General did not Well, I will show you. C4732. This is his letter to the GPA on 5 June, same lawyers as you.</li> <li>"Contrary to what the letter says", that is Mr McGrail's letter, "I've never said the CoP lied to me". I will ask you again: does it not concern you that the other two people in the meeting, at that relevant time were not saying what you were saying?</li> <li>A. No, and I'm I must tell you I think this entirely disingenuous, with respect, because the alleged dispute in respect of Mr Llamas and Mr McGrail is not in the meeting of 12 May. So, when Mr Llamas is saying that he does not say that Mr McGrail lied to him he</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A. Well</li> <li>Q I was not putting a proposition.</li> <li>A. Well, in the event that you would believe that the answer was going to be positive to either of them, you are wrong.</li> <li>Q. B1417, just to go back to those messages please. "Spoken to the DPP, he's categorical that whilst he told the RGP that an interview with JL would likely be necessary he strongly advised against a search warrant." I think your evidence now is that that was later corrected, and you think within I think you said 24 to 48 hours?</li> <li>A. I think so.</li> <li>Q. You think so. So, by 14 May?</li> <li>A. I think so.</li> <li>Q. If we go to A256, please. Now you met</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Attorney General had to say to him that it was not true.</li> <li>Q. But the Attorney General did not Well, I will show you. C4732. This is his letter to the GPA on 5 June, same lawyers as you.</li> <li>"Contrary to what the letter says", that is Mr McGrail's letter, "I've never said the CoP lied to me". I will ask you again: does it not concern you that the other two people in the meeting, at that relevant time were not saying what you were saying?</li> <li>A. No, and I'm I must tell you I think this entirely disingenuous, with respect, because the alleged dispute in respect of Mr Llamas and Mr McGrail is not in the meeting of 12 May. So, when Mr Llamas is saying that he does not say that Mr McGrail lied to him he is talking about in the things that happened</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>A. Well</li> <li>Q I was not putting a proposition.</li> <li>A. Well, in the event that you would believe that the answer was going to be positive to either of them, you are wrong.</li> <li>Q. B1417, just to go back to those messages please. "Spoken to the DPP, he's categorical that whilst he told the RGP that an interview with JL would likely be necessary he strongly advised against a search warrant." I think your evidence now is that that was later corrected, and you think within I think you said 24 to 48 hours?</li> <li>A. I think so.</li> <li>Q. You think so. So, by 14 May?</li> <li>A. I think so.</li> <li>Q. If we go to A256, please. Now you met with the Governor, on</li> </ul>
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array}$	<ul> <li>Attorney General had to say to him that it was not true.</li> <li>Q. But the Attorney General did not Well, I will show you. C4732. This is his letter to the GPA on 5 June, same lawyers as you.</li> <li>"Contrary to what the letter says", that is Mr McGrail's letter, "I've never said the CoP lied to me". I will ask you again: does it not concern you that the other two people in the meeting, at that relevant time were not saying what you were saying?</li> <li>A. No, and I'm I must tell you I think this entirely disingenuous, with respect, because the alleged dispute in respect of Mr Llamas and Mr McGrail is not in the meeting of 12 May. So, when Mr Llamas is saying that he does not say that Mr McGrail lied to him he is talking about in the things that happened before and after 12 May, not in the context of</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\\end{array} $	<ul> <li>A. Well</li> <li>Q I was not putting a proposition.</li> <li>A. Well, in the event that you would believe that the answer was going to be positive to either of them, you are wrong.</li> <li>Q. B1417, just to go back to those messages please. "Spoken to the DPP, he's categorical that whilst he told the RGP that an interview with JL would likely be necessary he strongly advised against a search warrant." I think your evidence now is that that was later corrected, and you think within I think you said 24 to 48 hours?</li> <li>A. I think so.</li> <li>Q. You think so. So, by 14 May?</li> <li>A. I think so.</li> <li>Q. If we go to A256, please. Now you met with the Governor, the Interim Governor, on 15 May, and this is what he says in paragraph</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Attorney General had to say to him that it was not true.</li> <li>Q. But the Attorney General did not Well, I will show you. C4732. This is his letter to the GPA on 5 June, same lawyers as you.</li> <li>"Contrary to what the letter says", that is Mr McGrail's letter, "I've never said the CoP lied to me". I will ask you again: does it not concern you that the other two people in the meeting, at that relevant time were not saying what you were saying?</li> <li>A. No, and I'm I must tell you I think this entirely disingenuous, with respect, because the alleged dispute in respect of Mr Llamas and Mr McGrail is not in the meeting of 12 May. So, when Mr Llamas is saying that he does not say that Mr McGrail lied to him he is talking about in the things that happened before and after 12 May, not in the context of 12 May. So, I just will not accept that that is</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	<ul> <li>A. Well</li> <li>Q I was not putting a proposition.</li> <li>A. Well, in the event that you would believe that the answer was going to be positive to either of them, you are wrong.</li> <li>Q. B1417, just to go back to those messages please. "Spoken to the DPP, he's categorical that whilst he told the RGP that an interview with JL would likely be necessary he strongly advised against a search warrant." I think your evidence now is that that was later corrected, and you think within I think you said 24 to 48 hours?</li> <li>A. I think so.</li> <li>Q. You think so. So, by 14 May?</li> <li>A. I think so.</li> <li>Q. If we go to A256, please. Now you met with the Governor, the Interim Governor, on 15 May, and this is what he says in paragraph 26.5. He says, "I clearly remember saying</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Attorney General had to say to him that it was not true.</li> <li>Q. But the Attorney General did not Well, I will show you. C4732. This is his letter to the GPA on 5 June, same lawyers as you.</li> <li>"Contrary to what the letter says", that is Mr McGrail's letter, "I've never said the CoP lied to me". I will ask you again: does it not concern you that the other two people in the meeting, at that relevant time were not saying what you were saying?</li> <li>A. No, and I'm I must tell you I think this entirely disingenuous, with respect, because the alleged dispute in respect of Mr Llamas and Mr McGrail is not in the meeting of 12 May. So, when Mr Llamas is saying that he does not say that Mr McGrail lied to him he is talking about in the things that happened before and after 12 May, not in the context of 12 May. So, I just will not accept that that is related to the things that Ian McGrail said to</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	<ul> <li>A. Well</li> <li>Q I was not putting a proposition.</li> <li>A. Well, in the event that you would believe that the answer was going to be positive to either of them, you are wrong.</li> <li>Q. B1417, just to go back to those messages please. "Spoken to the DPP, he's categorical that whilst he told the RGP that an interview with JL would likely be necessary he strongly advised against a search warrant." I think your evidence now is that that was later corrected, and you think within I think you said 24 to 48 hours?</li> <li>A. I think so.</li> <li>Q. You think so. So, by 14 May?</li> <li>A. I think so.</li> <li>Q. If we go to A256, please. Now you met with the Governor, the Interim Governor, on 15 May, and this is what he says in paragraph 26.5. He says, "I clearly remember saying something along the lines of 'now I've got</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Attorney General had to say to him that it was not true.</li> <li>Q. But the Attorney General did not Well, I will show you. C4732. This is his letter to the GPA on 5 June, same lawyers as you.</li> <li>"Contrary to what the letter says", that is Mr McGrail's letter, "I've never said the CoP lied to me". I will ask you again: does it not concern you that the other two people in the meeting, at that relevant time were not saying what you were saying?</li> <li>A. No, and I'm I must tell you I think this entirely disingenuous, with respect, because the alleged dispute in respect of Mr Llamas and Mr McGrail is not in the meeting of 12 May. So, when Mr Llamas is saying that he does not say that Mr McGrail lied to him he is talking about in the things that happened before and after 12 May, not in the context of 12 May. So, I just will not accept that that is related to the things that Ian McGrail said to me on 12 May. And in any event, the</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	<ul> <li>A. Well</li> <li>Q I was not putting a proposition.</li> <li>A. Well, in the event that you would believe that the answer was going to be positive to either of them, you are wrong.</li> <li>Q. B1417, just to go back to those messages please. "Spoken to the DPP, he's categorical that whilst he told the RGP that an interview with JL would likely be necessary he strongly advised against a search warrant." I think your evidence now is that that was later corrected, and you think within I think you said 24 to 48 hours?</li> <li>A. I think so.</li> <li>Q. You think so. So, by 14 May?</li> <li>A. I think so.</li> <li>Q. If we go to A256, please. Now you met with the Governor, the Interim Governor, on 15 May, and this is what he says in paragraph 26.5. He says, "I clearly remember saying something along the lines of 'now I've got that off my chest," and you then told him</li> </ul>

Page 204

51 (Pages 201 to 204)

1 made a serious error of judgement with 1 bottom of the page, "There can be little 2 2 regard to the execution of a search warrant surprise that, as we believe is the case, the 3 against James Levy, gone against the advice 3 DPP advised the Commissioner against the 4 4 of the DPP and AG". Now, do you accept making of these applications." Now, I think 5 that only you and the Attorney General 5 you have accepted that it was you who told 6 wrongly thought that he had gone against the 6 Hassans that? 7 advice of the DPP at that stage? 7 A. Well no, I have accepted that I told 8 A. No. 8 Hassans that --9 9 Q. So, who else and you? (?) O. Yes. 10 A. The DPP and Mr McGrail. 10 A. -- I am not accepting that I'm the only person who might have told Hassans that. 11 11 Q. No, no. The Attorney General has given 12 evidence that he misinterpreted --12 Q. Alright. You have accepted you told 13 A. Yeah. 13 Hassans. 14 14 Q. -- what the DPP said. So, the DPP did A. Yeah. I didn't --15 not know that at the time. Do you accept that 15 Q. (inaudible) 16 16 it was only you and the Attorney General A. Sorry, if I can just pause you there. Just 17 17 who were subject to that mistake? a... I didn't tell Hassans, I told Mr Baglietto 18 A. No, no, let's be clear. That mistake I 18 19 19 think by then had been shared with others, Q. Mr Levy. 20 20 A. -- probably James Levy... who had corrected it. 21 Q. Alright, so why did you tell the Governor 21 Q. And Mr Smith on Main Street, did you 22 22 that the Commissioner had gone against the tell him as well? 23 advice of the DPP? 23 A. No, Moshe Levy as well, it appears. And 24 24 I would have told Mr Smith and Mr Wagner A. I told the Governor that I had been told 25 by the Commissioner the various things that 25 if I'd met him on Main Street, who would Page 205 Page 207 1 he had told me, and the fact that, you know, 1 have been equally concerned, being a human 2 Michael had told me: strongly advised. But 2 rights lawyer, what was happening. 3 3 then it turned out not just to be strongly Q. So, you shared what you thought was the 4 advised, in fact that the DPP had, I believe 4 advice of the Director of Public Prosecutions 5 5 the question was: not advised on the warrant. in an ongoing investigation with the lawyer 6 And in fact, I think at one stage I was told 6 of the suspect? 7 7 they knew not to ask me, because if they had A. No. 8 8 asked me, you know, my view might have Q. Well, which bit of that did you not do? 9 9 been slightly different. A. I showed the absence of advice --10 10 Q. So, you are saying it is a complete O. No --11 11 A. -- not the advice. coincidence that the Governor makes exactly 12 the same mistake that the Attorney General 12 Q. Well, are you saying there again: it is just 13 13 a complete coincidence that -communicated to you --14 14 A. It is completely --A. Yeah. 15 15 Q. -- on this day. It is just a coincidence, Q. -- that the DPP advised (this language), 16 the DPP advised the Commissioner against 16 and you had in fact corrected him of all the 17 relevant facts? 17 the making of these applications. 18 18 A. Yeah, I don't think it's exactly the same A. Yes. 19 19 language, so I don't think it's so great a Q. Are you saying that it is completely 20 20 coincidence. Because if you look at the coincidental --21 21 language that you've taken me to, it's actually A. No. 22 22 different. So, I don't share your view as to it Q. -- that you were the only one, with the 23 being a coincidence. 23 Attorney General, who was operating under 24 24 that mistake, and that same mistake made it Q. And, then if we go to B5419. This is the 25 25 Hassans letter that they sent on 15 May, into the letter from the suspect's lawyers?

Page 206

52 (Pages 205 to 208)

Page 208

		1	
1	A. No, I am not taking that point at all, Mr	1	look, we want to share with you some advice
2	Wagner. The point I'm taking is that I didn't	2	we have had in a current investigation, this is
3	share the advice; I shared the absence of	3	the outcome of the advice. You think it is
4	advice, and that's completely different. One	4	appropriate to go and share that with
5	thing is to say: look, the DPP has told me,	5	anybody you want?
6	has told the Attorney General who has told	6	A. Well Mr Wagner, are you talking about
7	me, that there's a case of the Crown v Picardo	7	circumstances in which I would be advised
8	that establishes that you cannot obtain a	8	that I was being told is privileged, or a
9	search warrant in these circumstances, and	9	conversation before I'm told?
10	it's a proposition that must be followed in	10	Q. So, you are saying unless the Director of
10	cases such as this. And it's quite another to	11	Public Prosecutions or the police say to you:
12	say: the DPP didn't advise. That's different.	12	please do not tell anyone, you would expect
12	Q. That is not what he says	12	that they are just telling you the outcome of
13	A. That's different.	14	that advice for it to be shared with anybody?
14	Q he says, "advised the Commissioner	14	A. Let's be very clear: you have made the
15	against the making of these applications."	15	A. Let's be very clear, you have made the point repeatedly that (you or others, but it
	A. Well, I mean, that's form of words: didn't	10	
17			may have been Counsel for the Inquiry) that
18	advise, advised against. It's not to share the	18	the prosecuting authority is the DPP, that the
19	advice, it's to share the absence of advice,	19	investigating authority is the RGP. What is
20	and I think that is materially important and	20	implicit in that also is that the executive (and
21	it's relevant, because from the point of view	21	I lead the executive) is different to those two.
22	of widening the circle of privilege and	22	The circles of privilege that appertain to them
23	confidentiality	23	are different; that is to say, when one shares
24	Q. Yes	24	information with the other they are breaking
25	A it's quite one thing to go into the detail	25	the circle of privilege. If you're if you
	Page 209		Dama 211
	1 age 209		Page 211
1		1	
1 2	of something that you had been told and the	1 2	form part of the of the OCPL, you keep
_	of something that you had been told and the legal logic, and quite another to say that		form part of the of the OCPL, you keep everything that's in there that's confidential;
2	of something that you had been told and the legal logic, and quite another to say that advice has not been provided or this had been	2	form part of the of the OCPL, you keep everything that's in there that's confidential; if you form part of the police, you keep
2 3	of something that you had been told and the legal logic, and quite another to say that advice has not been provided or this had been against advice without going into the detail	2 3 4	form part of the of the OCPL, you keep everything that's in there that's confidential; if you form part of the police, you keep everything that's in there confidential; if
2 3 4	of something that you had been told and the legal logic, and quite another to say that advice has not been provided or this had been	2 3	form part of the of the OCPL, you keep everything that's in there that's confidential; if you form part of the police, you keep everything that's in there confidential; if you're in the cabinet, you keep the
2 3 4 5	of something that you had been told and the legal logic, and quite another to say that advice has not been provided or this had been against advice without going into the detail of it. I never had the detail of it Q. No	2 3 4 5	form part of the of the OCPL, you keep everything that's in there that's confidential; if you form part of the police, you keep everything that's in there confidential; if you're in the cabinet, you keep the deliberations of the cabinet confidential. If I
2 3 4 5 6 7	of something that you had been told and the legal logic, and quite another to say that advice has not been provided or this had been against advice without going into the detail of it. I never had the detail of it Q. No A because it didn't exist.	2 3 4 5 6 7	form part of the of the OCPL, you keep everything that's in there that's confidential; if you form part of the police, you keep everything that's in there confidential; if you're in the cabinet, you keep the deliberations of the cabinet confidential. If I shared a deliberation of the cabinet with a
2 3 4 5 6	of something that you had been told and the legal logic, and quite another to say that advice has not been provided or this had been against advice without going into the detail of it. I never had the detail of it Q. No A because it didn't exist. Q you had what you thought the outcome	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	form part of the of the OCPL, you keep everything that's in there that's confidential; if you form part of the police, you keep everything that's in there confidential; if you're in the cabinet, you keep the deliberations of the cabinet confidential. If I shared a deliberation of the cabinet with a third party, I would be breaching the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	of something that you had been told and the legal logic, and quite another to say that advice has not been provided or this had been against advice without going into the detail of it. I never had the detail of it Q. No A because it didn't exist.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	form part of the of the OCPL, you keep everything that's in there that's confidential; if you form part of the police, you keep everything that's in there confidential; if you're in the cabinet, you keep the deliberations of the cabinet confidential. If I shared a deliberation of the cabinet with a third party, I would be breaching the confidence of the deliberations of the cabinet,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	of something that you had been told and the legal logic, and quite another to say that advice has not been provided or this had been against advice without going into the detail of it. I never had the detail of it Q. No A because it didn't exist. Q you had what you thought the outcome of it was, which is that he'd advised against. Is that fair?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	form part of the of the OCPL, you keep everything that's in there that's confidential; if you form part of the police, you keep everything that's in there confidential; if you're in the cabinet, you keep the deliberations of the cabinet confidential. If I shared a deliberation of the cabinet with a third party, I would be breaching the confidence of the deliberations of the cabinet, and I would then have to accept that that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	of something that you had been told and the legal logic, and quite another to say that advice has not been provided or this had been against advice without going into the detail of it. I never had the detail of it Q. No A because it didn't exist. Q you had what you thought the outcome of it was, which is that he'd advised against. Is that fair? A. So if you want to tell me that shared the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	form part of the of the OCPL, you keep everything that's in there that's confidential; if you form part of the police, you keep everything that's in there confidential; if you're in the cabinet, you keep the deliberations of the cabinet confidential. If I shared a deliberation of the cabinet with a third party, I would be breaching the confidence of the deliberations of the cabinet, and I would then have to accept that that person might share that information more
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	of something that you had been told and the legal logic, and quite another to say that advice has not been provided or this had been against advice without going into the detail of it. I never had the detail of it Q. No A because it didn't exist. Q you had what you thought the outcome of it was, which is that he'd advised against. Is that fair? A. So if you want to tell me that shared the outcome of his advice	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	form part of the of the OCPL, you keep everything that's in there that's confidential; if you form part of the police, you keep everything that's in there confidential; if you're in the cabinet, you keep the deliberations of the cabinet confidential. If I shared a deliberation of the cabinet with a third party, I would be breaching the confidence of the deliberations of the cabinet, and I would then have to accept that that person might share that information more widely. If there are instances when
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	of something that you had been told and the legal logic, and quite another to say that advice has not been provided or this had been against advice without going into the detail of it. I never had the detail of it Q. No A because it didn't exist. Q you had what you thought the outcome of it was, which is that he'd advised against. Is that fair? A. So if you want to tell me that shared the outcome of his advice Q. Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	form part of the of the OCPL, you keep everything that's in there that's confidential; if you form part of the police, you keep everything that's in there confidential; if you're in the cabinet, you keep the deliberations of the cabinet confidential. If I shared a deliberation of the cabinet with a third party, I would be breaching the confidence of the deliberations of the cabinet, and I would then have to accept that that person might share that information more widely. If there are instances when information has been shared with me by the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	of something that you had been told and the legal logic, and quite another to say that advice has not been provided or this had been against advice without going into the detail of it. I never had the detail of it Q. No A because it didn't exist. Q you had what you thought the outcome of it was, which is that he'd advised against. Is that fair? A. So if you want to tell me that shared the outcome of his advice Q. Yes. A with Hassans, the answer is: I shared it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	form part of the of the OCPL, you keep everything that's in there that's confidential; if you form part of the police, you keep everything that's in there confidential; if you're in the cabinet, you keep the deliberations of the cabinet confidential. If I shared a deliberation of the cabinet with a third party, I would be breaching the confidence of the deliberations of the cabinet, and I would then have to accept that that person might share that information more widely. If there are instances when information has been shared with me by the senior command of the RGP, including by
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	of something that you had been told and the legal logic, and quite another to say that advice has not been provided or this had been against advice without going into the detail of it. I never had the detail of it Q. No A because it didn't exist. Q you had what you thought the outcome of it was, which is that he'd advised against. Is that fair? A. So if you want to tell me that shared the outcome of his advice Q. Yes. A with Hassans, the answer is: I shared it with Mr Baglietto, with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	form part of the of the OCPL, you keep everything that's in there that's confidential; if you form part of the police, you keep everything that's in there confidential; if you're in the cabinet, you keep the deliberations of the cabinet confidential. If I shared a deliberation of the cabinet with a third party, I would be breaching the confidence of the deliberations of the cabinet, and I would then have to accept that that person might share that information more widely. If there are instances when information has been shared with me by the senior command of the RGP, including by Ian McGrail when he was Commissioner of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	of something that you had been told and the legal logic, and quite another to say that advice has not been provided or this had been against advice without going into the detail of it. I never had the detail of it Q. No A because it didn't exist. Q you had what you thought the outcome of it was, which is that he'd advised against. Is that fair? A. So if you want to tell me that shared the outcome of his advice Q. Yes. A with Hassans, the answer is: I shared it with Mr Baglietto, with Q. Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	form part of the of the OCPL, you keep everything that's in there that's confidential; if you form part of the police, you keep everything that's in there confidential; if you're in the cabinet, you keep the deliberations of the cabinet confidential. If I shared a deliberation of the cabinet with a third party, I would be breaching the confidence of the deliberations of the cabinet, and I would then have to accept that that person might share that information more widely. If there are instances when information has been shared with me by the senior command of the RGP, including by Ian McGrail when he was Commissioner of Police, in respect of matters where they
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	of something that you had been told and the legal logic, and quite another to say that advice has not been provided or this had been against advice without going into the detail of it. I never had the detail of it Q. No A because it didn't exist. Q you had what you thought the outcome of it was, which is that he'd advised against. Is that fair? A. So if you want to tell me that shared the outcome of his advice Q. Yes. A with Hassans, the answer is: I shared it with Mr Baglietto, with Q. Yes. A James Levy; very likely with Moshe	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	form part of the of the OCPL, you keep everything that's in there that's confidential; if you form part of the police, you keep everything that's in there confidential; if you're in the cabinet, you keep the deliberations of the cabinet confidential. If I shared a deliberation of the cabinet with a third party, I would be breaching the confidence of the deliberations of the cabinet, and I would then have to accept that that person might share that information more widely. If there are instances when information has been shared with me by the senior command of the RGP, including by Ian McGrail when he was Commissioner of Police, in respect of matters where they needed cooperation from the Government or
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	of something that you had been told and the legal logic, and quite another to say that advice has not been provided or this had been against advice without going into the detail of it. I never had the detail of it Q. No A because it didn't exist. Q you had what you thought the outcome of it was, which is that he'd advised against. Is that fair? A. So if you want to tell me that shared the outcome of his advice Q. Yes. A with Hassans, the answer is: I shared it with Mr Baglietto, with Q. Yes. A James Levy; very likely with Moshe Levy, given what he says; with Mr Smith	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	form part of the of the OCPL, you keep everything that's in there that's confidential; if you form part of the police, you keep everything that's in there confidential; if you're in the cabinet, you keep the deliberations of the cabinet confidential. If I shared a deliberation of the cabinet with a third party, I would be breaching the confidence of the deliberations of the cabinet, and I would then have to accept that that person might share that information more widely. If there are instances when information has been shared with me by the senior command of the RGP, including by Ian McGrail when he was Commissioner of Police, in respect of matters where they needed cooperation from the Government or the Government needed cooperation from
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	of something that you had been told and the legal logic, and quite another to say that advice has not been provided or this had been against advice without going into the detail of it. I never had the detail of it Q. No A because it didn't exist. Q you had what you thought the outcome of it was, which is that he'd advised against. Is that fair? A. So if you want to tell me that shared the outcome of his advice Q. Yes. A with Hassans, the answer is: I shared it with Mr Baglietto, with Q. Yes. A James Levy; very likely with Moshe Levy, given what he says; with Mr Smith Q. Alright.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	form part of the of the OCPL, you keep everything that's in there that's confidential; if you form part of the police, you keep everything that's in there confidential; if you're in the cabinet, you keep the deliberations of the cabinet confidential. If I shared a deliberation of the cabinet with a third party, I would be breaching the confidence of the deliberations of the cabinet, and I would then have to accept that that person might share that information more widely. If there are instances when information has been shared with me by the senior command of the RGP, including by Ian McGrail when he was Commissioner of Police, in respect of matters where they needed cooperation from the Government or the Government needed cooperation from them, dealing with issues Let me give you
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array}$	of something that you had been told and the legal logic, and quite another to say that advice has not been provided or this had been against advice without going into the detail of it. I never had the detail of it Q. No A because it didn't exist. Q you had what you thought the outcome of it was, which is that he'd advised against. Is that fair? A. So if you want to tell me that shared the outcome of his advice Q. Yes. A with Hassans, the answer is: I shared it with Mr Baglietto, with Q. Yes. A James Levy; very likely with Moshe Levy, given what he says; with Mr Smith Q. Alright. A and I would have shared it with Mr	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array} $	form part of the of the OCPL, you keep everything that's in there that's confidential; if you form part of the police, you keep everything that's in there confidential; if you're in the cabinet, you keep the deliberations of the cabinet confidential. If I shared a deliberation of the cabinet with a third party, I would be breaching the confidence of the deliberations of the cabinet, and I would then have to accept that that person might share that information more widely. If there are instances when information has been shared with me by the senior command of the RGP, including by Ian McGrail when he was Commissioner of Police, in respect of matters where they needed cooperation from the Government or the Government needed cooperation from them, dealing with issues Let me give you an example which is obvious and comes to
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	of something that you had been told and the legal logic, and quite another to say that advice has not been provided or this had been against advice without going into the detail of it. I never had the detail of it Q. No A because it didn't exist. Q you had what you thought the outcome of it was, which is that he'd advised against. Is that fair? A. So if you want to tell me that shared the outcome of his advice Q. Yes. A with Hassans, the answer is: I shared it with Mr Baglietto, with Q. Yes. A James Levy; very likely with Moshe Levy, given what he says; with Mr Smith Q. Alright. A and I would have shared it with Mr Wagner if I'd seen you down Main Street. (?)	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	form part of the of the OCPL, you keep everything that's in there that's confidential; if you form part of the police, you keep everything that's in there confidential; if you're in the cabinet, you keep the deliberations of the cabinet confidential. If I shared a deliberation of the cabinet with a third party, I would be breaching the confidence of the deliberations of the cabinet, and I would then have to accept that that person might share that information more widely. If there are instances when information has been shared with me by the senior command of the RGP, including by Ian McGrail when he was Commissioner of Police, in respect of matters where they needed cooperation from the Government or the Government needed cooperation from them, dealing with issues Let me give you an example which is obvious and comes to my mind: the arrest of Grace 1 in Gibraltar's
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ \end{array}$	of something that you had been told and the legal logic, and quite another to say that advice has not been provided or this had been against advice without going into the detail of it. I never had the detail of it Q. No A because it didn't exist. Q you had what you thought the outcome of it was, which is that he'd advised against. Is that fair? A. So if you want to tell me that shared the outcome of his advice Q. Yes. A with Hassans, the answer is: I shared it with Mr Baglietto, with Q. Yes. A James Levy; very likely with Moshe Levy, given what he says; with Mr Smith Q. Alright. A and I would have shared it with Mr Wagner if I'd seen you down Main Street. (?) Q. So, the RGP senior command are in this	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	form part of the of the OCPL, you keep everything that's in there that's confidential; if you form part of the police, you keep everything that's in there confidential; if you're in the cabinet, you keep the deliberations of the cabinet confidential. If I shared a deliberation of the cabinet with a third party, I would be breaching the confidence of the deliberations of the cabinet, and I would then have to accept that that person might share that information more widely. If there are instances when information has been shared with me by the senior command of the RGP, including by Ian McGrail when he was Commissioner of Police, in respect of matters where they needed cooperation from the Government or the Government needed cooperation from them, dealing with issues Let me give you an example which is obvious and comes to my mind: the arrest of Grace 1 in Gibraltar's waters. Of course, you are going to keep
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ \end{array}$	of something that you had been told and the legal logic, and quite another to say that advice has not been provided or this had been against advice without going into the detail of it. I never had the detail of it Q. No A because it didn't exist. Q you had what you thought the outcome of it was, which is that he'd advised against. Is that fair? A. So if you want to tell me that shared the outcome of his advice Q. Yes. A with Hassans, the answer is: I shared it with Mr Baglietto, with Q. Yes. A James Levy; very likely with Moshe Levy, given what he says; with Mr Smith Q. Alright. A and I would have shared it with Mr Wagner if I'd seen you down Main Street. (?) Q. So, the RGP senior command are in this room now. Are you saying that if they come	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	form part of the of the OCPL, you keep everything that's in there that's confidential; if you form part of the police, you keep everything that's in there confidential; if you're in the cabinet, you keep the deliberations of the cabinet confidential. If I shared a deliberation of the cabinet with a third party, I would be breaching the confidence of the deliberations of the cabinet, and I would then have to accept that that person might share that information more widely. If there are instances when information has been shared with me by the senior command of the RGP, including by Ian McGrail when he was Commissioner of Police, in respect of matters where they needed cooperation from the Government or the Government needed cooperation from them, dealing with issues Let me give you an example which is obvious and comes to my mind: the arrest of Grace 1 in Gibraltar's waters. Of course, you are going to keep those things confidential. But if something is
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	of something that you had been told and the legal logic, and quite another to say that advice has not been provided or this had been against advice without going into the detail of it. I never had the detail of it Q. No A because it didn't exist. Q you had what you thought the outcome of it was, which is that he'd advised against. Is that fair? A. So if you want to tell me that shared the outcome of his advice Q. Yes. A with Hassans, the answer is: I shared it with Mr Baglietto, with Q. Yes. A James Levy; very likely with Moshe Levy, given what he says; with Mr Smith Q. Alright. A and I would have shared it with Mr Wagner if I'd seen you down Main Street. (?) Q. So, the RGP senior command are in this room now. Are you saying that if they come to you for any reason I am not sure why	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	form part of the of the OCPL, you keep everything that's in there that's confidential; if you form part of the police, you keep everything that's in there confidential; if you're in the cabinet, you keep the deliberations of the cabinet confidential. If I shared a deliberation of the cabinet with a third party, I would be breaching the confidence of the deliberations of the cabinet, and I would then have to accept that that person might share that information more widely. If there are instances when information has been shared with me by the senior command of the RGP, including by Ian McGrail when he was Commissioner of Police, in respect of matters where they needed cooperation from the Government or the Government needed cooperation from them, dealing with issues Let me give you an example which is obvious and comes to my mind: the arrest of Grace 1 in Gibraltar's waters. Of course, you are going to keep those things confidential. But if something is shared with me there should be absolutely no
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ \end{array}$	of something that you had been told and the legal logic, and quite another to say that advice has not been provided or this had been against advice without going into the detail of it. I never had the detail of it Q. No A because it didn't exist. Q you had what you thought the outcome of it was, which is that he'd advised against. Is that fair? A. So if you want to tell me that shared the outcome of his advice Q. Yes. A with Hassans, the answer is: I shared it with Mr Baglietto, with Q. Yes. A James Levy; very likely with Moshe Levy, given what he says; with Mr Smith Q. Alright. A and I would have shared it with Mr Wagner if I'd seen you down Main Street. (?) Q. So, the RGP senior command are in this room now. Are you saying that if they come	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	form part of the of the OCPL, you keep everything that's in there that's confidential; if you form part of the police, you keep everything that's in there confidential; if you're in the cabinet, you keep the deliberations of the cabinet confidential. If I shared a deliberation of the cabinet with a third party, I would be breaching the confidence of the deliberations of the cabinet, and I would then have to accept that that person might share that information more widely. If there are instances when information has been shared with me by the senior command of the RGP, including by Ian McGrail when he was Commissioner of Police, in respect of matters where they needed cooperation from the Government or the Government needed cooperation from them, dealing with issues Let me give you an example which is obvious and comes to my mind: the arrest of Grace 1 in Gibraltar's waters. Of course, you are going to keep those things confidential. But if something is

Page 212

53 (Pages 209 to 212)

1	extended.	1	confidence
2	Q. Would you, if you could have your time	2	Q. Yes.
3	again, share that advice with the lawyers of	3	A then it isn't in confidence.
4	the criminal suspect?	4	Q. Yes. I am going to put to you, Chief
5	A. Not just with the lawyers of Mr Levy, but	5	Minister, that as an experienced lawyer and a
6	also with Mr Smith and with Mr Wagner if I	6	King's Counsel you should have known
7	saw him down Main Street, because I	7	better.
8	believed that this was a gross abuse of power	8	A. I put it to you, Mr Wagner, that it is not
9	by the Royal Gibraltar Police and thought it	9	correct to suggest that I should not be free to
10	was inappropriate, and as I've said before I	10	share that information, given that I received
11	was evangelising about that by anyb with	11 12	it in a political position which did not extend
12 13	anybody who talked to me about it, because this was vox populi. Everybody in Gibraltar	12	to the circle of privilege or confidentiality which attaches to those conducting criminal
13	was talking about this. Let me just make this	13	proceedings, either in the Office of Criminal
14	point	14	Prosecutions or in the Royal Gibraltar Police,
16	Q. Nobody was talking about the advice	15	and that therefore I breached no privilege and
17	(inaudible)	17	I breached no confidence. And that is my
18	A. Let's be very clear, let's be very clear: this	18	view as a King's Counsel.
19	is not London, and this is not an anonymous	19	Q. Yes, and that remains your view now?
20	person that was subject to a police procedure.	20	A. I have just told you it is my view as a
21	This is Gibraltar; this was Gibraltar's most	21	King's Counsel.
22	high-profile lawyer, and he had been subject	22	Q. The Attorney General, during the course
23	to this police procedure, and everyone was	23	of this meeting on 13 May, referred to item
24	talking about it, me too. And one of the key	24	nine on this letter that was sent to Mr Levy.
25	things for me was that I had had confirmed to	25	You already discussed it with Counsel to the
	-		
	Page 213		Page 215
1	me from outside the circle of privilege in the	1	Inquiry, it was about messages between you
2	OCPL, and outside the circle of privilege in	2	and the Chief Minister, do you recall that.
3	the RGP, that that warrant had been obtained,	3	A. I am the Chief Minister.
4	with all the different degrees of strong advice	4	Q. Sorry, between you (as in, Mr Levy) and
5	against from the DPP, no advice from the	5	the Chief Minister. Do you recall the letter?
6	DPP, as I was told at different times. And the	6	A. Between me and Mr Levy, yeah.
7	thing for me was that I had been lied to by	7	Q. You and Mr Levy. And, are you aware
8	the Commissioner of Police.	8	that that text was changed at some point?
9	Q. Well, and you were angry. Did you ask	9	A. I am aware as a result of these
10	the Attorney General for permission to share	10	proceedings, and I was not otherwise aware.
11	the outcome of the advice with the lawyers of	11	Q. Yes. You were asked yesterday whether
12	the criminal suspect?	12	that was on the basis of discussions you had
13	A. I don't believe I needed it, so I didn't seek	13	with the Attorney General, and I am not sure
14	it.	14	you got around to answering the question.
15	Q. Did you ask the DPP for permission to	15	Was it on the basis of discussions
16	share the advice with the suspect?	16	A. I genuinely I mean
17	A. As you know, I have spoken to the DPP	17	Q you had had with the Attorney
18	only on a limited number of occasions and	18	General?
19	not in relation to this matter.	19	A. I can't recall. I mean
20	Q. Yes. So, you did not know whether the	20 21	Q. You cannot recall.
21	outcome of that advice had been provided to	21	A if there is a yeah.
22	you privately within confidentiality or not, at the time.	22	<ul><li>Q. Might have been?</li><li>A. It might have been, but this was not an</li></ul>
23 24		23	A. It might have been, but this was not an issue that was live for me, for my
24 25	A. Let's be very clear, you assume something is not expressly stated to be in	24	recollection to be as vivid as it is of the
25	something is not expressly stated to be in		

54 (Pages 213 to 216)

1	meeting	1	A this is May 2020
2	Q. Yes.	2	Q. Yes. Did you tell him about your
3	A in my office.	3	A I had resolved the issue of the
4	Q. The Governor. Is it correct to say that	4	investment in Astelon / 36 North in October
5	you contacted the Governor about Mr	5	2018, which was a full year and a half before.
6	McGrail, he did not contact you.	6	Q. But you still had a stake in 36 North in
7	A. I think the record the documentary	7	May 2020, didn't you?
8	record will show which of those is correct.	8	A. Well, I don't know when Astelon was
9	Q. Had the Interim Governor expressed any	9	liquidated
10	views to you before 12 May that he had lost	10	Q. Alright.
11	confidence in Mr McGrail?	11	A it may have been after that.
12	A. I cannot recall whether we've had any	12	Q. Okay.
13	conversations relating to the issues at sea at	13	A. It has been liquidated.
14	that stage, I think it all happened afterwards.	14	Q. So, you did not check?
15	Q. Yes. So, he had not expressed any view	15	A. I tell you what: I knew by then, and I'd
16	to you to the effect that he was losing	16	known for 18 months, that that was worth
17	confidence, or had lost confidence, in Mr	17	nothing or less, because I'd made the decision
18	McGrail?	18	that the contract should stay with Bland
19	A. I don't believe any of that happened	19	Limited.
20	before the 14th you know, 12th, 13th, 14th.	20	Q. Yes, but you still had a stake.
21	Those were the key dates.	21	A. I still was very clear in the fact that the
22	Q. Yes. But it was you that approached him?	22	investment in Astelon such as it may be,
23	A. I believe that's what the documentary	23	which I believe you reminded me was 2.94
24	record shows.	24	percent, had been rendered almost worthless
25	Q. Were you transparent with the Gibraltar	25	by the decision I had made 18 months before.
	Page 217		Page 219
1	Police Authority about your involvement	1	Q. Did you know at the time that Hassans
2	with Op Delhi?	2	still owned a third of the company
3	A. I'm sorry, did you say what?	3	beneficially?
4	Q. Were you transparent with the Gibraltar	4	A. I very likely would have
5	Police Authority about your invol	5	Q. Yes.
6	A. I'm sorry, the rustling has affected the	6	A in the sense that I wasn't told that they
7	was I what?	7	no longer did, but I also knew that that was
8	Q. Sorry, could someone shut the door?	8	probably worthless by then given the
9	Would that be possible? The wind is	9	decision I'd made 18 months earlier. So
10	blowing. A foul wind is blowing. (?)	10	although on paper that might have been true,
11	A. Will blow (?) if you shut the door, but	11	the value was then absolutely irrelevant.
12	what was the word you used?	12	Q. Yes. But you did not tell Joey Britto
13	Q. Were you transparent	13	about any of that, did you?
14	A. Oh, I see. Yes, I was.	14	A. I told Joey Britto about the things that
15	Q with the Gibraltar Police Authority?	15	had happened in my room on 12 May, and
16	A. I was transparent with Dr Britto, who's	16	why Ian McGrail had lied to me.
17	the person I met.	17	Q. Yes. You did not tell him about Op Delhi,
18	Q. Yes. Did you tell him about your	18	about 36 North.
19	personal connections to the Op Delhi	19	A. I did tell him I did tell him about the
20	investigation?	20	background to that. I don't know the detail to
21	A. I believe I did tell him about the issues	21	which I told him.
22	relating to Op Delhi, but it depends what you	22	Q. Well, he does not recall being told. I
23	call my personal connections, because	23	want to go to C4747, please. This is the
24	remember by then	24	letter you sent to the GPA on 5 June. You
25	Q. Did you tell him about your	25	were accused by Mr McGrail in his lawyer's
	Page 218		Page 220

55 (Pages 217 to 220)

		1	
1	letter of the 29th of having personal	1	questions rather than having to sit down and
2	connections to the investigation.	2	write it all longhand.
3	A. I don't have C4747, is that	3	Q. You said in this letter that your principle
4	Q. C4747	4	reason for losing confidence was what you
5	A. There it is. (?)	5	describe as "the two lies".
6	Q it's on the screen, it's the	6	A. Not just in this letter.
7	A. Yeah.	7	Q. Yes. But was it not the case that it was
8	Q it's the letter of 5 June. So, he had used	8	also the fact that the warrants were executed
9	the expression "personal connection with the	9	(or attempted to be executed) against your
10	outcome of the investigation". You say in	10	friend James Levy, which was central to the
11	that letter, "That personal connection is	11	loss of confidence in Mr McGrail?
12	presumably the fact that Mr James Levy,	12	A. No.
13	whose conduct is apparently under	13	Q. No, it was not. Okay, so that is
14	investigation, is the senior partner of	14	A. It wasn't. It was very clearly for me an
15	Hassans, a law firm of which I am also on a	15	issue
16	partner, although presently on sabbatical."	16	Q. Yes.
17	Was it not not quite the whole truth just to	17	A of confidence in Ian McGrail would
18	say: my personal connection is about James	18	have nothing to do with James Levy.
19	Levy being a partner of Hassans? Rather	19	Confidence in Ian McGrail had to do with
20	than going into the details about your other	20	Ian McGrail, and his ability to tell me the
21	personal connections to 36 North?	21	truth rather than something that was not
22	A. No. Because those have been resolved	22	truth. The uncomfortable truth. Public
23	already, in the circumstance that I've already	23	servants have to tell uncomfortable truths to
24 25	repeatedly explained to you in the past	24	elected officials. I would have had no
23	answers to your two questions.	25	difficulty with Ian McGrail telling me an
	Page 221	ļ	Page 223
1	Q. But they were still important in the	1	uncomfortable truth about James Levy if
2	investigation, were they not? You had to	2	that's what he felt he had to do. My loss of
3	give a statement later about your text	3	confidence was about the fact that he told me
4	messages to the founders.	4	something which was an untruth. The fact
5	A. Not because of my ownership of 2.4	5	that it was James Levy or anybody else was,
6	.94 percent in Astelon, but because	6	to that extent, neither here nor there. Of
7	Q. But you do not mention your connection	7	course the James Levy issue was relevant to
8	to the setting up of 36 North in that	8	the jurisdictional concern that I had, but it
9	paragraph, do you?	9	wasn't relevant to my loss of confidence in
10	A. No, I mean I (?) Mr Wagner, do you	10	Ian McGrail. You might have told me in that
11	want to let me answer your questions or not?	11	context, if you'll permit me, that I should
12	Q. Please go ahead.	12	have lost confidence in Paul Richardson, not
13	A. Right, because the reference you made to	13	in Ian McGrail, who was the person who says
14	the statement I had to give to the police was	14	that he believes that James Levy might have
15	not because of my ownership of 2.94 percent	15	destroyed evidence if we hadn't gone by way
16	of Astelon, it was because of the	16	of search warrant. But I didn't lose
17	communications with them, which did not	17	confidence in Paul Richardson; indeed, when
18	arise because of my ownership of Astelon. It	18	things have been said about Paul Richardson
19	arose because I had been the pivot for	19	I have described them as fanciful, because I
20	communication with John Perez in	20	don't think that his credibility has in any way
21	Government from the time that NCIS had	21	been negatively affected. For me, it's only
22	been created and senior exchanges had to be	22	Ian McGrail's credibility that is completely
23	had. That's why they wanted my	23	destroyed by the way that he misled me on
24	information, and they kindly allowed me to	24	12 May.
25	prepare the statement by way of answers to	25	Q. C4767, please. Oh sorry, excuse me,
	Page 222		Page 224
	-	1	-

www.epiqglobal.com Lower Ground Floor, 46 Chancery Lane casemanagers@epiqglobal.com London, WC2A 1JE

56 (Pages 221 to 224)

1			
1	A199, paragraph 68. This is your first	1	said; I challenge it, and say that you are
2	statement to the Inquiry. "After this	2	completely wrong.
3	exchange, I met with the Governor. I am not	3	Q. Yes. And is that not the reason why
4	able to recall that meeting in detail, but	4	conflict of interest policies exist in the first
5	subsequent WhatsApp and email exchanges	5	place: to avoid the situation when a minister
6	have assisted me to reconstruct the	6	is so personally and emotionally impacted by
7	discussion and events that followed. I do	7	an event, because it relates to them
8	specifically recall, however, that I explained	8	personally, that they cannot disentangle their
	to the Governor, Nick Pyle, the issues of the	9	motivations in deciding what to do next? Is
9 10	execution of the search warrant in respect of	10	that not the reason why
	-	10	•
11	Mr Levy and my views in respect thereof,		A. No, let me tell you
12	which was central to my loss of confidence	12	Q those policies exist?
13	in Mr McGrail and, in fact, is what I was	13	A. I am not going to give you a dissertation
14	referring to in the first of the WhatsApps I	14	on the existence of conflict of interest
15	have extracted, when I say: 'I will alert to a	15	Q. No, please do not.
16	particular matter when we meet" Are you	16	A but let me tell you very clearly that my
17	not saying exactly the opposite from what	17	views in relation to James Levy as a friend
18	you have told the Chairman: that in fact	18	and as a mentor, even in the heat of this
19	A. No.	19	moment, were subsidiary subsidiary to
20	Q you told Mr McGrail "the issues of the	20	my concerns about James Levy as a rain-
21	execution of the search warrant in respect of	21	maker and the jurisdictional challenge that
22	Mr Levy and my views in respect thereof"	22	Gibraltar could face as a result of him having
23	were "central to my loss of confidence in Mr	23	been served with a search warrant. So in my
24	McGrail"?	24	view, Mr Wagner, it is totally unfair, not to
25	A. No, I'm not saying the opposite, I'm	25	say wrong and untrue, to suggest that my
	Page 225		Page 227
1	saying exactly what I've told you. "the issues	1	emotions here were motivated through
2	of the execution of the search warrant", in	2	friendship and mentorship, only or
3	other words the things that I had been told	$\begin{vmatrix} 2\\ 3 \end{vmatrix}$	principally. And in fact, this issue for me
4	about the execution of that search warrant:	4	very quickly on 12 May became an issue in
5	the fact that they had been advised by the	5	relation to Ian McGrail about the credibility
6	DPP – first the Attorney General, then the	6	of Ian McGrail and therefore the confidence I
7	-	7	
8	DPP, to proceed by way of search warrant in respect of a senior member of the Bar like	8	could no longer have in him. And that was not related to my relationship of friendship,
8 9	James Levy. So, the lie that I had been told.	9	trust and mentorship with James Levy. I
10	So, exactly as I have said in evidence to this	10	have expressed it on many occasions, and
10	tribunal a moment ago and contrary to the	10	have expressed it on many occasions, and
11		11	you are free of course (subject to Mr
12		11	you are free of course (subject to Mr
12	inference set out in your question.	12	Chairman's views) to ask me in as many
13	<b>inference set out in your question.</b> Q. Is not the truth, Chief Minister, that you	12 13	Chairman's views) to ask me in as many different ways as you like, but you are going
13 14	<b>inference set out in your question.</b> Q. Is not the truth, Chief Minister, that you could not distinguish in your own mind	12 13 14	Chairman's views) to ask me in as many different ways as you like, but you are going to get the same answer from me every time,
13 14 15	<b>inference set out in your question.</b> Q. Is not the truth, Chief Minister, that you could not distinguish in your own mind between your highly emotional response to	12 13 14 15	Chairman's views) to ask me in as many different ways as you like, but you are going to get the same answer from me every time, because I am going to tell you the truth every
13 14 15 16	<b>inference set out in your question.</b> Q. Is not the truth, Chief Minister, that you could not distinguish in your own mind between your highly emotional response to the search warrant and your belief that Mr	12 13 14 15 16	Chairman's views) to ask me in as many different ways as you like, but you are going to get the same answer from me every time, because I am going to tell you the truth every time.
13 14 15 16 17	inference set out in your question. Q. Is not the truth, Chief Minister, that you could not distinguish in your own mind between your highly emotional response to the search warrant and your belief that Mr McGrail had lied to you?	12 13 14 15 16 17	Chairman's views) to ask me in as many different ways as you like, but you are going to get the same answer from me every time, because I am going to tell you the truth every time. Q. And just picking up on telling the truth,
13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>inference set out in your question.</li> <li>Q. Is not the truth, Chief Minister, that you could not distinguish in your own mind between your highly emotional response to the search warrant and your belief that Mr McGrail had lied to you?</li> <li>A. No, that is not the truth. That is a</li> </ul>	12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Chairman's views) to ask me in as many different ways as you like, but you are going to get the same answer from me every time, because I am going to tell you the truth every time. Q. And just picking up on telling the truth, when you found out (some time in the first
13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>inference set out in your question.</li> <li>Q. Is not the truth, Chief Minister, that you could not distinguish in your own mind between your highly emotional response to the search warrant and your belief that Mr McGrail had lied to you?</li> <li>A. No, that is not the truth. That is a mischaracterisation of the reality that has</li> </ul>	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Chairman's views) to ask me in as many different ways as you like, but you are going to get the same answer from me every time, because I am going to tell you the truth every time.</li> <li>Q. And just picking up on telling the truth, when you found out (some time in the first few days after the Attorney General sent you</li> </ul>
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>inference set out in your question.</li> <li>Q. Is not the truth, Chief Minister, that you could not distinguish in your own mind between your highly emotional response to the search warrant and your belief that Mr McGrail had lied to you?</li> <li>A. No, that is not the truth. That is a mischaracterisation of the reality that has appertained from the moment that on 12</li> </ul>	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Chairman's views) to ask me in as many different ways as you like, but you are going to get the same answer from me every time, because I am going to tell you the truth every time.</li> <li>Q. And just picking up on telling the truth, when you found out (some time in the first few days after the Attorney General sent you that messaged about "strongly advised") that</li> </ul>
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>inference set out in your question.</li> <li>Q. Is not the truth, Chief Minister, that you could not distinguish in your own mind between your highly emotional response to the search warrant and your belief that Mr McGrail had lied to you?</li> <li>A. No, that is not the truth. That is a mischaracterisation of the reality that has appertained from the moment that on 12 May, in my office, the office of the highest</li> </ul>	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Chairman's views) to ask me in as many different ways as you like, but you are going to get the same answer from me every time, because I am going to tell you the truth every time. Q. And just picking up on telling the truth, when you found out (some time in the first few days after the Attorney General sent you that messaged about "strongly advised") that it was incorrect. By that time you had told
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>inference set out in your question.</li> <li>Q. Is not the truth, Chief Minister, that you could not distinguish in your own mind between your highly emotional response to the search warrant and your belief that Mr McGrail had lied to you?</li> <li>A. No, that is not the truth. That is a mischaracterisation of the reality that has appertained from the moment that on 12 May, in my office, the office of the highest elected politician in this land, the</li> </ul>	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Chairman's views) to ask me in as many different ways as you like, but you are going to get the same answer from me every time, because I am going to tell you the truth every time. Q. And just picking up on telling the truth, when you found out (some time in the first few days after the Attorney General sent you that messaged about "strongly advised") that it was incorrect. By that time you had told the Governor and told Hassans that that was
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>inference set out in your question.</li> <li>Q. Is not the truth, Chief Minister, that you could not distinguish in your own mind between your highly emotional response to the search warrant and your belief that Mr McGrail had lied to you?</li> <li>A. No, that is not the truth. That is a mischaracterisation of the reality that has appertained from the moment that on 12 May, in my office, the office of the highest elected politician in this land, the Commissioner of Police decided to go down</li> </ul>	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Chairman's views) to ask me in as many different ways as you like, but you are going to get the same answer from me every time, because I am going to tell you the truth every time. Q. And just picking up on telling the truth, when you found out (some time in the first few days after the Attorney General sent you that messaged about "strongly advised") that it was incorrect. By that time you had told the Governor and told Hassans that that was the reason for your loss of confidence, had
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>inference set out in your question.</li> <li>Q. Is not the truth, Chief Minister, that you could not distinguish in your own mind between your highly emotional response to the search warrant and your belief that Mr McGrail had lied to you?</li> <li>A. No, that is not the truth. That is a mischaracterisation of the reality that has appertained from the moment that on 12 May, in my office, the office of the highest elected politician in this land, the Commissioner of Police decided to go down the road of untruth rather than the road of</li> </ul>	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Chairman's views) to ask me in as many different ways as you like, but you are going to get the same answer from me every time, because I am going to tell you the truth every time. Q. And just picking up on telling the truth, when you found out (some time in the first few days after the Attorney General sent you that messaged about "strongly advised") that it was incorrect. By that time you had told the Governor and told Hassans that that was the reason for your loss of confidence, had you not?
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>inference set out in your question.</li> <li>Q. Is not the truth, Chief Minister, that you could not distinguish in your own mind between your highly emotional response to the search warrant and your belief that Mr McGrail had lied to you?</li> <li>A. No, that is not the truth. That is a mischaracterisation of the reality that has appertained from the moment that on 12 May, in my office, the office of the highest elected politician in this land, the Commissioner of Police decided to go down</li> </ul>	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Chairman's views) to ask me in as many different ways as you like, but you are going to get the same answer from me every time, because I am going to tell you the truth every time. Q. And just picking up on telling the truth, when you found out (some time in the first few days after the Attorney General sent you that messaged about "strongly advised") that it was incorrect. By that time you had told the Governor and told Hassans that that was the reason for your loss of confidence, had
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>inference set out in your question.</li> <li>Q. Is not the truth, Chief Minister, that you could not distinguish in your own mind between your highly emotional response to the search warrant and your belief that Mr McGrail had lied to you?</li> <li>A. No, that is not the truth. That is a mischaracterisation of the reality that has appertained from the moment that on 12 May, in my office, the office of the highest elected politician in this land, the Commissioner of Police decided to go down the road of untruth rather than the road of</li> </ul>	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Chairman's views) to ask me in as many different ways as you like, but you are going to get the same answer from me every time, because I am going to tell you the truth every time. Q. And just picking up on telling the truth, when you found out (some time in the first few days after the Attorney General sent you that messaged about "strongly advised") that it was incorrect. By that time you had told the Governor and told Hassans that that was the reason for your loss of confidence, had you not?

57 (Pages 225 to 228)

1	the time I was telling the Governor and	1	A. Well, no, it's not. Hang on, the word is
2	Hassans the Attorney General may have	2	"suggest."
3	corrected that, and I was giving them my	3	Q. Yes, no, no, I understand what the word
4	version of that, which was not the "strongly	4	is but he his evidence was that he was
5	advised" version.	5	talking to a lawyer, was taking it as advice.
6	Q. Okay, well allow me to present the	6	A. I didn't hear his evidence so you will
7	evidence sorry, I will leave that aside. Did	7	excuse me for not wanting to take your word
8	you, once you realised the mistake, also	8	for what his evidence was or meant. I can
9	realise you had set a ball rolling which could	9	look at it in the transcript.
10	not be brought back? That you had told	10	Q. Fine, we will do that later you can do
11	Lewis Baglietto and you had told the Interim	11	that later. Now, 2103, that is on 21 May, if
12	Governor that the DPP had advised against	12	we go to A205, paragraph 81, this is your
13	the warrant. Did you then try and save that	13	statement, "The final, signed, version of the
14	by coming up with a different reason why	14	section 15 request to the RGP for a factual
15	you were saying and claiming that the	15	report was sent to Mr McGrail at 20:58 hrs
16	Commissioner had lied to you, which is that	16	on 21 May 2020," so do you accept that that
17	he had said in clear terms: I took advice, we	17	is three minutes before you proposed to Joey
18	were acting on advice from the DPP. Is that	18	Britto that Mr McGrail have a seven day
19	what happened? Is that why you do not set it	19	period to respond to his letter?
20	out on 5 June?	20	A. No, I accept it is whatever it is after I
21	A. That's not what happened, and that's not	21	suggest to Mr Britto that he should have
22	what I did.	22	seven days.
23	Q. You were keen for matters to proceed	23	Q. Three minutes?
24	quickly on the GPA process, is that correct?	24	A. Three minutes after I suggested.
25	A. For the reasons that you've seen in the	25	Q. How long were you giving Mr McGrail
20			
	Page 229		Page 231
1	exchanges between me and Nick Pyle.	1	to respond to the section 15?
1 2	exchanges between me and Nick Pyle. Q. B1441. These are text messages between		to respond to the section 15? A. Seven days.
2	Q. B1441. These are text messages between	1 2 3	A. Seven days.
2 3	Q. B1441. These are text messages between you and the Governor the Interim	2	<ul><li>A. Seven days.</li><li>Q. So at pretty much the same moment you</li></ul>
2 3 4	Q. B1441. These are text messages between you and the Governor the Interim Governor, sorry. The one at 13.59 further	2 3	<ul><li>A. Seven days.</li><li>Q. So at pretty much the same moment you provided him with a complex section 15</li></ul>
2 3 4 5	Q. B1441. These are text messages between you and the Governor the Interim	2 3 4	<ul><li>A. Seven days.</li><li>Q. So at pretty much the same moment you provided him with a complex section 15 report, the first time you had ever done it,</li></ul>
2 3 4	Q. B1441. These are text messages between you and the Governor the Interim Governor, sorry. The one at 13.59 further down, on the 18th.	2 3 4 5	<ul><li>A. Seven days.</li><li>Q. So at pretty much the same moment you provided him with a complex section 15</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>Q. B1441. These are text messages between you and the Governor the Interim Governor, sorry. The one at 13.59 further down, on the 18th.</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. "Yes re both. We cannot allow ourselves</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>A. Seven days.</li> <li>Q. So at pretty much the same moment you provided him with a complex section 15 report, the first time you had ever done it, with a seven day response time and</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>Q. B1441. These are text messages between you and the Governor the Interim Governor, sorry. The one at 13.59 further down, on the 18th.</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. "Yes re both. We cannot allow ourselves to be at daggers-drawn for too long, that</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>A. Seven days.</li> <li>Q. So at pretty much the same moment you provided him with a complex section 15 report, the first time you had ever done it, with a seven day response time and</li> <li>A. The first time it's ever been done.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>Q. B1441. These are text messages between you and the Governor the Interim Governor, sorry. The one at 13.59 further down, on the 18th.</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. "Yes re both. We cannot allow ourselves</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>A. Seven days.</li> <li>Q. So at pretty much the same moment you provided him with a complex section 15 report, the first time you had ever done it, with a seven day response time and</li> <li>A. The first time it's ever been done.</li> <li>Q. The first time it has ever been done and at</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q. B1441. These are text messages between you and the Governor the Interim Governor, sorry. The one at 13.59 further down, on the 18th.</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. "Yes re both. We cannot allow ourselves to be at daggers-drawn for too long, that would be institutionally bad for Gibraltar and the rule of law. I will ensure in what I</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A. Seven days.</li> <li>Q. So at pretty much the same moment you provided him with a complex section 15 report, the first time you had ever done it, with a seven day response time and</li> <li>A. The first time it's ever been done.</li> <li>Q. The first time it has ever been done and at the same moment you were providing him</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>Q. B1441. These are text messages between you and the Governor the Interim Governor, sorry. The one at 13.59 further down, on the 18th.</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. "Yes re both. We cannot allow ourselves to be at daggers-drawn for too long, that would be institutionally bad for Gibraltar and the rule of law. I will ensure in what I prepare for Joey that I propose a timetable 48</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>A. Seven days.</li> <li>Q. So at pretty much the same moment you provided him with a complex section 15 report, the first time you had ever done it, with a seven day response time and</li> <li>A. The first time it's ever been done.</li> <li>Q. The first time it has ever been done and at the same moment you were providing him with you were suggesting to Mr Britto</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Q. B1441. These are text messages between you and the Governor the Interim Governor, sorry. The one at 13.59 further down, on the 18th.</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. "Yes re both. We cannot allow ourselves to be at daggers-drawn for too long, that would be institutionally bad for Gibraltar and the rule of law. I will ensure in what I prepare for Joey that I propose a timetable 48 hour, or seven days to provide reasons." The</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>A. Seven days.</li> <li>Q. So at pretty much the same moment you provided him with a complex section 15 report, the first time you had ever done it, with a seven day response time and</li> <li>A. The first time it's ever been done.</li> <li>Q. The first time it has ever been done and at the same moment you were providing him with you were suggesting to Mr Britto that he be given seven days to respond to the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>Q. B1441. These are text messages between you and the Governor the Interim Governor, sorry. The one at 13.59 further down, on the 18th.</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. "Yes re both. We cannot allow ourselves to be at daggers-drawn for too long, that would be institutionally bad for Gibraltar and the rule of law. I will ensure in what I prepare for Joey that I propose a timetable 48</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>A. Seven days.</li> <li>Q. So at pretty much the same moment you provided him with a complex section 15 report, the first time you had ever done it, with a seven day response time and</li> <li>A. The first time it's ever been done.</li> <li>Q. The first time it has ever been done and at the same moment you were providing him with you were suggesting to Mr Britto that he be given seven days to respond to the GPA letter. Is that right?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Q. B1441. These are text messages between you and the Governor the Interim Governor, sorry. The one at 13.59 further down, on the 18th.</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. "Yes re both. We cannot allow ourselves to be at daggers-drawn for too long, that would be institutionally bad for Gibraltar and the rule of law. I will ensure in what I prepare for Joey that I propose a timetable 48 hour, or seven days to provide reasons." The Governor, if you just go below, says, "48 hours would not be unreasonable." You then</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A. Seven days.</li> <li>Q. So at pretty much the same moment you provided him with a complex section 15 report, the first time you had ever done it, with a seven day response time and</li> <li>A. The first time it's ever been done.</li> <li>Q. The first time it has ever been done and at the same moment you were providing him with you were suggesting to Mr Britto that he be given seven days to respond to the GPA letter. Is that right?</li> <li>A. Instead of 48 hours.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Q. B1441. These are text messages between you and the Governor the Interim Governor, sorry. The one at 13.59 further down, on the 18th.</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. "Yes re both. We cannot allow ourselves to be at daggers-drawn for too long, that would be institutionally bad for Gibraltar and the rule of law. I will ensure in what I prepare for Joey that I propose a timetable 48 hour, or seven days to provide reasons." The Governor, if you just go below, says, "48 hours would not be unreasonable." You then advise, if you go to B1437, this is a text</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A. Seven days.</li> <li>Q. So at pretty much the same moment you provided him with a complex section 15 report, the first time you had ever done it, with a seven day response time and</li> <li>A. The first time it's ever been done.</li> <li>Q. The first time it has ever been done and at the same moment you were providing him with you were suggesting to Mr Britto that he be given seven days to respond to the GPA letter. Is that right?</li> <li>A. Instead of 48 hours.</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. Yes, and probably I was having to</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Q. B1441. These are text messages between you and the Governor the Interim Governor, sorry. The one at 13.59 further down, on the 18th.</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. "Yes re both. We cannot allow ourselves to be at daggers-drawn for too long, that would be institutionally bad for Gibraltar and the rule of law. I will ensure in what I prepare for Joey that I propose a timetable 48 hour, or seven days to provide reasons." The Governor, if you just go below, says, "48 hours would not be unreasonable." You then advise, if you go to B1437, this is a text between you and Mr Britto, halfway down</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>A. Seven days.</li> <li>Q. So at pretty much the same moment you provided him with a complex section 15 report, the first time you had ever done it, with a seven day response time and</li> <li>A. The first time it's ever been done.</li> <li>Q. The first time it has ever been done and at the same moment you were providing him with you were suggesting to Mr Britto that he be given seven days to respond to the GPA letter. Is that right?</li> <li>A. Instead of 48 hours.</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Q. B1441. These are text messages between you and the Governor the Interim Governor, sorry. The one at 13.59 further down, on the 18th.</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. "Yes re both. We cannot allow ourselves to be at daggers-drawn for too long, that would be institutionally bad for Gibraltar and the rule of law. I will ensure in what I prepare for Joey that I propose a timetable 48 hour, or seven days to provide reasons." The Governor, if you just go below, says, "48 hours would not be unreasonable." You then advise, if you go to B1437, this is a text</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ \end{array} $	<ul> <li>A. Seven days.</li> <li>Q. So at pretty much the same moment you provided him with a complex section 15 report, the first time you had ever done it, with a seven day response time and</li> <li>A. The first time it's ever been done.</li> <li>Q. The first time it has ever been done and at the same moment you were providing him with you were suggesting to Mr Britto that he be given seven days to respond to the GPA letter. Is that right?</li> <li>A. Instead of 48 hours.</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. Yes, and probably I was having to produce a myriad of other things whilst I was</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Q. B1441. These are text messages between you and the Governor the Interim Governor, sorry. The one at 13.59 further down, on the 18th.</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. "Yes re both. We cannot allow ourselves to be at daggers-drawn for too long, that would be institutionally bad for Gibraltar and the rule of law. I will ensure in what I prepare for Joey that I propose a timetable 48 hour, or seven days to provide reasons." The Governor, if you just go below, says, "48 hours would not be unreasonable." You then advise, if you go to B1437, this is a text between you and Mr Britto, halfway down the page. 21 May, 9.03, you advise seven</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ \end{array} $	<ul> <li>A. Seven days.</li> <li>Q. So at pretty much the same moment you provided him with a complex section 15 report, the first time you had ever done it, with a seven day response time and</li> <li>A. The first time it's ever been done.</li> <li>Q. The first time it has ever been done and at the same moment you were providing him with you were suggesting to Mr Britto that he be given seven days to respond to the GPA letter. Is that right?</li> <li>A. Instead of 48 hours.</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. Yes, and probably I was having to produce a myriad of other things whilst I was doing this as well. I mean, we were all under</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q. B1441. These are text messages between you and the Governor the Interim Governor, sorry. The one at 13.59 further down, on the 18th.</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. "Yes re both. We cannot allow ourselves to be at daggers-drawn for too long, that would be institutionally bad for Gibraltar and the rule of law. I will ensure in what I prepare for Joey that I propose a timetable 48 hour, or seven days to provide reasons." The Governor, if you just go below, says, "48 hours would not be unreasonable." You then advise, if you go to B1437, this is a text between you and Mr Britto, halfway down the page. 21 May, 9.03, you advise seven days, can you see that?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A. Seven days.</li> <li>Q. So at pretty much the same moment you provided him with a complex section 15 report, the first time you had ever done it, with a seven day response time and</li> <li>A. The first time it's ever been done.</li> <li>Q. The first time it has ever been done and at the same moment you were providing him with you were suggesting to Mr Britto that he be given seven days to respond to the GPA letter. Is that right?</li> <li>A. Instead of 48 hours.</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. Yes, and probably I was having to produce a myriad of other things whilst I was doing this as well. I mean, we were all under a lot of pressure at the time and are still</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Q. B1441. These are text messages between you and the Governor the Interim Governor, sorry. The one at 13.59 further down, on the 18th.</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. "Yes re both. We cannot allow ourselves to be at daggers-drawn for too long, that would be institutionally bad for Gibraltar and the rule of law. I will ensure in what I prepare for Joey that I propose a timetable 48 hour, or seven days to provide reasons." The Governor, if you just go below, says, "48 hours would not be unreasonable." You then advise, if you go to B1437, this is a text between you and Mr Britto, halfway down the page. 21 May, 9.03, you advise seven days, can you see that?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>A. Seven days.</li> <li>Q. So at pretty much the same moment you provided him with a complex section 15 report, the first time you had ever done it, with a seven day response time and</li> <li>A. The first time it's ever been done.</li> <li>Q. The first time it has ever been done and at the same moment you were providing him with you were suggesting to Mr Britto that he be given seven days to respond to the GPA letter. Is that right?</li> <li>A. Instead of 48 hours.</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. Yes, and probably I was having to produce a myriad of other things whilst I was doing this as well. I mean, we were all under a lot of pressure at the time and are still today.</li> </ul>
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array}$	<ul> <li>Q. B1441. These are text messages between you and the Governor the Interim Governor, sorry. The one at 13.59 further down, on the 18th.</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. "Yes re both. We cannot allow ourselves to be at daggers-drawn for too long, that would be institutionally bad for Gibraltar and the rule of law. I will ensure in what I prepare for Joey that I propose a timetable 48 hour, or seven days to provide reasons." The Governor, if you just go below, says, "48 hours would not be unreasonable." You then advise, if you go to B1437, this is a text between you and Mr Britto, halfway down the page. 21 May, 9.03, you advise seven days, can you see that?</li> <li>A. Yeah. I advised (?)</li> <li>Q. You suggest, "I would suggest that you</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array} $	<ul> <li>A. Seven days.</li> <li>Q. So at pretty much the same moment you provided him with a complex section 15 report, the first time you had ever done it, with a seven day response time and</li> <li>A. The first time it's ever been done.</li> <li>Q. The first time it has ever been done and at the same moment you were providing him with you were suggesting to Mr Britto that he be given seven days to respond to the GPA letter. Is that right?</li> <li>A. Instead of 48 hours.</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. Yes, and probably I was having to produce a myriad of other things whilst I was doing this as well. I mean, we were all under a lot of pressure at the time and are still today.</li> <li>Q. No doubt.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q. B1441. These are text messages between you and the Governor the Interim Governor, sorry. The one at 13.59 further down, on the 18th.</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. "Yes re both. We cannot allow ourselves to be at daggers-drawn for too long, that would be institutionally bad for Gibraltar and the rule of law. I will ensure in what I prepare for Joey that I propose a timetable 48 hour, or seven days to provide reasons." The Governor, if you just go below, says, "48 hours would not be unreasonable." You then advise, if you go to B1437, this is a text between you and Mr Britto, halfway down the page. 21 May, 9.03, you advise seven days, can you see that?</li> <li>A. Yeah. I advised (?)</li> <li>Q. You suggest, "I would suggest that you provide seven days", at the end.</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	<ul> <li>A. Seven days.</li> <li>Q. So at pretty much the same moment you provided him with a complex section 15 report, the first time you had ever done it, with a seven day response time and</li> <li>A. The first time it's ever been done.</li> <li>Q. The first time it has ever been done and at the same moment you were providing him with you were suggesting to Mr Britto that he be given seven days to respond to the GPA letter. Is that right?</li> <li>A. Instead of 48 hours.</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. Yes, and probably I was having to produce a myriad of other things whilst I was doing this as well. I mean, we were all under a lot of pressure at the time and are still today.</li> <li>Q. No doubt.</li> <li>A. Having to do a lot of things at the same</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q. B1441. These are text messages between you and the Governor the Interim Governor, sorry. The one at 13.59 further down, on the 18th.</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. "Yes re both. We cannot allow ourselves to be at daggers-drawn for too long, that would be institutionally bad for Gibraltar and the rule of law. I will ensure in what I prepare for Joey that I propose a timetable 48 hour, or seven days to provide reasons." The Governor, if you just go below, says, "48 hours would not be unreasonable." You then advise, if you go to B1437, this is a text between you and Mr Britto, halfway down the page. 21 May, 9.03, you advise seven days, can you see that?</li> <li>A. Yeah. I advised (?)</li> <li>Q. You suggest, "I would suggest that you provide seven days", at the end.</li> <li>A. Yeah. But it says "suggest", not advise.</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	<ul> <li>A. Seven days.</li> <li>Q. So at pretty much the same moment you provided him with a complex section 15 report, the first time you had ever done it, with a seven day response time and</li> <li>A. The first time it's ever been done.</li> <li>Q. The first time it has ever been done and at the same moment you were providing him with you were suggesting to Mr Britto that he be given seven days to respond to the GPA letter. Is that right?</li> <li>A. Instead of 48 hours.</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. Yes, and probably I was having to produce a myriad of other things whilst I was doing this as well. I mean, we were all under a lot of pressure at the time and are still today.</li> <li>Q. No doubt.</li> <li>A. Having to do a lot of things at the same time though it is not in the context of a</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. B1441. These are text messages between you and the Governor the Interim Governor, sorry. The one at 13.59 further down, on the 18th.</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. "Yes re both. We cannot allow ourselves to be at daggers-drawn for too long, that would be institutionally bad for Gibraltar and the rule of law. I will ensure in what I prepare for Joey that I propose a timetable 48 hour, or seven days to provide reasons." The Governor, if you just go below, says, "48 hours would not be unreasonable." You then advise, if you go to B1437, this is a text between you and Mr Britto, halfway down the page. 21 May, 9.03, you advise seven days, can you see that?</li> <li>A. Yeah. I advised (?)</li> <li>Q. You suggest, "I would suggest that you provide seven days", at the end.</li> <li>A. Yeah. But it says "suggest", not advise.</li> <li>Q. He took it as advice, but you say it was</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	<ul> <li>A. Seven days.</li> <li>Q. So at pretty much the same moment you provided him with a complex section 15 report, the first time you had ever done it, with a seven day response time and</li> <li>A. The first time it's ever been done.</li> <li>Q. The first time it has ever been done and at the same moment you were providing him with you were suggesting to Mr Britto that he be given seven days to respond to the GPA letter. Is that right?</li> <li>A. Instead of 48 hours.</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. Yes, and probably I was having to produce a myriad of other things whilst I was doing this as well. I mean, we were all under a lot of pressure at the time and are still today.</li> <li>Q. No doubt.</li> <li>A. Having to do a lot of things at the same time though it is not in the context of a Commissioner of Police something that one</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Q. B1441. These are text messages between you and the Governor the Interim Governor, sorry. The one at 13.59 further down, on the 18th.</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. "Yes re both. We cannot allow ourselves to be at daggers-drawn for too long, that would be institutionally bad for Gibraltar and the rule of law. I will ensure in what I prepare for Joey that I propose a timetable 48 hour, or seven days to provide reasons." The Governor, if you just go below, says, "48 hours would not be unreasonable." You then advise, if you go to B1437, this is a text between you and Mr Britto, halfway down the page. 21 May, 9.03, you advise seven days, can you see that?</li> <li>A. Yeah. I advised (?)</li> <li>Q. You suggest, "I would suggest that you provide seven days", at the end.</li> <li>A. Yeah. But it says "suggest", not advise.</li> <li>Q. He took it as advice, but you say it was not advice.</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	<ul> <li>A. Seven days.</li> <li>Q. So at pretty much the same moment you provided him with a complex section 15 report, the first time you had ever done it, with a seven day response time and</li> <li>A. The first time it's ever been done.</li> <li>Q. The first time it has ever been done and at the same moment you were providing him with you were suggesting to Mr Britto that he be given seven days to respond to the GPA letter. Is that right?</li> <li>A. Instead of 48 hours.</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. Yes, and probably I was having to produce a myriad of other things whilst I was doing this as well. I mean, we were all under a lot of pressure at the time and are still today.</li> <li>Q. No doubt.</li> <li>A. Having to do a lot of things at the same time though it is not in the context of a Commissioner of Police something that one is asking an individual to do because in the</li> </ul>

58 (Pages 229 to 232)

1		1	
1	request, he would have the whole		about what the nolle prosequi would mean in
2	organisation available to provide the	$\begin{vmatrix} 2 \\ 2 \end{vmatrix}$	political terms and in fact I have been proved
3	information. Indeed what you saw was	3	right because in many instances people have
4	produced was not produced by Mr McGrail,	4	made mischief with those nolles to suggest
5	it was produced under the direction of Mr	5	that they have somehow been entered in a
6	McGrail but it was produced I believe	6	way that is of assistance to me when (a) they
7	principally by Mr Ullger and by Mr Yeats.	7	are not and everyone who has been properly
8	Q. Did you provide the same deadline in the	8	briefed understands that they are not
9	suggestion you made to Mr Britto and the	9	Q. You are saying I did not catch the very
10	section 15 request because you knew that it	10	beginning of what you said but you say you
11	would put Mr McGrail under immense	11	did not have any discussions at all with the
12	pressure?	12	Attorney General about the nolle prosequi
13	A. No, that was not for one moment any of	13	until he briefed you at the same time as he
14	the considerations in my mind.	14	briefed everybody else?
15	Q. So you did not consider whether it would	15	A. Yes, I mean, the nolle comes into this
16	put him under immense pressure?	16	very late in the day. Ian McGrail is long
17	A. No, I didn't because, first of all, it was not	17	retired now
18	up to me	18	Q. I am running out of time, sorry, can you
19	Q. So all good?	19	answer the question; did you have any
20	A. Sorry?	20	discussions at all with the Attorney General
21	Q. Sorry, please go on.	21	about the nolle prosequi until he briefed you
22	A. What did you say, "All good"?	22	at the same time as he briefed everybody
23	Q. Did you just think it was all good?	23	else?
24	A. No, no, the reason that I didn't have that	24	A. I do not believe I had any discussions
25	as a consideration because of the level at	25	with the Attorney General about the nolle
	Page 233		Page 235
			0
1		1	
1	which Mr McGrail, the Governor, the	1	prosequi at any time until he briefed me
2	which Mr McGrail, the Governor, the Attorney General the DPP, I and others were	2	prosequi at any time until he briefed me about the subject later on. There may have
2 3	which Mr McGrail, the Governor, the Attorney General the DPP, I and others were having to operate, which is not dissimilar to	2 3	prosequi at any time until he briefed me about the subject later on. There may have been mention of these things because I
2 3 4	which Mr McGrail, the Governor, the Attorney General the DPP, I and others were having to operate, which is not dissimilar to how perhaps individuals in practice at the	2 3 4	prosequi at any time until he briefed me about the subject later on. There may have been mention of these things because I believe that Ian McGrail was mentioning
2 3 4 5	which Mr McGrail, the Governor, the Attorney General the DPP, I and others were having to operate, which is not dissimilar to how perhaps individuals in practice at the Bar have to operate, is that you have to deal	2 3 4 5	prosequi at any time until he briefed me about the subject later on. There may have been mention of these things because I believe that Ian McGrail was mentioning nolle prosequi at the time of the meeting of
2 3 4 5 6	which Mr McGrail, the Governor, the Attorney General the DPP, I and others were having to operate, which is not dissimilar to how perhaps individuals in practice at the Bar have to operate, is that you have to deal with a very enlarged number of things at the	2 3 4 5 6	prosequi at any time until he briefed me about the subject later on. There may have been mention of these things because I believe that Ian McGrail was mentioning nolle prosequi at the time of the meeting of 13 May and that may have meant that those
2 3 4 5 6 7	which Mr McGrail, the Governor, the Attorney General the DPP, I and others were having to operate, which is not dissimilar to how perhaps individuals in practice at the Bar have to operate, is that you have to deal with a very enlarged number of things at the same time, so the fact that he would have to	2 3 4 5 6 7	prosequi at any time until he briefed me about the subject later on. There may have been mention of these things because I believe that Ian McGrail was mentioning nolle prosequi at the time of the meeting of 13 May and that may have meant that those words are used in discussions but not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	which Mr McGrail, the Governor, the Attorney General the DPP, I and others were having to operate, which is not dissimilar to how perhaps individuals in practice at the Bar have to operate, is that you have to deal with a very enlarged number of things at the same time, so the fact that he would have to cause his team to produce the section 15	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	prosequi at any time until he briefed me about the subject later on. There may have been mention of these things because I believe that Ian McGrail was mentioning nolle prosequi at the time of the meeting of 13 May and that may have meant that those words are used in discussions but not otherwise.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	which Mr McGrail, the Governor, the Attorney General the DPP, I and others were having to operate, which is not dissimilar to how perhaps individuals in practice at the Bar have to operate, is that you have to deal with a very enlarged number of things at the same time, so the fact that he would have to cause his team to produce the section 15 report was not an issue that should in any	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	prosequi at any time until he briefed me about the subject later on. There may have been mention of these things because I believe that Ian McGrail was mentioning nolle prosequi at the time of the meeting of 13 May and that may have meant that those words are used in discussions but not otherwise. Q. I think what you are saying is that you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	which Mr McGrail, the Governor, the Attorney General the DPP, I and others were having to operate, which is not dissimilar to how perhaps individuals in practice at the Bar have to operate, is that you have to deal with a very enlarged number of things at the same time, so the fact that he would have to cause his team to produce the section 15 report was not an issue that should in any way divert us from what might have been the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	prosequi at any time until he briefed me about the subject later on. There may have been mention of these things because I believe that Ian McGrail was mentioning nolle prosequi at the time of the meeting of 13 May and that may have meant that those words are used in discussions but not otherwise. Q. I think what you are saying is that you may have had discussions with the Attorney
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	which Mr McGrail, the Governor, the Attorney General the DPP, I and others were having to operate, which is not dissimilar to how perhaps individuals in practice at the Bar have to operate, is that you have to deal with a very enlarged number of things at the same time, so the fact that he would have to cause his team to produce the section 15 report was not an issue that should in any way divert us from what might have been the appropriate timetable that a Governor and a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>prosequi at any time until he briefed me about the subject later on. There may have been mention of these things because I believe that Ian McGrail was mentioning nolle prosequi at the time of the meeting of 13 May and that may have meant that those words are used in discussions but not otherwise.</li> <li>Q. I think what you are saying is that you may have had discussions with the Attorney General about the nolle prosequi?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	which Mr McGrail, the Governor, the Attorney General the DPP, I and others were having to operate, which is not dissimilar to how perhaps individuals in practice at the Bar have to operate, is that you have to deal with a very enlarged number of things at the same time, so the fact that he would have to cause his team to produce the section 15 report was not an issue that should in any way divert us from what might have been the appropriate timetable that a Governor and a Chief Minister might decide is the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>prosequi at any time until he briefed me about the subject later on. There may have been mention of these things because I believe that Ian McGrail was mentioning nolle prosequi at the time of the meeting of 13 May and that may have meant that those words are used in discussions but not otherwise.</li> <li>Q. I think what you are saying is that you may have had discussions with the Attorney General about the nolle prosequi?</li> <li>A. No, that is not what I have said. I have</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	which Mr McGrail, the Governor, the Attorney General the DPP, I and others were having to operate, which is not dissimilar to how perhaps individuals in practice at the Bar have to operate, is that you have to deal with a very enlarged number of things at the same time, so the fact that he would have to cause his team to produce the section 15 report was not an issue that should in any way divert us from what might have been the appropriate timetable that a Governor and a Chief Minister might decide is the appropriate timetable for us to suggest - not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>prosequi at any time until he briefed me about the subject later on. There may have been mention of these things because I believe that Ian McGrail was mentioning nolle prosequi at the time of the meeting of 13 May and that may have meant that those words are used in discussions but not otherwise.</li> <li>Q. I think what you are saying is that you may have had discussions with the Attorney General about the nolle prosequi?</li> <li>A. No, that is not what I have said. I have given a very full answer, Mr Wagner, and I</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	which Mr McGrail, the Governor, the Attorney General the DPP, I and others were having to operate, which is not dissimilar to how perhaps individuals in practice at the Bar have to operate, is that you have to deal with a very enlarged number of things at the same time, so the fact that he would have to cause his team to produce the section 15 report was not an issue that should in any way divert us from what might have been the appropriate timetable that a Governor and a Chief Minister might decide is the appropriate timetable for us to suggest - not advise, recommend or otherwise - to the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>prosequi at any time until he briefed me about the subject later on. There may have been mention of these things because I believe that Ian McGrail was mentioning nolle prosequi at the time of the meeting of 13 May and that may have meant that those words are used in discussions but not otherwise.</li> <li>Q. I think what you are saying is that you may have had discussions with the Attorney General about the nolle prosequi?</li> <li>A. No, that is not what I have said. I have given a very full answer, Mr Wagner, and I have told you that I did not believe that I</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	which Mr McGrail, the Governor, the Attorney General the DPP, I and others were having to operate, which is not dissimilar to how perhaps individuals in practice at the Bar have to operate, is that you have to deal with a very enlarged number of things at the same time, so the fact that he would have to cause his team to produce the section 15 report was not an issue that should in any way divert us from what might have been the appropriate timetable that a Governor and a Chief Minister might decide is the appropriate timetable for us to suggest - not advise, recommend or otherwise - to the GPA they might wish to consider but the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>prosequi at any time until he briefed me about the subject later on. There may have been mention of these things because I believe that Ian McGrail was mentioning nolle prosequi at the time of the meeting of 13 May and that may have meant that those words are used in discussions but not otherwise.</li> <li>Q. I think what you are saying is that you may have had discussions with the Attorney General about the nolle prosequi?</li> <li>A. No, that is not what I have said. I have given a very full answer, Mr Wagner, and I have told you that I did not believe that I have had such discussions with the Attorney</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	which Mr McGrail, the Governor, the Attorney General the DPP, I and others were having to operate, which is not dissimilar to how perhaps individuals in practice at the Bar have to operate, is that you have to deal with a very enlarged number of things at the same time, so the fact that he would have to cause his team to produce the section 15 report was not an issue that should in any way divert us from what might have been the appropriate timetable that a Governor and a Chief Minister might decide is the appropriate timetable for us to suggest - not advise, recommend or otherwise - to the GPA they might wish to consider but the decision as to how long they allow him was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>prosequi at any time until he briefed me about the subject later on. There may have been mention of these things because I believe that Ian McGrail was mentioning nolle prosequi at the time of the meeting of 13 May and that may have meant that those words are used in discussions but not otherwise.</li> <li>Q. I think what you are saying is that you may have had discussions with the Attorney General about the nolle prosequi?</li> <li>A. No, that is not what I have said. I have given a very full answer, Mr Wagner, and I have told you that I did not believe that I have had such discussions with the Attorney General about the nolle prosequi. The nolle</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	which Mr McGrail, the Governor, the Attorney General the DPP, I and others were having to operate, which is not dissimilar to how perhaps individuals in practice at the Bar have to operate, is that you have to deal with a very enlarged number of things at the same time, so the fact that he would have to cause his team to produce the section 15 report was not an issue that should in any way divert us from what might have been the appropriate timetable that a Governor and a Chief Minister might decide is the appropriate timetable for us to suggest - not advise, recommend or otherwise - to the GPA they might wish to consider but the decision as to how long they allow him was not a matter for us, it was a matter for the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>prosequi at any time until he briefed me about the subject later on. There may have been mention of these things because I believe that Ian McGrail was mentioning nolle prosequi at the time of the meeting of 13 May and that may have meant that those words are used in discussions but not otherwise.</li> <li>Q. I think what you are saying is that you may have had discussions with the Attorney General about the nolle prosequi?</li> <li>A. No, that is not what I have said. I have given a very full answer, Mr Wagner, and I have told you that I did not believe that I have had such discussions with the Attorney General about the nolle prosequi. The nolle prosequi is the one that was entered but I told</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	which Mr McGrail, the Governor, the Attorney General the DPP, I and others were having to operate, which is not dissimilar to how perhaps individuals in practice at the Bar have to operate, is that you have to deal with a very enlarged number of things at the same time, so the fact that he would have to cause his team to produce the section 15 report was not an issue that should in any way divert us from what might have been the appropriate timetable that a Governor and a Chief Minister might decide is the appropriate timetable for us to suggest - not advise, recommend or otherwise - to the GPA they might wish to consider but the decision as to how long they allow him was not a matter for us, it was a matter for the GPA. So I hope that puts your "all good"	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>prosequi at any time until he briefed me about the subject later on. There may have been mention of these things because I believe that Ian McGrail was mentioning nolle prosequi at the time of the meeting of 13 May and that may have meant that those words are used in discussions but not otherwise.</li> <li>Q. I think what you are saying is that you may have had discussions with the Attorney General about the nolle prosequi?</li> <li>A. No, that is not what I have said. I have given a very full answer, Mr Wagner, and I have told you that I did not believe that I have had such discussions with the Attorney General about the nolle prosequi. The nolle prosequi is the one that was entered but I told you that I seem to recall that in the meetings</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	which Mr McGrail, the Governor, the Attorney General the DPP, I and others were having to operate, which is not dissimilar to how perhaps individuals in practice at the Bar have to operate, is that you have to deal with a very enlarged number of things at the same time, so the fact that he would have to cause his team to produce the section 15 report was not an issue that should in any way divert us from what might have been the appropriate timetable that a Governor and a Chief Minister might decide is the appropriate timetable for us to suggest - not advise, recommend or otherwise - to the GPA they might wish to consider but the decision as to how long they allow him was not a matter for us, it was a matter for the GPA. So I hope that puts your "all good" comment into context.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>prosequi at any time until he briefed me about the subject later on. There may have been mention of these things because I believe that Ian McGrail was mentioning nolle prosequi at the time of the meeting of 13 May and that may have meant that those words are used in discussions but not otherwise.</li> <li>Q. I think what you are saying is that you may have had discussions with the Attorney General about the nolle prosequi?</li> <li>A. No, that is not what I have said. I have given a very full answer, Mr Wagner, and I have told you that I did not believe that I have had such discussions with the Attorney General about the nolle prosequi. The nolle prosequi is the one that was entered but I told you that I seem to recall that in the meetings on 13 or 14 May, Ian McGrail was</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	which Mr McGrail, the Governor, the Attorney General the DPP, I and others were having to operate, which is not dissimilar to how perhaps individuals in practice at the Bar have to operate, is that you have to deal with a very enlarged number of things at the same time, so the fact that he would have to cause his team to produce the section 15 report was not an issue that should in any way divert us from what might have been the appropriate timetable that a Governor and a Chief Minister might decide is the appropriate timetable for us to suggest - not advise, recommend or otherwise - to the GPA they might wish to consider but the decision as to how long they allow him was not a matter for us, it was a matter for the GPA. So I hope that puts your "all good" comment into context. Q. Did you have any discussion with the	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array} $	<ul> <li>prosequi at any time until he briefed me about the subject later on. There may have been mention of these things because I believe that Ian McGrail was mentioning nolle prosequi at the time of the meeting of 13 May and that may have meant that those words are used in discussions but not otherwise.</li> <li>Q. I think what you are saying is that you may have had discussions with the Attorney General about the nolle prosequi?</li> <li>A. No, that is not what I have said. I have given a very full answer, Mr Wagner, and I have told you that I did not believe that I have had such discussions with the Attorney General about the nolle prosequi. The nolle prosequi is the one that was entered but I told you that I seem to recall that in the meetings on 13 or 14 May, Ian McGrail was mentioning the words nolle prosequi and,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	which Mr McGrail, the Governor, the Attorney General the DPP, I and others were having to operate, which is not dissimilar to how perhaps individuals in practice at the Bar have to operate, is that you have to deal with a very enlarged number of things at the same time, so the fact that he would have to cause his team to produce the section 15 report was not an issue that should in any way divert us from what might have been the appropriate timetable that a Governor and a Chief Minister might decide is the appropriate timetable for us to suggest - not advise, recommend or otherwise - to the GPA they might wish to consider but the decision as to how long they allow him was not a matter for us, it was a matter for the GPA. So I hope that puts your "all good" comment into context. Q. Did you have any discussion with the Attorney General at any time about the	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	<ul> <li>prosequi at any time until he briefed me about the subject later on. There may have been mention of these things because I believe that Ian McGrail was mentioning nolle prosequi at the time of the meeting of 13 May and that may have meant that those words are used in discussions but not otherwise.</li> <li>Q. I think what you are saying is that you may have had discussions with the Attorney General about the nolle prosequi?</li> <li>A. No, that is not what I have said. I have given a very full answer, Mr Wagner, and I have told you that I did not believe that I have had such discussions with the Attorney General about the nolle prosequi. The nolle prosequi is the one that was entered but I told you that I seem to recall that in the meetings on 13 or 14 May, Ian McGrail was mentioning the words nolle prosequi and, therefore, they may have crept into</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	which Mr McGrail, the Governor, the Attorney General the DPP, I and others were having to operate, which is not dissimilar to how perhaps individuals in practice at the Bar have to operate, is that you have to deal with a very enlarged number of things at the same time, so the fact that he would have to cause his team to produce the section 15 report was not an issue that should in any way divert us from what might have been the appropriate timetable that a Governor and a Chief Minister might decide is the appropriate timetable for us to suggest - not advise, recommend or otherwise - to the GPA they might wish to consider but the decision as to how long they allow him was not a matter for us, it was a matter for the GPA. So I hope that puts your "all good" comment into context. Q. Did you have any discussion with the Attorney General at any time about the possibility of a nolle prosequi being entered	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	<ul> <li>prosequi at any time until he briefed me about the subject later on. There may have been mention of these things because I believe that Ian McGrail was mentioning nolle prosequi at the time of the meeting of 13 May and that may have meant that those words are used in discussions but not otherwise.</li> <li>Q. I think what you are saying is that you may have had discussions with the Attorney General about the nolle prosequi?</li> <li>A. No, that is not what I have said. I have given a very full answer, Mr Wagner, and I have told you that I did not believe that I have had such discussions with the Attorney General about the nolle prosequi. The nolle prosequi is the one that was entered but I told you that I seem to recall that in the meetings on 13 or 14 May, Ian McGrail was mentioning the words nolle prosequi and, therefore, they may have crept into exchanges between us in that context but not</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	which Mr McGrail, the Governor, the Attorney General the DPP, I and others were having to operate, which is not dissimilar to how perhaps individuals in practice at the Bar have to operate, is that you have to deal with a very enlarged number of things at the same time, so the fact that he would have to cause his team to produce the section 15 report was not an issue that should in any way divert us from what might have been the appropriate timetable that a Governor and a Chief Minister might decide is the appropriate timetable for us to suggest - not advise, recommend or otherwise - to the GPA they might wish to consider but the decision as to how long they allow him was not a matter for us, it was a matter for the GPA. So I hope that puts your "all good" comment into context. Q. Did you have any discussion with the Attorney General at any time about the possibility of a nolle prosequi being entered in the Op Delhi prosecutions?	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	<ul> <li>prosequi at any time until he briefed me about the subject later on. There may have been mention of these things because I believe that Ian McGrail was mentioning nolle prosequi at the time of the meeting of 13 May and that may have meant that those words are used in discussions but not otherwise.</li> <li>Q. I think what you are saying is that you may have had discussions with the Attorney General about the nolle prosequi?</li> <li>A. No, that is not what I have said. I have given a very full answer, Mr Wagner, and I have told you that I did not believe that I have had such discussions with the Attorney General about the nolle prosequi. The nolle prosequi is the one that was entered but I told you that I seem to recall that in the meetings on 13 or 14 May, Ian McGrail was mentioning the words nolle prosequi and, therefore, they may have crept into exchanges between us in that context but not because it was discussed with me, I had</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>which Mr McGrail, the Governor, the Attorney General the DPP, I and others were having to operate, which is not dissimilar to how perhaps individuals in practice at the Bar have to operate, is that you have to deal with a very enlarged number of things at the same time, so the fact that he would have to cause his team to produce the section 15 report was not an issue that should in any way divert us from what might have been the appropriate timetable that a Governor and a Chief Minister might decide is the appropriate timetable for us to suggest - not advise, recommend or otherwise - to the GPA they might wish to consider but the decision as to how long they allow him was not a matter for us, it was a matter for the GPA. So I hope that puts your "all good" comment into context.</li> <li>Q. Did you have any discussion with the Attorney General at any time about the possibility of a nolle prosequi being entered in the Op Delhi prosecutions?</li> <li>A. No, he briefed me at the same time as he</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	<ul> <li>prosequi at any time until he briefed me about the subject later on. There may have been mention of these things because I believe that Ian McGrail was mentioning nolle prosequi at the time of the meeting of 13 May and that may have meant that those words are used in discussions but not otherwise.</li> <li>Q. I think what you are saying is that you may have had discussions with the Attorney General about the nolle prosequi?</li> <li>A. No, that is not what I have said. I have given a very full answer, Mr Wagner, and I have told you that I did not believe that I have had such discussions with the Attorney General about the nolle prosequi. The nolle prosequi is the one that was entered but I told you that I seem to recall that in the meetings on 13 or 14 May, Ian McGrail was mentioning the words nolle prosequi and, therefore, they may have crept into exchanges between us in that context but not because it was discussed with me, I had absolutely no involvement, no discussion</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	which Mr McGrail, the Governor, the Attorney General the DPP, I and others were having to operate, which is not dissimilar to how perhaps individuals in practice at the Bar have to operate, is that you have to deal with a very enlarged number of things at the same time, so the fact that he would have to cause his team to produce the section 15 report was not an issue that should in any way divert us from what might have been the appropriate timetable that a Governor and a Chief Minister might decide is the appropriate timetable for us to suggest - not advise, recommend or otherwise - to the GPA they might wish to consider but the decision as to how long they allow him was not a matter for us, it was a matter for the GPA. So I hope that puts your "all good" comment into context. Q. Did you have any discussion with the Attorney General at any time about the possibility of a nolle prosequi being entered in the Op Delhi prosecutions?	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	<ul> <li>prosequi at any time until he briefed me about the subject later on. There may have been mention of these things because I believe that Ian McGrail was mentioning nolle prosequi at the time of the meeting of 13 May and that may have meant that those words are used in discussions but not otherwise.</li> <li>Q. I think what you are saying is that you may have had discussions with the Attorney General about the nolle prosequi?</li> <li>A. No, that is not what I have said. I have given a very full answer, Mr Wagner, and I have told you that I did not believe that I have had such discussions with the Attorney General about the nolle prosequi. The nolle prosequi is the one that was entered but I told you that I seem to recall that in the meetings on 13 or 14 May, Ian McGrail was mentioning the words nolle prosequi and, therefore, they may have crept into exchanges between us in that context but not because it was discussed with me, I had</li> </ul>

59 (Pages 233 to 236)

		1	
1	the nolle prosequis I say them in the plural	1	Q. It was a very long answer but are you
2	because I think there were three of them,	2	A. This is a very complex matter, Mr
3	have been politically disadvantageous to me	3	Wagner.
4	because people have believed that they have	4	Q. Are you being evasive
5	been designed to be politically advantageous	5	A. Not at all.
6	to me and so, therefore, I would refer you to	6	Q in not answering that question?
7	the full extent of my answer rather than your	7	A. I am being so particular I am being so
8	attempt to paraphrase it in one word.	8	particular that I think it is impossible for
9	Q. Any text messages with the Attorney	9	anybody to think I am being evasive. I have
10	General about a nolle prosequi?	10	given all of my WhatsApps with the Attorney
11	A. If you can point me to them, then they are	11	General so, therefore, if there is any
12	there.	12	reference in any of those WhatsApps to the
13	Q. I am asking you if you recall any?	13	words "nolle prosequi" either at the time of
14	A. You are asking me whether I can recall	14	the nolle prosequi in the case of Delhi or at
15	all of my text messages with the Attorney	15	the time in May 2020 when Mr McGrail
16	General. If you distil the words "nolle	16	started to use the language of nolle prosequi,
17	prosequi" from them	17	then it is there and if it is there, that is an
18	Q. Just any about the subject, do you recall	18	answer but what you are asking me to do is
19	any about the subject?	19	simply a mental exercise and I do not think it
20	A. All of my text messages are before the	20	is helpful for the Inquiry in trying to
21	tribunal and I am not going to even pretend	21	determine the facts that I should do that. The
22	for one moment to have a photographic	22	Inquiry has the WhatsApps, it can see that for
23	memory or to be able to sift through all of	23	itself. This should not be an adversarial
24	them to point you to any that might say the	24	process, it is an inquisitorial process.
25	words nolle prosequi. As it is all digital, we	25	Q. The Inquiry has 129 pages of WhatsApp -
	Page 237		Page 239
1		1	
1	can probably all search and see whether I	1	sorry, let us leave that. I want to get on to
2	have exchanged those discussion and used	2	the employment scheme, if I can put it like
2 3	have exchanged those discussion and used that word.	2 3	the employment scheme, if I can put it like that. Can I show you C6933 please. This is
2 3 4	<ul><li>have exchanged those discussion and used</li><li>that word.</li><li>Q. Do you recall sending or receiving any</li></ul>	2 3 4	the employment scheme, if I can put it like that. Can I show you C6933 please. This is a witness statement by Michael Crome who
2 3 4 5	<ul><li>have exchanged those discussion and used</li><li>that word.</li><li>Q. Do you recall sending or receiving any</li><li>text messages about the nolle prosequi with</li></ul>	2 3 4 5	the employment scheme, if I can put it like that. Can I show you C6933 please. This is a witness statement by Michael Crome who describes the scheme that was set up to deal
2 3 4 5 6	<ul><li>have exchanged those discussion and used that word.</li><li>Q. Do you recall sending or receiving any text messages about the nolle prosequi with the Attorney General?</li></ul>	2 3 4 5 6	the employment scheme, if I can put it like that. Can I show you C6933 please. This is a witness statement by Michael Crome who describes the scheme that was set up to deal with alleged whistleblowers.
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul><li>have exchanged those discussion and used that word.</li><li>Q. Do you recall sending or receiving any text messages about the nolle prosequi with the Attorney General?</li><li>A. I refer you to the answer I have just given</li></ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	the employment scheme, if I can put it like that. Can I show you C6933 please. This is a witness statement by Michael Crome who describes the scheme that was set up to deal with alleged whistleblowers. <b>A. What you call the scheme, yes.</b>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>have exchanged those discussion and used that word.</li> <li>Q. Do you recall sending or receiving any text messages about the nolle prosequi with the Attorney General?</li> <li>A. I refer you to the answer I have just given you.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>the employment scheme, if I can put it like</li> <li>that. Can I show you C6933 please. This is</li> <li>a witness statement by Michael Crome who</li> <li>describes the scheme that was set up to deal</li> <li>with alleged whistleblowers.</li> <li>A. What you call the scheme, yes.</li> <li>Q. "On 22 January I received an email from</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>have exchanged those discussion and used that word.</li> <li>Q. Do you recall sending or receiving any text messages about the nolle prosequi with the Attorney General?</li> <li>A. I refer you to the answer I have just given you.</li> <li>Q. So you are not answering the question</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>the employment scheme, if I can put it like</li> <li>that. Can I show you C6933 please. This is</li> <li>a witness statement by Michael Crome who</li> <li>describes the scheme that was set up to deal</li> <li>with alleged whistleblowers.</li> <li>A. What you call the scheme, yes.</li> <li>Q. "On 22 January I received an email from</li> <li>the GPF chairman in a statement which was</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>have exchanged those discussion and used that word.</li> <li>Q. Do you recall sending or receiving any text messages about the nolle prosequi with the Attorney General?</li> <li>A. I refer you to the answer I have just given you.</li> <li>Q. So you are not answering the question whether you recall that or not?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>the employment scheme, if I can put it like</li> <li>that. Can I show you C6933 please. This is</li> <li>a witness statement by Michael Crome who</li> <li>describes the scheme that was set up to deal</li> <li>with alleged whistleblowers.</li> <li>A. What you call the scheme, yes.</li> <li>Q. "On 22 January I received an email from</li> <li>the GPF chairman in a statement which was</li> <li>made allegations towards the former</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>have exchanged those discussion and used that word.</li> <li>Q. Do you recall sending or receiving any text messages about the nolle prosequi with the Attorney General?</li> <li>A. I refer you to the answer I have just given you.</li> <li>Q. So you are not answering the question whether you recall that or not?</li> <li>A. No, I am answering the question by</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>the employment scheme, if I can put it like</li> <li>that. Can I show you C6933 please. This is</li> <li>a witness statement by Michael Crome who</li> <li>describes the scheme that was set up to deal</li> <li>with alleged whistleblowers.</li> <li>A. What you call the scheme, yes.</li> <li>Q. "On 22 January I received an email from</li> <li>the GPF chairman in a statement which was</li> <li>made allegations towards the former</li> <li>Commissioner of Police. The email was</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>have exchanged those discussion and used that word.</li> <li>Q. Do you recall sending or receiving any text messages about the nolle prosequi with the Attorney General?</li> <li>A. I refer you to the answer I have just given you.</li> <li>Q. So you are not answering the question whether you recall that or not?</li> <li>A. No, I am answering the question by telling you that I could not do now the mental</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>the employment scheme, if I can put it like</li> <li>that. Can I show you C6933 please. This is</li> <li>a witness statement by Michael Crome who</li> <li>describes the scheme that was set up to deal</li> <li>with alleged whistleblowers.</li> <li>A. What you call the scheme, yes.</li> <li>Q. "On 22 January I received an email from</li> <li>the GPF chairman in a statement which was</li> <li>made allegations towards the former</li> <li>Commissioner of Police. The email was</li> <li>then forwarded directly to the Chief</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>have exchanged those discussion and used that word.</li> <li>Q. Do you recall sending or receiving any text messages about the nolle prosequi with the Attorney General?</li> <li>A. I refer you to the answer I have just given you.</li> <li>Q. So you are not answering the question whether you recall that or not?</li> <li>A. No, I am answering the question by telling you that I could not do now the mental exercise of going through all of my</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>the employment scheme, if I can put it like</li> <li>that. Can I show you C6933 please. This is</li> <li>a witness statement by Michael Crome who</li> <li>describes the scheme that was set up to deal</li> <li>with alleged whistleblowers.</li> <li>A. What you call the scheme, yes.</li> <li>Q. "On 22 January I received an email from</li> <li>the GPF chairman in a statement which was</li> <li>made allegations towards the former</li> <li>Commissioner of Police. The email was</li> <li>then forwarded directly to the Chief</li> <li>Minister." Pausing there, how was it</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>have exchanged those discussion and used that word.</li> <li>Q. Do you recall sending or receiving any text messages about the nolle prosequi with the Attorney General?</li> <li>A. I refer you to the answer I have just given you.</li> <li>Q. So you are not answering the question whether you recall that or not?</li> <li>A. No, I am answering the question by telling you that I could not do now the mental exercise of going through all of my WhatsApps with the Attorney General in my</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>the employment scheme, if I can put it like</li> <li>that. Can I show you C6933 please. This is</li> <li>a witness statement by Michael Crome who</li> <li>describes the scheme that was set up to deal</li> <li>with alleged whistleblowers.</li> <li>A. What you call the scheme, yes.</li> <li>Q. "On 22 January I received an email from</li> <li>the GPF chairman in a statement which was</li> <li>made allegations towards the former</li> <li>Commissioner of Police. The email was</li> <li>then forwarded directly to the Chief</li> <li>Minister." Pausing there, how was it</li> <li>appropriate for you to as a core participant</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>have exchanged those discussion and used that word.</li> <li>Q. Do you recall sending or receiving any text messages about the nolle prosequi with the Attorney General?</li> <li>A. I refer you to the answer I have just given you.</li> <li>Q. So you are not answering the question whether you recall that or not?</li> <li>A. No, I am answering the question by telling you that I could not do now the mental exercise of going through all of my</li> <li>WhatsApps with the Attorney General in my head to see whether I had used those words at</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>the employment scheme, if I can put it like</li> <li>that. Can I show you C6933 please. This is</li> <li>a witness statement by Michael Crome who</li> <li>describes the scheme that was set up to deal</li> <li>with alleged whistleblowers.</li> <li>A. What you call the scheme, yes.</li> <li>Q. "On 22 January I received an email from</li> <li>the GPF chairman in a statement which was</li> <li>made allegations towards the former</li> <li>Commissioner of Police. The email was</li> <li>then forwarded directly to the Chief</li> <li>Minister." Pausing there, how was it</li> <li>appropriate for you to as a core participant</li> <li>in this Inquiry, to be receiving any emails</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>have exchanged those discussion and used that word.</li> <li>Q. Do you recall sending or receiving any text messages about the nolle prosequi with the Attorney General?</li> <li>A. I refer you to the answer I have just given you.</li> <li>Q. So you are not answering the question whether you recall that or not?</li> <li>A. No, I am answering the question by telling you that I could not do now the mental exercise of going through all of my</li> <li>WhatsApps with the Attorney General in my head to see whether I had used those words at any time in the exchanges and whether I have</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ \end{array} $	<ul> <li>the employment scheme, if I can put it like</li> <li>that. Can I show you C6933 please. This is</li> <li>a witness statement by Michael Crome who</li> <li>describes the scheme that was set up to deal</li> <li>with alleged whistleblowers.</li> <li>A. What you call the scheme, yes.</li> <li>Q. "On 22 January I received an email from</li> <li>the GPF chairman in a statement which was</li> <li>made allegations towards the former</li> <li>Commissioner of Police. The email was</li> <li>then forwarded directly to the Chief</li> <li>Minister." Pausing there, how was it</li> <li>appropriate for you to as a core participant</li> <li>in this Inquiry, to be receiving any emails</li> <li>with potential statements criticising Mr</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>have exchanged those discussion and used that word.</li> <li>Q. Do you recall sending or receiving any text messages about the nolle prosequi with the Attorney General?</li> <li>A. I refer you to the answer I have just given you.</li> <li>Q. So you are not answering the question whether you recall that or not?</li> <li>A. No, I am answering the question by telling you that I could not do now the mental exercise of going through all of my</li> <li>WhatsApps with the Attorney General in my head to see whether I had used those words at any time in the exchanges and whether I have at the time that the nolle prosequis were</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ \end{array} $	<ul> <li>the employment scheme, if I can put it like</li> <li>that. Can I show you C6933 please. This is</li> <li>a witness statement by Michael Crome who</li> <li>describes the scheme that was set up to deal</li> <li>with alleged whistleblowers.</li> <li>A. What you call the scheme, yes.</li> <li>Q. "On 22 January I received an email from</li> <li>the GPF chairman in a statement which was</li> <li>made allegations towards the former</li> <li>Commissioner of Police. The email was</li> <li>then forwarded directly to the Chief</li> <li>Minister." Pausing there, how was it</li> <li>appropriate for you to as a core participant</li> <li>in this Inquiry, to be receiving any emails</li> <li>with potential statements criticising Mr</li> <li>McGrail?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>have exchanged those discussion and used that word.</li> <li>Q. Do you recall sending or receiving any text messages about the nolle prosequi with the Attorney General?</li> <li>A. I refer you to the answer I have just given you.</li> <li>Q. So you are not answering the question whether you recall that or not?</li> <li>A. No, I am answering the question by telling you that I could not do now the mental exercise of going through all of my</li> <li>WhatsApps with the Attorney General in my head to see whether I had used those words at any time in the exchanges and whether I have at the time that the nolle prosequis were entered or at the time around May 2020 when</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>the employment scheme, if I can put it like</li> <li>that. Can I show you C6933 please. This is</li> <li>a witness statement by Michael Crome who</li> <li>describes the scheme that was set up to deal</li> <li>with alleged whistleblowers.</li> <li>A. What you call the scheme, yes.</li> <li>Q. "On 22 January I received an email from</li> <li>the GPF chairman in a statement which was</li> <li>made allegations towards the former</li> <li>Commissioner of Police. The email was</li> <li>then forwarded directly to the Chief</li> <li>Minister." Pausing there, how was it</li> <li>appropriate for you to as a core participant</li> <li>in this Inquiry, to be receiving any emails</li> <li>with potential statements criticising Mr</li> <li>McGrail?</li> <li>A. Well, are you suggesting I should have</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>have exchanged those discussion and used that word.</li> <li>Q. Do you recall sending or receiving any text messages about the nolle prosequi with the Attorney General?</li> <li>A. I refer you to the answer I have just given you.</li> <li>Q. So you are not answering the question whether you recall that or not?</li> <li>A. No, I am answering the question by telling you that I could not do now the mental exercise of going through all of my</li> <li>WhatsApps with the Attorney General in my head to see whether I had used those words at any time in the exchanges and whether I have at the time that the nolle prosequis were entered or at the time around May 2020 when Ian McGrail in meetings with the Attorney</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ \end{array} $	<ul> <li>the employment scheme, if I can put it like</li> <li>that. Can I show you C6933 please. This is</li> <li>a witness statement by Michael Crome who</li> <li>describes the scheme that was set up to deal</li> <li>with alleged whistleblowers.</li> <li>A. What you call the scheme, yes.</li> <li>Q. "On 22 January I received an email from</li> <li>the GPF chairman in a statement which was</li> <li>made allegations towards the former</li> <li>Commissioner of Police. The email was</li> <li>then forwarded directly to the Chief</li> <li>Minister." Pausing there, how was it</li> <li>appropriate for you to as a core participant</li> <li>in this Inquiry, to be receiving any emails</li> <li>with potential statements criticising Mr</li> <li>McGrail?</li> <li>A. Well, are you suggesting I should have</li> <li>put up a barrier in my inbox?</li> </ul>
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	<ul> <li>have exchanged those discussion and used that word.</li> <li>Q. Do you recall sending or receiving any text messages about the nolle prosequi with the Attorney General?</li> <li>A. I refer you to the answer I have just given you.</li> <li>Q. So you are not answering the question whether you recall that or not?</li> <li>A. No, I am answering the question by telling you that I could not do now the mental exercise of going through all of my</li> <li>WhatsApps with the Attorney General in my head to see whether I had used those words at any time in the exchanges and whether I have at the time that the nolle prosequis were entered or at the time around May 2020 when Ian McGrail in meetings with the Attorney Goneral started to mention the words nolle</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\\end{array} $	<ul> <li>the employment scheme, if I can put it like</li> <li>that. Can I show you C6933 please. This is</li> <li>a witness statement by Michael Crome who</li> <li>describes the scheme that was set up to deal</li> <li>with alleged whistleblowers.</li> <li>A. What you call the scheme, yes.</li> <li>Q. "On 22 January I received an email from</li> <li>the GPF chairman in a statement which was</li> <li>made allegations towards the former</li> <li>Commissioner of Police. The email was</li> <li>then forwarded directly to the Chief</li> <li>Minister." Pausing there, how was it</li> <li>appropriate for you to as a core participant</li> <li>in this Inquiry, to be receiving any emails</li> <li>with potential statements criticising Mr</li> <li>McGrail?</li> <li>A. Well, are you suggesting I should have</li> <li>put up a barrier in my inbox?</li> <li>Q. Correct?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>have exchanged those discussion and used that word.</li> <li>Q. Do you recall sending or receiving any text messages about the nolle prosequi with the Attorney General?</li> <li>A. I refer you to the answer I have just given you.</li> <li>Q. So you are not answering the question whether you recall that or not?</li> <li>A. No, I am answering the question by telling you that I could not do now the mental exercise of going through all of my</li> <li>WhatsApps with the Attorney General in my head to see whether I had used those words at any time in the exchanges and whether I have at the time that the nolle prosequis were entered or at the time around May 2020 when Ian McGrail in meetings with the Attorney</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>the employment scheme, if I can put it like</li> <li>that. Can I show you C6933 please. This is</li> <li>a witness statement by Michael Crome who</li> <li>describes the scheme that was set up to deal</li> <li>with alleged whistleblowers.</li> <li>A. What you call the scheme, yes.</li> <li>Q. "On 22 January I received an email from</li> <li>the GPF chairman in a statement which was</li> <li>made allegations towards the former</li> <li>Commissioner of Police. The email was</li> <li>then forwarded directly to the Chief</li> <li>Minister." Pausing there, how was it</li> <li>appropriate for you to as a core participant</li> <li>in this Inquiry, to be receiving any emails</li> <li>with potential statements criticising Mr</li> <li>McGrail?</li> <li>A. Well, are you suggesting I should have</li> <li>put up a barrier in my inbox?</li> <li>Q. Correct?</li> <li>A. How? How does that happen? How do</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>have exchanged those discussion and used that word.</li> <li>Q. Do you recall sending or receiving any text messages about the nolle prosequi with the Attorney General?</li> <li>A. I refer you to the answer I have just given you.</li> <li>Q. So you are not answering the question whether you recall that or not?</li> <li>A. No, I am answering the question by telling you that I could not do now the mental exercise of going through all of my</li> <li>WhatsApps with the Attorney General in my head to see whether I had used those words at any time in the exchanges and whether I have at the time that the nolle prosequis were entered or at the time around May 2020 when Ian McGrail in meetings with the Attorney General might have referred me to that. That is what I am</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	<ul> <li>the employment scheme, if I can put it like</li> <li>that. Can I show you C6933 please. This is</li> <li>a witness statement by Michael Crome who</li> <li>describes the scheme that was set up to deal</li> <li>with alleged whistleblowers.</li> <li>A. What you call the scheme, yes.</li> <li>Q. "On 22 January I received an email from</li> <li>the GPF chairman in a statement which was</li> <li>made allegations towards the former</li> <li>Commissioner of Police. The email was</li> <li>then forwarded directly to the Chief</li> <li>Minister." Pausing there, how was it</li> <li>appropriate for you to as a core participant</li> <li>in this Inquiry, to be receiving any emails</li> <li>with potential statements criticising Mr</li> <li>McGrail?</li> <li>A. Well, are you suggesting I should have</li> <li>put up a barrier in my inbox?</li> <li>Q. Correct?</li> <li>A. How? How does that happen? How do</li> <li>you do that? I assume</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>have exchanged those discussion and used that word.</li> <li>Q. Do you recall sending or receiving any text messages about the nolle prosequi with the Attorney General?</li> <li>A. I refer you to the answer I have just given you.</li> <li>Q. So you are not answering the question whether you recall that or not?</li> <li>A. No, I am answering the question by telling you that I could not do now the mental exercise of going through all of my</li> <li>WhatsApps with the Attorney General in my head to see whether I had used those words at any time in the exchanges and whether I have at the time that the nolle prosequis were entered or at the time around May 2020 when Ian McGrail in meetings with the Attorney General might</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	<ul> <li>the employment scheme, if I can put it like</li> <li>that. Can I show you C6933 please. This is</li> <li>a witness statement by Michael Crome who</li> <li>describes the scheme that was set up to deal</li> <li>with alleged whistleblowers.</li> <li>A. What you call the scheme, yes.</li> <li>Q. "On 22 January I received an email from</li> <li>the GPF chairman in a statement which was</li> <li>made allegations towards the former</li> <li>Commissioner of Police. The email was</li> <li>then forwarded directly to the Chief</li> <li>Minister." Pausing there, how was it</li> <li>appropriate for you to as a core participant</li> <li>in this Inquiry, to be receiving any emails</li> <li>with potential statements criticising Mr</li> <li>McGrail?</li> <li>A. Well, are you suggesting I should have</li> <li>put up a barrier in my inbox?</li> <li>Q. Correct?</li> <li>A. How? How does that happen? How do</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>have exchanged those discussion and used that word.</li> <li>Q. Do you recall sending or receiving any text messages about the nolle prosequi with the Attorney General?</li> <li>A. I refer you to the answer I have just given you.</li> <li>Q. So you are not answering the question whether you recall that or not?</li> <li>A. No, I am answering the question by telling you that I could not do now the mental exercise of going through all of my</li> <li>WhatsApps with the Attorney General in my head to see whether I had used those words at any time in the exchanges and whether I have at the time that the nolle prosequis were entered or at the time around May 2020 when Ian McGrail in meetings with the Attorney General might have referred me to that. That is what I am saying to you. I think it is a very full answer</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	<ul> <li>the employment scheme, if I can put it like</li> <li>that. Can I show you C6933 please. This is</li> <li>a witness statement by Michael Crome who</li> <li>describes the scheme that was set up to deal</li> <li>with alleged whistleblowers.</li> <li>A. What you call the scheme, yes.</li> <li>Q. "On 22 January I received an email from</li> <li>the GPF chairman in a statement which was</li> <li>made allegations towards the former</li> <li>Commissioner of Police. The email was</li> <li>then forwarded directly to the Chief</li> <li>Minister." Pausing there, how was it</li> <li>appropriate for you to as a core participant</li> <li>in this Inquiry, to be receiving any emails</li> <li>with potential statements criticising Mr</li> <li>McGrail?</li> <li>A. Well, are you suggesting I should have</li> <li>put up a barrier in my inbox?</li> <li>Q. Correct?</li> <li>A. How? How does that happen? How do</li> <li>you do that? I assume</li> <li>Q. If you had said to Mr Crome, "I don't</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>have exchanged those discussion and used that word.</li> <li>Q. Do you recall sending or receiving any text messages about the nolle prosequi with the Attorney General?</li> <li>A. I refer you to the answer I have just given you.</li> <li>Q. So you are not answering the question whether you recall that or not?</li> <li>A. No, I am answering the question by telling you that I could not do now the mental exercise of going through all of my</li> <li>WhatsApps with the Attorney General in my head to see whether I had used those words at any time in the exchanges and whether I have at the time that the nolle prosequis were entered or at the time around May 2020 when Ian McGrail in meetings with the Attorney General might have referred me to that. That is what I am saying to you. I think it is a very full answer and it is undeserving of a suggestion that I</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	<ul> <li>the employment scheme, if I can put it like</li> <li>that. Can I show you C6933 please. This is</li> <li>a witness statement by Michael Crome who</li> <li>describes the scheme that was set up to deal</li> <li>with alleged whistleblowers.</li> <li>A. What you call the scheme, yes.</li> <li>Q. "On 22 January I received an email from</li> <li>the GPF chairman in a statement which was</li> <li>made allegations towards the former</li> <li>Commissioner of Police. The email was</li> <li>then forwarded directly to the Chief</li> <li>Minister." Pausing there, how was it</li> <li>appropriate for you to as a core participant</li> <li>in this Inquiry, to be receiving any emails</li> <li>with potential statements criticising Mr</li> <li>McGrail?</li> <li>A. Well, are you suggesting I should have</li> <li>put up a barrier in my inbox?</li> <li>Q. Correct?</li> <li>A. How? How does that happen? How do</li> <li>you do that? I assume</li> <li>Q. If you had said to Mr Crome, "I don't</li> <li>want to receive any critical statements</li> </ul>

60 (Pages 237 to 240)

Page 240

1 be seen to be potentially procuring or 1 supportive of Mr McGrail and was offered 2 2 influencing or in any way changing the protection? 3 direction of the proposed witness 3 A. I don't know. 4 4 Q. But you signed all the agreements, do you statements," you could have said that? 5 A. I don't accept that I have been or can be 5 remember anybody coming forward saying, 6 6 "I want to support Ian McGrail"? said to have been doing that. 7 7 A. I wasn't told the evidence that they were Q. No. When you ----8 8 A. And so look at what I say, refer it to the giving was A, B or C against Ian McGrail. 9 9 Inquiry. Q. So you had no idea ----10 10 Q. Yes, so if we go further down ----A. I was told that there was a potential A. Which I think is the entirely appropriate 11 11 detriment if they didn't get the --- if they 12 12 didn't get the protection. thing to do. 13 Q. You then --- there was a system set up 13 Q. You had no interest whether it was 14 14 whereby the ---negative or positive? 15 15 A. Which paragraph are you taking me to? A. Absolutely not. 16 16 Q. As a consequence, the Chief Minister ---Q. No, and you did not ----17 17 Mr Crome then explained the assurances that A. The call for evidence for the Inquiry gave 18 the Government would afford under the 18 rise to a lot of people who had gripes against 19 19 Employment Act 2012, you accept that there Ian McGrail potentially wanting to bring 20 20 is absolutely no mention at all in the those forward. 21 Employment Act of giving people alternative 21 Q. Do you accept, given the credibility of 22 22 employment? Mr McGrail is at issue in this Inquiry, that it 23 23 A. Only if you accept that it does not have to would assist you potentially if someone came 24 24 forward with negative evidence about Mr be in the Employment Act for it to be 25 25 relevant and helpful. McGrail? Page 241 Page 243 1 Q. In those --- there is then a meeting in this 1 A. Not necessarily. I think that those of us 2 case between Maurice Morello, Lief 2 who are trained in the law know that there 3 3 Simpson, "At this meeting I explained that if are different issues of credibility affecting 4 she wished to volunteer a statement to the 4 different moments and, therefore, the issue 5 5 Inquiry into the former Commissioner Ian that relates to me and the issue --- the one 6 McGrail, then the Government would afford 6 that seriously concerned me, which was the 7 7 her full protection including a transfer to 12 May, the issue of the maritime incident 8 8 another Government entity if her position and the failure to provide me with timely 9 9 within the RGP became untenable." Did you information on 14 May, et cetera, would be 10 10 approve that arrangement? completely different to the sorts of issues that 11 11 A. I approved not just this arrangement, I might arise in the context of the organisation. 12 approved the general tenor of these 12 Q. And so you trusted again yourself to be 13 13 arrangements and indeed I brought the able to separate out your personal interest in 14 whistleblowing legislation to Parliament 14 certain evidence being given to this Inquiry 15 15 and your interest and Gibraltar's interests? because we thought it was necessary to 16 16 provide these types of protections in these A. I am sorry, Mr Wagner, I don't believe 17 17 and other cases and these are not the only that I have any interest in the information 18 18 cases where they would have been provided. being given to this Inquiry in any particular 19 19 Q. But the whistleblower ---way, shape or form. 20 20 A. And indeed if a whistleblower had come Q. Okay. 21 21 forward who had information to put before A. The interest that I have in this Inquiry is 22 22 this tribunal which was favourable to Ian that it be able to obtain all of the facts; 23 23 McGrail they would also have been afforded whether they are favourable or unfavourable 24 24 the protection. is already a characterisation that I don't 25 Q. Did anybody come forward who was 25 recognise because what we are trying to do is Page 242 Page 244

61 (Pages 241 to 244)

1	get the facts. I am not trying to determine	1	would be expressed in a completely different
2	I am not trying to determine whether	2	way. There is no enthusiasm whatsoever in
3	anything is favourable. It is up to the	3	my remarks there.
4	Chairman to decide that which he thinks is	4	Q. Was it not totally inappropriate for you to
5	relevant and what consequence it may have	5	be anywhere near, within 100 miles you
6	in respect of his views of what happened in	6	might say, of witnesses, potential witnesses
7	May, June 2020. This is not a trial. There	7	to the Inquiry who would give critical
8	are no parties to it in the traditional	8	evidence against Mr McGrail?
9	adversarial way.	9	A. Every witness that wants to give evidence
10	Q. Sure, so you did not enthusiastically	10	to this Inquiry has been told in a call for
11	receive any negative evidence against Mr	11	evidence that they should come forward.
12	McGrail?	12	Some of them have had concerns that they
13	A. No, far from it.	13	would suffer detriment if they did. That is
14	Q. Can we have the new email up, please.	14	why some of them have come through that
15	This is an email, if we can go from the	15	system which we established in writing to
16	bottom, that was sent to the chair of the	16	ensure that it was objective and what I am
17	Gibraltar Police Federation	17	saying in that message is what I think is
18	A. This is not a new email. This is the email	18	absolutely right, which is that the information
19	that was before the magistrates' court during	19	must be laid before the Inquiry and the
20	the hearing of the	20	Commissioner to determine whether it's
21	Q. I am sorry, it was my shorthand, it is	21	relevant or not. That is the view that I think
22	newly with the Inquiry.	22	is the correct view and then the
23	A. Okay.	23	Commissioner can hear submissions from
24	Q. This is the person who alleged sexual	24	counsel for all sides about whether or not
25	assault against Mr McGrail that went to trial	25	those issues are relevant to the terms of
	D 245		D 047
	Page 245		Page 247
1	and he was acquitted, "My name is X" age	1	reference of the Inquiry and if he determines
2	"I am writing this statement in relation to	2	that it is relevant, he can then decide whether
3	a number of incidents I have experienced	3	any credibility should be attached to any
4	personally with the Royal Gibraltar Police	4	particular witness or otherwise. That is not
5	involving senior management." I am not	5	my role.
6	going to show the allegations but the	6	THE CHAIRMAN: (To the witness): In fact
7	allegations were set out in the email that	7	what I did was ensure that the complainant
8	followed, and then that is sent by the	8	was advised that she should report the
9	Federation Chairman to Mr Crome and if we	9	matters to the RGP which in fact happened.
10	go above, he forwards it to you, and you say,	10	A. Yes, that's right.
11	"This is chilling to the bone, remarkable.	11	MR WAGNER: (To the witness): At the
12	This information must be laid before the	12	same time you were offering in this
13	Inquiry for the Commissioner to determine	13	agreement jobs to those individuals. Is that
14	whether it is of relevance or not but it	14	correct?
15	describes the Mr McGrail we know. He was	15	A. No, that's not true.
16	a corrosive influence." Do you accept that	16	Q. If their situation became untenable, you
17	that is marked a neutral response to this very	17	were offering them jobs?
18	serious allegation?	18	A. No, that is not true and I heard you say
19	A. No, I don't.	19	that and you used the terminology of job
20	Q. Do you accept that you were responding	20	offers before. We never saw it that way. We
21	enthusiastically to the negative evidence	21	have only ever seen it as transfers. In other
22	against Mr McGrail?	22	words, these are people who have jobs
23		22	alwoody and are being transforred within their
25	A. Enthusiastically? To say that something	23	already and are being transferred within their
24	is chilling to the bone, one has to realise how	24	service of the Crown from one department to

Page 248

62 (Pages 245 to 248)

1	THE CHAIRMAN: I think that is about it.	1	invitation to you by Mr McGrail to do so?
2	MR WAGNER: I have just one more	2	A. I did.
3	question on that.	3	Q. Why did you do so?
4	THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.	4	A. Because Mr McGrail I recall from
5	MR WAGNER: (To the witness): When	5	memory at the time had said that there had
6	these people transferred, were they	6	been very grave issues that related to his
7	interviewed for their new positions?	7	retirement. I think he said that in response to
8	A. In some instances, they were in order to	8	an answer I had given in Parliament to
9	determine which would be the correct	9	opposition questions about his retirement. It
10	position. I don't know whether in all	10	was only after that that he made a public
10	instances but in some instances they might	10	statement taking Umbridge with something I
11	have had clearly transferable skills. I wasn't	11	had said and saying that the matter could
12	•	12	
	at all involved in what they would do once they some justs the Cibrolton Davalonment	13	only be resolved by way of a public inquiry
14	they came into the Gibraltar Development	1	and so I think within 48 hours of him having
15	Corporation and that, by the way, is perfectly	15	said that, I was on my feet again in
16	normal. It has happened on a number of	16	Parliament and I made the statement saying
17	occasions; in particular on occasions I can	17	that there would be such an inquiry.
18	recall that the current Commissioner has	18	Q. Is the position that you are here today and
19	asked us to act in that way in respect of	19	yesterday answering questions because you
20	transfers from the RGP, so that cannot be	20	have chosen to shine the spotlight on
21	improper in any way.	21	yourself?
22	Q. Is the truth that these were people being	22	A. To a very great extent, yes, on myself and
23	offered jobs with no strings attached?	23	on others but I have chosen that this process
24	A. Not at all. That allegation is as fanciful,	24	should become live and I gave the
25	in my view, as the allegations made against	25	opportunity for Mr McGrail and all others
	Page 249		Page 251
			- 480 -01
1	Paul Richardson, which, in my view, were	1	who had anything that they wished to
2	entirely fanciful.	2	contribute in the context of the terms of
2 3	entirely fanciful. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you, we	1	contribute in the context of the terms of
3	THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you, we	2 3	contribute in the context of the terms of reference to make those statements.
3 4	THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you, we will have a short break.	2 3 4	contribute in the context of the terms of
3 4 5	THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you, we will have a short break. SIR PETER CARUANA: Sir, just reviewing	2 3 4 5	<ul><li>contribute in the context of the terms of reference to make those statements.</li><li>Q. Chief Minister, do you have power to remove the Commissioner of Police?</li></ul>
3 4 5 6	THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you, we will have a short break. SIR PETER CARUANA: Sir, just reviewing things, I do not envisage being as long as I	2 3 4 5 6	<ul><li>contribute in the context of the terms of reference to make those statements.</li><li>Q. Chief Minister, do you have power to remove the Commissioner of Police?</li><li>A. No, no, I don't.</li></ul>
3 4 5 6 7	THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you, we will have a short break. SIR PETER CARUANA: Sir, just reviewing things, I do not envisage being as long as I have been allocated, so I do not envisage that	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>contribute in the context of the terms of reference to make those statements.</li> <li>Q. Chief Minister, do you have power to remove the Commissioner of Police?</li> <li>A. No, no, I don't.</li> <li>Q. So that statutory power, do you have the</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8	THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you, we will have a short break. SIR PETER CARUANA: Sir, just reviewing things, I do not envisage being as long as I have been allocated, so I do not envisage that we will be rising particularly late today.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>contribute in the context of the terms of reference to make those statements.</li> <li>Q. Chief Minister, do you have power to remove the Commissioner of Police?</li> <li>A. No, no, I don't.</li> <li>Q. So that statutory power, do you have the soft power, by which I mean political power,</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you, we will have a short break. SIR PETER CARUANA: Sir, just reviewing things, I do not envisage being as long as I have been allocated, so I do not envisage that we will be rising particularly late today. THE CHAIRMAN: You can	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>contribute in the context of the terms of reference to make those statements.</li> <li>Q. Chief Minister, do you have power to remove the Commissioner of Police?</li> <li>A. No, no, I don't.</li> <li>Q. So that statutory power, do you have the soft power, by which I mean political power, extra-statutory to remove the Commissioner</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you, we will have a short break. SIR PETER CARUANA: Sir, just reviewing things, I do not envisage being as long as I have been allocated, so I do not envisage that we will be rising particularly late today. THE CHAIRMAN: You can SIR PETER CARUANA: There is no need	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>contribute in the context of the terms of reference to make those statements.</li> <li>Q. Chief Minister, do you have power to remove the Commissioner of Police?</li> <li>A. No, no, I don't.</li> <li>Q. So that statutory power, do you have the soft power, by which I mean political power, extra-statutory to remove the Commissioner of Police?</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you, we will have a short break. SIR PETER CARUANA: Sir, just reviewing things, I do not envisage being as long as I have been allocated, so I do not envisage that we will be rising particularly late today. THE CHAIRMAN: You can SIR PETER CARUANA: There is no need to shorten matters.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>contribute in the context of the terms of reference to make those statements.</li> <li>Q. Chief Minister, do you have power to remove the Commissioner of Police?</li> <li>A. No, no, I don't.</li> <li>Q. So that statutory power, do you have the soft power, by which I mean political power, extra-statutory to remove the Commissioner of Police?</li> <li>A. I don't believe I do because all of the</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you, we will have a short break. SIR PETER CARUANA: Sir, just reviewing things, I do not envisage being as long as I have been allocated, so I do not envisage that we will be rising particularly late today. THE CHAIRMAN: You can SIR PETER CARUANA: There is no need to shorten matters. THE CHAIRMAN: You take your time but	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>contribute in the context of the terms of reference to make those statements.</li> <li>Q. Chief Minister, do you have power to remove the Commissioner of Police?</li> <li>A. No, no, I don't.</li> <li>Q. So that statutory power, do you have the soft power, by which I mean political power, extra-statutory to remove the Commissioner of Police?</li> <li>A. I don't believe I do because all of the powers to remove the Commissioner of</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you, we will have a short break. SIR PETER CARUANA: Sir, just reviewing things, I do not envisage being as long as I have been allocated, so I do not envisage that we will be rising particularly late today. THE CHAIRMAN: You can SIR PETER CARUANA: There is no need to shorten matters. THE CHAIRMAN: You take your time but we will have a short break now, thank you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>contribute in the context of the terms of reference to make those statements.</li> <li>Q. Chief Minister, do you have power to remove the Commissioner of Police?</li> <li>A. No, no, I don't.</li> <li>Q. So that statutory power, do you have the soft power, by which I mean political power, extra-statutory to remove the Commissioner of Police?</li> <li>A. I don't believe I do because all of the powers to remove the Commissioner of Police also, so</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you, we will have a short break. SIR PETER CARUANA: Sir, just reviewing things, I do not envisage being as long as I have been allocated, so I do not envisage that we will be rising particularly late today. THE CHAIRMAN: You can SIR PETER CARUANA: There is no need to shorten matters. THE CHAIRMAN: You take your time but we will have a short break now, thank you. (Short adjournment)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>contribute in the context of the terms of reference to make those statements.</li> <li>Q. Chief Minister, do you have power to remove the Commissioner of Police?</li> <li>A. No, no, I don't.</li> <li>Q. So that statutory power, do you have the soft power, by which I mean political power, extra-statutory to remove the Commissioner of Police?</li> <li>A. I don't believe I do because all of the powers to remove the Commissioner of Police require others to be involved also, so my expression of a lack of confidence on its</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you, we will have a short break. SIR PETER CARUANA: Sir, just reviewing things, I do not envisage being as long as I have been allocated, so I do not envisage that we will be rising particularly late today. THE CHAIRMAN: You can SIR PETER CARUANA: There is no need to shorten matters. THE CHAIRMAN: You take your time but we will have a short break now, thank you. (Short adjournment) FABIAN PICARDO (Continued):	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>contribute in the context of the terms of reference to make those statements.</li> <li>Q. Chief Minister, do you have power to remove the Commissioner of Police?</li> <li>A. No, no, I don't.</li> <li>Q. So that statutory power, do you have the soft power, by which I mean political power, extra-statutory to remove the Commissioner of Police?</li> <li>A. I don't believe I do because all of the powers to remove the Commissioner of Police require others to be involved also, so my expression of a lack of confidence on its own is not sufficient for the Commissioner of</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you, we will have a short break. SIR PETER CARUANA: Sir, just reviewing things, I do not envisage being as long as I have been allocated, so I do not envisage that we will be rising particularly late today. THE CHAIRMAN: You can SIR PETER CARUANA: There is no need to shorten matters. THE CHAIRMAN: You take your time but we will have a short break now, thank you. (Short adjournment) FABIAN PICARDO (Continued): Questioned by SIR PETER CARUANA	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ \end{array} $	<ul> <li>contribute in the context of the terms of reference to make those statements.</li> <li>Q. Chief Minister, do you have power to remove the Commissioner of Police?</li> <li>A. No, no, I don't.</li> <li>Q. So that statutory power, do you have the soft power, by which I mean political power, extra-statutory to remove the Commissioner of Police?</li> <li>A. I don't believe I do because all of the powers to remove the Commissioner of Police require others to be involved also, so my expression of a lack of confidence on its own is not sufficient for the Commissioner of Police to be removed.</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you, we will have a short break. SIR PETER CARUANA: Sir, just reviewing things, I do not envisage being as long as I have been allocated, so I do not envisage that we will be rising particularly late today. THE CHAIRMAN: You can SIR PETER CARUANA: There is no need to shorten matters. THE CHAIRMAN: You take your time but we will have a short break now, thank you. (Short adjournment) FABIAN PICARDO (Continued): Questioned by SIR PETER CARUANA (Continued):	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ \end{array} $	<ul> <li>contribute in the context of the terms of reference to make those statements.</li> <li>Q. Chief Minister, do you have power to remove the Commissioner of Police?</li> <li>A. No, no, I don't.</li> <li>Q. So that statutory power, do you have the soft power, by which I mean political power, extra-statutory to remove the Commissioner of Police?</li> <li>A. I don't believe I do because all of the powers to remove the Commissioner of Police require others to be involved also, so my expression of a lack of confidence on its own is not sufficient for the Commissioner of Police to be removed.</li> <li>Q. Do you have a statutory power to invite</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you, we will have a short break.</li> <li>SIR PETER CARUANA: Sir, just reviewing things, I do not envisage being as long as I have been allocated, so I do not envisage that we will be rising particularly late today.</li> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: You can</li> <li>SIR PETER CARUANA: There is no need to shorten matters.</li> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: You take your time but we will have a short break now, thank you.</li> <li>(Short adjournment)</li> <li>FABIAN PICARDO (Continued):</li> <li>Questioned by SIR PETER CARUANA</li> <li>(Continued):</li> <li>Q. Good afternoon, Chief Minister, can we</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>contribute in the context of the terms of reference to make those statements.</li> <li>Q. Chief Minister, do you have power to remove the Commissioner of Police?</li> <li>A. No, no, I don't.</li> <li>Q. So that statutory power, do you have the soft power, by which I mean political power, extra-statutory to remove the Commissioner of Police?</li> <li>A. I don't believe I do because all of the powers to remove the Commissioner of Police require others to be involved also, so my expression of a lack of confidence on its own is not sufficient for the Commissioner of Police to be removed.</li> <li>Q. Do you have a statutory power to invite him to retire?</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you, we will have a short break.</li> <li>SIR PETER CARUANA: Sir, just reviewing things, I do not envisage being as long as I have been allocated, so I do not envisage that we will be rising particularly late today.</li> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: You can</li> <li>SIR PETER CARUANA: There is no need to shorten matters.</li> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: You take your time but we will have a short break now, thank you. (Short adjournment)</li> <li>FABIAN PICARDO (Continued): Questioned by SIR PETER CARUANA (Continued):</li> <li>Q. Good afternoon, Chief Minister, can we just start here, was it your decision to call</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>contribute in the context of the terms of reference to make those statements.</li> <li>Q. Chief Minister, do you have power to remove the Commissioner of Police?</li> <li>A. No, no, I don't.</li> <li>Q. So that statutory power, do you have the soft power, by which I mean political power, extra-statutory to remove the Commissioner of Police?</li> <li>A. I don't believe I do because all of the powers to remove the Commissioner of Police require others to be involved also, so my expression of a lack of confidence on its own is not sufficient for the Commissioner of Police to be removed.</li> <li>Q. Do you have a statutory power to invite him to retire?</li> <li>A. No, not at all.</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you, we will have a short break.</li> <li>SIR PETER CARUANA: Sir, just reviewing things, I do not envisage being as long as I have been allocated, so I do not envisage that we will be rising particularly late today.</li> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: You can</li> <li>SIR PETER CARUANA: There is no need to shorten matters.</li> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: You take your time but we will have a short break now, thank you. (Short adjournment)</li> <li>FABIAN PICARDO (Continued):</li> <li>Questioned by SIR PETER CARUANA (Continued):</li> <li>Q. Good afternoon, Chief Minister, can we just start here, was it your decision to call this Inquiry?</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\\end{array} $	<ul> <li>contribute in the context of the terms of reference to make those statements.</li> <li>Q. Chief Minister, do you have power to remove the Commissioner of Police?</li> <li>A. No, no, I don't.</li> <li>Q. So that statutory power, do you have the soft power, by which I mean political power, extra-statutory to remove the Commissioner of Police?</li> <li>A. I don't believe I do because all of the powers to remove the Commissioner of Police require others to be involved also, so my expression of a lack of confidence on its own is not sufficient for the Commissioner of Police to be removed.</li> <li>Q. Do you have a statutory power to invite him to retire?</li> <li>A. No, not at all.</li> <li>Q. Have you ever invited him to retire,</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you, we will have a short break.</li> <li>SIR PETER CARUANA: Sir, just reviewing things, I do not envisage being as long as I have been allocated, so I do not envisage that we will be rising particularly late today.</li> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: You can</li> <li>SIR PETER CARUANA: There is no need to shorten matters.</li> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: You take your time but we will have a short break now, thank you.</li> <li>(Short adjournment)</li> <li>FABIAN PICARDO (Continued):</li> <li>Questioned by SIR PETER CARUANA</li> <li>(Continued):</li> <li>Q. Good afternoon, Chief Minister, can we just start here, was it your decision to call this Inquiry?</li> <li>A. Yes, it was.</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	<ul> <li>contribute in the context of the terms of reference to make those statements.</li> <li>Q. Chief Minister, do you have power to remove the Commissioner of Police?</li> <li>A. No, no, I don't.</li> <li>Q. So that statutory power, do you have the soft power, by which I mean political power, extra-statutory to remove the Commissioner of Police?</li> <li>A. I don't believe I do because all of the powers to remove the Commissioner of Police require others to be involved also, so my expression of a lack of confidence on its own is not sufficient for the Commissioner of Police to be removed.</li> <li>Q. Do you have a statutory power to invite him to retire?</li> <li>A. No, not at all.</li> <li>Q. Have you ever invited him to retire, privately or publicly?</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you, we will have a short break.</li> <li>SIR PETER CARUANA: Sir, just reviewing things, I do not envisage being as long as I have been allocated, so I do not envisage that we will be rising particularly late today.</li> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: You can</li> <li>SIR PETER CARUANA: There is no need to shorten matters.</li> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: You take your time but we will have a short break now, thank you.</li> <li>(Short adjournment)</li> <li>FABIAN PICARDO (Continued):</li> <li>Questioned by SIR PETER CARUANA</li> <li>(Continued):</li> <li>Q. Good afternoon, Chief Minister, can we just start here, was it your decision to call this Inquiry?</li> <li>A. Yes, it was.</li> <li>Q. Did you have any legal obligation to do</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	<ul> <li>contribute in the context of the terms of reference to make those statements.</li> <li>Q. Chief Minister, do you have power to remove the Commissioner of Police?</li> <li>A. No, no, I don't.</li> <li>Q. So that statutory power, do you have the soft power, by which I mean political power, extra-statutory to remove the Commissioner of Police?</li> <li>A. I don't believe I do because all of the powers to remove the Commissioner of Police require others to be involved also, so my expression of a lack of confidence on its own is not sufficient for the Commissioner of Police to be removed.</li> <li>Q. Do you have a statutory power to invite him to retire?</li> <li>A. No, not at all.</li> <li>Q. Have you ever invited him to retire, privately or publicly?</li> <li>A. Not at all.</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you, we will have a short break.</li> <li>SIR PETER CARUANA: Sir, just reviewing things, I do not envisage being as long as I have been allocated, so I do not envisage that we will be rising particularly late today.</li> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: You can</li> <li>SIR PETER CARUANA: There is no need to shorten matters.</li> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: You take your time but we will have a short break now, thank you.</li> <li>(Short adjournment)</li> <li>FABIAN PICARDO (Continued):</li> <li>Questioned by SIR PETER CARUANA</li> <li>(Continued):</li> <li>Q. Good afternoon, Chief Minister, can we just start here, was it your decision to call this Inquiry?</li> <li>A. Yes, it was.</li> <li>Q. Did you have any legal obligation to do so?</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	<ul> <li>contribute in the context of the terms of reference to make those statements.</li> <li>Q. Chief Minister, do you have power to remove the Commissioner of Police?</li> <li>A. No, no, I don't.</li> <li>Q. So that statutory power, do you have the soft power, by which I mean political power, extra-statutory to remove the Commissioner of Police?</li> <li>A. I don't believe I do because all of the powers to remove the Commissioner of Police require others to be involved also, so my expression of a lack of confidence on its own is not sufficient for the Commissioner of Police to be removed.</li> <li>Q. Do you have a statutory power to invite him to retire?</li> <li>A. No, not at all.</li> <li>Q. Have you ever invited him to retire, privately or publicly?</li> <li>A. Not at all.</li> <li>Q. Who has the power to invite the</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you, we will have a short break.</li> <li>SIR PETER CARUANA: Sir, just reviewing things, I do not envisage being as long as I have been allocated, so I do not envisage that we will be rising particularly late today.</li> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: You can</li> <li>SIR PETER CARUANA: There is no need to shorten matters.</li> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: You take your time but we will have a short break now, thank you. (Short adjournment)</li> <li>FABIAN PICARDO (Continued): Questioned by SIR PETER CARUANA (Continued):</li> <li>Q. Good afternoon, Chief Minister, can we just start here, was it your decision to call this Inquiry?</li> <li>A. Yes, it was.</li> <li>Q. Did you have any legal obligation to do so?</li> <li>A. I have none whatsoever.</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	<ul> <li>contribute in the context of the terms of reference to make those statements.</li> <li>Q. Chief Minister, do you have power to remove the Commissioner of Police?</li> <li>A. No, no, I don't.</li> <li>Q. So that statutory power, do you have the soft power, by which I mean political power, extra-statutory to remove the Commissioner of Police?</li> <li>A. I don't believe I do because all of the powers to remove the Commissioner of Police require others to be involved also, so my expression of a lack of confidence on its own is not sufficient for the Commissioner of Police to be removed.</li> <li>Q. Do you have a statutory power to invite him to retire?</li> <li>A. No, not at all.</li> <li>Q. Have you ever invited him to retire, privately or publicly?</li> <li>A. Not at all.</li> <li>Q. Who has the power to invite the Commissioner of Police to retire?</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you, we will have a short break.</li> <li>SIR PETER CARUANA: Sir, just reviewing things, I do not envisage being as long as I have been allocated, so I do not envisage that we will be rising particularly late today.</li> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: You can</li> <li>SIR PETER CARUANA: There is no need to shorten matters.</li> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: You take your time but we will have a short break now, thank you.</li> <li>(Short adjournment)</li> <li>FABIAN PICARDO (Continued):</li> <li>Questioned by SIR PETER CARUANA</li> <li>(Continued):</li> <li>Q. Good afternoon, Chief Minister, can we just start here, was it your decision to call this Inquiry?</li> <li>A. Yes, it was.</li> <li>Q. Did you have any legal obligation to do so?</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	<ul> <li>contribute in the context of the terms of reference to make those statements.</li> <li>Q. Chief Minister, do you have power to remove the Commissioner of Police?</li> <li>A. No, no, I don't.</li> <li>Q. So that statutory power, do you have the soft power, by which I mean political power, extra-statutory to remove the Commissioner of Police?</li> <li>A. I don't believe I do because all of the powers to remove the Commissioner of Police require others to be involved also, so my expression of a lack of confidence on its own is not sufficient for the Commissioner of Police to be removed.</li> <li>Q. Do you have a statutory power to invite him to retire?</li> <li>A. No, not at all.</li> <li>Q. Have you ever invited him to retire, privately or publicly?</li> <li>A. Not at all.</li> <li>Q. Who has the power to invite the</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you, we will have a short break.</li> <li>SIR PETER CARUANA: Sir, just reviewing things, I do not envisage being as long as I have been allocated, so I do not envisage that we will be rising particularly late today.</li> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: You can</li> <li>SIR PETER CARUANA: There is no need to shorten matters.</li> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: You take your time but we will have a short break now, thank you. (Short adjournment)</li> <li>FABIAN PICARDO (Continued): Questioned by SIR PETER CARUANA (Continued):</li> <li>Q. Good afternoon, Chief Minister, can we just start here, was it your decision to call this Inquiry?</li> <li>A. Yes, it was.</li> <li>Q. Did you have any legal obligation to do so?</li> <li>A. I have none whatsoever.</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	<ul> <li>contribute in the context of the terms of reference to make those statements.</li> <li>Q. Chief Minister, do you have power to remove the Commissioner of Police?</li> <li>A. No, no, I don't.</li> <li>Q. So that statutory power, do you have the soft power, by which I mean political power, extra-statutory to remove the Commissioner of Police?</li> <li>A. I don't believe I do because all of the powers to remove the Commissioner of Police require others to be involved also, so my expression of a lack of confidence on its own is not sufficient for the Commissioner of Police to be removed.</li> <li>Q. Do you have a statutory power to invite him to retire?</li> <li>A. No, not at all.</li> <li>Q. Have you ever invited him to retire, privately or publicly?</li> <li>A. Not at all.</li> <li>Q. Who has the power to invite the Commissioner of Police to retire?</li> </ul>

63 (Pages 249 to 252)

1	,. , <u>,</u> , ,.		
1	my retirements and resignations wrong,		even in the absence of the GPA process
2	under section 34, the GPA of course have	2	which was by then defunct because of their
3	power to invite him to retire. He has the	3	constitutional problem,
4	power to make representations and then they		Q. And, just to be clear, so that no one might
5	shall have him retire if they are not satisfied	5	think that this absence or where the power
6	and the Governor then under section 13 has	6	lies has been used for a purpose other than
7	the power to call on him to resign, I believe,	7	the one it had been used for, if Mr Pyle had
8	from memory, and if he does not resign upon	8	exercised his powers under section 13 would
9	the call from the Governor, then the	9	you have supported him doing so?
10	Governor has the power to suspend him.	10	A. I would have done so.
11	Q. In May 2020 did you lose confidence in	11	Q. It is the case that has been advanced, at
12	Mr McGrail as Commissioner of Police for	12	least latterly on behalf of Mr McGrail, that
13	the reasons that you have explained and I am	13	you have manipulated the then Governor,
14	not going to waste the tribunal's time taking	14	then then we are calling him the interim
15	you through again?	15	Governor, the then Governor, substantively
16	A. I did for all those reasons.	16	previously and later Deputy Governor, in
17	Q. Did you, therefore, as of that time, wish	17	order to have your way through him. Are
18	to see him cease to be Commissioner of	18	you aware of that allegation?
19	Police and replaced by somebody else?	19	A. I have seen it put and of course I don't
20	A. Yes, but I would caveat that by saying	20	agree with it.
21	that my mind was fully made up once I had	21	Q. Did Mr Pyle require any persuasion by
22	had a discussion with the Acting Governor at	22	you of the desirability of replacing Mr
23	the time.	23	McGrail as Commissioner of Police?
24	Q. Did you agree with the then governor, Mr	24	A. No, and as I think the electronic record
25	Pyle, to approach the GPA and ask them to	25	shows, not only was I what you might call
	Page 253		Page 255
1	consider exercising their powers to invite Mr	1	colloquially pushing at an open door, this
1	consider exercising their powers to invite Mr	1	colloquially pushing at an open door, this
2	McGrail to retire?	2	door swung open before I put my fingers on
2 3	McGrail to retire? A. Yes, as the electronic record shows that	2 3	door swung open before I put my fingers on it.
2 3 4	McGrail to retire? A. Yes, as the electronic record shows that we did.	2 3 4	<ul><li>door swung open before I put my fingers on</li><li>it.</li><li>Q. Did it require any persuasion by you to</li></ul>
2 3 4 5	McGrail to retire? A. Yes, as the electronic record shows that we did. Q. So regardless of whether you have power,	2 3 4 5	<ul><li>door swung open before I put my fingers on it.</li><li>Q. Did it require any persuasion by you to invite the police authority to consider</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6	<ul><li>McGrail to retire?</li><li>A. Yes, as the electronic record shows that we did.</li><li>Q. So regardless of whether you have power, statutorily or otherwise, is it your position</li></ul>	2 3 4 5 6	<ul><li>door swung open before I put my fingers on it.</li><li>Q. Did it require any persuasion by you to invite the police authority to consider inviting him to retire?</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul><li>McGrail to retire?</li><li>A. Yes, as the electronic record shows that we did.</li><li>Q. So regardless of whether you have power, statutorily or otherwise, is it your position that you were wanting to see Mr McGrail</li></ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul><li>door swung open before I put my fingers on it.</li><li>Q. Did it require any persuasion by you to invite the police authority to consider inviting him to retire?</li><li>A. Not at all.</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul><li>McGrail to retire?</li><li>A. Yes, as the electronic record shows that we did.</li><li>Q. So regardless of whether you have power, statutorily or otherwise, is it your position that you were wanting to see Mr McGrail leave his post?</li></ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>door swung open before I put my fingers on it.</li> <li>Q. Did it require any persuasion by you to invite the police authority to consider inviting him to retire?</li> <li>A. Not at all.</li> <li>Q. Why did he require no persuasion, in</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>McGrail to retire?</li> <li>A. Yes, as the electronic record shows that we did.</li> <li>Q. So regardless of whether you have power, statutorily or otherwise, is it your position that you were wanting to see Mr McGrail leave his post?</li> <li>A. We took the view together that we felt</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>door swung open before I put my fingers on it.</li> <li>Q. Did it require any persuasion by you to invite the police authority to consider inviting him to retire?</li> <li>A. Not at all.</li> <li>Q. Why did he require no persuasion, in your view?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>McGrail to retire?</li> <li>A. Yes, as the electronic record shows that we did.</li> <li>Q. So regardless of whether you have power, statutorily or otherwise, is it your position that you were wanting to see Mr McGrail leave his post?</li> <li>A. We took the view together that we felt that we had to what I think we called kick</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>door swung open before I put my fingers on it.</li> <li>Q. Did it require any persuasion by you to invite the police authority to consider inviting him to retire?</li> <li>A. Not at all.</li> <li>Q. Why did he require no persuasion, in your view?</li> <li>A. Well, I think for the reasons that are</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>McGrail to retire?</li> <li>A. Yes, as the electronic record shows that we did.</li> <li>Q. So regardless of whether you have power, statutorily or otherwise, is it your position that you were wanting to see Mr McGrail leave his post?</li> <li>A. We took the view together that we felt that we had to what I think we called kick off the GPA process to facilitate that.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>door swung open before I put my fingers on it.</li> <li>Q. Did it require any persuasion by you to invite the police authority to consider inviting him to retire?</li> <li>A. Not at all.</li> <li>Q. Why did he require no persuasion, in your view?</li> <li>A. Well, I think for the reasons that are largely set out in the electronic record of</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>McGrail to retire?</li> <li>A. Yes, as the electronic record shows that we did.</li> <li>Q. So regardless of whether you have power, statutorily or otherwise, is it your position that you were wanting to see Mr McGrail leave his post?</li> <li>A. We took the view together that we felt that we had to what I think we called kick off the GPA process to facilitate that.</li> <li>Q. When the police authority attempt to do</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>door swung open before I put my fingers on it.</li> <li>Q. Did it require any persuasion by you to invite the police authority to consider inviting him to retire?</li> <li>A. Not at all.</li> <li>Q. Why did he require no persuasion, in your view?</li> <li>A. Well, I think for the reasons that are largely set out in the electronic record of communications between us at the time and</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>McGrail to retire?</li> <li>A. Yes, as the electronic record shows that we did.</li> <li>Q. So regardless of whether you have power, statutorily or otherwise, is it your position that you were wanting to see Mr McGrail leave his post?</li> <li>A. We took the view together that we felt that we had to what I think we called kick off the GPA process to facilitate that.</li> <li>Q. When the police authority attempt to do so was frustrated by their procedural</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>door swung open before I put my fingers on it.</li> <li>Q. Did it require any persuasion by you to invite the police authority to consider inviting him to retire?</li> <li>A. Not at all.</li> <li>Q. Why did he require no persuasion, in your view?</li> <li>A. Well, I think for the reasons that are largely set out in the electronic record of communications between us at the time and which the Chairman will be cognisant of, and</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>McGrail to retire?</li> <li>A. Yes, as the electronic record shows that we did.</li> <li>Q. So regardless of whether you have power, statutorily or otherwise, is it your position that you were wanting to see Mr McGrail leave his post?</li> <li>A. We took the view together that we felt that we had to what I think we called kick off the GPA process to facilitate that.</li> <li>Q. When the police authority attempt to do so was frustrated by their procedural irregularity, who had the power you have</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>door swung open before I put my fingers on it.</li> <li>Q. Did it require any persuasion by you to invite the police authority to consider inviting him to retire?</li> <li>A. Not at all.</li> <li>Q. Why did he require no persuasion, in your view?</li> <li>A. Well, I think for the reasons that are largely set out in the electronic record of communications between us at the time and which the Chairman will be cognisant of, and the tenor of our conversations at the time</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>McGrail to retire?</li> <li>A. Yes, as the electronic record shows that we did.</li> <li>Q. So regardless of whether you have power, statutorily or otherwise, is it your position that you were wanting to see Mr McGrail leave his post?</li> <li>A. We took the view together that we felt that we had to what I think we called kick off the GPA process to facilitate that.</li> <li>Q. When the police authority attempt to do so was frustrated by their procedural irregularity, who had the power you have answered this question, the Governor had the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>door swung open before I put my fingers on it.</li> <li>Q. Did it require any persuasion by you to invite the police authority to consider inviting him to retire?</li> <li>A. Not at all.</li> <li>Q. Why did he require no persuasion, in your view?</li> <li>A. Well, I think for the reasons that are largely set out in the electronic record of communications between us at the time and which the Chairman will be cognisant of, and</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>McGrail to retire?</li> <li>A. Yes, as the electronic record shows that we did.</li> <li>Q. So regardless of whether you have power, statutorily or otherwise, is it your position that you were wanting to see Mr McGrail leave his post?</li> <li>A. We took the view together that we felt that we had to what I think we called kick off the GPA process to facilitate that.</li> <li>Q. When the police authority attempt to do so was frustrated by their procedural irregularity, who had the power you have</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>door swung open before I put my fingers on it.</li> <li>Q. Did it require any persuasion by you to invite the police authority to consider inviting him to retire?</li> <li>A. Not at all.</li> <li>Q. Why did he require no persuasion, in your view?</li> <li>A. Well, I think for the reasons that are largely set out in the electronic record of communications between us at the time and which the Chairman will be cognisant of, and the tenor of our conversations at the time which was identical to what is recorded in those electronic communications.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>McGrail to retire?</li> <li>A. Yes, as the electronic record shows that we did.</li> <li>Q. So regardless of whether you have power, statutorily or otherwise, is it your position that you were wanting to see Mr McGrail leave his post?</li> <li>A. We took the view together that we felt that we had to what I think we called kick off the GPA process to facilitate that.</li> <li>Q. When the police authority attempt to do so was frustrated by their procedural irregularity, who had the power you have answered this question, the Governor had the power thereafter to call for his resignation?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>door swung open before I put my fingers on it.</li> <li>Q. Did it require any persuasion by you to invite the police authority to consider inviting him to retire?</li> <li>A. Not at all.</li> <li>Q. Why did he require no persuasion, in your view?</li> <li>A. Well, I think for the reasons that are largely set out in the electronic record of communications between us at the time and which the Chairman will be cognisant of, and the tenor of our conversations at the time which was identical to what is recorded in those electronic communications.</li> <li>Q. Thank you, so, Chief Minister was this</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>McGrail to retire?</li> <li>A. Yes, as the electronic record shows that we did.</li> <li>Q. So regardless of whether you have power, statutorily or otherwise, is it your position that you were wanting to see Mr McGrail leave his post?</li> <li>A. We took the view together that we felt that we had to what I think we called kick off the GPA process to facilitate that.</li> <li>Q. When the police authority attempt to do so was frustrated by their procedural irregularity, who had the power you have answered this question, the Governor had the power thereafter to call for his resignation?</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ \end{array} $	<ul> <li>door swung open before I put my fingers on it.</li> <li>Q. Did it require any persuasion by you to invite the police authority to consider inviting him to retire?</li> <li>A. Not at all.</li> <li>Q. Why did he require no persuasion, in your view?</li> <li>A. Well, I think for the reasons that are largely set out in the electronic record of communications between us at the time and which the Chairman will be cognisant of, and the tenor of our conversations at the time which was identical to what is recorded in those electronic communications.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>McGrail to retire?</li> <li>A. Yes, as the electronic record shows that we did.</li> <li>Q. So regardless of whether you have power, statutorily or otherwise, is it your position that you were wanting to see Mr McGrail leave his post?</li> <li>A. We took the view together that we felt that we had to what I think we called kick off the GPA process to facilitate that.</li> <li>Q. When the police authority attempt to do so was frustrated by their procedural irregularity, who had the power you have answered this question, the Governor had the power thereafter to call for his resignation?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Did he in fact do so?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>door swung open before I put my fingers on it.</li> <li>Q. Did it require any persuasion by you to invite the police authority to consider inviting him to retire?</li> <li>A. Not at all.</li> <li>Q. Why did he require no persuasion, in your view?</li> <li>A. Well, I think for the reasons that are largely set out in the electronic record of communications between us at the time and which the Chairman will be cognisant of, and the tenor of our conversations at the time which was identical to what is recorded in those electronic communications.</li> <li>Q. Thank you, so, Chief Minister was this the position that you had lost confidence in</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>McGrail to retire?</li> <li>A. Yes, as the electronic record shows that we did.</li> <li>Q. So regardless of whether you have power, statutorily or otherwise, is it your position that you were wanting to see Mr McGrail leave his post?</li> <li>A. We took the view together that we felt that we had to what I think we called kick off the GPA process to facilitate that.</li> <li>Q. When the police authority attempt to do so was frustrated by their procedural irregularity, who had the power you have answered this question, the Governor had the power thereafter to call for his resignation?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Did he in fact do so?</li> <li>A. He did. Well, sorry, I mean, he was</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>door swung open before I put my fingers on it.</li> <li>Q. Did it require any persuasion by you to invite the police authority to consider inviting him to retire?</li> <li>A. Not at all.</li> <li>Q. Why did he require no persuasion, in your view?</li> <li>A. Well, I think for the reasons that are largely set out in the electronic record of communications between us at the time and which the Chairman will be cognisant of, and the tenor of our conversations at the time which was identical to what is recorded in those electronic communications.</li> <li>Q. Thank you, so, Chief Minister was this the position that you had lost confidence in Mr McGrail primarily for one reason, and Mr</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>McGrail to retire?</li> <li>A. Yes, as the electronic record shows that we did.</li> <li>Q. So regardless of whether you have power, statutorily or otherwise, is it your position that you were wanting to see Mr McGrail leave his post?</li> <li>A. We took the view together that we felt that we had to what I think we called kick off the GPA process to facilitate that.</li> <li>Q. When the police authority attempt to do so was frustrated by their procedural irregularity, who had the power you have answered this question, the Governor had the power thereafter to call for his resignation?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Did he in fact do so?</li> <li>A. He did. Well, sorry, I mean, he was he said he was going to do so and in order to</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array} $	<ul> <li>door swung open before I put my fingers on it.</li> <li>Q. Did it require any persuasion by you to invite the police authority to consider inviting him to retire?</li> <li>A. Not at all.</li> <li>Q. Why did he require no persuasion, in your view?</li> <li>A. Well, I think for the reasons that are largely set out in the electronic record of communications between us at the time and which the Chairman will be cognisant of, and the tenor of our conversations at the time which was identical to what is recorded in those electronic communications.</li> <li>Q. Thank you, so, Chief Minister was this the position that you had lost confidence in Mr McGrail primarily for one reason, and Mr Pyle had also done so primarily for other</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>McGrail to retire?</li> <li>A. Yes, as the electronic record shows that we did.</li> <li>Q. So regardless of whether you have power, statutorily or otherwise, is it your position that you were wanting to see Mr McGrail leave his post?</li> <li>A. We took the view together that we felt that we had to what I think we called kick off the GPA process to facilitate that.</li> <li>Q. When the police authority attempt to do so was frustrated by their procedural irregularity, who had the power you have answered this question, the Governor had the power thereafter to call for his resignation?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Did he in fact do so?</li> <li>A. He did. Well, sorry, I mean, he was he said he was going to do so and in order to do so he was going to meet with him to tell</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	<ul> <li>door swung open before I put my fingers on it.</li> <li>Q. Did it require any persuasion by you to invite the police authority to consider inviting him to retire?</li> <li>A. Not at all.</li> <li>Q. Why did he require no persuasion, in your view?</li> <li>A. Well, I think for the reasons that are largely set out in the electronic record of communications between us at the time and which the Chairman will be cognisant of, and the tenor of our conversations at the time which was identical to what is recorded in those electronic communications.</li> <li>Q. Thank you, so, Chief Minister was this the position that you had lost confidence in Mr McGrail primarily for one reason, and Mr Pyle had also done so primarily for other reasons. Is that correct?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>McGrail to retire?</li> <li>A. Yes, as the electronic record shows that we did.</li> <li>Q. So regardless of whether you have power, statutorily or otherwise, is it your position that you were wanting to see Mr McGrail leave his post?</li> <li>A. We took the view together that we felt that we had to what I think we called kick off the GPA process to facilitate that.</li> <li>Q. When the police authority attempt to do so was frustrated by their procedural irregularity, who had the power you have answered this question, the Governor had the power thereafter to call for his resignation?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Did he in fact do so?</li> <li>A. He did. Well, sorry, I mean, he was he said he was going to do so and in order to do so he was going to do so and I think</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	<ul> <li>door swung open before I put my fingers on it.</li> <li>Q. Did it require any persuasion by you to invite the police authority to consider inviting him to retire?</li> <li>A. Not at all.</li> <li>Q. Why did he require no persuasion, in your view?</li> <li>A. Well, I think for the reasons that are largely set out in the electronic record of communications between us at the time and which the Chairman will be cognisant of, and the tenor of our conversations at the time which was identical to what is recorded in those electronic communications.</li> <li>Q. Thank you, so, Chief Minister was this the position that you had lost confidence in Mr McGrail primarily for one reason, and Mr Pyle had also done so primarily for other reasons. Is that correct?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>McGrail to retire?</li> <li>A. Yes, as the electronic record shows that we did.</li> <li>Q. So regardless of whether you have power, statutorily or otherwise, is it your position that you were wanting to see Mr McGrail leave his post?</li> <li>A. We took the view together that we felt that we had to what I think we called kick off the GPA process to facilitate that.</li> <li>Q. When the police authority attempt to do so was frustrated by their procedural irregularity, who had the power you have answered this question, the Governor had the power thereafter to call for his resignation?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Did he in fact do so?</li> <li>A. He did. Well, sorry, I mean, he was he said he was going to do so and in order to do so he was going to do so and I think before Nic Pyle activated the section 13</li> </ul>	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ \end{array}$	<ul> <li>door swung open before I put my fingers on it.</li> <li>Q. Did it require any persuasion by you to invite the police authority to consider inviting him to retire?</li> <li>A. Not at all.</li> <li>Q. Why did he require no persuasion, in your view?</li> <li>A. Well, I think for the reasons that are largely set out in the electronic record of communications between us at the time and which the Chairman will be cognisant of, and the tenor of our conversations at the time which was identical to what is recorded in those electronic communications.</li> <li>Q. Thank you, so, Chief Minister was this the position that you had lost confidence in Mr McGrail primarily for one reason, and Mr Pyle had also done so primarily for other reasons. Is that correct?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. But you had both done so, albeit for a</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>McGrail to retire?</li> <li>A. Yes, as the electronic record shows that we did.</li> <li>Q. So regardless of whether you have power, statutorily or otherwise, is it your position that you were wanting to see Mr McGrail leave his post?</li> <li>A. We took the view together that we felt that we had to what I think we called kick off the GPA process to facilitate that.</li> <li>Q. When the police authority attempt to do so was frustrated by their procedural irregularity, who had the power you have answered this question, the Governor had the power thereafter to call for his resignation?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Did he in fact do so?</li> <li>A. He did. Well, sorry, I mean, he was he said he was going to do so and in order to do so he was going to do so and I think before Nic Pyle activated the section 13 procedure, Mr McGrail voluntarily retired</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	<ul> <li>door swung open before I put my fingers on it.</li> <li>Q. Did it require any persuasion by you to invite the police authority to consider inviting him to retire?</li> <li>A. Not at all.</li> <li>Q. Why did he require no persuasion, in your view?</li> <li>A. Well, I think for the reasons that are largely set out in the electronic record of communications between us at the time and which the Chairman will be cognisant of, and the tenor of our conversations at the time which was identical to what is recorded in those electronic communications.</li> <li>Q. Thank you, so, Chief Minister was this the position that you had lost confidence in Mr McGrail primarily for one reason, and Mr Pyle had also done so primarily for other reasons. Is that correct?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. But you had both done so, albeit for a myriad of reasons?</li> </ul>

64 (Pages 253 to 256)

1	Q. You referred to the electronic record, and	1	asked you towards the end of his examination
2	this is really the only thing I want to take you	2	of you that Mr Pyle had never previously
3	directly to at any length, so we will just	3	raised any complaint with you about Mr
4	spend a few minutes on this, I just want to	4	McGrail, is that actually true?
5	take you through the electronic record that	5	MR WAGNER: It was whether Mr Pyle had
6	you yourself have mentioned and I am going	6	ever said he lost confidence or was losing
7	to ask you whether you think it is fair to say	7	confidence in Mr McGrail.
8	that this is your open door that did not need	8	A. Mr Pyle had never told me that he was
9	pushing against. Can we go to B1439, that is	9	losing confidence in Mr McGrail, but he had
10	the thing we have heard so much about, and I	10	also been less than complimentary about Mr
11	am not going to take you to it because it has	11	McGrail before that date.
12	been read ad nauseum, you gave that literally	12	SIR PETER CARUANA: Can we turn up
13	to WhatsApp with that litany of issues to Mr	13	A255, which is Mr Pyle's witness statement, at
14	Pyle at 0949 hours and if my mathematics is	14	paragraph 26, and at 26.1 he says, "On the
15	not mistaken, eight minutes later or nine	15	14th of May I received a phone call from the
16	minutes later, what does he answer?	16	Chief Minister saying he wished to discuss an
17	A. He says, "I agree as we thought at the	17	important issue surrounding the RGP with me.
18	time wrong appointment, remind me to tell	18	My response was that this was a remarkable
19	you about the recruitment process which was	19	coincidence as I wanted to discuss my deep
20	abject, should we meet tomorrow after or	20	concerns about its leadership with him. We
21	before platinum."	21	agreed to meet the next day." Had you worked
22	Q. If there was manipulation, it can only	22	your manipulative magic on him at this stage?
23	have been the seductive effect of the list of	23	A. Neither then nor later. As I said to you in
24	issues that you chose to include in your	24	the course of my evidence yesterday, a
25	litany? I think that is the allegation.	25	Governor is not a stove that one loads with
	, 6		
	Page 257		Page 259
1	A. Yes, that is quite a way to put it but,	1	logs.
1 2	A. Yes, that is quite a way to put it but, absolutely.	1 2	<b>logs.</b> Q. And then he goes on, "We met on the 15th
	absolutely.	1 2 3	<b>logs.</b> Q. And then he goes on, "We met on the 15th of May, at the very start of which meeting the
2		2	Q. And then he goes on, "We met on the 15th
2 3	<b>absolutely.</b> Q. Can we go over the page to B1440 at	2 3	Q. And then he goes on, "We met on the 15th of May, at the very start of which meeting the
2 3 4	<b>absolutely.</b> Q. Can we go over the page to B1440 at 2003 do you see that there? Who first	2 3 4	Q. And then he goes on, "We met on the 15th of May, at the very start of which meeting the Chief Minister asked me to go first. I told him
2 3 4 5	<b>absolutely.</b> Q. Can we go over the page to B1440 at 2003 do you see that there? Who first suggests in that conversation speaking to the	2 3 4 5	Q. And then he goes on, "We met on the 15th of May, at the very start of which meeting the Chief Minister asked me to go first. I told him that I had had for some while concerns about
2 3 4 5 6	<b>absolutely.</b> Q. Can we go over the page to B1440 at 2003 do you see that there? Who first suggests in that conversation speaking to the chairman of the GPA?	2 3 4 5 6	Q. And then he goes on, "We met on the 15th of May, at the very start of which meeting the Chief Minister asked me to go first. I told him that I had had for some while concerns about the RGP and its leadership which the incident
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>absolutely.</li> <li>Q. Can we go over the page to B1440 at 2003 do you see that there? Who first suggests in that conversation speaking to the chairman of the GPA?</li> <li>A. Mr Pyle, the then Governor.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	Q. And then he goes on, "We met on the 15th of May, at the very start of which meeting the Chief Minister asked me to go first. I told him that I had had for some while concerns about the RGP and its leadership which the incident at sea has turned into a firm belief that changes
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>absolutely.</li> <li>Q. Can we go over the page to B1440 at 2003 do you see that there? Who first suggests in that conversation speaking to the chairman of the GPA?</li> <li>A. Mr Pyle, the then Governor.</li> <li>Q. What did he say, "Good as always to</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q. And then he goes on, "We met on the 15th of May, at the very start of which meeting the Chief Minister asked me to go first. I told him that I had had for some while concerns about the RGP and its leadership which the incident at sea has turned into a firm belief that changes in how the RGP works are needed. I briefly
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>absolutely.</li> <li>Q. Can we go over the page to B1440 at 2003 do you see that there? Who first suggests in that conversation speaking to the chairman of the GPA?</li> <li>A. Mr Pyle, the then Governor.</li> <li>Q. What did he say, "Good as always to catch up, I don't see any option re CoP, given</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q. And then he goes on, "We met on the 15th of May, at the very start of which meeting the Chief Minister asked me to go first. I told him that I had had for some while concerns about the RGP and its leadership which the incident at sea has turned into a firm belief that changes in how the RGP works are needed. I briefly ran through my concerns as outlined above."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>absolutely.</li> <li>Q. Can we go over the page to B1440 at 2003 do you see that there? Who first suggests in that conversation speaking to the chairman of the GPA?</li> <li>A. Mr Pyle, the then Governor.</li> <li>Q. What did he say, "Good as always to catch up, I don't see any option re CoP, given the evidence, I'll speak to Joey carefully</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Q. And then he goes on, "We met on the 15th of May, at the very start of which meeting the Chief Minister asked me to go first. I told him that I had had for some while concerns about the RGP and its leadership which the incident at sea has turned into a firm belief that changes in how the RGP works are needed. I briefly ran through my concerns as outlined above."</li> <li>Do you confirm Mr Pyle's evidence or do you demur from it that he went first and explained to you his concerns?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>absolutely.</li> <li>Q. Can we go over the page to B1440 at 2003 do you see that there? Who first suggests in that conversation speaking to the chairman of the GPA?</li> <li>A. Mr Pyle, the then Governor.</li> <li>Q. What did he say, "Good as always to catch up, I don't see any option re CoP, given the evidence, I'll speak to Joey carefully sometime next week."</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Q. And then he goes on, "We met on the 15th of May, at the very start of which meeting the Chief Minister asked me to go first. I told him that I had had for some while concerns about the RGP and its leadership which the incident at sea has turned into a firm belief that changes in how the RGP works are needed. I briefly ran through my concerns as outlined above."</li> <li>Do you confirm Mr Pyle's evidence or do you demur from it that he went first and explained to you his concerns?</li> <li>A. No, I think that's accurate.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>absolutely.</li> <li>Q. Can we go over the page to B1440 at 2003 do you see that there? Who first suggests in that conversation speaking to the chairman of the GPA?</li> <li>A. Mr Pyle, the then Governor.</li> <li>Q. What did he say, "Good as always to catch up, I don't see any option re CoP, given the evidence, I'll speak to Joey carefully sometime next week." (15.41)</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Joey there being?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Q. And then he goes on, "We met on the 15th of May, at the very start of which meeting the Chief Minister asked me to go first. I told him that I had had for some while concerns about the RGP and its leadership which the incident at sea has turned into a firm belief that changes in how the RGP works are needed. I briefly ran through my concerns as outlined above." Do you confirm Mr Pyle's evidence or do you demur from it that he went first and explained to you his concerns?</li> <li>A. No, I think that's accurate. Q. Sorry?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>absolutely.</li> <li>Q. Can we go over the page to B1440 at 2003 do you see that there? Who first suggests in that conversation speaking to the chairman of the GPA?</li> <li>A. Mr Pyle, the then Governor.</li> <li>Q. What did he say, "Good as always to catch up, I don't see any option re CoP, given the evidence, I'll speak to Joey carefully sometime next week." (15.41)</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Joey there being?</li> <li>A. Dr Joey Britto.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Q. And then he goes on, "We met on the 15th of May, at the very start of which meeting the Chief Minister asked me to go first. I told him that I had had for some while concerns about the RGP and its leadership which the incident at sea has turned into a firm belief that changes in how the RGP works are needed. I briefly ran through my concerns as outlined above." Do you confirm Mr Pyle's evidence or do you demur from it that he went first and explained to you his concerns?</li> <li>A. No, I think that's accurate.</li> <li>Q. Sorry?</li> <li>A. I think that's accurate.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>absolutely.</li> <li>Q. Can we go over the page to B1440 at 2003 do you see that there? Who first suggests in that conversation speaking to the chairman of the GPA?</li> <li>A. Mr Pyle, the then Governor.</li> <li>Q. What did he say, "Good as always to catch up, I don't see any option re CoP, given the evidence, I'll speak to Joey carefully sometime next week." (15.41)</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Joey there being?</li> <li>A. Dr Joey Britto.</li> <li>Q. And just whilst we are on this page, to not</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ \end{array} $	<ul> <li>Q. And then he goes on, "We met on the 15th of May, at the very start of which meeting the Chief Minister asked me to go first. I told him that I had had for some while concerns about the RGP and its leadership which the incident at sea has turned into a firm belief that changes in how the RGP works are needed. I briefly ran through my concerns as outlined above." Do you confirm Mr Pyle's evidence or do you demur from it that he went first and explained to you his concerns?</li> <li>A. No, I think that's accurate.</li> <li>Q. Sorry?</li> <li>A. I think that goes on, "I told him that the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>absolutely.</li> <li>Q. Can we go over the page to B1440 at 2003 do you see that there? Who first suggests in that conversation speaking to the chairman of the GPA?</li> <li>A. Mr Pyle, the then Governor.</li> <li>Q. What did he say, "Good as always to catch up, I don't see any option re CoP, given the evidence, I'll speak to Joey carefully sometime next week."</li> <li>(15.41)</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Joey there being?</li> <li>A. Dr Joey Britto.</li> <li>Q. And just whilst we are on this page, to not have to return to it, what did you mean when</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Q. And then he goes on, "We met on the 15th of May, at the very start of which meeting the Chief Minister asked me to go first. I told him that I had had for some while concerns about the RGP and its leadership which the incident at sea has turned into a firm belief that changes in how the RGP works are needed. I briefly ran through my concerns as outlined above." Do you confirm Mr Pyle's evidence or do you demur from it that he went first and explained to you his concerns?</li> <li>A. No, I think that's accurate.</li> <li>Q. Sorry?</li> <li>A. I think that's accurate.</li> <li>Q. And then he goes on, "I told him that the incident at sea which had caused the loss of</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>absolutely.</li> <li>Q. Can we go over the page to B1440 at 2003 do you see that there? Who first suggests in that conversation speaking to the chairman of the GPA?</li> <li>A. Mr Pyle, the then Governor.</li> <li>Q. What did he say, "Good as always to catch up, I don't see any option re CoP, given the evidence, I'll speak to Joey carefully sometime next week."</li> <li>(15.41)</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Joey there being?</li> <li>A. Dr Joey Britto.</li> <li>Q. And just whilst we are on this page, to not have to return to it, what did you mean when you said to Mr Pyle, "I think you have</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q. And then he goes on, "We met on the 15th of May, at the very start of which meeting the Chief Minister asked me to go first. I told him that I had had for some while concerns about the RGP and its leadership which the incident at sea has turned into a firm belief that changes in how the RGP works are needed. I briefly ran through my concerns as outlined above." Do you confirm Mr Pyle's evidence or do you demur from it that he went first and explained to you his concerns?</li> <li>A. No, I think that's accurate.</li> <li>Q. Sorry?</li> <li>A. I think that accurate.</li> <li>Q. And then he goes on, "I told him that the incident at sea which had caused the loss of two lives was without doubt going to cause</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>absolutely.</li> <li>Q. Can we go over the page to B1440 at 2003 do you see that there? Who first suggests in that conversation speaking to the chairman of the GPA?</li> <li>A. Mr Pyle, the then Governor.</li> <li>Q. What did he say, "Good as always to catch up, I don't see any option re CoP, given the evidence, I'll speak to Joey carefully sometime next week." (15.41)</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Joey there being?</li> <li>A. Dr Joey Britto.</li> <li>Q. And just whilst we are on this page, to not have to return to it, what did you mean when you said to Mr Pyle, "I think you have probably seen this coming before I have"?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Q. And then he goes on, "We met on the 15th of May, at the very start of which meeting the Chief Minister asked me to go first. I told him that I had had for some while concerns about the RGP and its leadership which the incident at sea has turned into a firm belief that changes in how the RGP works are needed. I briefly ran through my concerns as outlined above." Do you confirm Mr Pyle's evidence or do you demur from it that he went first and explained to you his concerns?</li> <li>A. No, I think that's accurate.</li> <li>Q. Sorry?</li> <li>A. I think that's accurate.</li> <li>Q. And then he goes on, "I told him that the incident at sea which had caused the loss of two lives was without doubt going to cause Gibraltar reputational or political damage. I</li> </ul>
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array}$	<ul> <li>absolutely.</li> <li>Q. Can we go over the page to B1440 at 2003 do you see that there? Who first suggests in that conversation speaking to the chairman of the GPA?</li> <li>A. Mr Pyle, the then Governor.</li> <li>Q. What did he say, "Good as always to catch up, I don't see any option re CoP, given the evidence, I'll speak to Joey carefully sometime next week." (15.41)</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Joey there being?</li> <li>A. Dr Joey Britto.</li> <li>Q. And just whilst we are on this page, to not have to return to it, what did you mean when you said to Mr Pyle, "I think you have probably seen this coming before I have"?</li> <li>A. Well, I had conversations with him where</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\\end{array} $	<ul> <li>Q. And then he goes on, "We met on the 15th of May, at the very start of which meeting the Chief Minister asked me to go first. I told him that I had had for some while concerns about the RGP and its leadership which the incident at sea has turned into a firm belief that changes in how the RGP works are needed. I briefly ran through my concerns as outlined above." Do you confirm Mr Pyle's evidence or do you demur from it that he went first and explained to you his concerns?</li> <li>A. No, I think that's accurate.</li> <li>Q. Sorry?</li> <li>A. I think that's accurate.</li> <li>Q. And then he goes on, "I told him that the incident at sea which had caused the loss of two lives was without doubt going to cause Gibraltar reputational or political damage. I said I could still not understand how the</li> </ul>
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	<ul> <li>absolutely.</li> <li>Q. Can we go over the page to B1440 at 2003 do you see that there? Who first suggests in that conversation speaking to the chairman of the GPA?</li> <li>A. Mr Pyle, the then Governor.</li> <li>Q. What did he say, "Good as always to catch up, I don't see any option re CoP, given the evidence, I'll speak to Joey carefully sometime next week." (15.41)</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Joey there being?</li> <li>A. Dr Joey Britto.</li> <li>Q. And just whilst we are on this page, to not have to return to it, what did you mean when you said to Mr Pyle, "I think you have probably seen this coming before I have"?</li> <li>A. Well, I had conversations with him where he had already indicated being less than</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	<ul> <li>Q. And then he goes on, "We met on the 15th of May, at the very start of which meeting the Chief Minister asked me to go first. I told him that I had had for some while concerns about the RGP and its leadership which the incident at sea has turned into a firm belief that changes in how the RGP works are needed. I briefly ran through my concerns as outlined above." Do you confirm Mr Pyle's evidence or do you demur from it that he went first and explained to you his concerns?</li> <li>A. No, I think that's accurate.</li> <li>Q. Sorry?</li> <li>A. I think that's accurate.</li> <li>Q. And then he goes on, "I told him that the incident at sea which had caused the loss of two lives was without doubt going to cause Gibraltar reputational or political damage. I said I could still not understand how the incident had unfolded but that what it did do</li> </ul>
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ \end{array}$	<ul> <li>absolutely.</li> <li>Q. Can we go over the page to B1440 at 2003 do you see that there? Who first suggests in that conversation speaking to the chairman of the GPA?</li> <li>A. Mr Pyle, the then Governor.</li> <li>Q. What did he say, "Good as always to catch up, I don't see any option re CoP, given the evidence, I'll speak to Joey carefully sometime next week." (15.41)</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Joey there being?</li> <li>A. Dr Joey Britto.</li> <li>Q. And just whilst we are on this page, to not have to return to it, what did you mean when you said to Mr Pyle, "I think you have probably seen this coming before I have"?</li> <li>A. Well, I had conversations with him where he had already indicated being less than impressed by the performance of the RGP</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	<ul> <li>Q. And then he goes on, "We met on the 15th of May, at the very start of which meeting the Chief Minister asked me to go first. I told him that I had had for some while concerns about the RGP and its leadership which the incident at sea has turned into a firm belief that changes in how the RGP works are needed. I briefly ran through my concerns as outlined above." Do you confirm Mr Pyle's evidence or do you demur from it that he went first and explained to you his concerns?</li> <li>A. No, I think that's accurate.</li> <li>Q. Sorry?</li> <li>A. I think that's accurate.</li> <li>Q. And then he goes on, "I told him that the incident at sea which had caused the loss of two lives was without doubt going to cause Gibraltar reputational or political damage. I said I could still not understand how the incident had unfolded but that what it did do was further demonstrate a lack of control by</li> </ul>
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ \end{array}$	<ul> <li>absolutely.</li> <li>Q. Can we go over the page to B1440 at 2003 do you see that there? Who first suggests in that conversation speaking to the chairman of the GPA?</li> <li>A. Mr Pyle, the then Governor.</li> <li>Q. What did he say, "Good as always to catch up, I don't see any option re CoP, given the evidence, I'll speak to Joey carefully sometime next week." (15.41)</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Joey there being?</li> <li>A. Dr Joey Britto.</li> <li>Q. And just whilst we are on this page, to not have to return to it, what did you mean when you said to Mr Pyle, "I think you have probably seen this coming before I have"?</li> <li>A. Well, I had conversations with him where he had already indicated being less than impressed by the performance of the RGP generally and the Commissioner in particular,</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	<ul> <li>Q. And then he goes on, "We met on the 15th of May, at the very start of which meeting the Chief Minister asked me to go first. I told him that I had had for some while concerns about the RGP and its leadership which the incident at sea has turned into a firm belief that changes in how the RGP works are needed. I briefly ran through my concerns as outlined above." Do you confirm Mr Pyle's evidence or do you demur from it that he went first and explained to you his concerns?</li> <li>A. No, I think that's accurate.</li> <li>Q. Sorry?</li> <li>A. I think that's accurate.</li> <li>Q. And then he goes on, "I told him that the incident at sea which had caused the loss of two lives was without doubt going to cause Gibraltar reputational or political damage. I said I could still not understand how the incident had unfolded but that what it did do was further demonstrate a lack of control by RGP leadership. There was a culture at the</li> </ul>
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	<ul> <li>absolutely.</li> <li>Q. Can we go over the page to B1440 at 2003 do you see that there? Who first suggests in that conversation speaking to the chairman of the GPA?</li> <li>A. Mr Pyle, the then Governor.</li> <li>Q. What did he say, "Good as always to catch up, I don't see any option re CoP, given the evidence, I'll speak to Joey carefully sometime next week." (15.41)</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Joey there being?</li> <li>A. Dr Joey Britto.</li> <li>Q. And just whilst we are on this page, to not have to return to it, what did you mean when you said to Mr Pyle, "I think you have probably seen this coming before I have"?</li> <li>A. Well, I had conversations with him where he had already indicated being less than impressed by the performance of the RGP generally and the Commissioner in particular, but nothing specific which I could point to.</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	<ul> <li>Q. And then he goes on, "We met on the 15th of May, at the very start of which meeting the Chief Minister asked me to go first. I told him that I had had for some while concerns about the RGP and its leadership which the incident at sea has turned into a firm belief that changes in how the RGP works are needed. I briefly ran through my concerns as outlined above." Do you confirm Mr Pyle's evidence or do you demur from it that he went first and explained to you his concerns?</li> <li>A. No, I think that's accurate.</li> <li>Q. Sorry?</li> <li>A. I think that's accurate.</li> <li>Q. And then he goes on, "I told him that the incident at sea which had caused the loss of two lives was without doubt going to cause Gibraltar reputational or political damage. I said I could still not understand how the incident had unfolded but that what it did do was further demonstrate a lack of control by RGP leadership. There was a culture at the RGP that was unhealthy and it stemmed from</li> </ul>
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ \end{array}$	<ul> <li>absolutely.</li> <li>Q. Can we go over the page to B1440 at 2003 do you see that there? Who first suggests in that conversation speaking to the chairman of the GPA?</li> <li>A. Mr Pyle, the then Governor.</li> <li>Q. What did he say, "Good as always to catch up, I don't see any option re CoP, given the evidence, I'll speak to Joey carefully sometime next week." (15.41)</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Joey there being?</li> <li>A. Dr Joey Britto.</li> <li>Q. And just whilst we are on this page, to not have to return to it, what did you mean when you said to Mr Pyle, "I think you have probably seen this coming before I have"?</li> <li>A. Well, I had conversations with him where he had already indicated being less than impressed by the performance of the RGP generally and the Commissioner in particular,</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	<ul> <li>Q. And then he goes on, "We met on the 15th of May, at the very start of which meeting the Chief Minister asked me to go first. I told him that I had had for some while concerns about the RGP and its leadership which the incident at sea has turned into a firm belief that changes in how the RGP works are needed. I briefly ran through my concerns as outlined above." Do you confirm Mr Pyle's evidence or do you demur from it that he went first and explained to you his concerns?</li> <li>A. No, I think that's accurate.</li> <li>Q. Sorry?</li> <li>A. I think that's accurate.</li> <li>Q. And then he goes on, "I told him that the incident at sea which had caused the loss of two lives was without doubt going to cause Gibraltar reputational or political damage. I said I could still not understand how the incident had unfolded but that what it did do was further demonstrate a lack of control by RGP leadership. There was a culture at the</li> </ul>
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	<ul> <li>absolutely.</li> <li>Q. Can we go over the page to B1440 at 2003 do you see that there? Who first suggests in that conversation speaking to the chairman of the GPA?</li> <li>A. Mr Pyle, the then Governor.</li> <li>Q. What did he say, "Good as always to catch up, I don't see any option re CoP, given the evidence, I'll speak to Joey carefully sometime next week." (15.41)</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Joey there being?</li> <li>A. Dr Joey Britto.</li> <li>Q. And just whilst we are on this page, to not have to return to it, what did you mean when you said to Mr Pyle, "I think you have probably seen this coming before I have"?</li> <li>A. Well, I had conversations with him where he had already indicated being less than impressed by the performance of the RGP generally and the Commissioner in particular, but nothing specific which I could point to.</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	<ul> <li>Q. And then he goes on, "We met on the 15th of May, at the very start of which meeting the Chief Minister asked me to go first. I told him that I had had for some while concerns about the RGP and its leadership which the incident at sea has turned into a firm belief that changes in how the RGP works are needed. I briefly ran through my concerns as outlined above." Do you confirm Mr Pyle's evidence or do you demur from it that he went first and explained to you his concerns?</li> <li>A. No, I think that's accurate.</li> <li>Q. Sorry?</li> <li>A. I think that's accurate.</li> <li>Q. And then he goes on, "I told him that the incident at sea which had caused the loss of two lives was without doubt going to cause Gibraltar reputational or political damage. I said I could still not understand how the incident had unfolded but that what it did do was further demonstrate a lack of control by RGP leadership. There was a culture at the RGP that was unhealthy and it stemmed from</li> </ul>

65 (Pages 257 to 260)

1		1	
1	been misled by Mr McGrail over issues that	1	black that he sent you, correct?
2	were the Governor's direct responsibility."	2	A. This is what he sends me on the Sunday at
3	Did he tell you that without need for	3	10 to 7 in the evening.
4	persuasion by you?	4	Q. After your meeting?
5	A. Absolutely.	5	A. Yes.
6	Q. And at 26.4, "I told them that I thought Mr	6	Q. So, that was his initiative, not yours?
7	McGrail had been evasive on this issue." Did	7	A. Yes, he originates that email trail.
8	he tell you that?	8	Q. What is in red is what you add by way of
9	A. Yes, he told me that specifically.	9	comment to what he says?
10	Q. And at 26.5, "I clearly remember saying	10	A. At 11.53 that night, I reply.
11	something along the lines of, 'Now I've got	11	Q. I see. So, again he initiates and you
12	that off my chest. What is on your mind?"	12	respond?
13	So, the door by then did not need the handle	13	A. That's right.
14	turning.	14	Q. If we could turn to - well, perhaps there is
15	A. Quite.	15	no need to turn to it, but at A241, Mr Pyle says
16	Q. 26.6, "The Chief Minister then outlined his	16	at paragraphs 4 and 5 in his witness statement
17	belief that Mr McGrail had made a serious	17	that he approved the note that you prepared of
18	error of judgment with regard to the execution	18	the 18th of May meeting with Dr Britto, is that
19	of the search warrant against James Levy,	19	correct?
20	gone against the advice" - we have covered	20	A. That's right.
21	that ground, with the DPP and the AG, " and	21	Q. You submitted it to him in draft and he
22	misled the Chief Minister about that. This was	22	approved it?
23	in relation to an ongoing criminal	23	A. That's right.
24	investigation." Did Mr Pyle give you the	24	Q. Chief Minister, were you aware that Mr
25	impression that he knew about that ongoing	25	Pyle was reporting back to London on all of
	Page 261		Page 263
1	criminal investigation?	1	these matters?
2	A. What, about the detail of the investigation?	2	A. Well, I wasn't aware of the reporting that
3	Q. Was he aware of it? Was it a factor in his	3	he was doing but, of course, it's in the role of a
4	mind?	4	Governor and Deputy Governor, and he would
5	A. I think he was as aware of it as everybody	5	have been fulfilling both functions at that time,
6	in town was because I think this was already	6	that they would be reporting back on any
7	two days later, aware of the fact that there had	7	matters of consequence in Gibraltar and this
8	been a search warrant executed at Hassans, but	8	was clearly a matter of consequence in
9	I don't recall that he was aware of any of the	9	Gibraltar, and at some stage later on he did
10	details of the investigation.	10	share with me that he was seeking advice from
11	Q. He says in the last paragraph there - he	11	London; from the Gibraltar desk, the Foreign
12	refers in the next paragraph to a long	12	Office, from Foreign Office lawyers if
13	discussion, "We both believed A long	13	necessary, etc.
14	discussion about the leadership of the RGP.	14	Q. Finally, at A257, which is the last
15	We concluded we had both lost confidence in	15	paragraph of his witness statement, he says, at
16	Mr McGrail who, as the head of the	16	27.1 (I think there is a typographical error
17	organisation, should be held to account for the	17	there in the numbered paragraphs), "The
18	RGP's failings." Is that the decision that you	18	decision to invoke the procedure relating to the
19	both came to?	19	exercise of my power under s.32 of the Police
20	A. That's an accurate reflection of the	20	Act to call for the resignation of Mr McGrail
21	conclusion of the meeting, yes.	21	was entirely my own." Did you play any role
22	Q. If we could turn up C3953, this is the 17th	22	in the Governor's decision to invoke or to
23	of May email, in the evening - is that an email	23	begin to invoke the procedure relating to s.13?
24	that - well, if we go further down we can see it	24	A. No, and I think that in the context of these
	possibly originally. This is the email in the	25	proceedings that has come out best in Mr
25	possibly originarily. This is the original in the		proceedings that has come out best in the
25	Page 262		Page 264

66 (Pages 261 to 264)

1	Britto's evidence, who says that when we were	1	on Monday" - do you think he was referring to
2	speaking to him, Mr Pyle was very clear that if	2	the idea to bring in a UK Commissioner or to
3	the s.34 procedure did not prosper, he would	3	wider issues?
4	be ready to pursue the s.13 procedure.	4	A. To the idea that, if the process ran its
5	Q. And Mr Pyle, of whom it is not said that he	5	course, either the s.34 process or the s.13
6	is lying, says, "At no time was I put under any	6	process, our view might be that we needed to
7	pressure by any person but, in particular, by	7	bring in somebody from outside Gibraltar to
8	the Chief Minister to decide on the course of	8	be Commissioner over the Royal Gibraltar
9	action outlined above, although of course I	9	Police at least for an interregnum. I think at
10	was comforted by the fact that he shared my	10	one stage he also says that he is getting in
11	view and would be supportive of my decision	11	touch with the person in Miami who is the
12	if I took it." Do you recognise the truth in that	12	Foreign Office advisor on police matters, and
13	sworn testimony?	13	he is only based in Miami because that's the
14	A. Absolutely.	14	most convenient central location for where
15	Q. Thank you.	15	most of the overseas territories are, which is in
16	A. I mean, if I may say so, my relationship	16	the Caribbean.
17	with Governors has always been a relationship	17	Q. One of the central themes - let me ask you
18	of equals, neither subservient to the other.	18	this first. Is it fair to interpret these and other
19	Never would it have been suggested, I would	19	exchanges as meaning that at that time - it may
20	have thought, by anyone that the role could	20	still be your position for all I know - but at
21	ever be reversed and that the Governor would	21	that time at least you were willing to consider
22	be subservient to a Chief Minister as is the	22	bringing in an external Commissioner of
23	upshot of what is being proposed in the	23	Police?
24	context of the theory being advanced by	24	A. That's absolutely right.
25	others.	25	Q. It has been one of the central themes of the
25	others.	25	Q. It has been one of the central themes of the
	Page 265		Page 267
1	O. We would be so lucky.	1	case advanced on behalf of Mr McGrail that
1 2	Q. We would be so lucky. A. Yes. indeed.	1 2	case advanced on behalf of Mr McGrail that one of the reasons why you put pressure on the
2	A. Yes, indeed.	2	one of the reasons why you put pressure on the
2 3	<ul><li>A. Yes, indeed.</li><li>Q. Can we turn to B1441, the discreetly point,</li></ul>		one of the reasons why you put pressure on the Commissioner of Police, then Mr McGrail,
2 3 4	<ul><li>A. Yes, indeed.</li><li>Q. Can we turn to B1441, the discreetly point, and do you remember being questioned about</li></ul>	2 3 4	one of the reasons why you put pressure on the Commissioner of Police, then Mr McGrail, was somehow to protect yourself, your friends,
2 3 4 5	<b>A. Yes, indeed.</b> Q. Can we turn to B1441, the discreetly point, and do you remember being questioned about this and what was the need to suggest that the	2 3 4 5	one of the reasons why you put pressure on the Commissioner of Police, then Mr McGrail,
2 3 4 5 6	<ul><li>A. Yes, indeed.</li><li>Q. Can we turn to B1441, the discreetly point, and do you remember being questioned about this and what was the need to suggest that the Chairman of the Police Authority be discreetly</li></ul>	2 3 4 5 6	one of the reasons why you put pressure on the Commissioner of Police, then Mr McGrail, was somehow to protect yourself, your friends, your quadruple conflicts and that this was the reason, to make sure that no-one ever dares
2 3 4 5 6 7	A. Yes, indeed. Q. Can we turn to B1441, the discreetly point, and do you remember being questioned about this and what was the need to suggest that the Chairman of the Police Authority be discreetly approached? Can we turn that up, at 1147 -	2 3 4 5 6 7	one of the reasons why you put pressure on the Commissioner of Police, then Mr McGrail, was somehow to protect yourself, your friends, your quadruple conflicts and that this was the reason, to make sure that no-one ever dares tamper with you again - are you familiar with
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A. Yes, indeed. Q. Can we turn to B1441, the discreetly point, and do you remember being questioned about this and what was the need to suggest that the Chairman of the Police Authority be discreetly approached? Can we turn that up, at 1147 - yes. You made allusion to your pillow and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	one of the reasons why you put pressure on the Commissioner of Police, then Mr McGrail, was somehow to protect yourself, your friends, your quadruple conflicts and that this was the reason, to make sure that no-one ever dares tamper with you again - are you familiar with that case that has been advanced?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. Yes, indeed. Q. Can we turn to B1441, the discreetly point, and do you remember being questioned about this and what was the need to suggest that the Chairman of the Police Authority be discreetly approached? Can we turn that up, at 1147 - yes. You made allusion to your pillow and then you said, "If we are going to do this, do	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	one of the reasons why you put pressure on the Commissioner of Police, then Mr McGrail, was somehow to protect yourself, your friends, your quadruple conflicts and that this was the reason, to make sure that no-one ever dares tamper with you again - are you familiar with that case that has been advanced? <b>A. I have understood that that is the case that</b>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	A. Yes, indeed. Q. Can we turn to B1441, the discreetly point, and do you remember being questioned about this and what was the need to suggest that the Chairman of the Police Authority be discreetly approached? Can we turn that up, at 1147 - yes. You made allusion to your pillow and then you said, "If we are going to do this, do we very discreetly at your end line someone	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	one of the reasons why you put pressure on the Commissioner of Police, then Mr McGrail, was somehow to protect yourself, your friends, your quadruple conflicts and that this was the reason, to make sure that no-one ever dares tamper with you again - are you familiar with that case that has been advanced? <b>A. I have understood that that is the case that has been advanced. It is nonsensical, untrue,</b>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A. Yes, indeed. Q. Can we turn to B1441, the discreetly point, and do you remember being questioned about this and what was the need to suggest that the Chairman of the Police Authority be discreetly approached? Can we turn that up, at 1147 - yes. You made allusion to your pillow and then you said, "If we are going to do this, do we very discreetly at your end line someone up? We cannot have it headless." Do you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	one of the reasons why you put pressure on the Commissioner of Police, then Mr McGrail, was somehow to protect yourself, your friends, your quadruple conflicts and that this was the reason, to make sure that no-one ever dares tamper with you again - are you familiar with that case that has been advanced? <b>A. I have understood that that is the case that has been advanced. It is nonsensical, untrue, unfair and totally contrary to what my</b>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A. Yes, indeed. Q. Can we turn to B1441, the discreetly point, and do you remember being questioned about this and what was the need to suggest that the Chairman of the Police Authority be discreetly approached? Can we turn that up, at 1147 - yes. You made allusion to your pillow and then you said, "If we are going to do this, do we very discreetly at your end line someone up? We cannot have it headless." Do you agree that you are the first to mention the word	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	one of the reasons why you put pressure on the Commissioner of Police, then Mr McGrail, was somehow to protect yourself, your friends, your quadruple conflicts and that this was the reason, to make sure that no-one ever dares tamper with you again - are you familiar with that case that has been advanced? A. I have understood that that is the case that has been advanced. It is nonsensical, untrue, unfair and totally contrary to what my intention was.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. Yes, indeed. Q. Can we turn to B1441, the discreetly point, and do you remember being questioned about this and what was the need to suggest that the Chairman of the Police Authority be discreetly approached? Can we turn that up, at 1147 - yes. You made allusion to your pillow and then you said, "If we are going to do this, do we very discreetly at your end line someone up? We cannot have it headless." Do you agree that you are the first to mention the word "discreetly"?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	one of the reasons why you put pressure on the Commissioner of Police, then Mr McGrail, was somehow to protect yourself, your friends, your quadruple conflicts and that this was the reason, to make sure that no-one ever dares tamper with you again - are you familiar with that case that has been advanced? <b>A. I have understood that that is the case that has been advanced. It is nonsensical, untrue, unfair and totally contrary to what my intention was.</b> Q. In your view, is such an objective more or
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A. Yes, indeed.</li> <li>Q. Can we turn to B1441, the discreetly point, and do you remember being questioned about this and what was the need to suggest that the Chairman of the Police Authority be discreetly approached? Can we turn that up, at 1147 - yes. You made allusion to your pillow and then you said, "If we are going to do this, do we very discreetly at your end line someone up? We cannot have it headless." Do you agree that you are the first to mention the word "discreetly"?</li> <li>A. Yes, absolutely.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>one of the reasons why you put pressure on the Commissioner of Police, then Mr McGrail, was somehow to protect yourself, your friends, your quadruple conflicts and that this was the reason, to make sure that no-one ever dares tamper with you again - are you familiar with that case that has been advanced?</li> <li>A. I have understood that that is the case that has been advanced. It is nonsensical, untrue, unfair and totally contrary to what my intention was.</li> <li>Q. In your view, is such an objective more or less likely to be feasible for you with an</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>A. Yes, indeed.</li> <li>Q. Can we turn to B1441, the discreetly point, and do you remember being questioned about this and what was the need to suggest that the Chairman of the Police Authority be discreetly approached? Can we turn that up, at 1147 - yes. You made allusion to your pillow and then you said, "If we are going to do this, do we very discreetly at your end line someone up? We cannot have it headless." Do you agree that you are the first to mention the word "discreetly"?</li> <li>A. Yes, absolutely.</li> <li>Q. Am I correct to think that it is in reference</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>one of the reasons why you put pressure on the Commissioner of Police, then Mr McGrail, was somehow to protect yourself, your friends, your quadruple conflicts and that this was the reason, to make sure that no-one ever dares tamper with you again - are you familiar with that case that has been advanced?</li> <li>A. I have understood that that is the case that has been advanced. It is nonsensical, untrue, unfair and totally contrary to what my intention was.</li> <li>Q. In your view, is such an objective more or less likely to be feasible for you with an external Commissioner of Police that you were</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>A. Yes, indeed.</li> <li>Q. Can we turn to B1441, the discreetly point, and do you remember being questioned about this and what was the need to suggest that the Chairman of the Police Authority be discreetly approached? Can we turn that up, at 1147 - yes. You made allusion to your pillow and then you said, "If we are going to do this, do we very discreetly at your end line someone up? We cannot have it headless." Do you agree that you are the first to mention the word "discreetly"?</li> <li>A. Yes, absolutely.</li> <li>Q. Am I correct to think that it is in reference to the idea, the proposal to which you</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	one of the reasons why you put pressure on the Commissioner of Police, then Mr McGrail, was somehow to protect yourself, your friends, your quadruple conflicts and that this was the reason, to make sure that no-one ever dares tamper with you again - are you familiar with that case that has been advanced? A. I have understood that that is the case that has been advanced. It is nonsensical, untrue, unfair and totally contrary to what my intention was. Q. In your view, is such an objective more or less likely to be feasible for you with an external Commissioner of Police that you were willing to bring in?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A. Yes, indeed.</li> <li>Q. Can we turn to B1441, the discreetly point, and do you remember being questioned about this and what was the need to suggest that the Chairman of the Police Authority be discreetly approached? Can we turn that up, at 1147 - yes. You made allusion to your pillow and then you said, "If we are going to do this, do we very discreetly at your end line someone up? We cannot have it headless." Do you agree that you are the first to mention the word "discreetly"?</li> <li>A. Yes, absolutely.</li> <li>Q. Am I correct to think that it is in reference to the idea, the proposal to which you appeared to be agreeing that Mr McGrail</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>one of the reasons why you put pressure on the Commissioner of Police, then Mr McGrail, was somehow to protect yourself, your friends, your quadruple conflicts and that this was the reason, to make sure that no-one ever dares tamper with you again - are you familiar with that case that has been advanced?</li> <li>A. I have understood that that is the case that has been advanced. It is nonsensical, untrue, unfair and totally contrary to what my intention was.</li> <li>Q. In your view, is such an objective more or less likely to be feasible for you with an external Commissioner of Police that you were willing to bring in?</li> <li>A. Less likely, obviously.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A. Yes, indeed.</li> <li>Q. Can we turn to B1441, the discreetly point, and do you remember being questioned about this and what was the need to suggest that the Chairman of the Police Authority be discreetly approached? Can we turn that up, at 1147 - yes. You made allusion to your pillow and then you said, "If we are going to do this, do we very discreetly at your end line someone up? We cannot have it headless." Do you agree that you are the first to mention the word "discreetly"?</li> <li>A. Yes, absolutely.</li> <li>Q. Am I correct to think that it is in reference to the idea, the proposal to which you appeared to be agreeing that Mr McGrail might be succeeded permanently or</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>one of the reasons why you put pressure on the Commissioner of Police, then Mr McGrail, was somehow to protect yourself, your friends, your quadruple conflicts and that this was the reason, to make sure that no-one ever dares tamper with you again - are you familiar with that case that has been advanced?</li> <li>A. I have understood that that is the case that has been advanced. It is nonsensical, untrue, unfair and totally contrary to what my intention was.</li> <li>Q. In your view, is such an objective more or less likely to be feasible for you with an external Commissioner of Police that you were willing to bring in?</li> <li>A. Less likely, obviously.</li> <li>Q. So, did you - moving briefly to the 18th of</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>A. Yes, indeed.</li> <li>Q. Can we turn to B1441, the discreetly point, and do you remember being questioned about this and what was the need to suggest that the Chairman of the Police Authority be discreetly approached? Can we turn that up, at 1147 - yes. You made allusion to your pillow and then you said, "If we are going to do this, do we very discreetly at your end line someone up? We cannot have it headless." Do you agree that you are the first to mention the word "discreetly"?</li> <li>A. Yes, absolutely.</li> <li>Q. Am I correct to think that it is in reference to the idea, the proposal to which you appeared to be agreeing that Mr McGrail might be succeeded permanently or temporarily by an external recruit?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>one of the reasons why you put pressure on the Commissioner of Police, then Mr McGrail, was somehow to protect yourself, your friends, your quadruple conflicts and that this was the reason, to make sure that no-one ever dares tamper with you again - are you familiar with that case that has been advanced?</li> <li>A. I have understood that that is the case that has been advanced. It is nonsensical, untrue, unfair and totally contrary to what my intention was.</li> <li>Q. In your view, is such an objective more or less likely to be feasible for you with an external Commissioner of Police that you were willing to bring in?</li> <li>A. Less likely, obviously.</li> <li>Q. So, did you - moving briefly to the 18th of May meeting - did you direct or instruct him</li> </ul>
$     \begin{array}{r}       2 \\       3 \\       4 \\       5 \\       6 \\       7 \\       8 \\       9 \\       10 \\       11 \\       12 \\       13 \\       14 \\       15 \\       16 \\       17 \\       18 \\       19 \\       20 \\     \end{array} $	<ul> <li>A. Yes, indeed.</li> <li>Q. Can we turn to B1441, the discreetly point, and do you remember being questioned about this and what was the need to suggest that the Chairman of the Police Authority be discreetly approached? Can we turn that up, at 1147 - yes. You made allusion to your pillow and then you said, "If we are going to do this, do we very discreetly at your end line someone up? We cannot have it headless." Do you agree that you are the first to mention the word "discreetly"?</li> <li>A. Yes, absolutely.</li> <li>Q. Am I correct to think that it is in reference to the idea, the proposal to which you appeared to be agreeing that Mr McGrail might be succeeded permanently or temporarily by an external recruit?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>one of the reasons why you put pressure on the Commissioner of Police, then Mr McGrail, was somehow to protect yourself, your friends, your quadruple conflicts and that this was the reason, to make sure that no-one ever dares tamper with you again - are you familiar with that case that has been advanced?</li> <li>A. I have understood that that is the case that has been advanced. It is nonsensical, untrue, unfair and totally contrary to what my intention was.</li> <li>Q. In your view, is such an objective more or less likely to be feasible for you with an external Commissioner of Police that you were willing to bring in?</li> <li>A. Less likely, obviously.</li> <li>Q. So, did you - moving briefly to the 18th of May meeting - did you direct or instruct him on what the GPA had to do?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A. Yes, indeed.</li> <li>Q. Can we turn to B1441, the discreetly point, and do you remember being questioned about this and what was the need to suggest that the Chairman of the Police Authority be discreetly approached? Can we turn that up, at 1147 - yes. You made allusion to your pillow and then you said, "If we are going to do this, do we very discreetly at your end line someone up? We cannot have it headless." Do you agree that you are the first to mention the word "discreetly"?</li> <li>A. Yes, absolutely.</li> <li>Q. Am I correct to think that it is in reference to the idea, the proposal to which you appeared to be agreeing that Mr McGrail might be succeeded permanently or temporarily by an external recruit?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. So that when Mr Pyle goes on to say just a</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>one of the reasons why you put pressure on the Commissioner of Police, then Mr McGrail, was somehow to protect yourself, your friends, your quadruple conflicts and that this was the reason, to make sure that no-one ever dares tamper with you again - are you familiar with that case that has been advanced?</li> <li>A. I have understood that that is the case that has been advanced. It is nonsensical, untrue, unfair and totally contrary to what my intention was.</li> <li>Q. In your view, is such an objective more or less likely to be feasible for you with an external Commissioner of Police that you were willing to bring in?</li> <li>A. Less likely, obviously.</li> <li>Q. So, did you - moving briefly to the 18th of May meeting - did you direct or instruct him on what the GPA had to do?</li> <li>A. I had neither the power to direct or instruct.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A. Yes, indeed.</li> <li>Q. Can we turn to B1441, the discreetly point, and do you remember being questioned about this and what was the need to suggest that the Chairman of the Police Authority be discreetly approached? Can we turn that up, at 1147 - yes. You made allusion to your pillow and then you said, "If we are going to do this, do we very discreetly at your end line someone up? We cannot have it headless." Do you agree that you are the first to mention the word "discreetly"?</li> <li>A. Yes, absolutely.</li> <li>Q. Am I correct to think that it is in reference to the idea, the proposal to which you appeared to be agreeing that Mr McGrail might be succeeded permanently or temporarily by an external recruit?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. So that when Mr Pyle goes on to say just a few minutes later, at 13.58 - no, later, when he</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>one of the reasons why you put pressure on the Commissioner of Police, then Mr McGrail, was somehow to protect yourself, your friends, your quadruple conflicts and that this was the reason, to make sure that no-one ever dares tamper with you again - are you familiar with that case that has been advanced?</li> <li>A. I have understood that that is the case that has been advanced. It is nonsensical, untrue, unfair and totally contrary to what my intention was.</li> <li>Q. In your view, is such an objective more or less likely to be feasible for you with an external Commissioner of Police that you were willing to bring in?</li> <li>A. Less likely, obviously.</li> <li>Q. So, did you - moving briefly to the 18th of May meeting - did you direct or instruct him on what the GPA had to do?</li> <li>A. I had neither the power to direct or instruct.</li> <li>Q. So, if we can just go back to C3953, which</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>A. Yes, indeed.</li> <li>Q. Can we turn to B1441, the discreetly point, and do you remember being questioned about this and what was the need to suggest that the Chairman of the Police Authority be discreetly approached? Can we turn that up, at 1147 - yes. You made allusion to your pillow and then you said, "If we are going to do this, do we very discreetly at your end line someone up? We cannot have it headless." Do you agree that you are the first to mention the word "discreetly"?</li> <li>A. Yes, absolutely.</li> <li>Q. Am I correct to think that it is in reference to the idea, the proposal to which you appeared to be agreeing that Mr McGrail might be succeeded permanently or temporarily by an external recruit?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. So that when Mr Pyle goes on to say just a few minutes later, at 13.58 - no, later, when he replies to you at 13.58, "Thinking about it</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>one of the reasons why you put pressure on the Commissioner of Police, then Mr McGrail, was somehow to protect yourself, your friends, your quadruple conflicts and that this was the reason, to make sure that no-one ever dares tamper with you again - are you familiar with that case that has been advanced?</li> <li>A. I have understood that that is the case that has been advanced. It is nonsensical, untrue, unfair and totally contrary to what my intention was.</li> <li>Q. In your view, is such an objective more or less likely to be feasible for you with an external Commissioner of Police that you were willing to bring in?</li> <li>A. Less likely, obviously.</li> <li>Q. So, did you - moving briefly to the 18th of May meeting - did you direct or instruct him on what the GPA had to do?</li> <li>A. I had neither the power to direct or instruct.</li> <li>Q. So, if we can just go back to C3953, which is that with all your red comments on Mr</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>A. Yes, indeed.</li> <li>Q. Can we turn to B1441, the discreetly point, and do you remember being questioned about this and what was the need to suggest that the Chairman of the Police Authority be discreetly approached? Can we turn that up, at 1147 - yes. You made allusion to your pillow and then you said, "If we are going to do this, do we very discreetly at your end line someone up? We cannot have it headless." Do you agree that you are the first to mention the word "discreetly"?</li> <li>A. Yes, absolutely.</li> <li>Q. Am I correct to think that it is in reference to the idea, the proposal to which you appeared to be agreeing that Mr McGrail might be succeeded permanently or temporarily by an external recruit?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. So that when Mr Pyle goes on to say just a few minutes later, at 13.58 - no, later, when he replies to you at 13.58, "Thinking about it quite a lot. Need to discreetly bring Joey</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>one of the reasons why you put pressure on the Commissioner of Police, then Mr McGrail, was somehow to protect yourself, your friends, your quadruple conflicts and that this was the reason, to make sure that no-one ever dares tamper with you again - are you familiar with that case that has been advanced?</li> <li>A. I have understood that that is the case that has been advanced. It is nonsensical, untrue, unfair and totally contrary to what my intention was.</li> <li>Q. In your view, is such an objective more or less likely to be feasible for you with an external Commissioner of Police that you were willing to bring in?</li> <li>A. Less likely, obviously.</li> <li>Q. So, did you - moving briefly to the 18th of May meeting - did you direct or instruct him on what the GPA had to do?</li> <li>A. I had neither the power to direct or instruct.</li> <li>Q. So, if we can just go back to C3953, which is that with all your red comments on Mr Pyle's email to you of the Sunday evening, and</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>A. Yes, indeed.</li> <li>Q. Can we turn to B1441, the discreetly point, and do you remember being questioned about this and what was the need to suggest that the Chairman of the Police Authority be discreetly approached? Can we turn that up, at 1147 - yes. You made allusion to your pillow and then you said, "If we are going to do this, do we very discreetly at your end line someone up? We cannot have it headless." Do you agree that you are the first to mention the word "discreetly"?</li> <li>A. Yes, absolutely.</li> <li>Q. Am I correct to think that it is in reference to the idea, the proposal to which you appeared to be agreeing that Mr McGrail might be succeeded permanently or temporarily by an external recruit?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. So that when Mr Pyle goes on to say just a few minutes later, at 13.58 - no, later, when he replies to you at 13.58, "Thinking about it</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>one of the reasons why you put pressure on the Commissioner of Police, then Mr McGrail, was somehow to protect yourself, your friends, your quadruple conflicts and that this was the reason, to make sure that no-one ever dares tamper with you again - are you familiar with that case that has been advanced?</li> <li>A. I have understood that that is the case that has been advanced. It is nonsensical, untrue, unfair and totally contrary to what my intention was.</li> <li>Q. In your view, is such an objective more or less likely to be feasible for you with an external Commissioner of Police that you were willing to bring in?</li> <li>A. Less likely, obviously.</li> <li>Q. So, did you - moving briefly to the 18th of May meeting - did you direct or instruct him on what the GPA had to do?</li> <li>A. I had neither the power to direct or instruct.</li> <li>Q. So, if we can just go back to C3953, which is that with all your red comments on Mr</li> </ul>

67 (Pages 265 to 268)

Г

68 (Pages 269 to 272)

1	middle of page 3, internal page 3 of the email	1	you were dealing with a career, you were
2		2	dealing with consequences that would be
3	A. There is the reference to Miami that I have	3	personally, of course, very detrimental to an
4	just seen.	4	individual and you had to do it properly if you
5	Q. Yes, you see the paragraph, "We should,	5	were going to do it.
6	however"?	6	Q. And in fact you said that this email served
7	A. Yes.	7	as a template for your subsequent draft note.
8	Q. So, you told Mr Pyle, "We should,	8	A. It's what I took into the meeting with Dr
9	however, at this stage limit ourselves to setting	9	Britto to take him through the issues and it's
10	out our concerns. We should also seek to	10	what I then use, because I had used it as the
11	understanding [understand, I suppose] the	11	template for what I was going to say, to
12	concerns of the GPA also, as I understand that	12	produce the file note that I produced.
13	the Chairman has been trying to speak to me	13	Q. So, does this also reflect the sentiment that
14	about the report in the past two weeks but I	14	you expressed to Dr Britto during the meeting?
15	have simply been unable to speak to him. It	15	A. Oh, very much so. Can you go down a
16	will then be a matter for the GPA to decide	16	little bit? I can only see half of that page. I
17	how to act and, if they were, acting	17	think I saw the reference to Miami there.
18	independently and in their own discretion and	18	Q. Yes, at the very bottom, the Overseas
19	on proper advice to decide that they wanted to	19	Territory Police Advisor.
20	engage the $s.34(1)$ power, then that is when	20	A. Yes.
21	they would need to consult both of us and then	21	THE CHAIRMAN: It is also in your email
22	seek the agreement of one of us. We would	22	exchange of the 16th.
23	then also have the benefit of any representation	23	A. It is, that's right. Thank you.
24	that the Commissioner might have made under	24	SIR PETER CARUANA: Just one point
25	s.34(2). That would mean that any decision	25	before I go from that. Did you share - and in
	Page 269		Page 271
1	that you might take to engage your own	1	the note itself, and the Chairman is familiar
2	powers if the GPA were not to discharge their	2	now with the note of the 18th of February and
3	function properly, which I have no reason to	3	he already knows that the last few paragraphs
4	doubt they will certainly seek to do, would be	4	reflect this sentiment which I have just
5	better informed and would enjoy the benefit of	5	explained to you, so I will not take you there -
6	explanation/information provided by the	6	but did you share with Dr Britto your primary
7	Commissioner in the course of his	7	reason that in your view Mr McGrail had lied
8	representations under s.34(2)." Do you agree	8	to you on the 12th of May?
9	that you are there setting out the correct	9	A. Of course.
10	procedure, including giving Mr McGrail the	10	Q. And did you explain your view to him with
11	opportunity to make representations on which	11	any reservation that he should not share it with
12	both the GPA, if they chose to, and the	12	the board members of the GPA?
13	Governor, if he had to, make their decisions?	13	A. Not at all.
14	A. I think that's self-evidently the case and it's	14	Q. Did you have any control of what he would
15	as detailed as could be for 10 to midnight on a	15	say or share with the board members of the
16	Sunday night.	16	GPA?
17	Q. Do you think that that reads very much,	17	A. No, not at all. The whole purpose of us
18	given that neither of you had any reason to	18	sharing with him was that he would go on to
19	believe that this would ever see the light of	19	share with the members of the GPA.
20	day, as it has, do you think it is fair to describe	20	Q. So, skipping over stuff that has been
21	that as not reflecting any great blunderbuss	21	thoroughly dealt with already, and not to cover
22	approach?	22	old ground: Chief Minister, just to be clear,
	A. Not just that. I mean, I was very	23	has it ever been suggested to you by the RGP
	A. DULTUSI LIIAL. I HIGHI, I WAS VELV		
23		24	or by anybody else for that matter that you
	concerned about the fact that what we had to do in this case had to be done properly because	24 25	or by anybody else for that matter that you were a suspect in their criminal investigation,

Epiq Europe Ltd +44 (0) 207 404 1400

www.epiqglobal.com Lower Ground Floor, 46 Chancery Lane London, WC2A 1JE casemanagers@epiqglobal.com

1	this Operation Delhi?	1	to proceed to allow the trial to go ahead in the
2	A. No, never.	2	context of the charges that had been brought
3	Q. Have they ever treated you as a suspect?	3	would be a bad thing for me because all of the
4	A. Not at all.	4	political consequences would be visited upon
5	Q. Have you ever taken any step or action to	5	me, and I was right about that.
6	prevent anyone from being investigated?	6	Q. Did you play any role - and when I say
7	A. Far from it.	7	you, I mean you directly or indirectly by
8	Q. Have you ever tried to talk Mr McGrail out	8	getting somebody else to do so on your behalf
9	of investigating Mr Levy?	9	- did you play any role whatsoever in the
10	A. Not at all. In fact, I think that the evidence	10	decision taken by the RGP in October 2020 to
11	shows that in the meeting of May '19, I'm the	11	stop treating Mr Levy as a suspect?
12	one who tells Mr Richardson, I think, or Mr	12	A. Not at all, none whatsoever.
13	McGrail, that they need to talk to the senior	13	Q. Were you aware of what was going on
14	partner of Hassans.	14	between June and October 2020 in relation to
15	Q. And to be clear, have you ever instructed	15	Op Delhi?
16	or asked or hinted to the Attorney General that	16	A. Not at all.
17	he should try and discourage the police from	17	Q. Were you aware whether the RGP were or
18	investigating this matter?	18	were not interrogating Mr Levy's devices
19	A. Far from it. Not at all.	19	during that period?
20	Q. Have you directly or indirectly taken any	20	A. If I had any information in that respect it
21	steps to try and curtail the RGP from taking	21	was in snatched conversations with James
22	any step in their investigation beyond the	22	Levy, not from anyone on what you might call
23	criticism that you made of what you were told	23	the official side.
24	on the 12th?	24	Q. So, do you think - it is ultimately a matter
25	A. Not only have I not, if I ever had I would	25	for the Chairman to express his view about it -
	D 070		D 075
	Page 273		Page 275
1	have failed myself in what I believe to be the	1	but did you think and do you now think if you
1 2	have failed myself in what I believe to be the central tenets of how we operate in this	1	but did you think and do you now think, if you
2	central tenets of how we operate in this	2	have changed your mind in the meantime, that
2 3	central tenets of how we operate in this jurisdiction, that I wouldn't be able to look at	2 3	have changed your mind in the meantime, that by commenting to the Commissioner what you
2 3 4	central tenets of how we operate in this jurisdiction, that I wouldn't be able to look at myself in the mirror.	2 3 4	have changed your mind in the meantime, that by commenting to the Commissioner what you thought about his decision to go warrant
2 3 4 5	central tenets of how we operate in this jurisdiction, that I wouldn't be able to look at myself in the mirror. Q. And just to deal with a suggestion put to	2 3 4 5	have changed your mind in the meantime, that by commenting to the Commissioner what you thought about his decision to go warrant instead of production order, that you were
2 3 4 5 6	<ul><li>central tenets of how we operate in this jurisdiction, that I wouldn't be able to look at myself in the mirror.</li><li>Q. And just to deal with a suggestion put to you by my learned friend, Mr Cruz, did you</li></ul>	2 3 4 5 6	have changed your mind in the meantime, that by commenting to the Commissioner what you thought about his decision to go warrant instead of production order, that you were interfering in a live criminal investigation?
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul><li>central tenets of how we operate in this jurisdiction, that I wouldn't be able to look at myself in the mirror.</li><li>Q. And just to deal with a suggestion put to you by my learned friend, Mr Cruz, did you tell the Commissioner of Police or any other</li></ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>have changed your mind in the meantime, that</li> <li>by commenting to the Commissioner what you</li> <li>thought about his decision to go warrant</li> <li>instead of production order, that you were</li> <li>interfering in a live criminal investigation?</li> <li>A. No, and not least because I did not believe</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>central tenets of how we operate in this jurisdiction, that I wouldn't be able to look at myself in the mirror.</li> <li>Q. And just to deal with a suggestion put to you by my learned friend, Mr Cruz, did you tell the Commissioner of Police or any other police officer, or did you ask anybody to do so</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>have changed your mind in the meantime, that</li> <li>by commenting to the Commissioner what you</li> <li>thought about his decision to go warrant</li> <li>instead of production order, that you were</li> <li>interfering in a live criminal investigation?</li> <li>A. No, and not least because I did not believe</li> <li>I was doing so - as I think we ventilated a</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul><li>central tenets of how we operate in this jurisdiction, that I wouldn't be able to look at myself in the mirror.</li><li>Q. And just to deal with a suggestion put to you by my learned friend, Mr Cruz, did you tell the Commissioner of Police or any other police officer, or did you ask anybody to do so on your behalf, not to execute the search</li></ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>have changed your mind in the meantime, that</li> <li>by commenting to the Commissioner what you</li> <li>thought about his decision to go warrant</li> <li>instead of production order, that you were</li> <li>interfering in a live criminal investigation?</li> <li>A. No, and not least because I did not believe</li> <li>I was doing so - as I think we ventilated a</li> <li>moment ago, it wasn't the Commissioner who</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul><li>central tenets of how we operate in this jurisdiction, that I wouldn't be able to look at myself in the mirror.</li><li>Q. And just to deal with a suggestion put to you by my learned friend, Mr Cruz, did you tell the Commissioner of Police or any other police officer, or did you ask anybody to do so on your behalf, not to execute the search warrant against Mr Levy?</li></ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>have changed your mind in the meantime, that</li> <li>by commenting to the Commissioner what you</li> <li>thought about his decision to go warrant</li> <li>instead of production order, that you were</li> <li>interfering in a live criminal investigation?</li> <li>A. No, and not least because I did not believe</li> <li>I was doing so - as I think we ventilated a</li> <li>moment ago, it wasn't the Commissioner who</li> <li>was doing it, he wasn't running the Operation.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>central tenets of how we operate in this jurisdiction, that I wouldn't be able to look at myself in the mirror.</li> <li>Q. And just to deal with a suggestion put to you by my learned friend, Mr Cruz, did you tell the Commissioner of Police or any other police officer, or did you ask anybody to do so on your behalf, not to execute the search warrant against Mr Levy?</li> <li>A. Absolutely not. In fact, I was told that the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>have changed your mind in the meantime, that</li> <li>by commenting to the Commissioner what you</li> <li>thought about his decision to go warrant</li> <li>instead of production order, that you were</li> <li>interfering in a live criminal investigation?</li> <li>A. No, and not least because I did not believe</li> <li>I was doing so - as I think we ventilated a</li> <li>moment ago, it wasn't the Commissioner who</li> <li>was doing it, he wasn't running the Operation.</li> <li>I didn't ask to speak to the person who was. I</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>central tenets of how we operate in this jurisdiction, that I wouldn't be able to look at myself in the mirror.</li> <li>Q. And just to deal with a suggestion put to you by my learned friend, Mr Cruz, did you tell the Commissioner of Police or any other police officer, or did you ask anybody to do so on your behalf, not to execute the search warrant against Mr Levy?</li> <li>A. Absolutely not. In fact, I was told that the search warrant had been executed.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>have changed your mind in the meantime, that</li> <li>by commenting to the Commissioner what you</li> <li>thought about his decision to go warrant</li> <li>instead of production order, that you were</li> <li>interfering in a live criminal investigation?</li> <li>A. No, and not least because I did not believe</li> <li>I was doing so - as I think we ventilated a</li> <li>moment ago, it wasn't the Commissioner who</li> <li>was doing it, he wasn't running the Operation.</li> <li>I didn't ask to speak to the person who was. I</li> <li>didn't seek to influence the officers who were</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>central tenets of how we operate in this jurisdiction, that I wouldn't be able to look at myself in the mirror.</li> <li>Q. And just to deal with a suggestion put to you by my learned friend, Mr Cruz, did you tell the Commissioner of Police or any other police officer, or did you ask anybody to do so on your behalf, not to execute the search warrant against Mr Levy?</li> <li>A. Absolutely not. In fact, I was told that the search warrant had been executed.</li> <li>Q. Did you ask anybody directly in the RGP</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>have changed your mind in the meantime, that</li> <li>by commenting to the Commissioner what you</li> <li>thought about his decision to go warrant</li> <li>instead of production order, that you were</li> <li>interfering in a live criminal investigation?</li> <li>A. No, and not least because I did not believe</li> <li>I was doing so - as I think we ventilated a</li> <li>moment ago, it wasn't the Commissioner who</li> <li>was doing it, he wasn't running the Operation.</li> <li>I didn't ask to speak to the person who was. I</li> <li>didn't seek to influence the officers who were</li> <li>in charge of it. Far from it, I wanted</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>central tenets of how we operate in this jurisdiction, that I wouldn't be able to look at myself in the mirror.</li> <li>Q. And just to deal with a suggestion put to you by my learned friend, Mr Cruz, did you tell the Commissioner of Police or any other police officer, or did you ask anybody to do so on your behalf, not to execute the search warrant against Mr Levy?</li> <li>A. Absolutely not. In fact, I was told that the search warrant had been executed.</li> <li>Q. Did you ask anybody directly in the RGP or get anybody to do so on your behalf not to</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>have changed your mind in the meantime, that</li> <li>by commenting to the Commissioner what you</li> <li>thought about his decision to go warrant</li> <li>instead of production order, that you were</li> <li>interfering in a live criminal investigation?</li> <li>A. No, and not least because I did not believe</li> <li>I was doing so - as I think we ventilated a</li> <li>moment ago, it wasn't the Commissioner who</li> <li>was doing it, he wasn't running the Operation.</li> <li>I didn't seek to influence the officers who were</li> <li>in charge of it. Far from it, I wanted</li> <li>explanations in order to be able to deal with</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>central tenets of how we operate in this jurisdiction, that I wouldn't be able to look at myself in the mirror.</li> <li>Q. And just to deal with a suggestion put to you by my learned friend, Mr Cruz, did you tell the Commissioner of Police or any other police officer, or did you ask anybody to do so on your behalf, not to execute the search warrant against Mr Levy?</li> <li>A. Absolutely not. In fact, I was told that the search warrant had been executed.</li> <li>Q. Did you ask anybody directly in the RGP or get anybody to do so on your behalf not to examine Mr Levy's communications beyond</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>have changed your mind in the meantime, that</li> <li>by commenting to the Commissioner what you</li> <li>thought about his decision to go warrant</li> <li>instead of production order, that you were</li> <li>interfering in a live criminal investigation?</li> <li>A. No, and not least because I did not believe</li> <li>I was doing so - as I think we ventilated a</li> <li>moment ago, it wasn't the Commissioner who</li> <li>was doing it, he wasn't running the Operation.</li> <li>I didn't ask to speak to the person who was. I</li> <li>didn't seek to influence the officers who were</li> <li>in charge of it. Far from it, I wanted</li> <li>explanations in order to be able to deal with</li> <li>the issue and I wanted information and that's</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>central tenets of how we operate in this jurisdiction, that I wouldn't be able to look at myself in the mirror.</li> <li>Q. And just to deal with a suggestion put to you by my learned friend, Mr Cruz, did you tell the Commissioner of Police or any other police officer, or did you ask anybody to do so on your behalf, not to execute the search warrant against Mr Levy?</li> <li>A. Absolutely not. In fact, I was told that the search warrant had been executed.</li> <li>Q. Did you ask anybody directly in the RGP or get anybody to do so on your behalf not to examine Mr Levy's communications beyond your 12th of May allegedly berating</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ \end{array} $	<ul> <li>have changed your mind in the meantime, that</li> <li>by commenting to the Commissioner what you</li> <li>thought about his decision to go warrant</li> <li>instead of production order, that you were</li> <li>interfering in a live criminal investigation?</li> <li>A. No, and not least because I did not believe</li> <li>I was doing so - as I think we ventilated a</li> <li>moment ago, it wasn't the Commissioner who</li> <li>was doing it, he wasn't running the Operation.</li> <li>I didn't ask to speak to the person who was. I</li> <li>didn't seek to influence the officers who were</li> <li>in charge of it. Far from it, I wanted</li> <li>explanations in order to be able to deal with</li> <li>the issue and I wanted information and that's</li> <li>what the 12th of May meeting would have</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>central tenets of how we operate in this jurisdiction, that I wouldn't be able to look at myself in the mirror.</li> <li>Q. And just to deal with a suggestion put to you by my learned friend, Mr Cruz, did you tell the Commissioner of Police or any other police officer, or did you ask anybody to do so on your behalf, not to execute the search warrant against Mr Levy?</li> <li>A. Absolutely not. In fact, I was told that the search warrant had been executed.</li> <li>Q. Did you ask anybody directly in the RGP or get anybody to do so on your behalf not to examine Mr Levy's communications beyond your 12th of May allegedly berating conversation with Mr McGrail?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>have changed your mind in the meantime, that</li> <li>by commenting to the Commissioner what you</li> <li>thought about his decision to go warrant</li> <li>instead of production order, that you were</li> <li>interfering in a live criminal investigation?</li> <li>A. No, and not least because I did not believe</li> <li>I was doing so - as I think we ventilated a</li> <li>moment ago, it wasn't the Commissioner who</li> <li>was doing it, he wasn't running the Operation.</li> <li>I didn't ask to speak to the person who was. I</li> <li>didn't seek to influence the officers who were</li> <li>in charge of it. Far from it, I wanted</li> <li>explanations in order to be able to deal with</li> <li>the issue and I wanted information and that's</li> <li>what the 12th of May meeting would have</li> <li>been about if I had been given truthful</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>central tenets of how we operate in this jurisdiction, that I wouldn't be able to look at myself in the mirror.</li> <li>Q. And just to deal with a suggestion put to you by my learned friend, Mr Cruz, did you tell the Commissioner of Police or any other police officer, or did you ask anybody to do so on your behalf, not to execute the search warrant against Mr Levy?</li> <li>A. Absolutely not. In fact, I was told that the search warrant had been executed.</li> <li>Q. Did you ask anybody directly in the RGP or get anybody to do so on your behalf not to examine Mr Levy's communications beyond your 12th of May allegedly berating conversation with Mr McGrail?</li> <li>A. No.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>have changed your mind in the meantime, that</li> <li>by commenting to the Commissioner what you</li> <li>thought about his decision to go warrant</li> <li>instead of production order, that you were</li> <li>interfering in a live criminal investigation?</li> <li>A. No, and not least because I did not believe</li> <li>I was doing so - as I think we ventilated a</li> <li>moment ago, it wasn't the Commissioner who</li> <li>was doing it, he wasn't running the Operation.</li> <li>I didn't seek to influence the officers who were</li> <li>in charge of it. Far from it, I wanted</li> <li>explanations in order to be able to deal with</li> <li>the issue and I wanted information and that's</li> <li>what the 12th of May meeting would have</li> <li>been about if I had been given truthful</li> <li>information and if it hadn't then morphed into</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>central tenets of how we operate in this jurisdiction, that I wouldn't be able to look at myself in the mirror.</li> <li>Q. And just to deal with a suggestion put to you by my learned friend, Mr Cruz, did you tell the Commissioner of Police or any other police officer, or did you ask anybody to do so on your behalf, not to execute the search warrant against Mr Levy?</li> <li>A. Absolutely not. In fact, I was told that the search warrant had been executed.</li> <li>Q. Did you ask anybody directly in the RGP or get anybody to do so on your behalf not to examine Mr Levy's communications beyond your 12th of May allegedly berating conversation with Mr McGrail?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did you express any view to anybody</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>have changed your mind in the meantime, that</li> <li>by commenting to the Commissioner what you</li> <li>thought about his decision to go warrant</li> <li>instead of production order, that you were</li> <li>interfering in a live criminal investigation?</li> <li>A. No, and not least because I did not believe</li> <li>I was doing so - as I think we ventilated a</li> <li>moment ago, it wasn't the Commissioner who</li> <li>was doing it, he wasn't running the Operation.</li> <li>I didn't seek to influence the officers who were</li> <li>in charge of it. Far from it, I wanted</li> <li>explanations in order to be able to deal with</li> <li>the issue and I wanted information and that's</li> <li>what the 12th of May meeting would have</li> <li>been about if I had been given truthful</li> <li>information and if it hadn't then morphed into</li> <li>somebody misleading me in my office, which</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>central tenets of how we operate in this jurisdiction, that I wouldn't be able to look at myself in the mirror.</li> <li>Q. And just to deal with a suggestion put to you by my learned friend, Mr Cruz, did you tell the Commissioner of Police or any other police officer, or did you ask anybody to do so on your behalf, not to execute the search warrant against Mr Levy?</li> <li>A. Absolutely not. In fact, I was told that the search warrant had been executed.</li> <li>Q. Did you ask anybody directly in the RGP or get anybody to do so on your behalf not to examine Mr Levy's communications beyond your 12th of May allegedly berating conversation with Mr McGrail?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did you express any view to anybody about whether charges should or should not be</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array} $	have changed your mind in the meantime, that by commenting to the Commissioner what you thought about his decision to go warrant instead of production order, that you were interfering in a live criminal investigation? <b>A.</b> No, and not least because I did not believe I was doing so - as I think we ventilated a moment ago, it wasn't the Commissioner who was doing it, he wasn't running the Operation. I didn't ask to speak to the person who was. I didn't seek to influence the officers who were in charge of it. Far from it, I wanted explanations in order to be able to deal with the issue and I wanted information and that's what the 12th of May meeting would have been about if I had been given truthful information and if it hadn't then morphed into somebody misleading me in my office, which is what it led to.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>central tenets of how we operate in this jurisdiction, that I wouldn't be able to look at myself in the mirror.</li> <li>Q. And just to deal with a suggestion put to you by my learned friend, Mr Cruz, did you tell the Commissioner of Police or any other police officer, or did you ask anybody to do so on your behalf, not to execute the search warrant against Mr Levy?</li> <li>A. Absolutely not. In fact, I was told that the search warrant had been executed.</li> <li>Q. Did you ask anybody directly in the RGP or get anybody to do so on your behalf not to examine Mr Levy's communications beyond your 12th of May allegedly berating conversation with Mr McGrail?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did you express any view to anybody about whether charges should or should not be brought against anybody and what charges</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	<ul> <li>have changed your mind in the meantime, that</li> <li>by commenting to the Commissioner what you</li> <li>thought about his decision to go warrant</li> <li>instead of production order, that you were</li> <li>interfering in a live criminal investigation?</li> <li>A. No, and not least because I did not believe</li> <li>I was doing so - as I think we ventilated a</li> <li>moment ago, it wasn't the Commissioner who</li> <li>was doing it, he wasn't running the Operation.</li> <li>I didn't ask to speak to the person who was. I</li> <li>didn't seek to influence the officers who were</li> <li>in charge of it. Far from it, I wanted</li> <li>explanations in order to be able to deal with</li> <li>the issue and I wanted information and that's</li> <li>what the 12th of May meeting would have</li> <li>been about if I had been given truthful</li> <li>information and if it hadn't then morphed into</li> <li>somebody misleading me in my office, which</li> <li>is what it led to.</li> <li>Q. Even during the so-called berating meeting</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>central tenets of how we operate in this jurisdiction, that I wouldn't be able to look at myself in the mirror.</li> <li>Q. And just to deal with a suggestion put to you by my learned friend, Mr Cruz, did you tell the Commissioner of Police or any other police officer, or did you ask anybody to do so on your behalf, not to execute the search warrant against Mr Levy?</li> <li>A. Absolutely not. In fact, I was told that the search warrant had been executed.</li> <li>Q. Did you ask anybody directly in the RGP or get anybody to do so on your behalf not to examine Mr Levy's communications beyond your 12th of May allegedly berating conversation with Mr McGrail?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did you express any view to anybody about whether charges should or should not be brought against anybody and what charges should or should not be brought?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>have changed your mind in the meantime, that</li> <li>by commenting to the Commissioner what you</li> <li>thought about his decision to go warrant</li> <li>instead of production order, that you were</li> <li>interfering in a live criminal investigation?</li> <li>A. No, and not least because I did not believe</li> <li>I was doing so - as I think we ventilated a</li> <li>moment ago, it wasn't the Commissioner who</li> <li>was doing it, he wasn't running the Operation.</li> <li>I didn't ask to speak to the person who was. I</li> <li>didn't seek to influence the officers who were</li> <li>in charge of it. Far from it, I wanted</li> <li>explanations in order to be able to deal with</li> <li>the issue and I wanted information and that's</li> <li>what the 12th of May meeting would have</li> <li>been about if I had been given truthful</li> <li>information and if it hadn't then morphed into</li> <li>somebody misleading me in my office, which</li> <li>is what it led to.</li> <li>Q. Even during the so-called berating meeting</li> <li>of the 12th of May, did you then in that</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>central tenets of how we operate in this jurisdiction, that I wouldn't be able to look at myself in the mirror.</li> <li>Q. And just to deal with a suggestion put to you by my learned friend, Mr Cruz, did you tell the Commissioner of Police or any other police officer, or did you ask anybody to do so on your behalf, not to execute the search warrant against Mr Levy?</li> <li>A. Absolutely not. In fact, I was told that the search warrant had been executed.</li> <li>Q. Did you ask anybody directly in the RGP or get anybody to do so on your behalf not to examine Mr Levy's communications beyond your 12th of May allegedly berating conversation with Mr McGrail?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did you express any view to anybody about whether charges should or should not be brought against anybody and what charges should or should not be brought?</li> <li>A. Not at all. In fact, what I said when I was</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	<ul> <li>have changed your mind in the meantime, that</li> <li>by commenting to the Commissioner what you</li> <li>thought about his decision to go warrant</li> <li>instead of production order, that you were</li> <li>interfering in a live criminal investigation?</li> <li>A. No, and not least because I did not believe</li> <li>I was doing so - as I think we ventilated a</li> <li>moment ago, it wasn't the Commissioner who</li> <li>was doing it, he wasn't running the Operation.</li> <li>I didn't ask to speak to the person who was. I</li> <li>didn't seek to influence the officers who were</li> <li>in charge of it. Far from it, I wanted</li> <li>explanations in order to be able to deal with</li> <li>the issue and I wanted information and that's</li> <li>what the 12th of May meeting would have</li> <li>been about if I had been given truthful</li> <li>information and if it hadn't then morphed into</li> <li>somebody misleading me in my office, which</li> <li>is what it led to.</li> <li>Q. Even during the so-called berating meeting</li> <li>of the 12th of May, did you then in that</li> <li>meeting even ask Mr McGrail not to proceed</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>central tenets of how we operate in this jurisdiction, that I wouldn't be able to look at myself in the mirror.</li> <li>Q. And just to deal with a suggestion put to you by my learned friend, Mr Cruz, did you tell the Commissioner of Police or any other police officer, or did you ask anybody to do so on your behalf, not to execute the search warrant against Mr Levy?</li> <li>A. Absolutely not. In fact, I was told that the search warrant had been executed.</li> <li>Q. Did you ask anybody directly in the RGP or get anybody to do so on your behalf not to examine Mr Levy's communications beyond your 12th of May allegedly berating conversation with Mr McGrail?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did you express any view to anybody about whether charges should or should not be brought against anybody and what charges should or should not be brought?</li> <li>A. Not at all. In fact, what I said when I was told about the nolle prosequi was that I thought</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\\\end{array} $	<ul> <li>have changed your mind in the meantime, that</li> <li>by commenting to the Commissioner what you</li> <li>thought about his decision to go warrant</li> <li>instead of production order, that you were</li> <li>interfering in a live criminal investigation?</li> <li>A. No, and not least because I did not believe</li> <li>I was doing so - as I think we ventilated a</li> <li>moment ago, it wasn't the Commissioner who</li> <li>was doing it, he wasn't running the Operation.</li> <li>I didn't ask to speak to the person who was. I</li> <li>didn't seek to influence the officers who were</li> <li>in charge of it. Far from it, I wanted</li> <li>explanations in order to be able to deal with</li> <li>the issue and I wanted information and that's</li> <li>what the 12th of May meeting would have</li> <li>been about if I had been given truthful</li> <li>information and if it hadn't then morphed into</li> <li>somebody misleading me in my office, which</li> <li>is what it led to.</li> <li>Q. Even during the so-called berating meeting</li> <li>of the 12th of May, did you then in that</li> <li>meeting even ask Mr McGrail not to proceed</li> <li>with the execution of the warrant?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>central tenets of how we operate in this jurisdiction, that I wouldn't be able to look at myself in the mirror.</li> <li>Q. And just to deal with a suggestion put to you by my learned friend, Mr Cruz, did you tell the Commissioner of Police or any other police officer, or did you ask anybody to do so on your behalf, not to execute the search warrant against Mr Levy?</li> <li>A. Absolutely not. In fact, I was told that the search warrant had been executed.</li> <li>Q. Did you ask anybody directly in the RGP or get anybody to do so on your behalf not to examine Mr Levy's communications beyond your 12th of May allegedly berating conversation with Mr McGrail?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did you express any view to anybody about whether charges should or should not be brought against anybody and what charges should or should not be brought?</li> <li>A. Not at all. In fact, what I said when I was</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	<ul> <li>have changed your mind in the meantime, that</li> <li>by commenting to the Commissioner what you</li> <li>thought about his decision to go warrant</li> <li>instead of production order, that you were</li> <li>interfering in a live criminal investigation?</li> <li>A. No, and not least because I did not believe</li> <li>I was doing so - as I think we ventilated a</li> <li>moment ago, it wasn't the Commissioner who</li> <li>was doing it, he wasn't running the Operation.</li> <li>I didn't ask to speak to the person who was. I</li> <li>didn't seek to influence the officers who were</li> <li>in charge of it. Far from it, I wanted</li> <li>explanations in order to be able to deal with</li> <li>the issue and I wanted information and that's</li> <li>what the 12th of May meeting would have</li> <li>been about if I had been given truthful</li> <li>information and if it hadn't then morphed into</li> <li>somebody misleading me in my office, which</li> <li>is what it led to.</li> <li>Q. Even during the so-called berating meeting</li> <li>of the 12th of May, did you then in that</li> <li>meeting even ask Mr McGrail not to proceed</li> </ul>

69 (Pages 273 to 276)

1	in his recollection suggests that I did.	1	that document?
2	Q. Did you know at that time at what stage the	2	A. No, that's not my world and it's not
3	execution of a warrant was?	3	something I would have expected to see, it's
4	A. I was told that it had been executed. If you	4	not something I saw, it's nothing anybody ever
5	look at the WhatsApp, I am told that the	5	referred to me and neither would they have.
6	warrant is being executed, "We are executing	6	Even in the guise of the Government as a
7	" So, as far as I was concerned, the horse	7	victim; so, in other words, the information that
8	had bolted, execution had happened.	8	we might have been given as a potential victim
9	Q. And in between the period - I am going to	9	or complainant. Nobody ever shared any of
10	mention May twice - May 2019 when Mr	10	that with me.
11	McGrail gives the first briefing to a largish	11	Q. And were you aware of a telephone
12	number of people in your office and May	12	conversation between the Attorney General
13	2020, so that year, were you generally aware	13	and the Director of Public Prosecutions on the
14	of what was going on in the investigation?	14	6th of April 2020?
15	A. In May '19 to '20	15	A. No, that's long before the 12th of May
16	Q. Yes.	16	2020, and my concerns about DPP's
17	THE CHAIRMAN: Including from Mr Levy,	17	involvement and the AG's reference to me of
18	presumably, you mean?	18	things he discussed with the DPP relates to this
19	SIR PETER CARUANA: I am going to ask	19	question of strongly advise what happens in
20	you - you can answer that as well - I was going	20	May 2020, absolutely nothing to do with any
21	to focus in on the things that we have heard	21	of that.
22	particularly about; for example, a meeting	22	Q. And on the 7th of April meeting between
23	between Mr Richardson and the DPP. But I	23	the Attorney General, the Commissioner of
23	will add that at the end, sir.	24	Police and Mr Richardson, would you have
25	A. So, as far as I know, in that period - and	25	been briefed on that after the event? Were you
25	A. 50, as fai as I know, in that period - and	25	been briefed on that after the event? Were you
	Page 277		Page 279
		1	
1	correct ma if I'm wrong Sir Potor bacausa	1	briefed on that after the event?
1	correct me if I'm wrong, Sir Peter, because	1	briefed on that after the event?
2	you've all been looking at this in great detail,	2	A. Not at all, and I would have been seeing
2 3	you've all been looking at this in great detail, but for me it's something that happened now	2 3	A. Not at all, and I would have been seeing Mr Yamas in his guise as the Government
2 3 4	you've all been looking at this in great detail, but for me it's something that happened now some five years ago in relation to 2019 - at	2 3 4	A. Not at all, and I would have been seeing Mr Yamas in his guise as the Government Chief Legal Advisor on matters generally and
2 3 4 5	you've all been looking at this in great detail, but for me it's something that happened now some five years ago in relation to 2019 - at different stages we were being told about the	2 3 4 5	A. Not at all, and I would have been seeing Mr Yamas in his guise as the Government Chief Legal Advisor on matters generally and in matters relating to negotiations as they were
2 3 4 5 6	you've all been looking at this in great detail, but for me it's something that happened now some five years ago in relation to 2019 - at different stages we were being told about the potential arrest of Mr Sanchez, who was away	2 3 4 5 6	A. Not at all, and I would have been seeing Mr Yamas in his guise as the Government Chief Legal Advisor on matters generally and in matters relating to negotiations as they were at the time of the New Year's Eve Framework
2 3 4 5 6 7	you've all been looking at this in great detail, but for me it's something that happened now some five years ago in relation to 2019 - at different stages we were being told about the potential arrest of Mr Sanchez, who was away on Government business and was returning to	2 3 4 5 6 7	A. Not at all, and I would have been seeing Mr Yamas in his guise as the Government Chief Legal Advisor on matters generally and in matters relating to negotiations as they were at the time of the New Year's Eve Framework Agreement, as it came to be known, but he
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	you've all been looking at this in great detail, but for me it's something that happened now some five years ago in relation to 2019 - at different stages we were being told about the potential arrest of Mr Sanchez, who was away on Government business and was returning to Gibraltar, but I was receiving no information	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A. Not at all, and I would have been seeing Mr Yamas in his guise as the Government Chief Legal Advisor on matters generally and in matters relating to negotiations as they were at the time of the New Year's Eve Framework Agreement, as it came to be known, but he wouldn't be talking to me about any of these
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	you've all been looking at this in great detail, but for me it's something that happened now some five years ago in relation to 2019 - at different stages we were being told about the potential arrest of Mr Sanchez, who was away on Government business and was returning to Gibraltar, but I was receiving no information from the official side, if you want to put it that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. Not at all, and I would have been seeing Mr Yamas in his guise as the Government Chief Legal Advisor on matters generally and in matters relating to negotiations as they were at the time of the New Year's Eve Framework Agreement, as it came to be known, but he wouldn't be talking to me about any of these things.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	you've all been looking at this in great detail, but for me it's something that happened now some five years ago in relation to 2019 - at different stages we were being told about the potential arrest of Mr Sanchez, who was away on Government business and was returning to Gibraltar, but I was receiving no information from the official side, if you want to put it that way. And from James Levy, I was being given	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>A. Not at all, and I would have been seeing</li> <li>Mr Yamas in his guise as the Government</li> <li>Chief Legal Advisor on matters generally and</li> <li>in matters relating to negotiations as they were</li> <li>at the time of the New Year's Eve Framework</li> <li>Agreement, as it came to be known, but he</li> <li>wouldn't be talking to me about any of these</li> <li>things.</li> <li>Q. And then there were the three meetings</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	you've all been looking at this in great detail, but for me it's something that happened now some five years ago in relation to 2019 - at different stages we were being told about the potential arrest of Mr Sanchez, who was away on Government business and was returning to Gibraltar, but I was receiving no information from the official side, if you want to put it that way. And from James Levy, I was being given the information that I have already shared with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>A. Not at all, and I would have been seeing Mr Yamas in his guise as the Government Chief Legal Advisor on matters generally and in matters relating to negotiations as they were at the time of the New Year's Eve Framework Agreement, as it came to be known, but he wouldn't be talking to me about any of these things.</li> <li>Q. And then there were the three meetings that the inquiry has heard of about on the 13th,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	you've all been looking at this in great detail, but for me it's something that happened now some five years ago in relation to 2019 - at different stages we were being told about the potential arrest of Mr Sanchez, who was away on Government business and was returning to Gibraltar, but I was receiving no information from the official side, if you want to put it that way. And from James Levy, I was being given the information that I have already shared with the tribunal, I was being given about his	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>A. Not at all, and I would have been seeing Mr Yamas in his guise as the Government Chief Legal Advisor on matters generally and in matters relating to negotiations as they were at the time of the New Year's Eve Framework Agreement, as it came to be known, but he wouldn't be talking to me about any of these things.</li> <li>Q. And then there were the three meetings that the inquiry has heard of about on the 13th, 15th and 20th of May, the ones that were</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	you've all been looking at this in great detail, but for me it's something that happened now some five years ago in relation to 2019 - at different stages we were being told about the potential arrest of Mr Sanchez, who was away on Government business and was returning to Gibraltar, but I was receiving no information from the official side, if you want to put it that way. And from James Levy, I was being given the information that I have already shared with the tribunal, I was being given about his concerns.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A. Not at all, and I would have been seeing Mr Yamas in his guise as the Government Chief Legal Advisor on matters generally and in matters relating to negotiations as they were at the time of the New Year's Eve Framework Agreement, as it came to be known, but he wouldn't be talking to me about any of these things.</li> <li>Q. And then there were the three meetings that the inquiry has heard of about on the 13th, 15th and 20th of May, the ones that were covertly recorded by Mr McGrail. At the time</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	you've all been looking at this in great detail, but for me it's something that happened now some five years ago in relation to 2019 - at different stages we were being told about the potential arrest of Mr Sanchez, who was away on Government business and was returning to Gibraltar, but I was receiving no information from the official side, if you want to put it that way. And from James Levy, I was being given the information that I have already shared with the tribunal, I was being given about his concerns. Q. But if, for example, Mr Richardson and Mr	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A. Not at all, and I would have been seeing Mr Yamas in his guise as the Government</li> <li>Chief Legal Advisor on matters generally and in matters relating to negotiations as they were at the time of the New Year's Eve Framework</li> <li>Agreement, as it came to be known, but he wouldn't be talking to me about any of these things.</li> <li>Q. And then there were the three meetings that the inquiry has heard of about on the 13th, 15th and 20th of May, the ones that were covertly recorded by Mr McGrail. At the time of these meetings were you aware of them?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	you've all been looking at this in great detail, but for me it's something that happened now some five years ago in relation to 2019 - at different stages we were being told about the potential arrest of Mr Sanchez, who was away on Government business and was returning to Gibraltar, but I was receiving no information from the official side, if you want to put it that way. And from James Levy, I was being given the information that I have already shared with the tribunal, I was being given about his concerns. Q. But if, for example, Mr Richardson and Mr Wyan and the DPP and another Crown	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>A. Not at all, and I would have been seeing Mr Yamas in his guise as the Government Chief Legal Advisor on matters generally and in matters relating to negotiations as they were at the time of the New Year's Eve Framework Agreement, as it came to be known, but he wouldn't be talking to me about any of these things.</li> <li>Q. And then there were the three meetings that the inquiry has heard of about on the 13th, 15th and 20th of May, the ones that were covertly recorded by Mr McGrail. At the time of these meetings were you aware of them?</li> <li>A. I can't tell you that I wasn't aware that</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>you've all been looking at this in great detail,</li> <li>but for me it's something that happened now</li> <li>some five years ago in relation to 2019 - at</li> <li>different stages we were being told about the</li> <li>potential arrest of Mr Sanchez, who was away</li> <li>on Government business and was returning to</li> <li>Gibraltar, but I was receiving no information</li> <li>from the official side, if you want to put it that</li> <li>way. And from James Levy, I was being given</li> <li>the information that I have already shared with</li> <li>the tribunal, I was being given about his</li> <li>concerns.</li> <li>Q. But if, for example, Mr Richardson and Mr</li> <li>Wyan and the DPP and another Crown</li> <li>counsel, Mr Zamitt, met on the 3rd of March</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ \end{array} $	<ul> <li>A. Not at all, and I would have been seeing Mr Yamas in his guise as the Government Chief Legal Advisor on matters generally and in matters relating to negotiations as they were at the time of the New Year's Eve Framework Agreement, as it came to be known, but he wouldn't be talking to me about any of these things.</li> <li>Q. And then there were the three meetings that the inquiry has heard of about on the 13th, 15th and 20th of May, the ones that were covertly recorded by Mr McGrail. At the time of these meetings were you aware of them?</li> <li>A. I can't tell you that I wasn't aware that meetings were happening because, you know,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>you've all been looking at this in great detail, but for me it's something that happened now some five years ago in relation to 2019 - at different stages we were being told about the potential arrest of Mr Sanchez, who was away on Government business and was returning to Gibraltar, but I was receiving no information from the official side, if you want to put it that way. And from James Levy, I was being given the information that I have already shared with the tribunal, I was being given about his concerns.</li> <li>Q. But if, for example, Mr Richardson and Mr Wyan and the DPP and another Crown counsel, Mr Zamitt, met on the 3rd of March 2020 in relation to charges, did you know</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A. Not at all, and I would have been seeing Mr Yamas in his guise as the Government Chief Legal Advisor on matters generally and in matters relating to negotiations as they were at the time of the New Year's Eve Framework Agreement, as it came to be known, but he wouldn't be talking to me about any of these things.</li> <li>Q. And then there were the three meetings that the inquiry has heard of about on the 13th, 15th and 20th of May, the ones that were covertly recorded by Mr McGrail. At the time of these meetings were you aware of them?</li> <li>A. I can't tell you that I wasn't aware that meetings were happening because, you know, with the level of intensity of things that were</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>you've all been looking at this in great detail,</li> <li>but for me it's something that happened now</li> <li>some five years ago in relation to 2019 - at</li> <li>different stages we were being told about the</li> <li>potential arrest of Mr Sanchez, who was away</li> <li>on Government business and was returning to</li> <li>Gibraltar, but I was receiving no information</li> <li>from the official side, if you want to put it that</li> <li>way. And from James Levy, I was being given</li> <li>the information that I have already shared with</li> <li>the tribunal, I was being given about his</li> <li>concerns.</li> <li>Q. But if, for example, Mr Richardson and Mr</li> <li>Wyan and the DPP and another Crown</li> <li>counsel, Mr Zamitt, met on the 3rd of March</li> <li>2020 in relation to charges, did you know</li> <li>anything about that before, during or after?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A. Not at all, and I would have been seeing Mr Yamas in his guise as the Government Chief Legal Advisor on matters generally and in matters relating to negotiations as they were at the time of the New Year's Eve Framework Agreement, as it came to be known, but he wouldn't be talking to me about any of these things.</li> <li>Q. And then there were the three meetings that the inquiry has heard of about on the 13th, 15th and 20th of May, the ones that were covertly recorded by Mr McGrail. At the time of these meetings were you aware of them?</li> <li>A. I can't tell you that I wasn't aware that meetings were happening because, you know, with the level of intensity of things that were going on, I might have to see Michael on other</li> </ul>
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ \end{array} $	<ul> <li>you've all been looking at this in great detail, but for me it's something that happened now some five years ago in relation to 2019 - at different stages we were being told about the potential arrest of Mr Sanchez, who was away on Government business and was returning to Gibraltar, but I was receiving no information from the official side, if you want to put it that way. And from James Levy, I was being given the information that I have already shared with the tribunal, I was being given about his concerns.</li> <li>Q. But if, for example, Mr Richardson and Mr Wyan and the DPP and another Crown counsel, Mr Zamitt, met on the 3rd of March 2020 in relation to charges, did you know anything about that before, during or after?</li> <li>A. No, no, no, not at all.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>A. Not at all, and I would have been seeing Mr Yamas in his guise as the Government Chief Legal Advisor on matters generally and in matters relating to negotiations as they were at the time of the New Year's Eve Framework Agreement, as it came to be known, but he wouldn't be talking to me about any of these things.</li> <li>Q. And then there were the three meetings that the inquiry has heard of about on the 13th, 15th and 20th of May, the ones that were covertly recorded by Mr McGrail. At the time of these meetings were you aware of them?</li> <li>A. I can't tell you that I wasn't aware that meetings were happening because, you know, with the level of intensity of things that were going on, I might have to see Michael on other matters and he couldn't be available because</li> </ul>
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array} $	<ul> <li>you've all been looking at this in great detail, but for me it's something that happened now some five years ago in relation to 2019 - at different stages we were being told about the potential arrest of Mr Sanchez, who was away on Government business and was returning to Gibraltar, but I was receiving no information from the official side, if you want to put it that way. And from James Levy, I was being given the information that I have already shared with the tribunal, I was being given about his concerns.</li> <li>Q. But if, for example, Mr Richardson and Mr Wyan and the DPP and another Crown counsel, Mr Zamitt, met on the 3rd of March 2020 in relation to charges, did you know anything about that before, during or after?</li> <li>A. No, no, no, not at all.</li> <li>Q. And if there was a meeting on the 1st of</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array} $	<ul> <li>A. Not at all, and I would have been seeing Mr Yamas in his guise as the Government Chief Legal Advisor on matters generally and in matters relating to negotiations as they were at the time of the New Year's Eve Framework Agreement, as it came to be known, but he wouldn't be talking to me about any of these things.</li> <li>Q. And then there were the three meetings that the inquiry has heard of about on the 13th, 15th and 20th of May, the ones that were covertly recorded by Mr McGrail. At the time of these meetings were you aware of them?</li> <li>A. I can't tell you that I wasn't aware that meetings were happening because, you know, with the level of intensity of things that were going on, I might have to see Michael on other matters and he couldn't be available because he was in meetings with Ian McGrail, etc., but</li> </ul>
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	<ul> <li>you've all been looking at this in great detail, but for me it's something that happened now some five years ago in relation to 2019 - at different stages we were being told about the potential arrest of Mr Sanchez, who was away on Government business and was returning to Gibraltar, but I was receiving no information from the official side, if you want to put it that way. And from James Levy, I was being given the information that I have already shared with the tribunal, I was being given about his concerns.</li> <li>Q. But if, for example, Mr Richardson and Mr Wyan and the DPP and another Crown counsel, Mr Zamitt, met on the 3rd of March 2020 in relation to charges, did you know anything about that before, during or after?</li> <li>A. No, no, no, not at all.</li> <li>Q. And if there was a meeting on the 1st of April in relation to charging advice, would you</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	<ul> <li>A. Not at all, and I would have been seeing Mr Yamas in his guise as the Government Chief Legal Advisor on matters generally and in matters relating to negotiations as they were at the time of the New Year's Eve Framework Agreement, as it came to be known, but he wouldn't be talking to me about any of these things.</li> <li>Q. And then there were the three meetings that the inquiry has heard of about on the 13th, 15th and 20th of May, the ones that were covertly recorded by Mr McGrail. At the time of these meetings were you aware of them?</li> <li>A. I can't tell you that I wasn't aware that meetings were happening because, you know, with the level of intensity of things that were going on, I might have to see Michael on other matters and he couldn't be available because he was in meetings with Ian McGrail, etc., but I wasn't aware of any of the details being</li> </ul>
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ \end{array}$	<ul> <li>you've all been looking at this in great detail, but for me it's something that happened now some five years ago in relation to 2019 - at different stages we were being told about the potential arrest of Mr Sanchez, who was away on Government business and was returning to Gibraltar, but I was receiving no information from the official side, if you want to put it that way. And from James Levy, I was being given the information that I have already shared with the tribunal, I was being given about his concerns.</li> <li>Q. But if, for example, Mr Richardson and Mr Wyan and the DPP and another Crown counsel, Mr Zamitt, met on the 3rd of March 2020 in relation to charges, did you know anything about that before, during or after?</li> <li>A. No, no, no, not at all.</li> <li>Q. And if there was a meeting on the 1st of April in relation to charging advice, would you have ever seen the so-called NDM? You may</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	<ul> <li>A. Not at all, and I would have been seeing Mr Yamas in his guise as the Government Chief Legal Advisor on matters generally and in matters relating to negotiations as they were at the time of the New Year's Eve Framework Agreement, as it came to be known, but he wouldn't be talking to me about any of these things.</li> <li>Q. And then there were the three meetings that the inquiry has heard of about on the 13th, 15th and 20th of May, the ones that were covertly recorded by Mr McGrail. At the time of these meetings were you aware of them?</li> <li>A. I can't tell you that I wasn't aware that meetings were happening because, you know, with the level of intensity of things that were going on, I might have to see Michael on other matters and he couldn't be available because he was in meetings with Ian McGrail, etc., but I wasn't aware of any of the details being discussed in any of the meetings, and neither</li> </ul>
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ \end{array}$	<ul> <li>you've all been looking at this in great detail, but for me it's something that happened now some five years ago in relation to 2019 - at different stages we were being told about the potential arrest of Mr Sanchez, who was away on Government business and was returning to Gibraltar, but I was receiving no information from the official side, if you want to put it that way. And from James Levy, I was being given the information that I have already shared with the tribunal, I was being given about his concerns.</li> <li>Q. But if, for example, Mr Richardson and Mr Wyan and the DPP and another Crown counsel, Mr Zamitt, met on the 3rd of March 2020 in relation to charges, did you know anything about that before, during or after?</li> <li>A. No, no, no, not at all.</li> <li>Q. And if there was a meeting on the 1st of April in relation to charging advice, would you have ever seen the so-called NDM? You may not even know what that stands for: National</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	<ul> <li>A. Not at all, and I would have been seeing Mr Yamas in his guise as the Government Chief Legal Advisor on matters generally and in matters relating to negotiations as they were at the time of the New Year's Eve Framework Agreement, as it came to be known, but he wouldn't be talking to me about any of these things.</li> <li>Q. And then there were the three meetings that the inquiry has heard of about on the 13th, 15th and 20th of May, the ones that were covertly recorded by Mr McGrail. At the time of these meetings were you aware of them?</li> <li>A. I can't tell you that I wasn't aware that meetings were happening because, you know, with the level of intensity of things that were going on, I might have to see Michael on other matters and he couldn't be available because he was in meetings with Ian McGrail, etc., but I wasn't aware of any of the details being discussed in any of the meetings, and neither was I interested in any of the detail that was</li> </ul>
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	<ul> <li>you've all been looking at this in great detail, but for me it's something that happened now some five years ago in relation to 2019 - at different stages we were being told about the potential arrest of Mr Sanchez, who was away on Government business and was returning to Gibraltar, but I was receiving no information from the official side, if you want to put it that way. And from James Levy, I was being given the information that I have already shared with the tribunal, I was being given about his concerns.</li> <li>Q. But if, for example, Mr Richardson and Mr Wyan and the DPP and another Crown counsel, Mr Zamitt, met on the 3rd of March 2020 in relation to charges, did you know anything about that before, during or after?</li> <li>A. No, no, no, not at all.</li> <li>Q. And if there was a meeting on the 1st of April in relation to charging advice, would you have ever seen the so-called NDM? You may not even know what that stands for: National Decision-Making Model Document, but that</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	<ul> <li>A. Not at all, and I would have been seeing Mr Yamas in his guise as the Government Chief Legal Advisor on matters generally and in matters relating to negotiations as they were at the time of the New Year's Eve Framework Agreement, as it came to be known, but he wouldn't be talking to me about any of these things.</li> <li>Q. And then there were the three meetings that the inquiry has heard of about on the 13th, 15th and 20th of May, the ones that were covertly recorded by Mr McGrail. At the time of these meetings were you aware of them?</li> <li>A. I can't tell you that I wasn't aware that meetings were happening because, you know, with the level of intensity of things that were going on, I might have to see Michael on other matters and he couldn't be available because he was in meetings with Ian McGrail, etc., but I wasn't aware of any of the details being discussed in any of the meetings, and neither was I interested in any of the detail that was being discussed in those meetings.</li> </ul>
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ \end{array}$	<ul> <li>you've all been looking at this in great detail, but for me it's something that happened now some five years ago in relation to 2019 - at different stages we were being told about the potential arrest of Mr Sanchez, who was away on Government business and was returning to Gibraltar, but I was receiving no information from the official side, if you want to put it that way. And from James Levy, I was being given the information that I have already shared with the tribunal, I was being given about his concerns.</li> <li>Q. But if, for example, Mr Richardson and Mr Wyan and the DPP and another Crown counsel, Mr Zamitt, met on the 3rd of March 2020 in relation to charges, did you know anything about that before, during or after?</li> <li>A. No, no, no, not at all.</li> <li>Q. And if there was a meeting on the 1st of April in relation to charging advice, would you have ever seen the so-called NDM? You may not even know what that stands for: National</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	<ul> <li>A. Not at all, and I would have been seeing Mr Yamas in his guise as the Government Chief Legal Advisor on matters generally and in matters relating to negotiations as they were at the time of the New Year's Eve Framework Agreement, as it came to be known, but he wouldn't be talking to me about any of these things.</li> <li>Q. And then there were the three meetings that the inquiry has heard of about on the 13th, 15th and 20th of May, the ones that were covertly recorded by Mr McGrail. At the time of these meetings were you aware of them?</li> <li>A. I can't tell you that I wasn't aware that meetings were happening because, you know, with the level of intensity of things that were going on, I might have to see Michael on other matters and he couldn't be available because he was in meetings with Ian McGrail, etc., but I wasn't aware of any of the details being discussed in any of the meetings, and neither was I interested in any of the detail that was</li> </ul>

www.epiqglobal.com Lower Ground Floor, 46 Chancery Lane casemanagers@epiqglobal.com London, WC2A 1JE

70 (Pages 277 to 280)

1	meeting, did Mr McGrail ever complain to you	1	up?" and all that stuff.
2	or somehow get a message to you that he	2	A. Yes, and this was an exhibit to that very
3	thought that you had interfered in a live	3	same witness statement.
4	criminal investigation?	4	Q. Are you familiar with the fact that that is
5	A. Not at all.	5	an exhibit? And, indeed, were it not for the
6	Q. Or did he ever suggest to you directly -	6	fact that you disclosed this witness statement,
7	well, we know it was not directly, but perhaps	7	the existence of that meeting might not be
8	through somebody else, that he could not	8	known?
9	thereby continue to serve as Commissioner of	9	A. Quite.
10	Police?	10	THE CHAIRMAN: It certainly would not
11	A. Not at all.	11	have been known because that is what
12	Q. Because of the interference that you had	12	revealed it.
13	done?	13	SIR PETER CARUANA: Exactly, sir, that is
14	A. Not at all. In the normal run of play, and I	14	the point. I am just trying to deal with this
15	say this not for your benefit, Sir Peter, because	15	point, that somehow you are being criticised
16	I'm sure that you're aware of it, but in the	16	by Mr Wagner, Mr Wagner on behalf of Mr
17	normal run of play, if the Chief Minister tried	17	McGrail - not him personally, of course - that,
18	something on like that, a Commissioner of	18	because you did not mention it in paragraph
19	Police would very likely have a conversation	19	11, you were somehow not revealing the fact
20	with the Governor about that and the Governor	20	that the meeting had taken place.
21	would seek to tell the Chief Minister to desist	20	A. That's right, it is revealed in the context of
22	from that sort of behaviour, which a Chief	21	the exhibit to that very same witness
23	Minister would never fall into the trap of	23	statement.
23	pursuing.	24	Q. Yes. I would just like to very briefly
25	Q. Was it ever suggested, until the email of	25	THE CHAIRMAN: You have got plenty of
20	2. Was it ever suggested, until the email of	23	The children of the new got plenty of
	Page 281		Page 283
1	the 5th of June, that he did not want to	1	time
1	the 5th of June, that he did not want to	1	time.
2	continue as Commissioner of Police because	2	SIR PETER CARUANA: Thank you. I will
2 3	continue as Commissioner of Police because of this interference?	2 3	SIR PETER CARUANA: Thank you. I will not be much longer, actually, sir. I just want to
2 3 4	continue as Commissioner of Police because of this interference? A. No, not at all. Quite the opposite. What	2 3 4	SIR PETER CARUANA: Thank you. I will not be much longer, actually, sir. I just want to deal briefly with - in relation to the HMIC
2 3 4 5	continue as Commissioner of Police because of this interference? A. No, not at all. Quite the opposite. What we saw was a considerably robust push-back	2 3 4 5	SIR PETER CARUANA: Thank you. I will not be much longer, actually, sir. I just want to deal briefly with - in relation to the HMIC report and resourcing and this idea that the
2 3 4 5 6	continue as Commissioner of Police because of this interference? A. No, not at all. Quite the opposite. What we saw was a considerably robust push-back against the GPA process.	2 3 4 5 6	SIR PETER CARUANA: Thank you. I will not be much longer, actually, sir. I just want to deal briefly with - in relation to the HMIC report and resourcing and this idea that the 2016 recommendations were somehow
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>continue as Commissioner of Police because of this interference?</li> <li>A. No, not at all. Quite the opposite. What we saw was a considerably robust push-back against the GPA process.</li> <li>Q. It was put to you by my learned friend, Mr</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	SIR PETER CARUANA: Thank you. I will not be much longer, actually, sir. I just want to deal briefly with - in relation to the HMIC report and resourcing and this idea that the 2016 recommendations were somehow delayed or there was a resources obstacle to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>continue as Commissioner of Police because of this interference?</li> <li>A. No, not at all. Quite the opposite. What we saw was a considerably robust push-back against the GPA process.</li> <li>Q. It was put to you by my learned friend, Mr Wagner, in respect of the meeting at your</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	SIR PETER CARUANA: Thank you. I will not be much longer, actually, sir. I just want to deal briefly with - in relation to the HMIC report and resourcing and this idea that the 2016 recommendations were somehow delayed or there was a resources obstacle to their implementation by Mr McGrail, I think
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>continue as Commissioner of Police because of this interference?</li> <li>A. No, not at all. Quite the opposite. What we saw was a considerably robust push-back against the GPA process.</li> <li>Q. It was put to you by my learned friend, Mr Wagner, in respect of the meeting at your house on Sunday the 17th of May, that you</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	SIR PETER CARUANA: Thank you. I will not be much longer, actually, sir. I just want to deal briefly with - in relation to the HMIC report and resourcing and this idea that the 2016 recommendations were somehow delayed or there was a resources obstacle to their implementation by Mr McGrail, I think you yourself alluded to the viewpoint - this is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>continue as Commissioner of Police because of this interference?</li> <li>A. No, not at all. Quite the opposite. What we saw was a considerably robust push-back against the GPA process.</li> <li>Q. It was put to you by my learned friend, Mr Wagner, in respect of the meeting at your house on Sunday the 17th of May, that you had, I think his word was, "Concealed"</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	SIR PETER CARUANA: Thank you. I will not be much longer, actually, sir. I just want to deal briefly with - in relation to the HMIC report and resourcing and this idea that the 2016 recommendations were somehow delayed or there was a resources obstacle to their implementation by Mr McGrail, I think you yourself alluded to the viewpoint - this is the end of your terrible day on the 14th of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>continue as Commissioner of Police because of this interference?</li> <li>A. No, not at all. Quite the opposite. What we saw was a considerably robust push-back against the GPA process.</li> <li>Q. It was put to you by my learned friend, Mr Wagner, in respect of the meeting at your house on Sunday the 17th of May, that you had, I think his word was, "Concealed"</li> <li>A. Not revealed.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	SIR PETER CARUANA: Thank you. I will not be much longer, actually, sir. I just want to deal briefly with - in relation to the HMIC report and resourcing and this idea that the 2016 recommendations were somehow delayed or there was a resources obstacle to their implementation by Mr McGrail, I think you yourself alluded to the viewpoint - this is the end of your terrible day on the 14th of May, do you remember?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>continue as Commissioner of Police because of this interference?</li> <li>A. No, not at all. Quite the opposite. What we saw was a considerably robust push-back against the GPA process.</li> <li>Q. It was put to you by my learned friend, Mr Wagner, in respect of the meeting at your house on Sunday the 17th of May, that you had, I think his word was, "Concealed"</li> <li>A. Not revealed.</li> <li>Q. Oh, that you did not reveal, not concealed,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	SIR PETER CARUANA: Thank you. I will not be much longer, actually, sir. I just want to deal briefly with - in relation to the HMIC report and resourcing and this idea that the 2016 recommendations were somehow delayed or there was a resources obstacle to their implementation by Mr McGrail, I think you yourself alluded to the viewpoint - this is the end of your terrible day on the 14th of May, do you remember? <b>A. Quite.</b>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>continue as Commissioner of Police because of this interference?</li> <li>A. No, not at all. Quite the opposite. What we saw was a considerably robust push-back against the GPA process.</li> <li>Q. It was put to you by my learned friend, Mr Wagner, in respect of the meeting at your house on Sunday the 17th of May, that you had, I think his word was, "Concealed"</li> <li>A. Not revealed.</li> <li>Q. Oh, that you did not reveal, not concealed, I beg his pardon, that you did not reveal the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	SIR PETER CARUANA: Thank you. I will not be much longer, actually, sir. I just want to deal briefly with - in relation to the HMIC report and resourcing and this idea that the 2016 recommendations were somehow delayed or there was a resources obstacle to their implementation by Mr McGrail, I think you yourself alluded to the viewpoint - this is the end of your terrible day on the 14th of May, do you remember? <b>A. Quite.</b> Q. Could we turn up B1216? Just a bit further
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>continue as Commissioner of Police because of this interference?</li> <li>A. No, not at all. Quite the opposite. What we saw was a considerably robust push-back against the GPA process.</li> <li>Q. It was put to you by my learned friend, Mr Wagner, in respect of the meeting at your house on Sunday the 17th of May, that you had, I think his word was, "Concealed"</li> <li>A. Not revealed.</li> <li>Q. Oh, that you did not reveal, not concealed, I beg his pardon, that you did not reveal the 17th of May meeting in paragraph 11 of your</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	SIR PETER CARUANA: Thank you. I will not be much longer, actually, sir. I just want to deal briefly with - in relation to the HMIC report and resourcing and this idea that the 2016 recommendations were somehow delayed or there was a resources obstacle to their implementation by Mr McGrail, I think you yourself alluded to the viewpoint - this is the end of your terrible day on the 14th of May, do you remember? <b>A. Quite.</b> Q. Could we turn up B1216? Just a bit further down, please. Well, perhaps not, perhaps you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>continue as Commissioner of Police because of this interference?</li> <li>A. No, not at all. Quite the opposite. What we saw was a considerably robust push-back against the GPA process.</li> <li>Q. It was put to you by my learned friend, Mr Wagner, in respect of the meeting at your house on Sunday the 17th of May, that you had, I think his word was, "Concealed"</li> <li>A. Not revealed.</li> <li>Q. Oh, that you did not reveal, not concealed, I beg his pardon, that you did not reveal the 17th of May meeting in paragraph 11 of your third witness statement. Do you remember</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>SIR PETER CARUANA: Thank you. I will not be much longer, actually, sir. I just want to deal briefly with - in relation to the HMIC report and resourcing and this idea that the 2016 recommendations were somehow delayed or there was a resources obstacle to their implementation by Mr McGrail, I think you yourself alluded to the viewpoint - this is the end of your terrible day on the 14th of May, do you remember?</li> <li>A. Quite.</li> <li>Q. Could we turn up B1216? Just a bit further down, please. Well, perhaps not, perhaps you were right, the third IM dialogue box there.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>continue as Commissioner of Police because of this interference?</li> <li>A. No, not at all. Quite the opposite. What we saw was a considerably robust push-back against the GPA process.</li> <li>Q. It was put to you by my learned friend, Mr Wagner, in respect of the meeting at your house on Sunday the 17th of May, that you had, I think his word was, "Concealed"</li> <li>A. Not revealed.</li> <li>Q. Oh, that you did not reveal, not concealed, I beg his pardon, that you did not reveal the 17th of May meeting in paragraph 11 of your third witness statement. Do you remember that?</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ \end{array} $	<ul> <li>SIR PETER CARUANA: Thank you. I will not be much longer, actually, sir. I just want to deal briefly with - in relation to the HMIC report and resourcing and this idea that the 2016 recommendations were somehow delayed or there was a resources obstacle to their implementation by Mr McGrail, I think you yourself alluded to the viewpoint - this is the end of your terrible day on the 14th of May, do you remember?</li> <li>A. Quite.</li> <li>Q. Could we turn up B1216? Just a bit further down, please. Well, perhaps not, perhaps you were right, the third IM dialogue box there. Yes, so this is Mr McGrail saying, "RGP</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>continue as Commissioner of Police because of this interference?</li> <li>A. No, not at all. Quite the opposite. What we saw was a considerably robust push-back against the GPA process.</li> <li>Q. It was put to you by my learned friend, Mr Wagner, in respect of the meeting at your house on Sunday the 17th of May, that you had, I think his word was, "Concealed"</li> <li>A. Not revealed.</li> <li>Q. Oh, that you did not reveal, not concealed, I beg his pardon, that you did not reveal the 17th of May meeting in paragraph 11 of your third witness statement. Do you remember that?</li> <li>A. That's right.</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ \end{array} $	<ul> <li>SIR PETER CARUANA: Thank you. I will not be much longer, actually, sir. I just want to deal briefly with - in relation to the HMIC report and resourcing and this idea that the 2016 recommendations were somehow delayed or there was a resources obstacle to their implementation by Mr McGrail, I think you yourself alluded to the viewpoint - this is the end of your terrible day on the 14th of May, do you remember?</li> <li>A. Quite.</li> <li>Q. Could we turn up B1216? Just a bit further down, please. Well, perhaps not, perhaps you were right, the third IM dialogue box there. Yes, so this is Mr McGrail saying, "RGP evolving" and then the sentence that starts</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>continue as Commissioner of Police because of this interference?</li> <li>A. No, not at all. Quite the opposite. What we saw was a considerably robust push-back against the GPA process.</li> <li>Q. It was put to you by my learned friend, Mr Wagner, in respect of the meeting at your house on Sunday the 17th of May, that you had, I think his word was, "Concealed"</li> <li>A. Not revealed.</li> <li>Q. Oh, that you did not reveal, not concealed, I beg his pardon, that you did not reveal the 17th of May meeting in paragraph 11 of your third witness statement. Do you remember that?</li> <li>A. That's right.</li> <li>Q. Well, could we turn - and it is true that</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>SIR PETER CARUANA: Thank you. I will not be much longer, actually, sir. I just want to deal briefly with - in relation to the HMIC report and resourcing and this idea that the 2016 recommendations were somehow delayed or there was a resources obstacle to their implementation by Mr McGrail, I think you yourself alluded to the viewpoint - this is the end of your terrible day on the 14th of May, do you remember?</li> <li>A. Quite.</li> <li>Q. Could we turn up B1216? Just a bit further down, please. Well, perhaps not, perhaps you were right, the third IM dialogue box there. Yes, so this is Mr McGrail saying, "RGP evolving" and then the sentence that starts three lines down in that dialogue: "Some of the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>continue as Commissioner of Police because of this interference?</li> <li>A. No, not at all. Quite the opposite. What we saw was a considerably robust push-back against the GPA process.</li> <li>Q. It was put to you by my learned friend, Mr Wagner, in respect of the meeting at your house on Sunday the 17th of May, that you had, I think his word was, "Concealed"</li> <li>A. Not revealed.</li> <li>Q. Oh, that you did not reveal, not concealed, I beg his pardon, that you did not reveal the 17th of May meeting in paragraph 11 of your third witness statement. Do you remember that?</li> <li>A. That's right.</li> <li>Q. Well, could we turn - and it is true that there is no reference in paragraph 11, but as to</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\end{array} $	<ul> <li>SIR PETER CARUANA: Thank you. I will not be much longer, actually, sir. I just want to deal briefly with - in relation to the HMIC report and resourcing and this idea that the 2016 recommendations were somehow delayed or there was a resources obstacle to their implementation by Mr McGrail, I think you yourself alluded to the viewpoint - this is the end of your terrible day on the 14th of May, do you remember?</li> <li>A. Quite.</li> <li>Q. Could we turn up B1216? Just a bit further down, please. Well, perhaps not, perhaps you were right, the third IM dialogue box there. Yes, so this is Mr McGrail saying, "RGP evolving" and then the sentence that starts three lines down in that dialogue: "Some of the reasons they offer [referring to the Inspectors</li> </ul>
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array}$	<ul> <li>continue as Commissioner of Police because of this interference?</li> <li>A. No, not at all. Quite the opposite. What we saw was a considerably robust push-back against the GPA process.</li> <li>Q. It was put to you by my learned friend, Mr Wagner, in respect of the meeting at your house on Sunday the 17th of May, that you had, I think his word was, "Concealed"</li> <li>A. Not revealed.</li> <li>Q. Oh, that you did not reveal, not concealed, I beg his pardon, that you did not reveal the 17th of May meeting in paragraph 11 of your third witness statement. Do you remember that?</li> <li>A. That's right.</li> <li>Q. Well, could we turn - and it is true that there is no reference in paragraph 11, but as to not revealing, could we turn to B1422 to 1423,</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	<ul> <li>SIR PETER CARUANA: Thank you. I will not be much longer, actually, sir. I just want to deal briefly with - in relation to the HMIC report and resourcing and this idea that the 2016 recommendations were somehow delayed or there was a resources obstacle to their implementation by Mr McGrail, I think you yourself alluded to the viewpoint - this is the end of your terrible day on the 14th of May, do you remember?</li> <li>A. Quite.</li> <li>Q. Could we turn up B1216? Just a bit further down, please. Well, perhaps not, perhaps you were right, the third IM dialogue box there. Yes, so this is Mr McGrail saying, "RGP evolving" and then the sentence that starts three lines down in that dialogue: "Some of the reasons they offer [referring to the Inspectors in their report] is that of resourcing, IT,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>continue as Commissioner of Police because of this interference?</li> <li>A. No, not at all. Quite the opposite. What we saw was a considerably robust push-back against the GPA process.</li> <li>Q. It was put to you by my learned friend, Mr Wagner, in respect of the meeting at your house on Sunday the 17th of May, that you had, I think his word was, "Concealed"</li> <li>A. Not revealed.</li> <li>Q. Oh, that you did not reveal, not concealed, I beg his pardon, that you did not reveal the 17th of May meeting in paragraph 11 of your third witness statement. Do you remember that?</li> <li>A. That's right.</li> <li>Q. Well, could we turn - and it is true that there is no reference in paragraph 11, but as to not revealing, could we turn to B1422 to 1423, at the very bottom of the page?</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	<ul> <li>SIR PETER CARUANA: Thank you. I will not be much longer, actually, sir. I just want to deal briefly with - in relation to the HMIC report and resourcing and this idea that the 2016 recommendations were somehow delayed or there was a resources obstacle to their implementation by Mr McGrail, I think you yourself alluded to the viewpoint - this is the end of your terrible day on the 14th of May, do you remember?</li> <li>A. Quite.</li> <li>Q. Could we turn up B1216? Just a bit further down, please. Well, perhaps not, perhaps you were right, the third IM dialogue box there. Yes, so this is Mr McGrail saying, "RGP evolving" and then the sentence that starts three lines down in that dialogue: "Some of the reasons they offer [referring to the Inspectors in their report] is that of resourcing, IT, infrastructure and other issues." Do you see</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>continue as Commissioner of Police because of this interference?</li> <li>A. No, not at all. Quite the opposite. What we saw was a considerably robust push-back against the GPA process.</li> <li>Q. It was put to you by my learned friend, Mr Wagner, in respect of the meeting at your house on Sunday the 17th of May, that you had, I think his word was, "Concealed"</li> <li>A. Not revealed.</li> <li>Q. Oh, that you did not reveal, not concealed, I beg his pardon, that you did not reveal the 17th of May meeting in paragraph 11 of your third witness statement. Do you remember that?</li> <li>A. That's right.</li> <li>Q. Well, could we turn - and it is true that there is no reference in paragraph 11, but as to not revealing, could we turn to B1422 to 1423, at the very bottom of the page?</li> <li>A. This is where we are agreeing that James is</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	<ul> <li>SIR PETER CARUANA: Thank you. I will not be much longer, actually, sir. I just want to deal briefly with - in relation to the HMIC report and resourcing and this idea that the 2016 recommendations were somehow delayed or there was a resources obstacle to their implementation by Mr McGrail, I think you yourself alluded to the viewpoint - this is the end of your terrible day on the 14th of May, do you remember?</li> <li>A. Quite.</li> <li>Q. Could we turn up B1216? Just a bit further down, please. Well, perhaps not, perhaps you were right, the third IM dialogue box there. Yes, so this is Mr McGrail saying, "RGP evolving" and then the sentence that starts three lines down in that dialogue: "Some of the reasons they offer [referring to the Inspectors in their report] is that of resourcing, IT, infrastructure and other issues." Do you see that?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>continue as Commissioner of Police because of this interference?</li> <li>A. No, not at all. Quite the opposite. What we saw was a considerably robust push-back against the GPA process.</li> <li>Q. It was put to you by my learned friend, Mr Wagner, in respect of the meeting at your house on Sunday the 17th of May, that you had, I think his word was, "Concealed"</li> <li>A. Not revealed.</li> <li>Q. Oh, that you did not reveal, not concealed, I beg his pardon, that you did not reveal the 17th of May meeting in paragraph 11 of your third witness statement. Do you remember that?</li> <li>A. That's right.</li> <li>Q. Well, could we turn - and it is true that there is no reference in paragraph 11, but as to not revealing, could we turn to B1422 to 1423, at the very bottom of the page?</li> <li>A. This is where we are agreeing that James is going to be collected by Lewis to come to my</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	<ul> <li>SIR PETER CARUANA: Thank you. I will not be much longer, actually, sir. I just want to deal briefly with - in relation to the HMIC report and resourcing and this idea that the 2016 recommendations were somehow delayed or there was a resources obstacle to their implementation by Mr McGrail, I think you yourself alluded to the viewpoint - this is the end of your terrible day on the 14th of May, do you remember?</li> <li>A. Quite.</li> <li>Q. Could we turn up B1216? Just a bit further down, please. Well, perhaps not, perhaps you were right, the third IM dialogue box there. Yes, so this is Mr McGrail saying, "RGP evolving" and then the sentence that starts three lines down in that dialogue: "Some of the reasons they offer [referring to the Inspectors in their report] is that of resourcing, IT, infrastructure and other issues." Do you see that?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	<ul> <li>continue as Commissioner of Police because of this interference?</li> <li>A. No, not at all. Quite the opposite. What we saw was a considerably robust push-back against the GPA process.</li> <li>Q. It was put to you by my learned friend, Mr Wagner, in respect of the meeting at your house on Sunday the 17th of May, that you had, I think his word was, "Concealed"</li> <li>A. Not revealed.</li> <li>Q. Oh, that you did not reveal, not concealed, I beg his pardon, that you did not reveal the 17th of May meeting in paragraph 11 of your third witness statement. Do you remember that?</li> <li>A. That's right.</li> <li>Q. Well, could we turn - and it is true that there is no reference in paragraph 11, but as to not revealing, could we turn to B1422 to 1423, at the very bottom of the page?</li> <li>A. This is where we are agreeing that James is going to be collected by Lewis to come to my house.</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	<ul> <li>SIR PETER CARUANA: Thank you. I will not be much longer, actually, sir. I just want to deal briefly with - in relation to the HMIC report and resourcing and this idea that the 2016 recommendations were somehow delayed or there was a resources obstacle to their implementation by Mr McGrail, I think you yourself alluded to the viewpoint - this is the end of your terrible day on the 14th of May, do you remember?</li> <li>A. Quite.</li> <li>Q. Could we turn up B1216? Just a bit further down, please. Well, perhaps not, perhaps you were right, the third IM dialogue box there. Yes, so this is Mr McGrail saying, "RGP evolving" and then the sentence that starts three lines down in that dialogue: "Some of the reasons they offer [referring to the Inspectors in their report] is that of resourcing, IT, infrastructure and other issues." Do you see that?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And then shooting down to the bottom of</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>continue as Commissioner of Police because of this interference?</li> <li>A. No, not at all. Quite the opposite. What we saw was a considerably robust push-back against the GPA process.</li> <li>Q. It was put to you by my learned friend, Mr Wagner, in respect of the meeting at your house on Sunday the 17th of May, that you had, I think his word was, "Concealed"</li> <li>A. Not revealed.</li> <li>Q. Oh, that you did not reveal, not concealed, I beg his pardon, that you did not reveal the 17th of May meeting in paragraph 11 of your third witness statement. Do you remember that?</li> <li>A. That's right.</li> <li>Q. Well, could we turn - and it is true that there is no reference in paragraph 11, but as to not revealing, could we turn to B1422 to 1423, at the very bottom of the page?</li> <li>A. This is where we are agreeing that James is going to be collected by Lewis to come to my</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	<ul> <li>SIR PETER CARUANA: Thank you. I will not be much longer, actually, sir. I just want to deal briefly with - in relation to the HMIC report and resourcing and this idea that the 2016 recommendations were somehow delayed or there was a resources obstacle to their implementation by Mr McGrail, I think you yourself alluded to the viewpoint - this is the end of your terrible day on the 14th of May, do you remember?</li> <li>A. Quite.</li> <li>Q. Could we turn up B1216? Just a bit further down, please. Well, perhaps not, perhaps you were right, the third IM dialogue box there. Yes, so this is Mr McGrail saying, "RGP evolving" and then the sentence that starts three lines down in that dialogue: "Some of the reasons they offer [referring to the Inspectors in their report] is that of resourcing, IT, infrastructure and other issues." Do you see that?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>

71 (Pages 281 to 284)

going to use this report?" Do you see that? 1 "But look at this moment..." Do you see ? 1 2 "Are you going to use this report to try to 2 A. Yes. 3 3 lobby for more resources, better resources, Q. "But look at this moment in time the RGP 4 4 more finances from the Gibraltar is well funded. The government has always, 5 Government?" Do you see that? 5 both this one and the previous 6 6 administrations has always supported the A. Yes. 7 Q. And what does Mr McGrail respond to 7 RGP in the funding of, even when we go 8 8 that? over and above our budget for exigencies. 9 9 A. Well, very helpfully, I suppose, it's the So they do not see that as good business 10 10 only good part of my day on the 14th of May, sense. They want to see us managing 11 he said this: "The Government has been very 11 through the police authority the budget 12 ourselves. " Do you think that is a fair supportive towards us, and in fact at the time 12 characterization by Mr McGrail of the 13 when the Inspectors were here in October, we 13 14 14 were already in the middle of that uplift that attitude of successive governments to RGP 15 15 the business case that we submitted to being well-funded? 16 16 Government had produced. So, we are, we've A. It feels almost as if we are in another 17 17 already assumed the first tranche of that uplift place! Yes, but I increase it from 5 million in 18 and there's another two. It was going to be 18 your time to 15 million in mine! 19 19 rolled out over a three year phased out period, Q. Well, yes, a much more generous budget. 20 20 and we're now in the second year." Going to the bottom of that paragraph, 21 (16.15) 21 "Whilst the current..." do you see that? 22 22 Q. Okay, can I turn you now over the page to A. Yes. 23 Mr McGrail's first long answer that starts 23 Q. "Whilst the current structures which are 24 there? Yes, that one. Thank you. And then 24 applied ... " Well, I will not go there because, 25 25 there is a reference there, I am not sure the sorry, that is the devolved funding point and Page 285 Page 287 1 Chairman is particularly interested in the 1 Mr Chairman has that point? 2 differences between our budgeting and the 2 A. I believe, Sir Peter, if it is helpful, there is 3 3 budgeting in the UK. I mean, it might just no issue between the police and the 4 help if you tell the Inquiry that the difference 4 government on that issue. It is just an 5 5 is that for funding for - for parliamentary external view that does not fit in with 6 appropriation purposes the RGP is treated 6 Gibraltar's funding structure. 7 7 like another department of the government. Q. Okay. So, the point that I was putting to 8 8 Is that correct? you is that in May 2000 - sorry, this is----? 9 9 A. That's exactly right. That is what I was A. Two days after he left my office on 12 10 10 trying to communicate yesterday, and in fact May he was still saying that the RGP 11 11 Mr McGrail dealt with the point about this resourcing was not an issue that was stopping 12 recommendation that, I think, Mr Wagner or 12 him from delivering against the HMIC report 13 13 findings, which he later does seek to rely on. Mr Santos put to me in the HMIC report, in 14 the same way using different language to the 14 Q. Yes. Okay. Then whisking through one 15 15 one I used before -or two points that have arisen more recently, 16 16 Q. But there are strict rules and the public and therefore I only have a note and it might 17 17 finance - in the Control and Public just take me a few seconds to retrieve this--18 18 Finance(sic) Act about how - whether Chief Minister, is it fair to say that you were 19 19 monies can or cannot be transferred from one in principle sympathetic to Mr Cornelio and 20 20 Perez starting up in business on their own end of -21 21 THE CHAIRMAN: You are quite right, Sir account? 22 22 Peter. This is -A. Yes, absolutely. 23 23 SIR PETER CARUANA: You understand Q. Was there - that you were aware of - a 24 24 that. Thank you sir. (To the witness) Then discussion taking place between Blands and 25 25 the second - about five or six lines down: Mr Cornelio and Mr Sanchez about the Page 286 Page 288

72 (Pages 285 to 288)

$ \begin{array}{c} 1\\2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\\25\end{array} $	NSCIS contract and how it would work and be managed in the context of them leaving that? A. Well, I was encouraging of Mr Perez and Cornelio, as I am of anybody who wants to establish a business in Gibraltar. I gave them that encouragement before I knew there was any suggestion of Hassans' involvement. In the context of my discussions with them, and - not with them, with Mr Perez, because I have never discussed anything with Mr Cornelio - and with Mr Gaggero, I expected an orderly transition between them because that is what had been presented to me, and Mr Sanchez is involved as a government official who is - that I think I have called in the context of my statement "the gate keeper" or "manager" in that respect of the NCIS(sic) administratively because the front end of the NCIS(sic is used by the Borders and Coastguard Agency, the police, customs etcetera. Q. So, do you recall when you made the decision that the contract would stay with Blands notwithstanding Mr Cornelio's and	<ol> <li>Operation Delhi has not even begun when I</li> <li>say, this contract is not going anywhere; it is</li> <li>staying with Blands. If he gives me an</li> <li>undertaking that they are going to be able to</li> <li>maintain it, and I make that decision there</li> <li>and then.</li> <li>Q. So, when my learned friend Mr Wagner</li> <li>asked you this morning if when the RGP</li> <li>seized Mr James Levy's devices, were you</li> <li>concerned that they would find messages</li> <li>favouring 36 North in them, you had 18</li> <li>months previously severed at least one of the</li> <li>three alleged triple conflicts, the financial</li> <li>one?</li> <li>A. Exactly the point I was trying to make to</li> <li>him.</li> <li>Q. You then had no financial interest with</li> <li>the NSCIS contract?</li> <li>A. That is exactly the point I was trying to</li> <li>make to him. He insisted that I still had a</li> <li>stake, but my point was to say that stake was</li> <li>by that stage entirely neutered by the actions</li> <li>I had taken in respect of the thing which he</li> <li>has put to me during the course of his</li> </ol>
25	Blands notwithstanding Mr Cornelio's and	
	Page 289	Page 291
$ \begin{array}{c} 1\\2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\\25\end{array} $	<ul> <li>Mr Perez's departure?</li> <li>A. In my office in the very moment that James Gaggero raised the issue of potential sabotage, and again it is one of those moments that you remember - just like I remember the 12 May moment with Ian McGrail. I remember the moment when James Gaggero told me that this was potential sabotage, and you know the hairs on the back of my neck went on end, and I decided</li> <li>Q. But do you remember when it was tentatively. If I suggest to you it was October 2018?</li> <li>A. September or October 2018.</li> <li>Q. So, that was when the Operation Delhi investigation was barely off the ground. Is that correct?</li> <li>A. No. If I may say so, I believe that is the day on which James Gaggero also told me, "I think I need to report this to the police."</li> <li>Q. So, he had not yet done so?</li> <li>A. And I said, I think, "If you think you should report this to the police." So,</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Q. At least in respect of the NSCIS contract?</li> <li>A was the thing that 36 North wanted,</li> <li>which was the NSCIS contract. Exactly my</li> <li>point.</li> <li>Q. (After a pause)</li> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: You have got plenty of</li> <li>time. Do you want just to consider your</li> <li>position for a few minutes?</li> <li>SIR PETER CARUANA: I do not think I</li> <li>need to, sir. I just need a few seconds just to</li> <li>decipher my own handwriting. (To the</li> <li>witness) My learned friend Mr Wagner put it</li> <li>to you that your personal connection with the</li> <li>investigation was your interest in 36 North?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Do you recall him putting that to you?</li> <li>A. Yes, I recall that.</li> <li>MR WAGNER: Sorry to interrupt. I do not</li> <li>think I ever put it in those terms.</li> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: You did not put it quite</li> <li>in those terms, but that is the effect of it.</li> <li>MR WAGNER: It is probably fair to say a</li> <li>personal interest, not the personal interest.</li> <li>THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.</li> <li>SIR PETER CARUANA: Was the</li> </ul>
	Page 290	Page 292

73 (Pages 289 to 292)

1	investigation into 36 North - was the	1	said "lobbying" or "pressuring" or whatever?
2	Operation Delhi into 36 North or into Mr	2	A. Yes.
3	Perez, Mr Cornelio and Mr Sanchez?	3	Q. Can we - 1646. Well, just starting at
4	A. In fact, I think it was specifically into Mr	4	1645, you say to the Chief Secretary:
5	Perez, Mr Cornelio and Mr Sanchez, and Mr	5	"Darren, when Joey speaks tomorrow at the
6	Sanchez was a government officer.	6	GPA he is going to explain my views on a
7	Q. Do you have a personal connection with	7	sensitive subject. Your support for me on
8	them?	8	this is key. I have grave grave concerns."
9	A. I have known Mr Perez in the context that	9	Was his answer; Yes, sir, three bags full, sir.
10	I have set out, only in the time that he used to	10	Of course you have my support. I will vote
11	come and see me. I haven't seen him since	11	for you because you have asked me to?
12	then. I have known Mr Sanchez as the	12	A. No, not at all.
13	private secretary to the Deputy Chief	13	Q. What was his answer?
14	Minister, but he is now no longer at No. 6	14	A. He said, a minute later: "I know and they
15	Convent Place and I have never properly met	15	are my concerns to for a whole range of
16	Mr Cornelio at all.	16	reasons. You have this support."
17	Q. Do you have a personal connection with	17	Q. Does it sound to you like the Chief
18	Mr Levey?	18	Secretary felt that he was being directed on
19	A. I do, and one that I have not been shy of	19	how to vote?
20	explaining.	20	A. Not at all.
21	Q. So, is your personal connection with the	21	THE CHAIRMAN: When this exchange
22	investigation your friendship with Mr Levy?	22	was first put to you, you said he was a
23	A. It is.	23	government appointee, which gave me the
24	Q. So, if we could just put up B4747, this is	24	strong impression that you expected him to
25	the half-truth that it was suggested that you	25	do precisely as he was told?
	···· ····· ···· ··· ··· ···· ··· ··· ·		
	Page 293		Page 295
			0
1	had uttered - sorry. C4747, this is the letter	1	
1	had uttered - sorry, C4747, this is the letter	1	A. No. I mean, what I said was that he may
2	of 5 June. Do you remember, that paragraph	2	A. No. I mean, what I said was that he may well
2 3	of 5 June. Do you remember, that paragraph starting, "Let me be absolutely clear	2 3	A. No. I mean, what I said was that he may
2 3 4	of 5 June. Do you remember, that paragraph starting, "Let me be absolutely clear A. Yes.	2 3 4	A. No. I mean, what I said was that he may well MR WAGNER: That is the witness's evidence?
2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>of 5 June. Do you remember, that paragraph starting, "Let me be absolutely clear</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. It was suggested to you by Mr Wagner</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>A. No. I mean, what I said was that he may well</li> <li>MR WAGNER: That is the witness's evidence?</li> <li>A. What I said was that on the first day that I</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>of 5 June. Do you remember, that paragraph starting, "Let me be absolutely clear</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. It was suggested to you by Mr Wagner that given that your personal connection is 36</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>A. No. I mean, what I said was that he may well</li> <li>MR WAGNER: That is the witness's evidence?</li> <li>A. What I said was that on the first day that I was elected, I had a meeting with the then</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>of 5 June. Do you remember, that paragraph starting, "Let me be absolutely clear</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. It was suggested to you by Mr Wagner that given that your personal connection is 36 North, this paragraph is at best a half-truth.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>A. No. I mean, what I said was that he may well</li> <li>MR WAGNER: That is the witness's evidence?</li> <li>A. What I said was that on the first day that I was elected, I had a meeting with the then appointee, who asked me how I expected him</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>of 5 June. Do you remember, that paragraph starting, "Let me be absolutely clear</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. It was suggested to you by Mr Wagner that given that your personal connection is 36 North, this paragraph is at best a half-truth. Do you remember?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>A. No. I mean, what I said was that he may well</li> <li>MR WAGNER: That is the witness's evidence?</li> <li>A. What I said was that on the first day that I was elected, I had a meeting with the then appointee, who asked me how I expected him to vote in respect of the appointment of the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>of 5 June. Do you remember, that paragraph starting, "Let me be absolutely clear</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. It was suggested to you by Mr Wagner that given that your personal connection is 36 North, this paragraph is at best a half-truth. Do you remember?</li> <li>A. Yes, he said that.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A. No. I mean, what I said was that he may well MR WAGNER: That is the witness's evidence?</li> <li>A. What I said was that on the first day that I was elected, I had a meeting with the then appointee, who asked me how I expected him to vote in respect of the appointment of the Commissioner in December 2011, and I told</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>of 5 June. Do you remember, that paragraph starting, "Let me be absolutely clear</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. It was suggested to you by Mr Wagner that given that your personal connection is 36 North, this paragraph is at best a half-truth. Do you remember?</li> <li>A. Yes, he said that.</li> <li>Q. If your personal connection with the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>A. No. I mean, what I said was that he may well MR WAGNER: That is the witness's evidence?</li> <li>A. What I said was that on the first day that I was elected, I had a meeting with the then appointee, who asked me how I expected him to vote in respect of the appointment of the Commissioner in December 2011, and I told him that I wanted him to decide for himself</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>of 5 June. Do you remember, that paragraph starting, "Let me be absolutely clear</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. It was suggested to you by Mr Wagner that given that your personal connection is 36 North, this paragraph is at best a half-truth. Do you remember?</li> <li>A. Yes, he said that.</li> <li>Q. If your personal connection with the investigation was only your friendship with</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>A. No. I mean, what I said was that he may well MR WAGNER: That is the witness's evidence?</li> <li>A. What I said was that on the first day that I was elected, I had a meeting with the then appointee, who asked me how I expected him to vote in respect of the appointment of the Commissioner in December 2011, and I told him that I wanted him to decide for himself once he had heard the interview of the then</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>of 5 June. Do you remember, that paragraph starting, "Let me be absolutely clear</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. It was suggested to you by Mr Wagner that given that your personal connection is 36 North, this paragraph is at best a half-truth. Do you remember?</li> <li>A. Yes, he said that.</li> <li>Q. If your personal connection with the investigation was only your friendship with Mr Levy, is there a half as opposed to a full</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>A. No. I mean, what I said was that he may well MR WAGNER: That is the witness's evidence?</li> <li>A. What I said was that on the first day that I was elected, I had a meeting with the then appointee, who asked me how I expected him to vote in respect of the appointment of the Commissioner in December 2011, and I told him that I wanted him to decide for himself once he had heard the interview of the then Commissioner, and I wouldn't direct him to</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>of 5 June. Do you remember, that paragraph starting, "Let me be absolutely clear</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. It was suggested to you by Mr Wagner that given that your personal connection is 36 North, this paragraph is at best a half-truth. Do you remember?</li> <li>A. Yes, he said that.</li> <li>Q. If your personal connection with the investigation was only your friendship with Mr Levy, is there a half as opposed to a full truth in that paragraph?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A. No. I mean, what I said was that he may well MR WAGNER: That is the witness's evidence?</li> <li>A. What I said was that on the first day that I was elected, I had a meeting with the then appointee, who asked me how I expected him to vote in respect of the appointment of the Commissioner in December 2011, and I told him that I wanted him to decide for himself once he had heard the interview of the then Commissioner, and I wouldn't direct him to vote for Mr X or Mr Y at the time in 2011.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>of 5 June. Do you remember, that paragraph starting, "Let me be absolutely clear</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. It was suggested to you by Mr Wagner that given that your personal connection is 36 North, this paragraph is at best a half-truth. Do you remember?</li> <li>A. Yes, he said that.</li> <li>Q. If your personal connection with the investigation was only your friendship with Mr Levy, is there a half as opposed to a full truth in that paragraph?</li> <li>A. No. I think it is a full truth, and if I may</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A. No. I mean, what I said was that he may well MR WAGNER: That is the witness's evidence?</li> <li>A. What I said was that on the first day that I was elected, I had a meeting with the then appointee, who asked me how I expected him to vote in respect of the appointment of the Commissioner in December 2011, and I told him that I wanted him to decide for himself once he had heard the interview of the then Commissioner, and I wouldn't direct him to vote for Mr X or Mr Y at the time in 2011. SIR PETER CARUANA: The point of my</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>of 5 June. Do you remember, that paragraph starting, "Let me be absolutely clear</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. It was suggested to you by Mr Wagner that given that your personal connection is 36 North, this paragraph is at best a half-truth. Do you remember?</li> <li>A. Yes, he said that.</li> <li>Q. If your personal connection with the investigation was only your friendship with Mr Levy, is there a half as opposed to a full truth in that paragraph?</li> <li>A. No. I think it is a full truth, and if I may say so, I mean I don't want it to be thought</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>A. No. I mean, what I said was that he may well MR WAGNER: That is the witness's evidence?</li> <li>A. What I said was that on the first day that I was elected, I had a meeting with the then appointee, who asked me how I expected him to vote in respect of the appointment of the Commissioner in December 2011, and I told him that I wanted him to decide for himself once he had heard the interview of the then Commissioner, and I wouldn't direct him to vote for Mr X or Mr Y at the time in 2011. SIR PETER CARUANA: The point of my question, Chief Minister, was whether this</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>of 5 June. Do you remember, that paragraph starting, "Let me be absolutely clear</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. It was suggested to you by Mr Wagner that given that your personal connection is 36 North, this paragraph is at best a half-truth. Do you remember?</li> <li>A. Yes, he said that.</li> <li>Q. If your personal connection with the investigation was only your friendship with Mr Levy, is there a half as opposed to a full truth in that paragraph?</li> <li>A. No. I think it is a full truth, and if I may say so, I mean I don't want it to be thought that I am anything other than entirely proud</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ \end{array} $	<ul> <li>A. No. I mean, what I said was that he may well MR WAGNER: That is the witness's evidence?</li> <li>A. What I said was that on the first day that I was elected, I had a meeting with the then appointee, who asked me how I expected him to vote in respect of the appointment of the Commissioner in December 2011, and I told him that I wanted him to decide for himself once he had heard the interview of the then Commissioner, and I wouldn't direct him to vote for Mr X or Mr Y at the time in 2011. SIR PETER CARUANA: The point of my question, Chief Minister, was whether this email indicates fairly that the Chief Secretary</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>of 5 June. Do you remember, that paragraph starting, "Let me be absolutely clear</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. It was suggested to you by Mr Wagner that given that your personal connection is 36 North, this paragraph is at best a half-truth. Do you remember?</li> <li>A. Yes, he said that.</li> <li>Q. If your personal connection with the investigation was only your friendship with Mr Levy, is there a half as opposed to a full truth in that paragraph?</li> <li>A. No. I think it is a full truth, and if I may say so, I mean I don't want it to be thought that I am anything other than entirely proud of my relationship with James Levy, and the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A. No. I mean, what I said was that he may well MR WAGNER: That is the witness's evidence?</li> <li>A. What I said was that on the first day that I was elected, I had a meeting with the then appointee, who asked me how I expected him to vote in respect of the appointment of the Commissioner in December 2011, and I told him that I wanted him to decide for himself once he had heard the interview of the then Commissioner, and I wouldn't direct him to vote for Mr X or Mr Y at the time in 2011. SIR PETER CARUANA: The point of my question, Chief Minister, was whether this email indicates fairly that the Chief Secretary has his own views about Mr McGrail and</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>of 5 June. Do you remember, that paragraph starting, "Let me be absolutely clear</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. It was suggested to you by Mr Wagner that given that your personal connection is 36 North, this paragraph is at best a half-truth. Do you remember?</li> <li>A. Yes, he said that.</li> <li>Q. If your personal connection with the investigation was only your friendship with Mr Levy, is there a half as opposed to a full truth in that paragraph?</li> <li>A. No. I think it is a full truth, and if I may say so, I mean I don't want it to be thought that I am anything other than entirely proud of my relationship with James Levy, and the longevity of it and my association with that</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A. No. I mean, what I said was that he may well MR WAGNER: That is the witness's evidence?</li> <li>A. What I said was that on the first day that I was elected, I had a meeting with the then appointee, who asked me how I expected him to vote in respect of the appointment of the Commissioner in December 2011, and I told him that I wanted him to decide for himself once he had heard the interview of the then Commissioner, and I wouldn't direct him to vote for Mr X or Mr Y at the time in 2011. SIR PETER CARUANA: The point of my question, Chief Minister, was whether this email indicates fairly that the Chief Secretary has his own views about Mr McGrail and how he might vote?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>of 5 June. Do you remember, that paragraph starting, "Let me be absolutely clear</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. It was suggested to you by Mr Wagner that given that your personal connection is 36 North, this paragraph is at best a half-truth. Do you remember?</li> <li>A. Yes, he said that.</li> <li>Q. If your personal connection with the investigation was only your friendship with Mr Levy, is there a half as opposed to a full truth in that paragraph?</li> <li>A. No. I think it is a full truth, and if I may say so, I mean I don't want it to be thought that I am anything other than entirely proud of my relationship with James Levy, and the longevity of it and my association with that firm.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>A. No. I mean, what I said was that he may well MR WAGNER: That is the witness's evidence?</li> <li>A. What I said was that on the first day that I was elected, I had a meeting with the then appointee, who asked me how I expected him to vote in respect of the appointment of the Commissioner in December 2011, and I told him that I wanted him to decide for himself once he had heard the interview of the then Commissioner, and I wouldn't direct him to vote for Mr X or Mr Y at the time in 2011. SIR PETER CARUANA: The point of my question, Chief Minister, was whether this email indicates fairly that the Chief Secretary has his own views about Mr McGrail and how he might vote?</li> <li>A. Absolutely right, and that is the case.</li> </ul>
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array}$	<ul> <li>of 5 June. Do you remember, that paragraph starting, "Let me be absolutely clear</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. It was suggested to you by Mr Wagner that given that your personal connection is 36 North, this paragraph is at best a half-truth. Do you remember?</li> <li>A. Yes, he said that.</li> <li>Q. If your personal connection with the investigation was only your friendship with Mr Levy, is there a half as opposed to a full truth in that paragraph?</li> <li>A. No. I think it is a full truth, and if I may say so, I mean I don't want it to be thought that I am anything other than entirely proud of my relationship with James Levy, and the longevity of it and my association with that firm.</li> <li>Q. Thank you, Chief Minister. Can we turn</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array} $	<ul> <li>A. No. I mean, what I said was that he may well MR WAGNER: That is the witness's evidence?</li> <li>A. What I said was that on the first day that I was elected, I had a meeting with the then appointee, who asked me how I expected him to vote in respect of the appointment of the Commissioner in December 2011, and I told him that I wanted him to decide for himself once he had heard the interview of the then Commissioner, and I wouldn't direct him to vote for Mr X or Mr Y at the time in 2011. SIR PETER CARUANA: The point of my question, Chief Minister, was whether this email indicates fairly that the Chief Secretary has his own views about Mr McGrail and how he might vote?</li> <li>A. Absolutely right, and that is the case. That is the case in relation to how I directed</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>of 5 June. Do you remember, that paragraph starting, "Let me be absolutely clear</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. It was suggested to you by Mr Wagner that given that your personal connection is 36 North, this paragraph is at best a half-truth. Do you remember?</li> <li>A. Yes, he said that.</li> <li>Q. If your personal connection with the investigation was only your friendship with Mr Levy, is there a half as opposed to a full truth in that paragraph?</li> <li>A. No. I think it is a full truth, and if I may say so, I mean I don't want it to be thought that I am anything other than entirely proud of my relationship with James Levy, and the longevity of it and my association with that firm.</li> <li>Q. Thank you, Chief Minister. Can we turn up B1426? This is your exchange of emails</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	<ul> <li>A. No. I mean, what I said was that he may well MR WAGNER: That is the witness's evidence?</li> <li>A. What I said was that on the first day that I was elected, I had a meeting with the then appointee, who asked me how I expected him to vote in respect of the appointment of the Commissioner in December 2011, and I told him that I wanted him to decide for himself once he had heard the interview of the then Commissioner, and I wouldn't direct him to vote for Mr X or Mr Y at the time in 2011. SIR PETER CARUANA: The point of my question, Chief Minister, was whether this email indicates fairly that the Chief Secretary has his own views about Mr McGrail and how he might vote?</li> <li>A. Absolutely right, and that is the case. That is the case in relation to how I directed the acting Chief Secretary in December</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>of 5 June. Do you remember, that paragraph starting, "Let me be absolutely clear</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. It was suggested to you by Mr Wagner that given that your personal connection is 36 North, this paragraph is at best a half-truth. Do you remember?</li> <li>A. Yes, he said that.</li> <li>Q. If your personal connection with the investigation was only your friendship with Mr Levy, is there a half as opposed to a full truth in that paragraph?</li> <li>A. No. I think it is a full truth, and if I may say so, I mean I don't want it to be thought that I am anything other than entirely proud of my relationship with James Levy, and the longevity of it and my association with that firm.</li> <li>Q. Thank you, Chief Minister. Can we turn up B1426? This is your exchange of emails with the Chief Secretary, Mr Grech, who you</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	<ul> <li>A. No. I mean, what I said was that he may well MR WAGNER: That is the witness's evidence?</li> <li>A. What I said was that on the first day that I was elected, I had a meeting with the then appointee, who asked me how I expected him to vote in respect of the appointment of the Commissioner in December 2011, and I told him that I wanted him to decide for himself once he had heard the interview of the then Commissioner, and I wouldn't direct him to vote for Mr X or Mr Y at the time in 2011. SIR PETER CARUANA: The point of my question, Chief Minister, was whether this email indicates fairly that the Chief Secretary has his own views about Mr McGrail and how he might vote?</li> <li>A. Absolutely right, and that is the case. That is the case in relation to how I directed the acting Chief Secretary in December 2011; how Mr Neish reminded me today that</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>of 5 June. Do you remember, that paragraph starting, "Let me be absolutely clear</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. It was suggested to you by Mr Wagner that given that your personal connection is 36 North, this paragraph is at best a half-truth. Do you remember?</li> <li>A. Yes, he said that.</li> <li>Q. If your personal connection with the investigation was only your friendship with Mr Levy, is there a half as opposed to a full truth in that paragraph?</li> <li>A. No. I think it is a full truth, and if I may say so, I mean I don't want it to be thought that I am anything other than entirely proud of my relationship with James Levy, and the longevity of it and my association with that firm.</li> <li>Q. Thank you, Chief Minister. Can we turn up B1426? This is your exchange of emails with the Chief Secretary, Mr Grech, who you were asked questions by my learned friend to</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	<ul> <li>A. No. I mean, what I said was that he may well MR WAGNER: That is the witness's evidence?</li> <li>A. What I said was that on the first day that I was elected, I had a meeting with the then appointee, who asked me how I expected him to vote in respect of the appointment of the Commissioner in December 2011, and I told him that I wanted him to decide for himself once he had heard the interview of the then Commissioner, and I wouldn't direct him to vote for Mr X or Mr Y at the time in 2011. SIR PETER CARUANA: The point of my question, Chief Minister, was whether this email indicates fairly that the Chief Secretary has his own views about Mr McGrail and how he might vote?</li> <li>A. Absolutely right, and that is the case. That is the case in relation to how I directed the acting Chief Secretary in December 2011; how Mr Neish reminded me today that the Chief Secretary at the time of Mr</li> </ul>
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	<ul> <li>of 5 June. Do you remember, that paragraph starting, "Let me be absolutely clear</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. It was suggested to you by Mr Wagner that given that your personal connection is 36 North, this paragraph is at best a half-truth. Do you remember?</li> <li>A. Yes, he said that.</li> <li>Q. If your personal connection with the investigation was only your friendship with Mr Levy, is there a half as opposed to a full truth in that paragraph?</li> <li>A. No. I think it is a full truth, and if I may say so, I mean I don't want it to be thought that I am anything other than entirely proud of my relationship with James Levy, and the longevity of it and my association with that firm.</li> <li>Q. Thank you, Chief Minister. Can we turn up B1426? This is your exchange of emails with the Chief Secretary, Mr Grech, who you were asked questions by my learned friend to suggest that you might have been</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	<ul> <li>A. No. I mean, what I said was that he may well MR WAGNER: That is the witness's evidence?</li> <li>A. What I said was that on the first day that I was elected, I had a meeting with the then appointee, who asked me how I expected him to vote in respect of the appointment of the Commissioner in December 2011, and I told him that I wanted him to decide for himself once he had heard the interview of the then Commissioner, and I wouldn't direct him to vote for Mr X or Mr Y at the time in 2011. SIR PETER CARUANA: The point of my question, Chief Minister, was whether this email indicates fairly that the Chief Secretary has his own views about Mr McGrail and how he might vote?</li> <li>A. Absolutely right, and that is the case. That is the case in relation to how I directed the acting Chief Secretary in December 2011; how Mr Neish reminded me today that the Chief Secretary at the time of Mr McGrail's appointment voted. He did not ask</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>of 5 June. Do you remember, that paragraph starting, "Let me be absolutely clear</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. It was suggested to you by Mr Wagner that given that your personal connection is 36 North, this paragraph is at best a half-truth. Do you remember?</li> <li>A. Yes, he said that.</li> <li>Q. If your personal connection with the investigation was only your friendship with Mr Levy, is there a half as opposed to a full truth in that paragraph?</li> <li>A. No. I think it is a full truth, and if I may say so, I mean I don't want it to be thought that I am anything other than entirely proud of my relationship with James Levy, and the longevity of it and my association with that firm.</li> <li>Q. Thank you, Chief Minister. Can we turn up B1426? This is your exchange of emails with the Chief Secretary, Mr Grech, who you were asked questions by my learned friend to</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	<ul> <li>A. No. I mean, what I said was that he may well MR WAGNER: That is the witness's evidence?</li> <li>A. What I said was that on the first day that I was elected, I had a meeting with the then appointee, who asked me how I expected him to vote in respect of the appointment of the Commissioner in December 2011, and I told him that I wanted him to decide for himself once he had heard the interview of the then Commissioner, and I wouldn't direct him to vote for Mr X or Mr Y at the time in 2011. SIR PETER CARUANA: The point of my question, Chief Minister, was whether this email indicates fairly that the Chief Secretary has his own views about Mr McGrail and how he might vote?</li> <li>A. Absolutely right, and that is the case. That is the case in relation to how I directed the acting Chief Secretary in December 2011; how Mr Neish reminded me today that the Chief Secretary at the time of Mr</li> </ul>

74 (Pages 293 to 296)

1	interview process and he voted as he believe	1	involving the government, the police, the
2	was appropriate; and how Mr Grech reacted	2	Port Authority, MoD Gibraltar and the
3	in the context of how he was going to	3	command of British Forces etcetera. All of
4	approach matters the following day after my	4	us maintained that confidentiality. Nobody
5	statement to him.	5	needed to tell the other that there were issues
6	Q. Did either of you think that this	6	that could not be shared widely.
7	WhatsApp exchange would ever see the light	7	Q. Are you effectively saying that when
8	of day?	8	people report to you as Chief Minister,
9	A. No, not at all.	9	depending on the context, sometimes things
10	Q. So, do you think that Mr Grech felt any	10	will plainly be confidential and it is not
11	great need to window-dress this for external	11	necessary for you to agree explicitly
12	appearances?	12	beforehand that that confidence should be
13	A. Not at all.	13	kept?
14	SIR PETER CARUANA: Thank you, sir.	14	A. That's right, but I also operate on the
15	MR SANTOS: A few short points.	15	basis, and you will see that I have said this on
16	THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.	16	a number of occasions, that the information
17	FURTHER QUESTIONED BY MR	17	that is provided to me is provided to me in
18	SANTOS	18	my capacity as the representative of the
19	MR SANTOS: Just focusing on that, that	19	people, and that the people should have
20	was before the meeting, the GPA meeting.	20	information, and that is why our rule on
21	How was Mr Grech aware of what your	21	maintaining of documents is not like rules in
22	concerns were at that stage?	22	the UK, and we believe that documents
23	A. I don't know. He may have spoken to	23	should be public as soon as possible and not
24	Joey already, but I know that they were and	24	wait for 30 years to pass.
25	are very close. I mean they've both been	25	Q. Is it not the case that the DPP's advice
			~
	Page 297		Page 299
1		1	
1	directors of education I think successive	1	was precisely the type of information that did
2	directors of education.	2	not require explicit description as
3	Q. Are you saying he was not aware from you?	3 4	confidential information?
4	•	5	A. As you can imagine, Mr Santos, I don't
5	A. He may have been but I cannot recall, other than this exchange having direct	6	agree with your view because I took a completely different view at the time because
6 7		7	· ·
7	exchanges with the Chief Secretary in respect of this matter. Otherwise, I would have	8	those who were sharing that information with me should have known that I was not minded
8 9	referred him to the fact that we had had	9	to keep it confidential. This was a looming
10		10	and important issue in town because of the,
10	discussions already. Q. On another topic, you would accept that	10	first of all, jurisdictional consequence for
11	in some circumstances confidentiality is	12	Gibraltar outside of the jurisdiction, and the
12	simply implied. For example, if you turn up	12	÷
	at a restaurant table and find somebody's	13	consequences inside the jurisdiction too, and therefore I was - as I said, I have used the
14 15	bank statement or medical records on the	14	word "evangelising" to represent talking to
		16	
16			
16 17	table, that does not entitle you to share them		everyone that was raising it with me about
17	with Mr Smith, for example?	17	the circumstances that had given rise to the
17 18	with Mr Smith, for example? A. I accept that and there are certain	17 18	the circumstances that had given rise to the execution of that search warrant, which I
17 18 19	with Mr Smith, for example? A. I accept that and there are certain circumstances where information has been	17 18 19	the circumstances that had given rise to the execution of that search warrant, which I have repeatedly said I felt was abusive.
17 18 19 20	with Mr Smith, for example? A. I accept that and there are certain circumstances where information has been shared with me where, even though there has	17 18 19 20	<ul><li>the circumstances that had given rise to the execution of that search warrant, which I have repeatedly said I felt was abusive.</li><li>Q. At the time that you were told about this,</li></ul>
17 18 19 20 21	with Mr Smith, for example? A. I accept that and there are certain circumstances where information has been shared with me where, even though there has not been an explicit reference for the need for	17 18 19 20 21	<ul><li>the circumstances that had given rise to the execution of that search warrant, which I have repeatedly said I felt was abusive.</li><li>Q. At the time that you were told about this, we have seen the WhatsApp exchanges that</li></ul>
17 18 19 20 21 22	with Mr Smith, for example? A. I accept that and there are certain circumstances where information has been shared with me where, even though there has not been an explicit reference for the need for confidentiality, I have maintained the	17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul><li>the circumstances that had given rise to the execution of that search warrant, which I have repeatedly said I felt was abusive.</li><li>Q. At the time that you were told about this, we have seen the WhatsApp exchanges that was the afternoon of 12 May. It was not vox</li></ul>
17 18 19 20 21 22 23	with Mr Smith, for example? A. I accept that and there are certain circumstances where information has been shared with me where, even though there has not been an explicit reference for the need for confidentiality, I have maintained the confidentiality that I appreciated was	17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>the circumstances that had given rise to the execution of that search warrant, which I have repeatedly said I felt was abusive.</li> <li>Q. At the time that you were told about this, we have seen the WhatsApp exchanges that was the afternoon of 12 May. It was not vox populi, (to use your term). I am not familiar</li> </ul>
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	with Mr Smith, for example? A. I accept that and there are certain circumstances where information has been shared with me where, even though there has not been an explicit reference for the need for confidentiality, I have maintained the confidentiality that I appreciated was required. For example, I gave the case of the	17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	the circumstances that had given rise to the execution of that search warrant, which I have repeatedly said I felt was abusive. Q. At the time that you were told about this, we have seen the WhatsApp exchanges that was the afternoon of 12 May. It was not vox populi, (to use your term). I am not familiar with that
17 18 19 20 21 22 23	with Mr Smith, for example? A. I accept that and there are certain circumstances where information has been shared with me where, even though there has not been an explicit reference for the need for confidentiality, I have maintained the confidentiality that I appreciated was	17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>the circumstances that had given rise to the execution of that search warrant, which I have repeatedly said I felt was abusive.</li> <li>Q. At the time that you were told about this, we have seen the WhatsApp exchanges that was the afternoon of 12 May. It was not vox populi, (to use your term). I am not familiar</li> </ul>
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	with Mr Smith, for example? A. I accept that and there are certain circumstances where information has been shared with me where, even though there has not been an explicit reference for the need for confidentiality, I have maintained the confidentiality that I appreciated was required. For example, I gave the case of the	17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	the circumstances that had given rise to the execution of that search warrant, which I have repeatedly said I felt was abusive. Q. At the time that you were told about this, we have seen the WhatsApp exchanges that was the afternoon of 12 May. It was not vox populi, (to use your term). I am not familiar with that

75 (Pages 297 to 300)

1 answer for a moment. If there is an 1 after this was that in fact the DPP had not 2 2 important issue in town and that was a advised. So, the correct position - the 3 sufficient reason to justify not keeping things 3 corrected position --4 4 confidential, that would... Let us say that Q. I accept that and --? 5 there is a terrorist shooting. That would be 5 A. That is what I felt free to be able to say, 6 an important issue in town, and the DPP tells 6 that he had not advised - and in fact, having 7 the Attorney General his advice on the matter 7 advised against... Even if I had said, and it is 8 in your presence, your justification for 8 possible that I did because of the particular 9 publicizing it would be that it is an important 9 time, that is the misapprehension under 10 issue in town. That cannot be right? 10 which I laboured for some time (it may have 11 11 A. No. It can't be right and it is not what I been hours or longer) that he advised against 12 am saying, and there are certain 12 is not to disclose the advice that he gave. 13 circumstances in which information has to be 13 That is to say there was no detail of the 14 14 kept confidential, which is what I am saying advice there, or why he advised against and 15 15 to Mr Santos, and agreeing with his earlier what that advice was. But I take the view, 16 16 position, and there are certain things that in and I believe I am totally free to take this 17 17 my view do not have to remain confidential. view, that I am able to share that with 18 The point I was going to make in reply to Mr 18 members of the public. Indeed, there are 19 19 Santos was that here we were not dealing circumstances when it would be appropriate 20 20 with advice. We were dealing with the for me not to share information, advice 21 absence of advice, and the key point for me 21 etcetera, and circumstances where it would 22 22 be appropriate. In the vast majority, it should was I wasn't sharing, and I gave the example 23 of a case I have imagined, which was R v 23 be appropriate for the government to disclose 24 24 Picardo, in order not to muddy the waters. information that it has at its disposal. 25 25 This was not the DPP saying to the Attorney Q. The letter from Hassans to--Page 301 Page 303 1 General: No. I have advised that in R v 1 A. There is a note from Ms Gallagher Picardo, the finding is that you cannot 2 2 coming through. 3 3 execute a search warrant in these Q. Yes, I-- The letter from Hassans to the 4 4 Attorney General or to the RGP is on 15 circumstances, but you can in these - and 5 5 that is the logic that we relied on, and I then May, I believe. I am just finding it here. 6 went on to share that legal advice. That was 6 C3802. This is the letter from Hassans to the 7 7 not the case. What we had was that the DPP Attorney General, and it is the final line on 8 had not given advice, or was not asked for 8 that page. "There can be little surprise that as 9 9 advice, and that is what I thought I was free we believe is the case the DPP advised the 10 10 Commissioner against the making of these to share. 11 MR SANTOS: I am sorry, but if we can look applications." Putting to one side the word 11 12 at B1417, the text that you receive from the 12 "strongly", the essence of the DPP's advice, 13 Attorney General is the second one - the 13 i.e. "against" is what finds its way into this 14 14 second WhatsApp message: "Spoken to letter, and that can only have come from 15 DPP. He is categorical that whilst he told the 15 either the AG or from you. Is that not 16 RGP that an interview with JL would likely 16 correct? 17 be necessary, he strongly advised against a 17 A. I think we went through this yesterday 18 search warrant."? 18 and I agreed with you at the time. 19 19 A. Yes. Q. Is it not the case that privilege in that 20 20 O. That is advice? information would sit with the client and not 21 21 A. But that was quickly corrected. with the DPP or the AG, and therefore it 22 22 would be for the RGP to waive that privilege Q. Not by the time of Hassans letter of that 23 evening which said, without the "strongly" 23 and not for the DPP or the AG? 24 24 says pretty much the same? A. That is a legal question. I am here to 25 A. But what I was left with very quickly 25 answer questions of fact. As you can Page 302 Page 304

Epiq Europe Ltd +44 (0) 207 404 1400 www.epiqglobal.com Lower Ground Floor, 46 Chancery Lane casemanagers@epiqglobal.com London, WC2A 1JE

76 (Pages 301 to 304)

1	imagine, I could probably work out what the	1	Q. I am just correcting. You said you had
2	answer is if I had time to look at the books.	2	nothing to do with the investigation, and I
3	But it was shared with me and I am neither	3	just wanted to make that point clear.
4	the Attorney General nor the RGP.	4	A. I know, but I think that is - yes, that is
5	THE CHAIRMAN: I think the objection to	5	not to have anything to do with the
6	that question is well known.	6	investigation. This was a public statement
7	MR SANTOS: I think, let us move to the	7	and it was a public intervention in that
8	next question. A couple of short questions	8	respect, but nothing to do with the
9	on the job offers. Is it correct to say that	9	investigation.
10	when RGP officers are moved to, say the	10	Q. I do not want to get into an argument
11	Gibraltar Development Corporation they are	11	over semantics at 4.40 on a Friday. All I am
12	not transferred out but rather resign as police	12	pointing out is - and I would like to make my
13	officers and then are newly employed by the	13	question without being interrupted - is that -
14	relevant department?	14	whatever we want to call it, you did have that
15	A. I think that is correct in the context of	15	communication with the Chief Secretary, and
16	how their employment is structured, but the	16	the Chief Secretary with the police in
17	pension, for example, continues straight	17	September 2020. That is all I wanted to
18	through. So, there is a continuation of	18	point out?
19	employment under the Crown. It is because	19	A. My answer is that that is not in any way
20	of the nature of the RGP, I think, that they	20	an interference with the investigation.
21	resign from one. It is also the case when you	21	Q. And that was not my suggestion?
22	go from being a civil servant going to the	22	A. But first of all - well, I am afraid that that
23	GDC, that you have to resign from the civil	23	is how I took your question, because
24	service whilst then continuing your	24	Q. Well, you can take it I am happy to
25	employment in the GDC, but your pension	25	clarify it.
	Page 305		Page 307
1	would continue straight through The same	1	$\Lambda_{}$ because you just an order it to the
1	would continue straight through. The same	1	A because you juxtaposed it to the
2	would be true if you went in the other	2	reference that I had made to not interfering
2 3	would be true if you went in the other direction, but entry into the civil service is	2 3	reference that I had made to not interfering with the investigation.
2 3 4	would be true if you went in the other direction, but entry into the civil service is only through the Services Commission and	2 3 4	<ul><li>reference that I had made to not interfering with the investigation.</li><li>Q. No. I said you said you had nothing to do</li></ul>
2 3 4 5	would be true if you went in the other direction, but entry into the civil service is only through the Services Commission and not through the GDC.	2 3 4 5	<ul><li>reference that I had made to not interfering with the investigation.</li><li>Q. No. I said you said you had nothing to do with the investigation.</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6	<ul><li>would be true if you went in the other</li><li>direction, but entry into the civil service is</li><li>only through the Services Commission and</li><li>not through the GDC.</li><li>Q. When you receive reports from potential</li></ul>	2 3 4 5 6	<ul><li>reference that I had made to not interfering with the investigation.</li><li>Q. No. I said you said you had nothing to do with the investigation.</li><li>A. I had nothing to do with the investigation.</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>would be true if you went in the other</li> <li>direction, but entry into the civil service is</li> <li>only through the Services Commission and</li> <li>not through the GDC.</li> <li>Q. When you receive reports from potential</li> <li>whistle-blowers, did you ever suggest that</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>reference that I had made to not interfering with the investigation.</li> <li>Q. No. I said you said you had nothing to do with the investigation.</li> <li>A. I had nothing to do with the investigation.</li> <li>Q. That is the only point?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>would be true if you went in the other direction, but entry into the civil service is only through the Services Commission and not through the GDC.</li> <li>Q. When you receive reports from potential whistle-blowers, did you ever suggest that they also report the matter to the RGP for</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>reference that I had made to not interfering with the investigation.</li> <li>Q. No. I said you said you had nothing to do with the investigation.</li> <li>A. I had nothing to do with the investigation.</li> <li>Q. That is the only point?</li> <li>A. This was a public statement about the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>would be true if you went in the other direction, but entry into the civil service is only through the Services Commission and not through the GDC.</li> <li>Q. When you receive reports from potential whistle-blowers, did you ever suggest that they also report the matter to the RGP for criminal investigation?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>reference that I had made to not interfering with the investigation.</li> <li>Q. No. I said you said you had nothing to do with the investigation.</li> <li>A. I had nothing to do with the investigation.</li> <li>Q. That is the only point?</li> <li>A. This was a public statement about the investigation, not the investigation.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>would be true if you went in the other direction, but entry into the civil service is only through the Services Commission and not through the GDC.</li> <li>Q. When you receive reports from potential whistle-blowers, did you ever suggest that they also report the matter to the RGP for criminal investigation?</li> <li>A. I think my view was that because they</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>reference that I had made to not interfering with the investigation.</li> <li>Q. No. I said you said you had nothing to do with the investigation.</li> <li>A. I had nothing to do with the investigation.</li> <li>Q. That is the only point?</li> <li>A. This was a public statement about the investigation, not the investigation.</li> <li>Q. I was just trying to establish that fact.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>would be true if you went in the other direction, but entry into the civil service is only through the Services Commission and not through the GDC.</li> <li>Q. When you receive reports from potential whistle-blowers, did you ever suggest that they also report the matter to the RGP for criminal investigation?</li> <li>A. I think my view was that because they were in the RGP, the thing to do was to refer</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>reference that I had made to not interfering with the investigation.</li> <li>Q. No. I said you said you had nothing to do with the investigation.</li> <li>A. I had nothing to do with the investigation.</li> <li>Q. That is the only point?</li> <li>A. This was a public statement about the investigation, not the investigation.</li> <li>Q. I was just trying to establish that fact.</li> <li>We can move on.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>would be true if you went in the other direction, but entry into the civil service is only through the Services Commission and not through the GDC.</li> <li>Q. When you receive reports from potential whistle-blowers, did you ever suggest that they also report the matter to the RGP for criminal investigation?</li> <li>A. I think my view was that because they were in the RGP, the thing to do was to refer matters to the Tribunal for the Tribunal to</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>reference that I had made to not interfering with the investigation.</li> <li>Q. No. I said you said you had nothing to do with the investigation.</li> <li>A. I had nothing to do with the investigation.</li> <li>Q. That is the only point?</li> <li>A. This was a public statement about the investigation, not the investigation.</li> <li>Q. I was just trying to establish that fact.</li> <li>We can move on.</li> <li>A. I know it's been a long week, but by the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>would be true if you went in the other direction, but entry into the civil service is only through the Services Commission and not through the GDC.</li> <li>Q. When you receive reports from potential whistle-blowers, did you ever suggest that they also report the matter to the RGP for criminal investigation?</li> <li>A. I think my view was that because they were in the RGP, the thing to do was to refer matters to the Tribunal for the Tribunal to make the decision on what should happen.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>reference that I had made to not interfering with the investigation.</li> <li>Q. No. I said you said you had nothing to do with the investigation.</li> <li>A. I had nothing to do with the investigation.</li> <li>Q. That is the only point?</li> <li>A. This was a public statement about the investigation, not the investigation.</li> <li>Q. I was just trying to establish that fact.</li> <li>We can move on.</li> <li>A. I know it's been a long week, but by the way, it is only Tuesday.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>would be true if you went in the other direction, but entry into the civil service is only through the Services Commission and not through the GDC.</li> <li>Q. When you receive reports from potential whistle-blowers, did you ever suggest that they also report the matter to the RGP for criminal investigation?</li> <li>A. I think my view was that because they were in the RGP, the thing to do was to refer matters to the Tribunal for the Tribunal to make the decision on what should happen.</li> <li>Q. You gave evidence that you had nothing</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>reference that I had made to not interfering with the investigation.</li> <li>Q. No. I said you said you had nothing to do with the investigation.</li> <li>A. I had nothing to do with the investigation.</li> <li>Q. That is the only point?</li> <li>A. This was a public statement about the investigation, not the investigation.</li> <li>Q. I was just trying to establish that fact.</li> <li>We can move on.</li> <li>A. I know it's been a long week, but by the way, it is only Tuesday.</li> <li>Q. The 17 May meeting: you make the point</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>would be true if you went in the other direction, but entry into the civil service is only through the Services Commission and not through the GDC.</li> <li>Q. When you receive reports from potential whistle-blowers, did you ever suggest that they also report the matter to the RGP for criminal investigation?</li> <li>A. I think my view was that because they were in the RGP, the thing to do was to refer matters to the Tribunal for the Tribunal to make the decision on what should happen.</li> <li>Q. You gave evidence that you had nothing to do with the operation and investigation</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>reference that I had made to not interfering with the investigation.</li> <li>Q. No. I said you said you had nothing to do with the investigation.</li> <li>A. I had nothing to do with the investigation.</li> <li>Q. That is the only point?</li> <li>A. This was a public statement about the investigation, not the investigation.</li> <li>Q. I was just trying to establish that fact.</li> <li>We can move on.</li> <li>A. I know it's been a long week, but by the way, it is only Tuesday.</li> <li>Q. The 17 May meeting: you make the point that in your third affidavit you exhibited the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>would be true if you went in the other direction, but entry into the civil service is only through the Services Commission and not through the GDC.</li> <li>Q. When you receive reports from potential whistle-blowers, did you ever suggest that they also report the matter to the RGP for criminal investigation?</li> <li>A. I think my view was that because they were in the RGP, the thing to do was to refer matters to the Tribunal for the Tribunal to make the decision on what should happen.</li> <li>Q. You gave evidence that you had nothing to do with the operation and investigation between January and October 2020. Would</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ \end{array} $	<ul> <li>reference that I had made to not interfering with the investigation.</li> <li>Q. No. I said you said you had nothing to do with the investigation.</li> <li>A. I had nothing to do with the investigation.</li> <li>Q. That is the only point?</li> <li>A. This was a public statement about the investigation, not the investigation.</li> <li>Q. I was just trying to establish that fact.</li> <li>We can move on.</li> <li>A. I know it's been a long week, but by the way, it is only Tuesday.</li> <li>Q. The 17 May meeting: you make the point that in your third affidavit you exhibited the text messages with Mr Baglietto which, for</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>would be true if you went in the other direction, but entry into the civil service is only through the Services Commission and not through the GDC.</li> <li>Q. When you receive reports from potential whistle-blowers, did you ever suggest that they also report the matter to the RGP for criminal investigation?</li> <li>A. I think my view was that because they were in the RGP, the thing to do was to refer matters to the Tribunal for the Tribunal to make the decision on what should happen.</li> <li>Q. You gave evidence that you had nothing to do with the operation and investigation between January and October 2020. Would you accept, however, that in September 2020</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ \end{array} $	<ul> <li>reference that I had made to not interfering with the investigation.</li> <li>Q. No. I said you said you had nothing to do with the investigation.</li> <li>A. I had nothing to do with the investigation.</li> <li>Q. That is the only point?</li> <li>A. This was a public statement about the investigation, not the investigation.</li> <li>Q. I was just trying to establish that fact.</li> <li>We can move on.</li> <li>A. I know it's been a long week, but by the way, it is only Tuesday.</li> <li>Q. The 17 May meeting: you make the point that in your third affidavit you exhibited the text messages with Mr Baglietto which, for the first time, revealed that meeting on 17</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>would be true if you went in the other direction, but entry into the civil service is only through the Services Commission and not through the GDC.</li> <li>Q. When you receive reports from potential whistle-blowers, did you ever suggest that they also report the matter to the RGP for criminal investigation?</li> <li>A. I think my view was that because they were in the RGP, the thing to do was to refer matters to the Tribunal for the Tribunal to make the decision on what should happen.</li> <li>Q. You gave evidence that you had nothing to do with the operation and investigation between January and October 2020. Would you accept, however, that in September 2020 you did intervene in response to an RGP</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>reference that I had made to not interfering with the investigation.</li> <li>Q. No. I said you said you had nothing to do with the investigation.</li> <li>A. I had nothing to do with the investigation.</li> <li>Q. That is the only point?</li> <li>A. This was a public statement about the investigation, not the investigation.</li> <li>Q. I was just trying to establish that fact.</li> <li>We can move on.</li> <li>A. I know it's been a long week, but by the way, it is only Tuesday.</li> <li>Q. The 17 May meeting: you make the point that in your third affidavit you exhibited the text messages with Mr Baglietto which, for the first time, revealed that meeting on 17 May. Why did you not reveal in your first</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>would be true if you went in the other direction, but entry into the civil service is only through the Services Commission and not through the GDC.</li> <li>Q. When you receive reports from potential whistle-blowers, did you ever suggest that they also report the matter to the RGP for criminal investigation?</li> <li>A. I think my view was that because they were in the RGP, the thing to do was to refer matters to the Tribunal for the Tribunal to make the decision on what should happen.</li> <li>Q. You gave evidence that you had nothing to do with the operation and investigation between January and October 2020. Would you accept, however, that in September 2020 you did intervene in response to an RGP press statement as you said yesterday to</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>reference that I had made to not interfering with the investigation.</li> <li>Q. No. I said you said you had nothing to do with the investigation.</li> <li>A. I had nothing to do with the investigation.</li> <li>Q. That is the only point?</li> <li>A. This was a public statement about the investigation, not the investigation.</li> <li>Q. I was just trying to establish that fact.</li> <li>We can move on.</li> <li>A. I know it's been a long week, but by the way, it is only Tuesday.</li> <li>Q. The 17 May meeting: you make the point that in your third affidavit you exhibited the text messages with Mr Baglietto which, for the first time, revealed that meeting on 17 May. Why did you not reveal in your first affidavit in response to our letter - the</li> </ul>
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array}$	<ul> <li>would be true if you went in the other direction, but entry into the civil service is only through the Services Commission and not through the GDC.</li> <li>Q. When you receive reports from potential whistle-blowers, did you ever suggest that they also report the matter to the RGP for criminal investigation?</li> <li>A. I think my view was that because they were in the RGP, the thing to do was to refer matters to the Tribunal for the Tribunal to make the decision on what should happen.</li> <li>Q. You gave evidence that you had nothing to do with the operation and investigation between January and October 2020. Would you accept, however, that in September 2020 you did intervene in response to an RGP press statement as you said yesterday to clarify that the government should not be</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array} $	<ul> <li>reference that I had made to not interfering with the investigation.</li> <li>Q. No. I said you said you had nothing to do with the investigation.</li> <li>A. I had nothing to do with the investigation.</li> <li>Q. That is the only point?</li> <li>A. This was a public statement about the investigation, not the investigation.</li> <li>Q. I was just trying to establish that fact.</li> <li>We can move on.</li> <li>A. I know it's been a long week, but by the way, it is only Tuesday.</li> <li>Q. The 17 May meeting: you make the point that in your third affidavit you exhibited the text messages with Mr Baglietto which, for the first time, revealed that meeting on 17 May. Why did you not reveal in your first affidavit in response to our letter - the Inquiry's letter of 4 April 2022 where we</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>would be true if you went in the other direction, but entry into the civil service is only through the Services Commission and not through the GDC.</li> <li>Q. When you receive reports from potential whistle-blowers, did you ever suggest that they also report the matter to the RGP for criminal investigation?</li> <li>A. I think my view was that because they were in the RGP, the thing to do was to refer matters to the Tribunal for the Tribunal to make the decision on what should happen.</li> <li>Q. You gave evidence that you had nothing to do with the operation and investigation between January and October 2020. Would you accept, however, that in September 2020 you did intervene in response to an RGP press statement as you said yesterday to clarify that the government should not be considered a complainant without seeing</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	<ul> <li>reference that I had made to not interfering with the investigation.</li> <li>Q. No. I said you said you had nothing to do with the investigation.</li> <li>A. I had nothing to do with the investigation.</li> <li>Q. That is the only point?</li> <li>A. This was a public statement about the investigation, not the investigation.</li> <li>Q. I was just trying to establish that fact.</li> <li>We can move on.</li> <li>A. I know it's been a long week, but by the way, it is only Tuesday.</li> <li>Q. The 17 May meeting: you make the point that in your third affidavit you exhibited the text messages with Mr Baglietto which, for the first time, revealed that meeting on 17 May. Why did you not reveal in your first affidavit in response to our letter - the Inquiry's letter of 4 April 2022 where we asked you for any documents in your</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>would be true if you went in the other direction, but entry into the civil service is only through the Services Commission and not through the GDC.</li> <li>Q. When you receive reports from potential whistle-blowers, did you ever suggest that they also report the matter to the RGP for criminal investigation?</li> <li>A. I think my view was that because they were in the RGP, the thing to do was to refer matters to the Tribunal for the Tribunal to make the decision on what should happen.</li> <li>Q. You gave evidence that you had nothing to do with the operation and investigation between January and October 2020. Would you accept, however, that in September 2020 you did intervene in response to an RGP press statement as you said yesterday to clarify that the government should not be considered a complainant without seeing evidence?</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	<ul> <li>reference that I had made to not interfering with the investigation.</li> <li>Q. No. I said you said you had nothing to do with the investigation.</li> <li>A. I had nothing to do with the investigation.</li> <li>Q. That is the only point?</li> <li>A. This was a public statement about the investigation, not the investigation.</li> <li>Q. I was just trying to establish that fact.</li> <li>We can move on.</li> <li>A. I know it's been a long week, but by the way, it is only Tuesday.</li> <li>Q. The 17 May meeting: you make the point that in your third affidavit you exhibited the text messages with Mr Baglietto which, for the first time, revealed that meeting on 17 May. Why did you not reveal in your first affidavit in response to our letter - the Inquiry's letter of 4 April 2022 where we asked you for any documents in your possession or control relevant to the subject</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>would be true if you went in the other direction, but entry into the civil service is only through the Services Commission and not through the GDC.</li> <li>Q. When you receive reports from potential whistle-blowers, did you ever suggest that they also report the matter to the RGP for criminal investigation?</li> <li>A. I think my view was that because they were in the RGP, the thing to do was to refer matters to the Tribunal for the Tribunal to make the decision on what should happen.</li> <li>Q. You gave evidence that you had nothing to do with the operation and investigation between January and October 2020. Would you accept, however, that in September 2020 you did intervene in response to an RGP press statement as you said yesterday to clarify that the government should not be considered a complainant without seeing evidence?</li> <li>A. Yes, but that is not to interfere in the</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	<ul> <li>reference that I had made to not interfering with the investigation.</li> <li>Q. No. I said you said you had nothing to do with the investigation.</li> <li>A. I had nothing to do with the investigation.</li> <li>Q. That is the only point?</li> <li>A. This was a public statement about the investigation, not the investigation.</li> <li>Q. I was just trying to establish that fact.</li> <li>We can move on.</li> <li>A. I know it's been a long week, but by the way, it is only Tuesday.</li> <li>Q. The 17 May meeting: you make the point that in your third affidavit you exhibited the text messages with Mr Baglietto which, for the first time, revealed that meeting on 17 May. Why did you not reveal in your first affidavit in response to our letter - the Inquiry's letter of 4 April 2022 where we asked you for any documents in your possession or control relevant to the subject matter of the Inquiry? Why did you not</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>would be true if you went in the other direction, but entry into the civil service is only through the Services Commission and not through the GDC.</li> <li>Q. When you receive reports from potential whistle-blowers, did you ever suggest that they also report the matter to the RGP for criminal investigation?</li> <li>A. I think my view was that because they were in the RGP, the thing to do was to refer matters to the Tribunal for the Tribunal to make the decision on what should happen.</li> <li>Q. You gave evidence that you had nothing to do with the operation and investigation between January and October 2020. Would you accept, however, that in September 2020 you did intervene in response to an RGP press statement as you said yesterday to clarify that the government should not be considered a complainant without seeing evidence?</li> <li>A. Yes, but that is not to interfere in the investigation; that is to clarify something</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	<ul> <li>reference that I had made to not interfering with the investigation.</li> <li>Q. No. I said you said you had nothing to do with the investigation.</li> <li>A. I had nothing to do with the investigation.</li> <li>Q. That is the only point?</li> <li>A. This was a public statement about the investigation, not the investigation.</li> <li>Q. I was just trying to establish that fact.</li> <li>We can move on.</li> <li>A. I know it's been a long week, but by the way, it is only Tuesday.</li> <li>Q. The 17 May meeting: you make the point that in your third affidavit you exhibited the text messages with Mr Baglietto which, for the first time, revealed that meeting on 17 May. Why did you not reveal in your first affidavit in response to our letter - the Inquiry's letter of 4 April 2022 where we asked you for any documents in your possession or control relevant to the subject matter of the Inquiry? Why did you not disclose those messages or the meeting in</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>would be true if you went in the other direction, but entry into the civil service is only through the Services Commission and not through the GDC.</li> <li>Q. When you receive reports from potential whistle-blowers, did you ever suggest that they also report the matter to the RGP for criminal investigation?</li> <li>A. I think my view was that because they were in the RGP, the thing to do was to refer matters to the Tribunal for the Tribunal to make the decision on what should happen.</li> <li>Q. You gave evidence that you had nothing to do with the operation and investigation between January and October 2020. Would you accept, however, that in September 2020 you did intervene in response to an RGP press statement as you said yesterday to clarify that the government should not be considered a complainant without seeing evidence?</li> <li>A. Yes, but that is not to interfere in the</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	<ul> <li>reference that I had made to not interfering with the investigation.</li> <li>Q. No. I said you said you had nothing to do with the investigation.</li> <li>A. I had nothing to do with the investigation.</li> <li>Q. That is the only point?</li> <li>A. This was a public statement about the investigation, not the investigation.</li> <li>Q. I was just trying to establish that fact.</li> <li>We can move on.</li> <li>A. I know it's been a long week, but by the way, it is only Tuesday.</li> <li>Q. The 17 May meeting: you make the point that in your third affidavit you exhibited the text messages with Mr Baglietto which, for the first time, revealed that meeting on 17 May. Why did you not reveal in your first affidavit in response to our letter - the Inquiry's letter of 4 April 2022 where we asked you for any documents in your possession or control relevant to the subject matter of the Inquiry? Why did you not</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>would be true if you went in the other direction, but entry into the civil service is only through the Services Commission and not through the GDC.</li> <li>Q. When you receive reports from potential whistle-blowers, did you ever suggest that they also report the matter to the RGP for criminal investigation?</li> <li>A. I think my view was that because they were in the RGP, the thing to do was to refer matters to the Tribunal for the Tribunal to make the decision on what should happen.</li> <li>Q. You gave evidence that you had nothing to do with the operation and investigation between January and October 2020. Would you accept, however, that in September 2020 you did intervene in response to an RGP press statement as you said yesterday to clarify that the government should not be considered a complainant without seeing evidence?</li> <li>A. Yes, but that is not to interfere in the investigation; that is to clarify something</li> </ul>	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	<ul> <li>reference that I had made to not interfering with the investigation.</li> <li>Q. No. I said you said you had nothing to do with the investigation.</li> <li>A. I had nothing to do with the investigation.</li> <li>Q. That is the only point?</li> <li>A. This was a public statement about the investigation, not the investigation.</li> <li>Q. I was just trying to establish that fact.</li> <li>We can move on.</li> <li>A. I know it's been a long week, but by the way, it is only Tuesday.</li> <li>Q. The 17 May meeting: you make the point that in your third affidavit you exhibited the text messages with Mr Baglietto which, for the first time, revealed that meeting on 17 May. Why did you not reveal in your first affidavit in response to our letter - the Inquiry's letter of 4 April 2022 where we asked you for any documents in your possession or control relevant to the subject matter of the Inquiry? Why did you not disclose those messages or the meeting in</li> </ul>

www.epiqglobal.com Lower Ground Floor, 46 Chancery Lane casemanagers@epiqglobal.com London, WC2A 1JE

77 (Pages 305 to 308)

1	A. Well, I think I have dealt with that	1 1 2024)
2		1 May 2024)
	already, but I would just reiterate that there	
3	has been an attempt by myself, by my office,	
4	by my counsel to provide as much	
5	information as possible as soon as possible.	
6	Given how calmly we take these things when	
7	we're sitting here together, it is difficult	
8	perhaps to understand what my day is like	
9	when I'm not sitting in the rarified	
10	environment of the Garrison library. It is	
11	very difficult to spend the time to analyse	
12	things in detail and therefore I have had to	
13	rely on my office and my counsel to assist	
14	me in the preparation of these statements	
15	etcetera, and we have tried to provide as	
16	much as possible as soon as possible. I know	
17	that other parties also have had to provide	
18	further information later as it has come to	
19	light. I tell you genuinely that a lot of	
20	recollection has been assisted by the	
20	electronic communications, because you	
21	simply wouldn't remember. In these days	
22	when we don't have written diaries and we	
23	only have Outlook or we have got one word	
25	of what is going to happen at a particular	
23	or what is going to happen at a particular	
	Page 309	Page 311
1	time, we would not remember otherwise. It	
2	is just impossible or super human to	
3	remember that much without these triggers,	
4	and as these triggers emerge we were able to	
4 5	spend time remembering and writing down,	
-		
6	and as soon as we were able to do that and	
7	time allowed, we have done so as timeously	
8	as possible.	
9	MR SANTOS: Thank you, Chief Minister. I	
10	have no further questions. Thank you for	
11	agreeing to sit a bit later today.	
12	A. Thank you very much.	
13	THE CHAIDMAN. Thenk you your much	
	THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much,	
14	and you are in plenty of time?	
15	and you are in plenty of time? A. Thank you very much. Mr Chairman, is	
15 16	and you are in plenty of time? A. Thank you very much. Mr Chairman, is it appropriate for me to thank everyone	
15 16 17	and you are in plenty of time? A. Thank you very much. Mr Chairman, is it appropriate for me to thank everyone involved in the proceedings for their work,	
15 16 17 18	and you are in plenty of time? A. Thank you very much. Mr Chairman, is it appropriate for me to thank everyone involved in the proceedings for their work, whatever side they may be on, because I am	
15 16 17 18 19	and you are in plenty of time? A. Thank you very much. Mr Chairman, is it appropriate for me to thank everyone involved in the proceedings for their work, whatever side they may be on, because I am sure that this process will be a positive one	
15 16 17 18 19 20	and you are in plenty of time? A. Thank you very much. Mr Chairman, is it appropriate for me to thank everyone involved in the proceedings for their work, whatever side they may be on, because I am sure that this process will be a positive one for Gibraltar. I say nothing more than that.	
15 16 17 18 19	and you are in plenty of time? A. Thank you very much. Mr Chairman, is it appropriate for me to thank everyone involved in the proceedings for their work, whatever side they may be on, because I am sure that this process will be a positive one	
15 16 17 18 19 20	and you are in plenty of time? A. Thank you very much. Mr Chairman, is it appropriate for me to thank everyone involved in the proceedings for their work, whatever side they may be on, because I am sure that this process will be a positive one for Gibraltar. I say nothing more than that.	
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	and you are in plenty of time? A. Thank you very much. Mr Chairman, is it appropriate for me to thank everyone involved in the proceedings for their work, whatever side they may be on, because I am sure that this process will be a positive one for Gibraltar. I say nothing more than that. THE CHAIRMAN: The answer to your	
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	and you are in plenty of time? A. Thank you very much. Mr Chairman, is it appropriate for me to thank everyone involved in the proceedings for their work, whatever side they may be on, because I am sure that this process will be a positive one for Gibraltar. I say nothing more than that. THE CHAIRMAN: The answer to your question is probably not, but you have done it	
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	and you are in plenty of time? A. Thank you very much. Mr Chairman, is it appropriate for me to thank everyone involved in the proceedings for their work, whatever side they may be on, because I am sure that this process will be a positive one for Gibraltar. I say nothing more than that. THE CHAIRMAN: The answer to your question is probably not, but you have done it anyway! (Laughter) Thank you.	
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	and you are in plenty of time? A. Thank you very much. Mr Chairman, is it appropriate for me to thank everyone involved in the proceedings for their work, whatever side they may be on, because I am sure that this process will be a positive one for Gibraltar. I say nothing more than that. THE CHAIRMAN: The answer to your question is probably not, but you have done it anyway! (Laughter) Thank you. (16.44)	

78 (Pages 309 to 311)

•				-
				Page 312
	243:15 247:18	<b>accord</b> 40:24	activity 145:9	193:11 197:16
<u>A</u>	258:2 261:5	account 40:14	ad 12:20 257:12	198:8 199:14
<b>A-2-1</b> 28:17	265:14 266:14	42:3 54:18 57:21	add 30:3 32:19	205:3,7,23 208:4
A1034 73:18	267:24 274:11	79:4 128:3 152:8	33:2 34:6 263:8	208:9,11 209:3,4
A1448 155:7			277:24	
A188 163:1,3	279:20 288:22	262:17 288:21		209:19,19 210:3
A192 109:14	294:3 296:19	<b>accuracy</b> 94:10	added 25:25 26:9	210:4,12 211:1,3
A199 225:1	absurd 170:1	<b>accurate</b> 94:9,16	26:10,11 32:14	211:14 213:3,16
<b>A205</b> 231:12	<b>abuse</b> 57:20,24	94:18 96:7	33:1,22	214:4,5,11,16,21
<b>A207</b> 4:6	64:2 149:11	196:16,17 260:13	adding 29:2,17	229:17,18 230:23
<b>A211</b> 28:16	156:8 213:8	260:15 262:20	additional 26:18	230:24 231:5
A224 159:8,11	abuses 58:5	accurately 200:15	191:15	261:20 264:10
A233 82:6,11	abusive 93:2	200:18	Additionally 26:24	269:19 278:21
A234 145:10,14	300:19	accusation 89:10	27:18 95:16	299:25 301:7,20
A241 263:15	accept 6:17,24	accusations 36:25	109:22	301:21 302:6,8,9
A255 259:13	11:25 31:12 57:4	63:25	additions 26:13	302:20 303:12,14
A256 204:18	61:11,21 71:16	accusatory 147:2	address 26:4 28:24	303:15,20 304:12
A257 264:14	82:23 86:25 93:4	<b>accuse</b> 83:12	35:18 58:11	advise 16:19,20
ability 12:17 23:21	99:25 105:17	accused 90:5	126:12	162:7 190:6,8
38:12 124:7	109:1 121:17	146:23,25 170:2	addressed 31:2	209:12,18 230:15
223:20	124:13 130:25	170:3,5 220:25	34:22	230:17,22 234:14
<b>abject</b> 47:14	133:10 148:7	accusing 88:6	addressing 7:2	279:19
257:20	160:22 161:22	achieve 107:9	Adjourned 74:4	advised 15:1,5,8
able 23:23 29:10	162:11 171:8	164:8,22	310:25	15:13,14,15,20
45:4 46:13,15	189:10 195:17	achieving 107:8	adjournment	15:22 16:7,11
61:25 66:8,8	196:9 197:19,24	acquire 145:3	168:8 250:14	30:17,22 38:2
68:8 70:19 77:1	198:4 202:21	acquitted 246:1	administrations	81:8 82:4,7
90:19 94:10,19	205:4,15 212:10	acrimonious 96:17	287:6	166:23 167:8,12
97:8 103:24	226:25 231:16,20	97:2	administratively	180:25 181:2
124:19 126:11	241:5,19,23	act 17:24 42:25	289:19	184:17,18 189:4
	243:21 246:16,20	44:18,21,25 45:1	admitted 163:12	189:20 190:4,12
140:6 149:1	298:11,18 303:4	55:3 67:15	adopt 10:7 132:21	190:16 198:24
151:9 162:7	306:17	139:13 194:18	adopting 132:19	204:11 206:2,4,5
169:10 188:6	acceptable 133:7	200:3 241:19,21	adoption 132:21	207:3 208:15,16
225:4 237:23	accepted 68:12,13	241:24 249:19	advance 177:16,17	209:15,18 210:9
244:13,22 274:3	161:20 207:5,7	264:20 269:17	advanced 255:11	211:7 226:5
276:14 291:4	207:12	286:18	265:24 268:1,8	228:20 229:5,12
303:5,17 310:4,6	accepting 207:10	acting 7:25 50:25	268:10	230:19 248:8
absence 208:9	accepting 207:10 access 109:4,11	186:25 229:18		302:1,17 303:2,6
209:3,19 255:1,5	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	253:22 269:17	advantageous 237:5	302:1,17 303:2,6 303:7,11,14
301:21	125:23 127:4,6	296:21		303:7,11,14 304:9
absent 73:14	127:11,17,24		advantages 105:14	
absolutely 6:20,24	128:25 129:17	action 125:21	<b>adversarial</b> 239:23 245:9	advising 10:9
19:24 21:15 53:9	130:2,3,7,10,21	176:6 177:5		16:13,14,16 28:7
54:5 67:11,12	130:22 133:14,16	265:9 273:5	adverse 105:15	158:12
71:4 88:18,25	133:18,20 134:9	actions 19:5 21:10	advice 13:10,25	advisor 267:12
148:13,13 152:16	134:10	21:12 56:12	16:11 24:25 28:8	271:19 280:4
163:21 166:12	accessing 127:13	87:21 126:14	28:11 64:7 93:24	affect 12:5
193:5 198:3	accidently 98:15	143:19 186:5	155:15 158:11	<b>affidavit</b> 51:22
212:24 220:11	accommodate	291:22	161:24,25 162:3	145:13 308:15,19
236:24 241:20	37:22 38:3	activated 254:23	172:1 183:4	afford 241:18
	-	-	-	-

www.epiqglobal.com Lov casemanagers@epiqglobal.com

5	1 5			2
				Page 313
242.6	76.10 10 10 01 0	124.11 127.10	188:9	211.5 14 212.12
242:6	76:18,18,19 81:2	134:11 137:19 192:4 274:16		211:5,14 213:12 224:5 239:9
<b>afforded</b> 242:23 <b>afraid</b> 10:17 83:14	81:13 112:15,17		angry 175:3,6,8,10	242:25 243:5
	112:22,22 118:24 119:2 121:8	<b>allocated</b> 250:7 <b>allow</b> 24:15 27:6	175:10,11,16,17 185:24 187:5	272:24 274:8,13
99:18 138:23,25 307:22	139:18 141:13	36:3,10 37:9	191:5 195:6	272.24 274.8,13 274:14,19,21
afternoon 23:3	143:7 145:17	131:15 145:1	214:9	279:4 289:5
51:2 192:14	154:23 259:21	229:6 230:7	anniversary 77:10	anyway 102:5
250:18 300:22	304:18	234:16 275:1	<b>annual</b> 117:19	194:20 310:23
AG 36:17 37:20,21	agreeing 76:22	allowed 18:5,12	annum 105:13	apart 200:24
62:3 193:11	266:17 282:22	60:18 222:24	anonymous	apologies 36:6
205:4 261:21	301:15 310:11	310:7	213:19	apologise 142:5
304:15,21,23	agreement 9:19	allowing 118:6,8	<b>answer</b> 14:18 30:5	apparent 180:16
AG's 38:1 191:6	24:8 105:8	<b>allows</b> 18:13	48:15 56:16 57:4	180:22
279:17	112:13 113:12,14	alluded 68:25	62:1 68:7 69:6	apparently 13:10
age 40:4 41:14	114:10,14,23	164:16 284:9	69:22 79:13,15	221:13
122:16,19,20	115:1,9,10,12	alluding 129:4,11	80:8,12 83:16	appeal 36:22
246:1	117:11 118:25	allusion 29:2,17	105:3 120:1	58:16,21 59:9,12
Agency 289:21	119:11 137:8,9	30:11 266:8	127:8 131:14	63:17
ago 27:25 63:21	248:13 269:22	Alright 57:3	132:1,3,6,9,14,18	<b>appear</b> 41:20
94:15 98:16	280:7	205:21 207:12	133:9 135:17,18	132:11
130:4 141:23	agreements 243:4	210:19 219:10	152:5 163:16	appearances
161:21 226:11	agrees 28:6	alternative 40:19	166:9 169:3	297:12
276:9 278:4	<b>Ah</b> 151:11 153:24	241:21	172:10 178:15	<b>appeared</b> 266:17
agree 11:2 24:3	ahead 28:12	ambit 195:8	179:8 182:17	appears 8:9 23:12
35:12 44:17	178:12 222:12	amended 26:10,11	204:5 210:14	159:21 207:23
54:11,19,23 55:7	275:1	amendment 40:6	222:11 228:14	appertain 211:22
55:8,17 56:13	aide 8:2	amendments	235:19 236:13	appertained
61:18 62:2,15,24	<b>aim</b> 103:14,15	23:14,16 28:9	237:7 238:7,23	194:20 226:20
62:25 69:8 70:11	<b>albeit</b> 256:23	32:18	239:1,18 251:8	application 21:21
79:10 84:13	alert 225:15	amicable 112:20	257:16 277:20	137:25 156:13
86:12 87:3 88:2	alerted 3:18	116:21 118:14	285:23 295:9,13	158:20 165:18
88:4,14 97:24	allegation 27:7	amicably 112:15	301:1 304:25	applications 207:4
99:9,16 102:21	88:13 89:1 90:12	112:17 117:4,5	305:2 307:19	208:17 209:16
110:19 111:14,14	90:17 91:16 92:4	<b>amount</b> 53:1,3	310:21	304:11
113:15,16 116:3	92:7 93:16	105:12 162:9	answered 14:17	applied 12:14
117:2,4,6,6,7,11	135:12 137:22	amounted 160:7	81:4 254:15	129:21 287:24
129:21 136:1,12	246:18,25 249:24	analogy 56:18	answering 167:1	applying 109:5
136:24 140:15,21	255:18 257:25	analyse 54:22	216:14 238:9,11	appointed 20:3
141:1 143:6,12	allegations 13:7	309:11	238:25 239:6	48:11
145:21 151:18	29:9 40:13,15	analysing 30:2	251:19	appointee 21:15
170:7,8 192:18	45:11,15 92:20	analysis 55:21	answers 68:5	295:23 296:7
192:20 253:24	93:6,12 240:10	56:22 144:19	80:11 100:14	appointment
255:20 257:17	246:6,7 249:25	Andy 3:7 79:7	166:18 221:25	47:10,10 48:7
266:12 270:8	alleged 14:22	angel 119:14	222:25	49:17 50:13,19
299:11 300:5	99:20,22 129:25	anger 66:25	<b>anyb</b> 213:11	51:3 186:23
agreeable 38:17	132:4 202:15	175:19 186:7,7	anybody 35:16	257:18 296:8,24
agreed 27:18,22	240:6 245:24	186:25	39:24 107:23	appreciated
28:5 35:8 36:18	291:13	angle 35:4	111:1 115:6	298:23
37:1 48:4,11	allegedly 125:25	angrily 163:12	183:22 185:20	approach 10:8
	-	-	-	-

www.epiqglobal.com Lower Ground F casemanagers@epiqglobal.com

Lower Ground Floor, 46 Chancery Lane m London, WC2A 1JE

5	1 5			5
				Page 314
25.8 100.2	annost 212.21	assault 245.25	194.679105.27	46.10 50.11
35:8 109:3 253:25 270:22	<b>arrest</b> 212:21 278:6	assault 245:25	184:6,7,8 185:2,7	46:10 50:11
		asset 106:5 assets 142:6	190:16,17,23,24	66:17 78:13
297:4	arrested 182:5,5		192:13,23 200:2	233:2 280:19
approached 40:12	<b>arrived</b> 36:12	assist 17:5 24:23	200:4 201:5,17	avoid 47:21
217:22 266:7	aside 114:6 229:7	80:1 98:5 105:22	202:1,2,4,25	114:23 171:15
appropriate 18:3	asked 24:23 26:17	243:23 309:13	203:1,3,7 205:5	227:5
21:9 71:5 121:20	47:15 49:24 54:8	assistance 78:21	205:11,16 206:12	avoided 106:22
149:14 165:5	62:2 66:11 69:15	152:17 196:2	208:23 209:6	aware 18:18,19
166:7,15 197:17	97:4 115:22	235:6	214:10 215:22	29:5 30:24,24
198:9 203:16,20	118:10,20,22	assistant 64:6	216:13,17 226:6	32:24 34:20,23
211:4 234:11,13	122:18 125:9	assisted 130:24	228:19 229:2	48:3,13,14,20,20
240:14 241:11	127:2 130:20	151:7,16 225:6	234:2,21 235:12	50:17,20 51:22
297:2 303:19,22	133:9 139:11	309:20	235:20,25 236:10	51:25 58:17 59:7
303:23 310:16	150:24 152:7	association 294:18	236:15 237:9,15	60:1,5 64:5,14
appropriation	163:21,23,24	<b>assume</b> 70:9 98:22	238:6,14,19,21	71:23 72:16,17
286:6	167:4 171:4	187:1 214:24	239:10 273:16	87:11,14,20
approval 41:19	172:25 174:7	240:22	279:12,23 301:7	95:21 184:25
44:2,3,4 122:4	177:19 178:6,8	assumed 92:22	301:25 302:13	186:17 216:7,9
approve 41:20	178:23 179:9	112:10 285:17	304:4,7 305:4	216:10 255:18
242:10	180:6 184:13,14	assuming 113:11	<b>auditor</b> 39:22 44:5	262:3,5,7,9
approved 115:11	185:2,8 186:23	assumption 169:7	44:6	263:24 264:2
135:7 242:11,12	206:8 216:11	assurance 40:18	August 75:6,16	275:13,17 277:13
263:17,22	249:19 259:1	40:23	97:7 98:17 99:6	279:11 280:14,15
approving 44:8	260:4 273:16	assurances 241:17	100:24 108:10	280:21 281:16
143:1	291:8 294:23	Astelon 119:21	127:5,7 130:16	288:23 297:21
April 1:12,16,21	295:11 296:7	120:8 141:23	133:2	298:3
64:9 81:8 82:5	302:8 308:21	219:4,8,22 222:6	authorise 127:5	
278:21,25 279:14	asking 1:18 25:7	222:16,18	131:8	<u> </u>
279:22 308:20	32:16 33:1,2	attached 248:3	authorised 127:3	<b>B</b> 19:25 196:25
Archbold 159:4	34:4,8 48:19	249:23	131:5	243:8
162:5	69:5 73:18 92:17	attaches 215:13	authoritative 59:5	<b>B1111</b> 93:19 94:24
Archibald 62:20	94:16,17 129:22	attachments 23:25	authority 18:17	<b>B1112</b> 95:14
<b>area</b> 106:25	130:15 131:2	attempt 66:5	24:16 26:17	<b>B1117</b> 96:10
<b>areas</b> 26:14	136:18,21,22	237:8 254:12	27:18,22 29:4,14	<b>B1120</b> 126:18,25
argued 127:3	138:13,13,17	309:3	53:23 54:2,9	<b>B1216</b> 284:13
131:4	140:20 142:5,8	attempted 223:9	55:3 78:23,25	<b>B1417</b> 198:20
arguing 69:5	159:1 172:13	attend 122:17	85:8 127:9,16,21	204:7 302:12
argument 307:10	175:15 178:2	attended 125:18	127:24 128:6	<b>B1418</b> 154:3
arguments 18:8	179:2 180:8,9	296:25	131:17,20,21	<b>B1422</b> 282:20
arisen 288:15	187:10 193:25	attention 97:5	132:5 211:18,19	<b>B1426</b> 20:18
arising 157:12	194:1 203:1	attest 5:4,6	218:1,5,15	294:21
<b>arm</b> 149:3	204:1 232:24	<b>attitude</b> 51:6,11	254:12 256:5	<b>B1436</b> 22:23
<b>arose</b> 41:4 54:18	237:13,14 239:18	287:14	266:6 287:11	<b>B1437</b> 25:2 230:15
222:19	aspect 2:22 95:23	Attorney 13:11,12	299:2	<b>B1439</b> 257:9
arranged 173:4	98:2	14:1 15:2 16:2	authority's 26:15	<b>B1440</b> 258:3
arrangement	aspects 164:7	29:3,18 30:16	automatically	<b>B1441</b> 230:2 266:3
127:13 242:10,11	<b>Asquez</b> 101:21	61:10 87:6	115:6	B3198 80:17,22
arrangements	assailant 70:24	148:19 166:22	automatons 89:25	<b>B4747</b> 293:24
242:13	71:11	167:8,11 180:24	available 18:4	<b>B5419</b> 206:24
				<b>B75</b> 188:19,24
		I	1	I

126:25 132:17         151:10,17 158:22         171:14,22 172:4         199:10 204:7         229:10 263:25         264:6 268:22         290:10         back-up 24:2         background         220:20         backing 105:5         backs 101:2         backwards 1:19         bad 3:14 230:9	105:23 107:10 152:3 171:25 216:12,15 299:15 beacon 71:15 bear 143:10 becoming 77:6 96:16 97:1 135:10 beg 282:13 began 143:20 beginning 9:21 36:25 47:24 75:4 153:1 235:10 begun 291:1 behalf 74:10 255:12 268:1 274:9,14 275:8 283:16	253:7 270:19 274:1 276:7 288:2 290:19 297:1 299:22 303:16 304:5,9 <b>believed</b> 12:14 28:21 50:1,1,2,3 83:5 118:10 155:14 156:6,8 156:12 180:20 181:7 184:8 186:19 192:22 200:18 213:8 237:4 260:25 262:13 <b>believes</b> 46:11 224:14	114:1,17,25 116:21,25 117:3 118:14,18 119:24 119:25 120:3 123:12 127:14 129:18 133:19 134:23 135:11 137:9,14 138:6 138:20 139:20 219:18 Bland's 75:8 99:24 Blands 104:6,9 112:12 121:9 129:10,11 288:24 289:25 291:3	Page 315 breaking 211:24 bridge 86:12,24 brief 47:8 67:19 164:16 186:11 briefed 164:18 184:13 185:1 234:24,25 235:8 235:13,14,21,22 236:1 279:25 280:1 briefing 177:15,18 177:25 178:12 179:17,19,25 180:7,10,11 182:8,15 277:11
30:3 31:17 33:9 34:5 36:23 94:12 100:16 104:9 126:25 132:17 151:10,17 158:22 171:14,22 172:4 199:10 204:7 229:10 263:25 264:6 268:22 290:10 back-up 24:2 background 220:20 backing 105:5 backs 101:2 backwards 1:19 bad 3:14 230:9	152:3 171:25 216:12,15 299:15 beacon 71:15 bear 143:10 becoming 77:6 96:16 97:1 135:10 beg 282:13 began 143:20 beginning 9:21 36:25 47:24 75:4 153:1 235:10 begun 291:1 behalf 74:10 255:12 268:1 274:9,14 275:8	274:1 276:7 288:2 290:19 297:1 299:22 303:16 304:5,9 <b>believed</b> 12:14 28:21 50:1,1,2,3 83:5 118:10 155:14 156:6,8 156:12 180:20 181:7 184:8 186:19 192:22 200:18 213:8 237:4 260:25 262:13 <b>believes</b> 46:11	116:21,25 117:3 118:14,18 119:24 119:25 120:3 123:12 127:14 129:18 133:19 134:23 135:11 137:9,14 138:6 138:20 139:20 219:18 <b>Bland's</b> 75:8 99:24 <b>Blands</b> 104:6,9 112:12 121:9 129:10,11 288:24 289:25 291:3	bridge 86:12,24 brief 47:8 67:19 164:16 186:11 briefed 164:18 184:13 185:1 234:24,25 235:8 235:13,14,21,22 236:1 279:25 280:1 briefing 177:15,18 177:25 178:12 179:17,19,25 180:7,10,11
30:3 31:17 33:9 34:5 36:23 94:12 100:16 104:9 126:25 132:17 151:10,17 158:22 171:14,22 172:4 199:10 204:7 229:10 263:25 264:6 268:22 290:10 back-up 24:2 background 220:20 backing 105:5 backs 101:2 backwards 1:19 bad 3:14 230:9	152:3 171:25 216:12,15 299:15 beacon 71:15 bear 143:10 becoming 77:6 96:16 97:1 135:10 beg 282:13 began 143:20 beginning 9:21 36:25 47:24 75:4 153:1 235:10 begun 291:1 behalf 74:10 255:12 268:1 274:9,14 275:8	274:1 276:7 288:2 290:19 297:1 299:22 303:16 304:5,9 <b>believed</b> 12:14 28:21 50:1,1,2,3 83:5 118:10 155:14 156:6,8 156:12 180:20 181:7 184:8 186:19 192:22 200:18 213:8 237:4 260:25 262:13 <b>believes</b> 46:11	116:21,25 117:3 118:14,18 119:24 119:25 120:3 123:12 127:14 129:18 133:19 134:23 135:11 137:9,14 138:6 138:20 139:20 219:18 <b>Bland's</b> 75:8 99:24 <b>Blands</b> 104:6,9 112:12 121:9 129:10,11 288:24 289:25 291:3	bridge 86:12,24 brief 47:8 67:19 164:16 186:11 briefed 164:18 184:13 185:1 234:24,25 235:8 235:13,14,21,22 236:1 279:25 280:1 briefing 177:15,18 177:25 178:12 179:17,19,25 180:7,10,11
34:5 36:23 94:12         100:16 104:9         126:25 132:17         151:10,17 158:22         171:14,22 172:4         199:10 204:7         229:10 263:25         264:6 268:22         290:10         background         220:20         backing 105:5         backs 101:2         backwards 1:19         bad 3:14 230:9	216:12,15 299:15 beacon 71:15 bear 143:10 becoming 77:6 96:16 97:1 135:10 beg 282:13 began 143:20 beginning 9:21 36:25 47:24 75:4 153:1 235:10 begun 291:1 behalf 74:10 255:12 268:1 274:9,14 275:8	288:2 290:19 297:1 299:22 303:16 304:5,9 <b>believed</b> 12:14 28:21 50:1,1,2,3 83:5 118:10 155:14 156:6,8 156:12 180:20 181:7 184:8 186:19 192:22 200:18 213:8 237:4 260:25 262:13 <b>believes</b> 46:11	118:14,18 119:24 119:25 120:3 123:12 127:14 129:18 133:19 134:23 135:11 137:9,14 138:6 138:20 139:20 219:18 <b>Bland's</b> 75:8 99:24 <b>Blands</b> 104:6,9 112:12 121:9 129:10,11 288:24 289:25 291:3	brief 47:8 67:19 164:16 186:11 briefed 164:18 184:13 185:1 234:24,25 235:8 235:13,14,21,22 236:1 279:25 280:1 briefing 177:15,18 177:25 178:12 179:17,19,25 180:7,10,11
100:16 104:9       I         126:25 132:17       I         151:10,17 158:22       I         171:14,22 172:4       I         199:10 204:7       I         229:10 263:25       I         264:6 268:22       I         290:10       I         background       I         220:20       I         backing 105:5       I         backwards 1:19       I         bad 3:14 230:9       I	beacon 71:15 bear 143:10 becoming 77:6 96:16 97:1 135:10 beg 282:13 began 143:20 beginning 9:21 36:25 47:24 75:4 153:1 235:10 begun 291:1 behalf 74:10 255:12 268:1 274:9,14 275:8	297:1 299:22 303:16 304:5,9 <b>believed</b> 12:14 28:21 50:1,1,2,3 83:5 118:10 155:14 156:6,8 156:12 180:20 181:7 184:8 186:19 192:22 200:18 213:8 237:4 260:25 262:13 <b>believes</b> 46:11	119:25 120:3 123:12 127:14 129:18 133:19 134:23 135:11 137:9,14 138:6 138:20 139:20 219:18 <b>Bland's</b> 75:8 99:24 <b>Blands</b> 104:6,9 112:12 121:9 129:10,11 288:24 289:25 291:3	164:16 186:11 briefed 164:18 184:13 185:1 234:24,25 235:8 235:13,14,21,22 236:1 279:25 280:1 briefing 177:15,18 177:25 178:12 179:17,19,25 180:7,10,11
126:25 132:17         151:10,17 158:22         171:14,22 172:4         199:10 204:7         229:10 263:25         264:6 268:22         290:10         back-up 24:2         background         220:20         backing 105:5         backs 101:2         backwards 1:19         bad 3:14 230:9	bear 143:10 becoming 77:6 96:16 97:1 135:10 beg 282:13 began 143:20 beginning 9:21 36:25 47:24 75:4 153:1 235:10 begun 291:1 behalf 74:10 255:12 268:1 274:9,14 275:8	303:16 304:5,9 believed 12:14 28:21 50:1,1,2,3 83:5 118:10 155:14 156:6,8 156:12 180:20 181:7 184:8 186:19 192:22 200:18 213:8 237:4 260:25 262:13 believes 46:11	123:12 127:14 129:18 133:19 134:23 135:11 137:9,14 138:6 138:20 139:20 219:18 <b>Bland's</b> 75:8 99:24 <b>Blands</b> 104:6,9 112:12 121:9 129:10,11 288:24 289:25 291:3	briefed 164:18 184:13 185:1 234:24,25 235:8 235:13,14,21,22 236:1 279:25 280:1 briefing 177:15,18 177:25 178:12 179:17,19,25 180:7,10,11
151:10,17 158:22171:14,22 172:4199:10 204:7229:10 263:25264:6 268:22290:10back-up 24:2background220:20backing 105:5backs 101:2backwards 1:19bad 3:14 230:9	becoming 77:6 96:16 97:1 135:10 beg 282:13 began 143:20 beginning 9:21 36:25 47:24 75:4 153:1 235:10 begun 291:1 behalf 74:10 255:12 268:1 274:9,14 275:8	believed 12:14 28:21 50:1,1,2,3 83:5 118:10 155:14 156:6,8 156:12 180:20 181:7 184:8 186:19 192:22 200:18 213:8 237:4 260:25 262:13 believes 46:11	129:18 133:19 134:23 135:11 137:9,14 138:6 138:20 139:20 219:18 Bland's 75:8 99:24 Blands 104:6,9 112:12 121:9 129:10,11 288:24 289:25 291:3	184:13 185:1 234:24,25 235:8 235:13,14,21,22 236:1 279:25 280:1 <b>briefing</b> 177:15,18 177:25 178:12 179:17,19,25 180:7,10,11
171:14,22 172:4199:10 204:7229:10 263:25264:6 268:22290:10back-up 24:2background220:20backing 105:5backs 101:2backwards 1:19bad 3:14 230:9	96:16 97:1 135:10 beg 282:13 began 143:20 beginning 9:21 36:25 47:24 75:4 153:1 235:10 begun 291:1 behalf 74:10 255:12 268:1 274:9,14 275:8	28:21 50:1,1,2,3 83:5 118:10 155:14 156:6,8 156:12 180:20 181:7 184:8 186:19 192:22 200:18 213:8 237:4 260:25 262:13 <b>believes</b> 46:11	134:23 135:11 137:9,14 138:6 138:20 139:20 219:18 <b>Bland's</b> 75:8 99:24 <b>Blands</b> 104:6,9 112:12 121:9 129:10,11 288:24 289:25 291:3	234:24,25 235:8 235:13,14,21,22 236:1 279:25 280:1 <b>briefing</b> 177:15,18 177:25 178:12 179:17,19,25 180:7,10,11
199:10 204:7         229:10 263:25         264:6 268:22         290:10         back-up 24:2         background         220:20         backing 105:5         backs 101:2         backwards 1:19         bad 3:14 230:9	135:10 beg 282:13 began 143:20 beginning 9:21 36:25 47:24 75:4 153:1 235:10 begun 291:1 behalf 74:10 255:12 268:1 274:9,14 275:8	83:5 118:10 155:14 156:6,8 156:12 180:20 181:7 184:8 186:19 192:22 200:18 213:8 237:4 260:25 262:13 <b>believes</b> 46:11	137:9,14 138:6 138:20 139:20 219:18 <b>Bland's</b> 75:8 99:24 <b>Blands</b> 104:6,9 112:12 121:9 129:10,11 288:24 289:25 291:3	235:13,14,21,22 236:1 279:25 280:1 <b>briefing</b> 177:15,18 177:25 178:12 179:17,19,25 180:7,10,11
229:10 263:25 264:6 268:22 290:10 back-up 24:2 background 220:20 backing 105:5 backs 101:2 backwards 1:19 bad 3:14 230:9	beg 282:13 began 143:20 beginning 9:21 36:25 47:24 75:4 153:1 235:10 begun 291:1 behalf 74:10 255:12 268:1 274:9,14 275:8	155:14 156:6,8 156:12 180:20 181:7 184:8 186:19 192:22 200:18 213:8 237:4 260:25 262:13 <b>believes</b> 46:11	138:20 139:20 219:18 Bland's 75:8 99:24 Blands 104:6,9 112:12 121:9 129:10,11 288:24 289:25 291:3	236:1 279:25 280:1 briefing 177:15,18 177:25 178:12 179:17,19,25 180:7,10,11
264:6 268:22       1         290:10       1         back-up 24:2       1         background       220:20         backing 105:5       1         backs 101:2       1         backwards 1:19       1         bad 3:14 230:9       1	began 143:20 beginning 9:21 36:25 47:24 75:4 153:1 235:10 begun 291:1 behalf 74:10 255:12 268:1 274:9,14 275:8	156:12 180:20 181:7 184:8 186:19 192:22 200:18 213:8 237:4 260:25 262:13 <b>believes</b> 46:11	219:18 Bland's 75:8 99:24 Blands 104:6,9 112:12 121:9 129:10,11 288:24 289:25 291:3	280:1 briefing 177:15,18 177:25 178:12 179:17,19,25 180:7,10,11
290:10       I         back-up 24:2       J         background       220:20         backing 105:5       I         backs 101:2       J         backwards 1:19       J         bad 3:14 230:9       I	beginning 9:21 36:25 47:24 75:4 153:1 235:10 begun 291:1 behalf 74:10 255:12 268:1 274:9,14 275:8	181:7 184:8 186:19 192:22 200:18 213:8 237:4 260:25 262:13 <b>believes</b> 46:11	Bland's 75:8 99:24 Blands 104:6,9 112:12 121:9 129:10,11 288:24 289:25 291:3	<b>briefing</b> 177:15,18 177:25 178:12 179:17,19,25 180:7,10,11
back-up 24:2 background 220:20 backing 105:5 backs 101:2 backwards 1:19 bad 3:14 230:9	36:25 47:24 75:4 153:1 235:10 begun 291:1 behalf 74:10 255:12 268:1 274:9,14 275:8	186:19 192:22 200:18 213:8 237:4 260:25 262:13 <b>believes</b> 46:11	Blands 104:6,9 112:12 121:9 129:10,11 288:24 289:25 291:3	177:25 178:12 179:17,19,25 180:7,10,11
background 220:20 backing 105:5 backs 101:2 backwards 1:19 bad 3:14 230:9	153:1 235:10 begun 291:1 behalf 74:10 255:12 268:1 274:9,14 275:8	200:18 213:8 237:4 260:25 262:13 <b>believes</b> 46:11	112:12 121:9 129:10,11 288:24 289:25 291:3	179:17,19,25 180:7,10,11
220:20     backing 105:5     backs 101:2 backwards 1:19 bad 3:14 230:9	<b>begun</b> 291:1 <b>behalf</b> 74:10 255:12 268:1 274:9,14 275:8	237:4 260:25 262:13 <b>believes</b> 46:11	129:10,11 288:24 289:25 291:3	180:7,10,11
backing 105:5 backs 101:2 backwards 1:19 bad 3:14 230:9	behalf 74:10 255:12 268:1 274:9,14 275:8	262:13 <b>believes</b> 46:11	289:25 291:3	
backs 101:2 backwards 1:19 bad 3:14 230:9	255:12 268:1 274:9,14 275:8	<b>believes</b> 46:11		102.0,13 277.11
backwards 1:19 bad 3:14 230:9	274:9,14 275:8			briefly 74:23
<b>bad</b> 3:14 230:9	-		<b>block</b> 57:20 <b>blow</b> 218:11	260:8 268:18
	203.10	beneficial 134:25		283:24 284:4
273:5	<b>behave</b> 35:16		blowing 218:10,10	
Degliatte 1/6.1	122:25	<b>beneficially</b> 120:5 120:15 220:3	<b>blunderbuss</b> 270:21	<b>bring</b> 39:20 104:9 173:22 243:19
<b>Baglietto</b> 146:1	behaved 156:7	benefit 27:13	<b>board</b> 58:4 272:12	
,			272:15	266:24 267:2,7 268:16
	behaviour 169:23	54:24 60:1 85:1		
156:11 157:22	281:22	87:4,9 90:19	body 55:22	bringing 267:22
	<b>belief</b> 50:8 78:7,13	117:21,25 172:14	<b>bold</b> 137:22	British 299:3
169:4,8 172:6	204:25 226:16	269:23 270:5	<b>bolted</b> 277:8	Britto 4:5,13,19,20
207:17 210:15	260:7 261:17	281:15	bone 246:11,24	4:20,25 5:5,10,18
	<b>believe</b> 6:7 8:14	berating 274:16	books 305:2	6:17,25 7:24 8:3
bags 295:9	9:2,3 14:25	276:21 280:25	boot 9:24	8:21 9:6 17:8
balance 35:9 36:18	17:13 18:22	best 78:7 260:25	borderline 63:6	18:24 19:8,8,13
ball 229:9	26:22 37:7 46:18	264:25 294:7	<b>Borders</b> 289:20	22:19 23:1 25:15
bank 298:15	51:2 55:21 58:20	better 22:5 31:1	<b>bottom</b> 16:25	27:3,23 28:8
bar 67:18 77:11,13	73:5,9 75:9 76:8	104:8 119:20	20:19 32:3 36:1	34:12 47:3
92:13 164:19	78:6 86:3,5	189:23 215:7	38:22 41:21	194:10,12 218:16
165:5 166:5,7	107:17 110:23	270:5 285:3	74:25 75:2 81:11	220:12,14 230:16
168:2 181:22	115:17,17 121:14	beyond 103:11	94:24 95:14	231:18,21 232:10
184:3 226:8	125:19 127:14	150:2 273:22	126:7 207:1	233:9 258:15
234:5	131:19 132:12	274:15	245:16 271:18	263:18 266:25
barely 290:17	135:24 149:17	<b>bit</b> 29:25 75:3	282:21 284:24	271:9,14 272:6
barrier 240:19	155:20 162:13	95:11 187:7	287:20	Britto's 6:10 19:17
barrister 195:15	164:1 169:15	189:2 198:4	<b>box</b> 284:15	70:20 71:4 265:1
based 50:8 65:24	170:22 173:13	208:8 271:16	breached 215:16	broad 109:2
65:24 66:17	174:5 191:8	284:13 310:11	215:17	broken 120:18
78:12 93:9	197:8 204:4	<b>bits</b> 32:14,15	breaching 212:8	brought 85:20
126:15 137:25	206:4 207:2	<b>black</b> 263:1	bread 103:21	116:5 229:10
195:10 267:13	214:13 217:19,23	<b>Bland</b> 75:12 88:7	break 2:12 59:1	242:13 274:21,22
<b>basis</b> 7:19 16:18	218:21 219:23	95:23 98:2,19	74:1 176:12	275:2
33:14 65:19	228:25 233:6	99:2,11,15 100:2	250:4,13	<b>budget</b> 287:8,11
66:19 68:21,24	235:24 236:4,14	100:3 102:16,19	breakdown 150:3	287:19
89:10 91:17	244:16 252:11	112:15,18,23	breakfast 3:6	budgeting 286:2,3

				Page 316
				<u>_</u>
<b>buffer</b> 55:15,19	cabinet 73:2 212:5	76:5 140:2	cause 234:8	292:6,20,24
56:3,14,22,24	212:6,7,9	<b>car</b> 191:17	260:18	295:21 297:16
building 173:21	cahoots 159:22	Care 147:24	caused 260:17	300:25 305:5
bullied 5:25	Caine 128:12,14	career 271:1	<b>caution</b> 62:14	310:13,15,21
bullying 13:7	128:15,17,18,23	carefully 24:22	80:13,14	Chairman's
<b>bundle</b> 4:7,9 84:15	129:5,7 131:22	54:22 258:10	caveat 253:20	228:12
84:16 145:11	call 17:25 18:3,6	Caribbean 267:16	cease 253:18	challenge 227:1,21
<b>Burnham</b> 3:7 79:8	22:17 41:4,7	carried 50:14	cent 5:13 141:8,23	challenged 60:3,4
<b>business</b> 68:15,17	45:15 54:17 58:5	191:16	142:8	180:21
68:18,22 69:1	74:20 75:16	carry 10:19 18:21	<b>central</b> 223:10	challenges 59:8,21
112:8,11 119:6,6	76:17 124:20	48:1 60:8 102:16	225:12,23 267:14	chambers 89:8
120:21 121:1	150:11 154:16,20	104:8 149:18	267:17,25 274:2	91:15 191:6
136:25 140:17,17	154:21,25 173:1	163:22	certain 6:9 105:16	chance 1:10
140:21 141:8	173:7,12 174:15	carrying 52:13	156:12 244:14	change 15:25
142:17 143:11,13	176:23,24 177:8	CARUANA 69:4	298:18 301:12,16	33:23 172:14
143:22,24 144:1	185:4,5 200:20	250:5,10,16	certainly 22:15,17	changed 2:17 52:4
278:7 285:15	218:23 240:7	259:12 271:24	30:9,10 34:21	216:8 276:2
287:9 288:20	243:17 247:10	277:19 283:13	44:4 59:13 87:1	changes 260:7
289:6	250:19 253:7,9	284:2 286:23	87:22 90:16	changing 241:2
businesses 141:3	254:16 255:25	292:9,25 296:14	124:11,12 163:11	characterisation
<b>butter</b> 103:21	259:15 264:20	297:14	180:4 199:8	71:3 96:6 105:17
buttressed 57:2	275:22 307:14	case 10:10 12:19	270:4 283:10	121:17,25 170:9
	called 3:24 74:20	25:19 26:1 27:5	cetera 144:16,17	195:18 197:22
<u> </u>	77:11 87:5	27:14 31:6 32:9	156:14 244:9	244:24
c 8:8 243:8	119:21 164:9	32:13 34:23	<b>chair</b> 17:21 19:11	characterise
<b>C3802</b> 304:6	167:22 172:23	43:19 53:4 58:11	26:21 245:16	103:18
C3953 262:22	188:8 195:5	58:12,13 59:13	chairman 12:25	characterising
268:22	254:10 289:16	63:16 64:15 70:4	19:9 20:11 46:21	120:25
<b>C3988</b> 7:9	calling 17:22	72:2 83:6 85:25	46:23 47:1,4	characterization
<b>C3991</b> 8:7	255:14	88:23 122:24	54:10 59:4,23	287:13
C4 196:6	calls 145:25	126:2 151:19	69:8,10,22 72:9	characters 35:15
C4-2 31:23	150:21 155:2	163:11 176:15	73:17,23 74:1,6	<b>charge</b> 136:6
C4234 13:1 17:17	calmed 179:15	177:9 190:19	76:25 80:12,15	176:4 177:13,24
17:18	calmer 186:10	192:12 199:25	122:13,18,23	276:13
C4282 26:5	calmly 35:20	207:2 209:7	123:1 124:15	charged 136:4
C4283 31:21 32:3	309:6	223:7 239:14	136:8 147:24	charges 274:20,21
C4359 34:24	candidate 50:7	242:2 252:25	153:11,21 165:17	275:2 278:17
C4732 202:5	candidates 48:21	255:11 268:1,8,9	166:25 167:3	charging 64:7
C4734 196:4	49:3 51:24	270:14,25 285:15	168:5,10 193:6	278:21
C4747 220:23	candidly 89:12	296:19,20 298:24	225:18 240:9	<b>charity</b> 147:25
221:3,4 294:1	93:1	299:25 301:23	245:4 246:9	148:3 155:19
C4748 84:14	candour 91:23	302:7 304:9,19	248:6 249:1,4	<b>cheap</b> 157:10
C4767 224:25	162:12	305:21	250:3,9,12	<b>check</b> 58:22 59:1
C4832 35:23	canoe 3:24	<b>cases</b> 63:5,6	256:13 258:6	159:5 162:5
C4879 37:18	capacity 83:21	209:11 242:17,18	266:6 269:13	184:20 185:3,8
C6932 41:11	91:25 162:2	<b>cash</b> 44:14	271:21 272:1	219:14
C6933 240:3	299:18	catch 235:9 258:9	275:25 277:17	checked 1:25
C7020 98:13	captain 75:22	categorical 198:22	283:10,25 286:1	85:14 94:8,17
<b>C7021</b> 132:23	captains 75:25	204:8 302:15	286:21 288:1	<b>checks</b> 94:11
C748 85:5,16				
	-	-	•	•

www.epiqglobal.com Lov casemanagers@epiqglobal.com

				Page 317
<b>cheer</b> 160:16	<b>circle</b> 209:22	<b>clearer</b> 32:20,24	<b>comes</b> 106:12	209:15 212:15
chest 204:23	211:25 214:1,2	clearly 14:25	108:24 121:14	214:8 226:23
261:12	215:12	62:20 131:25	130:17 195:18	229:16 232:23
<b>chief</b> 1:4 7:1 8:10	<b>circles</b> 211:22	197:10 201:2	212:20 235:15	240:11 242:5
12:20 20:4,20	circulate 36:25	204:21 223:14	comfortable 44:8	246:13 247:20,23
21:19,20 24:7,16	circumstance	227:16 249:12	comforted 265:10	249:18 252:5,9
27:20 28:2 32:5	221:23	261:10 264:8	<b>coming</b> 42:11	252:12,15,24
37:20,24 47:6,22	circumstances	<b>client</b> 146:12	114:7 118:24	253:12,18 255:23
48:2,23 49:1,5	61:3 62:25 112:1	153:18 194:22	146:9 229:14	258:23 267:2,8
50:17,23,25	194:20 197:7	304:20	243:5 258:19	267:22 268:3,15
51:13 52:18 55:4	209:9 211:7	<b>close</b> 25:6 67:4	304:2	269:24 270:7
55:10,16,19 56:4	298:12,19 300:17	156:17 297:25	<b>command</b> 210:22	274:7 276:3,9
56:8 58:25 59:3	301:13 302:4	closed 180:4	212:14 299:3	279:23 281:9,18
59:9,11 63:18	303:19,21	closest 156:19	commensurate	282:2 296:9,12
70:21 71:8 77:7	civil 139:13 153:15	<b>CM</b> 13:4 17:21	43:22	304:10
77:14 82:8 94:21	305:22,23 306:3	35:6 36:17 37:21	comment 127:18	Commissioner's
116:6 118:3	claimed 39:1	37:21,23 38:2,4	234:19 263:9	38:9
122:3 130:21	claiming 229:15	co-operation	<b>commenting</b> 100:9	committee 34:8,9
141:6,15,19	claims 3:16 157:23	78:21	276:3	common 151:5,19
142:24 149:18	158:14 160:2,4,9		<b>comments</b> 268:23	communicate
165:10 176:25	160:24 162:10	Coastguard 289:21	commercial 96:15	286:10
180:19,19 181:16	168:17 171:17,20	code 142:9	96:25 97:22 98:8	communicated
204:24 215:4	186:15	cognisant 256:13	106:20	13:18 22:20 32:4
216:2,3,5 226:13	clarification 71:19	coincidence	commercialise	206:13
234:12 240:12	clarify 2:10 60:18	206:11,15,20,23	104:5	Communicates
241:16 250:18	73:20 306:20,24	208:13 259:19	commercially	16:3
252:4 256:17	307:25	coincidental	106:24	communicating
259:16 260:4	class 42:5	208:20	<b>Commission</b> 306:4	20:10
261:16,22 263:24	clear 1:20 7:7 21:5	cold 190:21	commissioner	communication
265:8,22 272:22	49:23 61:6,9	collected 282:23	8:13,15 13:9	27:12 127:15,18
280:4 281:17,21	79:12 80:3 81:7	collision 13:6	17:23 18:1,7,11	128:3 222:20
281:22 288:18	96:1 99:10	colloquially 256:1	19:5 20:17 21:22	307:15
293:13 294:20,22	100.25 102.11			
	100:25 103:11	come 2:25 18:16	24:9 37:23 38:1	communications
295:4,17 296:15	106:17 112:9	23:8 31:17 40:1	38:3 39:7 49:21	15:11 109:19
295:4,17 296:15 296:16,21,23	106:17 112:9 114:23 119:23	23:8 31:17 40:1 57:24 58:2 67:19	38:3 39:7 49:21 50:4,6,15 51:4	15:11 109:19 134:17,20 151:7
295:4,17 296:15 296:16,21,23 298:7 299:8	106:17 112:9 114:23 119:23 129:23 130:14	23:8 31:17 40:1 57:24 58:2 67:19 73:7 85:20 88:12	38:3 39:7 49:21 50:4,6,15 51:4 52:15 53:11	15:11 109:19 134:17,20 151:7 152:15 154:14
295:4,17 296:15 296:16,21,23 298:7 299:8 307:15,16 310:9	106:17 112:9 114:23 119:23 129:23 130:14 131:7,7 132:22	23:8 31:17 40:1 57:24 58:2 67:19 73:7 85:20 88:12 104:14 106:15,23	38:3 39:7 49:21 50:4,6,15 51:4 52:15 53:11 54:18 55:6,12	15:11 109:19 134:17,20 151:7 152:15 154:14 160:1,7 222:17
295:4,17 296:15 296:16,21,23 298:7 299:8 307:15,16 310:9 child 38:10	106:17 112:9 114:23 119:23 129:23 130:14 131:7,7 132:22 142:4 151:22	23:8 31:17 40:1 57:24 58:2 67:19 73:7 85:20 88:12 104:14 106:15,23 112:8 122:5	38:3 39:7 49:21 50:4,6,15 51:4 52:15 53:11 54:18 55:6,12 56:11 57:7,8,21	15:11 109:19 134:17,20 151:7 152:15 154:14 160:1,7 222:17 256:12,16 274:15
295:4,17 296:15 296:16,21,23 298:7 299:8 307:15,16 310:9 child 38:10 children 122:16	106:17 112:9 114:23 119:23 129:23 130:14 131:7,7 132:22 142:4 151:22 158:12 160:3	23:8 31:17 40:1 57:24 58:2 67:19 73:7 85:20 88:12 104:14 106:15,23 112:8 122:5 142:24 143:25	38:3 39:7 49:21 50:4,6,15 51:4 52:15 53:11 54:18 55:6,12 56:11 57:7,8,21 73:6 163:13	15:11 109:19 134:17,20 151:7 152:15 154:14 160:1,7 222:17 256:12,16 274:15 309:21
295:4,17 296:15 296:16,21,23 298:7 299:8 307:15,16 310:9 child 38:10 children 122:16 chilling 246:11,24	106:17 112:9 114:23 119:23 129:23 130:14 131:7,7 132:22 142:4 151:22	23:8 31:17 40:1 57:24 58:2 67:19 73:7 85:20 88:12 104:14 106:15,23 112:8 122:5	38:3 39:7 49:21 50:4,6,15 51:4 52:15 53:11 54:18 55:6,12 56:11 57:7,8,21	15:11 109:19 134:17,20 151:7 152:15 154:14 160:1,7 222:17 256:12,16 274:15
295:4,17 296:15 296:16,21,23 298:7 299:8 307:15,16 310:9 child 38:10 children 122:16 chilling 246:11,24	106:17 112:9 114:23 119:23 129:23 130:14 131:7,7 132:22 142:4 151:22 158:12 160:3	23:8 31:17 40:1 57:24 58:2 67:19 73:7 85:20 88:12 104:14 106:15,23 112:8 122:5 142:24 143:25	38:3 39:7 49:21 50:4,6,15 51:4 52:15 53:11 54:18 55:6,12 56:11 57:7,8,21 73:6 163:13	15:11 109:19 134:17,20 151:7 152:15 154:14 160:1,7 222:17 256:12,16 274:15 309:21
295:4,17 296:15 296:16,21,23 298:7 299:8 307:15,16 310:9 child 38:10 children 122:16 chilling 246:11,24 choice 137:14 138:19 139:1,19	106:17 112:9 114:23 119:23 129:23 130:14 131:7,7 132:22 142:4 151:22 158:12 160:3 161:23,24 164:14 182:10,17 183:14 183:15,15 188:21	23:8 31:17 40:1 57:24 58:2 67:19 73:7 85:20 88:12 104:14 106:15,23 112:8 122:5 142:24 143:25 151:23 153:12	38:3 39:7 49:21 50:4,6,15 51:4 52:15 53:11 54:18 55:6,12 56:11 57:7,8,21 73:6 163:13 176:1,15 177:8 177:12 179:5 181:12,14,20,25	15:11 109:19 134:17,20 151:7 152:15 154:14 160:1,7 222:17 256:12,16 274:15 309:21 Community 147:24 companies 97:18
295:4,17 296:15 296:16,21,23 298:7 299:8 307:15,16 310:9 child 38:10 children 122:16 chilling 246:11,24 choice 137:14 138:19 139:1,19 139:19	106:17 112:9 114:23 119:23 129:23 130:14 131:7,7 132:22 142:4 151:22 158:12 160:3 161:23,24 164:14 182:10,17 183:14 183:15,15 188:21 201:10,11,13	23:8 31:17 40:1 57:24 58:2 67:19 73:7 85:20 88:12 104:14 106:15,23 112:8 122:5 142:24 143:25 151:23 153:12 160:16,20 164:16	38:3 39:7 49:21 50:4,6,15 51:4 52:15 53:11 54:18 55:6,12 56:11 57:7,8,21 73:6 163:13 176:1,15 177:8 177:12 179:5	15:11 109:19 134:17,20 151:7 152:15 154:14 160:1,7 222:17 256:12,16 274:15 309:21 <b>Community</b> 147:24
295:4,17 296:15 296:16,21,23 298:7 299:8 307:15,16 310:9 child 38:10 children 122:16 chilling 246:11,24 choice 137:14 138:19 139:1,19 139:19	106:17 112:9 114:23 119:23 129:23 130:14 131:7,7 132:22 142:4 151:22 158:12 160:3 161:23,24 164:14 182:10,17 183:14 183:15,15 188:21	23:8 31:17 40:1 57:24 58:2 67:19 73:7 85:20 88:12 104:14 106:15,23 112:8 122:5 142:24 143:25 151:23 153:12 160:16,20 164:16 164:24 173:14	38:3 39:7 49:21 50:4,6,15 51:4 52:15 53:11 54:18 55:6,12 56:11 57:7,8,21 73:6 163:13 176:1,15 177:8 177:12 179:5 181:12,14,20,25	15:11 109:19 134:17,20 151:7 152:15 154:14 160:1,7 222:17 256:12,16 274:15 309:21 Community 147:24 companies 97:18
295:4,17 296:15 296:16,21,23 298:7 299:8 307:15,16 310:9 child 38:10 children 122:16 chilling 246:11,24 choice 137:14 138:19 139:1,19 139:19 choose 46:5 51:8,9	106:17 112:9 114:23 119:23 129:23 130:14 131:7,7 132:22 142:4 151:22 158:12 160:3 161:23,24 164:14 182:10,17 183:14 183:15,15 188:21 201:10,11,13	23:8 31:17 40:1 57:24 58:2 67:19 73:7 85:20 88:12 104:14 106:15,23 112:8 122:5 142:24 143:25 151:23 153:12 160:16,20 164:16 164:24 173:14 174:8 177:25	38:3 39:7 49:21 50:4,6,15 51:4 52:15 53:11 54:18 55:6,12 56:11 57:7,8,21 73:6 163:13 176:1,15 177:8 177:12 179:5 181:12,14,20,25 182:6 183:11,18	15:11 109:19 134:17,20 151:7 152:15 154:14 160:1,7 222:17 256:12,16 274:15 309:21 Community 147:24 companies 97:18 company 119:7,8
295:4,17 296:15 296:16,21,23 298:7 299:8 307:15,16 310:9 child 38:10 children 122:16 chilling 246:11,24 choice 137:14 138:19 139:1,19 139:19 choose 46:5 51:8,9	106:17 112:9 114:23 119:23 129:23 130:14 131:7,7 132:22 142:4 151:22 158:12 160:3 161:23,24 164:14 182:10,17 183:14 183:15,15 188:21 201:10,11,13 205:18 211:15	23:8 31:17 40:1 57:24 58:2 67:19 73:7 85:20 88:12 104:14 106:15,23 112:8 122:5 142:24 143:25 151:23 153:12 160:16,20 164:16 164:24 173:14 174:8 177:25 178:9 185:12	38:3 39:7 49:21 50:4,6,15 51:4 52:15 53:11 54:18 55:6,12 56:11 57:7,8,21 73:6 163:13 176:1,15 177:8 177:12 179:5 181:12,14,20,25 182:6 183:11,18 186:1,14,17	15:11 109:19 134:17,20 151:7 152:15 154:14 160:1,7 222:17 256:12,16 274:15 309:21 <b>Community</b> 147:24 <b>companies</b> 97:18 <b>company</b> 119:7,8 119:11,13,25
295:4,17 296:15 296:16,21,23 298:7 299:8 307:15,16 310:9 child 38:10 children 122:16 chilling 246:11,24 choice 137:14 138:19 139:1,19 139:19 choose 46:5 51:8,9 chose 180:5 257:24 270:12	106:17 112:9 114:23 119:23 129:23 130:14 131:7,7 132:22 142:4 151:22 158:12 160:3 161:23,24 164:14 182:10,17 183:14 183:15,15 188:21 201:10,11,13 205:18 211:15 213:18,18 214:24	23:8 31:17 40:1 57:24 58:2 67:19 73:7 85:20 88:12 104:14 106:15,23 112:8 122:5 142:24 143:25 151:23 153:12 160:16,20 164:16 164:24 173:14 174:8 177:25 178:9 185:12 195:14 200:20	38:3 39:7 49:21 50:4,6,15 51:4 52:15 53:11 54:18 55:6,12 56:11 57:7,8,21 73:6 163:13 176:1,15 177:8 177:12 179:5 181:12,14,20,25 182:6 183:11,18 186:1,14,17 188:9 190:15	15:11 109:19 134:17,20 151:7 152:15 154:14 160:1,7 222:17 256:12,16 274:15 309:21 Community 147:24 companies 97:18 company 119:7,8 119:11,13,25 120:22,23 121:2
295:4,17 296:15 296:16,21,23 298:7 299:8 307:15,16 310:9 child 38:10 children 122:16 chilling 246:11,24 choice 137:14 138:19 139:1,19 139:19 choose 46:5 51:8,9 chose 180:5	106:17 112:9 114:23 119:23 129:23 130:14 131:7,7 132:22 142:4 151:22 158:12 160:3 161:23,24 164:14 182:10,17 183:14 183:15,15 188:21 201:10,11,13 205:18 211:15 213:18,18 214:24 219:21 229:17	23:8 31:17 40:1 57:24 58:2 67:19 73:7 85:20 88:12 104:14 106:15,23 112:8 122:5 142:24 143:25 151:23 153:12 160:16,20 164:16 164:24 173:14 174:8 177:25 178:9 185:12 195:14 200:20 210:23 242:20,25	38:3 39:7 49:21 50:4,6,15 51:4 52:15 53:11 54:18 55:6,12 56:11 57:7,8,21 73:6 163:13 176:1,15 177:8 177:12 179:5 181:12,14,20,25 182:6 183:11,18 186:1,14,17 188:9 190:15 191:10 193:15	15:11 109:19 134:17,20 151:7 152:15 154:14 160:1,7 222:17 256:12,16 274:15 309:21 <b>Community</b> 147:24 <b>companies</b> 97:18 <b>company</b> 119:7,8 119:11,13,25 120:22,23 121:2 121:23 137:7
295:4,17 296:15 296:16,21,23 298:7 299:8 307:15,16 310:9 child 38:10 children 122:16 chilling 246:11,24 choice 137:14 138:19 139:1,19 139:19 choose 46:5 51:8,9 chose 180:5 257:24 270:12 chosen 251:20,23	106:17 112:9 114:23 119:23 129:23 130:14 131:7,7 132:22 142:4 151:22 158:12 160:3 161:23,24 164:14 182:10,17 183:14 183:15,15 188:21 201:10,11,13 205:18 211:15 213:18,18 214:24 219:21 229:17 255:4 265:2	23:8 31:17 40:1 57:24 58:2 67:19 73:7 85:20 88:12 104:14 106:15,23 112:8 122:5 142:24 143:25 151:23 153:12 160:16,20 164:16 164:24 173:14 174:8 177:25 178:9 185:12 195:14 200:20 210:23 242:20,25 247:11,14 264:25	38:3 39:7 49:21 50:4,6,15 51:4 52:15 53:11 54:18 55:6,12 56:11 57:7,8,21 73:6 163:13 176:1,15 177:8 177:12 179:5 181:12,14,20,25 182:6 183:11,18 186:1,14,17 188:9 190:15 191:10 193:15 195:11,13,24	15:11 109:19 134:17,20 151:7 152:15 154:14 160:1,7 222:17 256:12,16 274:15 309:21 <b>Community</b> 147:24 <b>companies</b> 97:18 <b>company</b> 119:7,8 119:11,13,25 120:22,23 121:2 121:23 137:7 138:15 220:2

www.epiqglobal.com Lo casemanagers@epiqglobal.com

5	1 5			D 240
				Page 318
44:20,22	156:5 201:7	214:22 215:12	41:14	<b>consults</b> 24:6
competence 35:7	208:1 244:6	298:12,22,23	<b>consider</b> 18:4 21:9	contact 43:13
competition 83:7	270:24 277:7	298:12,22,23	24:22 27:20 28:7	74:13 159:21
complain 281:1	291:10	<b>confirm</b> 27:21	45:18,24 53:5	177:1 182:11
complainant 73:16	concerning 246:25	260:10	61:1,2 64:7	183:6 217:6
126:23 248:7	<b>concerns</b> 4:15 6:11	<b>confirmed</b> 37:25	70:19 156:19	contacted 217:5
279:9 306:21	20:25 21:2 29:23	61:10 105:11	185:23 233:15	contemporaneous
<b>complaint</b> 29:16	68:14 157:12	184:9 197:16	234:15 254:1	7:20 50:12
259:3	183:10 192:1	198:8 213:25	256:5 267:21	<b>content</b> 90:25 91:3
<b>Complaints</b> 58:3	197:13 227:20	confirming 5:12	292:7	<b>contention</b> 108:12
complete 106:2	234:25 247:12	conflating 104:24	considerably	203:7
155:17 161:6	259:20 260:5,9	<b>conflict</b> 106:22	282:5	contentious 95:25
206:10 208:13	260:12 269:10,12	123:17 125:2	consideration	96:3 98:4 106:13
<b>completely</b> 60:12	278:13 279:16	123.17 123.2 134:22 135:1,3	67:13 141:12	<b>context</b> 6:21 16:5
92:9 147:12	295:8,15 297:22	136:22 227:4,14	144:1,7 186:8	21:20 29:6 40:2
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
164:6 203:10	<b>conclude</b> 30:6 37:2	<b>conflicts</b> 124:21	233:25 considerations	51:12 60:7 67:22
208:14,19 209:4	concluded 18:14	268:5 291:13		70:3 71:4 81:17
224:22 227:2	262:15	confrontation	233:14	85:17 100:15
244:10 247:1	conclusion 27:9	194:11,14,15	<b>considered</b> 51:23	106:4 111:10
300:6	191:13 262:21	195:6	92:19 127:15,20	117:12 131:20
<b>complex</b> 162:20	conclusions 66:15	confusion 16:10	128:5 191:14	156:10 157:14
232:4 239:2	conditions 41:19	connection 60:23	306:21	159:3 165:4
compliance 29:12	<b>conduct</b> 221:13	221:9,11,18	considering 82:1	174:3 176:20
complimentary	conducting 215:13	222:7 292:13	considers 24:5	177:4 180:17
259:10	confer 47:2	293:7,17,21	consistent 14:5	193:18 202:20
composure 172:1	confess 147:11	294:6,10	21:23 24:18,20	224:11 232:22,25
concealed 282:10	confidence 2:16,23	connections	26:15 45:18	234:19 236:22
282:12	3:13 11:9 12:18	218:19,23 221:2	consistently 176:8	244:11 252:2
concept 80:7	17:11,16 20:7	221:21	consisting 48:22	264:24 265:24
157:18	21:6 27:5,10	conscience 186:3	consolidated 38:10	275:2 283:21
concern 10:23	29:7 155:17,23	consent 23:8	conspiracy 81:18	289:2,9,17 293:9
13:5 91:13 92:8	167:14 197:4,6	consequence 11:8	83:8 170:24	297:3 299:9
99:15,15 110:18	199:24 212:9	11:22 12:11	constant 86:6	305:15
111:10 126:5	215:1,3,17	73:13,14 86:15	constantly 82:18	Contingencies
128:15 129:1,20	217:11,17,17	241:16 245:5	82:18 101:17	139:13
138:2 141:7	223:4,11,17,19	264:7,8 300:11	129:19 201:8	continuation
183:5,7,8,12	224:3,9,12,17	consequences	constituted 61:2	305:18
186:20 200:23	225:12,23 228:6	12:13 17:15 20:2	107:22	<b>continue</b> 114:16
201:4 202:10	228:23 252:14	67:21 155:25	constitution 18:20	133:5,17 149:17
224:8	253:11 256:18	157:13,17,19	55:24 111:18	281:9 282:2
concerned 4:14	259:6,7,9 262:15	188:7 195:21	constitutional	306:1
10:25 11:23	299:12	271:2 275:4	60:21 71:10	continued 118:14
51:17,19 83:3	confidential 33:13	300:13	154:9 255:3	183:17,17 250:15
107:2 109:9	33:15 212:2,4,6	consequent 125:22	construction	250:17
110:4,9,13,22	212:23 299:10	126:14	132:12	continues 305:17
111:5,9,15,21	300:3,9 301:4,14	consequential	consult 200:4	continuing 305:24
124:18 126:3,4	301:17	12:22 186:5	269:21	contract 38:24
128:21,22 129:12	confidentiality	194:9	consulted 50:23	39:3,11,13 100:4
129:13 130:18	209:23 212:25	consequently	189:9,11 193:20	103:15 113:5,5
		± v		, í
			1	1

5	1 2			5
				Page 319
114 4 116 0	200.12	. 207.1		
114:4 116:2	200:12	correcting 307:1	<b>court</b> 58:16,18,20	criticism 273:23
121:22 122:1,2	<b>CoP</b> 35:11 36:3,10	correspondence	58:25 59:12	crocodile 3:24
123:12 125:1	36:12,19 37:10	90:14,23,25 91:2	63:17 149:19,20	<b>Crome</b> 40:16,16
134:23 135:5,11	197:2,10,11	<b>corrosive</b> 246:16	158:24 165:19	42:17 240:4,23
137:4 138:6	202:8 203:5	cost 117:19	245:19	241:17 246:9
143:1 144:11	258:9	counsel 49:24	courts 53:24 54:2	cross 12:8 96:20
219:18 289:1,24	copious 32:18	55:23 77:15	cover 272:21	97:16
291:2,18 292:1,3	core 45:19,22	84:17 113:22	covered 2:14	cross-examination
contracts 116:7	183:4 240:14	115:15,15 116:15	261:20	84:24
contrary 37:4	<b>Corneli</b> 163:23	116:16,18 151:21	covertly 10:8 31:3	Crown 115:14
202:7 226:11	Cornelio 76:20	152:17 153:8	280:13	116:14,16,17
268:11	85:25 95:7,18	154:22 158:1,5	<b>coy</b> 33:6,7,21,24	209:7 248:24
contribute 252:2	97:6 101:7,16	159:7 172:19	create 55:18 86:24	278:15 305:19
<b>control</b> 57:7 67:1	127:4,5,11,23	196:2 211:17	113:20 114:9	Cruz 52:20 59:5
68:11 260:22	128:19,25 129:10	215:6,18,21,25	134:2	59:24 60:15 63:9
272:14 286:17	129:15 130:18	247:24 278:16	created 84:17	66:20 69:2,9
308:22	131:5,8 133:13	309:4,13	134:1 135:6	72:2,11 73:25
convenient 267:14	133:13,22 139:21	counterparty	140:8 222:22	274:6
Convent 75:7	288:19,25 289:5	117:10	creating 103:23	<b>CTI</b> 115:25
173:5,10,10	289:12 293:3,5	country 3:9 31:19	105:3	culture 260:23
174:7,17 182:23	293:16	79:8,10	creation 56:21	current 154:16
293:15	Cornelio's 289:25	<b>counts</b> 203:25	credibility 46:16	211:2 249:18
conversation 38:6	coroner's 59:14	couple 25:9 93:21	224:20,22 228:5	287:21,23
47:18 69:20 95:9	<b>Corporation</b> 41:18	93:22 98:16,20	243:21 244:3	curtail 273:21
179:12 187:25	249:15 305:11	305:8	248:3	customs 289:21
211:9 258:5	correct 7:10 8:17	course 4:4 6:20	credit 171:2	<b>cut</b> 63:22
274:17 279:12	15:8 17:19 26:9	12:7 18:22 19:15	crept 236:21	
281:19	65:20 97:10	22:6 29:13 47:4	<b>crick</b> 91:11	D
conversations 6:2	103:17 112:12,24	47:13 50:14	criminal 70:10	d'etre 103:7
16:5 31:3 86:7	114:11 119:19,23	53:18,25 56:10	74:16 79:20 83:7	daggers-drawn
86:10 95:6 106:7	120:15 131:6	60:24 62:1,5	88:20 108:21	230:8
109:25 110:11	145:20 146:2	65:6 70:6 79:24	111:11 132:12	damage 260:19
111:12 149:24	154:18 163:14	82:10 87:15 91:3	136:4 143:24	damages 45:7
150:4,22 153:20	184:17,21 191:22	91:12 94:20	158:24 163:6	60:15 160:4
158:9 169:5	192:8 215:9	114:22 115:8	169:14,19,22	damming 13:6
217:13 256:14	217:4,8 229:24	121:3,18 123:20	170:2,4,5,11	damns 144:19
258:20 275:21	240:20 247:22	148:10 163:10	171:16,19 181:17	dares 268:6
<b>convey</b> 127:20	248:14 249:9	167:4 169:9	197:5,9 213:4	daresay 153:17
128:5	256:21,22,25	174:21 191:2	214:12 215:13,14	<b>Darren</b> 20:21,22
conveyed 187:9	263:1,19 266:15	193:2 201:19	261:23 262:1	21:25 22:16
<b>convicted</b> 136:4,13	266:20 270:9	212:22 215:22	272:25 276:6	295:5
143:23	278:1 286:8	224:7 228:11	281:4 306:9	date 30:10,20
convinced 84:2	290:18 303:2	253:2 255:19	criteria 11:16	34:16 114:17
165:14	304:16 305:9,15	259:24 264:3	critical 240:24	259:11
cooperation	<b>corrected</b> 13:13,16	265:8,9 267:5	247:7	dated 41:12 97:6
212:17,18	14:15,24 204:13	270:7 271:3	criticised 163:13	145:13
coordinated 200:9	205:20 206:16	272:9 283:17	188:10 283:15	dates 150:3 217:21
200:11	229:3 302:21	290:24 291:24	criticising 163:17	<b>David</b> 36:11,13,19
Coordination	303:3	295:10	178:21 240:16	36:22 37:12
-				<b>David's</b> 37:3
	1	I	I	I

				Page 320
<b>Davis</b> 49:19 50:2	109:21 125:16,17	decrease 143:13	delving 5:9	278:2 280:23
52:7	194:22 272:21	deemed 2:8 60:4	demonstrate 71:1	303:13 309:12
day 2:20 5:20 6:4	286:11 309:1	deep 158:23	260:22	detailed 10:11
7:7,8 10:6 21:4	deaths 186:16	259:19	demur 260:11	67:14 162:3
21:18,19 22:7,25	194:18	deeply 179:13	denied 49:6	270:15
25:15 34:5 89:13	<b>debatable</b> 171:2,6	<b>default</b> 18:16	department	details 25:7 221:20
89:21 100:24	debated 171:7	<b>defence</b> 71:16 97:4	131:23,23 139:9	262:10 280:21
137:2 153:13	December 50:24	127:3 131:4	139:10 248:24	detective 180:19
167:19 174:19	127:8 296:9,21	132:4	286:7 305:14	determine 18:2
182:6,21 185:22	decide 18:25 46:15	defend 71:13	departure 290:1	109:6 239:21
188:20 191:16	63:1 108:17	107:16,18,23	depending 299:9	245:1,2 246:13
192:2,4 194:9	234:12 245:4	<b>defendant</b> 70:4,6	depends 218:22	247:20 249:9
197:2 201:11	248:2 265:8	183:23	depth 48:22	determines 248:1
206:15 231:18	269:16,19 296:10	<b>defendants</b> 74:11	<b>Deputy</b> 49:1	determining 39:13
232:6 235:16	<b>decided</b> 26:20	183:21	255:16 264:4	detriment 43:2
259:21 270:20	72:14 138:24		293:13	
		<b>definitely</b> 149:21		44:25 45:2,4,9
284:10 285:10	139:20 166:15	192:20	<b>describe</b> 16:1 75:4	46:12 243:11
290:20 296:5	178:25 183:2	definition 158:8	95:9 135:3	247:13
297:4,8 309:8	226:23 290:11	158:10	174:12 223:5	detrimental 271:3
days 5:20 7:11	<b>deciding</b> 137:13	defraud 81:18	270:20	development
9:12 98:16	179:10 227:9	170:24	described 64:16	41:18 176:22
147:17 151:6	decipher 292:11	defunct 255:2	74:25 85:22	249:14 305:11
156:17 228:19	decision 19:2	degree 15:25	186:24 224:19	devices 23:22
230:12,18,21	43:23 44:1 46:8	37:23 185:16	describes 240:5	109:19,24 159:16
231:22 232:2,11	59:13 97:12	degrees 46:2 214:4	246:15	170:13 275:18
262:7 288:9	118:4 123:19,23	delayed 284:7	describing 55:2	291:9
309:22	123:24 124:1,3	<b>delete</b> 23:25	description 300:2	DeVincenzi
<b>de</b> 55:18 56:19	124:18,23,24,25	<b>Delhi</b> 8:25 29:16	deserves 26:3	115:18
deadline 233:8	125:3 135:10	58:8 60:20 74:11	designed 47:20	devolved 287:25
deal 9:23 12:16	137:3,6,25 138:7	79:17 80:19	58:4 132:9 150:9	dialogue 284:15
36:4,11 37:10	139:2,6 140:10	85:21 86:18 95:2	194:24 237:5	284:18
58:4 65:25 74:12	140:12 144:7,18	107:8 183:21	desirability 255:22	diaries 309:23
114:12 126:10	153:23,25 167:16	218:2,19,22	desire 98:5 105:22	diary 150:17
143:2 150:9	167:17 188:11	220:17 234:23	desist 281:21	151:14
153:4 176:20	199:9 219:17,25	239:14 273:1	desk 264:11	died 147:18
177:3 188:6	220:9 234:16	275:15 290:16	despite 133:4,12	dies 186:7
189:8,11 234:5	250:19 262:18	291:1 293:2	137:23	difference 16:13
240:5 274:5	264:18,22 265:11	deliberate 153:23	destroy 66:5	61:11,21 286:4
276:14 283:14	269:25 274:25	153:25	165:14 180:21	differences 62:5
284:4	275:10 276:4	deliberately 79:3	181:8	286:2
dealing 12:12	289:24 291:5	87:17	destroyed 224:15	different 5:24
65:10 102:15	306:13	deliberation 212:7	224:23	35:15,16 46:3
153:14 176:24	decision-making	deliberations	detail 8:24 9:3	57:17 60:12
212:19 271:1,2	124:7 278:24	18:10 19:14	10:5 17:10 30:4	105:19 106:15
301:19,20	decisions 139:15	212:6,9	30:4 42:7,7	141:25 146:7,8
,	143:19 190:10	delighted 123:2	74:20 97:11	146:10 164:6
dealings 32:6 79:1		179:14	156:10 209:25	175:18 176:19
<b>dealings</b> 32:6 79:1 <b>deals</b> 10:20 126:21	270:13			
deals 10:20 126:21	270:13 declaration 135:8			
dealings 32:6 79:1 deals 10:20 126:21 dealt 4:1 6:1 42:1 58:13 105:16	declaration 135:8 declarations 143:3	deliver 9:13 delivering 288:12	210:4,5 220:20 225:4 262:2	206:9,22 209:4 209:12,14 211:21

www.epiqglobal.com Lowe casemanagers@epiqglobal.com

Lower Ground Floor, 46 Chancery Lane m London, WC2A 1JE

5	1 2			5
				Page 321
211:23 214:4,6	107:25 303:12,23	298:10	276:8,10	19:8,12,17 22:19
228:13 229:14	308:24	disentangle 227:8	domain 36:24	23:1 25:15 27:3
244:3,4,10 247:1	disclosed 1:11 2:1	disgraceful 158:17	donated 148:3	28:7 34:12 47:3
278:5 286:14	108:6 109:7	disgracefully	door 180:4 218:8	71:4 194:10,12
300:6	110:22,22 150:2	156:6	218:11 256:1,2	218:16 258:15
differently 6:12	283:6	disingenuous	257:8 261:13	263:18 271:8,14
60:20 164:24	disclosing 43:7	152:21,23,24	dos 199:1	272:6
165:2 171:15,24	disclosure 2:3	202:14	doubt 18:13	draft 34:8,13
171:25 172:4,8	23:20 109:4	dismissed 59:22	110:19 171:24	263:21 271:7
difficult 9:23	146:9	60:2	232:20 260:18	drafted 40:22 85:9
61:17,20,24	discontinue	disposal 303:24	270:4	85:11 147:4,10
91:20 94:20	154:11	dispose 124:6,7	<b>Downing</b> 150:14	drawing 97:5
104:4 161:1,2	discount 127:23	134:25 135:14	<b>DOWNING</b> 150.14 <b>DPP</b> 13:13 15:4,13	dream 62:21
185:20 309:7,11	discourage 273:17	144:23 145:2	15:14,19,21 16:1	driving 143:1
difficulties 110:12	discovery 108:21	disposed 144:21	16:4,19 30:16	duty 19:19 162:12
114:24	109:3	144:25	61:1,6 62:3,13,17	uuty 17.17 102.12
difficulty 97:17	discreetly 266:3,6	dispute 96:15 97:1	64:5,16 65:1	E
223:25	266:10,13,24	97:22 98:8 105:4	71:23 72:14,20	E 101:18
digital 237:25	discretion 269:18	106:4,20 118:17	73:4,11 80:20,25	earlier 69:12
dinner 108:15	discuss 25:9,14	202:15	81:2,8,15,25 82:4	170:22 177:11
direct 131:16	97:9 203:20	disputed 80:25	132:19 167:13	184:2 190:14
261:2 268:19,21	259:16,19	dissertation	181:2 182:8,10	220:9 301:15
296:12 298:6	discussed 27:2	227:13	181:2 182:8,10	earliest 1:19,20
directed 295:18	30:25 49:20,22	<b>dissimilar</b> 234:3	182.14,10 185.0	early 61:3 94:25
296:20	64:8 82:14	distil 237:16	184:20 185:9	115:13 141:2
direction 57:25	104:13 148:9,23	distinction 61:7	189:9,12 190:3,4	earth 166:14
123:25 233:5	155:10 215:25	141:6	190:8,12 190:3,4	178:23 179:9
241:3 306:3	236:23 279:18	distinguish 226:14	190.8,12 193.12	183:1
directly 20:5 43:4	280:22,24 289:11	disturbed 67:5,12	193.21 197.10	easier 97:12
43:6 116:6 122:7	discussing 94:25	divert 163:10	198.8,21 199.10	113:17
131:8 240:12	148:11,16 149:6	234:10	205:4,7,10,14,14	easy 12:8
257:3 273:20	149:12 156:11	<b>divorce</b> 102:22	205:23 206:4	Ed 49:18 50:2 52:7
274:13 275:7	168:14	<b>document</b> 7:16	207:3 208:15,16	education 298:1,2
281:6,7	discussion 6:16	12:8 278:24	207:3 208:13,10	effect 3:17 12:16
<b>Director</b> 13:11	154:22 158:11	279:1	214:5,6,15,17	23:7 56:20
14:1,4 208:4	160:18 161:17,19	documentary 80:2	226:6,7 229:12	169:20 217:16
211:10 279:13	161:21 178:9	217:7,23	229:18 234:2	257:23 292:21
directors 298:1,2	225:7 234:20	<b>documents</b> 106:7	261:21 277:23	effectively 35:20
disadvantageous	236:24 238:2	146:10 151:8,24	278:15 279:18	44:9 98:24 299:7
237:3	253:22 262:13,14	153:16 299:21,22	301:6,25 302:7	effectiveness 54:15
<b>disagree</b> 55:14	288:24	308:21	302:15 303:1	effects 18:23 55:18
64:19,20 152:3	<b>discussions</b> 102:14	doing 10:9 11:6,7	302:13 303:1	56:20
disapproval 179:4	103:25 157:4,15	19:19 23:7 39:12	<b>DPP's</b> 80:5 193:11	efficiency 11:17
discharge 152:11	103:23 137:4,13	76:22 104:3	279:16 299:25	54:15
270:2	157:22,25 158:4		304:12	eggs 31:15
		115:6 118:5,7 121:16,25 137:17	<b>Dr</b> 4:5,20,20,25	<b>eight</b> 10:4 257:15
discharges 56:7	203:15,19 216:12	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		either 63:17 97:17
<b>discharging</b> 94:21 141:5	216:15 235:11,20	160:13,17 180:5	5:10,18 6:10,17	104:23 105:5
disclose 27:8	235:24 236:7,10	232:17 241:6	6:24 7:23 8:3,21	107:19 124:6,8
	236:15 289:9	255:9 264:3	9:6 17:8 18:24	131:20 145:23
	<u> </u>		<u> </u>	131.20 173.23

www.epiqglobal.com Lov casemanagers@epiqglobal.com

•				-
				Page 322
151:7 204:6	emphasized	enter 96:15,25	156:14 244:9	165:15 169:11
215:14 239:13	105:22	98:7 114:4	etcetera 9:10	172:19,20 175:6
267:5 297:6	employed 305:13	entered 234:22	289:22 299:3	180:6,16,21,24
304:15	employee 75:13	235:5 236:17	303:21 309:15	180:0,10,21,24
	1 0	238:18	ethical 45:25	189:8 190:3,5
elaborate 92:4,6	employees 45:8 75:8	enthusiasm 246:25		· · ·
<b>elected</b> 3:1 20:5 223:24 226:22	employer 45:1,6	247:2	evangelise 34:1	193:5,7 204:12 205:12 224:15
223.24 220.22	employment 44:18		<b>evangelising</b> 33:16 213:11 300:15	205.12 224.15 226:10 229:7
electronic 151:7	1 0	enthusiastically		
254:3 255:24	44:20,21,22 45:5 45:6 88:7 240:2	245:10 246:21,23	evasive 239:4,9 261:7	231:4,6,8 243:7
		<b>entirely</b> 52:16	eve 9:19 280:6	243:17,24 244:14
256:11,16 257:1	241:19,21,22,24	69:23 86:19		245:11 246:21
257:5 309:21	305:16,19,25	170:17 202:14	evening 36:16	247:8,9,11
element 39:17	enable 153:16	241:11 250:2	37:18 192:11	258:10 259:24
105:2	enabled 177:18	264:21 291:22	262:23 263:3	260:10 265:1
elevated 83:7	enables 40:8	294:16	268:24 302:23	273:10 296:4
elicited 84:7	enabling 153:10	entities 119:15	event 8:11 31:6	306:14,22 308:25
else's 64:21 132:20	encompassed 56:1	entitle 298:16	34:10 171:22	evidential 62:23
132:21	encourage 45:10	entitled 28:25	202:23 204:4	65:19 67:8 68:13
email 4:3 7:24	encouraged 45:14	52:11 57:12	227:7 279:25	evolving 284:17
13:2 37:8,18	encouragement	111:12,25 167:18	280:1	ex 129:11
107:12 163:8	289:7	entity 95:17	events 24:4 29:5	exactly 5:17 10:24
188:19 225:5	encouraging 160:8	103:23 113:25	147:19 172:11	12:20 28:2 38:23
240:8,11 245:14	160:14,23,25	114:3 125:1	203:4 225:7	49:13 59:7 69:2
245:15,18,18	162:9 289:4	242:8	eventually 45:3	69:3 93:7,14
246:7 262:23,23	endeavour 78:11	entry 25:24 150:17	194:3	96:9 101:4
262:25 263:7	endeavoured	151:14 306:3	everybody 213:13	102:10,11 104:12
268:24 269:1	77:24 78:2,4,17	environment	235:14,22 262:5	104:18 114:3
271:6,21 281:25	ended 134:23	309:10	everyone's 57:12	115:2 126:22
296:16	135:2 180:1	<b>envisage</b> 250:6,7	evidence 4:9 5:23	167:24 180:1
emailed 192:5,8,9	ends 114:13	equally 208:1	6:10 10:13 14:7	181:19 190:5
emails 25:21 47:13	enforcement 2:25	equals 265:18	14:21,23,24	194:13 199:7
151:24 152:9,14	20:7	equivalent 75:22	15:11,15,23	206:11,18 225:17
192:6 240:15	engage 19:4	Ernest 23:3 51:12	19:17 39:14	226:1,10 283:13
294:21	269:20 270:1	erroneous 54:21	40:11,21 41:5,7	286:9 291:15,19
embarrassed	engaging 176:18	error 205:1 261:18	42:19 43:19 44:9	292:3
94:13	enjoy 270:5	264:16	44:15 45:15,22	examination 60:8
emerge 310:4	enjoyed 155:23	errors 94:13	46:13,14,16	259:1
emerged 146:10	enlarged 234:6	essence 304:12	47:12 52:4,24	examine 274:15
emotion 66:25	<b>enquiries</b> 42:2	establish 114:13	58:9 59:16 61:16	example 5:18 12:1
187:9	ensure 29:11 42:4	114:21 120:20	64:2,11,12,13,24	26:24 53:22 70:1
emotional 89:21	46:8 54:15 56:6	289:6 308:10	65:3,22,24 66:2	72:21 83:17
90:4 185:24	71:14 94:10	established 95:17	66:10,19,21 67:6	87:23 110:1,25
226:15	112:2 113:24	122:21 134:4	67:14,25 70:8,19	111:1 133:20
emotionally 93:5	153:10 200:13	142:17 149:20	72:6,10,15 73:3	156:13 162:15,17
227:6	230:10 247:16	247:15	80:2 103:20	176:21 212:20
emotions 89:23	248:7	establishes 209:8	117:14 122:12	277:22 278:14
92:5 93:10 228:1	ensured 29:3	establishment	123:7,21 125:20	298:13,17,24
emphasis 54:25	ensuring 45:8	114:8	148:15 150:11	301:22 305:17
emphasised 98:4	133:6,17 162:17	<b>et</b> 144:16,16	153:17 164:3,12	Excellency 7:23
			l	

Epiq Europe Ltd +44 (0) 207 404 1400

www.epiqglobal.com casemanagers@epiqglobal.com

Lower Ground Floor, 46 Chancery Lane London, WC2A 1JE

	Page 323
	<b>factual</b> 135:17

43:14	22:1,3 254:1	explanation 47:16	extricate 113:10	<b>factual</b> 135:17
excess 162:21	<b>exhibit</b> 80:18	explanation/info	113:14	136:17 231:14
exchange 21:23	163:2 283:2,5,22	270:6	extricating 114:5	factually 87:1
22:25 28:20 44:9	exhibited 308:15	explanations	114:6	fail 143:22
69:10 104:11	exhibits 72:13	276:14		failed 27:8 140:17
191:5 225:3	73:20	explicit 105:1	F	140:21 142:16
271:22 294:21	exigencies 287:8	166:17 197:12	<b>Fa</b> 115:18	143:13 144:1
295:21 297:7	exist 81:19 210:7	199:12 298:21	Fabian 23:2 142:6	162:11 186:14
298:6	227:4,12	300:2	250:15	274:1
exchanged 47:12	existed 170:25	explicitly 299:11	face 3:4 227:22	failings 262:18
238:2	existence 227:14	exploit 103:24	facilitate 254:11	<b>failure</b> 60:16
exchanges 1:11,13	283:7	142:18	facilitating 70:22	144:20 203:5,6
2:4,19 4:4 23:13	exonerate 82:20	exploitation 103:8	fact 2:5 6:7 7:22	244:8
25:3 106:14	82:21 83:1,10	117:21	12:5 22:2 25:16	failures 160:5
128:13 181:8	exonerated 82:25	exposed 109:2	33:24 45:10,14	fair 2:15 3:14
222:22 225:5	86:8	exposure 60:15	48:3 52:12 67:16	18:24 45:18
230:1 236:22	exoneration 83:23	express 24:16 49:7	72:7 82:15 87:18	52:23 70:21 99:2
238:16 267:19	83:25	126:5 127:9	88:19 90:11,20	99:2 111:16,22
298:7 300:21	expect 74:18 75:23	179:4 274:19	92:25 113:17	115:1 116:10
<b>Exchequer</b> 60:16	106:11,19 152:1	275:25	126:15 137:23	121:24 156:1
exclude 87:18	165:1 172:9	expressed 49:8	140:1 141:10	157:3,21 166:11
122:7	175:24 176:18	80:7 86:1 131:25	155:14,21 166:19	168:11 170:4
exclusion 122:9	211:12	157:14 170:18,19	173:9 175:2	172:9 174:11
excuse 91:12	expectation	183:10 217:9,15	182:11,20 183:13	175:4,5,16 193:9
224:25 231:7	212:25	228:10 247:1	188:21 195:4,12	210:10 257:7
252:25	<b>expected</b> 106:17	271:14	195:19 196:8	267:18 270:20
<b>execute</b> 60:17 70:7	141:21 165:3	expressing 14:8	201:14 206:1,4,6	287:12 288:18
274:9 302:3	279:3 289:12	97:23 99:10,17	206:16 219:21	292:22
executed 85:24	295:24 296:7	expression 20:16	221:12 223:8	fairly 3:14 98:9
169:2 171:11,13	expecting 165:22	77:17 80:13	224:3,4 225:13	117:23 296:16
174:24 197:14,25	experience 50:9	99:23 132:15	225:18 226:5	fall 62:14 144:6
223:8,9 262:8	experienced 215:5	221:9 252:14	228:3 234:7	281:23
274:12 277:4,6	246:3	expressly 8:13	235:2 248:6,9	falling 137:17,20
executing 277:6	explain 8:21 12:9	29:11 214:25	254:18 262:7	false 92:4
execution 60:11	19:6 20:23 40:15	extend 53:22	265:10 270:24	familiar 41:1
67:21 89:14 93:3	178:18 272:10	215:11	271:6 273:10	77:17 268:7
181:21,25 205:2	295:6	extended 213:1	274:11,23 283:4	272:1 283:4
225:10,21 226:2	explained 10:23	extent 17:2 32:10	283:6,19 285:12	300:23
226:4 261:18	12:6 40:12 42:10	137:17 224:6	286:10 293:4	family-owned
276:24 277:3,8	54:10 62:13	237:7 251:22	298:9 303:1,6	119:25
300:18	91:21 93:1	external 266:19	304:25 308:10	fanciful 88:11,25
executive 211:20	191:19 221:24	267:22 268:15	facto 55:18 56:19	89:5 90:17,20
211:21	225:8 241:17	288:5 297:11	<b>factor</b> 262:3	92:7 93:16
exercise 19:1 55:5	242:3 253:13	extra-statutory	facts 10:25 11:4,8	224:19 249:24
55:11 108:22	260:11 272:5	252:9	11:21 12:13	250:2
238:13 239:19	explaining 11:7	extracted 225:15	34:16 60:12	far 1:12,16,19,19
264:19	72:7 152:21	extraordinary	162:21 178:4	10:14,25 11:22
exercised 255:8	293:20	147:19	181:6 206:17	45:14 51:16,16
exercising 21:24	explains 91:24	extremely 92:19	239:21 244:22	71:11 101:14
	_		245:1	
	1	1	1	1

www.epiqglobal.com Lov casemanagers@epiqglobal.com

Lower Ground Floor, 46 Chancery Lane m London, WC2A 1JE

				Page 324
112:10 124:18	160:21 271:12	126:20 131:14,16	forgot 153:18	223:10 227:17
161:25 245:13	filed 186:15	152:7 153:19	form 53:8 65:19	258:25 274:6
273:7,19 276:13	filibustering 68:3	158:21 163:2,3	209:17 212:1,3	282:7 291:7
277:7,25	<b>final</b> 24:17 36:7	166:22 167:7	244:19	292:12 294:23
fatal 13:6	81:1 95:13 150:7	180:24 184:5	former 54:10	friends 156:17,19
<b>favour</b> 50:18	231:13 304:7	186:13,18,22	74:11 240:10	160:18 161:17,19
124:2,4,24	finalised 37:5	196:10 198:11	242:5	161:21 268:4
favourable 242:22	Finally 264:14	201:15 203:23	formulated 152:4	friendship 228:2,8
244:23 245:3	finance 39:20 40:2	225:1,14 226:6	forward 1:17	293:22 294:11
favourably 117:16	286:17	227:4 228:18	140:16 242:21,25	<b>front</b> 7:1 109:16
favoured 51:21	Finance(sic)	232:5,7,8 233:17	243:5,20,24	190:18,24 289:19
125:2	286:18	258:4 260:4,11	247:11	FRS 11:19
favouring 99:11	finances 285:4	266:12 267:18	forwarded 98:23	frustrated 254:13
291:11	financial 44:3	277:11 285:17,23	240:12	fulfilling 264:5
FCDO 35:2	119:17 123:17	295:22 296:5	forwards 73:15	full 11:9 68:5 96:8
FCO 13:3,21	136:8,11 142:10	300:11 307:22	98:20 246:10	167:19 219:5
16:23 17:1 35:2	142:11,12,15	308:17,18	foul 80:9 218:10	236:13 237:7
36:1	143:6,6,7,12	<b>fish</b> 80:9	found 129:14	238:23 242:7
feasible 268:14	291:13,17	fit 67:19 104:21	133:7 137:10,16	294:12,14 295:9
February 41:12	<b>find</b> 45:11 61:16	288:5	138:10,15 173:5	fully 12:6,7 32:24
272:2	94:12 96:18	<b>five</b> 10:1,5 12:15	173:20 228:18	121:4,18 184:24
Federation 13:7	97:15 104:4	18:2 30:1 61:5	founders 95:3	194:12 253:21
245:17 246:9	107:4 127:10	168:10,12 191:15	98:18 107:8	<b>fun</b> 156:21
feel 17:6 20:16	128:2 151:13	278:4 286:25	136:2,12 138:16	<b>function</b> 57:5,19
21:13 29:19	177:23 185:20	flawed 55:20 83:6	143:23 222:4	270:3
33:11 44:8 97:9	188:5 193:13	170:20	<b>four</b> 6:6 10:15	functions 18:21
141:24 149:14	291:10 298:14	flimsy 64:2	23:4,5 34:9 90:2	21:24 22:1,3
feeling 91:24 93:2	finding 91:19	<b>fly</b> 115:14	195:25 196:5,7	56:7 152:12
feelings 18:14	302:2 304:5	<b>focus</b> 277:21	196:10	264:5
feels 16:3 32:25	findings 288:13	focused 140:19	<b>fourth</b> 10:16	<b>fund</b> 38:11
287:16	<b>finds</b> 304:13	focusing 297:19	frame 30:3	fundamental
fees 38:25 39:1	fine 122:23 231:10	followed 28:22	Framework 280:6	31:13
feet 251:15	fingers 256:2	209:10 225:7	fray 96:15,25 98:7	fundamentally
<b>fell</b> 137:21	finish 23:11 70:15	246:8	free 19:7 39:18	83:6 152:3
felt 4:22 5:25 6:1	finished 22:11	following 21:4	124:25 132:20	170:20
6:18,25 20:11	147:18	22:7 25:23 51:2	215:9 228:11	<b>funded</b> 287:4
25:12 27:1 30:11	<b>finishing</b> 157:20	182:9 191:16	302:9 303:5,16	<b>funding</b> 286:5
30:13 32:6 36:19	<b>firm</b> 24:17 120:14	297:4	free-standing 56:6	287:7,25 288:6
39:12 49:14	221:15 260:7	follows 159:25	56:23	<b>further</b> 17:6 25:3
51:14 67:14	294:19	fool 87:11	frequent 149:23	46:17 75:5 95:11
87:13 124:24	<b>firmly</b> 35:6	foot 159:5	frequently 80:7	189:2 196:19,20 196:23 197:4
169:16 175:9 187:12 203:16	<b>first</b> 4:10 9:21 11:16 15:24	footnote 162:5 forceful 20:15	Friday 61:6 307:11	196:23 197:4
224:2 254:9	23:12,14 24:14	<b>Forces</b> 299:3	<b>friend</b> 55:23 67:4	230:4 241:10 260:22 262:24
295:18 297:10	27:17 32:3 34:13	<b>Foreign</b> 264:11,12	67:11 106:8	284:13 297:17
300:19 303:5	36:1,16 38:10,18	267:12	156:23,25 157:5	309:18 310:10
<b>fight</b> 96:4	40:14 50:22	<b>forget</b> 101:17	157:9,11,13,16	<b>future</b> 88:7
figure 113:13	63:10 92:22	168:20	165:11 173:18	iuiui ( 00.7
file 9:10 17:7	117:15 121:11	forgetting 191:17	181:18,23 182:2	G
···· /··· /··/	11/.12 121.11		101.10,23 102.2	Gaggero 74:13,18
		I	l	00

Epiq Europe Ltd +44 (0) 207 404 1400 www.epiqglobal.com Lower Groun casemanagers@epiqglobal.com

Lower Ground Floor, 46 Chancery Lane m London, WC2A 1JE

				Page 325
75.10 01 76 15	006.16 007 10 16	Cibraltania 75.00		22.11 22.1 51 7
75:18,21 76:15	236:16 237:10,16	<b>Gibraltar's</b> 75:22	gives 277:11 291:3	23:11 32:1 51:7
76:17,22 88:23	238:6,14,20,21	75:25 89:7 91:14	<b>giving</b> 40:21 45:21	54:11 59:6,23
95:4,10 99:20	239:11 242:12	137:11 140:2	72:10 105:18	63:2 65:10,14
101:2,5 102:10	273:16 279:12,23	212:21 213:21	123:12 133:22	70:5 83:12,18
102:11,13,24	301:7 302:1,13	244:15 288:6	162:8,16 193:7	87:7 90:12,15,24
104:12,19 105:15	304:4,7 305:4	Gibraltarian	229:3 231:25	91:9 93:21 103:6
105:23 106:11,15	General's 29:18	103:12	241:21 243:8	104:23 117:16,24
106:19 120:2	generally 100:6,12	give 10:15 14:7	270:10	118:1,2,5,6,8
123:22 125:4	258:23 277:13	24:19 27:13	<b>go</b> 1:12,23 4:6 9:15	119:10 121:8,10
126:16 129:15,24	280:4	40:18 46:13	11:13 13:1 17:17	121:11 123:5
130:6,17 131:1	generous 88:8	52:24 68:5,8	19:25 20:18 21:8	133:6,18 140:15
133:5,12 135:12	287:19	69:6 83:16 94:22	22:23 25:2 27:12	145:8 151:22,25
139:24 144:15	genuinely 216:16	94:23 98:23	28:12 30:3 34:4	152:2 157:20
182:3 289:12	309:19	110:25 140:13,13	35:23 36:1,15	165:14 173:17
290:3,8,20	getting 25:8 28:7	162:18 168:11	41:11 51:7 56:2	182:5 196:21,24
Gaggero's 76:7	38:24 73:11	169:10 172:9	63:2,7 73:15	196:24 201:7
99:8 106:1,10,18	97:10 164:3	176:16 177:14	80:17 82:6 85:5	204:5 210:4
Gaggeros 140:3	267:10 275:8	179:16 199:11	95:11 98:13	212:22 215:4
Gallagher 153:8	GGCA 42:15	212:19 222:3,14	100:16 103:24	221:20 227:13
304:1	Gibraltar 3:17	227:13 247:7,9	107:1 109:14	228:13,15 237:21
Galliano 75:8	20:6,8 33:17	261:24	119:12 125:1	238:13 246:6
129:9 133:19	41:17 45:24 46:9	given 25:6 26:4,24	126:18,24 129:7	253:14 254:20,21
gambit 103:5	54:9 71:11,14,14	26:25 35:5 40:1	132:23 144:12	254:22 257:6,11
Garrison 309:10	73:5 76:6 78:15	40:19,23 42:9	145:10 151:10,17	260:18 266:9
gate 289:17	78:18,22,24	43:22 47:24	154:3 155:7	271:5,11 275:13
gatekeeper 128:11	81:23 85:7 92:14	64:24 65:1,13,22	159:4,8 162:4	277:9,14,19,20
128:16 131:22	103:10 107:20	67:14 68:10,12	164:2 165:5	280:18 282:23
<b>GDC</b> 305:23,25	108:13 111:8,17	69:21 70:16	166:15 177:23	285:1,2,18
306:5	111:20 117:25	72:15,21 79:3	178:25 180:25	287:20 291:2,4
gender 43:7	118:18 122:16	95:16 96:13,23	181:2 183:2	295:6 297:3
general 13:11,12	125:8,10,14	98:5 109:2,4	184:18 185:3,14	301:18 305:22
14:1 15:2 16:2	127:1 137:7	118:16 123:21	189:20 190:13,16	309:25
29:3 30:16 40:24	138:3,3,4 144:3	125:20 127:9,23	196:19,25 204:7	Gomez 48:22
61:11 87:6	144:16 148:3,4	129:17 131:16,19	204:18 206:24	51:12,17 200:21
148:20 166:22	149:20 151:21	138:18 149:16	209:25 211:4	Gonçalves 48:24
167:8,11 180:25	171:4 174:3	156:10 162:1,20	220:23 222:12	54:9 56:15
184:6,8,9 185:2,8	176:17 177:4	164:12 166:19	226:23 230:13,15	good 1:3,3 47:6,7
190:16,18,23,25	185:5 186:11	167:24 182:16	231:12 233:21	51:16 52:21,22
192:13,23 200:2	213:9,13,21	190:3,5 195:20	241:10 245:15	62:8,11 64:17,18
200:4 201:5,17	215:15 217:25	205:11 210:18	246:10 257:9	77:5 106:8
202:1,2,4,25	218:4,15 227:22	215:10 220:8	258:3 260:4	118:11,15 119:3
203:1,3,7 205:5	230:9 245:17	232:11 236:13	262:24 268:22,25	122:14 157:11
205:11,16 206:12	246:4 249:14	238:7 239:10	271:15,25 272:18	159:1 165:11
208:23 209:6	260:19 264:7,9	243:21 244:14,18	275:1 276:4	181:18 199:3
214:10 215:22	264:11 267:7,8	251:8 258:9	287:7,24 305:22	233:19,22,23
216:13,18 226:6	278:8 285:4	270:18 276:17	goes 23:3 102:18	234:18 250:18
228:19 229:2	289:6 299:2	278:10,12 279:8	260:2,16 266:21	258:8 285:10
234:2,21 235:12	300:12 305:11	294:6 300:17	going 1:17 4:9	287:9
235:20,25 236:11	310:20	302:8 309:6	9:18,20 20:23	goodness 130:23
		•	•	•

government 3:17         8:4 47:21 261:2 264:22         gripes 243:18 gross 213:8 gross 213:8         happened 7:7.8         221:15,19 228           13:4:12:24,25         Governors 265:17         gross 213:8 gross 213:8         10:6,11 21:18         229:2 262:8           13:3:16:8         17:8:18:2,10,13         261:21 27:22         87:12 92:24         Hassans 289:8           117:1,9,10,16         18:17.20 19:8.9         290:17         111:2 122:11         head 53:12 100           120:21 121:1,7         20:11,12,14,23         grounds 189:8,11         130:41 46:20         136:19 185:6,           121:21,22 133:8         21:10,12,16,21         guardian 53:13,16         151:10,12 152:8         head 53:10 7:19:14           144:11 145:8         21:24 22:7 24:4         148:25         guardian 53:13,16         160:19 172:17,17         head 156:19 172:17,17           227:62 80:3         48:25 51:1 55:9         guidiance 63:5         177:19,24 178:5         189:23 191:17           288:4 289:15         56:21,22 57:19         guidance 63:5         189:21 187:6,24         191:14 194:10           299:1 30:23         155:22 196:21         28:17         201:10 202:19         70:19 89:1           206:20 20:24         128:17         201:10 202:19         201:14 194:10         202:12 27:18           203:22 02:24:23 25:1		1 5			5
54:1,2,7 72:16.25         264:22         gross 213:8         10.6,11 21:18         229:2 262:8           104:3 112:24,25         Governors 265:17         gross 213:8         10.6,11 21:18         229:2 262:8           13:24,13,23         GPA 4:24 5:21,21         ground 176:24         67:3,10 70:16         30:3:25 304:3,3           115:3 116:8         17:8 18:2,10,13         261:21 272:22         87:12 92:24         Hassans' 289:8           117:1,9,10,16         18:17,20 19:8,9         290:17         111:2 122:11         head 53:12 100           120:21 121:1,7         20:11,12,16,21         grounds 189:81,11         130:41 46:20         136:19 185:6,6           144:11 145:8         21:10,21,621         guardian 53:13,16         160:19 172:17,17         head 136:19           144:51         242:62,8278:7         47:22,23 48:51,2         53:19         177:19,24 178:5         189:23 19:17           279:6 280:3         48:25 51:1 55:9         guardians 53:15         177:19:14 178:5         189:23 19:17           286:7 287:4         56:12,23,57,12         guidace 63:5         181:5 182:1,87:6,24         191:14 194:10           299:1 303:23         155:22 106:3         280:3         194:21 196:11         277:12 280:11           206:22 139:8         292:24 232:12         guidace 63:5         1					Page 326
54:1,2,7 72:16,25         264:22         gross 213:8         10:6,11 21:18         229:2 262:8           104:3 112:24,25         Governors 265:17         gross 213:8         10:6,11 21:18         229:2 262:8           13:24,13,23         GPA 4:24 5:21,21         groum 176:24         67:3,10 70:16         30:3:25 304:3,3           117:1,9,10,16         18:17,20 19:8,9         290:17         111:2 122:11         head 53:12 100           118:2,18 119:5         19:10,11,12,14,23         growth 142:20         147:6,8 149:11         238:15 262:16           120:21 121:1,7         20:11,12,16,21         guarantee 74:9         151:10,12 152:8         headless 266:11           144:11 145:8         21:24 22:7 24:4         148:25         185:18 154:23         headless 266:11           144:11 145:8         24:26,2 37:87         47:22,23 48:51,2         53:19         177:19:14 178:5         189:23 19:17           279:6 280:3         48:25 51:1 55:9         guardians 53:15,16         160:19 172:17,17         hear 13:6 31:17           286:7 287:4         56:12,2,3,5,7,12         guiardianship         178:10,19,24         79:21 280:11           299:1 30:3:23         155:22 196:3         280:3         194:21 196:11         27:21 280:11           299:1 30:3:23         155:22 17:14         280:23 <td< td=""><td>10.17</td><td>0 4 47 01 0/1 0</td><td>• • • • • • • • •</td><td>1</td><td>221.17.10.220.22</td></td<>	10.17	0 4 47 01 0/1 0	• • • • • • • • •	1	221.17.10.220.22
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	8				
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $			0	-	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	,				
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		,	0		,
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	,		0		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	,		0	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	-		0	-	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	-	,	0		
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		,	0	,	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	,			-	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $			0	,	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		,	0	,	
306:20199:20 200:3guy 101:2,6 102:8201:10 202:19296:11government's202:6 220:24128:17203:8 217:14,19hearing 245:20126:22 139:8229:24 232:121128:17202:15 229:19,21hearsay 49:13104:4 287:14255:1 258:6148:1 5928:19249:16 277:8227:18governments253:25 254:11123:14,15 145:16hairs 290:9haif 15:9 28:19123:14,15 145:166:19 7:1,25270:2,12 272:12270:2,12 272:12129:15 271:1620:2 42:8 92:25heat 174:10,1416:2,25 17:24295:6 297:20294:12160:10 208:2held 52:11 137:16:22,25 17:24295:6 297:20294:12160:10 208:2help 59:6,2420:3 22:20 24:6GPF 42:13 240:9294:7hagpens 93:9helfful 60:723:5 43:14 49:2298:25grant 162:6230:16happens 93:9helpful 60:723:5 43:14 49:2298:25grant 162:6230:16happenstance288:255:10,15,19 56:4grant 102:6handl 261:13happer 76:18handle 261:1371:6 155:22153:6handle 47:20hands 123:4haf3:15 168:3175:2 187:11205:21,24 206:11234:25 251:6handwer 76:18handwer 76:18hast 15 168:3175:2 187:11228:22 229:1,12graet 91:23 144:4292:11Hassans 60:2290:5,13 95:6,19162:8 165:12230:3,4,13 234:1149:7 206:19291:21 22.4290:5,13 95:6,19162:8 165:12234:11 253:6,9251:22 270:21happen 17:22.2			0		
government's 126:22 139:8 185:7202:6 220:24 229:24 232:12 234:15,18 253:2128:17203:8 217:14,19 220:15 229:19,21 245:6 248:9 249:16 277:8 249:16 277:8 249:16 277:8 249:16 277:8 249:16 277:8 249:16 277:8 					
126:22 139:8       229:24 232:12       234:15,18 253:2       H       220:15 229:19,21       hearsay 49:13         governments       253:25 254:11       hairs 290:9       249:16 277:8       227:18       heated 193:16         governor 4:15       268:20 269:12,16       123:14,15 145:16       happening 19:10       20:2 42:8 92:25       held 52:11 137:         12:19 13:17,19       272:16,19 282:6       219:5 271:16       100:6,12 105:6       148:1 262:17         16:22,25 17:24       295:6 297:20       294:12       160:10 208:2       help 59:6,24         20:3 22:20 24:6       GPF 42:13 240:9       half truth 293:25       280:16       156:24 286:4         24:15 27:1,1,2,19       Grace 212:21       294:7       happens 93:9       helpful 60:7         32:5 43:14 49:2       granting 132:5       grant 162:6       230:16       174:16 187:24       helpful 00:7         32:5 43:14 49:2       grave 20:25,25       handle 261:13       handle 261:13       happerstance       288:2         55:10,15,19 56:4       grave 20:25,25       handle 47:20       71:25 105:8,9       Hi 23:6 25:10         100:17 204:19,19       234:25 251:6       handwer 76:18       hafds 123:4       h43:15 168:3       175:2 187:11         217:4,5,9 225:3,9       295:8,8       handwriting <td></td> <td></td> <td>0.</td> <td></td> <td></td>			0.		
185:7 governments $234:15,18\ 253:2\ 255:1\ 258:6\ 253:25\ 254:11\ 255:1\ 258:6\ 255:1\ 258:6\ 268:20\ 269:12,16\ 255:1\ 258:6\ 268:20\ 269:12,16\ 268:20\ 269:12,16\ 277:8\ 249:16\ 277:8\ 249:16\ 277:8\ 249:16\ 277:8\ 249:16\ 277:8\ 249:16\ 277:8\ 249:16\ 277:8\ 249:16\ 277:8\ 227:18\ heatel\ 193:16\ heightened\ 93:1\ heid\ 52:1\ 137:\ 122:19\ 13:17,19\ 272:16,19\ 282:6\ 219:5\ 271:16\ 100:6,12\ 105:6\ 148:1\ 262:17\ 148:1\ 262:17\ 166:10\ 208:2\ 294:12\ 160:10\ 208:2\ 148:1\ 262:17\ 148:1\ 262:17\ 166:10\ 208:2\ 294:12\ 160:10\ 208:2\ 148:1\ 262:17\ 148:1\ 262:17\ 166:10\ 208:2\ 280:16\ 156:24\ 286:4\ 156:24\ 286:$			128:17	-	e
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	-
104:4 287:14 governor 4:15255:1 258:6 255:1 258:6half 15:9 28:19 123:14,15 145:16 152:7 167:4278:3 happening 19:10 20:2 42:8 92:25heated 193:16 heightened 93:1 heightened 93:16:19 7:1,25 12:19 13:17,19270:2,12 272:12 270:2,12 272:12152:7 167:4 294:1220:2 42:8 92:25 100:6,12 105:6heightened 93:1 heightened 93:116:22,25 17:24 20:3 22:20 24:6295:6 297:20 GPF 42:13 240:9 24:15 27:1,1,2,19 32:5 43:14 49:2 49:5,9 54:4 55:5 55:10,15,19 56:4 55:10,15,19 56:4 55:10,15,19 56:4 55:10,15,19 56:4 55:10,15,19 56:4 50:8 57:5 70:21forace 212:21 298:25 grant 162:6 granting 132:5 grateful 80:2 153:6half truth 293:25 294:7 halfway 77:2 230:16 handle 261:13 handle 261:13 handle 261:13 handle 47:20 71:25 105:8,9help 106:7 239:20 241:25 288:2200:17 204:19,19 228:22 229:1,12 234:25 251:6 230:3,4,13 234:1 234:12 253:6,9234:25 251:6 231:44:4 295:8,8hand 176:6 handver 76:18 hands 123:4 handwriting 292:11166:18 279:19 125:12 270:21239:20 241:25 288:2 handver 76:18 hands 123:4107:13,23 134:18 149:7 206:19 234:11 253:6,9174:16 187:24 149:7 206:19 251:22 270:21handwriting 292:11 Hang 15:16 231:1 happen 17:22,24266:25 307:24 90:5,13 95:6,19 96:13,24 98:612:10 - 208:22 229:13251:22 270:21149:7 206:19 251:22 270:21292:11 happen 17:22,24162:8 165:12 90:5,13 95:6,19 96:13,24 98:613:10 - 208:22 229:13251:22 270:21happen 17:22,24 496:13;24 98:6162:8 165:12 406:13;24 98:6	185:7	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
Init 20111Init 2011Init 2011Init 2011governor 4:15268:20 269:12,16123:14,15 145:16happening 19:106:19 7:1,25270:2,12 272:12152:7 167:420:2 42:8 92:2512:19 13:17,19272:16,19 282:6219:5 271:1620:2 42:8 92:2516:22,25 17:24295:6 297:20294:12160:10 208:220:3 22:20 24:6GPF 42:13 240:9half-truth 293:25280:1624:15 27:1,1,2,19Grace 212:21294:7happens 93:949:5,9 54:4 55:5granting 132:5halfway 77:2166:18 279:1949:5,9 54:4 55:5granting 132:5santing 132:5hand 176:655:10,15,19 56:4grateful 80:2handled 47:20174:16 187:24200:17 204:19,19234:25 251:6handver 76:18107:13,23 134:18205:21,24 206:11234:25 251:6handwriting266:25 307:24228:22 229:1,12great 91:23 144:4292:11Hassans 60:22230:3,4,13 234:1149:7 206:19292:1190:5,13 95:6,19234:11 253:6,9251:22 270:21happen 17:22,2496:13,24 98:6	0				
6:19 7:1,25270:2,12 272:12152:7 167:420:2 42:8 92:25held 52:11 137:12:19 13:17,19272:16,19 282:6219:5 271:1620:2 42:8 92:25held 52:11 137:16:22,25 17:24295:6 297:20294:12160:10 208:2help 59:6,2420:3 22:20 24:6GPF 42:13 240:9half-truth 293:25280:16help 59:6,2424:15 27:1,1,2,19Grace 212:21294:7halfway 77:2239:20 241:2549:5,9 54:4 55:5grant 162:6230:16happenstance288:255:10,15,19 56:4grateful 80:2handle 261:13handle 261:13halfer 20:15 105:8,971:6 155:22153:6handled 47:2071:25 105:8,9Hi 23:6 25:10200:17 204:19,19234:25 251:6hands 123:4143:15 168:3175:2 187:11217:4,5,9 225:3,9295:8,8292:11292:11Hagpen 17:22,2496:13,24 98:6234:11 253:6,9251:22 270:2151:16 231:190:5,13 95:6,19162:8 165:12234:11 253:6,9251:22 270:21happen 17:22,2496:13,24 98:6high-profile 13:					
12:1913:17,19272:16,19282:6219:5271:1620:12100:6,12105:616:22,2517:24295:6297:20294:12100:6,12105:6148:1262:1720:322:2024:6 <b>GPF</b> 42:13240:9 <b>half-truth</b> 293:25294:7help 59:6,24156:24286:424:1527:1,1,2,19298:25grant298:25294:7helpful 60:7239:20241:2549:5,954:455:5grant 162:6230:16happenstance288:2156:24288:255:10,15,1956:4grateful 80:2handle 261:13handle 261:13handle 261:13handle 47:20hidden 120:1371:6155:22153:6grave 20:25,25handled 47:20handwriting295:8,8171:25107:13,23134:18hidden 120:13205:21,24206:11295:8,8295:8,8292:11266:25307:24hierarchy 176:11230:3,4,13234:1251:22270:21happen 17:22,2490:5,1395:6,19162:8162:12234:11251:22270:21happen 17:22,2496:13,2498:6high-profile 13:2	0		-		heightened 93:10
1211912110, 12110, 1221029210294:12160:10160:10160:10208:216:22,2517:24295:6297:20294:12160:10208:2280:16help59:6,2424:1527:1,1,2,19Grace212:21294:7halfway77:2280:16helpful60:732:543:1449:2298:25grant162:6230:16happens93:9166:18279:19239:20241:2549:5,954:455:5grant162:6230:16happenstance288:2166:18288:2166:18288:2166:18279:19239:20241:2555:10,15,1956:4grateful80:2153:6handle261:13happenstance285:91107:13,23134:18helpfully120:1371:6155:22153:6grave20:25,25handled47:2071:25105:8,9Hi<23:6	,				
10:12,22 17:1220:3 22:20 24:6GPF 42:13 240:9half-truth 293:25280:16156:24 286:424:15 27:1,1,2,19Grace 212:21298:25294:7halfway 77:2280:16156:24 286:449:5,9 54:4 55:5grant 162:6granting 132:5andle 76:6handle 261:13halfet 174:16 187:24helpfully 120:1349:5,9 54:4 55:5granting 132:5grateful 80:2153:6handle 261:13handle 261:13halfet 20:13helpfully 120:1371:6 155:22153:6grave 20:25,25153:6handled 47:2071:25 105:8,9Hi 23:6 25:10200:17 204:19,19234:25 251:6234:25 251:6hands 123:4143:15 168:3175:2 187:11217:4,5,9 225:3,9295:8,8great 91:23 144:4292:11Hassans 60:22high 54:16 62:1230:3,4,13 234:1251:22 270:2151:22 270:21happen 17:22,2496:13,24 98:6high-profile 13:	-			· ·	
24:15 27:1,1,2,19 32:5 43:14 49:2 49:5,9 54:4 55:5 55:10,15,19 56:4 56:8 57:5 70:21Grace 212:21 298:25 grant 162:6 granting 132:5 grateful 80:2294:7 halfway 77:2 230:16 hand 176:6 handle 261:13 handled 47:20 handver 76:18 hands 123:4 hands 123:4happens 93:9 166:18 279:19 happenstance 174:16 187:24 happy 7:13 17:5 288:2helpful 60:7 239:20 241:25 288:2200:17 204:19,19 205:21,24 206:11 205:21,24 206:11 217:4,5,9 225:3,9 228:22 229:1,12 230:3,4,13 234:1149:7 206:19 251:22 270:21294:7 halfway 77:2 230:16 handle 261:13 handled 47:20 handover 76:18 hands 123:4 handwriting 292:11happens 93:9 166:18 279:19 happenstance 174:16 187:24 happen 77:13 17:5 286:25 307:24helpfully 120:13 286:25 307:24149:7 206:19 234:11 253:6,9291:12 251:22 270:21294:7 halfway 77:2 294:7happen 17:22,24 96:13,24 98:6helpfully 120:13 28:24 98:6					· ·
32:5 43:14 49:2 49:5,9 54:4 55:5 55:10,15,19 56:4 56:8 57:5 70:21298:25 grant 162:6 granting 132:5 grateful 80:2 153:6halfway 77:2 230:16 handle 261:13 handle 261:13 handled 47:20166:18 279:19 happenstance 174:16 187:24 happy 7:13 17:5239:20 241:25 288:2 helpfully 120:18 285:9200:17 204:19,19 205:21,24 206:11 217:4,5,9 225:3,9grave 20:25,25 234:25 251:6 295:8,8 great 91:23 144:4halfway 77:2 230:3,4,13 234:1 149:7 206:19halfway 77:2 230:16 handle 261:13 handled 47:20 handover 76:18 hands 123:4halfway 77:2 166:18 279:19 happenstance 174:16 187:24 happy 7:13 17:5 71:25 105:8,9 107:13,23 134:18 143:15 168:3 266:25 307:24helpfully 120:13 28:22 112230:3,4,13 234:1 234:11 253:6,9great 91:23 144:4 251:22 270:21poisting 132:5 handwriting 292:11halfway 77:2 166:18 279:19 happen 17:22,24helpfully 120:13 28:20160:15:12 162:8 165:12160:16:12 162:8 165:12175:2 187:11 162:8 165:12160:13 162:8 165:12160:14 162:8 165:12175:2 187:11 162:8 165:12					
49:5,9 54:4 55:5 55:10,15,19 56:4 56:8 57:5 70:21grant 162:6 grateful 80:2 153:6230:16 hand 176:6 handle 261:13 handled 47:20 handled 47:20 handover 76:18 handwriting 228:22 229:1,12 230:3,4,13 234:1162:6 grant 162:6 granting 132:5 grateful 80:2230:16 handle 261:13 handled 47:20 handover 76:18 handwriting 295:8,8 230:3,4,13 234:1162:6 288:2 helpfully 120:13 288:2205:21,24 206:11 217:4,5,9 225:3,9 234:12 53:6,9234:25 251:6 295:8,8 295:8,8 295:8,8 295:8,8 295:8,8 251:22 270:21130:16 handled 47:20 handover 76:18 handwriting 292:11 Hang 15:16 231:1 happen 17:22,24140:7 206:19 107:13,24 98:6140:100 20:110 288:2 helpfully 120:13 288:2 hidden 120:13 175:2 187:11 hierarchy 176:12 high 54:16 62:12 happen 17:22,24					-
10.15,9 5 11 1 55.5granting 132:5hand 176:6174:16 187:24helpfully 120:1355:10,15,19 56:4granting 132:5handl 261:13174:16 187:24helpfully 120:1356:8 57:5 70:21grateful 80:2153:6handle 261:13handle 47:20handled 47:20200:17 204:19,19grave 20:25,25sandled 47:20hands 123:4hidden 120:13205:21,24 206:11234:25 251:6hands 123:4143:15 168:3175:2 187:11217:4,5,9 225:3,9295:8,8295:8,8295:10handwriting266:25 307:24228:22 229:1,12great 91:23 144:4292:11Hassans 60:22high 54:16 62:12230:3,4,13 234:1149:7 206:19happen 17:22,2490:5,13 95:6,19162:8 165:12234:11 253:6,9251:22 270:21happen 17:22,2496:13,24 98:6high-profile 13:	32:5 43:14 49:2	298:25	v	166:18 279:19	239:20 241:25
56:8 57:5 70:21 71:6 155:22 200:17 204:19,19 205:21,24 206:11 217:4,5,9 225:3,9 234:11 253:6,9frandle 261:13 handled 47:20 hands 123:4 hands 123:4happy 7:13 17:5 71:25 105:8,9 107:13,23 134:18 143:15 168:3 266:25 307:24Hi 23:6 25:10 hidden 120:13 175:2 187:11217:4,5,9 225:3,9 228:22 229:1,12 234:11 253:6,9grate 91:23 144:4 149:7 206:19 251:22 270:21page 17:22,24 149:7 206:19 251:22 270:21handle 261:13 handled 47:20 handover 76:18 hands 123:4 handwriting 292:11 Hang 15:16 231:1 happen 17:22,24happy 7:13 17:5 71:25 105:8,9 107:13,23 134:18 143:15 168:3 266:25 307:24 High 54:16 62:1 High 54:16 62:1 162:8 165:12 High-profile 13:1	49:5,9 54:4 55:5	grant 162:6		happenstance	288:2
71:6 155:22153:6handled 47:2071:25 105:8,9Hi 23:6 25:10200:17 204:19,19grave 20:25,25handover 76:18107:13,23 134:18Hi 23:6 25:10205:21,24 206:11234:25 251:6234:25 251:6handwriting266:25 307:24Hi 23:6 25:10217:4,5,9 225:3,9295:8,8295:8,8295:8,8292:11handwriting266:25 307:24hierarchy 176:11230:3,4,13 234:1149:7 206:19292:11Hang 15:16 231:190:5,13 95:6,19high-profile 13:2234:11 253:6,9251:22 270:21happen 17:22,2496:13,24 98:6high-profile 13:2	55:10,15,19 56:4	granting 132:5			helpfully 120:18
200:17 204:19,19 205:21,24 206:11grave 20:25,25 234:25 251:6handover 76:18 hands 123:4107:13,23 134:18 143:15 168:3hidden 120:13 175:2 187:11217:4,5,9 225:3,9 228:22 229:1,12295:8,8 great 91:23 144:4292:11 Hang 15:16 231:1266:25 307:24 90:5,13 95:6,19hidden 120:13 175:2 187:11230:3,4,13 234:1 234:11 253:6,9149:7 206:19 251:22 270:21Hang 15:16 231:1 happen 17:22,2490:5,13 95:6,19 96:13,24 98:6hidben 120:13 162:8 165:12	56:8 57:5 70:21	0		happy 7:13 17:5	285:9
200:11/20 (119,19)grave 20:20;20205:21,24 206:11234:25 251:6217:4,5,9 225:3,9295:8,8228:22 229:1,12great 91:23 144:4230:3,4,13 234:1149:7 206:19234:11 253:6,9251:22 270:21hands 123:4hands 123:4hands 123:4149:7 206:19234:11 253:6,9251:22 270:21	71:6 155:22	153:6		71:25 105:8,9	Hi 23:6 25:10
203:21,21 200:11203 120 201:10handwriting203:10 101:10 100:00110:10 100:00217:4,5,9 225:3,9295:8,8295:8,8266:25 307:24hierarchy 176:10228:22 229:1,12great 91:23 144:4292:11Hang 15:16 231:190:5,13 95:6,19high 54:16 62:10230:3,4,13 234:1149:7 206:19149:7 206:19162:8 165:12162:8 165:12234:11 253:6,9251:22 270:21happen 17:22,2496:13,24 98:6high-profile 13:23	200:17 204:19,19	grave 20:25,25		107:13,23 134:18	hidden 120:13
228:22229:1,12great91:23144:4292:11Hassans60:22high54:1662:1230:3,4,13234:1149:7206:19Hang15:16231:190:5,1395:6,19162:8165:12234:11253:6,9251:22270:21Happen17:22,2496:13,2498:6High-profile13:2	205:21,24 206:11	234:25 251:6		143:15 168:3	175:2 187:11
230:3,4,13       234:11       149:7       206:19       Hang       15:16       231:1       90:5,13       95:6,19       162:8       165:12         234:11       253:6,9       251:22       270:21       Hang       17:22,24       96:13,24       98:6       high-profile       13:2	217:4,5,9 225:3,9	295:8,8	0	266:25 307:24	hierarchy 176:17
234:11 253:6,9 251:22 270:21 happen 17:22,24 96:13,24 98:6 high-profile 13:	228:22 229:1,12	great 91:23 144:4		Hassans 60:22	high 54:16 62:18
	230:3,4,13 234:1	149:7 206:19	0	90:5,13 95:6,19	162:8 165:12
253:10.22.24 278:2.297:11 51:1.90:21.105:9 1119:7.14.17 213:22	234:11 253:6,9	251:22 270:21		96:13,24 98:6	high-profile 13:8
	253:10,22,24	278:2 297:11		119:7,14,17	213:22
254:15 255:13,15       greatest 52:9       105:10 112:14       120:14,17 121:13       higher 39:1	254:15 255:13,15	greatest 52:9		120:14,17 121:13	8
255:15,16 258:7         greatly 3:11 31:18         115:5 117:5         121:15 135:22         highest 45:25	255:15,16 258:7	greatly 3:11 31:18		121:15 135:22	highest 45:25
259:25 264:4,4 151:6 119:10 142:24 141:2,3 145:6 157:6 226:21	259:25 264:4,4	151:6		141:2,3 145:6	157:6 226:21
	265:21 270:13	Grech 20:21 21:1		159:15 206:25	highlighted 26:8
281:20,20 22:1,16 294:22 178:3,14,15,16 207:6,8,11,13,17 27:16 154:8	281:20,20	22:1,16 294:22		207:6,8,11,13,17	27:16 154:8
Governor's 6:16297:2,10,21195:4 240:21210:14 220:1highly 226:15	Governor's 6:16	297:2,10,21		210:14 220:1	highly 226:15
306:13 309:25			306:13 309:25		

www.epiqglobal.com Lov casemanagers@epiqglobal.com

	1 9			2
				Page 327
hindgight 00,10	194.11 104.0 15	20.9 57.10 71.10	152.10 202.12 14	42.1 45.20 70.9
hindsight 90:19	184:11 194:8,15	29:8 57:19 71:10	153:19 203:12,14	43:1 45:20 70:8
172:15,15	201:12,25 202:22	72:25 117:12	257:24	177:1 182:4 234:4 248:13
hinted 273:16 HMIC 3:22 11:19	212:15 220:16	139:25 147:25 152:13 188:3	<b>included</b> 95:18 153:8,9	
	223:17,19,20,25	209:20 222:1	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	individuals' 43:16 Industrial 42:12
11:21 12:1,7 13:6 284:4	224:10,13,22 228:5,6 235:16	259:17 300:10	<b>including</b> 97:25 153:12 154:15	industry 75:23
286:13 288:12	236:4,19 238:19	301:2,6,9	183:22 212:14	76:1,5 140:2
hold 52:12 57:20	242:5,22 243:6,8	<b>importantly</b> 167:3	242:7 270:10	<b>inference</b> 226:12
148:1 189:7	242:3,22 243:0,8	importantly 107.5	277:17	<b>influence</b> 21:10,11
193:17	290:6	61:17 152:10,11	<b>income</b> 102:18	55:6,11,15 56:10
holds 66:1	<b>idea</b> 118:11,15	152:16 189:16	inconsistency	246:16 276:12
home 74:21 147:4	119:3 122:14	239:8 310:2	69:25 70:12,13	influencing 241:2
147:7,8,9 150:13	176:16 243:9	impressed 258:22	inconsistent 69:17	294:25
154:1	266:16 267:2,4	impression 4:16	incorrect 13:23,24	<b>informal</b> 12:23
honest 152:25	284:5	5:16 14:9 171:15	58:10 70:25 71:2	information 25:19
honestly 99:7	ideas 156:2,15	171:18 199:8,12	228:21	27:11,14 28:23
141:5	158:18,19 159:1	199:18 261:25	increase 143:8,11	33:11 46:9 64:8
hope 14:24 112:16	161:10,13,15	295:24	287:17	67:6 70:18 71:20
164:8,22,23	162:8 168:15	impressions 4:21	incredibly 88:13	71:22,22,24,25
166:10 234:18	idem 12:20	impromptu	independence	72:4 73:7,14,22
hoped 156:24	identical 256:15	187:23	18:23 20:14	79:25 83:22
hoping 164:10	ideological 106:16	improper 155:11	26:16 54:14 55:1	97:10 109:23
165:24 166:1,9	IM 159:19 284:15	249:21	55:25 56:2,5,24	132:7 139:9
horse 277:7	image 6:14	improperly 64:2	57:1,1,2	151:2 152:22
hour 230:12	imagine 2:24 9:11	inaccuracy 185:13	independent 19:14	153:11,12 166:3
hours 3:15 167:5	17:2 99:8 105:25	inaccurate 198:5	28:8,11 45:19	166:8,11,14
186:9 204:14	158:25 300:4	inadvertently	52:16 55:4 57:14	167:22,25 175:21
230:14 232:13	305:1	58:10 130:24	57:14,19 109:6	176:2,10 177:2
251:14 257:14	imagined 301:23	inappropriate	independently	177:23 179:3
303:11	immediately	69:15,23 87:21	18:21,25 21:24	180:18 181:9,9
house 40:7 174:18	100:11 139:10	195:10,19 197:8	22:2,3 26:17,20	181:17,20 185:10
188:2 282:9,24	immense 233:11	213:10 247:4	26:23 56:8	185:13 194:18
hrs 231:15	233:16	inappropriately	269:18	211:24 212:11,13
huge 53:1,3	impact 140:18,23	195:5	indicate 113:21	215:10 222:24
hugely 147:25	impacted 227:6	inaudible 34:15	116:19 154:21	233:3 242:21
human 110:20	implausible 191:1	38:19 39:16	indicated 7:14	244:9,17 246:12
208:1 310:2	193:14	46:22 50:16 66:5	115:13 116:23,24	247:18 275:20
hundred 5:12	implementation	69:4 81:23	258:21	276:15,18 278:8
hypothesis 143:17	284:8	139:22 193:8	indicates 296:16	278:11 279:7
Ι	implicit 211:20	199:5 201:22 207:15 213:17	indirect 119:17	298:19 299:16,20
<b>I</b> 304:3	<b>implied</b> 127:21 128:6 298:13	<b>inbox</b> 240:19	<b>indirectly</b> 131:12 135:20 273:20	300:1,3,7 301:13 303:20,24 304:20
<b>i.e</b> 17:22 304:13	implies 200:12	incensed 160:2	275:7	309:5,18
Ian 4:21,22 5:24	201:20	incident 1:9,14	<b>individual</b> 40:18	informed 270:5
5:25 6:2,8 12:18	importance 52:25	12:2 32:9 244:7	41:25 43:12	informing 19:11
15:17 39:6 49:20	53:1,3 181:4	260:6,17,21	44:23 45:1,3	infrastructure
50:3,15 52:14	important 2:22	incidentally 42:8	46:10 51:7 66:1	284:21
61:4 167:15	10:14 12:3,10	incidents 246:3	232:24 271:4	<b>initial</b> 16:23
172:25 173:8	20:1 28:21 29:6	include 109:20	individuals 13:3	initiates 263:11
174:1,4 183:18	2011 20121 2010			
~	I	I	I	I

				Page 328
initiative 263:6	instance 44:12	interested 108:14	49:3 249:7	invited 24:14
innocent 174:23	instances 42:6	136:16,22 141:8	interviewer's	177:21 252:20
inquest 59:14	43:17 212:12	142:2,3,7 183:19	284:25	invites 24:9,13
inquiring 184:4	235:3 249:8,11	183:23 280:23	interviews 42:9	inviting 256:6
inquiry 2:2,9 5:22	249:11	286:1	51:8 52:14 62:14	invoke 264:18,22
6:10 29:24 40:11	instinct 36:3,10	interesting 35:3,5	introductory	264:23
40:21 41:5,6	37:5,9	interests 79:5	11:14	<b>invol</b> 218:5
44:10 45:13,16	institution 117:9	142:10 244:15	investigated 136:3	involve 112:23,25
45:17,19,22	institutional 157:8	interface 74:18	273:6	113:1 145:5
50:21 55:24	institutionally	75:23 76:14	investigating	<b>involved</b> 38:13,25
60:25 61:2 68:9	53:13 230:9	176:14	80:19,21 92:21	39:15 68:15,17
72:23 77:22,25	instruct 116:17	interfacing 73:3,4	211:19 273:9,18	95:22 96:3 97:22
78:3,5,6,9,12	268:19,21	interfere 183:16	investigation 13:9	98:1 104:3
82:12 84:17	instructed 116:17	306:23	64:1,17 71:20	121:21 132:5
89:12 91:22	273:15	interfered 163:9	79:18 82:17,19	153:7 169:18
98:15 103:20	instruction 116:14	163:20 281:3	83:1,5,10 86:3,10	249:13 252:13
107:21 113:22	instructions 85:12	interference	86:18,21 87:8,17	289:15 310:17
115:15 132:25	121:5 198:17	281:12 282:3	87:19 132:2,8	involvement 9:1
143:15 145:16	instrumentalised	307:20	136:6 143:20	113:23 218:1
148:21 152:1,7	128:18,24	interfering 183:20	163:7,9,15,18,20	236:24 279:17
152:13,25 153:4	integrity 32:8	276:6 308:2	163:22,24,25	289:8
154:22 162:16,18	124:21 137:5	interim 204:19	164:4 175:23,25	involving 38:5
162:24 180:17	138:1	217:9 229:11	176:3,7 177:14	39:3 246:5 299:1
186:25 192:6	intellectual 114:2	230:3 255:14	181:18 183:16,20	irregularity
211:17 216:1	117:18 118:19	internal 269:1	197:5,9 208:5	254:14
225:2 239:20,22	intended 107:5	international	211:2 218:20	irrelevant 67:13
239:25 240:15	159:21	186:12	221:2,10,14	220:11
241:9 242:5	intensity 280:17	internationally	222:2 261:24	<b>is</b> 288:8
243:17,22 244:14	intention 268:12	103:8,25 117:22	262:1,2,10	issue 3:21,23 7:2
244:18,21 245:22	intentionally	interpret 267:18	272:25 273:22	17:13,16 31:7,13
246:13 247:7,10	194:24	interpreted 19:18	276:6 277:14	31:16 33:23 34:4
247:19 248:1	interact 145:8	19:21,23 127:19	281:4 290:17	35:13 36:23 37:5
250:20 251:13,17	interaction 70:17	128:4,8 129:7	292:14 293:1,22	61:5 63:10,15
280:11 286:4	interest 82:17 96:2	interregnum	294:11 306:9,15	72:3 73:21 100:1
308:23	96:13,23 98:6	267:9	306:24 307:2,6,9	106:12,13 110:17
Inquiry's 150:10	110:2,18 119:17	interrogate 170:13	307:20 308:3,5,6	117:17 123:16,18
308:20	119:21 120:16	interrogating	308:9,9	126:10,22 135:9
inquisitorial	121:14 122:6	275:18	investment 95:8	148:24 155:18
239:24	123:17 124:6,6	interrupt 292:18	95:19 119:14	164:14 184:10,11
inside 300:13	124:21 134:22,25	interrupted	123:8 219:4,22	185:14,19 192:15
insignificance 2:19	135:2,4,15 136:5	307:13	investments 145:6	216:24 219:3
insinuation 159:21	136:9,11,15,23	intervene 306:18	investor 121:15	223:15 224:7
insisted 291:20	136:25 138:2	intervention 307:7	investors 119:15	228:3,4 234:9
insofar 51:19	142:11,15 143:4	interview 48:8,8	invitation 8:4	243:22 244:4,5,7
94:10,19 137:2	143:7,7,10,12	51:15 52:17	251:1	259:17 261:7
inspector 82:8,8	227:4,14 243:13	198:23 204:9	invite 19:6,19	276:15 288:3,4
180:19,19	244:13,15,17,21	296:11 297:1	176:3 252:17,23	288:11 290:3
Inspectors 284:19	291:17 292:14,23	302:16	253:3 254:1	300:10 301:2,6
285:13	292:23	interviewed 48:21	256:5	301:10

www.epiqglobal.com Low casemanagers@epiqglobal.com

Lower Ground Floor, 46 Chancery Lane m London, WC2A 1JE

Page 329

				1 age 529
issues 2:6 13:5	jobs 248:13,17,22	59:9,11 63:18	30:12,15 32:12	272:3
25:9 30:9 33:20	249:23	justification 301:8	35:15,19,19	
35:9 58:14 96:3	<b>Joey</b> 20:22 220:12	justify 301:3	38:10,12 39:7	L
108:12 118:17	220:14 230:11	juxtaposed 308:1	40:4 41:2 44:13	laboured 303:10
143:3 159:24	231:17 258:10,14		79:19 80:4 87:7	lack 252:14 260:22
204:24 212:19	258:15 266:24	K	90:9,11,14,24	lacking 32:7
217:13 218:21	295:5 297:24	keen 229:23	101:13,14 120:9	laid 246:12 247:19
225:9,20 226:1	<b>Joey's</b> 23:21	keep 36:14 120:25	122:20 123:5,20	land 2:25 3:2,2
244:3,10 247:25	jog 153:16	196:21,24,24	128:7 131:9	226:22
251:6 257:13,24	jogged 146:11	212:1,3,5,22	133:4 134:7,7	language 15:1
261:1 267:3	<b>John</b> 75:9,11	300:9	135:7,19,21	16:7 24:24
271:9 284:21	76:19,21 101:1	keeper 289:17	141:1 144:3	115:23,24 149:8
299:5	101:15 102:7	keeping 26:22	154:20 158:3,7	150:8,18,20
item 215:23	104:1 222:20	121:4 153:1	161:12 165:11	189:10 199:4
ITLD 139:8	<b>Jonathan</b> 75:8	301:3	166:23 168:25	206:19,21 208:15
140:14	judge 92:23 93:7	kept 95:12 133:6	170:10 172:15	239:16 286:14
	93:11 189:5	133:18 134:23	175:21 176:21	large 82:15 97:13
J	judgement 59:24	299:13 301:14	178:3,3,5,13,15	largely 256:11
<b>James</b> 35:4 63:13	205:1	key 17:13,15 20:25	184:24 187:23	largish 277:11
74:13,17 76:10	judgment 58:13	21:14,15 31:7,13	190:7 191:25	late 168:10 184:1
76:15,15,16,22	58:25 60:6,9	144:9 155:18	190:7 191:25	192:9 235:16
83:11 98:19	261:18	213:24 217:21	192:21 194:11	250:8
101:5 102:10,11	judicial 58:24	295:8 301:21	199:3,18 205:15	Laughter 310:23
102:12,24 104:11	59:11	kick 254:10	206:1,8 214:17	Lavarello 55:2
104:12 105:14	<b>July</b> 74:22 75:16	kicks 29:14	214:20 217:20	law 2:24 20:7
106:9,11 111:3	95:10 104:14	kind 79:20 180:9	219:8 220:1,20	52:25 53:2,13,16
111:13 123:22	105:24	187:13	243:3 244:2	53:17,21 70:10
130:16 133:3,5	jumping 18:1	kindly 222:24	246:15 249:10	70:23 71:12,13
133:12 134:21	<b>June</b> 36:14,16	King's 77:15 215:6	267:20 277:2,25	71:16 81:19 87:2
139:24 140:3,3	37:19 74:17 85:7	215:18,21	278:17,23 280:16	107:22 124:10
144:15 147:15,15	85:10 87:3 163:8	Kingdom 20:4	281:7 290:9	156:20 170:25
148:25 159:16	201:3 202:6	46:4	295:14 297:23.24	185:7 221:15
163:24 179:1	203:3 220:24	knew 30:9,11	307:4 308:12	230:10 244:2
181:7 183:3	203.5 220.24	79:16 80:4 81:6	309:16	lawyer 24:22 25:8
205:3 207:20	245:7 275:14	87:16,18 90:15	knowing 129:18	77:7 141:6,17
210:17 221:12,18	282:1 294:2	90:24 91:1,3	183:24	146:1 150:23
223:10,18 224:1	junior 67:18	96:1 97:11	knowledge 62:23	162:3 168:16
224:5,7,14 226:9	164:19 166:6	101:14 102:2	67:9 68:13 78:7	196:12 200:7,10
227:17,20 228:9	168:1 181:22	119:7 130:22	78:13	208:2,5 213:22
261:19 275:21	184:2	134:5,8 159:20	known 52:10	215:5 231:5
278:10 282:22	jurisdiction 157:9	168:25,25 170:3	69:16 92:12,13	lawyer's 85:18
290:3,8,20 291:9	188:7 274:3	170:12 171:9,10	156:15 162:4	220:25
294:17	300:12,13	177:12 190:2,10	168:23 192:7	lawyers 85:9,19
January 240:8	jurisdictional	206:7 219:15	215:6 219:16	90:4 93:25 98:14
306:16	67:21 157:12,17	220:7 233:10	280:7 283:8,11	109:20 113:23
<b>JL</b> 189:8,11	157:19 164:15	261:25 289:7	293:9,12 300:8	115:3 132:24
198:23 204:10	195:7,20 224:8	know 1:15,22 2:3	305:6	163:8 198:16
302:16	227:21 300:11	6:5 7:5 9:18	knows 25:25 35:17	202:6 203:15,19
job 248:19,25	<b>Justice</b> 58:25 59:3	20:13 21:1 22:10	35:17 197:3	208:25 213:3,5
305:9	5 15 1 C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C	22:19 23:19	0011/19/10	214:11 264:12
	I	l	l	I

Epiq Europe Ltd +44 (0) 207 404 1400 www.epiqglobal.com Low casemanagers@epiqglobal.com

Lower Ground Floor, 46 Chancery Lane m London, WC2A 1JE

				Page 330
lead 35:6,13,14	let's 11:4 15:16	133:11 134:21	197:10 199:1,6	30:25 154:6,8
211:21	107:1 124:20	145:19 147:15,15	199:20 201:14	198:21 199:7,17
leader 160:16	132:22 161:23,23	147:23 148:25	202:8,18,25	199:19 200:2,25
leadership 160:6	205:18 211:15	149:24 152:19	202:0,10,25	201:21,23 202:15
259:20 260:6,23	213:18,18 214:24	153:25 154:15,16	220:16 226:17	201:21,25 202:15
260:25 262:14	letter 23:14 24:13	155:6,10 156:24	229:16 272:7	Llamas' 14:6
leading 61:3	24:14,24 25:7,14	157:1,13,22	Lief 242:2	Llamas's 199:22
175:22,25	26:5,14 27:4	158:17 159:16,22	<b>lies</b> 166:19 167:7	199:24
learn 13:21 22:8	28:13 29:3 31:22	160:1,25 163:24	195:3,3 223:5	loads 259:25
125:24 126:1	32:17 33:23 34:2	168:23 169:5,13	255:6	lobby 36:13 37:12
learned 55:23	34:12,22 40:23	172:7 173:17	life 20:13 46:1	285:3
158:21 258:25	41:12 42:3 85:7	174:19 179:1	171:23	lobbying 295:1
274:6 282:7	85:8,18 107:12	180:20 183:3,22	light 45:21 270:19	local 147:25
291:7 292:12	133:5 161:13	197:15 199:14	297:7 309:19	location 267:14
294:23	170:21 196:3	205:3 207:19,20	liken 31:5	lockdown 9:22
leave 47:3 105:7	198:2,4 199:19	207:23 210:17,18	limit 269:9	logic 210:2 302:5
106:1 229:7	199:23,23 200:20	213:5 215:24	limited 63:23 88:7	logical 86:15 177:6
240:1 254:8	202:5,7,8 203:3	216:4,6,7 221:12	95:20,24 96:14	logically 84:9,11
leaving 114:6	203:13,15,17,21	221:19 223:10,18	96:24 98:3 114:1	87:1
121:10 289:2	206:25 208:25	224:1,5,7,14	114:17 214:18	logistics 139:10
led 2:22 3:12	215:24 216:5	225:11,22 226:9	219:19	logs 260:1
105:10 142:19	220:24 221:1,8	227:17,20 228:9	line 150:7 189:3	London 213:19
167:14 179:10	221:11 223:3,6	261:19 273:9	266:10 304:7	263:25 264:11
185:25 189:13	231:19 232:12	274:10 275:11,22	lines 10:15 18:2	long 105:15
276:20	294:1 302:22	277:17 278:10	46:6 96:12 97:13	118:13,23 119:2
left 8:12,14 14:9	303:25 304:3,6	293:22 294:12,17	204:22 261:11	122:24 127:22
32:7 98:19 100:3	304:14 308:19,20	Levy's 8:25 70:2	284:18 286:25	143:20 230:8
141:22 165:2	letters 24:20 25:22	107:3 109:10	liquidated 219:9	231:25 234:16
180:3 288:9	42:21 90:8,13	110:5 134:13	219:13	235:16 239:1
302:25	161:11,16 200:9	147:3,7 157:23	list 118:16 149:2	250:6 262:12,13 279:15 285:23
legal 1:25 24:25	level 9:3 19:4	158:14 160:9,24	154:16 257:23	308:12
28:8,11 29:25 38:25 39:1 55:20	43:21 92:9,16 113:1,2,3 162:8	162:10 168:16,17 274:15 275:18	litany 257:13,25 literally 257:12	long-term 103:14
67:22 109:5	175:18 233:25	291:9	litigate 159:23	longer 92:12
113:2 158:8,10	280:17	Levys 140:3	litigation 90:8	135:19 149:3
161:10,24,25	Levey 293:18	Lewis 156:11	159:15	155:23 183:18
162:3 168:15	Levey 255:10 Levy 35:4 60:21	229:11 282:23	little 5:11 11:1	220:7 228:7
197:16 198:8	63:13 69:11,21	lexicon 92:17	25:25 29:24	284:3 293:14
199:14 210:2	76:10,15 79:17	149:10	65:12 66:7 74:22	303:11
250:22 280:4	81:2,10,15 82:4	<b>library</b> 309:10	75:3 84:5 95:11	longevity 294:18
302:6 304:24	82:14,25 85:24	lie 3:3 14:22 15:12	157:10 189:2	longhand 223:2
legally 56:18,21	86:4,6,22 87:19	31:20 79:9,11	207:1 271:16	look 11:4 15:16
109:20 155:11	88:5 89:6,11	184:5 190:22	304:8	24:19 29:24
legislate 171:5	92:8 93:1 95:6	195:2 201:15	live 3:8 79:8,10	37:22 61:6 75:3
legislated 81:24	97:6 98:19 99:10	202:24 226:9	192:15 216:24	84:15 87:10 90:2
legislation 242:14	100:24 104:11,18	lied 8:19 15:4	251:24 276:6	94:11 102:6
legitimately	109:10 110:1	155:15 167:15,20	281:3	125:11 129:24
127:19 128:4	111:3,13 112:5	181:13 184:10,14	lives 260:18	141:1 144:23
length 257:3	132:16,19 133:3	184:16 192:14,22	Llamas 16:15,24	151:11 171:22

				Page 331
172:4,16 179:11	lying 33:20 192:2	257:22	250:11 264:1,7	217:18 220:16,25
181:6 189:3	265:6	manipulative	267:12 280:4,5	223:11,17,19,20
206:20 209:5	205.0	259:22	280:19 297:4	223:25 224:10,13
211:1 231:9	Μ	manner 112:20	306:12	225:13,20,24
241:8 274:3	magic 259:22	127:20 128:4	Maurice 242:2	226:17 228:5,6
277:5 287:1,3	Magistrate 65:3	March 63:14	Mayor 3:7	231:15,18,25
302:11 305:2	magistrates'	278:16	<b>McGrail</b> 2:16,20	232:25 233:4,6
looked 170:21	158:24 165:19	maritime 32:8	2:23 3:13 4:21	232:25 235:1,0
looking 18:9 29:25	245:19	59:14 244:7	4:22 5:25 6:1,2,8	235:16 236:4,19
91:13 100:5	main 25:12 148:24	Mark 73:19 80:18	6:12,22,23 8:16	238:19 239:15
171:14 185:21	152:19 207:21,25	marked 246:17	8:19,22 12:18	240:17,25 242:6
278:2	210:21 213:7	marks 53:6	15:18 17:12,15	242:23 243:1,6,8
looks 25:4,4 98:19	<b>maintain</b> 138:18	massive 21:6	19:20 23:14	243:19,22,25
looming 300:9	140:7 291:5	material 9:12	24:13 27:6,13	245:12,25 246:15
loose 114:13	maintained 93:15	26:19,21 66:1	28:22 29:4,8	246:22 247:8
loosely 124:20	134:2,4,5 298:22	109:21 189:7	30:8,10,12,15,24	251:1,4,25
los 199:1	299:4	materialised 135:4	32:12,22 34:21	253:12 254:2,7
lose 2:22 141:10	maintaining 97:18	materially 209:20	39:6 40:14 44:14	254:24 255:12,23
224:16 253:11	139:23 299:21	mathematics	45:12 47:11	256:19 259:4,7,9
losing 17:11	maintenance	257:14	48:11 49:18,20	259:11 261:1,7
217:16 223:4	103:16 105:12	matrimonial	50:4,15 51:20,23	261:17 262:16
259:6,9	113:5 117:20	110:12	52:14 61:4 63:10	264:20 266:17
loss 2:15 3:13 21:6	119:6 137:4	matter 20:14 31:1	65:9,17 66:21	268:1,3 270:10
29:6 155:17	144:10	35:21 39:22	67:18 69:20	272:7 273:8,13
167:14 223:11	Majesty 7:4	45:17 47:9 59:15	70:14 87:5,13	274:17 276:23,25
224:2,9 225:12	Majesty's 151:21	60:19,25 61:5	109:18,24 126:20	277:11 280:13,20
225:23 228:23	majority 303:22	64:8 77:20 78:20	126:21 153:9	281:1 283:17
260:17	maker 227:21	79:2 110:17,18	155:15,23,25	284:8,16 285:7
lost 20:6 27:5	making 41:6 86:22	125:7 126:17	156:7 159:14,24	286:11 287:13
97:20 197:4,5	88:19 91:16	144:2,15 148:16	164:9,23 166:11	290:7 296:17
217:10,17 224:12	123:25 124:1	159:6 162:23,25	167:15 172:25	McGrail' 163:7
256:18 259:6	129:6,8 131:13	172:2,3,18	173:5,8,21 174:2	McGrail's 10:7
262:15	131:25 135:10	193:20 195:6	174:4 175:22,24	33:19 50:18
lot 9:9,9,16,18,20	137:25 142:1	214:19 225:16	178:18,22 179:16	85:18 160:6
34:16 52:25	153:4 159:2	234:17,17 239:2	179:18,24 180:23	186:20 200:22
69:25 113:17	169:7 173:24	251:12 264:8	181:5,11 182:22	202:8 224:22
128:13 197:3	207:4 208:17	269:16 272:24	183:5,18 184:11	285:23 296:24
232:18,21 243:18	209:16 304:10	273:18 275:24	184:16 185:15	mean 1:24 2:3 5:9
266:24 298:25	man 157:7 195:13	298:8 301:7	187:1 188:1,18	6:20 7:6 10:7
309:19	manage 10:1	306:8 308:23	189:13 190:2,18	22:17 23:24
Lots 89:20	managed 142:17	matters 2:14 11:5	190:22 191:5,11	32:24 34:3,6
Lounge 6:22	289:2	12:21,22 27:19	191:16,23,25	38:18 39:6 59:1
lower 105:12	management	39:5 61:8,8,12,13	192:14,21,24	61:25 68:19
117:19	135:4 246:5	61:22,23 62:6,6	193:10 194:8,15	70:17 72:20
lucky 266:1	manager 289:18	62:15 110:1	197:19 199:20	86:21 89:16
lunch 157:19	managing 287:10	144:17 148:8,9	200:25 201:12	92:11 94:11 96:6
164:20 168:15	Manchester 3:8	148:11 176:15	202:16,18,22	101:24 102:12
176:12 180:15	manipulated	190:7,9 212:16	204:25 205:10	107:17 108:1,12
lunchtime 77:2	255:13	229:23 248:9	212:15 217:6,11	110:13 130:3
	manipulation			

www.epiqglobal.com Lov casemanagers@epiqglobal.com

				Page 332
136:8 137:16	166:10 167:23	73:2 272:12,15	150:25 151:17	55:4,10,16,20
148:21 158:8,20	172:23,24 173:1	272:19 303:18	154:5 172:5,11	56:4,9 70:21
159:4 193:1	173:2 174:10,13	memoire 8:3	204:7 216:1	71:8 77:7,14
209:17 216:16,19	174:16 177:16,17	memories 146:11	222:4 230:2	94:21 111:4
222:10 232:17	177:22 178:12,17	151:5,6,16	237:9,15,20	118:3 121:21
235:1,15 252:8	178:21 179:3,15	153:16	238:5 291:10	130:21 141:7,15
254:19 258:17	179:18,22 180:1	memory 5:10 7:21	308:16,24	141:19 149:18
265:16 269:25	180:2,7,12,12,14	39:6 47:18 78:14	Messrs 95:18	165:10 181:17
270:23 275:7	182:9,15,21	146:19 147:13	met 4:5 19:13 22:7	204:24 215:5
277:18 286:3	183:9,12 184:5	148:23 237:23	25:14 36:17	216:2,3,5 226:13
294:15 296:1	184:15 185:24	251:5 253:8	101:8,15,22,24	227:5 234:12
297:25	187:14,15,20,21	mental 91:25	131:11 147:15,16	240:13 241:16
meaning 267:19	187:22,24 188:3	161:2 238:12	155:5 204:18	250:18 252:4
means 36:4,11	188:5,8,19,22	239:19	207:25 218:17	256:17 259:16
92:16 94:22	189:22 190:21	mention 4:25	225:3 260:2	260:4 261:16,22
107:18 194:1	192:25 193:16	53:11 59:18	278:16 293:15	263:24 265:8,22
199:6	195:18 197:11	222:7 236:3	<b>method</b> 189:6	272:22 281:17,21
meant 117:15	199:21 200:24	238:20 241:20	<b>Miami</b> 267:11,13	281:23 288:18
231:8 236:6	202:11,16 215:23	266:12 277:10	269:3 271:17	293:14 294:20
mechanism 112:19	217:1 225:4	283:18	Michael 199:11,16	296:15 299:8
112:21	236:5 242:1,3	mentioned 5:3	201:21,23 206:2	310:9
mechanisms	260:3 262:21	58:11 79:7	240:4 280:18	Minister's 47:23
155:24	263:4,18 268:19	100:20 193:24	mid 168:21 171:9	ministerial 142:9
media 23:6,19	271:8,14 273:11	257:6	middle 95:5 96:19	ministers 31:20
25:12 42:9	276:16,21,23	mentioning 236:4	269:1 285:14	79:9,11
medical 298:15	277:22 278:20	236:20	midnight 270:15	minor 141:3
meet 25:10,19,20	279:22 281:1	mentor 106:9	miles 58:12 247:5	<b>mintió</b> 199:1
26:1 27:15 32:13	282:8,14 283:7	156:20 227:18	million 39:10 46:4	minute 47:2 63:21
34:23 97:8	283:20 296:6	mentorship 228:2	148:2 287:17,18	295:14
225:16 254:21	297:20,20 308:14	228:9	mind 34:5 79:23	minutes 68:4 74:9
257:20 259:21	308:17,24	merely 29:17	79:25 89:19	76:24 86:2
<b>meeting</b> 2:6 4:2 5:8 6:23 7:10 8:2	meetings 6:9,21 35:15,18 43:17	message 14:6 21:8 28:1 85:23 97:5	109:6 141:12 151:22 212:21	168:10,12 178:11 191:15 231:17,23
8:9,16,18 9:15,16	75:17 76:2,4	100:10 115:16	226:14 233:14	231:24 257:4,15
11:7 12:24 17:9	129:24 130:6	133:1,10,11	253:21 262:4	257:16 266:22
22:9,22 25:5	145:25 150:5,13	173:16 178:6	276:2	292:8
51:1 69:19 74:24	150:16 169:9	195:16 247:17	mind?' 261:12	<b>mirror</b> 274:4
75:1,5,5,6,10	172:5,6 187:16	281:2 302:14	minded 300:8	misapprehension
80:20 87:6 102:2	236:18 238:19	messaged 228:20	mindful 18:11	303:9
125:19,21 126:20	280:10,14,16,20	messages 1:21,23	46:6	mischaracterisa
126:20 129:25	280:22,24	2:7 20:19 23:12	mine 132:22	226:19
130:1,5,8 139:24	member 21:10,12	23:25 28:20	146:20 149:3	mischief 105:2
144:14 145:19	34:9 67:18 92:13	53:10 76:9 98:14	201:4 287:18	235:4
146:13,14,16	164:19 165:4	98:20 99:3,19	minister 1:4 7:1	misconceived
147:3,6,7,10,11	166:4,6 168:1	100:8,11 105:20	8:10 12:20 20:4	170:17
147:12,21 149:15	181:22 184:3	107:4,24 108:4,5	21:19,20 24:7,16	misconduct 88:16
154:1 155:9	226:8	108:19,25 109:9	27:20 32:6 39:19	misfeasance 90:7
164:11,21,23	members 34:19	110:4 111:20	40:2 47:6 48:3	mishandling 13:8
165:2,21,25	48:4,12,25 49:2	112:4 132:24	49:6 50:23 52:18	misinterpreted
		-	-	<u>.</u>

www.epiqglobal.com Low casemanagers@epiqglobal.com

5	1 9			5
				Page 333
205.12				
205:12	months 219:16,25	nearest 3:24	neutral 107:5	<b>non-in</b> 113:11
mislead 191:12	220:9 291:12	necessarily 67:1	246:17	non-legal 158:4
194:24	moot 81:21	70:11 117:8	never 14:18,25	nonsense 49:4
misleading 31:14	moral 133:23,24	129:20 165:1	79:6 101:8,15	nonsensical
31:16 33:20	morass 79:24	170:8 244:1	106:17 108:17	201:16,19 268:10
276:19	Morello 40:10	necessary 28:23	120:13 135:4	normal 89:23
misled 8:13,22	242:2	198:24 204:10	140:19 141:8	249:16 281:14,17
17:14 31:14	Morello's 43:19	242:15 264:13	163:9,20,21,23	North 95:24 96:14
87:13 183:13	morning 1:3,4 3:6	299:11 302:17	163:24 170:5	96:24 98:3,7,18
195:1 201:6	21:5 31:18 47:6	neck 91:11 290:10	176:5,8 202:8	99:1,11,16 100:2
224:23 261:1,22	47:7 52:21,22	need 18:8 21:7	210:5 248:20	100:3 103:3,4,5,7
misquotation	74:21 77:5	25:8 38:12 54:18	259:2,8 265:19	103:11,17,22
16:18	186:12 291:8	63:1 68:3 76:5	273:2 281:23	112:12,16,18,23
misquoted 13:19	morphed 276:18	83:23 113:7	289:11 293:15	114:10,14,16
16:4	Moshe 207:23	141:23 143:14	<b>new</b> 9:19 40:10	116:22,25 117:3
misquoting 13:13	210:17	250:10 257:8	45:20 51:3 95:2	118:15 119:8
misremembered	motivated 228:1	261:3,13 263:15	95:17 102:9	120:6,9,12,15
194:4	motivations 227:9	266:5,24 269:21	113:25 114:3,10	122:6 123:8
mission 54:12,17	mounted 159:15	273:13 290:21	174:17 188:2	134:25 135:5,15
mistake 198:20	move 17:7 34:24	292:10,10 297:11	245:14,18 249:7	135:20 136:3,11
205:17,18 206:12	305:7 308:11	298:21	280:6	136:13,25 137:14
208:24,24 229:8	moved 305:10	needed 3:25 32:23	newly 245:22	137:24 140:13
mistaken 257:15	<b>moving</b> 40:10 58:7	36:18 37:1,5	305:13	142:11,14 144:13
misunderstanding	268:18	41:8 42:25 81:4	newspaper 3:16	144:19,22 145:2
185:25 189:14	muddy 301:24	212:17,18 214:13	Nic 254:23	145:4 219:4,6
misunderstood	multiple 104:22	260:8 267:6	Nick 5:7 11:22	220:18 221:21
201:22	<b>MW74</b> 73:20	299:5	14:8,25 15:3,6,23	222:8 291:11
mitigate 90:3	myriad 109:25	needing 9:5	16:6,8 35:19	292:2,14 293:1,2
<b>Mm</b> 67:2	155:4,5 169:5	needs 25:18	49:8,13,23 50:3	294:7
<b>MoD</b> 299:2	172:10 232:16	negative 243:14,24	52:5 225:9 230:1	nos 199:1
<b>Model</b> 278:24	256:24	245:11 246:21	night 8:1 108:15	<b>note</b> 5:7 7:9,11,19
Mole 174:18 188:2	N	negatively 140:18	263:10 270:16	7:20 8:6 9:4,6,25
moment 27:25		140:23 224:21	nine 48:4,12 86:2	10:2 11:3,6,9
71:17 91:8,22	name 54:3 70:4	negotiations 9:20	160:21 215:24	12:4,11,16 17:7
98:23 141:12	101:17,17 246:1	280:5	257:15	23:12 33:8 80:20
142:23 143:2	narrow 108:23	Neish 46:18,21,22	<b>no-one</b> 268:6	80:24 92:1 95:12
161:21 174:10,14	nation 53:7	46:24 47:2,5,7	nod 122:22	150:7 163:1
190:14 226:11,20	<b>national</b> 137:12	50:21 52:3	Nolan 124:23	188:18,22 191:23
227:19 232:3,9	138:4 278:23	296:22	nolle 234:22 235:1	263:17 271:7,12
233:13 237:22	nations 53:6	<b>neither</b> 80:8,9,10	235:12,15,21,25	272:1,2 288:16
276:9 287:1,3	natural 177:7	106:10,18 145:3	236:5,11,16,16	304:1
290:2,6,7 301:1	nature 153:13	182:19 201:1	236:20,25 237:1	notes 9:10 150:11
moments 177:10	305:20	224:6 259:23	237:10,16,25	159:5 187:13,15
244:4 290:5	nauseum 257:12	265:18 268:21	238:5,17,20	187:17,17,19
<b>Monday</b> 267:1	Navas 75:7	270:18 279:5	239:13,14,16	notice 113:19
money 148:2	NCIS 222:21	280:22 305:3	274:24,25	139:13
monies 286:19	NCIS(sic 289:20	nervous 6:18 7:3	nolles 235:4	notwithstanding
monitoring 35:10	NCIS(sic) 289:18	35:5 194:25	<b>non-</b> 117:10	289:25
<b>month</b> 98:17	<b>NDM</b> 278:22	neutered 291:22	132:15	novate 113:7
	near 74:25 247:5			

	j j	
	Page 334	
<b>2</b> 10 <b>2</b> 10	a 40 0 a 5 4 a 0	
218:2,19	249:8 254:20	
2 220:17	255:17 276:5,14	
275:15	301:24	
5:21 180:3	orderly 289:13	
2 257:8	orders 58:15	

	1	I	I	
November 48:21	obtains 24:7	203:4 215:14	107:8 218:2,19	249:8 254:20
77:12 145:13	obtention 60:11	217:3 226:21,21	218:22 220:17	255:17 276:5,14
NSCIS 76:11,14	obvious 79:15	264:12,12 267:12	234:23 275:15	301:24
100:4 102:16	91:21 212:20	276:19 277:12	<b>open</b> 155:21 180:3	orderly 289:13
103:8,16,21	obviously 29:19	288:9 290:2	256:1,2 257:8	orders 58:15
106:5 112:11	42:4 102:17	309:3,13	opened 186:10	organisation 53:12
117:18,20,22	113:17 172:12	officer 42:12 58:6	opening 101:12	102:17,19 185:6
119:6 125:5,16	184:25 268:17	92:20 149:18	102:1 103:5	233:2 244:11
125:18,24 127:4	occasions 63:24	176:3,25 177:24	<b>operate</b> 234:3,5	262:17
127:6,11 133:14	82:15 186:2	274:8 293:6	274:2 299:14	organisations
134:10 142:23	214:18 228:10	officers 4:23 40:13	operating 139:21	176:20
144:9,12 289:1	249:17,17 299:16	42:17 44:7 64:18	208:23	originally 262:25
291:18 292:1,3	<b>occur</b> 122:10	64:18 71:10	operation 8:24	originates 263:7
<b>number</b> 6:9 40:13	occurred 160:3	80:19,21 185:7	29:16 58:7 60:20	<b>OSG</b> 75:13
42:9 75:7,24	172:11	276:12 305:10,13	61:7 62:6 74:11	ostensible 127:16
82:15 127:2	occurring 8:11	official 2:25 3:1	163:14,15,17	127:21 128:5
146:7 150:3	<b>OCPL</b> 212:1 214:2	20:8 87:24 106:7	183:21 273:1	131:20,21
155:2 156:2	<b>October</b> 130:13,16	150:11,12,14,15	276:10 290:16	<b>outcome</b> 164:11
172:11 174:6,17	144:13 219:4	275:23 278:9	291:1 293:2	165:24 166:2
178:7 182:23	275:10,14 285:13	289:16	306:15	210:8,12 211:3
186:2 188:2	290:14,15 306:16	officially 22:20	operational 57:7	211:13 214:11,21
214:18 234:6	odd 150:8	officials 31:20	61:13,22 62:15	221:10
246:3 249:16	offence 79:21	79:9,11 223:24	68:11 72:22	outlined 204:25
277:12 299:16	81:18 82:3 170:3	<b>Oh</b> 130:23 151:14	188:10 190:6,8	260:9 261:16
numbered 264:17	170:4,6,11,24,25	218:14 224:25	opinions 24:20	265:9
numbers 41:23	offences 136:5	271:15 282:12	opportunities	Outlook 309:24
numerous 63:23				
numerous 05.25	143:24 169:14	<b>Okay</b> 57:11 59:12	179:24	outraged 155:14
	offend 124:19,22	63:8 64:16 73:23	opportunity 15:24	outside 110:1
0	offend 124:19,22 offended 53:8	63:8 64:16 73:23 85:4 119:4 168:5	<b>opportunity</b> 15:24 18:25 52:1 61:15	<b>outside</b> 110:1 176:8 214:1,2
<b>O</b> <b>o</b> 50:10	offend 124:19,22 offended 53:8 offer 38:5 43:24	63:8 64:16 73:23 85:4 119:4 168:5 219:12 223:13	<b>opportunity</b> 15:24 18:25 52:1 61:15 61:19 64:6,11	<b>outside</b> 110:1 176:8 214:1,2 267:7 300:12
0 0 50:10 0'clock 160:22	offend 124:19,22 offended 53:8 offer 38:5 43:24 44:13,19 88:19	63:8 64:16 73:23 85:4 119:4 168:5 219:12 223:13 229:6 244:20	<b>opportunity</b> 15:24 18:25 52:1 61:15 61:19 64:6,11 69:6 138:18	outside 110:1 176:8 214:1,2 267:7 300:12 overarching 54:12
<b>O</b> <b>o</b> 50:10 <b>o'clock</b> 160:22 168:6	offend 124:19,22 offended 53:8 offer 38:5 43:24 44:13,19 88:19 284:19	63:8 64:16 73:23 85:4 119:4 168:5 219:12 223:13 229:6 244:20 245:23 249:4	<b>opportunity</b> 15:24 18:25 52:1 61:15 61:19 64:6,11 69:6 138:18 177:15 179:17,19	outside 110:1 176:8 214:1,2 267:7 300:12 overarching 54:12 overemphasise
<b>O</b> <b>o</b> 50:10 <b>o'clock</b> 160:22 168:6 <b>oath</b> 5:12,14 153:1	offend 124:19,22 offended 53:8 offer 38:5 43:24 44:13,19 88:19 284:19 offered 38:14	63:8 64:16 73:23 85:4 119:4 168:5 219:12 223:13 229:6 244:20 245:23 249:4 250:3 285:22	<b>opportunity</b> 15:24 18:25 52:1 61:15 61:19 64:6,11 69:6 138:18 177:15 179:17,19 251:25 270:11	outside 110:1 176:8 214:1,2 267:7 300:12 overarching 54:12 overemphasise 181:3
<b>O</b> <b>o</b> 50:10 <b>o'clock</b> 160:22 168:6 <b>oath</b> 5:12,14 153:1 <b>object</b> 166:25	offend 124:19,22 offended 53:8 offer 38:5 43:24 44:13,19 88:19 284:19 offered 38:14 43:20 243:1	63:8 64:16 73:23 85:4 119:4 168:5 219:12 223:13 229:6 244:20 245:23 249:4 250:3 285:22 288:7,14	opportunity 15:24 18:25 52:1 61:15 61:19 64:6,11 69:6 138:18 177:15 179:17,19 251:25 270:11 opposed 294:12	outside 110:1 176:8 214:1,2 267:7 300:12 overarching 54:12 overemphasise 181:3 overseas 267:15
<b>O</b> <b>o</b> 50:10 <b>o'clock</b> 160:22 168:6 <b>oath</b> 5:12,14 153:1 <b>object</b> 166:25 <b>objection</b> 305:5	offend 124:19,22 offended 53:8 offer 38:5 43:24 44:13,19 88:19 284:19 offered 38:14 43:20 243:1 249:23	63:8 64:16 73:23 85:4 119:4 168:5 219:12 223:13 229:6 244:20 245:23 249:4 250:3 285:22 288:7,14 old 194:12 272:22	opportunity 15:24 18:25 52:1 61:15 61:19 64:6,11 69:6 138:18 177:15 179:17,19 251:25 270:11 opposed 294:12 opposite 106:2	outside 110:1 176:8 214:1,2 267:7 300:12 overarching 54:12 overemphasise 181:3 overseas 267:15 271:18
<b>O</b> <b>o</b> 50:10 <b>o'clock</b> 160:22 168:6 <b>oath</b> 5:12,14 153:1 <b>object</b> 166:25 <b>objection</b> 305:5 <b>objective</b> 136:23	offend 124:19,22 offended 53:8 offer 38:5 43:24 44:13,19 88:19 284:19 offered 38:14 43:20 243:1 249:23 offering 45:20	63:8 64:16 73:23 85:4 119:4 168:5 219:12 223:13 229:6 244:20 245:23 249:4 250:3 285:22 288:7,14 old 194:12 272:22 once 3:3 7:4 47:25	opportunity 15:24 18:25 52:1 61:15 61:19 64:6,11 69:6 138:18 177:15 179:17,19 251:25 270:11 opposed 294:12 opposite 106:2 160:10 225:17,25	outside 110:1 176:8 214:1,2 267:7 300:12 overarching 54:12 overemphasise 181:3 overseas 267:15 271:18 oversee 116:13
O o 50:10 o'clock 160:22 168:6 oath 5:12,14 153:1 object 166:25 objection 305:5 objective 136:23 151:2 247:16	offend 124:19,22 offended 53:8 offer 38:5 43:24 44:13,19 88:19 284:19 offered 38:14 43:20 243:1 249:23 offering 45:20 161:9,10,15	63:8 64:16 73:23 85:4 119:4 168:5 219:12 223:13 229:6 244:20 245:23 249:4 250:3 285:22 288:7,14 old 194:12 272:22 once 3:3 7:4 47:25 64:23 84:23	opportunity 15:24 18:25 52:1 61:15 61:19 64:6,11 69:6 138:18 177:15 179:17,19 251:25 270:11 opposed 294:12 opposite 106:2 160:10 225:17,25 282:4	outside 110:1 176:8 214:1,2 267:7 300:12 overarching 54:12 overemphasise 181:3 overseas 267:15 271:18 oversee 116:13 overseeing 116:9
<b>O</b> o 50:10 o'clock 160:22 168:6 oath 5:12,14 153:1 object 166:25 objection 305:5 objective 136:23 151:2 247:16 268:13	offend 124:19,22 offended 53:8 offer 38:5 43:24 44:13,19 88:19 284:19 offered 38:14 43:20 243:1 249:23 offering 45:20 161:9,10,15 248:12,17	63:8 64:16 73:23 85:4 119:4 168:5 219:12 223:13 229:6 244:20 245:23 249:4 250:3 285:22 288:7,14 old 194:12 272:22 once 3:3 7:4 47:25 64:23 84:23 138:10,15 191:13	opportunity 15:24 18:25 52:1 61:15 61:19 64:6,11 69:6 138:18 177:15 179:17,19 251:25 270:11 opposed 294:12 opposite 106:2 160:10 225:17,25 282:4 opposition 251:9	outside 110:1 176:8 214:1,2 267:7 300:12 overarching 54:12 overemphasise 181:3 overseas 267:15 271:18 oversee 116:13 overseeing 116:9 116:11
<b>O</b> o 50:10 o'clock 160:22 168:6 oath 5:12,14 153:1 object 166:25 objection 305:5 objective 136:23 151:2 247:16 268:13 obligation 18:20	offend 124:19,22 offended 53:8 offer 38:5 43:24 44:13,19 88:19 284:19 offered 38:14 43:20 243:1 249:23 offering 45:20 161:9,10,15 248:12,17 offers 248:20,25	63:8 64:16 73:23 85:4 119:4 168:5 219:12 223:13 229:6 244:20 245:23 249:4 250:3 285:22 288:7,14 old 194:12 272:22 once 3:3 7:4 47:25 64:23 84:23 138:10,15 191:13 201:14 229:8	opportunity 15:24 18:25 52:1 61:15 61:19 64:6,11 69:6 138:18 177:15 179:17,19 251:25 270:11 opposed 294:12 opposite 106:2 160:10 225:17,25 282:4 opposition 251:9 option 258:9	outside 110:1 176:8 214:1,2 267:7 300:12 overarching 54:12 overemphasise 181:3 overseas 267:15 271:18 oversee 116:13 overseeing 116:9 116:11 overwhelmed 6:18
<b>O</b> o 50:10 o'clock 160:22 168:6 oath 5:12,14 153:1 object 166:25 objection 305:5 objective 136:23 151:2 247:16 268:13 obligation 18:20 250:22	offend 124:19,22 offended 53:8 offer 38:5 43:24 44:13,19 88:19 284:19 offered 38:14 43:20 243:1 249:23 offering 45:20 161:9,10,15 248:12,17 offers 248:20,25 305:9	63:8 64:16 73:23 85:4 119:4 168:5 219:12 223:13 229:6 244:20 245:23 249:4 250:3 285:22 288:7,14 old 194:12 272:22 once 3:3 7:4 47:25 64:23 84:23 138:10,15 191:13 201:14 229:8 249:13 253:21	opportunity 15:24 18:25 52:1 61:15 61:19 64:6,11 69:6 138:18 177:15 179:17,19 251:25 270:11 opposed 294:12 opposite 106:2 160:10 225:17,25 282:4 opposition 251:9 option 258:9 options 156:12	outside 110:1 176:8 214:1,2 267:7 300:12 overarching 54:12 overemphasise 181:3 overseas 267:15 271:18 oversee 116:13 overseeing 116:9 116:11 overwhelmed 6:18 overwhelmingly
O o 50:10 o'clock 160:22 168:6 oath 5:12,14 153:1 object 166:25 objection 305:5 objective 136:23 151:2 247:16 268:13 obligation 18:20 250:22 obligations 56:23	offend 124:19,22 offended 53:8 offer 38:5 43:24 44:13,19 88:19 284:19 offered 38:14 43:20 243:1 249:23 offering 45:20 161:9,10,15 248:12,17 offers 248:20,25 305:9 office 3:1,4 36:20	63:8 64:16 73:23 85:4 119:4 168:5 219:12 223:13 229:6 244:20 245:23 249:4 250:3 285:22 288:7,14 old 194:12 272:22 once 3:3 7:4 47:25 64:23 84:23 138:10,15 191:13 201:14 229:8 249:13 253:21 296:11	opportunity 15:24 18:25 52:1 61:15 61:19 64:6,11 69:6 138:18 177:15 179:17,19 251:25 270:11 opposed 294:12 opposite 106:2 160:10 225:17,25 282:4 opposition 251:9 option 258:9 options 156:12 168:16,22	outside 110:1 176:8 214:1,2 267:7 300:12 overarching 54:12 overemphasise 181:3 overseas 267:15 271:18 oversee 116:13 overseeing 116:9 116:11 overwhelmed 6:18 overwhelmingly 2:21 10:14
O o 50:10 o'clock 160:22 168:6 oath 5:12,14 153:1 object 166:25 objection 305:5 objective 136:23 151:2 247:16 268:13 obligation 18:20 250:22 obligations 56:23 149:17	offend 124:19,22 offended 53:8 offer 38:5 43:24 44:13,19 88:19 284:19 offered 38:14 43:20 243:1 249:23 offering 45:20 161:9,10,15 248:12,17 offers 248:20,25 305:9 office 3:1,4 36:20 42:11 70:20 71:6	63:8 64:16 73:23 85:4 119:4 168:5 219:12 223:13 229:6 244:20 245:23 249:4 250:3 285:22 288:7,14 old 194:12 272:22 once 3:3 7:4 47:25 64:23 84:23 138:10,15 191:13 201:14 229:8 249:13 253:21 296:11 ones 26:8 34:19	opportunity 15:24 18:25 52:1 61:15 61:19 64:6,11 69:6 138:18 177:15 179:17,19 251:25 270:11 opposed 294:12 opposite 106:2 160:10 225:17,25 282:4 opposition 251:9 option 258:9 options 156:12 168:16,22 order 24:4 29:11	outside 110:1 176:8 214:1,2 267:7 300:12 overarching 54:12 overemphasise 181:3 overseas 267:15 271:18 oversee 116:13 overseeing 116:9 116:11 overwhelmed 6:18 overwhelmingly 2:21 10:14 owned 103:12
O o 50:10 o'clock 160:22 168:6 oath 5:12,14 153:1 object 166:25 objection 305:5 objective 136:23 151:2 247:16 268:13 obligation 18:20 250:22 obligations 56:23 149:17 obstacle 284:7	offend 124:19,22 offended 53:8 offer 38:5 43:24 44:13,19 88:19 284:19 offered 38:14 43:20 243:1 249:23 offering 45:20 161:9,10,15 248:12,17 offers 248:20,25 305:9 office 3:1,4 36:20 42:11 70:20 71:6 71:7 88:17 94:6	63:8 64:16 73:23 85:4 119:4 168:5 219:12 223:13 229:6 244:20 245:23 249:4 250:3 285:22 288:7,14 old 194:12 272:22 once 3:3 7:4 47:25 64:23 84:23 138:10,15 191:13 201:14 229:8 249:13 253:21 296:11 ones 26:8 34:19 63:1 93:20	opportunity 15:24 18:25 52:1 61:15 61:19 64:6,11 69:6 138:18 177:15 179:17,19 251:25 270:11 opposed 294:12 opposite 106:2 160:10 225:17,25 282:4 opposition 251:9 option 258:9 options 156:12 168:16,22 order 24:4 29:11 56:6 63:4 77:25	outside 110:1 176:8 214:1,2 267:7 300:12 overarching 54:12 overemphasise 181:3 overseas 267:15 271:18 oversee 116:13 overseeing 116:9 116:11 overwhelmed 6:18 overwhelmingly 2:21 10:14 owned 103:12 120:8,14 121:3
O o 50:10 o'clock 160:22 168:6 oath 5:12,14 153:1 object 166:25 objective 136:23 151:2 247:16 268:13 obligation 18:20 250:22 obligations 56:23 149:17 obstacle 284:7 obtain 60:17 70:8	offend 124:19,22 offended 53:8 offer 38:5 43:24 44:13,19 88:19 284:19 offered 38:14 43:20 243:1 249:23 offering 45:20 161:9,10,15 248:12,17 offers 248:20,25 305:9 office 3:1,4 36:20 42:11 70:20 71:6 71:7 88:17 94:6 94:21 102:3	63:8 64:16 73:23 85:4 119:4 168:5 219:12 223:13 229:6 244:20 245:23 249:4 250:3 285:22 288:7,14 old 194:12 272:22 once 3:3 7:4 47:25 64:23 84:23 138:10,15 191:13 201:14 229:8 249:13 253:21 296:11 ones 26:8 34:19 63:1 93:20 115:20 280:12	opportunity 15:24 18:25 52:1 61:15 61:19 64:6,11 69:6 138:18 177:15 179:17,19 251:25 270:11 opposed 294:12 opposite 106:2 160:10 225:17,25 282:4 opposition 251:9 option 258:9 options 156:12 168:16,22 order 24:4 29:11 56:6 63:4 77:25 84:19 103:9	outside 110:1 176:8 214:1,2 267:7 300:12 overarching 54:12 overemphasise 181:3 overseas 267:15 271:18 oversee 116:13 overseeing 116:9 116:11 overwhelmed 6:18 overwhelmingly 2:21 10:14 owned 103:12 120:8,14 121:3 220:2
O o 50:10 o'clock 160:22 168:6 oath 5:12,14 153:1 object 166:25 objection 305:5 objective 136:23 151:2 247:16 268:13 obligation 18:20 250:22 obligations 56:23 149:17 obstacle 284:7 obtain 60:17 70:8 209:8 244:22	offend 124:19,22 offended 53:8 offer 38:5 43:24 44:13,19 88:19 284:19 offered 38:14 43:20 243:1 249:23 offering 45:20 161:9,10,15 248:12,17 offers 248:20,25 305:9 office 3:1,4 36:20 42:11 70:20 71:6 71:7 88:17 94:6 94:21 102:3 125:17,22 126:6	63:8 64:16 73:23 85:4 119:4 168:5 219:12 223:13 229:6 244:20 245:23 249:4 250:3 285:22 288:7,14 old 194:12 272:22 once 3:3 7:4 47:25 64:23 84:23 138:10,15 191:13 201:14 229:8 249:13 253:21 296:11 ones 26:8 34:19 63:1 93:20 115:20 280:12 ongoing 13:8	opportunity 15:24 18:25 52:1 61:15 61:19 64:6,11 69:6 138:18 177:15 179:17,19 251:25 270:11 opposed 294:12 opposite 106:2 160:10 225:17,25 282:4 opposition 251:9 option 258:9 options 156:12 168:16,22 order 24:4 29:11 56:6 63:4 77:25 84:19 103:9 141:24 155:13	outside 110:1 176:8 214:1,2 267:7 300:12 overarching 54:12 overemphasise 181:3 overseas 267:15 271:18 oversee 116:13 overseeing 116:9 116:11 overwhelmed 6:18 overwhelmingly 2:21 10:14 owned 103:12 120:8,14 121:3 220:2 owner 120:6,11
O o 50:10 o'clock 160:22 168:6 oath 5:12,14 153:1 object 166:25 objection 305:5 objective 136:23 151:2 247:16 268:13 obligation 18:20 250:22 obligations 56:23 149:17 obstacle 284:7 obtain 60:17 70:8 209:8 244:22 obtained 64:2 70:3	offend 124:19,22 offended 53:8 offer 38:5 43:24 44:13,19 88:19 284:19 offered 38:14 43:20 243:1 249:23 offering 45:20 161:9,10,15 248:12,17 offers 248:20,25 305:9 office 3:1,4 36:20 42:11 70:20 71:6 71:7 88:17 94:6 94:21 102:3 125:17,22 126:6 126:9 150:6,16	63:8 64:16 73:23 85:4 119:4 168:5 219:12 223:13 229:6 244:20 245:23 249:4 250:3 285:22 288:7,14 old 194:12 272:22 once 3:3 7:4 47:25 64:23 84:23 138:10,15 191:13 201:14 229:8 249:13 253:21 296:11 ones 26:8 34:19 63:1 93:20 115:20 280:12 ongoing 13:8 163:14 208:5	opportunity 15:24 18:25 52:1 61:15 61:19 64:6,11 69:6 138:18 177:15 179:17,19 251:25 270:11 opposed 294:12 opposite 106:2 160:10 225:17,25 282:4 opposition 251:9 option 258:9 options 156:12 168:16,22 order 24:4 29:11 56:6 63:4 77:25 84:19 103:9 141:24 155:13 162:7,22 165:7	outside 110:1 176:8 214:1,2 267:7 300:12 overarching 54:12 overemphasise 181:3 overseas 267:15 271:18 oversee 116:13 overseeing 116:9 116:11 overwhelmed 6:18 overwhelmingly 2:21 10:14 owned 103:12 120:8,14 121:3 220:2 owner 120:6,11 ownership 105:10
O           o 50:10           o'clock 160:22           168:6           oath 5:12,14 153:1           object 166:25           objection 305:5           objective 136:23           151:2 247:16           268:13           obligation 18:20           250:22           obligations 56:23           149:17           obstacle 284:7           obtain 60:17 70:8           209:8 244:22           obtained 64:2 70:3           85:23 107:3	offend 124:19,22 offended 53:8 offer 38:5 43:24 44:13,19 88:19 284:19 offered 38:14 43:20 243:1 249:23 offering 45:20 161:9,10,15 248:12,17 offers 248:20,25 305:9 office 3:1,4 36:20 42:11 70:20 71:6 71:7 88:17 94:6 94:21 102:3 125:17,22 126:6 126:9 150:6,16 152:12 154:18	63:8 64:16 73:23 85:4 119:4 168:5 219:12 223:13 229:6 244:20 245:23 249:4 250:3 285:22 288:7,14 old 194:12 272:22 once 3:3 7:4 47:25 64:23 84:23 138:10,15 191:13 201:14 229:8 249:13 253:21 296:11 ones 26:8 34:19 63:1 93:20 115:20 280:12 ongoing 13:8 163:14 208:5 261:23,25	opportunity 15:24 18:25 52:1 61:15 61:19 64:6,11 69:6 138:18 177:15 179:17,19 251:25 270:11 opposed 294:12 opposite 106:2 160:10 225:17,25 282:4 opposition 251:9 option 258:9 options 156:12 168:16,22 order 24:4 29:11 56:6 63:4 77:25 84:19 103:9 141:24 155:13 162:7,22 165:7 166:16 169:10	outside 110:1 176:8 214:1,2 267:7 300:12 overarching 54:12 overemphasise 181:3 overseas 267:15 271:18 oversee 116:13 overseeing 116:9 116:11 overwhelmed 6:18 overwhelmingly 2:21 10:14 owned 103:12 120:8,14 121:3 220:2 owner 120:6,11 ownership 105:10 117:17 135:20,21
O           o 50:10           o'clock 160:22           168:6           oath 5:12,14 153:1           object 166:25           objection 305:5           objective 136:23           151:2 247:16           268:13           obligation 18:20           250:22           obligations 56:23           149:17           obstacle 284:7           obtain 60:17 70:8           209:8 244:22           obtained 64:2 70:3           85:23 107:3           167:9 197:6,14	offend 124:19,22 offended 53:8 offer 38:5 43:24 44:13,19 88:19 284:19 offered 38:14 43:20 243:1 249:23 offering 45:20 161:9,10,15 248:12,17 offers 248:20,25 305:9 office 3:1,4 36:20 42:11 70:20 71:6 71:7 88:17 94:6 94:21 102:3 125:17,22 126:6 126:9 150:6,16 152:12 154:18 156:7 164:9	63:8 64:16 73:23 85:4 119:4 168:5 219:12 223:13 229:6 244:20 245:23 249:4 250:3 285:22 288:7,14 old 194:12 272:22 once 3:3 7:4 47:25 64:23 84:23 138:10,15 191:13 201:14 229:8 249:13 253:21 296:11 ones 26:8 34:19 63:1 93:20 115:20 280:12 ongoing 13:8 163:14 208:5 261:23,25 Op 79:17 80:19	opportunity 15:24 18:25 52:1 61:15 61:19 64:6,11 69:6 138:18 177:15 179:17,19 251:25 270:11 opposed 294:12 opposite 106:2 160:10 225:17,25 282:4 opposition 251:9 option 258:9 options 156:12 168:16,22 order 24:4 29:11 56:6 63:4 77:25 84:19 103:9 141:24 155:13 162:7,22 165:7 166:16 169:10 181:10 188:6	outside 110:1 176:8 214:1,2 267:7 300:12 overarching 54:12 overemphasise 181:3 overseas 267:15 271:18 oversee 116:13 overseeing 116:9 116:11 overwhelmed 6:18 overwhelmingly 2:21 10:14 owned 103:12 120:8,14 121:3 220:2 owner 120:6,11 ownership 105:10 117:17 135:20,21 136:2 144:22,24
O           o 50:10           o'clock 160:22           168:6           oath 5:12,14 153:1           object 166:25           objection 305:5           objective 136:23           151:2 247:16           268:13           obligation 18:20           250:22           obligations 56:23           149:17           obstacle 284:7           obtain 60:17 70:8           209:8 244:22           obtained 64:2 70:3           85:23 107:3	offend 124:19,22 offended 53:8 offer 38:5 43:24 44:13,19 88:19 284:19 offered 38:14 43:20 243:1 249:23 offering 45:20 161:9,10,15 248:12,17 offers 248:20,25 305:9 office 3:1,4 36:20 42:11 70:20 71:6 71:7 88:17 94:6 94:21 102:3 125:17,22 126:6 126:9 150:6,16 152:12 154:18	63:8 64:16 73:23 85:4 119:4 168:5 219:12 223:13 229:6 244:20 245:23 249:4 250:3 285:22 288:7,14 old 194:12 272:22 once 3:3 7:4 47:25 64:23 84:23 138:10,15 191:13 201:14 229:8 249:13 253:21 296:11 ones 26:8 34:19 63:1 93:20 115:20 280:12 ongoing 13:8 163:14 208:5 261:23,25	opportunity 15:24 18:25 52:1 61:15 61:19 64:6,11 69:6 138:18 177:15 179:17,19 251:25 270:11 opposed 294:12 opposite 106:2 160:10 225:17,25 282:4 opposition 251:9 option 258:9 options 156:12 168:16,22 order 24:4 29:11 56:6 63:4 77:25 84:19 103:9 141:24 155:13 162:7,22 165:7 166:16 169:10	outside 110:1 176:8 214:1,2 267:7 300:12 overarching 54:12 overemphasise 181:3 overseas 267:15 271:18 oversee 116:13 overseeing 116:9 116:11 overwhelmed 6:18 overwhelmingly 2:21 10:14 owned 103:12 120:8,14 121:3 220:2 owner 120:6,11 ownership 105:10 117:17 135:20,21

www.epiqglobal.com casemanagers@epiqglobal.com

				Page 555
222:18	131:16 237:8	partly 121:2	peradventure	personal 156:17
owning 120:8	paraphrased	partner 95:20	103:11	218:19,23 221:1
	131:15	119:16 221:14,16	percent 120:12	221:9,11,18,21
P	pardon 282:13	221:19 273:14	219:24 222:6,15	244:13 292:13,23
pace 77:1	Parece 198:25	partners 89:9	perception 35:22	292:23 293:7,17
page 10:1,5,16	Parliament 77:21	91:15 95:19	Perez 76:20,21	293:21 294:6,10
11:24 12:21	81:23 148:4,5	120:18 135:22	85:25 95:7,18	personally 109:23
20:19 25:23	171:4 242:14	parts 26:7	104:1 163:22	227:6,8 246:4
27:17 31:22 36:1	251:8,16	party 52:13 55:4	222:20 288:20	271:3 283:17
41:21 74:23 75:1	parliamentary	107:21 108:16	289:4,10 293:3,5	personification
85:6 94:7 95:15	286:5	212:8	293:9	198:2,6
127:2 196:20,20	part 14:4 17:9	pass 299:24	Perez's 290:1	perspective 2:18
196:22 207:1	70:1 81:9,10,11	passing 72:22	perfectly 19:7	142:9
230:17 258:3,16	88:3 118:17	Patron 48:24	249:15	persuade 37:4,14
268:25 269:1,1	119:8,9,24	Paul 75:9,11 181:7	performance	61:17 201:8
271:16 282:21	126:11 134:12	224:12,17,18	258:22	persuasion 255:21
285:22 304:8	198:7 212:1,3	250:1	performer 89:8	256:4,8 261:4
pages 239:25	285:10	pause 81:9 91:8	91:15	persuasive 18:8
paginated 4:7	<b>part-</b> 120:5	95:15 188:24	performing 111:4	35:20
paid 39:10 44:7	<b>part-own</b> 120:22	189:1,2 196:4,24	period 5:22 9:18	Peter 69:4 250:5
pale 2:18	120:23	196:25 197:21	9:21 76:16,19	250:10,16 259:12
panel 48:22 49:2	part-owner 120:3	207:16 292:5	92:24,25 93:10	271:24 277:19
paper 220:10	120:4	Pausing 240:13	94:20 108:10	278:1 281:15
papers 185:1	part-owns 121:23	pay 39:5	130:12,15 154:24	283:13 284:2
paragraph 4:10	partial 79:3	payable 105:13	156:2 231:19	286:22,23 288:2
8:7,8 10:20,21	participant 45:20	<b>Payas</b> 75:10,11	275:19 277:9,25	292:9,25 296:14
13:4 17:20 27:17	45:23 240:14	paying 40:3	285:19	297:14
28:15,18 32:4	particular 73:2	payment 38:23,25	peripheral 47:9	phased 285:19
36:2,16 37:19	89:18 96:13,23	39:2	permanently	Philip 75:7
41:13 73:19	98:6 105:9	pejorative 132:9	149:13 266:18	<b>phone</b> 2:6 74:20
74:25 75:4 81:1	115:16 138:4	132:16	permission 214:10	75:16 104:13
81:12 82:11	147:16,21 148:12		214:15	107:3 109:10
85:16 94:24 95:5	150:10,10 164:3	38:14 39:4,15,18	permit 40:7	110:5 134:13,16
95:14 96:11,20	177:9 195:21	39:21 40:3 43:20	119:11 224:11	134:19 156:14
97:14 109:16	225:16 239:7,8	305:17,25	person 34:21 43:6	158:21 174:5,15
128:11 129:2	244:18 248:4	pensions 44:6	43:7,9,11,13	182:24,25 259:15
149:23 155:9	249:17 258:23	penultimate 85:16	45:21 51:9 76:21	phones 24:1
159:9,10,18	265:7 303:8	people 20:6 33:18	82:16 88:19	photographic
196:22 197:1	309:25	34:17 41:3,7	93:12 97:9 98:22	237:22
		,		
204:20 222:9	particularisation	46:4 89:20 92:14	101:16 116:7	<b>phrase</b> 31:17
204:20 222:9 225:1 231:12	particularisation 90:7	46:4 89:20 92:14 98:25 99:1 121:9	101:16 116:7 125:16 128:12	193:18
204:20 222:9 225:1 231:12 241:15 259:14	particularisation 90:7 particularise	46:4 89:20 92:14 98:25 99:1 121:9 126:6,9 133:23	101:16 116:7 125:16 128:12 142:25 174:23	193:18 phraseology
204:20 222:9 225:1 231:12 241:15 259:14 262:11,12 264:15	particularisation 90:7 particularise 92:15	46:4 89:20 92:14 98:25 99:1 121:9 126:6,9 133:23 137:6 149:7,9	101:16 116:7 125:16 128:12 142:25 174:23 176:13,23 182:1	193:18 phraseology 132:20,22 149:8
204:20 222:9 225:1 231:12 241:15 259:14 262:11,12 264:15 269:5 282:14,19	particularisation 90:7 particularise 92:15 particularly 33:6	46:4 89:20 92:14 98:25 99:1 121:9 126:6,9 133:23 137:6 149:7,9 165:13 200:24	101:16 116:7 125:16 128:12 142:25 174:23 176:13,23 182:1 207:11 212:11	193:18 phraseology 132:20,22 149:8 Picardo 1:5 46:17
204:20 222:9 225:1 231:12 241:15 259:14 262:11,12 264:15 269:5 282:14,19 283:18 287:20	particularisation 90:7 particularise 92:15 particularly 33:6 142:7 250:8	46:4 89:20 92:14 98:25 99:1 121:9 126:6,9 133:23 137:6 149:7,9 165:13 200:24 202:10 235:3	101:16 116:7 125:16 128:12 142:25 174:23 176:13,23 182:1 207:11 212:11 213:20 218:17	193:18 <b>phraseology</b> 132:20,22 149:8 <b>Picardo</b> 1:5 46:17 52:23 57:3 66:19
204:20 222:9 225:1 231:12 241:15 259:14 262:11,12 264:15 269:5 282:14,19 283:18 287:20 294:2,7,13	<b>particularisation</b> 90:7 <b>particularise</b> 92:15 <b>particularly</b> 33:6 142:7 250:8 277:22 286:1	46:4 89:20 92:14 98:25 99:1 121:9 126:6,9 133:23 137:6 149:7,9 165:13 200:24 202:10 235:3 237:4 241:21	101:16 116:7 125:16 128:12 142:25 174:23 176:13,23 182:1 207:11 212:11 213:20 218:17 224:13 245:24	193:18 <b>phraseology</b> 132:20,22 149:8 <b>Picardo</b> 1:5 46:17 52:23 57:3 66:19 74:10 77:6 80:24
204:20 222:9 225:1 231:12 241:15 259:14 262:11,12 264:15 269:5 282:14,19 283:18 287:20 294:2,7,13 <b>paragraphs</b>	<b>particularisation</b> 90:7 <b>particularise</b> 92:15 <b>particularly</b> 33:6 142:7 250:8 277:22 286:1 <b>parties</b> 70:9 99:22	46:4 89:20 92:14 98:25 99:1 121:9 126:6,9 133:23 137:6 149:7,9 165:13 200:24 202:10 235:3 237:4 241:21 243:18 248:22	101:16 116:7 125:16 128:12 142:25 174:23 176:13,23 182:1 207:11 212:11 213:20 218:17 224:13 245:24 265:7 267:11	193:18 <b>phraseology</b> 132:20,22 149:8 <b>Picardo</b> 1:5 46:17 52:23 57:3 66:19 74:10 77:6 80:24 81:21 142:6
204:20 222:9 225:1 231:12 241:15 259:14 262:11,12 264:15 269:5 282:14,19 283:18 287:20 294:2,7,13 <b>paragraphs</b> 263:16 264:17	<b>particularisation</b> 90:7 <b>particularise</b> 92:15 <b>particularly</b> 33:6 142:7 250:8 277:22 286:1 <b>parties</b> 70:9 99:22 146:8 153:7	46:4 89:20 92:14 98:25 99:1 121:9 126:6,9 133:23 137:6 149:7,9 165:13 200:24 202:10 235:3 237:4 241:21 243:18 248:22 249:6,22 277:12	101:16 116:7 125:16 128:12 142:25 174:23 176:13,23 182:1 207:11 212:11 213:20 218:17 224:13 245:24 265:7 267:11 276:11	193:18 <b>phraseology</b> 132:20,22 149:8 <b>Picardo</b> 1:5 46:17 52:23 57:3 66:19 74:10 77:6 80:24 81:21 142:6 209:7 250:15
204:20 222:9 225:1 231:12 241:15 259:14 262:11,12 264:15 269:5 282:14,19 283:18 287:20 294:2,7,13 <b>paragraphs</b>	<b>particularisation</b> 90:7 <b>particularise</b> 92:15 <b>particularly</b> 33:6 142:7 250:8 277:22 286:1 <b>parties</b> 70:9 99:22	46:4 89:20 92:14 98:25 99:1 121:9 126:6,9 133:23 137:6 149:7,9 165:13 200:24 202:10 235:3 237:4 241:21 243:18 248:22	101:16 116:7 125:16 128:12 142:25 174:23 176:13,23 182:1 207:11 212:11 213:20 218:17 224:13 245:24 265:7 267:11	193:18 <b>phraseology</b> 132:20,22 149:8 <b>Picardo</b> 1:5 46:17 52:23 57:3 66:19 74:10 77:6 80:24 81:21 142:6

www.epiqglobal.com Lowe casemanagers@epiqglobal.com

Lower Ground Floor, 46 Chancery Lane m London, WC2A 1JE

5	1 5			5
				Page 336
		122.0 144 2 16	22.20.22.26.14	255-5-264-10
pick 1:8 104:6	plural 237:1	132:8 144:3,16	32:20,23 36:14	255:5 264:19
picking 28:18	point 12:25 13:14	154:11 163:9,13	40:20 41:15	268:21 269:20
95:13 96:10	13:17 25:12,20	163:14 167:17,17	42:20 69:17 95:3	powers 17:25 18:4
228:17	30:15 32:9 35:3	170:13 171:17,20	130:14 132:13	18:15 54:17
<b>picture</b> 26:4 28:24	47:12 49:16 55:1	176:1,16 177:5,9	161:1,7 215:11	154:9 194:16
<b>pillow</b> 266:8	56:25 69:2,3	177:13 179:5	242:8 249:10	252:12 254:1
<b>pitch</b> 30:2	71:18 72:13	181:12,14,20,25	251:18 254:6	255:8 270:2
pitches 34:9	81:21,25 82:4	182:7 183:11,19	256:18 267:20	practice 158:24
<b>pivot</b> 42:13,14,17	86:22 93:14 96:5	185:5 186:14,17	292:8 301:16	162:2 234:4
42:18 222:19	104:2 111:16,16	188:9 193:15	303:2,3	practised 70:10
place 41:23 46:2	114:15 131:13	194:17 195:12,13	positions 42:25	practising 77:7
71:15 75:7 173:6	134:24 141:24	195:25 199:25	43:16 249:7	practitioner 67:23
173:10,10 174:7	168:18 171:7	200:3 211:11	positive 118:21	preamble 48:17
174:17 182:24	173:24 200:7	212:3,16 213:9	204:5 243:14	precious 11:1
227:5 283:20	203:12 209:1,2	213:20,23 214:8	310:19	precisely 64:25
287:17 288:24	209:21 211:16	215:15 218:1,5	possession 308:22	165:18 295:25
293:15	213:15 216:8	218:15 222:14	possibility 180:3	300:1
plainly 299:10	237:11,24 258:24	226:23 232:23	234:22	preclude 20:15
planning 298:25	266:3 271:24	240:11 245:17	possible 9:7 27:11	preference 97:23
platform 97:18	283:14,15 286:11	246:4 252:5,10	37:6 64:23 70:6	114:20,21,22
103:9,9 105:11	287:25 288:1,7	252:13,16,24	114:15 172:12	preferred 22:6
125:16,18 127:4	291:15,19,21	253:12,19 254:12	218:9 299:23	146:19
127:6,11 134:1,3	291:13,19,21	255:23 256:5	303:8 309:5,5,16	prejudge 18:10
134:6	301:18,21 307:3	264:19 266:6	309:16 310:8	premise 88:2
<b>platinum</b> 257:21	307:18 308:7,14	267:9,12,23	possibly 23:2	195:9
plausible 194:2	<b>pointing</b> 307:12	268:3,15 271:19	136:3 138:16	preparation 8:1
-	points 32:25 66:8	273:17 274:7,8	262:25	309:14
play 18:16 25:6	67:25 156:3	279:24 281:10,19		
264:21 275:6,9		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	post 182:13 254:8	prepare 9:6
281:14,17	168:14 288:15	282:2 287:11	post-Covid 9:22	222:25 230:11
please 13:1 20:18	297:15	288:3 289:21	potential 41:3	prepared 7:10,11
22:23 25:2,9,12	police 13:7 20:17	290:21,24,25	67:20 106:20,24	7:19 38:4 73:15
34:24 35:23	21:22 24:9 39:8	299:1 305:12	123:23 126:23	92:18 96:14,25
41:11 93:17,19	40:13 42:17	307:16	129:4 188:7	98:7 107:16,18
94:25 95:11	43:16 50:5,6,16	policies 227:4,12	195:20 240:16	149:16 179:17,19
96:10 97:8 98:13	52:15 53:11,23	political 106:15	243:10 247:6	196:2 263:17
126:18 131:15	54:1,9 56:3,9	215:11 235:2	278:6 279:8	preplanned 173:2
132:23 145:10	57:8,9,21 62:22	252:8 260:19	290:3,9 306:6	presence 6:18
159:8 163:1	63:1 68:11 73:5	275:4	potentially 40:5	48:25 195:1
168:6 177:23	78:16,18,22,24	politically 237:3,5	45:4 88:20 116:4	301:8
178:18 188:24	84:3 85:8 86:11	politician 3:2	117:20 126:2	present 75:10
196:4 204:8,18	86:17,20 89:2,4	226:22	137:11 142:19	229:6
211:12 220:23	92:20 93:18	politicians 3:10	154:10 241:1	presented 121:6
222:12 224:25	98:10,11 104:21	<b>politics</b> 176:17	243:19,23	121:12,12 289:14
227:15 233:21	106:3 107:2,20	<b>populi</b> 33:17 149:5	<b>pounds</b> 39:10	presently 221:16
240:3 245:14	107:25 108:14	213:13 300:23	power 57:20,24	press 186:12
284:14	111:8,20 125:8	<b>Port</b> 299:2	58:5 213:8 252:4	306:19
plenty 179:18,24	125:10,14 126:8	position 13:16,19	252:7,8,8,17,23	pressing 9:8
283:25 292:6	126:17 127:1	14:15 16:1,15,23	253:3,4,7,10	pressure 232:18
310:14	130:20 131:1	21:4,5 27:21	254:5,14,16	233:12,16 265:7
		, ,	, , -	,,
		1	1	1

www.epiqglobal.com Lowe casemanagers@epiqglobal.com

5	1 5			5
				Page 337
268:2	privileged 33:12	229:24 239:24,24	86:14 159:2	233:8 242:16
pressuring 295:1	33:14 66:1	251:23 254:11	proposition 204:3	244:8 309:4,15
presumably 8:15	109:21 110:24	255:1 257:19	209:10	309:17
85:11 93:23 99:2	211:8	267:4,5,6 282:6	propriety 197:13	provided 5:23
221:12 277:18	probably 4:8 9:5	297:1 310:19	prosecuted 136:13	17:10,13 71:24
presume 84:19	31:1 44:2 98:22	procuring 241:1	143:23	72:1 108:3,4
pretend 237:21	123:24 136:14	produce 9:10,11	prosecuting	116:14,16 132:24
pretends 111:2	141:18 149:7	9:14,25 10:1	211:18	148:15 151:25
pretty 232:3	171:25 207:20	34:13 72:6	prosecution 72:24	185:14 194:17
302:24	220:8 232:15	102:18 103:10	136:6 144:17	210:3 214:21
prevent 22:4 30:5	238:1 258:19	232:16 234:8	prosecutions	232:4 242:18
45:1 273:6	292:22 305:1	271:12	13:12 14:2,5	270:6 299:17,17
preventing 130:3	310:22	produced 5:7 9:12	208:4 211:11	providing 24:25
previous 37:8	probity 32:8 54:16	31:3 115:9,12	215:15 234:23	232:9
100:17 287:5	124:22	116:5 122:2	279:13	provision 40:8
previously 97:21	problem 255:3	145:15 233:4,4,5	prosecutorial 61:8	provisions 24:21
255:16 259:2	problems 114:1	233:6 271:12	61:12,22 62:6	29:12 42:23,24
291:12	140:8	285:16	72:23	44:17,21
price 31:15	procedural 254:13	production 58:15	prosequi 234:22	<b>public</b> 3:9 13:11
primarily 256:19	procedure 28:21	63:4 155:13	235:1,12,21	14:1,4 31:20
256:20	40:24 41:2,22	165:6 166:16	236:1,5,11,16,17	36:24 41:16 44:6
primary 17:11	213:20,23 254:24	181:10 276:5	236:20,25 237:10	46:1 64:13,15
197:9 272:6	264:18,23 265:3	profession 141:5	237:17,25 238:5	79:9,11 87:24
principal 44:4,5	265:4 270:10	professional 157:7	238:21 239:13,14	88:16 106:5
187:16	proceed 15:5	profit 103:10	239:16 274:24,25	138:2 208:4
principally 9:14	116:20 167:10,13	programmer	prosequis 237:1	211:11 223:22
147:23 148:6	179:11 197:18	101:1,6 102:8	238:17	250:25 251:10,13
228:3 233:7	198:10 226:7	progress 68:4	prosper 265:3	279:13 286:16,17
principle 223:3	229:23 275:1	project 176:22,24	protect 36:19 43:1	299:23 303:18
288:19	276:23	promised 112:8	54:14 79:4	307:6,7 308:8
principles 12:14	proceeded 15:18	promoting 160:9	136:20 268:4	<b>publicizing</b> 301:9
12:15 46:1	155:12 177:20	160:15,24 162:10	protected 44:24	publicly 50:11
124:23 138:1	proceeding 185:1	168:17	protecting 136:16	252:21 306:25
print 7:24	proceedings 37:2	proper 269:19	<b>protection</b> 41:9,10	<b>pull</b> 93:19
<b>prior</b> 79:18,21	74:16 111:11,11	properly 28:22	242:7,24 243:2	purporting 10:12
privacy 110:20	153:2,15 215:14	39:13 44:24	242:7,24 243:2	purpose 132:11
111:18	216:10 264:25	60:17 145:7	protections 242:16	255:6 272:17
private 79:4 110:3	310:17	149:20 162:7	protects 111:18	purposes 71:13
110:4,11,16,23	process 5:19,21,21	235:7 270:3,25	proud 294:16	286:6
111:12,13 112:4	19:10,12 20:12	271:4 293:15	proved 235:2	<b>pursue</b> 156:13
125:19,20 126:12	21:21 26:23	properties 118:19	provide 26:18,21	265:4
130:8 293:13	47:10,14,24 48:4	property 114:2	32:10 44:22 46:7	pursuing 26:23
privately 214:22	48:6,7,10 49:6,10	117:18	46:12 71:21	192:13 281:24
252:21	50:13 52:16 64:1	proposal 266:16	98:15 108:2,18	push-back 282:5
privilege 110:10	70:16,17 113:16	propose 230:11	113:19 132:7	<b>pushing</b> 256:1
209:22 211:22,25	113:20 115:4,5,8	proposed 58:3	150:24 152:22	257:9
212:25 214:1,2	115:19,21,22	156:2 231:17	150.24 152.22	<b>put</b> 10:4 25:13
212.23 214.1,2 215:12,16 304:19	116:9,11,13	241:3 265:23	179:17,19,25	26:25 27:5 28:25
304:22	122:4 153:7,9	proposing 68:1	230:12,21 233:2	34:14 41:23
JUT.22	122.7 133.1,7	Proposing 00.1	230.12,21 233.2	נ2.1ד דו.דט
	l	l	l	

www.epiqglobal.com casemanagers@epiqglobal.com

5	1 2			5
				Page 338
49:15 57:18	quarter 39:10	quickly 3:25	123:15 257:12	90:15,22,23
59:25 61:10	168:12	<b>чискіў</b> 5.25 167:11 185:11	reading 3:15 10:19	90.13,22,23 109:18 117:14
	que 198:25	190:18 228:4	54:24	127:10 128:2
	question 2:13	229:24 302:21,25	reads 270:17	130:5 146:16,19
106:21 121:18,19	14:11,13,14,17	quiet 186:8	ready 265:4	146:24 147:3,9
123:3 132:13	17:3 30:6 39:25	quite 3:5 20:9	realise 169:22	147:11,14 154:21
125.5 152.15	50:8 57:16 60:19	26:13 86:14	229:9 246:24	159:25 169:10
161:11 176:6	61:20,24 66:12	88:22 94:23	realised 69:13	172:6 179:25
196:22 203:16,20	67:7 74:6 79:14	108:23 209:11,25	229:8	180:14 189:18,19
203:24 215:4,8	84:4 88:3 92:15	210:2 221:17	reality 226:19	199:22 216:2,5
233:11,16 240:2	97:4 100:9,15,16	258:1 261:15	really 3:5 47:9	216:19,20 217:12
240:19 242:21	104:9 105:3	266:24 282:4	67:3,9 68:14	220:22 225:4,8
255:19 256:2	109:1 111:23	283:9 284:12	69:7 72:19 128:7	236:18 237:13,14
258:1 265:6	130:13 131:14	286:21 292:20	133:21 143:25	237:18 238:4,10
268:2 274:5	134:9 135:14,16	quorate 29:14	257:2	249:18 251:4
278:9 282:7	136:23 138:13	quotation 79:7	realms 5:9	262:9 289:23
286:13 291:24	140:20 152:4	quote 49:17	reason 3:12 10:15	292:16,17 298:5
292:12,19,20	165:20 167:1	quoting 13:20,22	17:11 42:13	recalled 149:15
292:12,19,20	175:15 178:23	<b>quoting</b> 15.20,22	64:18 85:22 86:3	receive 68:18
<b>puts</b> 234:18	187:11 193:22	R	86:5 103:22,23	141:21 181:19
puts 234.18 putting 27:11	195:10 200:16	<b>r</b> 124:20 301:23	128:10 129:13	240:24 245:11
79:22 81:5,7	204:1 206:5	302:1	128.10 129.15	302:12 306:6
159:3 204:3	216:14 226:12	rain- 227:20	150:19,20 152:2	received 23:9
288:7 292:16	235:19 238:9,11	raise 111:16 174:4	150:19,20 152:2	215:10 240:8
304:11	239:6 249:3	raised 25:9 27:19	177:10 184:24	259:15
<b>Pyle</b> 1:12,14 2:5	254:15 279:19	63:10,14,15	197:8,9 210:24	
4:3,5 5:7 7:25	284:25 296:15	82:17 110:17		receiving 194:19 238:4 240:15
11:22 13:2 14:8	304:24 305:6,8	259:3 290:3	223:4 227:3,10 228:23 229:14	278:8
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	raises 35:9		recess 58:22
14:25 15:3,6,24	307:13,23 310:22	raising 111:15	233:24 256:19	
16:6,8 17:20 35:1,19,25 37:4	questionable 123:2	300:16	268:6 270:3,18 272:7 301:3	<b>recognise</b> 57:18 101:23 244:25
		raison 103:7		
47:13,14 48:18 48:24 49:9,13,23	<b>questioned</b> 1:6	ran 260:9 267:4	reasonable 39:2	265:12 recollection 40:25
· · ·	47:5 52:20 74:7	range 21:2 295:15	reasons 2:18 20:8	
50:3 51:19,22	77:4 250:16	ranks 56:11	21:2 88:1 89:11	191:22 196:17
52:5 53:10 187:2	266:4 297:17	rarified 309:9	91:20 118:16	201:10,11,13
	<b>questioning</b> 65:14	rate 39:21	121:4 134:17	216:25 277:1
230:1 253:25	65:15,18 291:25	re-elected 3:7	136:17 156:9	309:20
-	<b>questions</b> 46:18,19	re-employment	157:7 182:16	recollections 7:5
256:20 257:14	69:5 74:10 76:23	41:17	197:3 229:25	recommend
258:7,18 259:2,5	80:8,11,12 81:4	reached 27:9	230:12 253:13,16	234:14
259:8 261:24	84:20 93:17	66:14 122:9	256:10,21,24	recommendation
263:15,25 265:2	132:1,3,6,8,10,14	reacted 297:2	268:2 284:19	286:12
265:5 266:21	132:18 133:8	reactions 90:4	295:16	recommendations
269:8	169:3 203:2	read 17:8 48:17	recall 4:13 5:4,5	284:6
<b>Pyle's</b> 259:13	221:25 222:11	52:1,2 54:22	5:18 7:8 16:6	reconstruct 151:9
260:10 268:24	223:1 251:9,19	58:19 59:24 60:6	23:16 38:21	151:15 225:6
0	294:23 304:25	61:15,19 64:12	50:20 60:15 63:9	record 10:8 12:23
	305:8 310:10	64:13 72:18 81:9	64:3 82:14,24	22:12 41:25 93:8
qualms 148:14	<b>quick</b> 162:25	81:12 98:24	85:8 88:8,10	151:3 158:2
Yuanno 170.17		01.12 70.27		

www.epiqglobal.com Lov casemanagers@epiqglobal.com

Lower Ground Floor, 46 Chancery Lane m London, WC2A 1JE

5	1 9			5
				Page 339
10(.1( 10 017 7	74.00 115 15 10		200.12.200.12	221.24.200.10
196:16,18 217:7	74:23 115:15,18	relates 81:10	288:13 309:13	221:24 300:19
217:8,24 254:3	115:25 125:7,17	99:19 100:10	relying 7:21,22	replaced 253:19
255:24 256:11	140:12 146:17	108:11 227:7	remain 110:23	replacing 255:22
257:1,5	149:21 163:7	244:5 279:18	301:17	replied 82:18
recorded 6:3,8	168:19 170:22,23	relating 1:9 99:15	remains 161:5	replies 266:23
31:4 127:10	170:23 215:23	143:3,24 144:17	215:19	reply 27:6 200:19
153:20 193:1	238:22 257:1	217:13 218:22	remarkable 3:5	263:10 301:18
256:15 280:13	279:5 298:9	264:18,23 280:5	65:13 246:11	report 3:22 11:19
recording 179:12	referring 30:13	relation 5:22 6:11	259:18	11:21,24 12:2,7
189:22 191:15,18	37:8 99:12 124:9	29:16 32:11	remarks 247:3	13:6 22:17 40:17
records 150:1,12	144:15 193:19	39:24 49:17	remedy 44:19	89:2,4 126:7
150:12,15 154:20	225:14 267:1	63:13 66:2 67:16	<b>remember</b> 6:12,14	231:15 232:5
298:15	284:19	67:17 77:20	22:13 44:5 53:14	234:9 248:8
recover 45:7 189:7	refers 14:4 262:12	78:19 85:24	106:5 108:10	269:14 284:5,20
recruit 266:19	reflect 19:15 29:21	129:25 159:16,23	110:3 111:17	285:1,2 286:13
recruitment	98:9 117:13	159:24 164:18	118:24 149:1,2	288:12 290:21,24
257:19	140:1 200:15,18	166:4 168:1	151:15 155:10	290:25 299:8
red 46:6 263:8	271:13 272:4	172:2,2,3 188:10	174:20,22 180:9	306:8
268:23	reflected 48:15	214:19 227:17	194:6,8 196:14	reported 16:23
redeployment	49:11,12	228:5 246:2	204:21 218:24	22:13,16 144:2
41:16 44:19	reflecting 29:21	261:23 275:14	243:5 261:10	reporting 16:22
redressed 185:11	52:7 100:8	278:4,17,21	266:4 282:15	17:1 22:18
refer 4:19 9:17	132:17 270:21	284:4 296:20	284:11 290:5,6,7	126:16 131:24
11:24 12:9 56:22	reflection 99:3	Relations 42:12	290:12 294:2,8	263:25 264:2,6
67:15 98:21	102:12 186:8	relationship 4:22	294:25 309:22	reports 16:15 21:3
116:1 125:10,13	190:21 262:20	4:24 93:8 95:23	310:1,3	64:13,15 306:6
126:11 146:4	reflections 106:6	98:2 228:8	remembered	represent 300:15
153:25 197:11	reflects 182:20	265:16,17 294:17	201:2	representation
200:3 237:6	refuse 72:8	relative 120:2	remembering	269:23
238:7 241:8	refused 71:21,23	relatively 74:23	151:8 310:5	representations
306:11	72:6 203:13,25	96:7 162:20	remembers 6:13	18:12 23:9 24:5
reference 8:8,16	regard 62:18	relevance 45:16	remind 30:19	24:6,15 29:10
8:18 16:9,10	92:24 124:13	46:15 108:24	257:18	200:22 253:4
25:17 70:2 71:5	140:5 157:6,16	246:14	reminded 17:21	270:8,11
72:13 73:18	165:12 205:2	relevant 12:15	120:19 219:23	representative
115:2 151:12	261:18	16:6 25:13 43:12	296:22	47:22,23 299:18
196:23 202:24	regarded 75:25	108:6,8,9 132:7	<b>remove</b> 252:5,9,12	representatives
203:2 222:13	regardless 254:5	133:24 152:22	removed 155:25	49:5
239:12 248:1	region 148:1	199:25 202:11	252:16	represented 200:6
252:3 266:15	regular 154:14	206:17 209:21	remuneration	reputational 68:21
269:3 271:17	regularising 95:3	224:7,9 241:25	141:22	68:24 260:19
279:17 282:19	reinforced 191:21	245:5 247:21,25	render 49:4	request 13:4 36:13
285:25 298:21	reiterate 309:2	248:2 305:14	rendered 219:24	36:21 37:12 72:4
308:2	rejected 37:24	308:22	repeat 134:18	76:2,4,7 121:16
references 186:11	rejoinder 171:3	reliance 197:15	175:14	231:14 233:1,10
referred 4:19 12:6	relate 91:4 157:8	198:7 199:14	repeated 105:21	require 41:15
31:8 41:3 42:6	related 91:6	relied 302:5	repeatedly 98:4	44:18 113:21
44:14 55:24	134:17 202:22	reluctance 104:2,6	144:8 176:11	252:13 255:21
63:16,20 65:8,16	228:8 251:6	rely 9:14 90:19	186:25 211:16	256:4,8 300:2
		1	1	I

www.epiqglobal.com Lower Ground Floor, 46 Chancery Lane casemanagers@epiqglobal.com

London, WC2A 1JE

5	1 5			5
				Page 340
	104.0 106.4.15	. 1005.17	275 10 17 204 16	41 ( 042 10
required 9:16 10:4	184:2 186:4,15	retired 235:17	275:10,17 284:16	rise 41:6 243:18
39:19 40:6 78:20	195:15 200:5	254:24,25	286:6 287:3,7,14	300:17
135:8 298:24	201:9 202:14,15	retirement 41:14	288:10 291:8	rising 250:8
requirement 2:2	203:11 212:16	61:4 251:7,9	302:16 304:4,22	risk 137:23 164:15
44:2	225:10,11,21,22	retirements 253:1	305:4,10,20	risks 138:5
requires 29:13	226:8 245:6	retract 36:21	306:8,11,18	road 226:24,24
44:25 135:16	249:19 275:20	retrieve 288:17	<b>RGP's</b> 64:1 110:2	robust 282:5
145:21	282:8 289:18	return 156:14	160:5 262:18	role 40:19 54:8
requiring 124:3	291:23 292:1	158:20 258:17	Richard 49:21	55:9 57:4 248:5
research 159:4	296:8 298:7	returning 278:7	Richardson 65:2	264:3,21 265:20
reservation 272:11	307:8	reveal 145:18,24	82:9,10 88:6	275:6,9
residence 150:15	respectively 12:17	146:14 150:21	90:6 176:4 181:7	roles 45:21
resign 253:7,8	respond 99:6	151:1 153:23	191:19 224:12,17	rolled 285:19
305:12,21,23	159:25 231:19	282:12,13 308:18	224:18 250:1	rolling 229:9
resignation 17:25	232:1,11 263:12	revealed 282:11	273:12 277:23	room 7:23 201:18
18:6 254:16	285:7	283:12,21 308:17	278:14 279:24	202:1 210:23
264:20	responding 28:24	revealing 146:23	riding 101:2	220:15
resignations 253:1	85:17 246:20	282:20 283:19	<b>right</b> 15:11,20,22	route 63:3,7
resigned 254:25	responds 21:1	reverence 70:20	26:3,7 35:9 46:8	165:15
resigning 147:24	response 40:17	Reverend 48:23	50:7 51:9 60:10	<b>Royal</b> 73:5 78:15
resiles 15:2	84:7 196:3	reversal 161:6	60:13 62:21 75:2	78:18 107:20
resolve 117:17	197:12 226:15	reversed 265:21	75:11,15 77:6,9	108:13 111:8,19
resolved 30:23	232:6 246:17	review 58:24	79:19,21 80:16	125:8,10,13
123:11,16,18	250:25 251:7	59:11	81:14 84:9 86:8	127:1 144:3,16
135:9 219:3	259:18 306:18	reviewed 32:18	88:22,23 90:5	177:4 185:4
221:22 251:13	308:19	64:23	96:19,20 100:4	213:9 215:15
resonated 3:11	responsibility	reviewing 250:5	107:18 110:20	246:4 267:8
31:18	261:2	reward 44:14	111:5 120:24,24	<b>rule</b> 52:25 53:1,13
resort 189:6	responsive 159:10	<b>RGP</b> 3:22 54:14	125:6 135:17	53:16,16,21
resources 284:7	rest 11:3 21:8	54:16 55:1 56:12	137:6 138:7,14	70:23 71:12,13
285:3,3	39:21 135:9	57:20,23 64:9	139:18 141:12	71:16 124:2,5,9
resourcing 284:5	147:17 194:14	70:1 71:21,25	142:14 148:20	124:10,11,20
284:20 288:11	restaurant 298:14	72:5,7,20 73:8,8	149:12 154:7	230:10 299:20
respect 11:5,8	result 5:8 22:8	73:10 82:16 90:8	166:13 168:17,24	rules 122:15
12:21 17:10 29:1	40:20 46:12	109:11 112:4	173:6 181:16,19	286:16 299:21
34:7 42:18 51:3	60:16 93:2	133:9 134:14,16	181:24 182:3	rumours 36:24
52:10 56:12	121:16 141:5	134:20 155:12	188:21 192:10	<b>run</b> 115:8 281:14
57:13 59:14 66:7	143:19 201:13	161:11,14 176:7	195:23 196:23	281:17
67:13 70:9 71:5	216:9 227:22	176:14 178:22	222:13 232:12	running 235:18
71:7,12 79:1,22	resulted 146:9	190:11 197:23	235:3 247:18	276:10
84:5 92:1 117:18	150:6	198:22 204:9	248:10 254:25	rustling 218:6
121:13 124:21	Resumed 1:5,7	210:22 211:19	263:13,20,23	
125:22 144:5,6	retaining 133:14	212:14 214:3	267:24 271:23	S
155:16 164:13,17	retire 17:23 18:3	231:14 242:9	275:5 282:17	<b>s</b> 163:7
166:23 169:2	19:20 24:10,12	248:9 249:20	283:21 284:15	<b>s.13</b> 264:23 265:4
171:5,11,20	24:13 36:22	258:22 259:17	286:9,21 296:19	267:5
172:10 174:24	252:18,20,24	260:6,8,23,24	299:14 301:10,11	<b>s.32</b> 264:19
176:14 181:22	253:3,5 254:2	262:14 272:23	rights 38:7,8,15	<b>s.34</b> 265:3 267:5
182:1 183:20	256:6	273:21 274:13	208:2	s.34(1) 269:20
102.1 103.20	2000	2,3,21 2, 1,13	200.2	s.34(2) 269:25
	<u> </u>	l	<u> </u>	

Epiq Europe Ltd +44 (0) 207 404 1400 www.epiqglobal.com Lowe casemanagers@epiqglobal.com

7 May 2024

5	1 5			j i
				Page 341
270.9	09.24.25.00.22	90.22 91.5 7	194.6 190.2	155.04 156 5 10
270:8	98:24,25 99:23	80:23 81:5,7	184:6 189:3	155:24 156:5,18
sabbatical 95:21	99:25 100:22	84:24 189:1	198:7 203:24	159:5 175:6
119:16 221:16	102:7,11,13,13	221:6	285:20 286:25	182:22 186:13
sabotage 123:23	102:14 104:7,10	scroll 74:22	302:13,14	195:9,14 218:14
129:25 135:13	104:17,18,25	scrutiny 18:18	secondly 65:16	230:18 238:1,15
140:8 290:4,9	105:19,25 106:8	19:5	seconds 30:1	239:22 253:18
sabotaged 125:5	108:8 110:9	scurrilous 200:19	288:17 292:10	254:7 258:4,9
125:25 134:12	111:3 127:22	sea 1:9,14 186:16	secret 106:16	262:24 263:11
<b>sabotaging</b> 129:16	128:7,19 133:3	194:18 217:13	secretaries 173:12	269:5 270:19
130:19 137:11	138:11,14 149:9	260:7,17	secretary 20:20	271:16 278:25
138:16	170:10 178:17	search 8:25 15:5	28:2 37:20,24	279:3 280:18
saboteur 130:24	179:9 180:8	15:19 58:14	44:3 48:23 49:1	284:21 285:1,5
safeguarding	191:6 194:5	60:17 62:13 63:3	50:17,25 51:13	287:1,9,10,21
54:13	198:6 202:11,12	63:10,15 65:9,17	116:6 122:3	293:11 297:7
salary 39:7 141:18	202:17 204:21	67:17,22 69:13	125:19,20 126:13	299:15
Sanchez 72:4 86:1	206:10 208:12,19	70:2,7 89:15	130:9 142:25	seeing 23:18 280:2
115:17 128:12,14	210:23 211:10	91:4,5 93:3	174:4 293:13	306:21
128:15 131:22	225:17,25 226:1	149:24 154:10	294:22 295:4,18	seek 21:9 23:8
278:6 288:25	229:15 235:9	155:12 156:4,9	296:16,21,23	41:19 63:5
289:15 293:3,5,6	236:9 238:23	157:24 162:6	298:7 307:15,16	194:18 195:2
293:12	243:5 247:17	164:2,17 165:5	section 17:22 18:5	197:17 198:9
sanctioned 199:9	251:12,16 253:20	165:16 166:16	18:12,15,19 19:1	214:13 269:10,22
sanctions 88:21	259:16 261:10	167:10,13,25	24:3,18 29:1,13	270:4 276:12
Santos 1:3,6 13:1	284:16 288:10	169:1 171:10,13	55:25 154:7	281:21 288:13
31:25 33:9	298:3 299:7	174:24 177:20	194:17 231:14	seeking 21:11
122:15,20,24	301:12,14,25	178:25 179:7,11	232:1,4,25	45:10 55:11
145:17 286:13	says 13:4,25 17:20	181:1,3,21 182:1	233:10 234:8	174:15 176:10,12
297:15,18,19	23:1 25:5 27:17	183:2,9,25	253:2,6 254:23	176:13 178:11
300:4 301:15,19	28:10 35:3 36:2	184:12,19 189:21	255:8	264:10
302:11 305:7	36:17 37:19	190:4,13,17	sections 93:22,23	seeks 24:4
310:9	41:13 130:17	195:12,14,16,21	sector 41:16	seen 50:10,10
SAREEN 74:7,8	133:15 159:14,19	197:7,15,25	secured 88:6	66:12 67:19 76:9
76:23	173:14 187:5	198:25 199:8,13	security 137:12	93:22 95:12
satisfied 189:5	199:7 202:7	204:11 205:2	138:4	106:14 128:13
253:5	204:20,21 209:13	209:9 224:16	seductive 257:23	133:1 180:17
<b>Saturday</b> 74:21	209:15 210:18	225:10,21 226:2	see 20:12 22:15	196:9 199:5
108:15	224:13 230:13,22	226:4,7,16	23:2,3,4,5,11	210:21 229:25
save 229:13	257:17 259:14	227:23 238:1	25:5,11,12 27:24	241:1 248:21
saw 6:8 191:9	262:11 263:9,15	261:19 262:8	28:23 31:12	255:19 258:19
213:7 233:3	264:15 265:1,6	274:9,12 300:18	35:11 37:20	269:4 278:22
248:20 271:17	267:10 302:24	302:3,18	42:19 64:11 66:8	293:11 300:21
279:4 282:5	scare 123:5	searched 186:3	69:16 74:24 75:3	seized 291:9
saying 5:8,11,15	scheme 24:18	seat 143:1	84:18 85:6 90:9	self-evidently
5:19 18:15 19:18	240:2,5,7	second 8:7 11:16	94:7 96:21 97:15	178:10 270:14
25:18 26:7 37:11	scintilla 141:11	13:3 27:16 31:22	101:15 104:14,15	self-serving
37:13 62:1 70:15	scope 2:1,8 108:21	36:2,7 37:19	104:16,16 105:8	191:23
71:2 75:15 81:10	108:24	72:12 88:3 96:11	105:9 107:13	selflessly 137:5
82:7 83:11,24	screen 11:12,13	159:9,11 166:23	111:8 112:4	selflessness 124:22
86:16 88:10	32:2 74:14 75:2	167:12 181:1	123:2 148:23	138:1
		l	l	

Epiq Europe Ltd +44 (0) 207 404 1400 www.epiqglobal.com Low casemanagers@epiqglobal.com

				Page 342
selfsame 182:6	sequester 139:12	264:10 271:25	278:9 304:11	227:5 248:16
semantics 307:11	serious 88:13	272:6,11,15,19	310:18	six 10:3 59:8,21
sembling 191:11	91:16 92:20	298:16 302:6,10	sides 98:5 105:22	146:12 286:25
seminal 7:2 20:9	136:4 161:25	303:17,20	247:24	skills 249:12
sending 25:22	205:1 246:18	shared 4:15 8:10	sift 237:23	skipping 272:20
168:15,22 238:4	261:17	33:11,14 155:20	signature 41:21	slash 76:20
sends 23:6 263:2	seriously 108:13	205:19 208:3	signed 40:22 94:7	slightly 46:3 206:9
senior 2:24 3:1	244:6	209:3 210:11,14	116:2,3 139:12	slowing 30:2
20:7 56:11 75:12	servant 305:22	210:20 211:14	151:20 189:4	small 119:17
89:7 91:14,19	servants 3:9	212:7,13,24	231:13 243:4	124:20
109:19 165:4	223:23	265:10 278:11	signing 42:3,21	Smith 148:24
166:4 210:22	serve 281:9	279:9 298:20	signs 116:7	152:19 207:21,24
212:14 221:14	served 227:23	299:6 305:3	silk 89:7 91:14,19	210:18 213:6
222:22 226:8	271:6	shares 211:23	similar 58:14 97:3	298:17
246:5 273:13	service 43:21,23	sharing 4:20 19:3	154:13	snatched 275:21
sense 13:24 32:7	248:24 305:24	156:15,22,23	<b>simple</b> 65:18	<b>so-and-so</b> 41:13
56:24 136:15	306:3	272:18 300:7	152:10	so-called 276:21
158:5 174:9	Services 306:4	301:22	simpler 57:18	278:22
175:17 220:6	set 8:24 9:4 11:20	shift 185:20	simply 16:20 27:5	soft 252:8
287:10	11:21 13:5 20:9	shine 251:20	87:7 132:4	solely 112:22
sensing 104:2	55:22 62:19	shocked 125:24	137:21 156:14	solicitor 158:2,6
sensitive 20:24	77:25 84:4 95:16	126:1	165:9 167:16	solicitors 152:18
109:23 166:6	105:23 120:7	shooting 284:24	186:6 190:6	solid 114:23
295:7	128:10 142:13	301:5	193:12 239:19	solution 97:11
sent 7:15,25 25:12	143:17 144:9	<b>short</b> 30:5 74:4	269:15 298:13	133:7
35:1 85:7,14	226:12 229:9,19	149:10 168:8	309:22	somebody 22:2,4
97:6 178:5	240:5 241:13	250:4,13,14	Simpson 242:3	40:3 64:20 84:1
195:16 206:25	246:7 256:11	297:15 305:8	single 162:5	91:23 92:11
215:24 220:24	293:10	short-term 103:15	sinister 104:17,20	98:25 100:21
228:19 231:15	sets 35:25 96:8	<b>shorten</b> 250:11	sir 1:3 36:11,13,19	101:22 132:20,21
245:16 246:8	126:14	shorthand 149:4	36:22 37:3,12	157:15 194:10
263:1 278:25	setting 37:17	245:21	47:3 69:4 163:1	253:19 267:7
sentence 32:1,3,15	162:12 222:8	<b>show</b> 7:17 11:3	250:5,5,10,16	275:8 276:19
36:7 161:6	269:9 270:9	32:1,2 202:5	259:12 271:24	281:8
168:19 284:17	seven 46:1 59:8,21	217:8 240:3	277:19,24 278:1	somebody's
sentiment 271:13	96:12 97:13	246:6	281:15 283:13,13	298:14
272:4	196:5 230:12,17	<b>showed</b> 107:5	284:2,3 286:21	somewhat 127:22
separate 103:23	230:21 231:18,22	208:9	286:23,24 288:2	150:8
244:13	232:2,6,11	shown 93:20 95:8	292:9,10,25	son 146:15,17
separately 12:17	severed 291:12	133:2 196:8	295:9,9 296:14	150:23
86:18	severely 89:14	shows 52:15	297:14,14	soon 9:7 37:6
separation 46:3	sexual 245:24	217:24 254:3	sit 176:17 187:22	299:23 309:5,16
September 74:24	shape 53:8 112:19	255:25 273:11	223:1 304:20	310:6
75:1,17 134:24	244:19 share 66:15 201:5	shut 218:8,11 shy 77:12 202:10	310:11 sitting 6:15 101:17	sooner 189:22
135:15 144:13	share 66:15 201:5	shy 77:13 293:19	sitting 6:15 191:17	sophisticated
290:15 306:17	206:22 209:3,18	side 39:15 99:8	309:7,9	158:19
307:17	209:19 211:1,4 212:11 213:3	104:23 105:5	<b>situation</b> 8:12 31:19 39:11	sorry 1:20 7:12
<b>sequencing</b> 23:10 26:25		106:1,10,12,18 106:19 275:23		9:17 14:13,20 17:17 28:17 36:5
20.23	214:10,16 215:10	100.19 273:23	91:20 195:4	1/.1/20:1/30:3
			l	

Epiq Europe Ltd +44 (0) 207 404 1400

www.epiqglobal.com casemanagers@epiqglobal.com

Lower Ground Floor, 46 Chancery Lane London, WC2A 1JE

Page 343
101:23 148:24

2)5.5	Suges 113.13	151.20 155.17	50.15	substantivery
295:5	stages 115:13	151:20 153:19	street 56:15	substantive 20.15
speaks 20:22	291:22 297:22	147:10 149:16,22	305:17 306:1	substantive 26:13
265:2	269:9 277:2	146:3,14 147:5	straight 89:17	substance 184:12
192:24 258:5	264:9 267:10	145:18,22,24	stove 259:25	227:19
160:14 188:23	217:14 259:22	127:1 145:12,15	stopping 288:11	subsidiary 227:19
speaking 2:5 14:10	205:7 206:6	110:7 126:11,12	168:4 275:11	265:18,22
276:11	192:1 201:1	101.13 104.22	163:23,25 167:19	subservient
258:10 269:13,15	175:21 184:1	101:13 104:22	140:7 152:13	146:4
172:23 173:8,11 178:6 193:2	130:23 135:6	94:1 96:8 97:3	stop 37:1 91:7	49:22 63:14
43.13 124.13 172:25 173:8,11	122:9 125:15	87:23 93:18,24	<b>stood</b> 18:7 167:18	subsequently 38:2
43:15 124:15	97:14 114:24	82:12,13,24	<b>Stipendiary</b> 65:2	225:5 271:7
<b>speak</b> 14:21 43:3	48:9 64:23 63:3 72:23,24 77:25	72:12,12 74:15	175:8 191:4	69:19 155:16
Spanish 149:7,10	48:9 64:25 65:5	55:7,8 63:25	stick 59:20 164:21	subsequent 4:3
space 6:6 178:11	28:10 30:19 39:9	5:1 28:15 40:22 54:12,17,19,20	step 273:5,22 steps 112:2 273:21	285:15
132:9 193:7	stage 5:19 9:7 15:7 15:21 25:17	<b>statement</b> 4:6,11 5:1 28:15 40:22	stemmed 260:24	247:23 submitted 263:21
56:22 295:17 sounds 44:16 72:9	staff 4:23	214:25	staying 291:3	submissions 247:23
sound 54:20 56:19	squared 160:12	97:20 199:12	289:24	submission 172:18
soul 186:4	163:18	stated 51:22 97:7	139:20 219:18	295:7 308:22
163:10 174:4,14	square 36:23	89:19 161:2	137:8 138:6,19	236:2 237:18,19
sought 78:11	93:6	state 71:10 78:14	stay 122:25 135:11	213:20,22 228:11
108:15	<b>spurious</b> 92:19	284:17 285:23	195:7 252:7,17	162:23 205:17
Sotogrande	<b>spotlight</b> 251:20	starts 101:17,18	29:12 55:22	131:24 132:10
sorts 244:10	173:4	295:3	statutory 24:21	110:10 126:21
170:4 281:22	spontaneously	288:20 294:3	statutorily 254:6	88:20 95:2
136:21 153:15	185:24	starting 168:11	statute 45:7	74:12 76:10,14
113:11 133:22	173:22 174:9	238:20 239:16	status 41:9	43:18 46:11 74:8
91:7 95:4 113:5	<b>spontaneous</b> 173:7	145:16 179:8	states 197:12	subject 20:24
sort 29:24 57:16	302:14	41:23 113:24	252:3 309:14	stuff 272:20 283:1
294:1 302:11	214:17 297:23	started 19:13	240:16,24 241:4	structures 287:23
288:8 292:18	182:25 204:8	250:19 260:3	153:3 181:8	structured 305:16
		115:22 178:17,21		
245:21 254:19,25 260:14 287:25	89:20 133:4 147:14 149:10	74:2 115:3,19,21	97:24 109:15 146:8 148:22	302:17,23 304:12 structure 288:6
	1			
233:20,21 235:18 240:1 244:16	spoken 43:5 47:25	star 89:8 91:14 start 9:13 46:24	52:2,3 72:19	206:2,3 228:20 229:4 279:19
233:20,21 235:18	174:19 192:17 198:21 199:3	278:23 star 89:8 91:14	308:8 statements 4:8	198:24 204:11
218:3,6,8 224:25 229:7 230:4	<b>spoke</b> 14:18 33:16	stands 71:15	306:19 307:6	16:7,11 30:17,22
207:16 216:4	spent 9:16	190:24 201:24	297:5 298:15	strongly 15:1,8,22
196:20,21,22	310:5	standing 188:23	283:23 289:17	214:4 295:24
188:24 195:3	257:4 309:11	standards 45:25	282:15 283:3,6	strong 16:11 18:8
165:10 169:21	spend 147:17	stakes 141:3	263:16 264:15	strings 249:23
158:7 159:10	spelled 29:15,23	291:21,21	251:11,16 259:13	119:12
146:13 147:9	specifics 12:1	145:4 219:6,20	242:4 246:2	strike 103:2 105:7
124:17 135:14	293:4	144:22,24 145:2	231:13 240:4,9	strict 286:16
96:18,19 123:9	225:8 261:9	140:24 142:12,20	222:25 225:2	strength 18:14
79:13 82:7 96:12	161:18 164:21	137:8,24 140:17	168:20 222:3,14	213:7
63:22 72:11 78:2	specifically 28:5	136:2,17,20,24	163:19 164:13	207:21,25 210:21
57:23 59:9 62:9	140:5 258:24	stake 135:20,22	159:11 163:2,4	150:14 152:20
	specific 131:14	146:10 278:5	154:4 159:9,11	101:23 148:24

2	1 0			•
				Page 344
255.15	Sunday 147.16	annunicing 102.02	59,21,02,1,02,21	toohnical 112.1.2
255:15	<b>Sunday</b> 147:16	surprising 193:23	58:21 92:1 93:21	<b>technical</b> 113:1,3
succeed 137:3	263:2 268:24	surrounded 33:21	100:3 112:2,19	128:16 133:23,25
succeeded 59:22	270:16 282:9	surrounding	137:23 138:7	176:25
142:14 143:11	sundry 148:12	259:17	139:10 154:9	technology 139:9
266:18	super 310:2	survive 136:14	162:1 167:18	teeth 187:8
succeeding 137:1	superintendent	suspect 60:22	187:13,15,17,17	<b>telephone</b> 187:25 279:11
successive 287:14	185:4	69:11,14,16,21 70:5 80:10 15	187:18 188:22	_ , ,
298:1	support 20:24	70:5 80:10,15	189:24 193:4	<b>telephonic</b> 149:25
suddenly 3:20,23	21:3,14 38:1	81:3,16 82:5	231:7 250:12	tell 5:10,17 6:3,4
suffer 45:9 247:13	95:1 101:1 102:7	145:19 150:22	257:2,5,11 270:1	7:13 9:2 15:13
suffered 45:4	102:8,9 104:23	168:24 169:6	271:9 272:5	22:10 54:23
suffering 43:2	104:24 107:6	171:9,16,19	288:17 303:15,16	58:22 78:4,11,17
44:24 45:2	133:23,24,25	179:13 208:6	307:24 309:6	92:16 97:8
sufficient 17:10	157:23 158:14	213:4 214:12,16	taken 7:22 8:3	123:22 149:13
30:8,14 32:12	161:10 199:19	272:25 273:3	11:10 35:6 109:3	165:11 169:13
252:15 301:3	203:6 243:6	275:11	113:22 126:14	193:10 202:13
suffrage 20:5	295:7,10,16	suspect's 146:1,15	138:5 154:6	205:21 207:17,22
suggest 34:10	supported 255:9	146:17 150:23,23	206:21 273:5,20	210:11 211:12
104:16 132:10	287:6	208:25	275:10 283:20	218:18,21,25
143:16 215:9	supporting 95:7	suspected 79:20	291:23	219:2,15 220:12
227:25 230:20,20	133:19 160:8,14	83:3 125:4	talk 15:25 83:18	220:17,19,19
230:22 231:2,21	160:23,25 162:9	129:15 169:14,22	83:20 84:1,3	223:20,23 227:11
234:13 235:4	171:16,19 201:2	170:7,11	86:11,17,20	227:16 228:15
266:5 281:6	supportive 243:1	suspend 253:10	110:8 130:1	254:21 257:18
290:13 294:24	265:11 285:12	swayed 112:3	133:15 144:14	261:3,8 274:7
306:7	suppose 35:14	swearing 36:20	173:23 174:1	280:15 281:21
suggested 39:4	54:25 55:3 93:4	37:3	195:11 273:8,13	286:4 299:5
72:5 82:16 84:6	93:11 94:8	switchboard 174:2	talked 56:15 72:3	309:19
84:8 87:11 139:1	108:17 174:12	174:3	213:12	telling 5:16 12:12
154:19 169:16	182:3 269:11	sworn 146:12	talking 4:2 15:3,3	21:12 22:4 48:14
178:8 231:24	285:9	265:13	15:7 33:18 34:18	52:4 62:22 68:19
265:19 272:23	Supreme 58:18,24	swung 256:2	46:7 47:17 60:14	82:24 83:4
281:25 293:25	sure 23:4 25:10	sympathetic	66:18 87:16	108:13 109:18
294:5	43:6 58:10 69:11	288:19	102:24 110:11	133:11 170:12
suggesting 68:2	82:2,19 83:1,10	sympathize 102:20	123:10 158:3,13	180:15,22 211:13
81:6 83:14 84:10	94:9,18 102:4	syntax 94:12	158:16 202:19	223:25 228:17
86:23 104:20,21	107:14 122:13	system 125:5,25	211:6 213:14,16	229:1 238:12
124:13 232:10	129:6 130:9,9	127:17,24 129:16	213:24 231:5	tells 273:12 301:6
240:18	131:25 153:4	130:2,3,7,10,19	280:8 300:15	temperament 50:6
suggestion 49:4	160:21 210:24	133:6,14,18	talks 45:8 142:10	186:20
169:17 233:9	216:13 245:10	134:11 137:12	tamper 268:7	template 8:6 271:7
238:24 274:5	268:6 281:16	138:17 139:11,14	tax 39:18	271:11
289:8 307:21	285:25 310:19	140:7 241:13	<b>tax-free</b> 40:3	temporarily
suggests 258:5	surname 101:18	247:15	taxpayer 103:13	266:19
277:1	surprise 207:2		105:12,14 117:22	tend 176:23
suitable 51:24	304:8	table 6:16 298:14	138:3 142:22	187:16
summer 74:13	surprised 4:14,17	298:16	<b>Teacher's</b> 42:16	tended 23:24
76:13 95:1	34:18 49:19,24	take 31:21 33:9	team 1:24,25 2:11	tenets 274:2
112:10	49:25 190:12,14	38:19 40:6 45:5	109:5 234:8	tenor 242:12
		30.17 40.0 43.3		

7 May 2024

256:14	265:24		1	Page 345
256:14	265:24		I	
230.14	203.24	31:6,11 32:11,19	206:19 207:4	93:15 96:9
tension 58:14	thereof 156:1	32:22 37:14,17	209:20 211:3	112:14,17 151:18
tentatively 290:13	225:11,22	38:11 39:1,8,9,17	217:7,14 224:20	158:17 171:2
-	thing 1:8 3:12,25	42:22 43:6,25	233:23 236:9,25	184:15 191:9,11
termination	47:20 53:5 83:15	47:15,16,18	237:2 238:23	195:24 205:6
127:12	84:6,8,10,12	48:16 50:21 51:8	239:8,9,19	208:3 210:8
terminology	86:13 104:12,18	52:23 55:9,20,25	241:11 244:1	213:9 242:15
248:19	144:9 147:22	56:14,17,18,21	247:17,21 249:1	257:17 261:6
terms 2:15 31:8	166:5 177:6,7	57:6 58:9 59:5	251:7,14 254:10	265:20 274:24
37:24 38:13,16	184:7 186:13	59:18 60:6 62:19	254:22 255:5,24	276:4 281:3
41:19 54:10	200:13 201:16	65:12 70:25	256:10 257:7,25	294:15 302:9
60:21 71:20 88:8	209:5,25 214:7	74:14 76:21	258:18 260:13,15	threat 159:15,23
102:21 129:21	241:12 257:2,10	77:12 79:19,22	262:5,6 264:16	three 75:17 101:13
149:11 168:19	275:3 291:23	80:6,25 82:12	264:24 266:15	120:11 196:7
178:24 197:12	292:2 306:11	83:17 84:4,9	267:1,9 270:14	200:15,17 231:17
	things 3:19 18:7	85:9 86:9,14	270:17,20 271:17	231:23,24 237:2
235:2 247:25	19:15 33:10	87:4,9,10 89:11	273:10,12 275:24	280:10 284:18
252:2 292:19,21	39:15,20 42:10	89:18 90:6,18	276:1,1,8,25	285:19 291:13
terrible 284:10	50:22 52:6,8,8	91:7,8 92:1,23	282:10 284:8	295:9
territories 267:15	57:22 62:3 66:9	96:7,8,12 98:11	286:12 287:12	<b>thrown</b> 60:10
Territory 271:19	83:17 89:23 90:2	101:2,10,12,18	289:16 290:21,23	158:23
terrorist 301:5	92:10 94:12	103:19,25 104:24	290:23 292:9,19	Thursday 37:3
testimony 265:13	104:5 105:16	105:1 108:9,11	293:4 294:14	tie 168:13
text 76:9 85:23	116:20 124:8	111:16 113:21	297:6,10 298:1	time 1:14,24 2:4
97:5 98:14 107:4	129:6 143:15	117:12,13 119:21	300:25 304:17	9:10,16,23 15:3
133:10,11 154:5	145:5 151:8,9,11	121:24 122:21	305:5,7,15,20	15:24 23:4,24
173:16 199:5,10	169:8,24 171:23	123:13 124:2	306:10 307:4	24:2 28:20 30:7
216:8 222:3	171:24 180:15	125:9,11,12	309:1	30:13 36:3,10
230:2,15 237:9	191:20 196:14	126:19 129:13	thinking 37:17	37:10,11 49:20
237:15,20 238:5	201:12 202:19,22	130:1,6,8 132:3	89:17 131:21	50:9,12 51:13
302:12 308:16	205:25 212:23	133:1,24 134:7	164:24 165:2	52:5,6,8,9 63:22
texted 177:10	213:25 220:14	135:1,2 141:13	266:23,25	69:12 70:10 73:6
texting 98:25	224:18 226:3	141:25 143:14	thinks 245:4	73:22 74:4 76:4
thank 2:13 17:4	232:16,21 234:6	145:21 146:4,7,9	third 25:24 27:16	81:20 87:3 89:15
46:17,20 52:18	236:3 250:6	146:11,22 150:10	70:9 81:12 82:12	89:19 91:18
52:19 60:13	277:21 279:18	151:13 153:22,22	98:21 101:16	94:23 100:1,6,12
73:23,25 74:15	280:9,17 299:9	155:1,8 157:9,20	107:21 120:10,12	104:1,15 105:16
76:24,25 77:5	301:3,16 309:6	166:17 168:11	120:14 145:13	108:7 117:15
138:9,11 168:3,5	309:12	170:17 171:12,18	188:15 212:8	120:5 124:16
	think 3:20 4:18	172:9 173:11,15	220:2 282:15	126:13 127:6,12
256:17 265:15	7:24 9:7 11:5	174:1 175:2,5	284:15 308:15	130:4 134:11
271:23 284:2	12:15 13:18	180:23 182:10,19	thirty 120:11	141:11 142:11
285:24 286:24	14:20 15:6 16:5	185:19 188:14	this 288:17	147:14,18 148:1
294:20 297:14	16:9 17:7,9	190:20,25 191:3	thorough 64:17	148:11 151:22
310:9,10,12,13	18:24 20:1 21:11	192:7 193:10,13	thoroughly 272:21	154:13 160:10
310:15,16,23	23:23 24:19	200:11,16 201:4	thought 19:4 29:7	161:3 163:1
thanks 23:5 25:11	25:16,17 26:7,14	202:13 204:12,13	30:8 37:21 39:2	168:21 169:1
themes 267:17,25	27:10 28:10	204:13,15,16,17	88:10,24 90:17	171:1 182:12
theory 193:21	29:22 30:19,19	205:19 206:6,18	90:17 91:22	183:24 186:7,9
	,	, -		,
I			l	

Epiq Europe Ltd +44 (0) 207 404 1400

www.epiqglobal.com casemanagers@epiqglobal.com

Lower Ground Floor, 46 Chancery Lane London, WC2A 1JE

Page 346

				Page 346
186:18,22 188:15	28:2 30:16 48:18	133:13,22	transpired 125:21	223:21,22,22
190:2,7,10	49:14 50:21	tomorrow 20:22	trap 137:20	224:1 226:13,18
192:16 196:10	51:25 52:6,7	160:22 257:20	281:23	226:25 228:15,17
198:10,11 200:17	61:14 64:10	295:5	trawl 148:22	249:22 265:12
202:11 205:15	68:20 70:13	tone 147:1	152:14 162:22	294:13,14
213:2 214:23	72:17 73:8,9,10	top 54:16 81:10	trawled 151:25	truthful 3:10
220:1 222:21	73:10 74:17,19	85:5 189:3	152:9	46:13 100:14
228:14,16,18,21	77:22 78:3,6,9,15	topic 40:10 112:8	trawling 180:18	152:25 169:11
229:1 232:5,6,7,8	78:22,24 81:19	157:21 298:11	treated 60:20 81:3	276:17
232:18,22 234:7	86:7 88:1 89:12	total 75:17	81:16 82:5 273:3	truths 223:23
234:21,24 235:13	101:8 103:19	totally 28:5 227:24	286:6	try 38:2 47:8 74:2
235:18,22 236:1	106:2 109:24	247:4 268:11	treating 275:11	151:13,15 176:6
236:5 238:16,17	115:21 125:4	303:16	trial 68:9 245:7,25	183:1 201:8
238:18 239:13,15	126:16 133:12	touch 35:5 101:25	275:1	229:13 273:17,21
248:12 250:12	134:15 141:9	267:11	<b>Triay</b> 74:15	285:2
251:5 253:14,17	145:4,7 148:10	town 149:5 186:7	tribunal 44:20,23	trying 15:10 16:24
253:23 256:12,14	161:17 166:3,5	262:6 300:10	45:5,6 46:9,13,14	68:5 86:24 98:9
257:18 264:5	169:4,24 171:12	301:2,6,10	52:1 61:14 101:9	120:20 121:3,5
265:6 267:19,21	176:11 180:14,24	traditional 245:8	107:20 117:14	121:18,19 144:4
277:2 280:6,13	181:6,24 182:4	traditions 106:16	149:19,21,22	144:5 162:22
284:1 285:12	183:5 184:1,1	trail 263:7	162:12 226:11	182:20 200:12,14
287:3,18 292:7	185:15,17,18	trained 244:2	237:21 242:22	200:14,18 239:20
293:10 296:13,23	189:25 190:12,15	tranche 285:17	278:12 306:12,12	244:25 245:1,2
300:6,20 302:22	193:19 195:3,3	transactional	tribunal's 253:14	269:13 283:14
303:9,10 304:18	197:20,25 198:22	44:11	tried 163:10 273:8	286:10 291:15,19
305:2 308:17	204:9,23 205:24	transcript 10:6,11	281:17 309:15	308:10
309:11 310:1,5,7	205:24 206:1,2,6	10:12 231:9	triggers 310:3,4	<b>Tuesday</b> 1:1
310:14	207:5,7,11,12,17	transcripts 31:2	triple 291:13	308:13
timely 244:8	207:24 209:5,6,6	61:15 153:19	<b>true</b> 10:17 51:20	<b>turn</b> 91:9 93:6
timeously 310:7	210:1 211:8,9	transfer 112:7	151:4 161:5,7	259:12 262:22
times 5:24 89:6	214:6 215:20	116:21 121:22	162:14 167:12	263:14,15 266:3
93:20 104:23	220:6,14,21,22	242:7	184:8 185:16,17	266:7 282:18,20
150:3 166:21	224:3,10 225:18	transferable	185:18 190:19	284:13 285:22
175:13 214:6	225:20 226:1,3,9	249:12	193:13 201:25	294:20 298:13
timetable 230:11	228:21,22,25	transferred 24:1	202:3 220:10	<b>turned</b> 50:1,2
234:11,13	229:10,11 236:14	103:16 112:11	248:15,18 259:4	206:3 260:7
tittle-tattle 99:12	236:17 243:7,10	122:1 248:23	282:18 306:2	<b>turning</b> 261:14
99:14 110:24	247:10 259:8	249:6 286:19	trust 138:22	<b>tv</b> 3:6
<b>to</b> 303:25	260:4,16 261:6,9	305:12	147:25 228:9	twice 3:3 8:20
today 25:6 60:7	269:8 273:23	transferring 119:5	trusted 244:12	50:22 58:18
130:9 181:12,15	274:11,24 277:4	120:21 121:1	trustworthy 92:22	188:14 201:14
232:19 250:8	277:5 278:5	transfers 248:21	truth 5:13 77:18	277:10
251:18 296:22	290:8,20 295:25	249:20	77:18,19,23 78:1	<b>two</b> 7:11 41:13
310:11	296:9 300:20	transition 76:18	78:3,5,8,10,12,16	74:9 76:24 97:18
told 3:20 6:3,6,20	302:15	289:13	78:18,19,19,23	99:3 100:10,17
8:5 14:25 15:12	<b>Tommy</b> 76:20	translated 175:7	78:25 79:4 87:25	115:14 123:8,9
15:16,17,17,17	101:7,16 127:23	transparent	111:1 153:5,5,6	123:11,13 141:25
15:18,23 21:18	128:25 129:15	217:25 218:4,13	162:16,18,19,19	164:6 166:20
22:11,18 27:23	130:18 133:4,13	218:16	162:23 221:17	167:7 200:23

www.epiqglobal.com casemanagers@epiqglobal.com

•				•
				Page 347
202.10.211.21	undoustor de 025.9	undata 25.1	52.11 12 59.21	wated 50.19 51.14
202:10 211:21 221:25 223:5	understands 235:8	update 35:1	52:11,12 58:21	<b>voted</b> 50:18 51:14 296:24 297:1
260:18 262:7	understood 27:14	<b>uphold</b> 45:25 46:1	64:21,21,22,24	<b>vox</b> 33:17 149:5
269:14 285:18	29:8 42:23,24	<b>uplift</b> 285:14,17	65:19,23,23,25 66:15 71:4 80:5	213:13 300:22
	62:7,8,10 67:20	<b>upset</b> 67:4 174:20		215:15 500:22
288:9,15	69:9,18 71:18 72:17 01:18	174:22 175:11,16	86:1 99:10,17,24	W
<b>two-way</b> 56:15	73:17 91:18 268:9	175:17,18	104:2 116:19	Wagner 77:1,4,5
<b>type</b> 300:1 <b>types</b> 242:16	undertaken 177:6	<b>upsetting</b> 99:1 175:1	118:13,20,21,22 118:22 139:14	80:17 92:6 99:18
v 1				107:10 110:14
typographical 264:16	undertaking 139:25 140:6	<b>upshot</b> 119:4 265:23	144:9,12 155:11 158:11 160:3	123:3 124:12,17
204.10	291:4		161:4 162:1	136:10 138:11
U		<b>use</b> 89:16,17 103:9 115:23 129:1	170:16 179:4	143:14 148:14
UK 267:2 286:3	undeserving 238:24	150:20 161:16	185:21 191:21	154:2 165:23
299:22			194:23 201:6	167:2,21 168:3
Ullger 43:9,15	undo 195:2 undone 135:22	194:16 201:7,9 239:16 271:10	206:8,22 209:21	168:13 183:14
49:22 51:21,24				187:23 193:9,17
233:7	<b>undue</b> 55:5,11,15 56:10	285:1,2 300:23	215:18,19,20	207:24 209:2
<b>ultimately</b> 275:24	unfair 83:8 169:16	usual 101:3 122:4	217:15 227:24	210:21 211:6
um 76:16,22 77:10	227:24 268:11	uttered 294:1	247:21,22 249:25 250:1 254:9	213:6 215:8
77:11 83:4		V	256:9 265:11	222:10 227:24
101:17 175:24	unfairly 84:5	v 209:7 301:23		236:13 239:3
Umbridge 251:11	unfavourable 244:23	302:1	267:6 268:13	244:16 248:11
unable 8:14 14:7	-	vaguest 31:8	272:7,10 274:19	249:2,5 258:25
22:10 127:17	unfolded 260:21	validity 60:2	275:25 288:5	259:5 282:8
269:15	unhealthy 260:24	value 142:20,22	300:5,6 301:17	283:16,16 286:12
uncomfortable	uniformed 58:6	220:11	303:15,17 306:10	291:7 292:12,18
5:11 166:24	unintentionally	vanishing 85:21	viewpoint 284:9	292:22 294:5
167:6 223:22,23	112:3	VAR 29:25 31:5	views 20:16,23	296:3
224:1	<b>union</b> 42:15,16,16	various 97:24	22:5 29:2,18	wait 97:15 299:24
uncomfortably	Unite 42:15	130:6 205:25	47:21 48:1 52:17	waive 304:22
67:5,12	United 20:4 46:3	vary 7:5	57:13,15 155:24	want 1:8 36:12
unconcerned	universal 20:5	vary 7.5 vast 303:22	217:10 225:11,22	37:11 59:2,25
72:19	<b>university</b> 141:22	vast 505.22 vehement 35:18	227:17 228:12	68:7 79:16 83:18
understand 15:10	158:22	vehemently 20:10	245:6 295:6	84:3 86:17 93:17
19:20,22 20:1	unlawful 60:5	ventilated 276:8	296:17	95:22 96:2 97:21
59:25 62:19 66:6	unreasonable	venture 95:2 102:9	<b>virtue</b> 197:4	93.22 90.2 97.21 98:1 100:14
67:24 68:2,10	230:14	Venture 95.2 102.9 Veralls 58:12	vis 148:19,19	101:1 102:7,20
75:14 119:1	Unrecognisable	verbal 40:18	vision 172:16	101:1102:7,20
121:4,19 122:15	53:7	verify 183:6	visited 275:4	111:19 112:7
144:5 157:6	unrelated 86:19	versed 119:20	vitiate 161:4	126:24 129:23
165:3 178:1	109:25	version 175:9	viva 12:10 60:8	120.24 129.25
183:1 194:13	<b>untenable</b> 21:6	229:4,5 231:13	vivid 216:25	143:5 158:12
231:3 260:20	28:6 40:20 41:15	versions 84:21	vividly 6:15	164:20 173:8,14
269:11,12 286:23	42:21 43:1 242:9	85:1	voce 12:10	173:23 176:21
309:8	248:16	vest 57:7	volition 63:5	177:22 178:13
understandable	<b>untrue</b> 227:25	vested 68:11	voluntarily 254:24	194:15,16 210:11
149:9	268:10	victim 279:7,8	<b>volunteer</b> 242:4	211:1,5 220:23
understanding	<b>untruth</b> 224:4	view 24:17,17	<b>vote</b> 50:25 148:4	222:11 240:1,24
60:9 108:23	226:24	26:22 35:25 49:7	295:10,19 296:8	240:25 243:6
269:11	untruthful 166:19	49:8,10 50:12	296:13,18,25	257:2,4 278:9
207.11		77.0,10 30.12		207.2,7 270.J

Epiq Europe Ltd +44 (0) 207 404 1400 www.epiqglobal.com Lower casemanagers@epiqglobal.com

Lower Ground Floor, 46 Chancery Lane m London, WC2A 1JE

				Page 348
282:1 284:3	206:5 209:9	132:16 138:25	37:20 101:12	70:25 71:2
287:10 292:7	214:3 224:16	140:19 142:18	123:14 165:15	widely 212:12
294:15 307:10,14	225:10,21 226:2	152:21 154:17	173:12 184:9	299:6
wanted 39:18 42:4	226:4,7,16	155:12 160:7	185:16 245:25	widening 209:22
83:20 100:3	227:23 229:13	162:11,13 164:2	260:11 290:10	wider 41:16 117:9
103:2,24 105:6	261:19 262:8	165:5,6 166:15	302:6 304:17	267:3
107:9 111:23	274:10,12 276:4	167:10,13,24	306:2	wild 44:16
113:1 119:2	276:24 277:3,6	170:17,18 174:13	weren't 200:14	willing 267:21
126:10 141:4	300:18 302:3,18	177:20 178:25	Wessex 6:22	268:16
166:8 167:22	warrants 8:25	179:11 181:1,2	west 44:16	wind 218:9,10
170:13 173:11	58:15 60:17	181:10 182:19	WhatsApp 1:11	window-dress
175:20 176:2	62:13 70:7 91:4	183:2,19,25	1:23 2:4 23:24	297:11
222:23 259:19	149:25 162:6	184:19 185:3	28:1,20 66:24	wise 31:6
269:19 276:13,15	171:13 223:8	189:21 190:13,17	68:19 69:19	wish 2:12 23:11
292:2 296:10	wasn't 24:25 60:24	194:22,23 197:18	104:10,11 107:12	90:1 234:15
307:3,17	63:11 72:17 82:2	194:22,25 197:10	150:25 151:23	253:17
wanting 46:12	89:17 109:13	224:15,20,23	150:25 151:25	wished 114:12
86:11,20 112:4	113:7 116:11	226:7 234:10	239:25 257:13	178:8 179:20
231:7 243:19	128:11,16 134:15	235:6 241:2	277:5 297:7	242:4 252:1
254:7	144:11 166:1	244:19 245:9	300:21 302:14	259:16
wants 28:11 247:9	168:18 203:1	247:2 248:20	WhatsApps	withdraw 36:13
289:5	220:6 223:14	249:15,19,21	100:18,21 106:6	37:12
warrant 15:6,19	224:9 243:7	251:13 255:17	225:14 238:14	witness 4:6,8,10
30:18 33:17,19	249:12 264:2	258:1 263:8	239:10,12,22	5:1 28:15 40:22
60:2,10 63:3,11	276:9,10 280:15	278:10 282:25	whatsoever 112:6	60:1 63:24 69:5
63:16 65:9,17	280:21 301:22	286:14 304:13	163:25 236:25	72:11,12,18
67:17,22 69:13	waste 253:14	307:19 308:13	247:2 250:24	80:10 83:21
70:3 85:23 89:15	watch 61:16,19	ways 35:16 90:3	275:9,12	84:22 108:3
91:5 93:3 148:25	64:12	228:13	whilst 18:9 37:21	136:10 145:11,12
154:10 155:13	watched 52:17	we're 57:13 124:9	49:9 136:1	153:21 154:2
156:4,9 157:24	watching 3:6	285:20 309:7	154:17 198:22	165:17,23 167:6
158:15 159:16,24	water 193:18	we've 35:8 102:21	204:9 232:16	167:21 172:20
164:2,17 165:6	waters 212:22	114:1 217:12	258:16 287:21,23	240:4 241:3
165:16 166:16	301:24	285:16	302:15 305:24	247:9 248:4,6,11
167:9,10,13,25	way 5:25 12:5	wealthier 141:4,17	whisking 288:14	249:5 259:13
169:2 171:10	13:22 14:8,14	wealthy 141:14,16	whistle-blowers	263:16 264:15
174:24 176:10	15:5,19 18:23	141:24	306:7	282:15 283:3,6
177:20 179:1,7	19:21 28:1,3,19	Wednesday	whistleblower	283:22 286:24
179:11 181:1,3	33:13,15 34:17	310:25	43:8 242:19,20	292:12
181:21 182:1	35:18 37:2 38:4	week 3:14,19 8:11	whistleblower's	witness's 296:3
183:2,10,25	40:9 42:14,22,23	15:9 51:2 158:22	42:20	witnesses 84:25
184:13,19 189:4	47:19 53:8 54:21	258:11 308:12	whistleblowers	247:6,6
189:21 190:4,13	57:17 60:3 67:15	weekend 132:25	41:4,8 43:4 45:9	word 94:8 129:1
190:17 193:11	71:1 80:1 86:13	weeks 195:25	240:6	157:9 158:5
195:12,15,17,22	87:2 100:5	196:10 269:14	whistleblowing	201:8 218:12
197:7,14,15,17	103:18 105:2,7	weight 48:2 50:14	42:5 242:14	231:1,3,7 237:8
197:20 198:1,9	105:10 106:10,22	well-funded	wholeheartedly	238:3 254:25
198:25 199:9,13	116:20 120:7,25	287:15	54:23	266:12 282:10
204:11 205:2	127:22 128:6	went 13:10,25	wholly 3:10 14:5	300:15 304:11
			<i>.</i>	
	I	1	1	I

				Page 349
309:24	writing 25:7,13	123:8,9,11,13	<b>11</b> 149:23 282:14	<b>13.59</b> 230:4
wording 11:14	37:25 107:11,15	141:22 156:16	282:19 283:19	<b>13th</b> 192:19,24
words 5:17 89:16	113:8,9,12,18	194:12 278:4	11.10 66:23	193:1 217:20
89:17,18 104:25	114:18,19 115:24	299:24	<b>11.17</b> 74:3	280:11
124:25 129:19	127:10 128:2	years' 43:21	<b>11.27</b> 74:5	14 122:16,22,23
169:15,20 173:8	178:12 246:2	<b>Yeats</b> 233:7	<b>11.35</b> 36:14	123:1 155:19
178:4,20 189:17	247:15 310:5	yellow 26:8,14	<b>11.53</b> 263:10	204:16 236:19
189:18,19,19	written 9:13,15	32:15	<b>11.56</b> 101:20	244:9
209:17 226:3	12:8 41:22,25	yesterday 1:9,10	<b>11:58</b> 23:1	<b>14.00</b> 168:9
236:7,20 237:16	84:21 85:1 94:14	2:14 3:4,20 8:5	<b>1119</b> 97:3	<b>14.30</b> 198:19
237:25 238:15,20	111:17 198:12,16	33:10 46:7 47:11	<b>1147</b> 266:7	<b>140,000</b> 39:8
239:13 248:22	200:10 309:23	48:16 49:11,12	<b>12</b> 2:17 6:24 8:9,19	<b>1423</b> 282:20
279:7	wrong 7:6 65:21	49:18 57:6 58:9	29:5,17,23 32:11	<b>1438</b> 25:23
work 9:13,15 36:3	138:23,25 139:5	59:18 63:23	32:21,23 33:6	14th 217:20,20
36:10 37:10	164:2 185:10	66:25 69:9 71:19	63:14 65:5,17,20	259:15 284:10
39:22 89:25	191:4 192:8,23	72:3,5 74:17	66:10,18,20,24	285:10
107:10 129:6,8	203:10,25 204:6	77:21 80:9 88:5	79:18,21,23,24	<b>15</b> 145:13 194:17
141:17 145:16	227:2,25 253:1	89:7 103:20	80:4,5 87:12	204:20 206:25
153:14 289:1	257:18 278:1	113:22 115:16,25	127:2 154:17	231:14 232:1,4
305:1 310:17	wrongdoing 45:11	117:23 122:12	164:9 165:21	232:25 233:10
worked 44:6 94:6	82:22	123:7 132:15	172:23 177:8	234:8 287:18
119:12 259:21	wrongly 205:6	145:17 146:18,18	183:17 184:4,5	304:4
works 260:8	wrote 51:20 94:4	154:21 186:18	184:11 187:21	<b>15.00</b> 230:25
world 107:13	107:19 188:19	194:7 216:11	192:2 194:12	<b>15.41</b> 258:12
279:2	194:3 196:11	251:19 259:24	202:16,20,21,23	<b>15th</b> 260:2 280:12
worried 83:12	Wyan 65:2 73:19	286:10 304:17	203:4,8 217:10	<b>16.15</b> 285:21
110:8,13,21	80:18 82:8,8	306:19	220:15 224:24	<b>16.44</b> 310:24
111:9,15 129:22	94:5 278:15		226:20 228:4	<b>1645</b> 295:4
130:22 134:13,16	<b>Wyan's</b> 72:11	Z	244:7 288:9	<b>1646</b> 295:3
134:19 201:9		<b>Z</b> 83:13	290:6 300:22	16th 271:22
worry 111:10	X	Zamitt 64:6 65:1	<b>12.31</b> 135:25	<b>17</b> 4:4 145:19
129:16,20	<b>X</b> 83:13 136:22	278:16	<b>12.34</b> 86:2	147:4,7 155:9
worse 153:24	246:1 296:13	0	<b>120</b> 147:18	308:14,17
worth 140:25			<b>129</b> 239:25	17th 8:1 155:6
142:15 143:18,18	$\frac{\mathbf{Y}}{\mathbf{X}_{00}}$	<b>0949</b> 257:14	<b>12th</b> 69:18 107:3	262:22 282:9,14
219:16	<b>Y</b> 83:13 296:13	1	109:8 182:21	<b>18</b> 4:4 219:16,25
worthless 219:24	<b>Yamas</b> 280:3	<u>1</u> 212:21	183:9,12 192:9,9	220:9 291:11
220:8	yeah 34:25 35:24	<b>1-1</b> 28:18	193:3 194:21	<b>18th</b> 230:5 263:18
worthy 92:1	36:9 205:13	<b>10</b> 150:13 159:10	217:20 272:8	268:18 272:2
wouldn't 22:18	206:14,18 207:14	159:18 192:11	273:24 274:16	<b>19</b> 126:19 273:11
44:12 101:23	216:6,21 221:7	263:3 270:15	276:16,22 279:15	277:15
106:9 111:9	230:6,19,22	<b>10.00</b> 1:2 310:25	280:25	<b>1994</b> 77:12
157:25 185:4	year 123:14,15 145:15 152:6,6	<b>10.00</b> 1.2 510.25 <b>10.1</b> 159:9	<b>13</b> 75:6 154:25	1st 278:20,25
274:3 280:8	219:5 277:13	<b>10.36</b> 33:4	215:23 236:6,19	
296:12 309:22	219:5 277:15 285:19,20	<b>100</b> 247:5	253:6 254:23	$\frac{2}{2.25,10}$
write 9:9 23:10	285:19,20 Year's 9:19 280:6	<b>100%</b> 103:12	255:8	<b>2</b> 25:10
94:5 110:7	years 6:6 34:10	105:10	<b>13.04</b> 168:7	<b>2.4</b> 222:5
195:23 196:14,15	43:23 52:11 77:9	<b>100,000</b> 148:2	<b>13.1(f)</b> 18:5,16	<b>2.94</b> 119:19 120:8
198:13 223:2	77:13 90:2 94:14	<b>100,000</b> 146.2 <b>101</b> 158:24	<b>13.58</b> 266:22,23	120:11,17 141:7
	11.15 70.2 74.14			141:23 142:8
				•

Page 350

r				Page 350
210.22 222 15	36 5 30 4 31 361 10	4 40 207 11	100.24	
219:23 222:15	<b>26.5</b> 204:21 261:10	<b>4.40</b> 307:11	100:24	
<b>20</b> 7:11 20:20 77:9	<b>26.6</b> 261:16	445 20:21	<b>9.03</b> 230:17	
77:13 277:15	<b>26th</b> 61:6	<b>45</b> 109:16	<b>92</b> 28:15,18	
<b>20/20</b> 172:16	<b>27</b> 43:22 75:1	<b>48</b> 3:15 18:19	<b>94</b> 222:6	
<b>20:58</b> 231:15	<b>27.1</b> 264:16	55:25 186:9	<b>9th</b> 100:23	
2000 288:8	<b>29</b> 85:18	204:14 230:11,13		
<b>2003</b> 258:4	<b>29th</b> 221:1	232:13 251:14		
<b>2011</b> 50:24 296:9	<b>2pm</b> 25:5	<b>4845</b> 36:15		
296:13,22	2	<b>4874</b> 38:20		
<b>2012</b> 241:19	3	<b>4th</b> 127:7 130:13		
<b>2016</b> 284:6	<b>3</b> 74:24 168:12	130:16		
<b>2018</b> 74:14 75:6,17	269:1,1			
76:13 95:1 97:7	<b>30</b> 1:12,21 48:20	5		
98:17 99:6	97:6 141:22	<b>5</b> 82:11 85:7,10		
112:10 127:5	299:24	87:3 163:8 201:3		
130:14 133:3	<b>30th</b> 77:10 133:2	202:6 203:3		
134:24 135:15	<b>31</b> 163:6	220:24 221:8		
143:21 219:5	<b>31st</b> 127:7 130:16	229:20 263:16		
290:14,15	<b>33</b> 73:19	287:17 294:2		
<b>2019</b> 144:13	<b>34</b> 17:22 18:13	<b>50s</b> 141:2		
277:10 278:4	19:1 24:3,18	<b>5th</b> 282:1		
2020 1:12,16,21	29:13 253:2			
64:9 79:18 81:8	<b>34(2)</b> 29:1	6		
109:8 123:10	<b>36</b> 95:24 96:14,24	<b>6</b> 75:7 173:5 174:6		
145:20 163:8	98:3,6,18,25	174:17 178:7		
219:1,7 231:16	99:11,16 100:2,3	182:23 188:2		
238:18 239:15	103:3,4,5,7,10,16	293:14		
245:7 253:11	103:22 112:12,16	<b>60</b> 40:4 46:4		
275:10,14 277:13	112:18,23 114:10	<b>68</b> 225:1		
278:17 279:14,16	114:14,16 116:21	<b>69</b> 73:20		
279:20 306:16,17	116:25 117:3	<b>6th</b> 279:14		
307:17	118:15 119:8			
<b>2021</b> 74:17 93:18	120:6,9,12,15			
<b>2022</b> 308:20	122:6 123:8	7 1:1 11:24 36:14		
<b>2023</b> 41:12 145:13	134:25 135:5,15	36:16 263:3		
<b>2024</b> 1:1 311:1	135:20 136:2,11	72 73:20		
<b>20th</b> 280:12	136:13,25 137:13	75 188:24		
<b>21</b> 74:21 75:16	137:24 140:13	76 188:24		
95:10 230:17	142:11,14 144:12	<b>7th</b> 279:22		
231:11,16	144:19,22 145:2	8		
<b>2103</b> 231:11	145:4 219:4,6			
<b>21st</b> 104:14 105:24	220:18 221:21	<b>8</b> 37:19 64:9 81:8		
<b>22</b> 25:3 30:21 35:1	222:8 291:11	82:5 310:25 8 2 21:24		
240:8	292:2,14 293:1,2	<b>8-3</b> 31:24		
<b>24</b> 43:21 204:14	294:6	<b>81</b> 231:12		
<b>25</b> 74:2	<b>3988</b> 11:13	<b>89</b> 4:10		
<b>26</b> 259:14	<b>3rd</b> 278:16	9		
<b>26.1</b> 259:14		<b>9</b> 41:12 50:24		
<b>26.4</b> 261:6	4	98:16 99:6		
	<b>4</b> 263:16 308:20	20.10 22.0		
	l		l	l