
From: Nick Cruz
Sent: 23 June 2024 21:50
To: Charles Simpson; Julian Santos
Cc: Sebastian Triay; Hope Williams; Arcelia Hernandez Cordero
Subject: RE: Inquiry

Dear Charles and Julian.

We refer to the below that the RGP find most astonishing. We appreciate you have still to determine whether this distraction should proceed.

The RGP welcomed the indication given by CTI in his oral Opening Submissions (notwithstanding paragraph 81a of his Opening written submissions) on Day 1 of Inquiry that the Chairman was not minded to make a determination on the Search Warrant issues.

On Day 1 following representations the RGP made, CTI said:

*“Similarly, I submit that it is necessary for the Inquiry to look into this point too, given that the search warrants are the context to some of the most important exchanges in this Inquiry. That said, I should make three matters clear. First, our submissions are just that, submissions. Our considered view on the basis for the warrant obviously does not bind you, sir. Second, we do not invite you to rule upon or even arrive at a definitive determination as to the lawfulness of the warrants. **Third, I do not understand it to be your intention to arrive at such a definitive determination.**”*

The RGP have relied on that assurance and have conducted themselves (to their detriment) in this manner throughout the Inquiry (including in their questioning) by not exercised any public law rights that were available to them, to reinforce their position. I appreciate that you will write to us tomorrow, but Mr Levy and Baglietto knew exactly what the issues were, their partners and lawyers have been in this Inquiry at all times. They gave evidence in early April, they had every ability to apply for CP status as Op D Defendants did (or JR back then in May 2020), and admit in their recent submission that, *“it was foreseeable that evidence referring to suspicion against him would arise”*. They wait until Friday 23 June to engage and throw the proverbial grenade.

The RGP will continue to rely on previous assurances and not engage in this 21-day post Inquiry process, albeit it will reinforce its views on Tuesday, as per its written submissions that the Chairmans position must be the correct one. It will inevitably have to reserve its public law rights.

Kind Regards,

Nick