

---

**Inquiry into the Retirement of  
the Former Commissioner of Police, Mr Ian McGrail  
A Ruling upon the application for Legal Expenses Funding  
by Mr Paul Richardson**

---

Mr Richardson has applied for public funding to cover the costs of his legal representation at the forthcoming reconvened hearing. Since I consider the application to be non-contentious, I propose to deal with it shortly. Subject to some minor exceptions (which I identify later in the Ruling), I grant the application for the following reasons:

1. Mr Richardson is a person attending the Inquiry to give evidence, he is therefore eligible for an award to cover his reasonable legal expenses from public funds under section 32(3)(a) of the Inquiries Act 2024.
2. Furthermore, at any rate to some extent, his conduct is the subject of inquiry and he is concerned in the matters under inquiry and, therefore, he is eligible under paragraph 5(a) of the Inquiry's Protocol on Legal Representation. He may be subject to significant criticism, particularly in relation to disclosure issues and, therefore, he is also eligible under paragraph 5(b).
3. The Police Superintendents' Association (PSA) has thus far been paying his expenses through their legal professional insurance policy, which paid for his representation during the Inquiry's Main hearings, but that policy has an indemnity limit of £350,000, inclusive of VAT. That limit has now been - or is about to be - exceeded (by the costs of retaining his English solicitors) with the result and funding from this source is no longer available for the purpose of meeting the costs of Leading Counsel and a local agent at the forthcoming reconvened hearing in Gibraltar.
4. Paragraph 6 of the Funding Protocol provides that awards from public funds should not be made where other 'substantial bodies' could reasonably be expected to cover the costs. But, since the PSA has now reached its funding limits, they can no longer be expected to cover the costs. Therefore, paragraph 6 does not apply.
5. Mr Richardson is a retired Superintendent of the RGP, he has confirmed that he does not otherwise have sufficient means to cover the costs of representation himself.

Therefore, he has, in effect, no other means for such funding and he is therefore eligible under paragraph 5(c) of the Protocol.

6. I have no doubt that, in the circumstances, it is fair, necessary, reasonable and proportionate to make the award and it is an appropriate use of public funds (therefore within paragraph 5(d) of the Protocol) and I make such an award.
7. It is plainly appropriate to instruct Mr Gibbs KC, an advocate of great experience and skill, who represented him through the Main Hearing. The legal fees claimed in respect of Mr Gibbs KC are reasonable.
8. Although his costs of travel and accommodation costs appear reasonable, I am reluctant formally to approve them, since such costs are normally considered by the Secretary of the Inquiry, who has knowledge of local conditions. These particular fees will therefore be subject to the approval of the Secretary.
9. Mr Gomez, acting as local agent, should only be paid at the rate of only £100 per hour, rather than at £175 per hour as claimed. I approve a budget of £500 for “*toing and froing with STI and other Core Participants*” on the basis of 5 hours. This is further on the understanding that it is not necessary for Mr Gomez to attend the reconvened hearing as Mr Richardson’s agent given that I understand Ms Irvine (Mr Richardson’s English solicitor) will in any event be present funded by the PSA.
10. I do not authorise the payment of Mr Richardson’s costs to travel to London. In my judgement, the conference can take place online via Microsoft Teams (or another suitable platform), or when Mr Gibbs KC is in Gibraltar.

**Sir Peter Openshaw DL**

**28 March 2025**