OPUS2

Manchester Arena Inquiry

Day 149

September 20, 2021

Opus 2 - Official Court Reporters

Phone: +44 (0)20 3008 5900

Email: transcripts@opus2.com

Website: https://www.opus2.com

1 Monday, 20 September 2021
2 (9.30 am)
3 Housekeeping
4 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: Good morning, Mr Greaney.
5 MR GREANEY: Sir, good morning. I know that before we start
6 to deal with the business of the morning, there is
7 something that you would like to say.
8 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: It just occurred to me that I had failed
9 to acknowledge on Friday the fact that we had reached
10 a significant stage in the hearing, the completion of
11 chapter 10. It has taken a long time and I'm very
12 grateful to everyone for the detail with which the
13 examination of the evidence which has been done. I do
14 appreciate that. It seems to me that a number of things
15 have been identified as going wrong in the rescue
16 attempt. Obviously, there will need to be careful
17 analysis of the evidence, but I think it's accepted on
18 everybody's part that there are things which have gone
19 wrong. So as a result, there are likely to be warning
20 letters of some kind going out to corporate CPs as well
21 as individuals.
22 MR GREANEY: Indeed.
23 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: It has become fairly obvious of at least
24 what a number of the criticisms or potential criticisms
25 are likely to be, so can I encourage CPs and individuals

1 to consider responses to warning letters before they go
2 out. They will know what they are likely to contain, at
3 least in part, and it will make the process that much
4 quicker because I do not want to have the whole hearing
5 delayed on the fact that we are taking a long time to
6 get responses to warning letters.
7 Secondly, it has been possible to identify some
8 things that have gone wrong. More difficult may be
9 finding ways of ensuring that they don't go wrong again.
10 So when it comes to recommendations, I am going to need
11 a great deal of assistance because I don't think it's
12 going to be straightforward, so can I encourage everyone
13 to apply their minds to that as well. But thank you
14 very much, everyone, for getting us through chapter 10
15 in reasonably speedy time.
16 Application re Special Advocates
17 Submissions by MR GREANEY
18 MR GREANEY: Thank you very much, sir.
19 The purpose of the hearing this morning is to
20 address three connected topics: first, the submission of
21 the bereaved families that they and their
22 representatives should be able to attend the closed
23 hearing of the inquiry and have disclosed to them the
24 underlying closed material.
25 Second, the alternative submission made on behalf of

1 some, but not all, families that, in the alternative,
2 you should appoint a team of special advocates to
3 represent the families in relation to the closed
4 material and the closed hearing.
5 And, third, the inquiry legal team's road map for
6 when and how the additional outstanding issues relating
7 to the public interest immunity restriction material and
8 the closed hearing should be addressed.
9 Sir, you have received submissions in writing on
10 those issues as follows: from the families represented
11 by Hogan Lovells and Slater & Gordon, dated 17 August;
12 from the families represented by Broudie Jackson Canter,
13 Hudgells, and Addleshaw Goddard, dated 27 August; from
14 the Secretary of State for the Home Department, dated
15 1 September; from Greater Manchester Police, also dated
16 1 September; and from counsel to the inquiry, dated
17 9 September.
18 You indicated, sir, at the end of last week that you
19 had read those submissions and intended to do so again
20 and for our part therefore we propose to take our
21 submissions shortly.
22 But before we do so, it is important that we should
23 make some introductory remarks. These issues for
24 examination today date back to events in 2019.
25 A hearing to determine claims for public interest

1 immunity by the Secretary of State and Counter-terrorism
2 Policing North-west took place before you, initially in
3 open, but then in closed, on 6 September 2019.
4 By an open ruling dated 13 September, you upheld
5 those claims and went on to express a provisional view
6 that an Article 2 compliant investigation could not be
7 conducted within the framework of the inquests. And
8 that led, in due course, of course, to the establishment
9 of this inquiry.
10 The consequence of your PII ruling is that some
11 evidence will be heard in this inquiry in a closed
12 hearing, as everyone acknowledged at the time. We do
13 recognise that this causes concern. However, everyone
14 should understand and understand clearly two things
15 about that closed hearing.
16 First, the reason why such a hearing has to take
17 place was explained by you, sir, in your open judgment
18 on the PII applications in the following terms:
19 "I am satisfied, having heard the justifications for
20 them, [that is to say the claims to PII] that to make
21 public those matters would assist terrorists in carrying
22 out the sort of atrocities committed in Manchester and
23 would make it less likely for the security service and
24 Counter-terrorism Policing to be able to prevent them."
25 That is why there must be a closed hearing: it is

1 because to deal with the relevant material in public
2 would help terrorists to carry out the very type of
3 attack that stole 22 innocent lives on 22 May 2017 and
4 make attacks more likely and/or even more deadly, the
5 opposite of what everyone in this process wishes to
6 achieve.
7 Second, you did not rule, as you did on
8 13 September 2019, out of a desire to protect the police
9 and security services from scrutiny. Nothing in fact
10 could be further from the truth. The reason why there
11 has to be a closed hearing is precisely to enable such
12 scrutiny to take place.
13 The reality is that without conversion from inquests
14 to an inquiry with closed hearing, the question of
15 whether what the security service and CTP knew before
16 the arena attack was capable of thwarting the attack
17 could not be investigated in the way in which you, sir,
18 are determined to investigate it.
19 We wish to assure everyone that in the closed
20 hearing, the conduct of the security service and
21 Counter-terrorism Policing will be subject to the
22 closest scrutiny and, to the fullest extent possible,
23 your open report will identify your findings.
24 Against that background, it is worth emphasising, in
25 our view, that none of what we will submit today is

1 about trust in the families, nor as we understand it are
2 the submissions of the families about trust in you or us
3 as the inquiry legal team.
4 As for our trust in the families and their
5 representatives, it is right that we should make plain
6 that throughout this process they have behaved in a way
7 that is responsible and highly constructive. We accept
8 that no one wishes more than the families to prevent the
9 revelation to terrorists of information that would be of
10 assistance to them, so all should understand that the
11 submissions we have made in writing and will make now
12 orally in summary have been made on that basis. But
13 equally, all should understand that you are required to
14 act in accordance with established legal principles.
15 As for the trust of the families, we have been
16 gratified to read in the submissions of the families
17 that they have confidence in the inquiry legal team to
18 engage in a robust examination of all witnesses,
19 including those who represent the state. Those
20 submissions also make plain that the families have
21 complete confidence in you, sir.
22 We do understand that the families' submissions as
23 to approach represent genuinely held views and are not
24 intended as criticism, but we hope that it is understood
25 that the same applies to what we have to say too.

1 So, sir, we'll turn to the first of those three
2 topics that we identified.
3 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: Just before you do, can I make one
4 observation. This relates to -- this is not done by
5 advocates or by CPs, but in some areas there have been
6 suggestions that because of the fact that there is going
7 to be closed hearings, that this in some way will make
8 these hearings more secretive than other ones. Can
9 I just contrast and explain what appears to me, and
10 I hope this is understood and believed correct, to be
11 the contrast between, for example, the inquests into the
12 7/7 hearings, the inquests into the Westminster Bridge
13 deaths and the inquests into the London Bridge deaths.
14 That was that in each of those case, as I understand
15 it, there were PII hearings and evidence was excluded
16 from the inquests as a result of those PII hearings.
17 That material was therefore never, ever heard or
18 explored in those inquests. I make no criticism of
19 that: it is because the coroner decided that a proper
20 Article 2 investigation could be conducted without going
21 into the PII material.
22 It was accepted at the outset by the
23 Secretary of State, and it's certainly clear to me, that
24 there is no way that an Article 2 compliant inquest into
25 these matters could have been conducted without an

1 investigation into the PII material. That is the
2 difference between the two. Therefore, that is why
3 we are having a closed hearing. It in fact means that
4 there will be a more in-depth inquiry into matters,
5 potentially, in this inquiry than there was in those
6 inquests, although I hasten to say that is because the
7 coroners in all those cases decided that it was not
8 necessary to investigate the PII material and they
9 didn't look at it and it wasn't produced in the inquiry.
10 So that is the distinction which should be drawn.
11 The only other inquiry which I am aware of, but there
12 may be others, is the Litvinenko Inquiry. In that case
13 the coroner decided he could not have a proper inquest
14 which looked at all matters without investigation into
15 PII matters. He asked for an inquiry, which was
16 initially refused by the Secretary of State and then the
17 Divisional Court ruled that there should be an inquiry
18 which looked into the PII material.
19 The relatives of Litvinenko were not permitted to
20 take part in that, nor were there any legal
21 representatives, and we will be looking at the judgment
22 of Sir Robert Owen in that case in this matter.
23 But I hasten to say why we are having -- the PII
24 matters need to looked at by me in order to have
25 a proper Article 2 investigation, and that has been

1 accepted by the Secretary of State as well. So I hope
2 that explains to people the difference and doesn't mean
3 that there is greater secrecy in this inquiry than there
4 has been in others.
5 That's off the cuff; I hope that does adequately and
6 properly explain the position.
7 MR GREANEY: Sir, that does make sense. I am quite certain
8 that that will be understood by everyone in this room
9 and we can only hope that it is understood also by those
10 outside of this room.
11 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: Who report on these matters.
12 MR GREANEY: Sir, just to deal with one matter, there have
13 been two other inquests converted into inquiries that
14 we are aware of.
15 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: I don't doubt that.
16 MR GREANEY: Both were very different, they were police
17 shootings, the cases involving Anthony Grainger and
18 Jermaine Baker, which is currently, as we understand it
19 being --
20 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: But the same procedure has been adopted
21 in that case?
22 MR GREANEY: It has, sir.
23 Thank you very much for those remarks. Can we turn
24 then to those three topics. As I made plain, bearing in
25 mind the detail of the written submissions, we don't

1 propose to deal with things in anything other than
2 summary.
3 The first topic, as we indicated, concerns the
4 submission on behalf of the bereaved families that they
5 and their representatives should be able to attend the
6 closed hearing of the inquiry and have disclosed to them
7 the underlying closed material. We address this at
8 paragraphs 5 to 28 of the submissions at divider 2 of
9 your bundle.
10 What is in effect being suggested by the families is
11 what is sometimes called a confidentiality ring, that is
12 to say permitting a limited group to have access to
13 closed material on the bases of enhanced undertakings.
14 However, in a series of cases, the courts at the highest
15 levels have rejected the use of any such arrangement.
16 It is right that the courts have identified the
17 problems inherent in lawyers having access to material
18 that their clients do not as one of the reasons why such
19 arrangements should not occur, which is not a problem
20 that would arise on the proposal of the families,
21 of course. However, that is far from the only problem
22 that has been identified, as was set out with clarity by
23 the Administrative Court in AHK; see paragraph 22 of our
24 written submissions.
25 The reality, we submit, is that restrictions for

1 disclosure to those in the position of the families
2 cannot logically be different from and less strict than
3 those which the courts, including the House of Lords in
4 Somerville, have said must apply to their lawyers.
5 Sir, on the authorities, we as the inquiry legal
6 team are satisfied that if you were to adopt this
7 proposal of the families and permit them to be present
8 at the closed hearing and to have access to the closed
9 material, you would be acting unlawfully.
10 Not only, of course, do you have a responsibility
11 not to act in a way that you know would be unlawful, but
12 to do so would inevitably result in a public law
13 challenge. That would result, we have no doubt, in
14 delay and postpone the time at which you would be able
15 to report and make the recommendations that you
16 mentioned just earlier today. That, sir, is not what
17 anyone involved in this inquiry wants.
18 That's all we propose to say about topic 1.
19 That leads to the alternative submission made on
20 behalf of some but, as we indicated, not all families,
21 namely that you should appoint, as it is described,
22 a team of special advocates to represent the families in
23 relation to the closed material.
24 Pausing for just one moment, by "appoint" we
25 understand the families to be submitting that you should

1 request the Attorney General to make such an
2 appointment, although we acknowledge that that is
3 a request she would be expected to comply with absent
4 exceptional circumstances not to do so; see AHK (2009)
5 EWCA Civ 287 at paragraph 21.
6 This submission of the families gives rise, we
7 suggest, to two questions. First, a jurisdictional
8 question: do you have power to direct that special
9 advocates be instructed in the way that we have
10 explained? And second, if you do, should you exercise
11 that power in the circumstances as they currently exist?
12 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: Do you mind if I just stop you for
13 a moment?
14 MR GREANEY: Not at all, sir, no.
15 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: The first issue as to jurisdiction has
16 taken up a fairly considerable part of people's
17 submissions to me and authorities. Today, you disclosed
18 to all the other parties the House of Lords case in
19 Roberts v the Parole Board, which would appear to
20 suggest that in a similar case where there is no
21 statutory power or where it is not within the rules for
22 the Parole Board to appoint a special advocate, ie an
23 analogous situation to this, as it appears to me at
24 present, that the House of Lords did rule by three to
25 two that actually the Parole Board did have the power to

1 do that to ensure that justice occurred.
2 Of the people in this case, the Secretary of State
3 for the Home Department has argued that I do not have
4 the power to do so, and I think she is the only person
5 to do so. I just wonder whether, if Ms McGahey has had
6 the opportunity to read Roberts, whether she still
7 maintains that submission. Of course she's perfectly at
8 liberty to do so and I will hear it, but if that has
9 caused a change of heart on her part, on the
10 Secretary of State's part, then it would be interesting
11 to know it now because it would cut out some of the
12 argument.
13 Ms McGahey, are you able to just answer that
14 question either yes or no?
15 MS McGAHEY: Sir, I have had the opportunity very briefly to
16 read Roberts and I haven't managed to read the entire
17 authority in the time available. The
18 Secretary of State's position is still that this inquiry
19 does not have jurisdiction to appoint special advocates.
20 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: I shall listen with interest to the
21 argument.
22 MS McGAHEY: Sir, my suggestion was to be that, bearing in
23 mind that counsel to the inquiry invites you to exercise
24 any discretion you do have against the appointment of
25 special advocates, you may wish to consider first the

1 issue of whether you would exercise a discretion if you
2 had it, because if your decision is that you would not
3 do so, there may actually be no need for you to make the
4 detailed consideration to the question of whether
5 you have the jurisdiction at all. Of course, if you do
6 decide that you would exercise that discretion, then
7 obviously the issue of jurisdiction becomes relevant.
8 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: Ms McGahey, that's tempting, but no. If
9 the issue is being raised and it's there on a skeleton
10 argument, then I will rule on it.
11 MS McGAHEY: Sir, I'm very sorry, for whatever reason,
12 I can't hear you.
13 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: I said your invitation is very
14 tempting -- can you hear me now?
15 MS McGAHEY: I can, thank you, sir.
16 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: But I'm rejecting it. The issue has
17 been raised and while it is there, I shall rule on it.
18 But thank you very much, I just wanted to see whether it
19 was still maintained.
20 MS McGAHEY: Thank you, sir.
21 MR GREANEY: Sir, there's obviously a difficulty on the line
22 with Ms McGahey in both directions. I know Mr Suter and
23 those who sit behind him will do what they can to solve
24 that before we turn to Ms McGahey in, I would have
25 thought, an hour or so.

1 Sir, as you have just identified yourself, those two
2 questions that we have posed have generated different
3 submissions from different core participants. Of those
4 who have made submissions in writing, as you have
5 indicated, only the Secretary of State argues that you
6 do not have a power to direct that special advocates be
7 instructed.
8 Whereas of those who have made submissions in
9 writing, only the families represented by Hogan Lovells
10 and Slater & Gordon argue that you should exercise any
11 such power that you do have in favour of directing the
12 appointment.
13 Sir, we address these two questions in detail at
14 paragraphs 44 to 61 of our written submissions. Our
15 submission in summary on the first question, so the
16 question of whether there is a power, is that you do
17 have the power to direct the appointment of special
18 advocates.
19 It is certainly right that the Inquiries Act (2005)
20 does not provide an express power for you to direct such
21 an appointment. However, neither does the Act prohibit
22 you from doing so. We recognise the appointment of
23 special advocates in other jurisdictions is most often
24 regulated by statute. However, the courts have made
25 clear that courts and other bodies have or at least may

1 have a common law power to ask the Attorney General to
2 appoint a special advocate where the interests of
3 justice require.
4 It is relevant perhaps to cite just two examples of
5 such authorities. In Roberts v the Parole Board, sir,
6 the case to which you just made reference, the citation
7 of which is 2005 2 Appeal Cases 738, the issue for the
8 House of Lords was formulated as follows: whether the
9 Parole Board, a statutory tribunal of limited
10 jurisdiction, is able, within the powers granted by the
11 Criminal Justice Act 1991 and compatibly with Article 5
12 of the European Convention on Human Rights, (a) to
13 withhold material relevant to the appellant's parole
14 review from his legal representatives, and (b), and this
15 was the issue which is critical for our purposes,
16 instead to disclose that material to a specially
17 appointed advocate, an SAA, who will represent the
18 appellant in his absence at a closed hearing before the
19 board.
20 Sir, for our purposes, there is no difference
21 between what we understand a special advocate to be and
22 what was described by the House of Lords as a specially
23 appointed advocate. They amount to precisely the same
24 thing.
25 By a majority, sir, to steal your own words, the

1 House of Lords answered those questions "yes". It was
2 made plain that although the power to appoint a special
3 advocate existed, even in the absence of express
4 statutory provision, it was a power that should be
5 exercised only exceptionally. Sir, so we hope we are
6 clear about the effect, the important for our purposes
7 effect of Roberts. Yes, even in the absence of
8 underpinning by statute or by rules, the power to
9 appoint a special advocate exists, but that power is one
10 to be exercised in exceptional circumstances.
11 The second of the two authorities --
12 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: Just before we pass on, it was
13 a three/two decision, a very powerful minority decision
14 as well, but the issue there was: this is a case where
15 a particular prisoner was applying for parole, the
16 Secretary of State, in opposing that, wanted to rely on
17 some material which was covered by PII and therefore
18 could not be disclosed to the prisoner.
19 The alternative scenarios were either you had
20 a special advocate, so that somebody at least
21 representing the prisoner could know of what the
22 material was and it could be taken into account by the
23 Parole Board, or the alternative proposed by the
24 minority was that that material, which could affect
25 whether it was safe to release the prisoner into the

1 community, would not be considered at all by the Parole
2 Board. That is what the minority said should happen
3 and, really, Lord Woolf, in putting out the majority
4 decision, was saying we have to be interested in public
5 safety and the protection of the public and therefore
6 it would be unconscionable not to allow that material to
7 be heard by the Parole Board. I hope I properly
8 summarise the issue.
9 MR GREANEY: Sir, you've entirely accurately summarised the
10 issue as it arose and, as we have indicated, the
11 majority said in that situation it is to be managed, if
12 exceptional circumstances such as those exist, by
13 a special advocate procedure.
14 It is also relevant to have regard to what was said
15 by the High Court in a more recent authority,
16 Competitions and Markets Authority v Concordia. That
17 case reached the courts on a number of occasions. The
18 report that I am referring to is 2018, EWHC 3158.
19 In that case the High Court was asked to appoint
20 a special advocate for two preliminary hearings, each of
21 which would have concerned PII material, and the court
22 ruled as follows at paragraphs 7 to 8 and 11 of the
23 judgment. In paragraph 7 the court said as follows:
24 "It is well established now that the courts may
25 invite the Attorney General to appoint a special

1 advocate in a case where there is no statutory procedure
2 as long as the circumstances make it appropriate."
3 Paragraph 8:
4 "As to what those circumstances are, it is clear
5 from the cases that the appointment of a special
6 advocate, certainly in a non-statutory case, is regarded
7 as an exceptional event, indeed one to be the event of
8 last resort, rather than in any sense a default
9 position."
10 Then 11:
11 "So it is clear on the authorities [said the court]
12 that it is competent for the court in a non-statutory
13 case to seek the appointment of a special advocate, but
14 it is also clear that this is something exceptional and
15 a special case has to be made out for that appointment."
16 So again, sir, we would submit those same two
17 principles emerging from that authority, which itself
18 had reviewed a number of authorities: (1) the power does
19 exist but (2), it is to be exercised only in exceptional
20 circumstances.
21 In our submission, it is clear from section 17.16
22 the Inquiries Act that Parliament intended the chairman
23 of an inquiry such as you to be able to create
24 a procedure that is tailored to the requirements of the
25 particular matter rather than imposing one predefined

1 and rigid structure on all statutory inquiries.
2 On balance, we consider that this will extend to the
3 appointment of a special advocate where exceptional
4 circumstances justify it. We pause to note that this
5 was also the provisional view of Sir Robert Owen in the
6 Litvinenko Inquiry.
7 So if we're right about that, it leads to the second
8 question namely whether exceptional circumstances exist
9 here such as to justify the exercise of the power. In
10 short, we submit that it is plain that they do not
11 because the appointment of a special advocate, or even
12 a team of them, would not offer anything that counsel to
13 the inquiry and the broader legal inquiry team does not.
14 And that submission applies both to the disclosure role
15 and the hearing role as described by the Hogan Lovells
16 and Slater & Gordon families.
17 Sir, we do not accept the argument of those families
18 that the interests pursued by CTI are materially
19 different from the interests which the families' own
20 lawyers would properly pursue. As they recognise, these
21 proceedings are inquisitorial. The terms of reference
22 require you to:
23 "Investigate how and in what circumstances
24 22 innocent people came to lose their lives in the
25 attack at the Manchester Arena on 22 May 2017 and to

1 make any such recommendations as may seem appropriate."
2 Sir, like the lawyers for the families, the role of
3 CTI is to seek answers to matters within this scope. We
4 do agree with the families that special advocates may,
5 to quote them:
6 "Use their skill, ingenuity and experience, accrued
7 in very many similar exercises to arrive at compromises
8 and develop arguments that achieve safe and lawful
9 disclosure that had been thought impossible by all
10 at the outset of the process."
11 However, sir, we do not consider that a special
12 advocate would offer anything in this inquiry which CTI
13 does not, save for a greater number of minds focusing
14 upon the same matters. The inquiry legal team has
15 a team of vetted lawyers who are familiar with the
16 closed material in this inquiry and are involved in the
17 closed hearing. Each member of that team is experienced
18 in the type of exercises that the families highlight,
19 and the reality therefore is that the work of a team of
20 special advocates would be nothing more than
21 duplicative.
22 Moreover, in one important respect, a special
23 advocate would be at a disadvantage as compared with
24 vetted members of the inquiry legal team. Unlike
25 a special advocate, vetted members of the inquiry legal

1 team have already seen the closed documents and may
2 continue to communicate with the families and indeed
3 with other core participants and their lawyers.
4 The involvement of counsel to the inquiry is thus of
5 more value to the families than the involvement of
6 a special advocate would be. That, sir, of course is
7 a matter that the BJC, Hudgells and Addleshaw Goddard
8 families attach importance to in arguing that no special
9 advocate should be appointed.
10 So sir, in all of those circumstances and the others
11 we have identified in our written submissions, we submit
12 that no compelling argument has been made out in favour
13 of the appointment of special advocates and certainly no
14 exceptional circumstances are shown to exist.
15 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: I wonder whether it's worth outlining in
16 public just exactly what the limitations are on what the
17 special advocate can do and would do if I were to
18 appoint one.
19 MR GREANEY: The critical difference that I was seeking to
20 highlight in what I just said is that a special advocate
21 could take instructions prior to viewing the closed
22 material. But as soon as he or she had had any access
23 to the closed material, they would thereafter not be
24 permitted under any circumstances to have any further
25 contact with the families or their lawyers.

1 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: Thank you.
2 MR GREANEY: Sir, that is all we wish to say by way of oral
3 summary of our position on topic 2.
4 We'll turn then to deal briefly with the third and
5 final topic, the road map. This is addressed at
6 paragraphs 29 to 43 of our written submissions and we
7 won't seek to repeat those to any extent, but we will
8 set out the timetable that we invite you to direct,
9 which for your note is at paragraph 43. It's in the
10 following terms:
11 "Any amended or updated open versions of the
12 existing for restriction order applications and any
13 further open restriction order applications should be
14 filed by 10 am on 21 September [that is to say
15 tomorrow]. The inquiry legal team will also make an
16 open restriction order application on behalf of the
17 principal chapter 14 expert instructed by you, sir, by
18 the same time on the same date, 10 am on 21 September.
19 Any responses to these open restriction order
20 applications from core participants must be filed by
21 4 pm on 27 September. Submissions from counsel to the
22 inquiry will be provided by 12 pm on 30 September."
23 And sir, you will consider those applications and
24 submissions at an open hearing on 1 October.
25 Any amended or updated closed versions of the

1 existing four applications and any further closed
2 restriction order applications should be filed by 10 am
3 on 4 October. And sir, you will consider those
4 applications and submissions at a closed hearing on
5 18 October.
6 Having set out the inquiry legal team's position in
7 summary, unless there's anything else that you would
8 like to say at this stage, I will turn to the core
9 participants.
10 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: Thank you.
11 MR GREANEY: I'd invite Mr Cooper on behalf of the families
12 that he represents to make his submissions, please.
13 MR COOPER: Thank you, Mr Greaney.
14 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: Can I indicate that nothing I said
15 in the preliminary remarks is to indicate that I have in
16 any way prejudged the submissions.
17 MR COOPER: Of course.
18 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: Can I also indicate that I will want the
19 families to know as much as they can, and I understand
20 their desires to find out anything that could have gone
21 wrong, even if it involved the intelligence service and
22 MI5, but you will appreciate, all the lawyers here will
23 appreciate, that I am governed by the law and I must not
24 act unlawfully however restrictive that may be and
25 however unfortunate the consequences of that may be.

1 I also do hope that throughout this inquiry, our aim
2 has to be and has been to keep the trust and confidence
3 of the families in the exercise that we are doing. And
4 we are doing it to the best of our abilities with yours
5 and the families' help.
6 Submissions by MR COOPER
7 MR COOPER: I'm grateful, sir. Let me, as a preliminary,
8 endorse what Mr Greaney has said and, if reassurance is
9 needed -- and I'm sure it isn't -- emphasise the trust
10 that the families have both in you, sir, and indeed
11 in the inquiry legal team. Our submissions should not
12 be taken as a criticism as far as that is concerned.
13 Again, I can highlight, as I have highlighted in the
14 past, the extremely fruitful and productive relationship
15 the family teams do have with your inquiry legal team,
16 which has, I hope, helped you in the process.
17 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: It has, and there has been a high degree
18 of cooperation, which has not always been apparent in
19 every other inquiry which may be taking place or has
20 taken place. It seems to me to be benefit of us all.
21 But everyone must understand: I have to act in
22 accordance with the law.
23 MR COOPER: That is understood. And you know, sir,
24 certainly from your conduct of this inquiry, the
25 families that we all represent have presented a sensible

1 and a respectful approach to this process.
2 But we are at a particularly sensitive stage here of
3 this inquiry and perhaps one of the most sensitive
4 stages when it comes to the reception of evidence. And
5 part and parcel of our application today is simply to
6 ventilate the concerns that do labour within certain
7 sections of the families. And I think I can speak for
8 all families -- there's a difference between us on
9 certain issues -- to indicate that we all support and
10 would encourage open disclosure so far as we can have it
11 and indeed as full access to the process so far as it is
12 legally able to be achieved.
13 But I would start in these submissions,
14 knowledgeable though I am that you've read our
15 submissions at tab 3 of the bundle --
16 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: Mr Cooper, you feel free to say whatever
17 you wish to do in public. It is a public hearing and
18 I understand I'm not the only person who needs to know
19 what is being said.
20 MR COOPER: I'm grateful, sir. We have to start in this
21 way, that we do find it -- and those instructing us find
22 it -- somewhat ironic in the minds of many that our
23 ability from a lay perspective perhaps to do our duty,
24 both on behalf of the families and the country at large,
25 is being questioned by a security service in the light

1 of their performance concerning Salman Abedi and the
2 Manchester Arena attack.
3 It is already clear on the open material we have, on
4 admissions that have been made, that the performance of
5 the security services was, some might say, poor, and for
6 us to be, on their submissions, criticised or indeed
7 challenged as to our ability to perform our duties of
8 confidentiality is somewhat ironic and I put it no
9 higher than that.
10 You know, sir, that the lawyers representing the
11 family teams, and indeed the families, have all given
12 undertakings which they have adhered to in the strictest
13 possible way and you know, sir, should it be possible
14 according to law that enhanced undertakings be offered
15 to lawyers or the families, then they would also be
16 signed up to, one assumes that they would be reasonable,
17 in a forthright and cooperative way.
18 But there is an element of surprise that the
19 security services, who on their own admissions and their
20 own documents, performed their duties in some way very
21 poorly, should be criticising us. It is right to lay
22 some perspective on this because it forms our submission
23 on whether this is exceptional. Perhaps it does go in
24 many respects to the heart of the consideration that
25 you have.

1 Of course we've considered the authorities and in
2 particular the authority most recently supplied to us.
3 We do pick up that challenge to persuade you that the
4 circumstances in which we seek a special advocate are
5 exceptional. What is that exceptional circumstance?
6 It's this: the security services have admitted to
7 significant fault. Their admissions are limited, and
8 I'll go through a few of them -- all this is in open
9 material so I've been very careful to ensure that what
10 I am about to submit is already in open material, but
11 the security services have admitted to what some might
12 consider already grave breaches of their duty in both
13 following and apprehending Salman Abedi and others and
14 indeed in due course taking significant steps to prevent
15 the atrocity that occurred on 22 May 2017.
16 Their admissions, as we will articulate in a moment,
17 are staggering as they are limited. The exceptional
18 feature here is precisely that: that we have a party
19 here who will be represented in these hearings -- and
20 I think it's important to highlight that as well in our
21 submissions, that in the very hearings that the family
22 CP lawyers are deprived from attending and questioning
23 or making legal submissions to you, sir, the security
24 services, MI5, will have their legal representatives
25 present, who are perfectly able to make submissions to

1 you, who are perfectly able and permitted to ask
2 questions. It is somewhat invidious, we say, of them to
3 suggest in their written documents, and maybe orally
4 today, that the proceedings are non-adversarial,
5 inquisitorial and therefore little representation is
6 needed in these closed sessions.
7 If that be the case, sir, we ask rhetorically, why
8 are they there? Why are they there to be able to make
9 submissions? Surely CTI can do it for them. Why are
10 they there to ask questions? Surely CTI, on CTI's
11 arguments to exclude the families, can do that for them?
12 We submit on that basis, the inquisitorial argument
13 fails immediately. Because to use the inelegant
14 expression, what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the
15 gander. If CTI -- and again none of these submissions
16 are made in any way, and Mr Greaney knows it, to
17 challenge the competence, fairness and application of
18 CTI, but if they're good enough for the families, I put
19 it rather inelegantly, they should be good enough for
20 the security services as well. The security services
21 therefore, on CTI's argument and even indeed on the
22 Secretary of State's argument, effectively argue that
23 they shouldn't be there either. And at the very least,
24 sir, we ask for parity: if we can't be there, neither
25 should they, but if they are there, more to the point,

1 so should we.
2 But the exceptional nature, as I indicated a moment
3 ago, is that partial admission from the security
4 services of what we would phrase grave breaches of their
5 duty, both in the apprehension and detection of
6 Salman Abedi and others, and again, I take this from
7 Witness X. In his statement, {INQ022846/1}, I don't
8 need to see it, I simply make the reference to it.
9 MI5, it seems, were aware in 2017 of a significant
10 threat posed to the United Kingdom based on individuals
11 of national security concern, who were thought to have
12 travelled to Syria, Iraq and the surrounding region.
13 MI5 recognised the need to:
14 "Track their movement, process on return, and ensure
15 that they do not present a threat when back in the
16 United Kingdom."
17 His paragraph 29.
18 Those steps, sir, were not, as you know, imposed to
19 mitigate the threat posed by Salman Abedi, despite prior
20 notice of various factors of significant concern. We
21 deal with it briefly.
22 Here is an example of that exceptional feature of
23 grave, grave underperformance by MI5 and the security
24 services headlined in these statements, and no more than
25 headlined. So let it not be said, perhaps: there

1 you are, we've made disclosure, what are you complaining
2 about? No, sir, our response there would be: we've
3 simply been given headlines, which in those
4 circumstances, and I'll go on to a few other examples in
5 a moment, necessitate, in addition to CTI, a presence,
6 firstly, in a hearing or hearings by a team of special
7 advocates, all we suggest representing the families, not
8 special advocates for each family, but also perhaps more
9 significantly, a special advocate to assess disclosure
10 or the level of disclosure the families are getting at
11 the moment. I'll come on to that in a moment because
12 we've had none.
13 In 2010, going back to our exceptional submission,
14 the Joint Terrorism Analyst Centre, JTAC, reported how
15 radicalisation within the Libyan community of Manchester
16 may be influenced by elder generations, historical links
17 to extremist groups such as the Libyan Islamic Fighting
18 Group, and the report noted how this could lead to the
19 exposure of Libya-linked individuals to extremist
20 viewpoints during young adulthood, for example through
21 their parents and their connections; paragraph 32.
22 And yet none of these factors, sir, seem to have
23 been given any or any appropriate weight by the security
24 services in the case of Salman Abedi. MI5 disclosed to
25 us in open material at paragraph 83 that their initial

1 awareness of Salman Abedi occurred, staggeringly
2 perhaps, on 30 December 2010. They received a trace
3 request. That's all they've told us. They have not
4 disclosed whether or not the individual they received
5 that information from was from Abedi's family. If it
6 was, it perhaps chimes with the warnings given in that
7 2010 report.
8 No explanation has been given by the security
9 services, no disclosure has been given by CTI as to any
10 investigation or evaluation of Abedi was embarked upon
11 at this time. This submission cross-refers to our
12 concerns that although Mr Greaney has reassured us as to
13 the assiduous approach to CTI, so far we've had no
14 disclosure for over a year. It does give us concern,
15 and we hope it's not the case, and now is not the time
16 for hesitant submissions, that CTI are not simply
17 rubber-stamping the security services' applications.
18 I'm sure that's not the case, but now is the time to
19 make that submission and to pitch it at that level to
20 ensure and get reassurance that when material is being
21 supplied to CTI, an assiduous examination of it is
22 undertaken, because at the moment the concern the
23 families have is that we've had absolutely no
24 disclosure, which is somewhat disconcerting in the sense
25 that it seems that there is nothing that the security

1 services apparently don't want us to see that we're
2 seeing. It may well be that every single application
3 the security services make to CTI are extremely valid,
4 in accordance with the position that we are in and
5 therefore are accepted, but we don't know.
6 We don't have a special advocate, for instance, or
7 an ear or an eye in the proceedings to reassure us that
8 requests being made by the security services, a security
9 service that has already woefully misperformed on the
10 evidence we have seen, are not presenting material to
11 the inquiry legal team which may have another
12 interpretation and might lead to disclosure.
13 One of the exceptional circumstances, and our
14 submission here, sir, is we are dealing with a party, a
15 security service, MI5, here, would have made mistakes,
16 it might be considered, and there special transparency
17 so far as it may be achieved is required.
18 This is not a situation, perhaps in the normal
19 course of events, where a party is making disclosure or
20 maybe making arguments in due course in closed session,
21 who are coming from a position of not being imputed, of
22 material not being available to criticise them, or
23 indeed it not being known that they have made mistakes.
24 Here, already is a damaged party. Here, already is
25 a damaged MI5.

1 From that perspective, it makes it an exceptional
2 circumstance, in our respectful submission, that given
3 that we are already dealing with a damaged party, extra
4 special representation should be presented for the
5 families to assess what should be disclosed, what
6 shouldn't be disclosed, and representation at the
7 hearing to make submissions and to ask questions, just
8 as legal representation is being allowed for MI5 and the
9 security services to have their advocate there to
10 protect their interests.
11 Sir, again, none of this I am repeating from
12 a written document, our written submission, I just add
13 more flesh to the bones perhaps.
14 In July 2014, Salman Abedi was clearly known to the
15 security services. Whether or not he was a person of
16 interest and to what level he was a person of interest
17 is still opaque. We've been given some information,
18 we're not told the basis of any assessments that are
19 undertaken, which in our submission, admittedly from
20 a position of not seeing any material, is surprising
21 that at least we can't be given the basis of any
22 assessments that were taking place, even a redacted
23 basis of any assessments that were being taken, either
24 of Abedi, his family or his associates, telephone
25 contacts, for instance, contacts with others.

1 Sir, you will be hearing in due course, or at least
2 seeing, Abdallah. It is clear that Salman Abedi was
3 a well-known contact with Abdallah. MI5 continue to
4 refuse to even acknowledge that fact, continue to refuse
5 to even acknowledge what is blatantly obvious on the
6 papers we've seen that Salman Abedi was a well-known
7 contact with Abdallah. That again does not fill the
8 families that we represent with confidence that we're
9 having a security service who are attempting to help, in
10 practice, as they say in principle --
11 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: Mr Cooper, I'm sorry to interrupt you,
12 I'll just need that explained a bit more.
13 MR COOPER: Sir, of course.
14 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: It is in open, the contacts with
15 Abdallah and Salman Abedi.
16 MR COOPER: Yes, indeed, as I understand it.
17 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: I just wonder what the criticism of MI5
18 is in relation to that. You said they weren't
19 acknowledging that.
20 MR COOPER: As far as I understand it, there's been no
21 official acknowledgement by MI5, and if I've got that
22 wrong... It's simply an example, sir, again, of matters
23 that might be easily acknowledged, which are not, which
24 leads us to believe that the level of cooperation by MI5
25 and the security services, with as transparent an

1 approach as possible towards the families, is simply not
2 there.
3 It's clear, as you know, sir, from the material in
4 open, and indeed that will be further examined in due
5 course, that there was significant contact between
6 Salman Abedi and Abdallah, and I understand that to be
7 in open, and --
8 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: It is. It will be examined in open
9 hearing.
10 MR COOPER: In due course.
11 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: Yes.
12 MR COOPER: MI5 were made aware, for instance, of
13 Salman Abedi's travel out of the UK. No port stops, for
14 instance, as we know, were initiated. We have no
15 disclosure or information, apart from mere headlines, as
16 to MI5's attitude, behaviour and performance of their
17 duty in relation to that.
18 There are a number of other pieces of information --
19 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: Let's talk about the port stops for
20 a moment, which obviously is a really important matter
21 for me to consider. It is in open. There will
22 of course be the opportunity to ask questions of
23 Witness J when he comes to it about that and I would
24 expect that to be vigorously pursued, as no doubt it
25 will be.

1 MR COOPER: Well, sir, yes, but it rather leads me to an
2 issue I was about to go to a little later but I'll go to
3 now: we have only recently heard that in addition to
4 Witness J, and indeed another witness from
5 counter-terrorism, there are 14 witnesses now being
6 called or being presented by the inquiry legal team for
7 questioning. We don't know who they are, we don't know
8 any details about them, even in an anonymous form. And
9 such is the secrecy, it seems, of the witnesses being
10 heard in this hearing that even the expert witness who
11 is giving evidence in relation to preventability, we're
12 not even told of his or her name, we're refused access
13 to his or her CV, we don't even know what their
14 qualifications are.
15 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: I'm quite happy to hear argument about
16 that in due course, clearly. I have always been
17 hesitant about it being publicly known the number of
18 witnesses. The reason for that is by knowing -- the
19 Secretary of State for the Home Department has decided
20 to voluntarily disclose that, that's absolutely fine by
21 me, but it can cause misapprehension. One can get,
22 because there's a lot of witnesses, a view, well, there
23 must be a lot of material, stuff like that. They may be
24 repetitive, they may be dealing with all sorts of
25 things. So I'm always concerned that people read too

1 much into these sorts of things or more than they can
2 do. That's my hesitancy.
3 MR COOPER: Indeed, sir, and in terms of an analysis of what
4 these 14 anonymous witnesses may say, another reason
5 in the exceptional circumstances, that is of a security
6 service that's already indicated on statements we have,
7 in my words, they were gravely at fault here, even more
8 reason for there to be a special advocate present on
9 behalf of the families to look at the disclosure
10 in relation to those 14 witnesses and to consider
11 whether they do or whether they do not add materially to
12 the issue. We don't know. One presumes, certainly
13 given the assiduous way CTI and STI have chosen
14 witnesses, perfectly properly, I might add --
15 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: The problem with special advocates, as
16 you're aware, is they can be there and they can make
17 those sort of enquiries, but they actually can't tell
18 you the result any more than I can.
19 MR COOPER: No, sir, but they do represent, so far as they
20 can, the interests of the families and they do start
21 from a position of partiality. That doesn't mean that
22 they can obviously go back and report back to families,
23 but their approach, if I may submit, is a little
24 different in the sense that they have direct
25 instructions so far as they understand it or information

1 as to the position of the families' cases.
2 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: I'm hesitant about partiality because
3 we are conducting together an inquisitorial process.
4 I do understand you can say: well, the particular
5 concerns the families have can be raised with them and
6 they can direct it down that line, but for me partiality
7 does not, expressed in that way, just baldly as
8 partiality -- it starts to look like an adversarial
9 process, which we are not in and I'm very keen that we
10 should never get into.
11 MR COOPER: I understand, sir, but again -- and I promise
12 this is the last time I will mention it -- but the
13 disjunct between there being representatives for the
14 security services present --
15 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: I understand that.
16 MR COOPER: -- grates -- I know it's not a legal expression
17 but it ...
18 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: I know it does. It's actually happened
19 every time this has happened in an inquiry. I don't
20 think there's ever been an inquiry where just no one can
21 be there at all.
22 MR COOPER: Given that the powers of a chair are wide, we
23 could perhaps encourage either you, sir, or the inquiry
24 legal team to work out whether there is a power that
25 you have to exclude all advocates from the hearing, save

1 CTI, of course, and that if you do have that power --
2 and we can look into it in due course -- to do so,
3 we would be strongly arguing that if family CPs are
4 excluded from the process, so should those of the
5 security services.
6 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: Well, I've heard the argument and the
7 reasons for it. Thank you, Mr Cooper.
8 MR COOPER: Again, as far as the special advocate is
9 concerned, the special advocate of course would be able
10 to make submissions on behalf of the families, would be
11 able to consider disclosure on behalf of the families,
12 and this would be an important adjunct to assist,
13 particularly in the exceptional circumstance of
14 a security service which is already flawed in these
15 proceedings, concerning their duties on the night of the
16 22nd, to ensure that you are assisted, CTI are assisted,
17 by a family -- one or one team of family special
18 advocates who can also make submissions -- let's not
19 forget that, if I may say so -- that may assist you in
20 response of relevance.
21 I touched upon disclosure and I know and I saw --
22 one is always hyperaware when one is on my feet (sic) of
23 reactions both of the bench, as it were, and indeed of
24 opponents when I mentioned --
25 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: I have never made any reaction of any

1 sort, Mr Cooper, surely.
2 MR COOPER: -- when I mentioned rubber-stamping.
3 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: No advocate likes to be told they're
4 being a rubber stamp (overspeaking).
5 MR COOPER: I understand that and Mr Greaney knows me well
6 enough, it wasn't a personal slight on him. It was
7 a shorthand way of making my point. I emphasise again,
8 because I want to come back to it -- I come with giveth
9 and taketh on this one as it were -- I emphasise again,
10 I'm not suggesting anything improper, let me make that
11 very, very clear indeed.
12 What I am arguing, though, is that the fact that
13 over the year, and despite a number of rulings and
14 despite a number of hearings, and also despite promises
15 from those representing the security services of
16 a degree of disclosure, we have had nothing or hardly --
17 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: You actually have now, you've had the
18 number of witnesses which I think the promises were as
19 to what they would disclose. I can't remember back in
20 enough detail.
21 MR COOPER: That's recent, I think.
22 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: Oh yes. No, no, you haven't had
23 anything until recently, I do understand that.
24 MR COOPER: My submission is that it is at hearings which
25 were due to take place in August 2019, for instance,

1 nothing, absolutely nothing. That's either because, and
2 this is why my submissions become, maybe, a little
3 jolting to some -- that's either because, and we don't
4 know, MI5 and those representing them have not made
5 disclosure, or it may be because they have made
6 disclosure to CTI over a year ago and we've heard
7 nothing, one of those two, and we don't know.
8 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: Obviously, CTI have had disclosure of
9 all the material which MI5 has and it is then for CTI to
10 see whether the claim for national security and PII is
11 justified.
12 I think that one needs to look at the authorities --
13 I don't want you to go through them, but just be aware
14 of them -- the authorities from the Supreme Court as to
15 the importance of the Secretary of State's judgement and
16 certificate of what is national security. My impression
17 from the decisions of the Supreme Court, ending up with
18 Begum, which we have there, is that the Supreme Court
19 have said that any judge, anyone in my position, anyone
20 in CTI's position, has to pay all due respect to what
21 the Secretary of State is saying about national security
22 because she is the person charged with that by
23 Parliament.
24 That does not mean just because they say it's
25 national security then we just say, "Fine, it's national

1 security"; clearly it needs to be examined. But one
2 does have to attach weight to a certificate from the
3 Secretary of State and their reasons for it. So I just
4 want to point out, as I know you know well, but to
5 everybody else, what the courts have said, which I have
6 to follow.
7 MR COOPER: I understand, and in many respects -- again,
8 this another expressions I use -- to a degree we're all
9 in a degree of a straitjacket here, whether it's for
10 good or bad reason.
11 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: But you might need to go and complain to
12 the Supreme Court if you don't like the attitude,
13 really.
14 MR COOPER: Also though, sir, when it comes to certificates
15 and the declaration of national security -- and I know,
16 as we know you well now, you'll be aware that one
17 shouldn't always pay lip service to a simple
18 declaration, as it were.
19 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: Absolutely not.
20 MR COOPER: I remember in submissions that Mr Eadie was
21 involved in a year or so ago there was a graphic
22 expression, which I can't remember what it was now,
23 about effectively one shouldn't just salute the flag, as
24 it were, one should --
25 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: It comes from various authorities, that:

1 hold a white flag up, salute the flag, whatever you
2 like.
3 MR COOPER: It is that. We again -- and we make these
4 arguments from a point of utter ignorance as to what's
5 going on for reasons as to where we are. We encourage,
6 if that's all we can do here at this stage, we encourage
7 real diligence by those looking at this material, and
8 perhaps even encourage them, if we may, to go back over
9 the material they have made decisions on because there
10 is concern -- and part and parcel of these submissions
11 today and whilst I am making particular oral submissions
12 on them in addition to my written submissions -- because
13 there is unease, which needs to be dealt with here and
14 now, and if we can provide that service to you and to
15 CTI by making these submissions, I think we're being
16 positive, as it were.
17 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: No, no, absolutely. Let me say at once
18 that if restriction orders are made or before they are
19 made, the material will be looked at again. But beyond
20 that, whatever the position, whatever the ruling about
21 special advocates, during any closed hearing I will be
22 looking with great care to see whether what is put
23 before me in closed is actually justified on the basis
24 of national security for it to be in closed. There has
25 to be a degree of trust and reliance, I'm afraid, that

1 inevitably comes into the process, but I will be looking
2 carefully during that to see whether things can be put
3 into open which are being argued should be done in
4 closed.
5 MR COOPER: That is obviously reassuring to hear because
6 it is the balance between national security and family
7 participation and it is that acute balance ‑‑
8 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: Well, open justice and national
9 security.
10 MR COOPER: Sir, yes. Again we indicate, particularly
11 in the context of this party, of MI5, there is
12 particular concern that the material that is being
13 supplied shows more mistakes they made or more evidence
14 in respects to the mistakes they've admitted publicly in
15 headline already.
16 We can conclude, hopefully succinctly, now. We have
17 noted the submissions, of course, eloquent and able, as
18 one would expect, of Mr Weatherby, and as far as his
19 arguments are concerned about candour and about full
20 disclosure, we support them of course. He will no doubt
21 equally eloquently articulate those submissions.
22 Our position is that if you are against him on that,
23 or against us on that, then it is important for
24 participation of the families, certainly those that we
25 represent, that the next step be taken, which is the

1 special advocate step, and that the difference really
2 between ourselves and perhaps the position that
3 Mr Weatherby is ably arguing for is that if you're
4 against him, there ends the matter. The position is, we
5 submit, is if you're against him ‑‑ and we hope you're
6 not ‑‑ then there is another way to achieve family
7 participation, which should not be lost and should be
8 not given up.
9 As far as the law is concerned, we support and
10 repeat the submissions made by CTI on the effect of your
11 power and that won't assist you to repeat it. Indeed,
12 in Litvinenko, it was accepted there is such a power, it
13 is just that the tribunal ‑‑
14 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: I think it is fair to say
15 Sir Robert Owen didn't look in apparently huge detail at
16 the issue, but maybe he, having decided that in any
17 event he wouldn't have done it, decided that he didn't
18 need to ‑‑
19 MR COOPER: Maybe. And we are reassured, for I would have
20 made submissions otherwise ‑‑ when my learned friend
21 suggested that you indicate your discretion before you
22 first decide the law. It's very important, whilst each
23 inquiry is within its own bubble, as it were, to use the
24 popular terminology, it is important and we know
25 you will give it a full, reasoned judgment on this

1 issue, which will arise again, I am sure.
2 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: And I will look first as to whether
3 there is the power or not and then I will consider
4 whether, if there is the power, it's an appropriate case
5 to appoint special advocates.
6 MR COOPER: In essence, we agree. Firstly, is there
7 a power? We suggest there is. Then the question in
8 short is whether a special advocate is necessary,
9 whether it's exceptional, whether it's in the interests
10 of fairness and the families' right to participate
11 in the investigation, and we have already submitted on
12 that.
13 We obviously commend our written submissions to you.
14 We deal with one aspect from CTI in their paragraph 67
15 or 6.7, I can't see whether I put a dot there or not,
16 it's simply this: cost. One single team to represent
17 all family interests, which in many respects, sir,
18 we would submit, whatever your decision is, the cost
19 argument really is irrelevant as far as that is
20 concerned.
21 Sir, unless we can assist you any further, those are
22 our submissions. We hope that they'll be taken as
23 positively as we have tried to present them, but they do
24 have that underlying thread of real concern that what is
25 going on that they cannot see is continued to be done

1 rigorously.
2 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: Absolutely, and I do understand that,
3 Mr Cooper. Can I just also say, just so no one is under
4 any misapprehension, what I don't want to do is provide
5 something which actually is not achieving anything, just
6 so people can say, "Well, we now trust you". That's not
7 the aim. So I have to be satisfied that having special
8 advocates would actually achieve something constructive
9 rather than simply for the procedure, rather than simply
10 saying, "The families have asked for it, therefore I'll
11 give it to them".
12 MR COOPER: Let me make it clear, sir. We're not seeking
13 a special advocate on a trust issue.
14 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: I understand that.
15 MR COOPER: We're seeking a special advocate for all the
16 reasons we have hopefully articulated, the special
17 reasons we have articulated, which means that in these
18 exceptional circumstances, dealing with a party that we
19 are dealing with, a special advocate is appropriate.
20 I certainly wouldn't dream ‑‑ neither would those
21 I represent want me to ‑‑ of, in any way, impugning the
22 trust we have both in you, sir, and indeed the inquiry
23 legal team.
24 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: I'm grateful for that, Mr Cooper.
25 Thank you. Is it sensible to have a break? I'm going

1 to have 5 minutes whatever.
2 MR GREANEY: Let's have a break of 15 minutes then, sir.
3 (10.42 am)
4 (A short break)
5 (10.57 am)
6 MR GREANEY: Next, Mr Atkinson.
7 Submissions by MR ATKINSON
8 MR ATKINSON: Sir, I will endeavour not to repeat that which
9 my learned friend Mr Cooper has already said, which
10 I adopt, inevitably in saying that I will repeat things
11 that he has said for which I apologise, but it is
12 important to stress how important this issue is for
13 those I represent.
14 We repeat our submission advanced in the summer of
15 last year that full and effective scrutiny which
16 attracts public confidence and that of the bereaved
17 families involves their maximum participation in the
18 testing of evidence as to preventability and therefore
19 the issues raised in chapter 14.
20 Whilst the Secretary of State suggests in her
21 submissions that Article 2 has no bearing on the
22 analysis that engages you, sir, today, we submit it is
23 in fact central to it.
24 At paragraph 2.1 of our submissions, we quote the
25 analysis of Lord Bingham in the case of Amin as to the

1 purposes of an Article 2 investigation, namely to
2 ensure, so far as possible, that the full facts are
3 brought to light, that culpable and discreditable
4 conduct is exposed and brought to public notice, that
5 suspicion of deliberate wrongdoing, if unjustified, is
6 allayed, and that dangerous practices and procedures are
7 rectified, and that those who have lost their relatives
8 may at least have the satisfaction of knowing that
9 lessons learned from the deaths may save the lives of
10 others.
11 That neatly encapsulates, we submit, why it is that
12 the maximisation of their participation in this process
13 is essential. We do not accept that such maximisation
14 is in turn unlawful. Section 19 of the Inquiries Act
15 gives you, sir, the power to regulate who is and is not
16 present in relation to restricted order material
17 hearings and who is or is not provided with restricted
18 material. That is a lawful basis for you, sir, to allow
19 wider access than is contended for by CTI here.
20 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: Even when it's covered by PII?
21 MR ATKINSON: That is the difference between the position
22 adopted by the Supreme Court in Somerville and what
23 we are contending for here. In Somerville what
24 concerned the court there was that material had been
25 adjudged to be covered by PII and was then given to

1 a confidentiality ring, and the court was concerned both
2 with the practical implications of that and how that
3 worked.
4 Here, although you, sir, have made rulings as to the
5 application of PII in the context of the inquest back in
6 2019, we are now in a different situation because we are
7 covered by the Inquiries Act, we are covered by the
8 procedures that you, sir, can put into place under
9 section 19 as to who can be present and what material
10 can be provided and can reassess PII in the light of
11 those as to where the protection of public interest
12 in relation to national security now lies in that new
13 environment.
14 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: I entirely accept that, but if I do make
15 restriction orders on the basis that the material is
16 covered by PII, are you then saying that in those
17 circumstances CPs can be permitted to be at the hearing?
18 MR ATKINSON: To answer that by analogy, in the context of
19 the Undercover Policing Inquiry,
20 Sir Christopher Pitchford identified that where --
21 having identified all the practical problems that the
22 Supreme Court did with a confidentiality ring, went on
23 to identify that there would be circumstances in which
24 there could be a sharing of material between
25 participants who had the same interest and where, here,

1 the families have the same interest as the inquiry team
2 and as the Secretary of State in protecting national
3 security and avoiding anything that would help
4 a terrorist, there is that common interest which could
5 allow that. But, sir, I say at once that clearly, you,
6 sir, could identify a category of material that should
7 not be disseminated because of its implications for
8 national security but can be disseminated under
9 section 19 to a defined group. And we would submit that
10 there is that middle ground, so effectively it's now
11 three categories, not two: it's not PII or not, it's PII
12 covered by section 19 or not. We contend that where
13 there is that middle category, the families should be
14 within, not outside, the circle.
15 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: I'd be much helped by seeing the
16 judgment of Sir Christopher Pitchford when he dealt with
17 that if that were possible.
18 MR ATKINSON: I think we did provide it back in August last
19 year, but we'll provide it again.
20 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: Thank you.
21 MR ATKINSON: It's also right and again something that we
22 observed last August that in the Azelle Rodney Inquiry,
23 rule 12.3 of the Inquiry Rules, which is disclosure for
24 the purposes of determining an issue under section 19,
25 was used to allow the bereaved families access to some

1 material which was otherwise covered by PII. Again,
2 we'll provide that to you as well, sir.
3 So we submit that it is not a simple black and white
4 "This is unlawful, you can't do it", we submit that
5 section 19 means that you can to the extent that you
6 assess the balance permits it with PII, section 19 and
7 open material as three categories.
8 We further submit that it is important that this is
9 approached now very carefully because of the history.
10 The history is very well set out and we entirely endorse
11 Mr Weatherby's and Mr Gozem's submissions from
12 paragraphs 11 to 22 of their document where they set out
13 the reality, which is that in July of last year, it was
14 submitted on behalf of the Secretary of State that
15 it would be possible, her words, to provide core
16 participants with some further information concerning
17 the MI5 witnesses of fact, including the number of
18 witnesses, their employer and a general indication as to
19 the scope of their evidence and that they would make
20 submissions to you as to the extent to which their roles
21 could be identified. That was set out by them in July
22 of last year with a view to being able to deal with it
23 by August of last year.
24 And a year and a month on from that, we have just
25 had the numbers, we are still waiting for the rest, and

1 that is, to use another word of my learned friend,
2 unsatisfactory. It does very much call into question
3 whether, for whatever good reason there has been this
4 delay, the process is working as well as it should to
5 ensure the maximising of participation by the families
6 and the maximising of public confidence in this process
7 and it is against that background that we have made the
8 application that we do today that you, sir, should
9 consider your discretion to allow a special advocate
10 here.
11 We submit that the fact you, sir, have the power to
12 order a special advocate is clear. Section 19, as
13 already prefaced, does indicate that you, sir, have the
14 power to determine who is present during a closed
15 session and who should have access to closed material.
16 That clearly, on its face, allows you to determine who
17 should have that, including a special advocate. I say
18 that that can be said as to include that because
19 section 17 of the Act makes clear that you, sir, can
20 direct the procedure and conduct of your inquiry save
21 where the Act or Rules limits you. Neither the Act nor
22 the Rules limit you as to the appointment of a special
23 advocate and there is therefore no statutory bar to you
24 doing that.
25 The Secretary of State submits that you can't

1 because in other contexts, other statutory regimes
2 provide for a special advocate, this one doesn't,
3 therefore you can't. We submit, first, that those
4 statutory regimes that she points to are ones which have
5 such a fundamental bearing on liability and lawful
6 regulation in relation to an individual that it is
7 essential that those rights are protected and therefore
8 that is spelt out with a procedure in those contexts.
9 That is not to say that it can only be in those contexts
10 that you can have a special advocate.
11 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: Can you tell me any occasion on which
12 a special advocate has been appointed when it's not
13 concerning allegations being made against an individual
14 or group of people who cannot be told of what that
15 information is?
16 MR ATKINSON: We recognise that there is no inquiry that has
17 had this ‐‐
18 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: Sorry, forgive me, I'm not concerned
19 with inquiries. It doesn't mean it has to be
20 exclusively, but it's normally been used on an occasion
21 when someone is being ‐‐ in the information in the
22 Roberts case, there was information about Mr Roberts
23 which might make it unsafe to allow him to come to be
24 released. In all the other occasions, it seemed to
25 involve someone having an accusation made against him,

1 her or a group, which they cannot know the details of
2 because of PII and therefore, in fairness to them, to
3 try and meet the allegation so far as possible,
4 a special advocate is appointed. I just wonder whether
5 there's any occasion ‐‐
6 MR ATKINSON: Beyond that. We submit that we fit in that
7 category which I will develop in a moment, but I think
8 our researches, and I will be corrected from behind if I
9 am wrong, thus far haven't identified any further
10 example. But we submit that we are within that category
11 because you, sir, concluded in 2019 that this was an
12 Article 2 investigation and that it was one that could
13 not satisfy the requirements of Article 2 without steps
14 beyond the parameters of an inquest.
15 Therefore, issues that are central to the concerns
16 of the bereaved families and the satisfaction of
17 Article 2 in their context can only be dealt with in
18 less than an open setting and therefore in a setting
19 where section 19 gives you, sir, the power to determine
20 who should be present.
21 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: Okay. It's not identical, is it, but
22 you say it's analogous?
23 MR ATKINSON: Yes. Further, in answer to the submission of
24 the Secretary of State that it's only in, for example,
25 SIAC that you can have a special advocate, we

1 respectfully endorse CTI's submission at paragraph 48(e)
2 of their written document that there is a recognised
3 common law discretion to permit a special advocate, the
4 case of Roberts that they identified this morning being
5 an example of that.
6 It is something that you, sir, we know, would only
7 grant if you considered that was the only way to ensure
8 the proper level of participation by the families, but
9 if you conclude it is the only way then there is no bar,
10 we submit, to you doing so, and to the extent that
11 Sir Robert Owen analysed the point, his approach in
12 Litvinenko supports you in doing that. So that is our
13 response to the Secretary of State's submission that you
14 can't do it.
15 As to whether you should, we submit that my learned
16 friend Mr Greaney, with the very greatest of respect to
17 him, slightly oversimplifies the position in relation to
18 a special advocate in that under the Civil Procedure
19 Rules. A special advocate, once appointed, can report
20 back to the families that which the court permits them
21 to do and permits them to do in writing. For your note,
22 sir, Civil Procedure Rules 82.11(4).
23 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: I'm impressed with your intimate
24 knowledge of the Civil Procedure Rules, Mr Atkinson.
25 MR ATKINSON: I give all credit for that to Mr Jamieson, who

1 clearly has had a much misspent youth.
2 The position is that there can be a form of
3 dialogue. We entirely understand Mr Greaney to be right
4 to say that there is that ongoing dialogue between
5 counsel to the inquiry and the CPs, but there is no
6 reason why you, sir, could not regulate a form of
7 contact between the special advocate appointed and the
8 families to ensure again their maximum engagement where
9 appropriate.
10 We submit that there are a number of areas where
11 a special advocate can and should provide assistance.
12 First, in relation to the process of disclosure. If the
13 reality is that the delay of the last year has been
14 because of the burden on those involved, then having
15 additional minds engaged on the process is worth having
16 because time now is short.
17 Whilst we entirely agree that counsel to the inquiry
18 have rigorously tested the evidence throughout this
19 process and you, sir, have sought to do so, and
20 succeeded, I hasten to add --
21 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: It's okay, I'm not offended.
22 MR ATKINSON: Blowing our own trumpet, we do consider that
23 on behalf of the families we have helped to highlight
24 areas of evidence, issues with the evidence, that have
25 been beyond the original intention of CTI in what they

1 were proposing to ask of witnesses and which has spurred
2 you on, sir, to further inquiry in areas that perhaps
3 had not had focus at the outset.
4 Through feeding that material to a special advocate
5 who will be there in the room, we understand, and can
6 ask those additional questions beyond that which CTI
7 ask, that process can continue. Not, we would submit,
8 in a way that we would wish, and more particularly that
9 the families would wish, because they would wish us to
10 be there, but it would give them further the confidence
11 that there was someone in the room representing their
12 concerns and their interests in addition to CTI rather
13 than that burden again being purely on them.
14 So it is the proper investigation of disclosure with
15 additional minds that have an understanding of the
16 families' position, the testing of evidence from that
17 perspective and, to echo my learned friend Mr Cooper,
18 that parity with the Secretary of State if she is to be
19 permitted.
20 Of course, the answer to my learned friend
21 Mr Cooper's invitation is that section 19 would permit
22 you to exclude the Secretary of State from the closed
23 hearings, just as it would permit you to exclude the
24 families from the hearings if that is what you
25 considered to be the way to ensure their confidence and

1 public confidence in the process.
2 Beyond that, sir, I suspect I'll be repeating myself
3 and those therefore are our submissions.
4 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: Thank you very much, Mr Atkinson.
5 MR GREANEY: Thank you, Mr Atkinson.
6 Next, then, sir, I will turn to Mr Weatherby.
7 Submissions by MR WEATHERBY
8 MR WEATHERBY: Good morning, sir.
9 Again, I will try my hardest not to repeat either
10 what has been said earlier or too much what has been put
11 in writing. I know you have had the opportunity of
12 looking at the written submissions.
13 Turning to what Mr Greaney described as topic 1,
14 I think it's important that we get away from looking at
15 this through the language of public interest immunity
16 because the statutory regime that we're looking at here
17 was designed to deal with the problems that arose with
18 public interest immunity. So the Inquiries Act and
19 section 19 and section 17 read together is predicated
20 not only on facilitating the tribunal from hearing
21 material that would otherwise be removed from the
22 process, but it is also facilitating the least
23 interference possible for an open process if it did so
24 (inaudible: distorted).
25 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: I'm afraid you've frozen momentarily.

1 But I will use the time to take in that submission.
2 Just hang on, Mr Weatherby, we've lost sight of you
3 and we lost you for a moment when you froze. You were
4 making the submission that we should look at it not in
5 the language of PII but looking at it under the
6 Inquiries Act.
7 MR WEATHERBY: Yes. I am not for a moment suggesting that
8 some of the other authorities aren't relevant, but the
9 whole purpose of the Inquiries Act in this respect was
10 to present a regime which facilitated the tribunal,
11 first of all, hearing the material that would otherwise
12 be removed from the process.
13 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: Okay, just help me about that. The
14 reason why we have had to be converted to an inquiry is
15 because under the procedure for inquests, it is not
16 possible to have a completely closed hearing.
17 MR WEATHERBY: Yes.
18 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: So how come when we have the inquiry,
19 and that's because of PII, when we become an inquiry
20 somehow different rules apply? I'm not sure I follow
21 that. Can I say, I accept entirely that there should be
22 the minimum diminishing of open justice. So can I make
23 that absolutely clear? I entirely accept that.
24 MR WEATHERBY: Sure.
25 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: But once you have done that, is it any

1 different?
2 MR WEATHERBY: Well, it is different because you go from
3 what is essentially more or less a binary process to one
4 which allows the tribunal to hear any potentially
5 relevant material. Also, it provides a regime whereby
6 not only the tribunal can but the tribunal must look to
7 see how it can minimise the interference with the
8 ordinary process of the rule of law.
9 That's where we come at it. It's not that referring
10 to public interest immunity is wrong, but section 19
11 covers the balance of public interest in the same way
12 for any issue of where the balance of public interest
13 arises, but it also has the corollary of it, which is
14 that it provides the tools by which you can minimise
15 rather than look at this in a binary process.
16 Therefore, I think if one is going to look at the
17 learning from the earlier cases, one has to look at it
18 through that lens and must approach it from -- that it
19 facilitates both the hearing of material that would
20 otherwise be removed --
21 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: Mr Weatherby, I accept that in
22 principle. I accept that it's not a binary process and
23 that you can look at ways of making disclosure or
24 partial disclosure subject to the requirements of public
25 interest immunity, which you know affect me as they

1 affect all of us. So yes, one needs to look at the
2 processes and try and devise ways by which the minimum
3 derogation from the principles of open justice apply.
4 So if that's what you're saying, I in no way disagree.
5 MR WEATHERBY: But the way CTI have come at this is to
6 essentially say you can't have the second part of that
7 process because this is PII, it's national security.
8 And what I'm saying is that the better way of looking at
9 it is that section 19 is there to deal with all manner
10 of the balance of public interest, or indeed where
11 there isn't any balance of public interest but there's
12 an actual statutory prohibition.
13 Again, I make it quite clear, I'm not talking about
14 this case, but you might have a case where the reason
15 for a section 19 hearing is because of telephone
16 intercepts and there is a statutory prohibition on the
17 evidence being in public, though there was such
18 interception.
19 But then section 19, even there, provides
20 a framework by which that restricted/prohibited evidence
21 can have this minimum interference possible facilitation
22 applied to it as well in that the information which is
23 the product of the interception can be disclosed even if
24 the actual interception and the provenance point cannot,
25 not because of any balance but because of the statutory

1 prohibition.
2 So therefore, we say that you should approach this
3 from the point of view that anybody who applies to have
4 material restricted in this process or, of course, CTI
5 or you may do it of your own volition, but any approach
6 to restriction of that evidence must be on the basis of
7 engaging the second part of that process. I may have
8 gone a long way round the houses on that, but it's
9 a very important point that it's not binary and the fact
10 that we may use the term "public interest immunity
11 applies", in my submission, is not helpful and the fact
12 that national security is used, it may be an entirely
13 appropriate description but it isn't, as we have heard,
14 a trump card which -- the flag is flown and there is no
15 better restriction available.
16 It isn't, again, as simple as saying that the
17 tribunal should have deference to the view of the Home
18 Secretary, we agree with that. There should be
19 deference, but of course, ultimately, it's your decision
20 as to whether material falls within this category. But
21 that isn't an end point. Even if it falls into the
22 category of national security, the second part of the
23 Inquiries Act process must still apply and the inquiry
24 must apply the minimum interference necessary approach
25 to that material as well.

1 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: Let's just look at that for a moment,
2 please. So you rightly say let's talk about
3 interception. I am prohibited by statute for letting
4 anything be known that information comes from
5 interception. What you are saying is that actually
6 doesn't mean that the material which comes from the
7 interception cannot be disclosed --
8 MR WEATHERBY: Absolutely.
9 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: -- subject to the fact of disclosing the
10 material doesn't make it clear that it came from
11 a telephone interception?
12 MR WEATHERBY: Yes.
13 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: You agree with that?
14 MR WEATHERBY: Absolutely. So in a case, and again I stress
15 I have no knowledge, there may be telephone intercepts
16 involved in this case, but I have no knowledge of that
17 so I'm not in any way suggesting that there is. But in
18 a case where the section 19 material is telephone
19 intercepts then you would have no discretion, you could
20 not hear that evidence in open conditions because of the
21 prohibition, but you could and should, if it is
22 relevant, hear it in section 19 hearings. But there may
23 be a way of doing that which allows for lesser
24 restriction. A very simple, easy answer to that might
25 be that the material is summarised and disclosed. So

1 in that example, the hearing might be closed but with
2 a full gisting and summary, which would give the full
3 nine yards to the actual material without --
4 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: Mr Weatherby, sorry, at a very early
5 stage -- and I think it was Mr Cooper who said this --
6 actually you're not interested in how MI5 got the
7 information, whatever it may be, all you're interested
8 in is what the information is. But of course that does
9 mean that if revealing the information also brings in
10 matters which maybe affect national security, that has
11 to be taken into account too. So it's not just simply
12 saying, "Actually, we don't want to know where it came
13 from, we just want to know what it is", that may of
14 itself disclose matters which affect national security.
15 MR WEATHERBY: Well, it might. That's why each --
16 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: It's not as straightforward as it sounds
17 to carry that exercise out.
18 MR WEATHERBY: With respect, both HMG and, with respect to
19 Mr Greaney, in terms of the submissions about PII,
20 that is where the argument is being pressed. What we
21 say is that each piece of material needs to be
22 considered to apply the minimum interference possible
23 approach to it and that may mean restricting attendance
24 at hearings, it may mean having closed hearings, and it
25 probably will mean a mixture and indeed, on past

1 experience, it is likely in our submission to mean that
2 witnesses will give both open and closed evidence, so
3 a witness may well have 50% of their evidence entirely
4 to be able to be given in open conditions and 50% which
5 isn't --
6 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: Well, I understand you're not just
7 coming to this, but of course Witness J is in precisely
8 that position and will be a witness who gives evidence
9 both in open and in closed, and you're saying that needs
10 to be looked at in relation to any witness and
11 I understand that point.
12 MR WEATHERBY: That's a starting point with all witnesses
13 and, absolutely, that is the point. In fact, we would
14 say it's much more important with the other witnesses
15 because from our perspective, Witness J is presenting
16 what I'll put as neutrally as I can as a corporate view
17 of the evidence rather than material which is actually
18 of particular help to the families or anybody watching.
19 So in terms of the national security --
20 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: Sorry, Mr Weatherby, I'm not going to
21 allow you to get away with that precisely. I think
22 Witness J's evidence, both in open and no doubt in
23 closed, will be of assistance to the inquiry and also
24 thereby of assistance to the families. I understand you
25 say that other witnesses may be of more direct

1 assistance, but I am not going to accept that Witness J
2 won't be of any help.
3 MR WEATHERBY: I'm sorry, Witness J may well be of great
4 assistance to the inquiry and thereby to the families
5 and everybody else, I accept that. What I meant is that
6 in open evidence, so far the evidence of Witness J is
7 not of great assistance to the families because --
8 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: I understand your point on that.
9 MR WEATHERBY: I hadn't put it very carefully. But there is
10 more information in open source material than Witness J
11 has put within Witness J's statement. That's the point
12 I sought to make.
13 In terms of the national security aspect then, the
14 national security category should simply be considered
15 as a public interest reason for an application or an own
16 volition approach to the issue of section 19 and it very
17 much ought not to be viewed, in our submission, as
18 a trump card.
19 We've given the examples already in terms of the
20 interception of communications for example, but there
21 are many other examples, and we've given some of them in
22 writing. So for example, if the evidence related to the
23 existence of an informer -- and I again stress I have no
24 information about this, I'm not suggesting there is or
25 isn't in this case -- but let's say the information

1 related to an informer, the very existence of whom may
2 be so sensitive that it must to the utmost. That may
3 well be an instance where you would determine that the
4 hearings must be closed to everybody apart from the
5 absolute minimum.
6 But there may be, again, ways of involving others
7 without the disclosure or the involvement even with the
8 hearings involving the existence of the informer. And
9 to change the facts or change the example to
10 interoperability , there may be different agencies
11 involved here. So obviously from the families'
12 perspective there are issues which may involve MI6 or
13 GCHQ or other parts of the intelligence community apart
14 from MI5 and CTP. There may very well be
15 interoperability issues here: how well or otherwise did
16 these agencies work together and was that a point of
17 failure with respect to this particular case? Again,
18 I don't know. Those may be quite sensitive, but they
19 may not be so sensitive as would reach the hurdle of
20 restricting the families or the families'
21 representatives from being in the restricted rather than
22 absolutely closed hearings. So therefore, even in terms
23 of national security material, there should be no binary
24 approach.
25 With respect to national security ——

1 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: If you're expecting me to say something
2 you are not necessarily going to find it every time, but
3 I accept all those arguments, but clearly —— well,
4 you will well know, just taking your example, without
5 giving any indication either way, just as with closed
6 hearings, if you have informants, we have struggled
7 in the criminal courts often with the concept that it
8 may be that if there is information provided, by
9 disclosing the information you disclose where it comes
10 from.
11 MR WEATHERBY: Yes, of course.
12 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: That's the problem we have struggled
13 with in the criminal courts often. So there are lots of
14 different factors which I do understand need to be taken
15 into account.
16 MR WEATHERBY: And with respect, I entirely understand and
17 agree that in saying that these things aren't binary,
18 I'm not suggesting they're easy either, but I am
19 suggesting that there must be a range of solutions
20 rather than the fact that all but two vast corporate
21 statements will suffice for the chapter 14 evidence.
22 And those are really the concerns that we've tried to
23 express in the written submissions which I'll come to in
24 a moment.
25 But before I move on from this point, and I have

1 laboured it so I will move on, there has been mention of
2 the case of Roberts this morning and that raised some
3 further thoughts about the Parole Board. In fact, the
4 Parole Board is a —— or parole hearings are subject to
5 statutory and secondary legislation which regulates
6 those hearings and they do allow representatives, for
7 example, to see restricted material on undertakings,
8 indeed including national security material. I haven't
9 provided it because it only arose this morning on
10 consideration of Roberts, but it may be something that
11 we send through later.
12 Current rule 17 expressly refers to national
13 security material with respect to parole hearings and
14 gives the parole chair the discretion to disclose
15 material to representatives of the prisoner within those
16 processes. So it's not, again, as binary as it perhaps
17 is being ——
18 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: I think those are the 2004 Rules. The
19 rules have now changed several times since then and
20 there are now new rules which do take into account,
21 because it's now become more often, dealing with
22 information relating to convicted terrorists who are
23 coming up for parole. So a different situation does now
24 arise and it's now become considered necessary to have
25 rules which do provide for situations when, because of

1 national security, neither the prisoner nor his
2 representative can be allowed to know the information.
3 But I diverge, really.
4 MR WEATHERBY: I'm sorry, I have not made myself clear here.
5 There has been for a long time the power in the Rules to
6 disclose material to the prisoner's representative on
7 undertakings. There is now under the 2019 current
8 Rules, in rule 17, expressly referred to national
9 security material, and on an application by the
10 Secretary of State, the chair can either reject the
11 application and disclose it to the prisoner and his or
12 her representative or they can disclose it to the
13 prisoner's representative on undertakings, including
14 national security material. So I'm merely pointing that
15 out as an example where the statutory regime allows for
16 what we are advocating here and that the fact that this
17 may well fall within what would otherwise be considered
18 public interest immunity does not mean that there is no
19 process which allows for it to be dealt with on that
20 basis.
21 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: Mr Weatherby, I'm sorry, I wasn't aware
22 that you were aware of the 2019 Rules, which of course
23 are not referred to in Roberts.
24 MR WEATHERBY: Yes. Just as an aside, the 2019 Rules do in
25 fact put Roberts on a statutory basis because they also

1 include special advocates.
2 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: Absolutely.
3 MR WEATHERBY: I'll move on from that.
4 The second point I want to make is about trust and
5 I want to reiterate what has been said by others, that
6 the families have trust in the process, in you as the
7 chair, and indeed in CTI. I want to make that
8 completely clear. They also want to make clear that the
9 rule of law stands upon open justice and not trust and
10 that --
11 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: No, no, absolutely, and you've already
12 said that CTI have actually misunderstood the law
13 somewhat, which no doubt they will wish to reply to in
14 due course.
15 MR WEATHERBY: Sure. Therefore, the issue, the question,
16 the principle here is not trust, otherwise we would have
17 a very different situation if it was.
18 Putting a caveat on that, I would say that trust
19 might be relevant to issues of the restrictions
20 necessary under section 19, and therefore if you
21 determine material should be restricted under
22 section 19, and go on to consider whether there are
23 restrictions which would allow disclosure or presence in
24 the hearing, then past behaviour is a good indicator of
25 future behaviour in this respect. So trust might be

1 relevant to the balance under section 19 on that point.
2 It will also, of course, be relevant to the
3 confidence of the families going forward in respect of
4 chapter 14 and whether the families have the same degree
5 of confidence in the inquiry in respect of the
6 chapter 14 material.
7 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: Mr Weatherby, I well understand that
8 you are putting forward legal propositions to me which
9 you say I should be following and I can well understand
10 you saying, if I don't follow those legal principles,
11 you will take the normal course that people do when they
12 think judges have got it wrong.
13 What I feel slightly hesitant about is somebody
14 saying to me: actually, if you don't agree with me on
15 this, I won't trust you. And that's a bit of
16 a gun-to-the-head job, isn't it?
17 MR WEATHERBY: I'm trying to avoid that for obvious reasons.
18 I don't want to put an impertinent and (overspeaking) --
19 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: It's not impertinent, it's just -- you
20 know, if I get the law wrong, you have your remedy.
21 MR WEATHERBY: Yes.
22 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: But to say (overspeaking) trust you.
23 MR WEATHERBY: The point I'm trying to make and the reason
24 I caveated and prefaced it by indicating how the
25 perception of the families is at a high level in terms

1 of the process that we've come to so far is that in
2 considering the discretions that you have here, if your
3 judgment is that material has to be treated as sensitive
4 and therefore restricted, the discretion you then have
5 to consider what level of restriction is applied, all
6 that I'm submitting is that the more careful the
7 discretion is and the less wide margin given to the
8 sensitivity -- I haven't put that as eloquently as
9 perhaps I might.
10 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: All I can do, Mr Weatherby, is set out
11 to you, having heard these submissions, in as much
12 detail as I can the principles I will then apply. It is
13 of course then open to you to say, "You are applying the
14 wrong legal principles". I just prefer to identify it
15 in that way rather than, "We don't trust you any more".
16 MR WEATHERBY: Yes, well, I'm sorry if that's the perception
17 I put across. That's not what I'm saying. I'm simply
18 saying that there are issues of wide public importance,
19 not just to the families here, and issues that we have
20 raised, I'll come on to them in a moment, early on in
21 this process from open source which haven't been dealt
22 with by the open source chapter 14 materials so far.
23 Therefore, the maximum degree to which the chapter 14
24 material can be put into open will maximise the
25 confidence of the families in the process. That's all

1 I'm trying to get across.
2 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: Confidence in the process I understand,
3 but you may need occasionally to go to Parliament to
4 change some things related to national security.
5 MR WEATHERBY: Yes, okay. I have made my submissions on the
6 process and that the process does in fact give the
7 tribunal quite a wide ambit to the approach to be taken.
8 Finally in terms of this issue of trust, and
9 segueing away from the tricky territory I have just been
10 on, but in terms of MI5 itself, I am not going to make
11 a crass submission that MI5 is a terrible organisation
12 which makes calamitous decisions all the time, I'm not
13 going to do that. But the corollary of that is it is
14 wrong to assume they don't make mistakes or indeed that
15 they always act properly. And again, we have raised
16 issues in the past about the security services more
17 generally.
18 Again, the rule of law assumes that courts and
19 tribunals, through their independence, don't put
20 organisations which are in the difficult position of the
21 security services, from a legal perspective, on
22 a pedestal and make assumptions which aren't properly to
23 be made.
24 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: I think I am absolutely alert to that,
25 so I hope -- anyone can make mistakes and if there are

1 mistakes which have been made, they need to be
2 identified and they need to be put right. For example,
3 the information which is in open, that whatever mistakes
4 were made, there's a team of experts at MI5 who all
5 said, "It wouldn't have made any difference", that is
6 the sort of thing which will be given the most rigorous
7 examination.
8 MR WEATHERBY: Yes. I'm sure the families would be
9 heartened to hear that expressly asserted.
10 In terms of the difference between this case and
11 other processes, the other processes that were mentioned
12 earlier, whereby inquests have proceeded with material
13 being excluded, has been because the coroner has
14 determined that the Article 2 obligations on the state
15 can be discharged without that material. And that must
16 be, to the largest extent, factually based, but that is
17 not this case and that is of course why we're here as
18 a public inquiry --
19 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: Mr Weatherby, I understand that and
20 I know you understand it. I was only making the point
21 because it was somehow being suggested that because
22 we are having a closed hearing rather than what happened
23 in the other inquests, which was to exclude anything
24 covered by PII entirely, that somehow we are more secret
25 than they were. I'm afraid I don't understand that and

1 I think it's a misconception which I hope you would
2 agree with.
3 MR WEATHERBY: It is. I absolutely agree. And the reason
4 we are here is so that, on the ruling made, there is
5 pertinent material that must be considered here. Then
6 the inquests couldn't proceed because the Article 2
7 obligation would not have been discharged. So going to
8 the public inquiry facilitates that happening, but it
9 facilitates that happening on the basis of my earlier
10 submission of the corollary of applying the least
11 restrictive measures possible.
12 I will just finish on this point about the extent of
13 that because we set out in our opening submissions many
14 of the concerns from open source material and no doubt
15 you will have noticed the widespread public concern
16 about the level of material which is in open source,
17 which may be relevant to the issues in this case.
18 Mr Cooper has gone on to indicate the Abdallah
19 texts, the Abdalraouf Abdallah texts between him and
20 Salman Abedi, and of course Mr Abdallah was prosecuted
21 to the full extent of the law well before this plot came
22 to fruition, and therefore those texts would have been
23 available to the security services. That was put in
24 evidence through Mr Barraclough. I haven't read it
25 recently, but so far as my recollection is, they are not

1 considered at all in Witness X's statement. Therefore,
2 as we currently stand, they are not addressed in the MI5
3 open material so far and that is a concern to us.
4 That's just an example, there are other issues -- the
5 relationship of Salman Abedi with other individuals, for
6 example -- and those aren't considered within
7 Witness X's statement.
8 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: Right, Mr Weatherby. I am quite happy
9 to invite the Secretary of State -- for Witness J to
10 deal with those matters in a separate statement if you
11 would like advance knowledge of what he proposed to say.
12 I was aware that there were going to be matters on which
13 cross-examination would take place in any event, but if
14 you do want them to be dealt with in statements
15 beforehand, I can certainly invite that to happen.
16 MR WEATHERBY: You've already ruled on the Rule 10 process
17 with respect to Witness J and Mr Scally, which of course
18 we're all aware of, and we will be raising issues on
19 that.
20 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: It's really just whether you want
21 advance knowledge of the answer or whether you're happy
22 to wait until then to get the answers.
23 MR WEATHERBY: We would like, in the normal way of all
24 witnesses, that the open evidence from MI5 deals with
25 all of the material that MI5 know is relevant, first of

1 all from their perspective alone, but also from the
2 matters that have been raised within this process and
3 the Abdallah text is an example of that.
4 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: Has the Rule 10 process started for that
5 or not yet?
6 MR WEATHERBY: We are due to file Rule 10 proposals,
7 I think, a week tomorrow.
8 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: Okay, thank you.
9 MR WEATHERBY: Just moving on, a few further points, I'm not
10 going to labour the points I made about special
11 advocates in writing, but I just want to finish by
12 raising three points, really.
13 First of all, there is no difference between the
14 position of any of the family teams on the aim of the
15 submissions. As you know, all of the families are
16 looking for maximum openness and transparency and
17 candour. The difference between us is merely one of
18 process and that's the difference between the family
19 teams in terms of the special advocates.
20 In terms of jurisdiction, the second point, HMG are
21 correct in saying that the starting point is to look
22 at the statutory regime to see whether there is an
23 express or implied power to appoint a special advocate,
24 and of course if there is such a clear power, then no
25 problem. But if there isn't such a clear power, it is

1 not correct to then presume that Parliament didn't
2 intend for such power to exist and the useful reference
3 that's been made this morning to the case of Roberts is
4 really a determinative point on that. In Roberts, of
5 course, the House of Lords confirmed that there was
6 a power not clearly set out but to be derived from the
7 general procedural power in the statute that lay behind
8 the Parole Board Rules. That's precisely the point here
9 on jurisdiction .
10 So the next step is to look at what the Act provides
11 more generally and the Act here is quite clear more
12 generally that it gives you, as the chair, a wide
13 discretion as to process, to devise the process to deal
14 with the terms of reference as you deem appropriate
15 within a limited number of important principles, for
16 example fairness.
17 Therefore we say that although HMG are right in the
18 starting point, they give up halfway through, if I can
19 put it that way, and that although it was a preliminary
20 view by Sir Robert Owen in Litvinenko, we would say that
21 it was persuasively put by a judge with a wealth of
22 experience in this area. And therefore we would say
23 there very clearly is a power to provide for a special
24 advocate.
25 Having said that, we argue against you exercising

1 the discretion for a special advocate, and we do so
2 because we say that it would achieve a result which is
3 rather the opposite of that intended by those proposing
4 it . Instead of providing a meaningful representation
5 for the families , it would merely give a misleading
6 impression that they were represented within closed
7 sessions, for the reasons that have been advanced by
8 Mr Greaney and others. In particular, the special
9 advocates would not be able to interact with the
10 families once they has seen or taken part in the closed
11 hearings. So we argue rhetorically, how would the
12 families know they had added any value to the process
13 one way or the other?
14 There has been no special advocate appointed in an
15 inquisitorial process. Not a determinative matter, but
16 one which we say is to be persuasively added to the mix,
17 if I can put it that way.
18 There are no advantages, therefore, that we can see
19 for a special advocate being brought into the process.
20 We can think of at least two disadvantages. First of
21 all , the point about counsel to the inquiry, their job
22 being to discuss with all CPs and engage with all CPs as
23 to how to make the process work as efficiently and
24 properly as possible, that will not stop because of the
25 closed hearings and therefore they are in a better

1 position than a special advocate would be.
2 But secondly, CTI, of course, have engaged from the
3 outset, and even if fully resourced, practically
4 it would be rather impossible for a special advocate to
5 get up to speed to the extent that CTI would. And it
6 shouldn't be forgotten that if a special advocate was
7 appointed, the families would not instruct a special
8 advocate to do anything, the families here have no
9 special knowledge of matters in a way that even in
10 Litvinenko, Mrs Litvinenko may have had some special
11 knowledge. But here, for the reasons that Mr Greaney
12 referred to earlier , the families have no special
13 knowledge, and therefore they have nothing to add
14 in that sense to the closed hearings. The special
15 advocate would be instructed by the same authority as
16 CTI and the special advocate would have no
17 responsibility to the families . So we say on the basis
18 of all those points, the special advocate would add
19 nothing positive to the process but would give an
20 impression, which wouldn't be right, that the families
21 actually did have a voice in the room. For those
22 reasons, on that one particular point, we part company
23 from two of the other family teams.
24 I'm not sure I can assist further .
25 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: I'm very grateful, Mr Weatherby,

1 thank you.
2 MR GREANEY: Sir, we have been going, again, for —— perhaps
3 it's in fact not quite an hour, so I will invite
4 Ms McGahey at least to start her submissions, please.
5 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: Thank you.
6 MS McGAHEY: Sir, I can hear you now.
7 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: Thank you very much.
8 Submissions by MS McGAHEY
9 MS McGAHEY: Sir, may I deal briefly first with the
10 submissions made to the effect that the families should
11 themselves, or their representatives, should be
12 permitted to be present during what is essentially at
13 the moment categorised as closed evidence.
14 The Secretary of State supports the submissions of
15 counsel to the inquiry and also, in particular , for the
16 reasons already identified , by Mr Justice Ouseley in the
17 authority cited, the risk of inadvertent disclosure is
18 simply too great.
19 My learned friend Mr Atkinson referred to the
20 restriction orders ruling made by Lord Justice Pitchford
21 in the undercover policing inquiry . I believe that the
22 order to which Mr Atkinson was referring was the
23 restriction orders, legal principles and approach ruling
24 of 3 May 2016 and to paragraph 171 of that ruling.
25 In my submission, what Lord Justice Pitchford had in

1 mind there, Sir Christopher Pitchford had in mind there
2 was a much, much more limited form of sharing of
3 information because what he did say was that there could
4 be -- he indicated a confidentiality ring was generally
5 undesirable for the reasons given by Mr Justice Ouseley,
6 essentially that they just didn't work and the risk of
7 an inadvertent disclosure was too great. And he went on
8 at paragraph 171 to say there might be exceptions where
9 there was a close identity of interest, but the example
10 he gave was where there were two police officers who
11 sought anonymity, the representatives of both might be
12 present for each other, or indeed when one police
13 officer was giving evidence and his partner was also
14 present or represented. In my submission those examples
15 of identity of interest are far, far narrower than the
16 identity of interest which is present here, which is
17 said to be the identity of interest shared by everybody
18 to prevent inadvertent disclosure that could assist
19 terrorists.
20 I have nothing further to say on the issue of the
21 access of families and their representatives more
22 generally.
23 Turning to the issue of special advocates,
24 I recognise that the Secretary of State is alone here in
25 submitting, sir, that you do not have the power to

1 appoint special advocates. I do note, however, in the
2 submissions by Greater Manchester Police, counsel there
3 noted that there were very powerful arguments against
4 the inquiry having such a power and indeed counsel to
5 the inquiry themselves indicate in their submissions
6 only that it is probable that you do so.
7 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: Well, apart from anything else, in
8 Roberts, Lord Bingham, as well as Lord Steyn, both
9 indicated that there was no power, but however they were
10 outvoted three to two.
11 MS McGAHEY: They were, sir. Lord Steyn in particular was
12 trenchant in his opinion that this was an utterly
13 unacceptable trampling over the prerogative of
14 Parliament.
15 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: And the Lord Chief Justice found it
16 rather awful that he was being accused of being quite so
17 unfair.
18 MS McGAHEY: Indeed. It was a very, very different
19 situation, that in Roberts, as you indicated at the
20 beginning, sir, because the situation was such that
21 either this material would not be taken into account, in
22 which case a prisoner who was very dangerous to the
23 public should go free, or it could be -- the information
24 could be given to him with the risk that an informant
25 might lose his or her life, and those ultimately were

1 the only two hideous possibilities. Those had to be
2 balanced against the need for that prisoner to receive
3 a fair hearing.
4 My submission is that the situation we have in this
5 inquiry is very, very different from that of the Parole
6 Board. A number of crucial distinctions. The Parole
7 Board example, just as the example of all the other
8 cases in the authorities referred to, are adversarial.
9 A party has a case. A party has --
10 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: I'm really sorry, by definition the
11 Parole Board is inquisitorial. That's how it actually
12 operates in practice. I understand that you can
13 discriminate on the basis that someone is being accused
14 of some form of misconduct or something against their
15 interests, but I don't think it is right to say it's
16 adversarial rather than inquisitorial. That's how the
17 Parole Board operates.
18 MS McGAHEY: I'm very grateful for that indication, sir.
19 I have to say I have no personal experience of appearing
20 before the Parole Board.
21 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: Well, you should try it.
22 MS McGAHEY: Thank you, sir. It was recognised in Roberts
23 that for Article 5(4) purposes, the Parole Board was
24 identifiable as a court; paragraph 66 in Lord Steyn's
25 judgment. In that case, the rights of that prisoner

1 were being determined, the right to be free or the
2 compulsion to stay in prison perhaps for the rest of his
3 life. In my submission, sir, the situation is very,
4 very different here, where your inquiry is vastly -- if
5 I can say vastly more inquisitorial, if there are
6 categories of inquisitorial proceedings, because the
7 interests are far, far wider. And also crucially,
8 although I'll certainly defer to you on expertise as to
9 Parole Board procedure, there is no equivalent of
10 counsel to the inquest or counsel to the inquiry, any
11 form of amicus.
12 The situation being addressed in Roberts was one in
13 which either this material could be used or it couldn't
14 and there was nobody to represent the interests of that
15 prisoner, nobody there to see fair play, no neutral
16 counsel. And for that reason, Lord Woolf did, with what
17 appears to be some reluctance, agree that this was the
18 only measure, that in a situation that was not ideal,
19 this was the least worst solution.
20 And indeed, from certainly 2016 onwards, and the
21 Parole Board Rules from 2016 onwards, as I understand
22 it, the appointment of the special advocate has been put
23 on a statutory footing.
24 But sir, my submission is that there still remain
25 very grave difficulties in implying a power where none

1 has been granted expressly by statute. It has been set
2 out already in our written submissions, so I won't
3 repeat what is there. But my submission is that the
4 difficulty is exemplified by matters raised by counsel
5 to the inquiry. As counsel to the inquiry asserted in
6 their written submissions, any special advocate
7 appointed to represent the interests of a core
8 participant would have no immunity from suit. And
9 counsel to the inquiry also referred to the special
10 advocate acting for core participants as clients.
11 In my submission, sir, that would be a very, very
12 substantial departure from the role of a special
13 advocate in any other statutory proceedings, well, with
14 the exception of the Parole Board, to which I'll come
15 back. In all other statutory proceedings in which I am
16 aware, where a special advocate can be appointed, the
17 empowering statute provides that the special advocate is
18 not responsible to the party to the proceedings whose
19 interests that special advocate represents. And for the
20 record, that provision is present in paragraph 10.4 of
21 schedule 4 of the Terrorism Prevention and Investigation
22 Measures Act (2011), the TPIM Act. It is present in
23 section 6.4 of the Special Immigration Appeals
24 Commission Act (1997). It is present in section 9.4 of
25 the Justice and Security Act (2013). It is present in

1 schedule 3, paragraph 7.4, of the Terrorism Act (2005).
2 In section 91.8(b) of the Northern Ireland Act (1998)
3 and in schedule 6, paragraph 6, section 4 of the
4 Anti-terrorism, Crime and Security Act (2011).
5 All of these acts provide that a special advocate
6 owes no duty to the individual or person whose interests
7 he represents. And indeed my learned friend
8 Mr Weatherby, making submissions just now, acknowledged
9 that a special advocate should have no such duty.
10 Oddly, sir, the Parole Board Rules of 2019 do not appear
11 to contain that provision, the only one of which I'm
12 aware.
13 But taking the special advocate regime more
14 generally, in the way it applies everywhere else other
15 than potentially the Parole Board, a special advocate
16 owes no duty to the person whose interests he's
17 representing, and therefore in practice has immunity
18 from suit.
19 In my submission, it would be very odd indeed if
20 a special advocate appointed by a public inquiry owed
21 duties but the special advocate appointed by the
22 Attorney General following a request by the court did
23 not. It was also not clear from counsel to the inquiry
24 whether a special advocate appointed to represent the
25 inquiry itself would have immunity from suit. Because

1 if not, that would lead to the very odd result that
2 counsel to the inquiry would have that benefit but the
3 inquiry's special advocate would not.
4 Sir, in my submission, this inquiry has no power to
5 order that a special advocate should have no immunity
6 from suit.
7 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: The other case referred to by counsel to
8 the inquiry is the case of Competition and Markets
9 Authority, which does appear to say that there is
10 a common law power to appoint a special advocate. I can
11 understand that you can argue the use of the power,
12 where there's no statutory authority, either primary or
13 secondary, would be exceptional. It's the argument that
14 I just have no power to do so, which seems to me... Are
15 you saying generally if there is no statutory power to
16 appoint then there is no power to have a special
17 advocate? In which case you run across, appear to cross
18 Roberts and also the Competition and Markets Authority.
19 Or do you say in the case of inquiries, there is no
20 power to do it, and in that case why do you exclude the
21 exceptional case?
22 I can understand the submission which says it can
23 only be exceptional, but you're saying no power.
24 MS McGAHEY: We say that a public inquiry has no power, yes.
25 We say regardless of the situation at common law with

1 courts, an inquiry has no power.
2 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: Okay.
3 MS McGAHEY: You don't really need to rule, sir, whether the
4 House of Lords was correct in 2005 in Roberts because
5 the position with respect to special advocates has now
6 been put on a statutory footing in any event.
7 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: I don't think I would be entitled to say
8 the House of Lords was wrong. That seems to go beyond
9 my power, but yes, thank you.
10 MS McGAHEY: But it's not the present situation in any event
11 and one wonders why, if the common law power were
12 considered appropriate, there was felt to be a need to
13 make the statutory provision in the Parole Board rules
14 for a special advocate.
15 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: I think the answer to that is to do with
16 the increase in terrorist cases that were being dealt
17 with, so it was going to become a more common occurrence
18 than it had been in Roberts, which is accepted as being
19 highly exceptional. I think that's the reason.
20 MS McGAHEY: Thank you, sir.
21 But in an inquiry, there is already a very detailed
22 statutory regime, set out both in the Inquiries Act and
23 in the Inquiry Rules 2006, and my submission, sir,
24 is that it would be extraordinary if Parliament had
25 wished there to be the power to appoint special

1 advocates but yet had not done so.
2 In the Greater Manchester Police submissions, my
3 learned friend Mr Horwell sets out in detail reasons
4 against -- that an inquiry should not hold such a power,
5 but goes on to say, as do counsel to the inquiry, that
6 it is possible to have an inquiry in which there's no
7 counsel to the inquiry and therefore one must -- and for
8 that reason alone, the police say, therefore one must
9 imply a power to appoint a special advocate to deal with
10 situations in which there is no CTI.
11 My submission, sir, is that that is wrong. If an
12 advocate is needed where there is no counsel to the
13 inquiry, the solution is to appoint counsel to the
14 inquiry. It doesn't have to be an appointment forever,
15 it can be an appointment for a limited purpose. Rule 2
16 of the Inquiry Rules just says:
17 "Counsel to the inquiry is someone appointed as
18 counsel (to the inquiry)."
19 My submission is that that is where the solution
20 lies: there is no need for a special advocate and no
21 need for statutory provision for one or an implied power
22 for one because there is counsel to the inquiry. And
23 in that respect, a public inquiry differs completely
24 from any court proceedings and from the Parole Board.
25 For that reason, sir, perhaps it isn't necessary for

1 me to go into detail about the further distinctions
2 between the common law power of the courts and those of
3 an inquiry. My submission is those common law
4 authorities all relate to instances in which an
5 appointment is being made or suggested, where there's
6 a recognised or an existing procedural framework within
7 which the special advocate can operate, for example
8 a PII hearing, or where the proceedings are closely
9 analogous to those in which special advocates were
10 already appointed by statute. A public inquiry doesn't
11 have that framework, it doesn't have that framework for
12 special advocates at all. It has a very different one
13 and a very specific one: counsel to the inquiry has
14 immunity from suit. If there were an entitlement by
15 statute -- if there were an entitlement to have special
16 advocates, special advocates would have that entitlement
17 too and there is no such provision within the Inquiries
18 Act or the Inquiry Rules.
19 My submission, sir, also is that on any view, the
20 authorities indicate that appointment of a special
21 advocate, absent statutory provision, is one of last
22 resort, where there is no other means of achieving
23 justice, and that's very clearly from the Parole Board
24 case. My submission is that the concept of achieving
25 justice as between parties to litigation or indeed

1 a prisoner before a Parole Board and
2 a Secretary of State opposing parole do not apply to
3 a public inquiry. The task of a chairman is not to
4 ensure a fair trial or even to uphold the rights of
5 particular individuals, but it is to conduct a full and
6 fearless investigation in accordance with the inquiry's
7 terms of reference. And in my submission, the
8 principles identified in these authorities are of
9 limited application when it comes to seeking to
10 transpose them to the proceedings of a public inquiry.
11 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: Ms McGahey, I was just trying to think
12 of possible arguments where occasionally a special
13 advocate may be necessary. Take a public inquiry which
14 was set up arising from a death caused by the police, so
15 there are various individual police officers who could
16 be criticised by an inquiry for their behaviour and
17 there is some information which may be critical of those
18 particular police officers or a particular police
19 officer, which cannot be disclosed to them because of
20 matters of national security and so they can't provide
21 any sort of answer to what may be being put forward.
22 Might that not be an occasion when a special advocate
23 might be required?
24 MS McGAHEY: My submission is no, sir, because the job would
25 be taken on by counsel to the inquiry and counsel to the

1 inquiry would have all the advantages already identified
2 by counsel to the present inquiry in that those counsel
3 could continue to liaise with the police officers and
4 their representatives. They would be in a position to
5 put together a gist, they would be in a position to say
6 very strongly, "This is not going to work", for whatever
7 reason, or they're in a position to say, "These are
8 inquisitorial proceedings, this inquiry on any view
9 will not determine civil or criminal liability", and
10 therefore one has to accept the limitations which always
11 exists in closed proceedings.
12 I'm trying to...
13 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: That's fine. Thank you.
14 MS McGAHEY: Sir, may I turn briefly to the submissions made
15 by Mr Cooper at the beginning. He referred repeatedly
16 to the test of an appointment of a special advocate in
17 exceptional circumstances and said that it was met,
18 essentially because, in his submission, MI5 had failed.
19 My submission is that whether exceptional
20 circumstances are present does not depend on whether the
21 security agencies or anyone else before this inquiry
22 have been at fault. If a power exists at all, the
23 exceptional circumstances in which a special advocate
24 should be appointed is when the interests of justice
25 require it and there is no other means of achieving

1 justice.
2 In the context of this inquiry, sir, my submission
3 is that counsel to the inquiry not only can do but
4 should do the task that special advocates would do, for
5 all the reasons that have been articulated by counsel to
6 the inquiry, my learned friend Mr Weatherby, and also by
7 the Secretary of State in her written submissions.
8 My learned friend Mr Cooper asks why should the
9 Secretary of State be present if the families are not or
10 the family representatives in the form of special
11 advocates are not. My submission is that that
12 misrepresents the position. Firstly, this is not
13 adversarial, it's not a tit for tat, it is not an
14 equality of arms situation, it is a procedure, the
15 closed procedure, being used to enable you to assess and
16 counsel to the inquiry to probe evidence that cannot be
17 made public.
18 Secondly, the answer is, of course, that witnesses
19 are entitled to representation before you and that means
20 appropriately cleared advocates who are entitled to
21 appear before you in closed session.
22 Thirdly, the Secretary of State's legal team are in
23 a position during closed hearings to deal with questions
24 such as, "Can this be gisted? Is there another document
25 that goes to this? Is there something missing here?

97

1 Surely it's possible to unredact paragraph 6?" Those
2 are all reasons for the Secretary of State's counsel and
3 solicitor to be present.
4 My submission is that there is no need, if you have
5 a discretion at all to appoint special advocates, for
6 there to be extra special representation for the
7 families because of the nature of this evidence. It is
8 a task that counsel to the inquiry can and should
9 conduct themselves.
10 Sir, unless I can assist you further, the
11 Secretary of State relies on her written submissions and
12 those are my oral ones.
13 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: Thank you very much, Ms McGahey.
14 MR GREANEY: Sir, Mr Horwell has been in touch with me to
15 indicate that he doesn't wish to amplify orally his
16 submissions in writing.
17 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: I'm grateful. I have read his
18 submissions. That, I hope, is apparent.
19 MR GREANEY: Sir, there is no particular issue upon which we
20 propose to reply, even assuming it would be appropriate
21 for a reply from us given the circumstances, but if
22 there are any particular issues you would like me to
23 address, I will seek to do so.
24 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: No, thank you.
25 MR GREANEY: May I say this by way of, I hope, reassurance,

98

1 that whatever your ruling on this application, counsel
2 to the inquiry will ensure that the degree of scrutiny
3 of the conduct of Counter-terrorism Policing and the
4 security service will be intense in the highest degree.
5 We certainly will not proceed on the basis that they are
6 infallible, nor will we proceed on the basis that they
7 never do things that they ought not to do.
8 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: Thank you.
9 I will give a judgment as soon as I can. There are
10 important matters of principle which I propose to deal
11 with in any event and there are other practical matters.
12 I will hope to do so, certainly after next weekend if
13 I can, if that's sufficiently early for people. I may
14 give a short judgment orally because written judgments
15 tend to be quite long and sometimes not everyone wishes
16 to read them all but just go to the last paragraph.
17 I will give a short oral judgement but I will also give
18 a more detailed written judgment.
19 MR COOPER: We're very grateful, thank you.
20 MR GREANEY: Sir, we won't be in a position to restart until
21 2 o'clock, when I will make a very short opening
22 statement in relation to chapters 11 and 12, and then
23 call Dr Lumb, the consultant forensic pathologist.
24 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: Thank you for the brevity and the
25 clarity with which the submissions were made.

99

1 Thank you.
2 (12.20 pm)
3 (The lunch adjournment)
4 (2.00 pm)
5 Opening statement by MR GREANEY
6 MR GREANEY: Sir, good afternoon. As I indicated before
7 lunch, we are turning now to chapters 11 and 12.
8 Chapter 11 deals with the evidence of what happens
9 during an explosion and how the pathologists responded
10 to the events of 22 May. Chapter 12 then deals with the
11 experience on the night of the attack of each of the 22
12 who died.
13 These chapters are a vital but plainly difficult
14 part of the oral evidence hearings and it is appropriate
15 that we should make some brief remarks about them by way
16 of introduction.
17 We will begin by setting out in summary form what
18 issues appear to the inquiry legal team to arise
19 in relation to chapters 11 and 12, and in broad terms
20 there are two of them.
21 First, these chapters will serve as an investigation
22 as to how and in what circumstances each of those who
23 were killed died. They will aim to answer the questions
24 which would have been required to be ascertained and to
25 address the medical cause of death in the event that

100

1 this inquiry had remained 22 inquests.
2 Second, in doing so, the inquiry will consider the
3 issue of survivability in the case of each of those who
4 died. This is, of course, an important question in its
5 own right and, moreover, will be capable of bearing on
6 the consequences of any failure in the adequacy and/or
7 effectiveness of the emergency response.
8 The investigation of these issues has its origin in
9 chapters 9 and 10. Chapters 11 and 12 will provide the
10 opportunity to continue and conclude those enquiries so
11 that the answers that each of the families of the
12 deceased deserve can be given.
13 We will turn next to provide a high-level
14 introduction to the evidence we'll hear in chapters 11
15 and 12.
16 In chapter 11, an expert in forensic pathology,
17 Dr Lumb, who in fact is seated in the witness box ready
18 to give evidence, along with experts in the effect of
19 the impact of a blast wave from the detonation of
20 a bomb, the blast wave panel, will be called.
21 In this capital, chapter 11, the evidence of Dr Lumb
22 will be confined to providing an explanation of the
23 approach adopted by the team of forensic pathologists
24 who dealt with those who died. He will explain that his
25 role as a Home Office pathologist and that of his

1 colleagues is to conduct post-mortem examinations upon
2 those who have died in suspicious circumstances.
3 On the night of the arena attack, Dr Lumb was duty
4 forensic pathologist for Manchester and other areas and
5 was alerted to what had happened at the arena at 6 am on
6 23 May. He will explain what happened in the hours and
7 days thereafter so that the families of those who died,
8 and indeed the public at large, can have confidence that
9 an appropriate process was adopted by the pathologists.
10 The evidence of the blast wave panel in chapter 11
11 will be confined to an overview of the effect of
12 a detonation and the five separate ways from primary to
13 quinary that an explosion may harm the human body. That
14 evidence will be called tomorrow morning.
15 Although the panel will not deal with any individual
16 in their evidence at this stage, their evidence will, at
17 least to some extent, be graphic and undoubtedly
18 distressing and so we invite those most directly
19 affected to consider closely whether they need to watch
20 and listen to that evidence.
21 The blast wave panel will explain in chapter 11 that
22 in relation to each of the 22 who died, they have
23 provided an opinion falling into one of three
24 categories.
25 First, unsurvivable injuries, meaning that they were

1 so severe that even if the most comprehensive and
2 advanced medical treatment available at the time was
3 initiated immediately after injury survival was deemed
4 impossible.
5 Second, unlikely to be survivable, meaning that the
6 injuries were so severe that even if the most
7 comprehensive and advanced medical treatment was
8 initiated immediately after injury, survival would not
9 be expected although it would not be impossible.
10 Third, potentially survivable, meaning injuries that
11 could prove fatal but where the experts are aware of or
12 have direct experience of individuals who have survived
13 such injuries.
14 However, sir, as we have made plain, in chapter 11,
15 neither Dr Lumb nor the blast wave panel will give
16 evidence about any individual deceased. So the evidence
17 in chapter 11 will provide the context for the evidence
18 in chapter 12.
19 Chapter 12 is concerned with the experience of each
20 of those who died and will commence tomorrow afternoon
21 at, I believe, 1.30.
22 It will involve the hearing of evidence relating to
23 each of the 22. This will include evidence about them
24 as a person, about how they came to be in the City Room,
25 and about them after the explosion. There will be

1 evidence, usually a brief summary, that will be read
2 from the pathologist who performed the post-mortem
3 examinations. The blast wave panel will also be
4 recalled to give their evidence about whether or not the
5 injuries which were sustained by each were or may have
6 been survivable if different or earlier attention had
7 been given.
8 In one case, the case of Saffie-Rose Roussos,
9 additional expert evidence will be called on the issue
10 of survivability because that is likely to be
11 a particularly complex question in her case. The
12 inquiry legal team has liaised closely with those who
13 represent her over that question and we are grateful for
14 their help and cooperation.
15 Sir, additional expert evidence has also been
16 obtained about John Atkinson and we anticipate will be
17 called too. Again, there has been a good deal of help
18 and cooperation from those who represent his family.
19 Tomorrow afternoon, as chapter 12 starts,
20 Ms Cartwright will explain the process by which the
21 chapter 12 evidence has been gathered and the procedure
22 that will be adopted during chapter 12 itself and will
23 also indicate the intended timetable. As a result, it
24 is not necessary for me to deal with those issues now.
25 Finally, we are conscious of how difficult this

1 section of evidence will be for each bereaved family.
2 Everyone will wish to ensure that answers are found to
3 help each family but that it is done in the most careful
4 and sensitive way possible.
5 Sir, that is all we propose to say in what we said
6 would be brief opening remarks.
7 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: Mr Greaney, I'm well aware that an
8 enormous amount of work has been going on behind the
9 scenes between counsel to the inquiry and counsels for
10 the families to try and deal with this obviously in
11 necessary detail but also in a way which is most
12 acceptable and best for the families. I am really very
13 grateful to everybody for the efforts they have made.
14 MR GREANEY: Sir, thank you for those remarks. May I add
15 that I do not believe there could have been any greater
16 cooperation than has in fact occurred.
17 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: Thank you.
18 MR GREANEY: Could I turn immediately then to ask that
19 Dr Lumb be sworn, please.
20 DR PHILIP LUMB (sworn)
21 Questions from MR GREANEY
22 MR GREANEY: Doctor, would you begin by identifying
23 yourself, please?
24 A. Yes. My name is Dr Phil Derek Lumb. I'm a forensic
25 pathologist on the Home Office register. We're

1 sometimes known as Home Office pathologists.
2 Q. What is the role of a forensic pathologist, please?
3 A. Yes, most of our work involves conducting post−mortem
4 examinations upon individuals who have died in
5 suspicious circumstances.
6 Q. You have described yourself as a Home Office
7 pathologist. What is the Home Office pathologist list,
8 please?
9 A. Yes. This is a list of pathologists who have the
10 requisite qualifications to conduct post−mortem
11 examinations on deaths in suspicious circumstances. So
12 we are not in fact employees, it's just a list held by
13 the Home Office and that permits us to do this type of
14 work.
15 Q. Do the Home Office pathologists in England and Wales
16 work within areas called group practices?
17 A. Yes, that's correct.
18 Q. And is the group practice within which you work and
19 indeed worked in May 2017, one that covers a large area,
20 including North Wales, Merseyside, Lancashire, Cumbria,
21 Greater Manchester, South Yorkshire, West Yorkshire and
22 Humberside?
23 A. Yes, that's correct.
24 Q. In total, how many Home Office pathologists are there or
25 were there in 2017 covering that area?

1 A. There were 11 forensic pathologists covering that area.
2 Q. On a day−to−day basis, however, was that geographical
3 area divided up into sub−areas?
4 A. Yes, that's correct. So it's divided into three areas
5 and myself and three other colleagues now cover the
6 Greater Manchester area and South Yorkshire area. So
7 that's what we do on a day−to−day basis, cover that
8 area.
9 Q. And the two colleagues with whom you covered that area
10 were?
11 A. In 2017, Dr Naomi Carter and Dr Charles Wilson.
12 Q. Did you and those two colleagues principally work from
13 three mortuaries?
14 A. Yes, that's correct. Our main mortuaries are at the
15 Royal Blackburn Hospital, the Medico−Legal Centre in
16 Sheffield, and the mortuary at the Royal Oldham Hospital
17 in Manchester.
18 Q. And it's going to be the mortuary at the Royal Oldham
19 Hospital that is of principal relevance to your evidence
20 today, am I right?
21 A. That's correct.
22 Q. Does your group run a weekly rota?
23 A. Yes, that's correct. It runs from a Monday to a Monday
24 and you're on call for the entire week. And then the
25 following week, somebody else takes over. So yes,

1 that's how we run.
2 Q. As a group, are Home Office pathologists expected to
3 provide a forensic pathology service in the event of
4 what is usually described as a mass fatality incident?
5 A. Yes, that's correct. That would be expected of the
6 local group practice.
7 Q. In order to plan for such a terrible event, had you
8 undertaken planning prior to May 2017?
9 A. Yes, we had. Many of us had been involved in previous
10 incidents before. We also have regular run−throughs of
11 how we may deal with a situation and I certainly worked
12 closely with Michelle Hoyle, who was the mortuary
13 manager at the Royal Oldham Hospital, just to plan how
14 we would organise things during the course of a mass
15 fatality incident.
16 Q. So two particular planning aspects: one, you had,
17 I think, previously met with senior police officers of,
18 so far as relevant to our case, Greater Manchester
19 Police?
20 A. Yes, that's correct, so we met with them previously to
21 discuss a mass fatality incident, yes.
22 Q. And as you just told us, you had done what you describe
23 as walk−throughs with the mortuary manager at Royal
24 Oldham Hospital in order to establish a process by which
25 you would deal with a mass fatality incident?

1 A. That's correct.
2 Q. Did you yourself also have some involvement with other
3 mass fatality incidents --
4 A. Yes.
5 Q. -- or the aftermath to them?
6 A. Yes. I was involved in the Selby rail disaster in 2001,
7 a mass fatality incident, and also I've been involved
8 again with the inquests into the Hillsborough disaster
9 some years after the event. So I'd had some involvement
10 in mass fatality incidents.
11 Q. And did your experience in relation to the Selby rail
12 disaster and the inquests into those who died in the
13 Hillsborough disaster assist you in formulating the
14 approach that you're going to tell us about to the
15 attack at the Manchester Arena?
16 A. Yes, that's correct. So observing those incidents
17 helped me formulate a plan for this incident, yes.
18 Q. You have explained to us the duty rota system and is it
19 the position that during the week commencing
20 22 May 2017, you were the duty forensic pathologist for
21 Greater Manchester Police?
22 A. Yes, that's correct.
23 Q. On the morning of 23 May, at about 6 am, were you made
24 aware of the events that had occurred the night before
25 at Manchester Arena?

1 A. Yes, that's correct, I was made aware of them.
2 Q. As duty pathologist, what was your role thereafter to
3 be?
4 A. Because I was the on-call pathologist that week,
5 it would naturally fall to me to become the lead
6 pathologist and there's a variety of different roles
7 I would take on during that week.
8 Q. We'll just identify in summary what those roles are.
9 The context, I suppose, is that in relation to such an
10 event at the arena in which many people sadly died you
11 would not be able to carry out all the work of forensic
12 pathology yourself?
13 A. That's correct, yes, we would need the assistance of
14 other pathologists.
15 Q. There would need to be a team?
16 A. That's correct.
17 Q. And you would therefore have a role in leading and
18 coordinating that team?
19 A. That's correct.
20 Q. So as for the lead pathologist's basic roles, those
21 roles you performed during the period from 23 May, first
22 of all was it your responsibility to organise the
23 pathological involvement in the incident?
24 A. Yes, that's correct.
25 Q. Meaning that it was for you to identify other

1 pathologists to work with you in relation to the attack?
2 A. Yes, that's correct.
3 Q. Along with organising cover for the pathology that may
4 need to be carried out in relation to other unconnected
5 deaths?
6 A. Yes, that's correct.
7 Q. Was it part of your basic role to help to set up the
8 mortuary?
9 A. Yes, I'd have a role in that.
10 Q. To design the mortuary process, including coordinating
11 with other organisations?
12 A. That's correct, yes.
13 Q. And to be a point of contact for other agencies such as
14 the police?
15 A. Yes, that's correct.
16 Q. Having yourself become aware of the arena attack at 6.00
17 on the morning of the 23rd, did you make contact with
18 your colleagues within your group?
19 A. Yes. I made contact with Dr Carter and Dr Wilson to
20 make them aware of the situation.
21 Q. Did they indicate that each of them would be available
22 immediately to come to assist the response?
23 A. Yes, they did.
24 Q. Was it also necessary for you to contact other
25 Home Office pathologists, not within your group or

1 subgroup but within your broader group?
2 A. Yes, I contacted other pathologists within the broader
3 group, namely Drs Kirsten Hope and Michael Parsons and
4 they offered their assistance. Dr Hope was going to
5 take over the post-mortem examinations for any other
6 suspicious deaths, unconnected suspicious deaths, that
7 had occurred, and Dr Parsons was going to help us during
8 the process.
9 Q. Did you also during that period of the early morning of
10 the 23rd make contact with Mr Meadows, Her Majesty's
11 Coroner for the City of Manchester?
12 A. Yes, that's correct.
13 Q. And moreover, for reasons we are going to come on to,
14 even at that stage was it clear to you that radiological
15 assessment of those who had died would form a critical
16 part of your investigation?
17 A. Yes, that's correct.
18 Q. As a result, did you contact or were you put in contact
19 with someone who was an expert in that area?
20 A. Yes, that's correct. I was given basically a contact
21 number for an individual that would help us.
22 Q. Were those contact details you were given for
23 Colonel Ian Gibb?
24 A. Yes, that's correct.
25 Q. Who was a colleague that you knew had been involved, for

1 example, among other events, in the aftermath of the 7/7
2 London terror attacks?
3 A. That was my understanding, yes.
4 Q. Your understanding is correct. Did you then attempt to
5 make contact with Colonel Gibb?
6 A. Yes, that's correct. I made contact with him just to
7 basically explore the possibility of him helping us
8 in the case. I passed on the contact number to the
9 coroner as well.
10 Q. And although implicit in the evidence you have given,
11 Colonel Gibb was an expert in radiology?
12 A. That's correct.
13 Q. Was one of the matters you raised with Colonel Gibb the
14 availability of a mobile CT scanner?
15 A. Yes, that's correct. The Royal Oldham Hospital mortuary
16 doesn't have a CT scanner attached to it and I was aware
17 of a mobile CT scanner that I'd used in various
18 exercises before. And next to the Royal Oldham Hospital
19 is a position where we could have placed that mobile CT
20 scanner.
21 Q. So did you in fact make arrangements for that to occur?
22 A. Yes, that's correct.
23 Q. Did you, without going into really too much detail, then
24 take steps to ensure that the mortuary at the Royal
25 Oldham Hospital would be used exclusively in connection

1 with those who had died in the arena attack?
2 A. Yes, and all that process was actually well underway in
3 any event, so that was all being arranged.
4 Q. Having spoken to those people and having taken those
5 steps, did you then begin to make your way to the Royal
6 Oldham Hospital mortuary?
7 A. Yes, that's correct.
8 Q. At what time did you arrive?
9 A. About 10.30 in the morning.
10 Q. As you've indicated already, by the time you arrived,
11 had the entire mortuary at that hospital already been
12 made available for your exclusive use?
13 A. Yes, the mortuary staff had already been preparing it
14 and getting it ready for the mass fatality incident,
15 yes.
16 Q. So were you content that the arrangements that needed to
17 be made for the forensic pathology response to an awful
18 event such as this were operating as they ought to be?
19 A. Yes, very much so. They were all in action and ready.
20 Q. At the mortuary, did you meet with your colleagues,
21 Dr Carter and Dr Wilson?
22 A. Yes, that's correct.
23 Q. Did the three of you then travel to the arena itself and
24 indeed to the City Room?
25 A. We did, yes. That's correct.

1 Q. At what time did you arrive at the outer cordon of the
2 scene?
3 A. 12.27 hours that day.
4 Q. In summary form, what was the purpose, and indeed the
5 importance, if it was important, of the forensic
6 pathologists making a visit to the scene?
7 A. Yes, a number of reasons to visit the scene. At that
8 time, many of the investigating officers and the coroner
9 were present at the scene, so it was important to meet
10 with them. We could conduct an early assessment of what
11 resources we may need, for example the number of
12 pathologists that may be needed and the DVI teams. We
13 had the opportunity to also speak to the crime scene
14 manager and to a number of -- for a number of reasons
15 and what we were to expect and were there any hazards
16 and to ensure that there wasn't a CBRN hazard in this
17 case as well. CBRN stands for chemical, biological,
18 radiological and nuclear, so to ensure there wasn't
19 a contaminant that we needed special equipment for, but
20 that was not the case.
21 Q. Yes.
22 A. One of the other important reasons was it may have been
23 possible for me to give an early indication as to how
24 long the process might take as well.
25 Q. Was it, moreover, important to the work that you were to

1 do to see where within the scene those who had died
2 were?
3 A. Yes, so the position of the deceased can help explain
4 some of the pathologies found in this case, so that was
5 important as well.
6 Q. And were those who had died still at the scene at that
7 time?
8 A. That's correct, yes.
9 Q. Were two other purposes of your visit to enable
10 a discussion of what you describe as identity continuity
11 to occur?
12 A. Yes, that's just to understand how the identity would be
13 maintained from the scene all the way through the
14 process.
15 Q. And also so that a discussion could take place about the
16 removal of those who were dead from the scene in a way
17 that was both safe and dignified?
18 A. That's correct, yes.
19 Q. Did you meet at the scene Detective Chief
20 Inspector Crompton, one of the senior investigators?
21 A. Yes, that's correct.
22 Q. The coroner, Mr Meadows?
23 A. Yes, that's correct.
24 Q. And other representatives of the coroner and Greater
25 Manchester Police?

1 A. That's correct, yes.
2 Q. Without going into the detail of it, whilst there at the
3 scene, were you provided with a history of what the
4 police understood at that stage had happened by
5 Detective Chief Inspector Crompton?
6 A. Yes, I was given a background.
7 Q. Would that be entirely conventional that you would
8 receive the history as it was understood at that stage?
9 A. Yes, that's normal for any Home Office autopsy we
10 conduct: we get a briefing prior to the commencement by
11 investigating officers.
12 Q. Were you led from the outer cordon to the inner cordon
13 of the scene at 12.57 hours?
14 A. Yes, that's correct.
15 Q. Was it possible for you to walk into the central area of
16 the scene itself?
17 A. No. We had to walk around the outside. There was
18 a health and safety concern about falling glass from the
19 ceiling above.
20 Q. But is it the position that nonetheless you were able to
21 obtain the information that you required about where
22 those who were dead were positioned from the position
23 that you were in within the inner cordon?
24 A. Yes, that's correct.
25 Q. And was it, moreover, established by you and your team

1 that steps had been taken by the police to ensure that
2 the position of each dead person had been properly
3 documented by photographs being taken?
4 A. Yes, that's correct, yes.
5 Q. What time did you and your colleagues leave the scene?
6 A. At 13.19 hours.
7 Q. Did you do so in order to attend what is known as a mass
8 fatalities coordinating meeting?
9 A. That's correct, yes.
10 Q. Did that take place at Greater Manchester Police force
11 headquarters?
12 A. It did, yes.
13 Q. Discussing many issues that did not bear directly upon
14 the forensic pathology?
15 A. Yes, that's correct.
16 Q. But towards the end were some issues that were of
17 relevance to you addressed?
18 A. That's correct, yes.
19 Q. During the late afternoon of that same day, 23 May, did
20 you and your colleagues return to the mortuary at Royal
21 Oldham Hospital?
22 A. Yes, we did, yes.
23 Q. What was the purpose of returning there at that stage?
24 A. We were going to have a discussion at that point about
25 the approach to the post-mortem examinations, and we

1 gathered together to have a discussion about that.
2 Q. Did you also during that process contact Dr Daniel
3 du Plessis, a consultant neuropathologist based at the
4 Royal Salford Hospital?
5 A. Yes, that's correct.
6 Q. To what end?
7 A. So Dr Du Plessis is a neuropathologist and we sought his
8 advice on the necessity for any specialist samples to be
9 taken and he gave us some advice.
10 Q. During that meeting of the pathologists at the mortuary,
11 did you discuss the main considerations of and,
12 moreover, objectives of the post-mortem examinations
13 that you and your team intended to carry out?
14 A. Yes, that's correct.
15 Q. And what were those considerations and objectives?
16 A. These are very similar to many suspicious deaths that we
17 conduct. So there was -- evidence recovery is one
18 objective. Identification of the deceased and
19 documentation of the injuries and all the other
20 pathological findings, so that includes natural disease
21 also. Then ultimately to provide the cause of death.
22 We knew that survivability may be an issue, so we
23 discussed the fact that we needed to document, for
24 example, puncture marks and so forth, and injury
25 assessment in order to assist viewing at a later stage.

1 Q. In relation to survivability, we'll all have understood
2 what you were looking for, but at that early stage, did
3 you understand that in due course that important issue
4 of survivability would be likely to involve
5 consideration by other experts in addition to the
6 forensic pathologists?
7 A. That's correct.
8 Q. And that you therefore needed to have in mind the need
9 to gather information that they might need in order to
10 assist in their assessment?
11 A. Yes, that's correct.
12 Q. You told us that at a very early stage you made contact
13 with Colonel Gibb, the radiologist, and I indicated that
14 you would come on to tell us why you thought that
15 radiology was likely to be of considerable importance.
16 So could you identify, please, for us, because this may
17 be an issue during the course of chapter 12, why you
18 felt at that point that radiology was important?
19 A. Yes. So in this case, it was going to assist us in
20 evidence recovery. Very commonly in cases where there
21 are missiles within the body, radiology can help us find
22 them. There's a health and safety role in these cases
23 for us, particularly as pathologists -- there are often
24 sharp fragments in these sort of cases, so it would
25 alert us to where those were and, if possible, to avoid

1 those.
2 Q. I think I can probably take the balance of this rather
3 more shortly. The radiology was important for reasons
4 connected with the assistance of identification and also
5 to enable you to pre-plan the post-mortem or autopsy
6 examinations?
7 A. Yes, that's correct.
8 Q. Necessarily, was a decision made that full post-mortem
9 examinations should be conducted in relation to each of
10 the 22 who had died?
11 A. Yes, that's correct.
12 Q. And that careful steps would need to be taken to ensure
13 that the examinations were recorded photographically?
14 A. Yes, that's a standard process for us in Home Office
15 cases, to take still images.
16 Q. Did you also agree, and we don't need to go into the
17 detail of this for my purposes, a pathological sampling
18 protocol?
19 A. Yes, we did.
20 Q. Relating to histology and blood?
21 A. That's correct.
22 Q. And did you agree that some of the injuries could be
23 given standard terminology?
24 A. Yes, that's correct.
25 Q. Was it resolved that the post-mortem examinations should

1 be conducted by three teams?
2 A. Yes, that's correct.
3 Q. And what was it intended each of those teams should be
4 comprised of?
5 A. The teams normally would comprise the pathologist, an
6 anatomical pathology technologist, basically they are an
7 assistant to the pathologist, a forensic imaging
8 specialist to take the photographs, exhibits officers
9 and they would normally take samples, DVI officers,
10 again part of the process, and scene of crime
11 investigators. So that was the essential make-up of
12 each team.
13 Q. Did you then identify a timetable for carrying out of
14 the post-mortem examinations?
15 A. Yes, a timetable was constructed.
16 Q. And at about this time, did the mobile CT scanning unit
17 arrive and was it prepared for use?
18 A. Yes, it was, that's correct.
19 Q. During the course of 23 May, did the bodies of those who
20 had died arrive at the mortuary?
21 A. Yes, they did, that's correct.
22 Q. Were steps taken to ensure that the dignity of the
23 deceased was preserved?
24 A. Yes, that's correct. So scaffolding had been erected
25 around the building to ensure that dignity was

1 preserved.
2 Q. Had the radiology team led by Colonel Gibb arrived at
3 the mortuary?
4 A. Yes, they had done, yes.
5 Q. Together with other experts?
6 A. That's correct, yes.
7 Q. And did a full team meeting then take place, including
8 representatives of Greater Manchester Police?
9 A. That's correct, yes.
10 Q. Which resulted in a process being agreed for each
11 post-mortem examination?
12 A. Yes, that's correct.
13 Q. Did the post-mortem examinations commence on 24 May?
14 A. They did, yes, that's correct.
15 Q. And conclude on 28 May?
16 A. Yes, that's correct.
17 Q. Doctor, I don't need to ask you about any more of the
18 detail of your witness statement. I appreciate, I know
19 you will appreciate, that it may seem to those who are
20 watching that we've been through your evidence in
21 a rather technical way. But I know that there are some
22 things that you would like to say, both about the
23 process and about the families of the victims of this
24 attack. I'm at page 15 of your statement.
25 A. Yes. I just thought it was important for me to state

1 that the mortuary process was very much a team effort
2 and I would like to take this opportunity to thank every
3 person involved in the mortuary process for their hard
4 work and professionalism during this difficult period.
5 May I also take this opportunity to offer my
6 condolences to the families of the 22 individuals who
7 lost their lives during the incident.
8 MR GREANEY: Doctor, those are my questions.
9 Pursuant to the Rule 10 process, Mr Weatherby's team
10 indicated that they might, depending on the areas
11 covered by me, have some questions and I will therefore
12 turn to him to ask whether he does have questions.
13 Questions from MR WEATHERBY
14 MR WEATHERBY: Yes, please, Dr Lumb. May I just ask you
15 very quickly, in terms of the radiology, the CT imaging
16 was taken prior to the post-mortem examinations; is that
17 right?
18 A. That's correct.
19 Q. You then got the results from the radiology and you, the
20 pathologists, considered what the CT images showed in
21 order to (inaudible: distorted); is that right?
22 A. Yes, that's correct.
23 Q. So effectively you and the radiologist had a conference
24 before the pathological examination and then that
25 assisted you in that examination?

1 A. That's correct.
2 MR WEATHERBY: That's all I ask. Thank you very much,
3 Dr Lumb.?
4 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: Thank you, Mr Weatherby.
5 MR GREANEY: Sir, as Mr Weatherby certainly appreciates, and
6 you will appreciate, the radiology is something that
7 we will have to look at, certainly in relation to one of
8 those who died, much more closely during the course of
9 chapter 12.
10 Sir, I don't know whether you have any questions for
11 Dr Lumb.
12 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: No, I'm very grateful, thank you very
13 much for coming and for the work you and your team did.
14 MR GREANEY: Sir, as I indicated at the beginning of the
15 afternoon, the next stage will be evidence from the
16 blast wave panel. For what I usually describe as very
17 good reason, it is not possible for those experts to
18 give evidence until tomorrow morning, so I'm afraid that
19 means, for once, an earlier than normal finish.
20 SIR JOHN SAUNDERS: Thank you. 9.30 tomorrow?
21 MR GREANEY: Yes, sir.
22 (2.39 pm)
23 (The inquiry adjourned until 9.30 am
24 on Tuesday, 21 September 2021)
25

125

1 I N D E X
2

3 Housekeeping 1
4
5 Application re Special Advocates 2
6 Submissions by MR GREANEY 2
7 Submissions by MR COOPER 25
8 Submissions by MR ATKINSON 49
9 Submissions by MR WEATHERBY 60
10 Submissions by MS McGAHEY 84
11
12 Opening statement by MR GREANEY 100
13
14 DR PHILIP LUMB (sworn) 105
15 Questions from MR GREANEY 105
16 Questions from MR WEATHERBY 124
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

126

127

A

abdallah (9) 35:2,3,7,15 36:6 78:18,19,20 80:3
abdalraouf (1) 78:19
abedi (15) 27:1 28:13 30:6,19 31:24 32:1,10 34:14,24 35:2,6,15 36:6 78:20 79:5
abedis (2) 32:5 36:13
abilities (1) 25:4
ability (2) 26:23 27:7
able (19) 2:22 4:24 10:5 11:14 13:13 16:10 19:23 26:12 28:25 29:1,8 40:9,11 45:17 53:22 67:4 82:9 110:11 117:20
ably (1) 46:3
above (1) 117:19
absence (3) 16:18 17:3,7
absent (2) 12:3 94:21
absolute (1) 69:5
absolutely (15) 32:23 37:20 42:1 43:19 44:17 48:2 61:23 65:8,14 67:13 69:22 73:2,11 76:24 78:3
accept (12) 6:7 20:17 50:13 51:14 61:21,23 62:21,22 68:1,5 70:3 96:10
acceptable (1) 105:12
accepted (6) 1:17 7:22 9:1 33:5 46:12 92:18
access (10) 10:12,17 11:8 22:22 26:11 37:12 50:19 52:25 54:15 85:21
accordance (4) 6:14 25:22 33:4 95:6
according (1) 27:14
account (5) 17:22 66:11 70:15 71:20 86:21
accrued (1) 21:6
accurately (1) 18:9
accusation (1) 55:25
accused (2) 86:16 87:13
achieve (5) 5:6 21:8 46:6 48:8 82:2
achieved (2) 26:12 33:17
achieving (4) 48:5 94:22,24 96:25
acknowledge (4) 1:9 12:2 35:4,5
acknowledged (3) 4:12 35:23 90:8
acknowledgement (1) 35:21
acknowledging (1) 35:19
across (3) 75:17 76:1 91:17
acting (2) 11:9 89:10
action (1) 114:19
acts (1) 90:5
actual (3) 63:12,24 66:3
actually (17) 12:25 14:3 38:17 39:18 41:17 44:23 48:5,8 65:5 66:6,12 67:17 73:12 74:14 83:21 87:11 114:2
acute (1) 45:7
add (7) 34:12 38:11,14 58:20 83:13,18 105:14
added (2) 82:12,16
addition (5) 31:5 37:3 44:12 59:12 120:5
additional (6) 3:6 58:15 59:6,15 104:9,15
addleshaw (2) 3:13 22:7
address (5) 2:20 10:7 15:13 98:23 100:25
addressed (5) 3:8 23:5 79:2 88:12 118:17
adequacy (1) 101:6
adequately (1) 9:5
adhered (1) 27:12
adjourned (1) 125:23
adjournment (1) 100:3
adjudged (1) 50:25
adjunct (1) 40:12
administrative (1) 10:23
admission (1) 30:3
admissions (4) 27:4,19 28:7,16
admitted (3) 28:6,11 45:14
admittedly (1) 34:19
adopt (2) 11:6 49:10
adopted (5) 9:20 50:22 101:23 102:9 104:22
adulthood (1) 31:20
advance (2) 79:11,21
advanced (4) 49:14 82:7 103:2,7
advantages (2) 82:18 96:1
adversarial (4) 39:8 87:8,16 97:13
advice (2) 119:8,9
advocate (90) 12:22 16:2,17,21,23 17:3,9,20 18:13,20 19:1,6,13 20:3,11 21:12,23,25 22:6,9,17,20 28:4 31:9 33:6 34:9 38:8 40:8,9 41:3 46:1 47:8 48:13,15,19 54:9,12,17,23 55:2,10,12 56:4,25 57:3,18,19 58:7,11 59:4 80:23 81:24 82:1,14,19 83:1,4,6,8,15,16,18 88:22 89:6,10,13,16,17,19 90:5,9,13,15,20,21,24 91:3,5,10,17 92:14 93:9,12,20 94:7,21 95:13,22 96:16,23
advocates (38) 2:16 3:2 7:5 11:22 12:9 13:19,25 15:6,18,23 21:4,20 22:13 31:7,8 38:15 39:25 40:18 44:21 47:5 48:8 73:1 80:11,19 82:9 85:23 86:1 92:5 93:1 94:9,12,16,16 97:4,11,20 98:5 126:5
advocating (1) 72:16
affect (5) 17:24 62:25 63:1 66:10,14
affected (1) 102:19
afraid (4) 44:25 60:25 77:25 125:18
after (5) 99:12 103:3,8,25 109:9
aftermath (2) 109:5 113:1
afternoon (5) 100:6 103:20 104:19 118:19 125:15
again (37) 2:9 3:19 19:16 25:13 29:15 30:6 34:11 35:7,22 39:11 40:8 41:7,9 43:7 44:3,19 45:10 47:1 52:19,21 53:1 58:8 59:13 60:9 63:13 64:16 65:14 68:23 69:6,17 71:16 76:15,18 84:2 104:17 109:8 122:10
against (14) 5:24 13:24 45:22,23 46:4,5 54:7 55:13,25 81:25 86:3 87:2,14 93:4
agencies (4) 69:10,16 96:21 111:13
ago (3) 30:3 42:6 43:21
agree (12) 21:4 47:6 58:17 64:18 65:13 70:17 74:14 78:2,3 88:17 121:16,22
agreed (1) 123:10
ahk (2) 10:23 12:4
aim (4) 25:1 48:7 80:14 100:23
alert (2) 76:24 120:25
alerted (1) 102:5
allayed (1) 50:6
allegation (1) 56:3
allegations (1) 55:13
allow (9) 18:6 50:18 52:5,25 54:9 55:23 67:21 71:6 73:23
allowed (2) 34:8 72:2
allows (5) 54:16 62:4 65:23 72:15,19
alone (3) 80:1 85:24 93:8
along (2) 101:18 111:3
already (25) 22:1 27:3 28:10,12 33:9,24,24 34:3 38:6 40:14 45:15 47:11 49:9 54:13 68:19 73:11 79:16 84:16 89:2 92:21 94:10 96:1 114:10,11,13
also (50) 3:15 6:20 9:9 18:14 19:14 20:5 23:15 24:18 25:1 27:15 31:8 40:18 41:14 43:14 48:3 52:21 60:22 62:5,13 66:9 67:23 72:25 73:8 74:2 80:1 84:15 85:13 88:7 89:9 90:23 91:18 94:19 97:6 99:17 104:3,15,23 105:11 108:10 109:2,7 111:24 112:9 115:13 116:15 119:2,21 121:4,16 124:5
alternative (5) 2:25 3:1 11:19 17:19,23
although (11) 8:6 12:2 17:2 32:12 51:4 81:17,19 88:8 102:15 103:9 113:10
always (7) 25:18 37:16,25 40:22 43:17 76:15 96:10
ambit (1) 76:7
amended (2) 23:11,25
amicus (1) 88:11
amin (1) 49:25
among (1) 113:1
amount (2) 16:23 105:8
amplify (1) 98:15
analogous (3) 12:23 56:22 94:9
analogy (1) 51:18
analysed (1) 57:11
analysis (4) 1:17 38:3 49:22,25
analyst (1) 31:14
anatomical (1) 122:6
andor (2) 5:4 101:6
anonymity (1) 85:11
anonymous (2) 37:8 38:4
another (7) 33:11 37:4 38:4 43:8 46:6 54:1 97:24
answer (10) 13:13 51:18 56:23 59:20 65:24 79:21 92:15 95:21 97:18 100:23
answered (1) 17:1
answers (4) 21:3 79:22 101:11 105:2
anthony (1) 9:17
anticipate (1) 104:16
antiterrorism (1) 90:4
anybody (2) 64:3 67:18
anyone (5) 11:17 42:19,19 76:25 96:21
anything (13) 10:1 20:12 21:12 24:7,20 41:10,23 48:5 52:3 65:4 77:23 83:8 86:7
apart (4) 36:15 69:4,13 86:7
apologise (1) 49:11
apparent (2) 25:18 98:18
apparently (2) 33:1 46:15
appeal (1) 16:7
appeals (1) 89:23
appear (6) 12:19 90:10 91:9,17 97:21 100:18
appearing (1) 87:19
appears (3) 7:9 12:23 88:17
appellant (1) 16:18
appellants (1) 16:13
application (13) 2:16 23:16 26:5 29:17 33:2 51:5 54:8 68:15 72:9,11 95:9 99:1 126:5
applications (9) 4:18 23:12,13,20,23 24:1,2,4 32:17
applied (2) 63:22 75:5
applies (5) 6:25 20:14 64:3,11 90:14
apply (9) 2:13 11:4 61:20 63:3 64:23,24 66:22 75:12 95:2
applying (3) 17:15 75:13 78:10
appoint (20) 3:2 11:21,24 12:22 13:19 16:2 17:2,9 18:19,25 22:18 47:5 80:23 86:1 91:10,16 92:25 93:9,13 98:5
appointed (17) 16:17,23 22:9 55:12 56:4 57:19 58:7 82:14 83:7 89:7,16 90:20,21,24 93:17 94:10 96:24
appointment (19) 12:2 13:24 15:12,17,21,22 19:5,13,15 20:3,11 22:13 54:22 88:22 93:14,15 94:5,20 96:16
appreciate (6) 1:14 24:22,23 123:18,19 125:6
appreciates (1) 125:5
apprehending (1) 28:13
apprehension (1) 30:5
approach (18) 6:23 26:1 32:13 36:1 38:23 57:11 62:18 64:2,5,24 66:23 68:16 69:24 76:7 84:23 101:23 109:14 118:25
approached (1) 53:9
appropriate (12) 19:2 21:1 31:23 47:4 48:19 58:9 64:13 81:14 92:12 98:20 100:14 102:9
appropriately (1) 97:20
area (11) 81:22 106:19,25 107:1,3,6,6,8,9 112:19 117:15
areas (8) 7:5 58:10,24 59:2 102:4 106:16 107:4 124:10
arena (11) 5:16 20:25 27:2 102:3,5 109:15,25 110:10 111:16 114:1,23
arent (4) 61:8 70:17 76:22 79:6
argue (5) 15:10 29:22 81:25 82:11 91:11
argued (2) 13:3 45:3
argues (1) 15:5
arguing (4) 22:8 40:3 41:12 46:3
argument (13) 13:12,21 14:10 20:17 22:12 29:12,21,22 37:15 40:6 47:19 66:20 91:13
arguments (8) 21:8 29:11 33:20 44:4 45:19 70:3 86:3 95:12
arise (4) 10:20 47:1 71:24 100:18
arises (1) 62:13
arising (1) 95:14
arms (1) 97:14
arose (3) 18:10 60:17 71:9
around (2) 117:17 122:25
arranged (1) 114:3
arrangement (1) 10:15
arrangements (3) 10:19 113:21 114:16
arrive (5) 21:7 114:8 115:1 122:17,20
arrived (2) 114:10 123:2
article (13) 4:6 7:20,24 8:25 16:11 49:21 50:1 56:12,13,17 77:14 78:6 87:23
articulate (2) 28:16 45:21
articulated (3) 48:16,17 97:5
ascertained (1) 100:24
aside (1) 72:24
ask (15) 16:1 29:1,7,10,24 34:7 36:22 59:1,6,7 105:18 123:17 124:12,14 125:2
asked (3) 8:15 18:19 48:10
asks (1) 97:8
aspect (2) 47:14 68:13
aspects (1) 108:16
asserted (2) 77:9 89:5
assess (4) 31:9 34:5 53:6 97:15
assessment (4) 112:15 115:10 119:25 120:10
assessments (3) 34:18,22,23
assiduous (3) 32:13,21 38:13
assist (13) 4:21 40:12,19 46:11 47:21 83:24 85:18 98:10 109:13 111:22 119:25 120:10,19
assistance (11) 2:11 6:10 58:11 67:23,24 68:1,4,7 110:13 112:4 121:4
assistant (1) 122:7
assisted (3) 40:16,16 124:25
associates (1) 34:24
assume (1) 76:14
assumes (2) 27:16 76:18
assuming (1) 98:20
assumptions (1) 76:22
assure (1) 5:19
atkinson (19) 49:6,7,8 50:21 51:18 52:18,21 55:16 56:6,23 57:24,25 58:22 60:4,5 84:19,22 104:16 126:8
atrocities (1) 4:22
atrocity (1) 28:15
attach (2) 22:8 43:2
attached (1) 113:16
attack (12) 5:3,16,16 20:25 27:2 100:11 102:3 109:15 111:1,16 114:1 123:24
attacks (2) 5:4 113:2
attempt (2) 1:16 113:4
attempting (1) 35:9
attend (3) 2:22 10:5 118:7
attendance (1) 66:23
attending (1) 28:22
attention (1) 104:6
attitude (2) 36:16 43:12
attorney (4) 12:1 16:1 18:25 90:22
attracts (1) 49:16
august (6) 3:11,13 41:25 52:18,22 53:23
authorities (15) 11:5 12:17 16:5 17:11 19:11,18 28:1 42:12,14 43:25 61:8 87:8 94:4,20 95:8
authority (10) 13:17 18:15,16 19:17 28:2 83:15 84:17 91:9,12,18
autopsy (2) 117:9 121:5
availability (1) 113:14
available (7) 13:17 33:22 64:15 78:23 103:2 111:21 114:12
avoid (2) 74:17 120:25
avoiding (1) 52:3
aware (20) 8:11 9:14 30:9 36:12 38:16 42:13 43:16 72:21,22 79:12,18 89:16 90:12 103:11 105:7 109:24 110:1 111:16,20 113:16
awareness (1) 32:1
away (3) 60:14 67:21 76:9
awful (2) 86:16 114:17
azelle (1) 52:22

B

b (1) 16:14
back (12) 3:24 30:15 31:13 38:22,22 41:8,19 44:8 51:5 52:18 57:20 89:15
background (3) 5:24 54:7 117:6
bad (1) 43:10
baker (1) 9:18
balance (11) 20:2 45:6,7 53:6 62:11,12 63:10,11,25 74:1 121:2
balanced (1) 87:2
baldly (1) 39:7
bar (2) 54:23 57:9
barraclough (1) 78:24
based (3) 30:10 77:16 119:3
bases (1) 10:13
basic (2) 110:20 111:7
basically (3) 112:20 113:7 122:6
basis (18) 6:12 29:12 34:18,21,23 44:23 50:18 51:15 64:6 72:20,25 78:9 83:17 87:13 99:5,6 107:2,7
bear (1) 118:13
bearing (5) 9:24 13:22 49:21 55:5 101:5
become (8) 1:23 42:2 61:19 71:21,24 92:17 110:5 111:16
becomes (1) 14:7
before (24) 1:5 2:1 3:22 4:2 5:15 7:3 14:24 16:18 17:12 44:18,23 46:21 70:25 78:21 87:20 95:1 96:21 97:19,21 100:6 108:10 109:24 113:18 124:24
beforehand (1) 79:15
begin (3) 100:17 105:22 114:5
beginning (3) 86:20 96:15 125:14
begum (1) 42:18
behalf (11) 2:25 10:4 11:20 23:16 24:11 26:24 38:9 40:10,11 53:14 58:23
behaved (1) 6:6
behaviour (4) 36:16 73:24,25 95:16
behind (4) 14:23 56:8 81:7 105:8
being (47) 9:19 10:10 14:9 26:19,25 32:20 33:8,21,22,23 34:8,23 37:5,6,9,17 39:13 41:4 44:15 45:3,12 53:22 55:13,21 57:4 59:13 63:17 66:20 69:21 71:17 77:13,21 82:19,22 86:16,16 87:13 88:1,12 92:16,18 94:5 95:21 97:15 114:3 118:3 123:10
believe (4) 35:24 84:21 103:21 105:15
believed (1) 7:10
bench (1) 40:23
benefit (2) 25:20 91:2
bereaved (6) 2:21 10:4 49:16 52:25 56:16 105:1
best (2) 25:4 105:12
better (3) 63:8 64:15 82:25
between (20) 7:11 8:2 16:21 26:8 36:5 39:13 45:6 46:2 50:21 51:24 58:4,7 77:10 78:19 80:13,17,18 94:2,25 105:9
beyond (7) 44:19 56:6,14 58:25 59:6 60:2 92:8
binary (7) 62:3,15,22 64:9 69:23 70:17 71:16
bingham (2) 49:25 86:8
biological (1) 115:17
bit (2) 35:12 74:15
bjc (1) 22:7
black (1) 53:3
blackburn (1) 107:15
blast (7) 101:19,20 102:10,21 103:15 104:3 125:16
blatantly (1) 35:5
blood (1) 121:20
blowing (1) 58:22
board (27) 12:19,22,25 16:5,9,19 17:23 18:2,7 71:3,4 81:8 87:6,7,11,17,20,23 88:9,21 89:14 90:10,15 92:13 93:24 94:23 95:1
bodies (2) 15:25 122:19
body (2) 102:13 120:21
bomb (1) 101:20
bones (1) 34:13
both (20) 9:16 14:22 20:14 25:10 26:24 28:12 30:5 40:23 48:22 51:1 62:19 66:18 67:2,9,22 85:11 86:8 92:22 116:17 123:22
box (1) 101:17
breaches (2) 28:12 30:4
break (3) 48:25 49:2,4
brevity (1) 99:24
bridge (2) 7:12,13
brief (3) 100:15 104:1 105:6
briefing (1) 117:10
briefly (5) 13:15 23:4 30:21 84:9 96:14
brings (1) 66:9
broad (1) 100:19
broader (3) 20:13 112:1,2
broudie (1) 3:12
brought (3) 50:3,4 82:19
bubble (1) 46:23
building (1) 122:25
bundle (2) 10:9 26:15
burden (2) 58:14 59:13
business (1) 1:6

C

calamitous (1) 76:12
call (3) 54:2 99:23 107:24
called (7) 10:11 37:6 101:20 102:14 104:9,17 106:16
came (5) 20:24 65:10 66:12 78:21 103:24
candour (2) 45:19 80:17
cannot (8) 11:2 47:25 55:14 56:1 63:24 65:7 95:19 97:16
cant (13) 14:12 29:24 34:21 38:17 41:19 43:22 47:15 53:4 54:25 55:3 57:14 63:6 95:20
canter (1) 3:12
capable (2) 5:16 101:5
capital (1) 101:21
card (2) 64:14 68:18
care (1) 44:22
careful (5) 1:16 28:9 75:6 105:3 121:12
carefully (3) 45:2 53:9 68:9
carried (1) 111:4
carry (4) 5:2 66:17 110:11 119:13
carrying (2) 4:21 122:13
carter (3) 107:11 111:19 114:21
cartwright (1) 104:20
cases (13) 8:7 9:17 10:14 16:7 19:5 39:1 62:17 87:8 92:16 120:20,22,24 121:15
categories (4) 52:11 53:7 88:6 102:24
categorised (1) 84:13
category (7) 52:6,13 56:7,10 64:20,22 68:14
cause (3) 37:21 100:25 119:21
caused (2) 13:9 95:14
causes (1) 4:13
caveat (1) 73:18
caveated (1) 74:24
cbrn (2) 115:16,17
ceiling (1) 117:19
central (3) 49:23 56:15 117:15
centre (2) 31:14 107:15
certain (3) 9:7 26:6,9
certificate (2) 42:16 43:2
certificates (1) 43:14
chair (5) 39:22 71:14 72:10 73:7 81:12
chairman (2) 19:22 95:3
challenge (3) 11:13 28:3 29:17
challenged (1) 27:7
change (4) 13:9 69:9,9 76:4
changed (1) 71:19

chapter (24) 1:11 2:14 23:17 49:19 70:21 74:4,6 75:22,23 100:8,10 101:16,21 102:10,21 103:14,17,18,19 104:19,21,22 120:17 125:9
chapters (8) 99:22 100:7,13,19,21 101:9,9,14
charged (1) 42:22
charles (1) 107:11
chemical (1) 115:17
chief (3) 86:15 116:19 117:5
chimes (1) 32:6
chosen (1) 38:13
christopher (3) 51:20 52:16 85:1
circle (1) 52:14
circumstance (3) 28:5 34:2 40:13
circumstances (28) 12:4,11 17:10 18:12 19:2,4,20 20:4,8,23 22:10,14,24 28:4 31:4 33:13 38:5 48:18 51:17,23 96:17,20,23 98:21 100:22 102:2 106:5,11
citation (1) 16:6
cite (1) 16:4
cited (1) 84:17
city (3) 103:24 112:11 114:24
civ (1) 12:5
civil (4) 57:18,22,24 96:9
claims (3) 3:25 4:5,20
clarity (2) 10:22 99:25
clear (25) 7:23 15:25 17:6 19:4,11,14,21 27:3 35:2 36:3 41:11 48:12 54:12,19 61:23 63:13 65:10 72:4 73:8,8 80:24,25 81:11 90:23 112:14
cleared (1) 97:20
clearly (11) 4:14 34:14 37:16 43:1 52:5 54:16 58:1 70:3 81:6,23 94:23
clients (2) 10:18 89:10
close (1) 85:9
closed (57) 2:22,24 3:3,4,8 4:3,11,15,25 5:11,14,19 7:7 8:3 10:6,7,13 11:8,8,23 16:18 21:16,17 22:1,21,23 23:25 24:1,4 29:6 33:20 44:21,23,24 45:4 54:14,15 59:22 61:16 66:1,24 67:2,9,23 69:4,22 70:5 77:22 82:6,10,25 83:14 84:13 96:11 97:15,21,23
closely (5) 94:8 102:19 104:12 108:12 125:8
closest (1) 5:22
colleague (1) 112:25
colleagues (8) 102:1 107:5,9,12 111:18 114:20 118:5,20
colonel (6) 112:23 113:5,11,13 120:13 123:2
come (14) 31:11 41:8,8 55:23 61:18 62:9 63:5 70:23 75:1,20 89:14 111:22 112:13 120:14
comes (10) 2:10 26:4 36:23 43:14,25 45:1 65:4,6 70:9 95:9
coming (4) 33:21 67:7 71:23 125:13
commence (2) 103:20 123:13
commencement (1) 117:10
commencing (1) 109:19
commend (1) 47:13
commission (1) 89:24
committed (1) 4:22
common (9) 16:1 52:4 57:3 91:10,25 92:11,17 94:2,3
commonly (1) 120:20
communicate (1) 22:2
communications (1) 68:20
community (3) 18:1 31:15 69:13
company (1) 83:22
compared (1) 21:23
compatibly (1) 16:11
compelling (1) 22:12
competence (1) 29:17
competent (1) 19:12
competition (2) 91:8,18
competitions (1) 18:16
complain (1) 43:11
complaining (1) 31:1
complete (1) 6:21
completely (3) 61:16 73:8 93:23
completion (1) 1:10
complex (1) 104:11
compliant (2) 4:6 7:24
comply (1) 12:3
comprehensive (2) 103:1,7
comprise (1) 122:5
comprised (1) 122:4
compromises (1) 21:7
compulsion (1) 88:2
concept (2) 70:7 94:24
concern (11) 4:13 30:11,20 32:14,22 44:10 45:12 47:24 78:15 79:3 117:18
concerned (11) 18:21 25:12 37:25 40:9 45:19 46:9 47:20 50:24 51:1 55:18 103:19
concerning (4) 27:1 40:15 53:16 55:13
concerns (8) 10:3 26:6 32:12 39:5 56:15 59:12 70:22 78:14
conclude (4) 45:16 57:9 101:10 123:15
concluded (1) 56:11
concordia (1) 18:16
conditions (2) 65:20 67:4
condolences (1) 124:6
conduct (12) 5:20 25:24 50:4 54:20 95:5 98:9 99:3 102:1 106:10 115:10 117:10 119:17
conducted (5) 4:7 7:20,25 121:9 122:1
conducting (2) 39:3 106:3
conference (1) 124:23
confidence (14) 6:17,21 25:2 35:8 49:16 54:6 59:10,25 60:1 74:3,5 75:25 76:2 102:8
confidentiality (5) 10:11 27:8 51:1,22 85:4
confined (2) 101:22 102:11
confirmed (1) 81:5
connected (2) 2:20 121:4
connection (1) 113:25
connections (1) 31:21
conscious (1) 104:25
consequence (1) 4:10
consequences (2) 24:25 101:6
consider (17) 2:1 13:25 20:2 21:11 23:23 24:3 28:12 36:21 38:10 40:11 47:3 54:9 58:22 73:22 75:5 101:2 102:19
considerable (2) 12:16 120:15
consideration (4) 14:4 27:24 71:10 120:5
considerations (2) 119:11,15
considered (14) 18:1 28:1 33:16 57:7 59:25 66:22 68:14 71:24 72:17 78:5 79:1,6 92:12 124:20
considering (1) 75:2
constructed (1) 122:15
constructive (2) 6:7 48:8
consultant (2) 99:23 119:3
contact (19) 22:25 35:3,7 36:5 58:7 111:13,17,19,24 112:10,18,18,20,22 113:5,6,8 119:2 120:12
contacted (1) 112:2
contacts (3) 34:25,25 35:14
contain (2) 2:2 90:11
contaminant (1) 115:19
contend (1) 52:12
contended (1) 50:19
contending (1) 50:23
content (1) 114:16
context (7) 45:11 51:5,18 56:17 97:2 103:17 110:9
contexts (3) 55:1,8,9
continue (6) 22:2 35:3,4 59:7 96:3 101:10
continued (1) 47:25
continuity (1) 116:10
contrast (2) 7:9,11
convention (1) 16:12
conventional (1) 117:7
conversion (1) 5:13
converted (2) 9:13 61:14
convicted (1) 71:22
cooper (47) 24:11,13,17 25:6,7,23 26:16,20 35:11,13,16,20 36:10,12 37:1 38:3,19 39:11,16,22 40:7,8 41:1,2,5,21,24 43:7,14,20 44:3 45:5,10 46:19 47:6 48:3,12,15,24 49:9 59:17 66:5 78:18 96:15 97:8 99:19 126:7
cooperation (5) 25:18 35:24 104:14,18 105:16
cooperative (1) 27:17
coopers (1) 59:21
coordinating (3) 110:18 111:10 118:8
cordon (4) 115:1 117:12,12,23
core (7) 15:3 22:3 23:20 24:8 53:15 89:7,10
corollary (3) 62:13 76:13 78:10
coroner (8) 7:19 8:13 77:13 112:11 113:9 115:8 116:22,24
coroners (1) 8:7
corporate (3) 1:20 67:16 70:20
correct (67) 7:10 80:21 81:1 92:4 106:17,23 107:4,14,21,23 108:5,20 109:1,16,22 110:1,13,16,19,24 111:2,6,12,15 112:12,17,20,24 113:4,6,12,15,22 114:7,22,25 116:8,18,21,23 117:1,14,24 118:4,9,15,18 119:5,14 120:7,11 121:7,11,21,24 122:2,18,21,24 123:6,9,12,14,16 124:18,22 125:1
corrected (1) 56:8
cost (2) 47:16,18
couldnt (2) 78:6 88:13
counsel (39) 3:16 13:23 20:12 22:4 23:21 58:5,17 82:21 84:15 86:2,4 88:10,10,16 89:4,5,9 90:23 91:2,7 93:5,7,12,13,17,18,22 94:13 95:25,25 96:2,2 97:3,5,16 98:2,8 99:1 105:9
counsels (1) 105:9
counterterrorism (5) 4:1,24 5:21 37:5 99:3
country (1) 26:24
course (47) 4:8,8 10:21 11:10 13:7 14:5 22:6 24:17 28:1,14 33:19,20 35:1,13 36:5,10,22 37:16 40:1,2,9 45:17,20 59:20 64:4,19 66:8 67:7 70:11 72:22 73:14 74:2,11 75:13 77:17 78:20 79:17 80:24 81:5 83:2 97:18 101:4 108:14 120:3,17 122:19 125:8
courts (13) 10:14,16 11:3 15:24,25 18:17,24 43:5 70:7,13 76:18 92:1 94:2
cover (3) 107:5,7 111:3
covered (11) 17:17 50:20,25 51:7,7,16 52:12 53:1 77:24 107:9 124:11
covering (2) 106:25 107:1
covers (2) 62:11 106:19
cp (1) 28:22
cps (8) 1:20,25 7:5 40:3 51:17 58:5 82:22,22
crass (1) 76:11
create (1) 19:23
credit (1) 57:25
crime (3) 90:4 115:13 122:10
criminal (4) 16:11 70:7,13 96:9
critical (4) 16:15 22:19 95:17 112:15
criticise (1) 33:22
criticised (2) 27:6 95:16
criticising (1) 27:21
criticism (4) 6:24 7:18 25:12 35:17
criticisms (2) 1:24,24
crompton (2) 116:20 117:5
cross (1) 91:17
crossexamination (1) 79:13
crossrefers (1) 32:11
crucial (1) 87:6
crucially (1) 88:7
ct (7) 113:14,16,17,19 122:16 124:15,20
cti (34) 20:18 21:3,12 29:9,10,15,18 31:5 32:9,13,16,21 33:3 38:13 40:1,16 42:6,8,9 44:15 46:10 47:14 50:19 58:25 59:6,12 63:5 64:4 73:7,12 83:2,5,16 93:10
ctis (4) 29:10,21 42:20 57:1
ctp (2) 5:15 69:14
cuff (1) 9:5
culpable (1) 50:3
cumbria (1) 106:20
current (2) 71:12 72:7
currently (3) 9:18 12:11 79:2
cut (1) 13:11
cv (1) 37:13

D

d (1) 126:1
damaged (3) 33:24,25 34:3
dangerous (2) 50:6 86:22
daniel (1) 119:2
date (2) 3:24 23:18
dated (6) 3:11,13,14,15,16 4:4
day (2) 115:3 118:19
days (1) 102:7
daytoday (2) 107:2,7
dead (3) 116:16 117:22 118:2
deadly (1) 5:4
deal (23) 1:6 2:11 5:1 9:12 10:1 23:4 30:21 47:14 53:22 60:17 63:9 79:10 81:13 84:9 93:9 97:23 99:10 102:15 104:17,24 105:10 108:11,25
dealing (6) 33:14 34:3 37:24 48:18,19 71:21
deals (3) 79:24 100:8,10
dealt (8) 44:13 52:16 56:17 72:19 75:21 79:14 92:16 101:24
death (3) 95:14 100:25 119:21
deaths (8) 7:13,13 50:9 106:11 111:5 112:6,6 119:16
deceased (5) 101:12 103:16 116:3 119:18 122:23
december (1) 32:2
decide (2) 14:6 46:22
decided (6) 7:19 8:7,13 37:19 46:16,17
decision (7) 14:2 17:13,13 18:4 47:18 64:19 121:8
decisions (3) 42:17 44:9 76:12
declaration (2) 43:15,18
deem (1) 81:14
deemed (1) 103:3
default (1) 19:8
defer (1) 88:8
deference (2) 64:17,19
defined (1) 52:9
definition (1) 87:10
degree (9) 25:17 41:16 43:8,9 44:25 74:4 75:23 99:2,4
delay (3) 11:14 54:4 58:13
delayed (1) 2:5
deliberate (1) 50:5
department (3) 3:14 13:3 37:19
departure (1) 89:12
depend (1) 96:20
depending (1) 124:10
deprived (1) 28:22
derek (1) 105:24
derived (1) 81:6
derogation (1) 63:3
describe (3) 108:22 116:10 125:16
described (6) 11:21 16:22 20:15 60:13 106:6 108:4
description (1) 64:13
deserve (1) 101:12
design (1) 111:10
designed (1) 60:17
desire (1) 5:8
desires (1) 24:20
despite (4) 30:19 41:13,14,14
detail (13) 1:12 9:25 15:13 41:20 46:15 75:12 93:3 94:1 105:11 113:23 117:2 121:17 123:18
detailed (3) 14:4 92:21 99:18
details (3) 37:8 56:1 112:22
detection (1) 30:5
detective (2) 116:19 117:5
determinative (2) 81:4 82:15
determine (7) 3:25 54:14,16 56:19 69:3 73:21 96:9
determined (3) 5:18 77:14 88:1
determining (1) 52:24
detonation (2) 101:19 102:12
develop (2) 21:8 56:7
devise (2) 63:2 81:13
dialogue (2) 58:3,4
didnt (5) 8:9 46:15,17 81:1 85:6
died (18) 100:12,23 101:4,24 102:2,7,22 103:20 106:4 109:12 110:10 112:15 114:1 116:1,6 121:10 122:20 125:8
difference (12) 8:2 9:2 16:20 22:19 26:8 46:1 50:21 77:5,10 80:13,17,18
different (20) 9:16 11:2 15:2,3 20:19 38:24 51:6 61:20 62:1,2 69:10 70:14 71:23 73:17 86:18 87:5 88:4 94:12 104:6 110:6
differs (1) 93:23
difficult (5) 2:8 76:20 100:13 104:25 124:4
difficulties (1) 88:25
difficulty (2) 14:21 89:4
dignified (1) 116:17
dignity (2) 122:22,25
diligence (1) 44:7
diminishing (1) 61:22
direct (10) 12:8 15:6,17,20 23:8 38:24 39:6 54:20 67:25 103:12
directing (1) 15:11
directions (1) 14:22
directly (2) 102:18 118:13
disadvantage (1) 21:23
disadvantages (1) 82:20
disagree (1) 63:4
disaster (4) 109:6,8,12,13
discharged (2) 77:15 78:7
disclose (9) 16:16 37:20 41:19 66:14 70:9 71:14 72:6,11,12
disclosed (12) 2:23 10:6 12:17 17:18 31:24 32:4 34:5,6 63:23 65:7,25 95:19
disclosing (2) 65:9 70:9
disclosure (31) 11:1 20:14 21:9 26:10 31:1,9,10 32:9,14,24 33:12,19 36:15 38:9 40:11,21 41:16 42:5,6,8 45:20 52:23 58:12 59:14 62:23,24 69:7 73:23 84:17 85:7,18
disconcerting (1) 32:24
discreditable (1) 50:3
discretion (13) 13:24 14:1,6 46:21 54:9 57:3 65:19 71:14 75:4,7 81:13 82:1 98:5
discretions (1) 75:2
discriminate (1) 87:13
discuss (3) 82:22 108:21 119:11
discussed (1) 119:23
discussing (1) 118:13
discussion (4) 116:10,15 118:24 119:1
disease (1) 119:20
disjunct (1) 39:13
disseminated (2) 52:7,8
distinction (1) 8:10
distinctions (2) 87:6 94:1
distorted (2) 60:24 124:21
distressing (1) 102:18
diverge (1) 72:3
divided (2) 107:3,4
divider (1) 10:8
divisional (1) 8:17
doctor (3) 105:22 123:17 124:8
document (5) 34:12 53:12 57:2 97:24 119:23
documentation (1) 119:19
documented (1) 118:3
documents (3) 22:1 27:20 29:3
does (25) 9:5,7 13:19 15:20,21 19:18 20:13 21:13 27:23 32:14 35:7 39:7,18 42:24 43:2 54:2,13 66:8 71:23 72:18 76:6 91:9 96:20 107:22 124:12
doesnt (11) 9:2 38:21 55:2,19 65:6,10 93:14 94:10,11 98:15 113:16
doing (8) 15:22 25:3,4 54:24 57:10,12 65:23 101:2
done (10) 1:13 7:4 45:3 46:17 47:25 61:25 93:1 105:3 108:22 123:4
dont (33) 2:9,11 9:15,25 30:7 33:1,5,6 37:7,7,13 38:12 39:19 42:3,7,13 43:12 48:4 66:12 69:18 74:10,14,18 75:15 76:14,19 77:25 87:15 92:3,7 121:16 123:17 125:10
dot (1) 47:15
doubt (7) 9:15 11:13 36:24 45:20 67:22 73:13 78:14
down (1) 39:6
dr (22) 99:23 101:17,21 102:3 103:15 105:19,20,24 107:11,11 111:19,19 112:4,7 114:21,21 119:2,7 124:14 125:3,11 126:14
drawn (1) 8:10
dream (1) 48:20
drs (1) 112:3
du (2) 119:3,7
due (13) 4:8 28:14 33:20 35:1 36:4,10 37:16 40:2 41:25 42:20 73:14 80:6 120:3
duplicative (1) 21:21
during (22) 31:20 44:21 45:2 54:14 84:12 97:23 100:9 104:22 108:14 109:19 110:7,21 112:7,9 118:19 119:2,10 120:17 122:19 124:4,7 125:8
duties (4) 27:7,20 40:15 90:21
duty (11) 26:23 28:12 30:5 36:17 90:6,9,16 102:3 109:18,20 110:2
dvi (2) 115:12 122:9

E

e (1) 126:1
eadie (1) 43:20
ear (1) 33:7
earlier (8) 11:16 60:10 62:17 77:12 78:9 83:12 104:6 125:19
early (8) 66:4 75:20 99:13 112:9 115:10,23 120:2,12
easily (1) 35:23
easy (2) 65:24 70:18
echo (1) 59:17
effect (7) 10:10 17:6,7 46:10 84:10 101:18 102:11
effective (1) 49:15
effectively (4) 29:22 43:23 52:10 124:23
effectiveness (1) 101:7
efficiently (1) 82:23
effort (1) 124:1
efforts (1) 105:13
either (14) 13:14 17:19 29:23 34:23 39:23 42:1,3 60:9 70:5,18 72:10 86:21 88:13 91:12
elder (1) 31:16
element (1) 27:18
eloquent (1) 45:17
eloquently (2) 45:21 75:8
else (7) 24:7 43:5 68:5 86:7 90:14 96:21 107:25
embarked (1) 32:10
emergency (1) 101:7
emerging (1) 19:17
emphasise (3) 25:9 41:7,9
emphasising (1) 5:24
employees (1) 106:12
employer (1) 53:18
empowering (1) 89:17
enable (4) 5:11 97:15 116:9 121:5
encapsulates (1) 50:11
encourage (7) 1:25 2:12 26:10 39:23 44:5,6,8
end (4) 3:18 64:21 118:16 119:6
endeavour (1) 49:8
ending (1) 42:17
endorse (3) 25:8 53:10 57:1
ends (1) 46:4
engage (2) 6:18 82:22
engaged (2) 58:15 83:2
engagement (1) 58:8
engages (1) 49:22
engaging (1) 64:7
england (1) 106:15

enhanced (2) 10:13 27:14
enormous (1) 105:8
enough (4) 29:18,19 41:6,20
enquiries (2) 38:17 101:10
ensure (20) 13:1 28:9 30:14 32:20 40:16 50:2 54:5 57:7 58:8 59:25 95:4 99:2 105:2 113:24 115:16,18 118:1 121:12 122:22,25
ensuring (1) 2:9
entire (3) 13:16 107:24 114:11
entirely (12) 18:9 51:14 53:10 58:3,17 61:21,23 64:12 67:3 70:16 77:24 117:7
entitled (3) 92:7 97:19,20
entitlement (3) 94:14,15,16
environment (1) 51:13
equality (1) 97:14
equally (2) 6:13 45:21
equipment (1) 115:19
equivalent (1) 88:9
erected (1) 122:24
essence (1) 47:6
essential (3) 50:13 55:7 122:11
essentially (5) 62:3 63:6 84:12 85:6 96:18
establish (1) 108:24
established (3) 6:14 18:24 117:25
establishment (1) 4:8
european (1) 16:12
evaluation (1) 32:10
even (28) 5:4 17:3,7 20:11 24:21 29:21 34:22 35:4,5 37:8,10,12,13 38:7 44:8 50:20 63:19,23 64:21 69:7,22 83:3,9 95:4 98:20 103:1,6 112:14
event (14) 19:7,7 46:17 79:13 92:6,10 99:11 100:25 108:3,7 109:9 110:10 114:3,18
events (5) 3:24 33:19 100:10 109:24 113:1
ever (2) 7:17 39:20
every (5) 25:19 33:2 39:19 70:2 124:2
everybody (5) 43:5 68:5 69:4 85:17 105:13
everybodys (1) 1:18
everyone (11) 1:12 2:12,14 4:12,13 5:5,19 9:8 25:21 99:15 105:2
everywhere (1) 90:14
evidence (61) 1:13,17 4:11 7:15 26:4 33:10 37:11 45:13 49:18 53:19 58:18,24,24 59:16 63:17,20 64:6 65:20 67:2,3,8,17,22 68:6,6,22 70:21 78:24 79:24 84:13 85:13 97:16 98:7 100:8,14 101:14,18,21 102:10,14,16,16,20 103:16,16,17,22,23 104:1,4,9,15,21 105:1 107:19 113:10 119:17 120:20 123:20 125:15,18
ewca (1) 12:5
ewhc (1) 18:18
exactly (1) 22:16
examination (8) 1:13 3:24 6:18 32:21 77:7 123:11 124:24,25
examinations (14) 102:1 104:3 106:4,11 112:5 118:25 119:12 121:6,9,13,25 122:14 123:13 124:16
examined (3) 36:4,8 43:1
example (26) 7:11 30:22 31:20 35:22 56:10,24 57:5 66:1 68:20,22 69:9 70:4 71:7 72:15 77:2 79:4,6 80:3 81:16 85:9 87:7,7 94:7 113:1 115:11 119:24
examples (5) 16:4 31:4 68:19,21 85:14
exception (1) 89:14
exceptional (29) 12:4 17:10 18:12 19:7,14,19 20:3,8 22:14 27:23 28:5,5,17 30:2,22 31:13 33:13 34:1 38:5 40:13 47:9 48:18 91:13,21,23 92:19 96:17,19,23
exceptionally (1) 17:5
exceptions (1) 85:8
exclude (6) 29:11 39:25 59:22,23 77:23 91:20
excluded (3) 7:15 40:4 77:13
exclusive (1) 114:12
exclusively (2) 55:20 113:25
exemplified (1) 89:4
exercise (8) 12:10 13:23 14:1,6 15:10 20:9 25:3 66:17
exercised (3) 17:5,10 19:19
exercises (3) 21:7,18 113:18
exercising (1) 81:25
exhibits (1) 122:8
exist (6) 12:11 18:12 19:19 20:8 22:14 81:2
existed (1) 17:3
existence (3) 68:23 69:1,8
existing (3) 23:12 24:1 94:6
exists (3) 17:9 96:11,22
expect (3) 36:24 45:18 115:15
expected (4) 12:3 103:9 108:2,5
expecting (1) 70:1
experience (8) 21:6 67:1 81:22 87:19 100:11 103:12,19 109:11
experienced (1) 21:17
expert (7) 23:17 37:10 101:16 104:9,15 112:19 113:11
expertise (1) 88:8
experts (6) 77:4 101:18 103:11 120:5 123:5 125:17
explain (7) 7:9 9:6 101:24 102:6,21 104:20 116:3
explained (4) 4:17 12:10 35:12 109:18
explains (1) 9:2
explanation (2) 32:8 101:22
explore (1) 113:7
explored (1) 7:18
explosion (3) 100:9 102:13 103:25
exposed (1) 50:4
exposure (1) 31:19
express (5) 4:5 15:20 17:3 70:23 80:23
expressed (1) 39:7
expression (3) 29:14 39:16 43:22
expressions (1) 43:8
expressly (4) 71:12 72:8 77:9 89:1
extend (1) 20:2
extent (10) 5:22 23:7 53:5,20 57:10 77:16 78:12,21 83:5 102:17
extra (2) 34:3 98:6
extraordinary (1) 92:24
extremely (2) 25:14 33:3
extremist (2) 31:17,19
eye (1) 33:7

F

face (1) 54:16
facilitated (1) 61:10
facilitates (3) 62:19 78:8,9
facilitating (2) 60:20,22
facilitation (1) 63:21
factors (3) 30:20 31:22 70:14
factually (1) 77:16
failed (2) 1:8 96:18
fails (1) 29:13
failure (2) 69:17 101:6
fair (4) 46:14 87:3 88:15 95:4
fairly (2) 1:23 12:16
fairness (4) 29:17 47:10 56:2 81:16
fall (2) 72:17 110:5
falling (2) 102:23 117:18
falls (2) 64:20,21
familiar (1) 21:15
families (108) 2:21 3:1,3,10,12 6:1,2,4,8,15,16,20,22 10:4,10,20 11:1,7,20,22,25 12:6 15:9 20:16,17,19 21:2,4,18 22:2,5,8,25 24:11,19 25:3,5,10,25 26:7,8,24 27:11,15 29:11,18 31:7,10 32:23 34:5 35:8 36:1 38:9,20,22 39:1,5 40:10,11 45:24 47:10 48:10 49:17 52:1,13,25 54:5 56:16 57:8,20 58:8,23 59:9,16,24 67:18,24 68:4,7 69:11,20,20 73:6 74:3,4,25 75:19,25 77:8 80:15 82:5,10,12 83:7,8,12,17,20 84:10 85:21 97:9 98:7 101:11 102:7 105:10,12 123:23 124:6
family (19) 25:15 27:11 28:21 31:8 32:5 34:24 40:3,17,17 45:6 46:6 47:17 80:14,18 83:23 97:10 104:18 105:1,3
far (26) 10:21 25:12 26:10,11 32:13 33:17 35:20 38:19,25 40:8 45:18 46:9 47:19 50:2 56:3,9 68:6 75:1,22 78:25 79:3 85:15,15 88:7,7 108:18
fatal (1) 103:11
fatalities (1) 118:8
fatality (8) 108:4,15,21,25 109:3,7,10 114:14
fault (3) 28:7 38:7 96:22
favour (2) 15:11 22:12
fearless (1) 95:6
feature (2) 28:18 30:22
feeding (1) 59:4
feel (2) 26:16 74:13
feet (1) 40:22
felt (2) 92:12 120:18
few (3) 28:8 31:4 80:9
fighting (1) 31:17
file (1) 80:6
filed (3) 23:14,20 24:2
fill (1) 35:7
final (1) 23:5
finally (2) 76:8 104:25
find (5) 24:20 26:21,21 70:2 120:21
finding (1) 2:9
findings (2) 5:23 119:20
fine (3) 37:20 42:25 96:13
finish (3) 78:12 80:11 125:19
first (20) 2:20 4:16 7:1 10:3 12:7,15 13:25 15:15 46:22 47:2 55:3 58:12 61:11 79:25 80:13 82:20 84:9 100:21 102:25 110:21
firstly (3) 31:6 47:6 97:12
fit (1) 56:6
five (1) 102:12
flag (4) 43:23 44:1,1 64:14
flawed (1) 40:14
flesh (1) 34:13
flown (1) 64:14
focus (1) 59:3
focusing (1) 21:13
follow (3) 43:6 61:20 74:10
following (6) 4:18 23:10 28:13 74:9 90:22 107:25
follows (4) 3:10 16:8 18:22,23
footing (2) 88:23 92:6
force (1) 118:10
forensic (15) 99:23 101:16,23 102:4 105:24 106:2 107:1 108:3 109:20 110:11 114:17 115:5 118:14 120:6 122:7
forever (1) 93:14
forget (1) 40:19
forgive (1) 55:18
forgotten (1) 83:6
form (10) 37:8 58:2,6 85:2 87:14 88:11 97:10 100:17 112:15 115:4
forms (1) 27:22
formulate (1) 109:17
formulated (1) 16:8
formulating (1) 109:13
forth (1) 119:24
forthright (1) 27:17
forward (3) 74:3,8 95:21
found (3) 86:15 105:2 116:4
four (1) 24:1
fragments (1) 120:24
framework (5) 4:7 63:20 94:6,11,11
free (3) 26:16 86:23 88:1
friday (1) 1:9
froze (1) 61:3
frozen (1) 60:25
fruitful (1) 25:14
fruition (1) 78:22
full (11) 26:11 45:19 46:25 49:15 50:2 66:2,2 78:21 95:5 121:8 123:7
fullest (1) 5:22
fully (1) 83:3
fundamental (1) 55:5
further (18) 5:10 22:24 23:13 24:1 36:4 47:21 53:8,16 56:9,23 59:2,10 71:3 80:9 83:24 85:20 94:1 98:10
future (1) 73:25

G

gander (1) 29:15
gather (1) 120:9
gathered (2) 104:21 119:1
gave (2) 85:10 119:9
gchq (1) 69:13
general (6) 12:1 16:1 18:25 53:18 81:7 90:22
generally (7) 76:17 81:11,12 85:4,22 90:14 91:15
generated (1) 15:2
generations (1) 31:16
genuinely (1) 6:23
geographical (1) 107:2
get (11) 2:6 32:20 37:21 39:10 60:14 67:21 74:20 76:1 79:22 83:5 117:10
getting (3) 2:14 31:10 114:14
gibb (6) 112:23 113:5,11,13 120:13 123:2
gist (1) 96:5
gisted (1) 97:24
gisting (1) 66:2
give (20) 32:14 46:25 48:11 57:25 59:10 66:2 67:2 76:6 81:18 82:5 83:19 99:9,14,17,17 101:18 103:15 104:4 115:23 125:18
given (28) 27:11 31:3,23 32:6,8,9 34:2,17,21 38:13 39:22 46:8 50:25 67:4 68:19,21 75:7 77:6 85:5 86:24 98:21 101:12 104:7 112:20,22 113:10 117:6 121:23
gives (6) 12:6 50:15 56:19 67:8 71:14 81:12
giveth (1) 41:8
giving (3) 37:11 70:5 85:13
glass (1) 117:18
goddard (2) 3:13 22:7
goes (2) 93:5 97:25
going (33) 1:15,20 2:10,12 7:6,20 31:13 44:5 47:25 48:25 62:16 67:20 68:1 70:2 74:3 76:10,13 78:7 79:12 80:10 84:2 92:17 96:6 105:8 107:18 109:14 112:4,7,13 113:23 117:2 118:24 120:19
gone (5) 1:18 2:8 24:20 64:8 78:18
good (11) 1:4,5 29:18,19 43:10 54:3 60:8 73:24 100:6 104:17 125:17
goose (1) 29:14
gordon (3) 3:11 15:10 20:16
governed (1) 24:23
gozems (1) 53:11
grainger (1) 9:17
grant (1) 57:7
granted (2) 16:10 89:1
graphic (2) 43:21 102:17
grateful (11) 1:12 25:7 26:20 48:24 83:25 87:18 98:17 99:19 104:13 105:13 125:12
grates (1) 39:16
gratified (1) 6:16
grave (5) 28:12 30:4,23,23 88:25
gravely (1) 38:7
greaney (48) 1:4,5,22 2:17,18 9:7,12,16,22 12:14 14:21 18:9 22:19 23:2 24:11,13 25:8 29:16 32:12 41:5 49:2,6 57:16 58:3 60:5,13 66:19 82:8 83:11 84:2 98:14,19,25 99:20 100:5,6 105:7,14,18,21,22 124:8 125:5,14,21 126:6,12,15
great (6) 2:11 44:22 68:3,7 84:18 85:7
greater (13) 3:15 9:3 21:13 86:2 93:2 105:15 106:21 107:6 108:18 109:21 116:24 118:10 123:8
greatest (1) 57:16
ground (1) 52:10
group (14) 10:12 31:18 52:9 55:14 56:1 106:16,18 107:22 108:2,6 111:18,25 112:1,3
groups (1) 31:17
guntothehead (1) 74:16

H

hadnt (1) 68:9
halfway (1) 81:18
hang (1) 61:2
happen (2) 18:2 79:15
happened (6) 39:18,19 77:22 102:5,6 117:4
happening (2) 78:8,9
happens (1) 100:8
happy (3) 37:15 79:8,21
hard (1) 124:3
hardest (1) 60:9
hardly (1) 41:16
harm (1) 102:13
hasten (3) 8:6,23 58:20
havent (7) 13:16 41:22 56:9 71:8 75:8,21 78:24
having (20) 4:19 8:3,23 10:17 24:6 35:9 46:16 48:7 51:21 55:25 58:14,15 66:24 75:11 77:22 81:25 86:4 111:16 114:4,4
hazard (1) 115:16
hazards (1) 115:15
headline (1) 45:15
headlined (2) 30:24,25
headlines (2) 31:3 36:15
headquarters (1) 118:11
health (2) 117:18 120:22
hear (11) 13:8 14:12,14 37:15 45:5 62:4 65:20,22 77:9 84:6 101:14
heard (10) 4:11,19 7:17 18:7 37:3,10 40:6 42:6 64:13 75:11
hearing (42) 1:10 2:4,19,23 3:4,8,25 4:12,15,16,25 5:11,14,20 8:3 10:6 11:8 16:18 20:15 21:17 23:24 24:4 26:17 31:6 34:7 35:1 36:9 37:10 39:25 44:21 51:17 60:20 61:11,16 62:19 63:15 66:1 73:24 77:22 87:3 94:8 103:22
hearings (29) 7:7,8,12,15,16 18:20 28:19,21 31:6 41:14,24 50:17 59:23,24 65:22 66:24,24 69:4,8,22 70:6 71:4,6,13 82:11,25 83:14 97:23 100:14
heart (2) 13:9 27:24
heartened (1) 77:9
held (2) 6:23 106:12
help (15) 5:2 25:5 35:9 52:3 61:13 67:18 68:2 104:14,17 105:3 111:7 112:7,21 116:3 120:21
helped (4) 25:16 52:15 58:23 109:17
helpful (1) 64:11
helping (1) 113:7
here (38) 20:9 24:22 26:2 28:18,19 30:22 33:14,15,24,24 38:7 43:9 44:6,13 50:19,23 51:4,25 54:10 60:16 69:11,15 72:4,16 73:16 75:2,19 77:17 78:4,5 81:8,11 83:8,11 85:16,24 88:4 97:25
hes (1) 90:16
hesitancy (1) 38:2
hesitant (4) 32:16 37:17 39:2 74:13
hideous (1) 87:1
high (4) 18:15,19 25:17 74:25
higher (1) 27:9
highest (2) 10:14 99:4
highlevel (1) 101:13
highlight (5) 21:18 22:20 25:13 28:20 58:23
highlighted (1) 25:13
highly (2) 6:7 92:19
hillsborough (2) 109:8,13
histology (1) 121:20
historical (1) 31:16
history (4) 53:9,10 117:3,8
hmg (3) 66:18 80:20 81:17
hogan (3) 3:11 15:9 20:15
hold (2) 44:1 93:4
home (16) 3:14 13:3 37:19 64:17 101:25 105:25 106:1,6,7,13,15,24 108:2 111:25 117:9 121:14
hope (19) 6:24 7:10 9:1,5,9 17:5 18:7 25:1,16 32:15 46:5 47:22 76:25 78:1 98:18,25 99:12 112:3,4
hopefully (2) 45:16 48:16
horwell (2) 93:3 98:14
hospital (12) 107:15,16,19 108:13,24 113:15,18,25 114:6,11 118:21 119:4
hour (2) 14:25 84:3
hours (4) 102:6 115:3 117:13 118:6
house (9) 11:3 12:18,24 16:8,22 17:1 81:5 92:4,8
housekeeping (2) 1:3 126:3
houses (1) 64:8
however (12) 4:13 10:14,21 15:21,24 21:11 24:24,25 86:1,9 103:14 107:2
hoyle (1) 108:12
hudgells (2) 3:13 22:7
huge (1) 46:15
human (2) 16:12 102:13
humberside (1) 106:22
hurdle (1) 69:19
hyperaware (1) 40:22

I

ian (1) 112:23
id (5) 24:11 52:15 109:9 111:9 113:17
ideal (1) 88:18
identical (1) 56:21
identifiable (1) 87:24
identification (2) 119:18 121:4
identified (15) 1:15 7:2 10:16,22 15:1 22:11 51:20,21 53:21 56:9 57:4 77:2 84:16 95:8 96:1
identify (9) 2:7 5:23 51:23 52:6 75:14 110:8,25 120:16 122:13
identifying (1) 105:22
identity (6) 85:9,15,16,17 116:10,12
ie (1) 12:22
ignorance (1) 44:4
ill (13) 28:8 31:4,11 35:12 37:2 48:10 60:2 67:16 70:23 73:3 75:20 88:8 89:14
im (55) 1:11 14:11,16 25:7,9 26:18,20 32:18 35:11 37:15,25 39:2,9 41:10 44:25 48:24,25 55:18 57:23 58:21 60:25 61:20 63:8,13 65:17 67:20 68:3,24 70:18 72:4,14,21 74:17,23 75:6,16,17,17 76:1,12 77:8,25 80:9 83:24,25 87:10,18 90:11 96:12 98:17 105:7,24 123:24 125:12,18
images (2) 121:15 124:20
imaging (2) 122:7 124:15
immediately (5) 29:13 103:3,8 105:18 111:22
immigration (1) 89:23
immunity (13) 3:7 4:1 60:15,18 62:10,25 64:10 72:18 89:8 90:17,25 91:5 94:14
impact (1) 101:19
impertinent (2) 74:18,19
implications (2) 51:2 52:7
implicit (1) 113:10
implied (2) 80:23 93:21
imply (1) 93:9
implying (1) 88:25
importance (5) 22:8 42:15 75:18 115:5 120:15
important (27) 3:22 17:6 21:22 28:20 36:20 40:12 45:23 46:22,24 49:12,12 53:8 60:14 64:9 67:14 81:15 99:10 101:4 115:5,9,22,25 116:5 120:3,18 121:3 123:25
imposed (1) 30:18
imposing (1) 19:25
impossible (4) 21:9 83:4 103:4,9
impressed (1) 57:23
impression (3) 42:16 82:6 83:20
improper (1) 41:10
impugning (1) 48:21
imputed (1) 33:21
inadvertent (3) 84:17 85:7,18

inaudible (2) 60:24 124:21
incident (9) 108:4,15,21,25 109:7,17 110:23 114:14 124:7
incidents (4) 108:10 109:3,10,16
include (3) 54:18 73:1 103:23
includes (1) 119:20
including (9) 6:19 11:3 53:17 54:17 71:8 72:13 106:20 111:10 123:7
increase (1) 92:16
independence (1) 76:19
indepth (1) 8:4
indicate (13) 24:14,15,18 26:9 45:10 46:21 54:13 78:18 86:5 94:20 98:15 104:23 111:21
indicated (15) 3:18 10:3 11:20 15:5 18:10 30:2 38:6 85:4 86:9,19 100:6 114:10 120:13 124:10 125:14
indicating (1) 74:24
indication (4) 53:18 70:5 87:18 115:23
indicator (1) 73:24
individual (8) 32:4 55:6,13 90:6 95:15 102:15 103:16 112:21
individuals (9) 1:21,25 30:10 31:19 79:5 95:5 103:12 106:4 124:6
inelegant (1) 29:13
inelegantly (1) 29:19
inevitably (3) 11:12 45:1 49:10
infallible (1) 99:6
influenced (1) 31:16
informant (1) 86:24
informants (1) 70:6
information (28) 6:9 32:5 34:17 36:15,18 38:25 53:16 55:15,21,22 63:22 65:4 66:7,8,9 68:10,24,25 70:8,9 71:22 72:2 77:3 85:3 86:23 95:17 117:21 120:9
informer (3) 68:23 69:1,8
ingenuity (1) 21:6
inherent (1) 10:17
initial (1) 31:25
initially (2) 4:2 8:16
initiated (3) 36:14 103:3,8
injuries (7) 102:25 103:6,10,13 104:5 119:19 121:22
injury (3) 103:3,8 119:24
inner (2) 117:12,23
innocent (2) 5:3 20:24
inq0228461 (1) 30:7
inquest (5) 7:24 8:13 51:5 56:14 88:10
inquests (16) 4:7 5:13 7:11,12,13,16,18 8:6 9:13 61:15 77:12,23 78:6 101:1 109:8,12
inquiries (14) 9:13 15:19 19:22 20:1 50:14 51:7 55:19 60:18 61:6,9 64:23 91:19 92:22 94:17
inquiry (122) 2:23 3:5,16 4:9,11 5:14 6:3,17 8:4,5,9,11,12,15,17 9:3 10:6 11:5,17 13:18,23 19:23 20:6,13,13 21:12,14,16,24,25 22:4 23:15,22 24:6 25:1,11,15,19,24 26:3 33:11 37:6 39:19,20,23 46:23 48:22 51:19 52:1,22,23 54:20 55:16 58:5,17 59:2 61:14,18,19 64:23 67:23 68:4 74:5 77:18 78:8 82:21 84:15,21 86:4,5 87:5 88:4,10 89:5,5,9 90:20,23,25 91:2,4,8,24 92:1,21,23 93:4,5,6,7,13,14,16,17,18,22,23 94:3,10,13,18 95:3,10,13,16,25 96:1,2,8,21 97:2,3,6,16 98:8 99:2 100:18 101:1,2 104:12 105:9 125:23
inquirys (2) 91:3 95:6
inquisitorial (10) 20:21 29:5,12 39:3 82:15 87:11,16 88:5,6 96:8
inspector (2) 116:20 117:5
instance (6) 33:6 34:25 36:12,14 41:25 69:3
instances (1) 94:4
instead (2) 16:16 82:4
instruct (1) 83:7
instructed (4) 12:9 15:7 23:17 83:15
instructing (1) 26:21
instructions (2) 22:21 38:25
intelligence (2) 24:21 69:13
intend (1) 81:2
intended (7) 3:19 6:24 19:22 82:3 104:23 119:13 122:3
intense (1) 99:4
intention (1) 58:25
interact (1) 82:9
interception (8) 63:18,23,24 65:3,5,7,11 68:20
intercepts (3) 63:16 65:15,19
interest (24) 3:7,25 13:20 34:16,16 51:11,25 52:1,4 60:15,18 62:10,11,12,25 63:10,11 64:10 68:15 72:18 85:9,15,16,17
interested (3) 18:4 66:6,7
interesting (1) 13:10
interests (16) 16:2 20:18,19 34:10 38:20 47:9,17 59:12 87:15 88:7,14 89:7,19 90:6,16 96:24
interference (5) 60:23 62:7 63:21 64:24 66:22
interoperability (2) 69:10,15
interpretation (1) 33:12
interrupt (1) 35:11
intimate (1) 57:23
into (36) 7:11,12,13,21,24 8:1,4,14,18 9:13 17:22,25 38:1 39:10 40:2 45:1,3 51:8 54:2 64:21 66:11 70:15 71:20 75:24 82:19 86:21 94:1 102:23 107:3,4 109:8,12 113:23 117:2,15 121:16
introduction (2) 100:16 101:14
introductory (1) 3:23
investigate (3) 5:18 8:8 20:23
investigated (1) 5:17
investigating (2) 115:8 117:11
investigation (15) 4:6 7:20 8:1,14,25 32:10 47:11 50:1 56:12 59:14 89:21 95:6 100:21 101:8 112:16
investigators (2) 116:20 122:11
invidious (1) 29:2
invitation (2) 14:13 59:21
invite (7) 18:25 23:8 24:11 79:9,15 84:3 102:18
invites (1) 13:23
involve (4) 55:25 69:12 103:22 120:4
involved (12) 11:17 21:16 24:21 43:21 58:14 65:16 69:11 108:9 109:6,7 112:25 124:3
involvement (6) 22:4,5 69:7 109:2,9 110:23
involves (2) 49:17 106:3
involving (3) 9:17 69:6,8
iraq (1) 30:12
ireland (1) 90:2
ironic (2) 26:22 27:8
irrelevant (1) 47:19
islamic (1) 31:17
isnt (10) 25:9 63:11 64:13,16,21 67:5 68:25 74:16 80:25 93:25
issues (22) 3:6,10,23 26:9 49:19 56:15 58:24 69:12,15 73:19 75:18,19 76:16 78:17 79:4,18 98:22 100:18 101:8 104:24 118:13,16
its (63) 1:17 2:11 7:23 14:9 22:15 23:9 28:6,20 32:15 35:22 36:3 39:16,18 42:24,25 43:9 46:22,23 47:4,9,9,16 50:20 52:7,10,11,11,21 54:16 55:12,20 56:21,22,24 58:21 60:14 62:9,22 63:7 64:8,9,19 66:11,16 67:14 71:16,21,24 74:19,19 78:1 79:20 84:3 87:15 91:13 92:10 97:13 98:1 101:4,8 106:12 107:4,18
itself (7) 19:17 66:14 76:10 90:25 104:22 114:23 117:16
ive (4) 28:9 35:21 40:6 109:7

J

j (10) 36:23 37:4 67:7,15 68:1,3,6,10 79:9,17
jackson (1) 3:12
jamieson (1) 57:25
jermaine (1) 9:18
job (3) 74:16 82:21 95:24
john (112) 1:4,8,23 7:3 9:11,15,20 12:12,15 13:20 14:8,13,16 17:12 22:15 23:1 24:10,14,18 25:17 26:16 35:11,14,17 36:8,11,19 37:15 38:15 39:2,15,18 40:6,25 41:3,17,22 42:8 43:11,19,25 44:17 45:8 46:14 47:2 48:2,14,24 50:20 51:14 52:15,20 55:11,18 56:21 57:23 58:21 60:4,25 61:13,18,25 62:21 65:1,9,13 66:4,16 67:6,20 68:8 70:1,12 71:18 72:21 73:2,11 74:7,19,22 75:10 76:2,24 77:19 79:8,20 80:4,8 83:25 84:5,7 86:7,15 87:10,21 91:7 92:2,7,15 95:11 96:13 98:13,17,24 99:8,24 104:16 105:7,17 125:4,12,20
joint (1) 31:14
jolting (1) 42:3
js (2) 67:22 68:11
jtac (1) 31:14
judge (2) 42:19 81:21
judgement (2) 42:15 99:17
judges (1) 74:12
judgment (10) 4:17 8:21 18:23 46:25 52:16 75:3 87:25 99:9,14,18
judgments (1) 99:14
july (3) 34:14 53:13,21
jurisdiction (7) 12:15 13:19 14:5,7 16:10 80:20 81:9
jurisdictional (1) 12:7
jurisdictions (1) 15:23
justifications (1) 4:19
justified (2) 42:11 44:23
justify (2) 20:4,9

K

keen (1) 39:9
keep (1) 25:2
killed (1) 100:23
kind (1) 1:20
kingdom (2) 30:10,16
kirsten (1) 112:3
knew (3) 5:15 112:25 119:22
know (46) 1:5 2:2 11:11 13:11 14:22 17:21 24:19 25:23 26:18 27:10,13 30:18 33:5 36:3,14 37:7,7,13 38:12 39:16,18 40:21 42:4,7 43:4,4,15,16 46:24 56:1 57:6 60:11 62:25 66:12,13 69:18 70:4 72:2 74:20 77:20 79:25 80:15 82:12 123:18,21 125:10
knowing (2) 37:18 50:8
knowledge (8) 57:24 65:15,16 79:11,21 83:9,11,13
knowledgeable (1) 26:14
known (6) 33:23 34:14 37:17 65:4 106:1 118:7
knows (2) 29:16 41:5

L

labour (2) 26:6 80:10
laboured (1) 71:1
lancashire (1) 106:20
language (2) 60:15 61:5
large (3) 26:24 102:8 106:19
largest (1) 77:16
last (12) 3:18 19:8 39:12 49:15 52:18,22 53:13,22,23 58:13 94:21 99:16
late (1) 118:19
later (3) 37:2 71:11 119:25
lawful (3) 21:8 50:18 55:5
lawyers (11) 10:17 11:4 20:20 21:2,15 22:3,25 24:22 27:10,15 28:22
lay (3) 26:23 27:21 81:7
lead (5) 31:18 33:12 91:1 110:5,20
leading (1) 110:17
leads (4) 11:19 20:7 35:24 37:1
learned (12) 46:20 49:9 50:9 54:1 57:15 59:17,20 84:19 90:7 93:3 97:6,8
learning (1) 62:17
least (14) 1:23 2:3 15:25 17:20 29:23 34:21 35:1 50:8 60:22 78:10 82:20 84:4 88:19 102:17
leave (1) 118:5
led (3) 4:8 117:12 123:2
legal (31) 3:5 6:3,14,17 8:20 11:5 16:14 20:13 21:14,24,25 23:15 24:6 25:11,15 28:23,24 33:11 34:8 37:6 39:16,24 48:23 74:8,10 75:14 76:21 84:23 97:22 100:18 104:12
legally (1) 26:12
legislation (1) 71:5
lens (1) 62:18
less (5) 4:23 11:2 56:18 62:3 75:7
lesser (1) 65:23
lessons (1) 50:9
let (5) 25:7 30:25 41:10 44:17 48:12
lets (6) 36:19 40:18 49:2 65:1,2 68:25
letters (3) 1:20 2:1,6
letting (1) 65:3
level (8) 31:10 32:19 34:16 35:24 57:8 74:25 75:5 78:16
levels (1) 10:15
liability (2) 55:5 96:9
liaise (1) 96:3
liaised (1) 104:12
liberty (1) 13:8
libyalinked (1) 31:19
libyan (2) 31:15,17
lies (2) 51:12 93:20
life (2) 86:25 88:3
light (3) 26:25 50:3 51:10
like (12) 1:7 21:2 24:8 37:23 39:8 43:12 44:2 79:11,23 98:22 123:22 124:2
likely (9) 1:19,25 2:2 4:23 5:4 67:1 104:10 120:4,15
likes (1) 41:3
limit (1) 54:22
limitations (2) 22:16 96:10
limited (8) 10:12 16:9 28:7,17 81:15 85:2 93:15 95:9
limits (1) 54:21
line (2) 14:21 39:6
links (1) 31:16
lip (1) 43:17
list (3) 106:7,9,12
listen (2) 13:20 102:20
litigation (1) 94:25
little (4) 29:5 37:2 38:23 42:2
litvinenko (8) 8:12,19 20:6 46:12 57:12 81:20 83:10,10
lives (4) 5:3 20:24 50:9 124:7
local (1) 108:6
logically (1) 11:2
london (2) 7:13 113:2
long (7) 1:11 2:5 19:2 64:8 72:5 99:15 115:24
look (18) 8:9 38:9 39:8 40:2 42:12 46:15 47:2 61:4 62:6,15,16,17,23 63:1 65:1 80:21 81:10 125:7
looked (5) 8:14,18,24 44:19 67:10
looking (11) 8:21 44:7,22 45:1 60:12,14,16 61:5 63:8 80:16 120:2
lords (9) 11:3 12:18,24 16:8,22 17:1 81:5 92:4,8
lose (2) 20:24 86:25
lost (5) 46:7 50:7 61:2,3 124:7
lot (2) 37:22,23
lots (1) 70:13
lovells (3) 3:11 15:9 20:15
lumb (12) 99:23 101:17,21 102:3 103:15 105:19,20,24 124:14 125:3,11 126:14
lunch (2) 100:3,7

M

main (2) 107:14 119:11
maintained (2) 14:19 116:13
maintains (1) 13:7
majestys (1) 112:10
majority (3) 16:25 18:3,11
makes (3) 34:1 54:19 76:12
makeup (1) 122:11
making (11) 28:23 33:19,20 41:7 44:11,15 61:4 62:23 77:20 90:8 115:6
managed (2) 13:16 18:11
manager (3) 108:13,23 115:14
manchester (19) 3:15 4:22 20:25 27:2 31:15 86:2 93:2 102:4 106:21 107:6,17 108:18 109:15,21,25 112:11 116:25 118:10 123:8
manner (1) 63:9
many (13) 21:7 26:22 27:24 43:7 47:17 68:21 78:13 106:24 108:9 110:10 115:8 118:13 119:16
map (2) 3:5 23:5
margin (1) 75:7
markets (3) 18:16 91:8,18
marks (1) 119:24
mass (9) 108:4,14,21,25 109:3,7,10 114:14 118:7
material (86) 2:24 3:4,7 5:1 7:17,21 8:1,8,18 10:7,13,17 11:9,23 16:13,16 17:17,22,24 18:6,21 21:16 22:22,23 27:3 28:9,10 31:25 32:20 33:10,22 34:20 36:3 37:23 42:9 44:7,9,19 45:12 50:16,18,24 51:9,15,24 52:6 53:1,7 54:15 59:4 60:21 61:11 62:5,19 64:4,20,25 65:6,10,18,25 66:3,21 67:17 68:10 69:23 71:7,8,13,15 72:6,9,14 73:21 74:6 75:3,24 77:12,15 78:5,14,16 79:3,25 86:21 88:13
materially (2) 20:18 38:11
materials (1) 75:22
matter (7) 8:22 9:12 19:25 22:7 36:20 46:4 82:15
matters (21) 4:21 7:25 8:4,14,15,24 9:11 21:3,14 35:22 66:10,14 79:10,12 80:2 83:9 89:4 95:20 99:10,11 113:13
maximisation (2) 50:12,13
maximise (1) 75:24
maximising (2) 54:5,6
maximum (4) 49:17 58:8 75:23 80:16
maybe (6) 29:3 33:20 42:2 46:16,19 66:10
mcgahey (27) 13:5,13,15,22 14:8,11,15,20,22,24 84:4,6,8,9 86:11,18 87:18,22 91:24 92:3,10,20 95:11,24 96:14 98:13 126:10
meadows (2) 112:10 116:22
mean (11) 9:2 38:21 42:24 55:19 65:6 66:9,23,24,25 67:1 72:18
meaning (4) 102:25 103:5,10 110:25
meaningful (1) 82:4
means (7) 8:3 48:17 53:5 94:22 96:25 97:19 125:19
meant (1) 68:5
measure (1) 88:18
measures (2) 78:11 89:22
medical (3) 100:25 103:2,7
medicolegal (1) 107:15
meet (4) 56:3 114:20 115:9 116:19
meeting (3) 118:8 119:10 123:7
member (1) 21:17
members (2) 21:24,25
mention (2) 39:12 71:1
mentioned (4) 11:16 40:24 41:2 77:11
mere (1) 36:15
merely (3) 72:14 80:17 82:5
merseyside (1) 106:20
met (3) 96:17 108:17,20
mi5 (27) 24:22 28:24 30:9,13,23 31:24 33:15,25 34:8 35:3,17,21,24 36:12 42:4,9 45:11 53:17 66:6 69:14 76:10,11 77:4 79:2,24,25 96:18
mi5s (1) 36:16
mi6 (1) 69:12
michael (1) 112:3
michelle (1) 108:12
middle (2) 52:10,13
might (23) 27:5 28:11 33:12,16 35:23 38:14 43:11 55:23 63:14 65:24 66:1,15 73:19,25 75:9 85:8,11 86:25 95:22,23 115:24 120:9 124:10
mind (6) 9:25 12:12 13:23 85:1,1 120:8
minds (5) 2:13 21:13 26:22 58:15 59:15
minimise (2) 62:7,14
minimum (6) 61:22 63:2,21 64:24 66:22 69:5
minority (3) 17:13,24 18:2
minutes (2) 49:1,2
misapprehension (2) 37:21 48:4
misconception (1) 78:1
misconduct (1) 87:14
misleading (1) 82:5
misperformed (1) 33:9
misrepresents (1) 97:12
missiles (1) 120:21
missing (1) 97:25
misspent (1) 58:1
mistakes (8) 33:15,23 45:13,14 76:14,25 77:1,3
misunderstood (1) 73:12
mitigate (1) 30:19
mix (1) 82:16
mixture (1) 66:25
mobile (4) 113:14,17,19 122:16
moment (16) 11:24 12:13 28:16 30:2 31:5,11,11 32:22 36:20 56:7 61:3,7 65:1 70:24 75:20 84:13
momentarily (1) 60:25
monday (3) 1:1 107:23,23
month (1) 53:24
more (40) 2:8 5:4,4 6:8 7:8 8:4 18:15 21:20 22:5 29:25 30:24 31:8 34:13 35:12 38:1,7,18 45:13,13 59:8 62:3 67:14,25 68:10 71:21 75:6,15 76:16 77:24 81:11,11 85:2,21 88:5 90:13 92:17 99:18 121:3 123:17 125:8
moreover (6) 21:22 101:5 112:13 115:25 117:25 119:12
morning (15) 1:4,5,6 2:19 57:4 60:8 71:2,9 81:3 102:14 109:23 111:17 112:9 114:9 125:18
mortuaries (2) 107:13,14
mortuary (18) 107:16,18 108:12,23 111:8,10 113:15,24 114:6,11,13,20 118:20 119:10 122:20 123:3 124:1,3
most (10) 15:23 26:3 28:2 77:6 102:18 103:1,6 105:3,11 106:3
move (3) 70:25 71:1 73:3
movement (1) 30:14
moving (1) 80:9
ms (28) 13:5,13,15,22 14:8,11,15,20,22,24 84:4,6,8,9 86:11,18 87:18,22 91:24 92:3,10,20 95:11,24 96:14 98:13 104:20 126:10
much (25) 2:3,14,18 9:23 14:18 24:19 38:1 52:15 54:2 58:1 60:4,10 67:14 68:17 75:11 84:7 85:2,2 98:13 113:23 114:19 124:1 125:2,8,13
must (18) 4:25 11:4 23:20 24:23 25:21 37:23 62:6,18 64:6,23,24 69:2,4 70:19 77:15 78:5 93:7,8
myself (3) 60:2 72:4 107:5

N

n (1) 126:1
name (2) 37:12 105:24
namely (4) 11:21 20:8 50:1 112:3
naomi (1) 107:11
narrower (1) 85:15

national (30) 30:11 42:10,16,21,25,25 43:15 44:24 45:6,8 51:12 52:2,8 63:7 64:12,22 66:10,14 67:19 68:13,14 69:23,25 71:8,12 72:1,8,14 76:4 95:20
natural (1) 119:20
naturally (1) 110:5
nature (2) 30:2 98:7
neatly (1) 50:11
necessarily (2) 70:2 121:8
necessary (10) 8:8 47:8 64:24 71:24 73:20 93:25 95:13 104:24 105:11 111:24
necessitate (1) 31:5
necessity (1) 119:8
need (29) 1:16 2:10 8:24 14:3 30:8,13 35:12 43:11 46:18 70:14 76:3 77:1,2 87:2 92:3,12 93:20,21 98:4 102:19 110:13,15 111:4 115:11 120:8,9 121:12,16 123:17
needed (8) 25:9 29:6 93:12 114:16 115:12,19 119:23 120:8
needs (7) 26:18 42:12 43:1 44:13 63:1 66:21 67:9
neither (6) 15:21 29:24 48:20 54:21 72:1 103:15
neuropathologist (2) 119:3,7
neutral (1) 88:15
neutrally (1) 67:16
never (4) 7:17 39:10 40:25 99:7
next (8) 45:25 49:6 60:6 81:10 99:12 101:13 113:18 125:15
night (4) 40:15 100:11 102:3 109:24
nine (1) 66:3
nobody (2) 88:14,15
nonadversarial (1) 29:4
none (6) 5:25 29:15 31:12,22 34:11 88:25
nonetheless (1) 117:20
nonstatutory (2) 19:6,12
nor (6) 6:1 8:20 54:21 72:1 99:6 103:15
normal (5) 33:18 74:11 79:23 117:9 125:19
normally (3) 55:20 122:5,9
north (1) 106:20
northern (1) 90:2
northwest (1) 4:2
note (4) 20:4 23:9 57:21 86:1
noted (3) 31:18 45:17 86:3
nothing (11) 5:9 21:20 24:14 32:25 41:16 42:1,1,7 83:13,19 85:20
notice (2) 30:20 50:4
noticed (1) 78:15
nuclear (1) 115:18
number (20) 1:14,24 18:17 19:18 21:13 36:18 37:17 41:13,14,18 53:17 58:10 81:15 87:6 112:21 113:8 115:7,11,14,14
numbers (1) 53:25

O

objective (1) 119:18
objectives (2) 119:12,15
obligation (1) 78:7
obligations (1) 77:14
observation (1) 7:4
observed (1) 52:22
observing (1) 109:16
obtain (1) 117:21
obtained (1) 104:16
obvious (3) 1:23 35:5 74:17
obviously (10) 1:16 14:7,21 36:20 38:22 42:8 45:5 47:13 69:11 105:10
occasion (4) 55:11,20 56:5 95:22
occasionally (2) 76:3 95:12
occasions (2) 18:17 55:24
occur (3) 10:19 113:21 116:11
occurred (7) 1:8 13:1 28:15 32:1 105:16 109:24 112:7
occurrence (1) 92:17
oclock (1) 99:21
october (3) 23:24 24:3,5
odd (2) 90:19 91:1
oddly (1) 90:10
offended (1) 58:21
offer (3) 20:12 21:12 124:5
offered (2) 27:14 112:4
office (12) 101:25 105:25 106:1,6,7,13,15,24 108:2 111:25 117:9 121:14
officer (2) 85:13 95:19
officers (9) 85:10 95:15,18 96:3 108:17 115:8 117:11 122:8,9
official (1) 35:21
often (5) 15:23 70:7,13 71:21 120:23
oh (1) 41:22
okay (6) 56:21 58:21 61:13 76:5 80:8 92:2
oldham (9) 107:16,18 108:13,24 113:15,18,25 114:6 118:21
oncall (1) 110:4
once (6) 44:17 52:5 57:19 61:25 82:10 125:19
ones (3) 7:8 55:4 98:12
ongoing (1) 58:4
onwards (2) 88:20,21
opaque (1) 34:17
open (43) 4:3,4,17 5:23 23:11,13,16,19,24 26:10 27:3 28:8,10 31:25 35:14 36:4,7,8,21 45:3,8 53:7 56:18 60:23 61:22 63:3 65:20 67:2,4,9,22 68:6,10 73:9 75:13,21,22,24 77:3 78:14,16 79:3,24
opening (5) 78:13 99:21 100:5 105:6 126:12
openness (1) 80:16
operate (1) 94:7
operates (2) 87:12,17
operating (1) 114:18
opinion (2) 86:12 102:23
opponents (1) 40:24
opportunity (8) 13:6,15 36:22 60:11 101:10 115:13 124:2,5
opposing (2) 17:16 95:2
opposite (2) 5:5 82:3
oral (5) 23:2 44:11 98:12 99:17 100:14
orally (4) 6:12 29:3 98:15 99:14
order (16) 8:24 23:12,13,16,19 24:2 50:16 54:12 84:22 91:5 108:7,24 118:7 119:25 120:9 124:21
orders (4) 44:18 51:15 84:20,23
ordinary (1) 62:8
organisation (1) 76:11
organisations (2) 76:20 111:11
organise (2) 108:14 110:22
organising (1) 111:3
origin (1) 101:8
original (1) 58:25
others (10) 8:12 9:4 22:10 28:13 30:6 34:25 50:10 69:6 73:5 82:8
otherwise (8) 46:20 53:1 60:21 61:11 62:20 69:15 72:17 73:16
ought (3) 68:17 99:7 114:18
ourselves (1) 46:2
ouseley (2) 84:16 85:5
outer (2) 115:1 117:12
outlining (1) 22:15
outset (4) 7:22 21:10 59:3 83:3
outside (3) 9:10 52:14 117:17
outstanding (1) 3:6
outvoted (1) 86:10
over (8) 32:14 41:13 42:6 44:8 86:13 104:13 107:25 112:5
oversimplifies (1) 57:17
overspeaking (3) 41:4 74:18,22
overview (1) 102:11
owed (1) 90:20
owen (5) 8:22 20:5 46:15 57:11 81:20
owes (2) 90:6,16
own (9) 16:25 20:19 27:19,20 46:23 58:22 64:5 68:15 101:5

P

panel (7) 101:20 102:10,15,21 103:15 104:3 125:16
papers (1) 35:6
paragraph (19) 10:23 12:5 18:23 19:3 23:9 30:17 31:21,25 47:14 49:24 57:1 84:24 85:8 87:24 89:20 90:1,3 98:1 99:16
paragraphs (5) 10:8 15:14 18:22 23:6 53:12
parameters (1) 56:14
parcel (2) 26:5 44:10
parents (1) 31:21
parity (2) 29:24 59:18
parliament (6) 19:22 42:23 76:3 81:1 86:14 92:24
parole (33) 12:19,22,25 16:5,9,13 17:15,23 18:1,7 71:3,4,4,13,14,23 81:8 87:5,6,11,17,20,23 88:9,21 89:14 90:10,15 92:13 93:24 94:23 95:1,2
parsons (2) 112:3,7
part (18) 1:18 2:3 3:20 8:20 12:16 13:9,10 26:5 44:10 63:6 64:7,22 82:10 83:22 100:14 111:7 112:16 122:10
partial (2) 30:3 62:24
partiality (4) 38:21 39:2,6,8
participant (1) 89:8
participants (7) 15:3 22:3 23:20 24:9 51:25 53:16 89:10
participate (1) 47:10
participation (7) 45:7,24 46:7 49:17 50:12 54:5 57:8
particular (18) 17:15 19:25 28:2 39:4 44:11 45:12 67:18 69:17 82:8 83:22 84:15 86:11 95:5,18,18 98:19,22 108:16
particularly (6) 26:2 40:13 45:10 59:8 104:11 120:23
parties (2) 12:18 94:25
partner (1) 85:13
parts (1) 69:13
party (10) 28:18 33:14,19,24 34:3 45:11 48:18 87:9,9 89:18
pass (1) 17:12
passed (1) 113:8
past (4) 25:14 66:25 73:24 76:16
pathological (4) 110:23 119:20 121:17 124:24
pathologies (1) 116:4
pathologist (14) 99:23 101:25 102:4 104:2 105:25 106:2,7,7 109:20 110:2,4,6 122:5,7
pathologists (20) 100:9 101:23 102:9 106:1,9,15,24 107:1 108:2 110:14,20 111:1,25 112:2 115:6,12 119:10 120:6,23 124:20
pathology (7) 101:16 108:3 110:12 111:3 114:17 118:14 122:6
pause (1) 20:4
pausing (1) 11:24
pay (2) 42:20 43:17
pedestal (1) 76:22
people (10) 9:2 13:2 20:24 37:25 48:6 55:14 74:11 99:13 110:10 114:4
peoples (1) 12:16
perception (2) 74:25 75:16
perfectly (4) 13:7 28:25 29:1 38:14
perform (1) 27:7
performance (3) 27:1,4 36:16
performed (3) 27:20 104:2 110:21
perhaps (19) 16:4 26:3,23 27:23 30:25 31:8 32:2,6 33:18 34:13 39:23 44:8 46:2 59:2 71:16 75:9 84:2 88:2 93:25
period (3) 110:21 112:9 124:4
permit (4) 11:7 57:3 59:21,23
permits (4) 53:6 57:20,21 106:13
permitted (6) 8:19 22:24 29:1 51:17 59:19 84:12
permitting (1) 10:12
person (10) 13:4 26:18 34:15,16 42:22 90:6,16 103:24 118:2 124:3
personal (2) 41:6 87:19
perspective (8) 26:23 27:22 34:1 59:17 67:15 69:12 76:21 80:1
persuade (1) 28:3
persuasively (2) 81:21 82:16
pertinent (1) 78:5
phil (1) 105:24
philip (2) 105:20 126:14
photographically (1) 121:13
photographs (2) 118:3 122:8
phrase (1) 30:4
pick (1) 28:3
piece (1) 66:21
pieces (1) 36:18
pii (30) 4:10,18,20 7:15,16,21 8:1,8,15,18,23 17:17 18:21 42:10 50:20,25 51:5,10,16 52:11,11 53:1,6 56:2 61:5,19 63:7 66:19 77:24 94:8
pitch (1) 32:19
pitchford (5) 51:20 52:16 84:20,25 85:1
place (12) 4:2,17 5:12 25:19,20 34:22 41:25 51:8 79:13 116:15 118:10 123:7
placed (1) 113:19
plain (6) 6:5,20 9:24 17:2 20:10 103:14
plainly (1) 100:13
plan (3) 108:7,13 109:17
planning (2) 108:8,16
play (1) 88:15
please (9) 24:12 65:2 84:4 105:19,23 106:2,8 120:16 124:14
plessis (2) 119:3,7
plot (1) 78:21
pm (5) 23:21,22 100:2,4 125:22
pointing (1) 72:14
points (5) 55:4 80:9,10,12 83:18
police (22) 3:15 5:8 9:16 85:10,12 86:2 93:2,8 95:14,15,18,18 96:3 108:17,19 109:21 111:14 116:25 117:4 118:1,10 123:8
policing (6) 4:2,24 5:21 51:19 84:21 99:3
poor (1) 27:5
poorly (1) 27:21
popular (1) 46:24
port (2) 36:13,19
posed (3) 15:2 30:10,19
position (38) 9:6 11:1 13:18 19:9 23:3 24:6 33:4,21 34:20 38:21 39:1 42:19,20 44:20 45:22 46:2,4 50:21 57:17 58:2 59:16 67:8 76:20 80:14 83:1 92:5 96:4,5,7 97:12,23 99:20 109:19 113:19 116:3 117:20,22 118:2
positioned (1) 117:22
positive (2) 44:16 83:19
positively (1) 47:23
possibilities (1) 87:1
possibility (1) 113:7
possible (23) 2:7 5:22 27:13,13 36:1 50:2 52:17 53:15 56:3 60:23 61:16 63:21 66:22 78:11 82:24 93:6 95:12 98:1 105:4 115:23 117:15 120:25 125:17
postmortem (14) 102:1 104:2 106:3,10 112:5 118:25 119:12 121:5,8,25 122:14 123:11,13 124:16
postpone (1) 11:14
potential (1) 1:24
potentially (4) 8:5 62:4 90:15 103:10
power (58) 12:8,11,21,25 13:4 15:6,11,16,17,20 16:1 17:2,4,8,9 19:18 20:9 39:24 40:1 46:11,12 47:3,4,7 50:15 54:11,14 56:19 72:5 80:23,24,25 81:2,6,7,23 85:25 86:4,9 88:25 91:4,10,11,14,15,16,20,23,24 92:1,9,11,25 93:4,9,21 94:2 96:22
powerful (2) 17:13 86:3
powers (2) 16:10 39:22
practical (3) 51:2,21 99:11
practically (1) 83:3
practice (5) 35:10 87:12 90:17 106:18 108:6
practices (2) 50:6 106:16
precisely (6) 5:11 16:23 28:18 67:7,21 81:8
predefined (1) 19:25
predicated (1) 60:19
prefaced (2) 54:13 74:24
prefer (1) 75:14
prejudged (1) 24:16
preliminary (4) 18:20 24:15 25:7 81:19
prepared (1) 122:17
preparing (1) 114:13
preplan (1) 121:5
prerogative (1) 86:13
presence (2) 31:5 73:23
present (26) 11:7 12:24 28:25 30:15 38:8 39:14 47:23 50:16 51:9 54:14 56:20 61:10 84:12 85:12,14,16 89:20,22,24,25 92:10 96:2,20 97:9 98:3 115:9
presented (3) 25:25 34:4 37:6
presenting (2) 33:10 67:15
preserved (2) 122:23 123:1
pressed (1) 66:20
presume (1) 81:1
presumes (1) 38:12
prevent (4) 4:24 6:8 28:14 85:18
preventability (2) 37:11 49:18
prevention (1) 89:21
previous (1) 108:9
previously (2) 108:17,20
primary (2) 91:12 102:12
principal (2) 23:17 107:19
principally (1) 107:12
principle (4) 35:10 62:22 73:16 99:10
principles (9) 6:14 19:17 63:3 74:10 75:12,14 81:15 84:23 95:8
prior (5) 22:21 30:19 108:8 117:10 124:16
prison (1) 88:2
prisoner (12) 17:15,18,21,25 71:15 72:1,11 86:22 87:2,25 88:15 95:1
prisoners (2) 72:6,13
probable (1) 86:6
probably (2) 66:25 121:2
probe (1) 97:16
problem (5) 10:19,21 38:15 70:12 80:25
problems (3) 10:17 51:21 60:17
procedural (2) 81:7 94:6
procedure (15) 9:20 18:13 19:1,24 48:9 54:20 55:8 57:18,22,24 61:15 88:9 97:14,15 104:21
procedures (2) 50:6 51:8
proceed (3) 78:6 99:5,6
proceeded (1) 77:12
proceedings (13) 20:21 29:4 33:7 40:15 88:6 89:13,15,18 93:24 94:8 95:10 96:8,11
process (66) 2:3 5:5 6:6 21:10 25:16 26:1,11 30:14 39:3,9 40:4 45:1 50:12 54:4,6 58:12,15,19 59:7 60:1,22,23 61:12 62:3,8,15,22 63:7 64:4,7,23 72:19 73:6 75:1,21,25 76:2,6,6 79:16 80:2,4,18 81:13,13 82:12,15,19,23 83:19 102:9 104:20 108:24 111:10 112:8 114:2 115:24 116:14 119:2 121:14 122:10 123:10,23 124:1,3,9
processes (4) 63:2 71:16 77:11,11
produced (1) 8:9
product (1) 63:23
productive (1) 25:14
professionalism (1) 124:4
prohibit (1) 15:21
prohibited (1) 65:3
prohibition (4) 63:12,16 64:1 65:21
promise (1) 39:11
promises (2) 41:14,18
proper (5) 7:19 8:13,25 57:8 59:14
properly (8) 9:6 18:7 20:20 38:14 76:15,22 82:24 118:2
proposal (2) 10:20 11:7
proposals (1) 80:6
propose (6) 3:20 10:1 11:18 98:20 99:10 105:5
proposed (2) 17:23 79:11
proposing (2) 59:1 82:3
propositions (1) 74:8
prosecuted (1) 78:20
protect (2) 5:8 34:10
protected (1) 55:7
protecting (1) 52:2
protection (2) 18:5 51:11
protocol (1) 121:18
prove (1) 103:11
provenance (1) 63:24
provide (18) 15:20 44:14 48:4 52:18,19 53:2,15 55:2 58:11 71:25 81:23 90:5 95:20 101:9,13 103:17 108:3 119:21
provided (7) 23:22 50:17 51:10 70:8 71:9 102:23 117:3
provides (5) 62:5,14 63:19 81:10 89:17
providing (2) 82:4 101:22
provision (7) 17:4 89:20 90:11 92:13 93:21 94:17,21
provisional (2) 4:5 20:5
public (41) 3:7,25 4:21 5:1 11:12 18:4,5 22:16 26:17,17 49:16 50:4 51:11 54:6 60:1,15,18 62:10,11,12,24 63:10,11,17 64:10 68:15 72:18 75:18 77:18 78:8,15 86:23 90:20 91:24 93:23 94:10 95:3,10,13 97:17 102:8
publicly (2) 37:17 45:14
puncture (1) 119:24
purely (1) 59:13
purpose (5) 2:19 61:9 93:15 115:4 118:23
purposes (8) 16:15,20 17:6 50:1 52:24 87:23 116:9 121:17
pursuant (1) 124:9
pursue (1) 20:20
pursued (2) 20:18 36:24
putting (3) 18:3 73:18 74:8

Q

q (99) 106:2,6,15,18,24 107:2,9,12,18,22 108:2,7,16,22 109:2,5,11,18,23 110:2,8,15,17,20,25 111:3,7,10,13,16,21,24 112:9,13,18,22,25 113:4,10,13,21,23 114:4,8,10,16,20,23 115:1,4,21,25 116:6,9,15,19,22,24 117:2,7,12,15,20,25 118:5,7,10,13,16,19,23 119:2,6,10,15 120:1,8,12 121:2,8,12,16,20,22,25 122:3,13,16,19,22 123:2,5,7,10,13,15,17 124:19,23
qualifications (2) 37:14 106:10
question (13) 5:14 12:8 13:14 14:4 15:15,16 20:8 47:7 54:2 73:15 101:4 104:11,13
questioned (1) 26:25
questioning (2) 28:22 37:7
questions (19) 12:7 15:2,13 17:1 29:2,10 34:7 36:22 59:6 97:23 100:23 105:21 124:8,11,12,13 125:10 126:15,16
quicker (1) 2:4
quickly (1) 124:15
quinary (1) 102:13
quite (10) 9:7 37:15 63:13 69:18 76:7 79:8 81:11 84:3 86:16 99:15
quote (2) 21:5 49:24

R

radicalisation (1) 31:15
radiological (2) 112:14 115:18
radiologist (2) 120:13 124:23
radiology (9) 113:11 120:15,18,21 121:3 123:2 124:15,19 125:6
rail (2) 109:6,11
raised (10) 14:9,17 39:5 49:19 71:2 75:20 76:15 80:2 89:4 113:13
raising (2) 79:18 80:12
range (1) 70:19
rather (19) 19:8,25 29:19 37:1 48:9,9 59:12 62:15 67:17 69:21 70:20 75:15 77:22 82:3 83:4 86:16 87:16 121:2 123:21
re (2) 2:16 126:5
reach (1) 69:19
reached (2) 1:9 18:17
reaction (1) 40:25
reactions (1) 40:23
read (12) 3:19 6:16 13:6,16,16 26:14 37:25 60:19 78:24 98:17 99:16 104:1
ready (3) 101:17 114:14,19
real (2) 44:7 47:24
reality (5) 5:13 10:25 21:19 53:13 58:13
really (14) 18:3 36:20 43:13 46:1 47:19 70:22 72:3 79:20 80:12 81:4 87:10 92:3 105:12 113:23
reason (20) 4:16 5:10 14:11 37:18 38:4,8 43:10 54:3 58:6 61:14 63:14 68:15 74:23 78:3 88:16 92:19 93:8,25 96:7 125:17
reasonable (1) 27:16
reasonably (1) 2:15
reasoned (1) 46:25
reasons (20) 10:18 40:7 43:3 44:5 48:16,17 74:17 82:7 83:11,22 84:16 85:5 93:3 97:5 98:2 112:13 115:7,14,22 121:3
reassess (1) 51:10
reassurance (3) 25:8 32:20 98:25
reassure (1) 33:7
reassured (2) 32:12 46:19
reassuring (1) 45:5
recalled (1) 104:4
receive (2) 87:2 117:8
received (3) 3:9 32:2,4
recent (2) 18:15 41:21
recently (4) 28:2 37:3 41:23 78:25
reception (1) 26:4
recognise (5) 4:13 15:22 20:20 55:16 85:24
recognised (4) 30:13 57:2 87:22 94:6
recollection (1) 78:25
recommendations (3) 2:10 11:15 21:1
record (1) 89:20
recorded (1) 121:13
recovery (2) 119:17 120:20
rectified (1) 50:7
redacted (1) 34:22
reference (6) 16:6 20:21 30:8 81:2,14 95:7
referred (8) 72:8,23 83:12 84:19 87:8 89:9 91:7 96:15
referring (3) 18:18 62:9 84:22
refers (1) 71:12
refuse (2) 35:4,4
refused (2) 8:16 37:12
regard (1) 18:14
regarded (1) 19:6
regardless (1) 91:25
regime (7) 60:16 61:10 62:5 72:15 80:22 90:13 92:22
regimes (2) 55:1,4
region (1) 30:12
register (1) 105:25
regular (1) 108:10
regulate (2) 50:15 58:6
regulated (1) 15:24
regulates (1) 71:5
regulation (1) 55:6
reiterate (1) 73:5
reject (1) 72:10
rejected (1) 10:15
rejecting (1) 14:16
relate (1) 94:4
related (3) 68:22 69:1 76:4
relates (1) 7:4
relating (4) 3:6 71:22 103:22 121:20
relation (22) 3:3 11:23 35:18 36:17 37:11 38:10 50:16 51:12 55:6 57:17 58:12 67:10 99:22 100:19 102:22 109:11 110:9 111:1,4 120:1 121:9 125:7
relationship (2) 25:14 79:5
relatives (2) 8:19 50:7
release (1) 17:25
released (1) 55:24
relevance (3) 40:20 107:19 118:17
relevant (14) 5:1 14:7 16:4,13 18:14 61:8 62:5 65:22 73:19 74:1,2 78:17 79:25 108:18
reliance (1) 44:25
relies (1) 98:11
reluctance (1) 88:17
rely (1) 17:16
remain (1) 88:24
remained (1) 101:1
remarks (6) 3:23 9:23 24:15 100:15 105:6,14
remedy (1) 74:20
remember (3) 41:19 43:20,22
removal (1) 116:16
removed (3) 60:21 61:12 62:20
repeat (8) 23:7 46:10,11 49:8,10,14 60:9 89:3
repeatedly (1) 96:15
repeating (2) 34:11 60:2
repetitive (1) 37:24
reply (3) 73:13 98:20,21
report (8) 5:23 9:11 11:15 18:18 31:18 32:7 38:22 57:19
reported (1) 31:14
represent (17) 3:3 6:19,23 11:22 16:17 25:25 35:8 38:19 45:25 47:16 48:21 49:13 88:14 89:7 90:24 104:13,18
representation (7) 29:5 34:4,6,8 82:4 97:19 98:6
representative (4) 72:2,6,12,13
representatives (17) 2:22 6:5 8:21 10:5 16:14 28:24 39:13 69:21 71:6,15 84:11 85:11,21 96:4 97:10 116:24 123:8
represented (6) 3:10,12 15:9 28:19 82:6 85:14
representing (7) 17:21 27:10 31:7 41:15 42:4 59:11 90:17
represents (3) 24:12 89:19 90:7
request (4) 12:1,3 32:3 90:22
requests (1) 33:8
require (3) 16:3 20:22 96:25
required (5) 6:13 33:17 95:23 100:24 117:21
requirements (3) 19:24 56:13 62:24
requisite (1) 106:10
rescue (1) 1:15
researches (1) 56:8
resolved (1) 121:25
resort (2) 19:8 94:22
resourced (1) 83:3
resources (1) 115:11
respect (16) 21:22 42:20 57:16 61:9 66:18,18 69:17,25 70:16 71:13 73:25 74:3,5 79:17 92:5 93:23
respectful (2) 26:1 34:2
respectfully (1) 57:1
respects (4) 27:24 43:7 45:14 47:17
responded (1) 100:9
response (6) 31:2 40:20 57:13 101:7 111:22 114:17
responses (3) 2:1,6 23:19
responsibility (3) 11:10 83:17 110:22
responsible (2) 6:7 89:18
rest (2) 53:25 88:2
restart (1) 99:20
restricted (7) 50:16,17 64:4 69:21 71:7 73:21 75:4
restrictedprohibited (1) 63:20
restricting (2) 66:23 69:20
restriction (14) 3:7 23:12,13,16,19 24:2 44:18 51:15 64:6,15 65:24 75:5 84:20,23
restrictions (3) 10:25 73:19,23
restrictive (2) 24:24 78:11
result (9) 1:19 7:16 11:12,13 38:18 82:2 91:1 104:23 112:18
resulted (1) 123:10
results (1) 124:19
return (2) 30:14 118:20
returning (1) 118:23
revealing (1) 66:9
revelation (1) 6:9
review (1) 16:14
reviewed (1) 19:18
rhetorically (2) 29:7 82:11
rightly (1) 65:2
rights (4) 16:12 55:7 87:25 95:4
rigid (1) 20:1
rigorous (1) 77:6
rigorously (2) 48:1 58:18
ring (4) 10:11 51:1,22 85:4
rise (1) 12:6
risk (3) 84:17 85:6 86:24
road (2) 3:5 23:5
robert (5) 8:22 20:5 46:15 57:11 81:20
roberts (21) 12:19 13:6,16 16:5 17:7 55:22,22 57:4 71:2,10 72:23,25 81:3,4 86:8,19 87:22 88:12 91:18 92:4,18
robust (1) 6:18
rodney (1) 52:22
role (11) 20:14,15 21:2 89:12 101:25 106:2 110:2,17 111:7,9 120:22
roles (5) 53:20 110:6,8,20,21
room (7) 9:8,10 59:5,11 83:21 103:24 114:24
rota (2) 107:22 109:18
round (1) 64:8
roussos (1) 104:8
royal (11) 107:15,16,18 108:13,23 113:15,18,24 114:5 118:20 119:4
rubber (1) 41:4
rubberstamping (2) 32:17 41:2
ruled (3) 8:17 18:22 79:16
rules (24) 12:21 17:8 52:23 54:21,22 57:19,22,24 61:20 71:18,19,20,25 72:5,8,22,24 81:8 88:21 90:10 92:13,23 93:16 94:18
ruling (8) 4:4,10 44:20 78:4 84:20,23,24 99:1
rulings (2) 41:13 51:4
run (3) 91:17 107:22 108:1
runs (1) 107:23
runthroughs (1) 108:10

S

saa (1) 16:17
sadly (1) 110:10
safe (3) 17:25 21:8 116:17
safety (3) 18:5 117:18 120:22
saffierose (1) 104:8
salford (1) 119:4
salman (14) 27:1 28:13 30:6,19 31:24 32:1 34:14 35:2,6,15 36:6,13 78:20 79:5
salute (2) 43:23 44:1
same (13) 6:25 9:20 16:23 19:16 21:14 23:18,18 51:25 52:1 62:11 74:4 83:15 118:19
samples (2) 119:8 122:9
sampling (1) 121:17
satisfaction (2) 50:8 56:16
satisfied (3) 4:19 11:6 48:7
satisfy (1) 56:13
sauce (2) 29:14,14
saunders (111) 1:4,8,23 7:3 9:11,15,20 12:12,15 13:20 14:8,13,16 17:12 22:15 23:1 24:10,14,18 25:17 26:16 35:11,14,17 36:8,11,19 37:15 38:15 39:2,15,18 40:6,25 41:3,17,22 42:8 43:11,19,25 44:17 45:8 46:14 47:2 48:2,14,24 50:20 51:14 52:15,20 55:11,18 56:21 57:23 58:21 60:4,25 61:13,18,25 62:21 65:1,9,13 66:4,16 67:6,20 68:8 70:1,12 71:18 72:21 73:2,11 74:7,19,22 75:10 76:2,24 77:19 79:8,20 80:4,8 83:25 84:5,7 86:7,15 87:10,21 91:7 92:2,7,15 95:11 96:13 98:13,17,24 99:8,24 105:7,17 125:4,12,20
save (4) 21:13 39:25 50:9 54:20
saw (1) 40:21
saying (19) 18:4 42:21 48:10 49:10 51:16 63:4,8 64:16 65:5 66:12 67:9 70:17 74:10,14 75:17,18 80:21 91:15,23
scaffolding (1) 122:24
scally (1) 79:17
scanner (4) 113:14,16,17,20
scanning (1) 122:16
scenarios (1) 17:19
scene (15) 115:2,6,7,9,13 116:1,6,13,16,19 117:3,13,16 118:5 122:10
scenes (1) 105:9
schedule (3) 89:21 90:1,3
scope (2) 21:3 53:19
scrutiny (5) 5:9,12,22 49:15 99:2
seated (1) 101:17
second (12) 2:25 5:7 12:10 17:11 20:7 63:6 64:7,22 73:4 80:20 101:2 103:5
secondary (2) 71:5 91:13
secondly (3) 2:7 83:2 97:18
secrecy (2) 9:3 37:9
secret (1) 77:24
secretary (34) 3:14 4:1 7:23 8:16 9:1 13:2,10,18 15:5 17:16 29:22 37:19 42:15,21 43:3 49:20 52:2 53:14 54:25 56:24 57:13 59:18,22 64:18 72:10 79:9 84:14 85:24 95:2 97:7,9,22 98:2,11
secretive (1) 7:8
section (29) 19:21 50:14 51:9 52:9,12,24 53:5,6 54:12,19 56:19 59:21 60:19,19 62:10 63:9,15,19 65:18,22 68:16 73:20,22 74:1 89:23,24 90:2,3 105:1
sections (1) 26:7
security (68) 4:23 5:9,15,20 26:25 27:5,19 28:6,11,23 29:20,20 30:3,11,23 31:23 32:8,17,25 33:3,8,8,15 34:9,15 35:9,25 38:5 39:14 40:5,14 41:15 42:10,16,21,25 43:1,15 44:24 45:6,9 51:12 52:3,8 63:7 64:12,22 66:10,14 67:19 68:13,14 69:23,25 71:8,13 72:1,9,14 76:4,16,21 78:23 89:25 90:4 95:20 96:21 99:4
see (16) 10:23 12:4 14:18 30:8 33:1 42:10 44:22 45:2 47:15,25 62:7 71:7 80:22 82:18 88:15 116:1
seeing (4) 33:2 34:20 35:2 52:15
seek (5) 19:13 21:3 23:7 28:4 98:23
seeking (4) 22:19 48:12,15 95:9
seem (3) 21:1 31:22 123:19
seemed (1) 55:24
seems (7) 1:14 25:20 30:9 32:25 37:9 91:14 92:8
seen (4) 22:1 33:10 35:6 82:10
segueing (1) 76:9
selby (2) 109:6,11
send (1) 71:11
senior (2) 108:17 116:20
sense (5) 9:7 19:8 32:24 38:24 83:14
sensible (2) 25:25 48:25
sensitive (7) 26:2,3 69:2,18,19 75:3 105:4
sensitivity (1) 75:8
separate (2) 79:10 102:12
september (12) 1:1 3:15,16,17 4:3,4 5:8 23:14,18,21,22 125:24
series (1) 10:14
serve (1) 100:21
service (14) 4:23 5:15,20 24:21 26:25 33:9,15 35:9 38:6 40:14 43:17 44:14 99:4 108:3
services (25) 5:9 27:5,19 28:6,11,24 29:20,20 30:4,24 31:24 32:9,17 33:1,3,8 34:9,15 35:25 39:14 40:5 41:15 76:16,21 78:23
session (3) 33:20 54:15 97:21
sessions (2) 29:6 82:7
set (13) 10:22 23:8 24:6 53:10,12,21 75:10 78:13 81:6 89:1 92:22 95:14 111:7
sets (1) 93:3
setting (3) 56:18,18 100:17
several (1) 71:19
severe (2) 103:1,6
shall (2) 13:20 14:17
shared (1) 85:17
sharing (2) 51:24 85:2
sharp (1) 120:24
sheffield (1) 107:16
shes (1) 13:7
shootings (1) 9:17
short (7) 20:10 47:8 49:4 58:16 99:14,17,21
shorthand (1) 41:7
shortly (2) 3:21 121:3
should (69) 2:22 3:2,8,22 4:14 6:5,10,13 8:10,17 10:5,19 11:21,25 12:10 15:10 17:4 18:2 22:9 23:13 24:2 25:11 27:13,21 29:19,25 30:1 34:4,5 39:10 40:4 43:24 45:3 46:7,7 52:6,13 54:4,8,15,17 56:20 57:15 58:11 61:4,21 64:2,17,18 65:21 68:14 69:23 73:21 74:9 84:10,11 86:23 87:21 90:9 91:5 93:4 96:24 97:4,8 98:8 100:15 121:9,25 122:3
shouldnt (5) 29:23 34:6 43:17,23 83:6
showed (1) 124:20
shown (1) 22:14
shows (1) 45:13
siac (1) 56:25
sic (1) 40:22
sight (1) 61:2
signed (1) 27:16
significant (6) 1:10 28:7,14 30:9,20 36:5
significantly (1) 31:9
similar (3) 12:20 21:7 119:16
simple (4) 43:17 53:3 64:16 65:24
since (1) 71:19
single (2) 33:2 47:16
sir (244) 1:4,5,8,23 2:18 3:9,18 4:17 5:17 6:21 7:1,3 8:22 9:7,11,12,15,20,22 11:5,16 12:12,14,15 13:15,20,22 14:8,11,13,15,16,20,21 15:1,13 16:5,20,25 17:5,12 18:9 19:16 20:5,17 21:2,11 22:6,10,15 23:1,2,17,23 24:3,10,14,18 25:7,10,17,23 26:16,20 27:10,13 28:23 29:7,24 30:18 31:2,22 33:14 34:11 35:1,11,13,14,17,22 36:3,8,11,19 37:1,15 38:3,15,19 39:2,11,15,18,23 40:6,25 41:3,17,22 42:8 43:11,14,19,25 44:17 45:8,10 46:14,15 47:2,17,21 48:2,12,14,22,24 49:2,8,22 50:15,18,20 51:4,8,14,20 52:5,6,15,16,20 53:2 54:8,11,13,19 55:11,18 56:11,19,21 57:6,11,22,23 58:6,19,21 59:2 60:2,4,6,8,25 61:13,18,25 62:21 65:1,9,13 66:4,16 67:6,20 68:8 70:1,12 71:18 72:21 73:2,11 74:7,19,22 75:10 76:2,24 77:19 79:8,20 80:4,8 81:20 83:25 84:2,5,6,7,9 85:1,25 86:7,11,15,20 87:10,18,21,22 88:3,24 89:11 90:10 91:4,7 92:2,3,7,15,20,23 93:11,25 94:19 95:11,24 96:13,14 97:2 98:10,13,14,17,19,24 99:8,20,24 100:6 103:14 104:15 105:5,7,14,17 125:4,5,10,12,14,20,21
sit (1) 14:23
situation (17) 12:23 18:11 33:18 51:6 71:23 73:17 86:19,20 87:4 88:3,12,18 91:25 92:10 97:14 108:11 111:20
situations (2) 71:25 93:10
skeleton (1) 14:9
skill (1) 21:6
slater (3) 3:11 15:10 20:16
slight (1) 41:6
slightly (2) 57:17 74:13
solicitor (1) 98:3
solution (3) 88:19 93:13,19
solutions (1) 70:19
solve (1) 14:23
somebody (3) 17:20 74:13 107:25
somehow (3) 61:20 77:21,24
someone (6) 55:21,25 59:11 87:13 93:17 112:19
somerville (3) 11:4 50:22,23
something (11) 1:7 19:14 48:5,8 52:21 57:6 70:1 71:10 87:14 97:25 125:6
sometimes (3) 10:11 99:15 106:1
somewhat (5) 26:22 27:8 29:2 32:24 73:13
soon (2) 22:22 99:9
sort (6) 4:22 38:17 41:1 77:6 95:21 120:24
sorts (2) 37:24 38:1
sought (4) 58:19 68:12 85:11 119:7
sounds (1) 66:16
source (5) 68:10 75:21,22 78:14,16
south (2) 106:21 107:6
speak (2) 26:7 115:13
special (130) 2:16 3:2 11:22 12:8,22 13:19,25 15:6,17,23 16:2,21 17:2,9,20 18:13,20,25 19:5,13,15 20:3,11 21:4,11,20,22,25 22:6,8,13,17,20 28:4 31:6,8,9 33:6,16 34:4 38:8,15 40:8,9,17 44:21 46:1 47:5,8 48:7,13,15,16,19 54:9,12,17,22 55:2,10,12 56:4,25 57:3,18,19 58:7,11 59:4 73:1 80:10,19,23 81:23 82:1,8,14,19 83:1,4,6,7,9,10,12,14,16,18 85:23 86:1 88:22 89:6,9,12,16,17,19,23 90:5,9,13,15,20,21,24 91:3,5,10,16 92:5,14,25 93:9,20 94:7,9,12,15,16,20 95:12,22 96:16,23 97:4,10 98:5,6 115:19 126:5
specialist (2) 119:8 122:8
specially (2) 16:16,22
specific (1) 94:13
speed (1) 83:5
speedy (1) 2:15
spelt (1) 55:8
spoken (1) 114:4
spurred (1) 59:1
staff (1) 114:13
stage (14) 1:10 24:8 26:2 44:6 66:5 102:16 112:14 117:4,8 118:23 119:25 120:2,12 125:15
stages (1) 26:4
staggering (1) 28:17
staggeringly (1) 32:1
stamp (1) 41:4
stand (1) 79:2
standard (2) 121:14,23
stands (2) 73:9 115:17
start (5) 1:5 26:13,20 38:20 84:4
started (1) 80:4
starting (3) 67:12 80:21 81:18
starts (2) 39:8 104:19

statement (10) 30:7 68:11 79:1,7,10 99:22 100:5 123:18,24 126:12
statements (4) 30:24 38:6 70:21 79:14
states (7) 13:10,18 29:22 42:15 57:13 97:22 98:2
statute (8) 15:24 17:8 65:3 81:7 89:1,17 94:10,15
statutory (26) 12:21 16:9 17:4 19:1 20:1 54:23 55:1,4 60:16 63:12,16,25 71:5 72:15,25 80:22 88:23 89:13,15 91:12,15 92:6,13,22 93:21 94:21
stay (1) 88:2
steal (1) 16:25
step (3) 45:25 46:1 81:10
steps (8) 28:14 30:18 56:13 113:24 114:5 118:1 121:12 122:22
steyn (2) 86:8,11
steyns (1) 87:24
sti (1) 38:13
still (9) 13:6,18 14:19 34:17 53:25 64:23 88:24 116:6 121:15
stole (1) 5:3
stop (2) 12:12 82:24
stops (2) 36:13,19
straightforward (2) 2:12 66:16
straitjacket (1) 43:9
stress (3) 49:12 65:14 68:23
strict (1) 11:2
strictest (1) 27:12
strongly (2) 40:3 96:6
structure (1) 20:1
struggled (2) 70:6,12
stuff (1) 37:23
subareas (1) 107:3
subgroup (1) 112:1
subject (4) 5:21 62:24 65:9 71:4
submit (24) 5:25 10:25 19:16 20:10 22:11 28:10 29:12 38:23 46:5 47:18 49:22 50:11 52:9 53:3,4,8 54:11 55:3 56:6,10 57:10,15 58:10 59:7
submits (1) 54:25
submitted (2) 47:11 53:14
submitting (3) 11:25 75:6 85:25
substantial (1) 89:12
succeeded (1) 58:20
succinctly (1) 45:16
suffice (1) 70:21
sufficiently (1) 99:13
suggest (5) 12:7,20 29:3 31:7 47:7
suggested (4) 10:10 46:21 77:21 94:5
suggesting (6) 41:10 61:7 65:17 68:24 70:18,19
suggestion (1) 13:22
suggestions (1) 7:6
suggests (1) 49:20
suit (5) 89:8 90:18,25 91:6 94:14
summarise (1) 18:8
summarised (2) 18:9 65:25
summary (10) 6:12 10:2 15:15 23:3 24:7 66:2 100:17 104:1 110:8 115:4
summer (1) 49:14
supplied (3) 28:2 32:21 45:13
support (3) 26:9 45:20 46:9
supports (2) 57:12 84:14
suppose (1) 110:9
supreme (6) 42:14,17,18 43:12 50:22 51:22
sure (8) 25:9 32:18 47:1 61:20,24 73:15 77:8 83:24
surely (4) 29:9,10 41:1 98:1
surprise (1) 27:18
surprising (1) 34:20
surrounding (1) 30:12
survivability (5) 101:3 104:10 119:22 120:1,4
survivable (3) 103:5,10 104:6
survival (2) 103:3,8
survived (1) 103:12
suspect (1) 60:2
suspicion (1) 50:5
suspicious (6) 102:2 106:5,11 112:6,6 119:16
sustained (1) 104:5
suter (1) 14:22
sworn (3) 105:19,20 126:14
syria (1) 30:12
system (1) 109:18

T

tab (1) 26:15
tailored (1) 19:24
taken (21) 1:11 12:16 17:22 25:12,20 34:23 45:25 47:22 66:11 70:14 76:7 82:10 86:21 95:25 114:4 118:1,3 119:9 121:12 122:22 124:16
takes (1) 107:25
taketh (1) 41:9
taking (6) 2:5 25:19 28:14 34:22 70:4 90:13
talk (2) 36:19 65:2
talking (1) 63:13
task (3) 95:3 97:4 98:8
tat (1) 97:13
team (39) 3:2 6:3,17 11:6,22 20:12,13 21:14,15,17,19,24 22:1 23:15 25:11,15 31:6 33:11 37:6 39:24 40:17 47:16 48:23 52:1 77:4 97:22 100:18 101:23 104:12 110:15,18 117:25 119:13 122:12 123:2,7 124:1,9 125:13
teams (11) 3:5 24:6 25:15 27:11 80:14,19 83:23 115:12 122:1,3,5
technical (1) 123:21
technologist (1) 122:6
telephone (5) 34:24 63:15 65:11,15,18
tempting (2) 14:8,14
tend (1) 99:15
term (1) 64:10
terminology (2) 46:24 121:23
terms (19) 4:18 20:21 23:10 38:3 66:19 67:19 68:13,19 69:22 74:25 76:8,10 77:10 80:19,20 81:14 95:7 100:19 124:15
terrible (2) 76:11 108:7
territory (1) 76:9
terror (1) 113:2
terrorism (3) 31:14 89:21 90:1
terrorist (2) 52:4 92:16
terrorists (5) 4:21 5:2 6:9 71:22 85:19
test (1) 96:16
tested (1) 58:18
testing (2) 49:18 59:16
text (1) 80:3
texts (3) 78:19,19,22
thank (35) 2:13,18 9:23 14:15,18,20 23:1 24:10,13 40:7 48:25 52:20 60:4,5 80:8 84:1,5,7 87:22 92:9,20 96:13 98:13,24 99:8,19,24 100:1 105:14,17 124:2 125:2,4,12,20
thats (102) 9:5 11:18 14:8 32:3,18 37:20 38:2,6 41:21 42:1,3 44:6 48:6 61:19 62:9 63:4 66:15 67:12 68:11 70:12 74:15 75:16,17,25 79:4 80:18 81:3,8 87:11,16 92:19 94:23 96:13 99:13 106:17,23 107:4,7,14,21,23 108:1,5,20 109:1,16,22 110:1,13,16,19,24 111:2,6,12,15 112:12,17,20,24 113:6,12,15,22 114:7,22,25 116:8,12,18,21,23 117:1,9,14,24 118:4,9,15,18 119:5,14 120:7,11 121:7,11,14,21,24 122:2,18,21,24 123:6,9,12,14,16 124:18,22 125:1,2
themselves (3) 84:11 86:5 98:9
thereafter (3) 22:23 102:7 110:2
thereby (2) 67:24 68:4
therefore (39) 3:20 7:17 8:2 17:17 18:5 21:19 29:5,21 33:5 48:10 49:18 54:23 55:3,7 56:2,15,18 60:3 62:16 64:2 69:22 73:15,20 75:4,23 78:22 79:1 81:17,22 82:18,25 83:13 90:17 93:7,8 96:10 110:17 120:8 124:11
theres (14) 14:21 24:7 26:8 35:20 37:22 39:20 56:5 63:11 77:4 91:12 93:6 94:5 110:6 120:22
theyll (1) 47:22
theyre (4) 29:18 41:3 70:18 96:7
theyve (2) 32:3 45:14
thing (2) 16:24 77:6
third (3) 3:5 23:4 103:10
thirdly (1) 97:22
though (4) 26:14 41:12 43:14 63:17
thought (5) 14:25 21:9 30:11 120:14 123:25
thoughts (1) 71:3
thread (1) 47:24
threat (3) 30:10,15,19
three (14) 2:20 7:1 9:24 12:24 52:11 53:7 80:12 86:10 102:23 107:4,5,13 114:23 122:1
threetwo (1) 17:13
through (13) 2:14 28:8 31:20 42:13 59:4 60:15 62:18 71:11 76:19 78:24 81:18 116:13 123:20
throughout (3) 6:6 25:1 58:18
thus (2) 22:4 56:9
thwarting (1) 5:16
time (25) 1:11 2:5,15 4:12 11:14 13:17 23:18 32:11,15,18 39:12,19 58:16 61:1 70:2 72:5 76:12 103:2 114:8,10 115:1,8 116:7 118:5 122:16
times (1) 71:19
timetable (4) 23:8 104:23 122:13,15
tit (1) 97:13
today (10) 3:24 5:25 11:16 12:17 26:5 29:4 44:11 49:22 54:8 107:20
together (6) 39:3 60:19 69:16 96:5 119:1 123:5
told (7) 32:3 34:18 37:12 41:3 55:14 108:22 120:12
tomorrow (7) 23:15 80:7 102:14 103:20 104:19 125:18,20
too (9) 6:25 37:25 60:10 66:11 84:18 85:7 94:17 104:17 113:23
took (1) 4:2
tools (1) 62:14
topic (5) 10:3 11:18 23:3,5 60:13
topics (3) 2:20 7:2 9:24
total (1) 106:24
touch (1) 98:14
touched (1) 40:21
towards (2) 36:1 118:16
tpim (1) 89:22
trace (1) 32:2
track (1) 30:14
trampling (1) 86:13
transparency (2) 33:16 80:16
transparent (1) 35:25
transpose (1) 95:10
travel (2) 36:13 114:23
travelled (1) 30:12
treated (1) 75:3
treatment (2) 103:2,7
trenchant (1) 86:12
trial (1) 95:4
tribunal (9) 16:9 46:13 60:20 61:10 62:4,6,6 64:17 76:7
tribunals (1) 76:19
tricky (1) 76:9
tried (2) 47:23 70:22
trump (2) 64:14 68:18
trumpet (1) 58:22
trust (20) 6:1,2,4,15 25:2,9 44:25 48:6,13,22 73:4,6,9,16,18,25 74:15,22 75:15 76:8
truth (1) 5:10
try (5) 56:3 60:9 63:2 87:21 105:10
trying (5) 74:17,23 76:1 95:11 96:12
tuesday (1) 125:24
turn (11) 7:1 9:23 14:24 23:4 24:8 50:14 60:6 96:14 101:13 105:18 124:12
turning (3) 60:13 85:23 100:7
type (3) 5:2 21:18 106:13

U

uk (1) 36:13
ultimately (3) 64:19 86:25 119:21
unacceptable (1) 86:13
unconnected (2) 111:4 112:6
unconscionable (1) 18:6
undercover (2) 51:19 84:21
underlying (3) 2:24 10:7 47:24
underperformance (1) 30:23
underpinning (1) 17:8
understand (45) 4:14,14 6:1,10,13,22 7:14 9:18 11:25 16:21 24:19 25:21 26:18 35:16,20 36:6 38:25 39:4,11,15 41:5,23 43:7 48:2,14 58:3 59:5 67:6,11,24 68:8 70:14,16 74:7,9 76:2 77:19,20,25 87:12 88:21 91:11,22 116:12 120:3
understanding (3) 59:15 113:3,4
understood (8) 6:24 7:10 9:8,9 25:23 117:4,8 120:1
undertaken (3) 32:22 34:19 108:8
undertakings (6) 10:13 27:12,14 71:7 72:7,13
underway (1) 114:2
undesirable (1) 85:5
undoubtedly (1) 102:17
unease (1) 44:13
unfair (1) 86:17
unfortunate (1) 24:25
unit (1) 122:16
united (2) 30:10,16
unjustified (1) 50:5
unlawfully (2) 11:9 24:24
unless (3) 24:7 47:21 98:10
unlike (1) 21:24
unlikely (1) 103:5
unredact (1) 98:1
unsafe (1) 55:23
unsatisfactory (1) 54:2
unsurvivable (1) 102:25
until (5) 41:23 79:22 99:20 125:18,23
updated (2) 23:11,25
upheld (1) 4:4
uphold (1) 95:4
upon (8) 21:14 32:10 40:21 73:9 98:19 102:1 106:4 118:13
used (7) 52:25 55:20 64:12 88:13 97:15 113:17,25
useful (1) 81:2
usually (3) 104:1 108:4 125:16
utmost (1) 69:2
utter (1) 44:4
utterly (1) 86:12

V

v (3) 12:19 16:5 18:16
valid (1) 33:3
value (2) 22:5 82:12
variety (1) 110:6
various (4) 30:20 43:25 95:15 113:17
vast (1) 70:20
vastly (2) 88:4,5
ventilate (1) 26:6
versions (2) 23:11,25
vetted (3) 21:15,24,25
victims (1) 123:23
viewed (1) 68:17
viewing (2) 22:21 119:25
viewpoints (1) 31:20
views (1) 6:23
vigorously (1) 36:24
visit (3) 115:6,7 116:9
vital (1) 100:13
voice (1) 83:21
volition (2) 64:5 68:16
voluntarily (1) 37:20

W

wait (1) 79:22
waiting (1) 53:25
wales (2) 106:15,20
walk (2) 117:15,17
walkthroughs (1) 108:23
wants (1) 11:17
warning (3) 1:19 2:1,6
warnings (1) 32:6
wasnt (5) 8:9 41:6 72:21 115:16,18
watch (1) 102:19
watching (2) 67:18 123:20
wave (7) 101:19,20 102:10,21 103:15 104:3 125:16
way (45) 5:17 6:6 7:7,24 11:11 12:9 23:2 24:16 26:21 27:13,17,20 29:16 38:13 39:7 41:7 46:6 48:21 57:7,9 59:8,25 62:11 63:4,5,8 64:8 65:17,23 70:5 75:15 79:23 81:19 82:13,17 83:9 90:14 98:25 100:15 105:4,11 114:5 116:13,16 123:21
ways (5) 2:9 62:23 63:2 69:6 102:12
wealth (1) 81:21
weatherby (54) 45:18 46:3 60:6,7,8 61:2,7,17,24 62:2,21 63:5 65:8,12,14 66:4,15,18 67:12,20 68:3,9 70:11,16 72:4,21,24 73:3,15 74:7,17,21,23 75:10,16 76:5 77:8,19 78:3 79:8,16,23 80:6,9 83:25 90:8 97:6 124:13,14 125:2,4,5 126:9,16
weatherbys (2) 53:11 124:9
week (7) 3:18 80:7 107:24,25 109:19 110:4,7
weekend (1) 99:12
weekly (1) 107:22
weight (2) 31:23 43:2
wellknown (2) 35:3,6
went (3) 4:5 51:22 85:7
werent (1) 35:18
west (1) 106:21
westminster (1) 7:12
weve (15) 28:1 31:1,2,12 32:13,23 34:17 35:6 42:6 61:2 68:19,21 70:22 75:1 123:20
whatever (12) 14:11 26:16 44:1,20,20 47:18 49:1 54:3 66:7 77:3 96:6 99:1
whats (1) 44:4
whereas (1) 15:8
whereby (2) 62:5 77:12
whilst (5) 44:11 46:22 49:20 58:17 117:2
white (2) 44:1 53:3
whole (2) 2:4 61:9
whom (2) 69:1 107:9
whose (3) 89:18 90:6,16
wide (5) 39:22 75:7,18 76:7 81:12
wider (2) 50:19 88:7
widespread (1) 78:15
wilson (3) 107:11 111:19 114:21
wish (10) 5:19 13:25 23:2 26:17 59:8,9,9 73:13 98:15 105:2
wished (1) 92:25
wishes (3) 5:5 6:8 99:15
withhold (1) 16:13
witness (22) 30:7 36:23 37:4,4,10 67:3,7,8,10,15,22 68:1,3,6,10,11 79:1,7,9,17 101:17 123:18
witnesses (18) 6:18 37:5,9,18,22 38:4,10,14 41:18 53:17,18 59:1 67:2,12,14,25 79:24 97:18
woefully (1) 33:9
wonder (4) 13:5 22:15 35:17 56:4
wonders (1) 92:11
wont (6) 23:7 46:11 68:2 74:15 89:2 99:20
woolf (2) 18:3 88:16
work (17) 21:19 39:24 69:16 82:23 85:6 96:6 105:8 106:3,14,16,18 107:12 110:11 111:1 115:25 124:4 125:13
worked (3) 51:3 106:19 108:11
working (1) 54:4
worst (1) 88:19
worth (3) 5:24 22:15 58:15
wouldnt (4) 46:17 48:20 77:5 83:20
writing (9) 3:9 6:11 15:4,9 57:21 60:11 68:22 80:11 98:16
written (19) 9:25 10:24 15:14 22:11 23:6 29:3 34:12,12 44:12 47:13 57:2 60:12 70:23 89:2,6 97:7 98:11 99:14,18
wrong (14) 1:15,19 2:8,9 24:21 35:22 56:9 62:10 74:12,20 75:14 76:14 92:8 93:11
wrongdoing (1) 50:5

X

x (2) 30:7 126:1
xs (2) 79:1,7

Y

yards (1) 66:3
year (11) 32:14 41:13 42:6 43:21 49:15 52:19 53:13,22,23,24 58:13
years (1) 109:9
yet (3) 31:22 80:5 93:1
yorkshire (3) 106:21,21 107:6
youll (1) 43:16
young (1) 31:20
youre (14) 38:16 46:3,5,5 63:4 66:6,7 67:6,9 70:1 79:21 91:23 107:24 109:14
yours (1) 25:4
yourself (6) 15:1 105:23 106:6 109:2 110:12 111:16
youth (1) 58:1
youve (7) 18:9 26:14 41:17 60:25 73:11 79:16 114:10

1

1 (7) 3:15,16 11:18 19:18 23:24 60:13 126:3
10 (10) 1:11 2:14 23:14,18 24:2 79:16 80:4,6 101:9 124:9
100 (1) 126:12
1030 (1) 114:9
104 (1) 89:20
1042 (1) 49:3
105 (2) 126:14,15
1057 (1) 49:5
11 (16) 18:22 19:10 53:12 99:22 100:7,8,19 101:9,14,16,21 102:10,21 103:14,17 107:1
12 (14) 23:22 99:22 100:7,10,19 101:9,15 103:18,19 104:19,21,22 120:17 125:9
1220 (1) 100:2
1227 (1) 115:3
123 (1) 52:23
124 (1) 126:16
1257 (1) 117:13
13 (2) 4:4 5:8
130 (1) 103:21
1319 (1) 118:6
14 (10) 23:17 37:5 38:4,10 49:19 70:21 74:4,6 75:22,23
15 (2) 49:2 123:24
17 (5) 3:11 54:19 60:19 71:12 72:8
171 (2) 84:24 85:8
1716 (1) 19:21
18 (1) 24:5
19 (21) 50:14 51:9 52:9,12,24 53:5,6 54:12 56:19 59:21 60:19 62:10 63:9,15,19 65:18,22 68:16 73:20,22 74:1
1991 (1) 16:11
1997 (1) 89:24
1998 (1) 90:2

2

2 (19) 4:6 7:20,24 8:25 10:8 16:7 19:19 23:3 49:21 50:1 56:12,13,17 77:14 78:6 93:15 99:21 126:5,6
20 (1) 1:1
200 (1) 100:4
2001 (1) 109:6
2004 (1) 71:18
2005 (4) 15:19 16:7 90:1 92:4
2006 (1) 92:23

2009 (1) 12:4
2010 (3) 31:13 32:2,7
2011 (2) 89:22 90:4
2013 (1) 89:25
2014 (1) 34:14
2016 (3) 84:24 88:20,21
2017 (9) 5:3 20:25 28:15 30:9 106:19,25 107:11 108:8 109:20
2018 (1) 18:18
2019 (10) 3:24 4:3 5:8 41:25 51:6 56:11 72:7,22,24 90:10
2021 (2) 1:1 125:24
21 (5) 12:5 23:14,18 49:24 125:24
22 (15) 5:3,3 10:23 20:24,25 28:15 53:12 100:10,11 101:1 102:22 103:23 109:20 121:10 124:6
22nd (1) 40:16
23 (5) 102:6 109:23 110:21 118:19 122:19
239 (1) 125:22
23rd (2) 111:17 112:10
24 (1) 123:13
25 (1) 126:7
27 (2) 3:13 23:21
28 (2) 10:8 123:15
287 (1) 12:5
29 (2) 23:6 30:17

3

3 (3) 26:15 84:24 90:1
30 (2) 23:22 32:2
3158 (1) 18:18
32 (1) 31:21

4

4 (4) 23:21 24:3 89:21 90:3
43 (2) 23:6,9
44 (1) 15:14
48e (1) 57:1
49 (1) 126:8

5

5 (3) 10:8 16:11 49:1
50 (2) 67:3,4
54 (1) 87:23

6

6 (6) 4:3 90:3,3 98:1 102:5 109:23
60 (1) 126:9
600 (1) 111:16
61 (1) 15:14
64 (1) 89:23
66 (1) 87:24
67 (2) 47:14,15

7

7 (2) 18:22,23
738 (1) 16:7
74 (1) 90:1
77 (2) 7:12 113:1

8

8 (2) 18:22 19:3
82114 (1) 57:22
83 (1) 31:25
84 (1) 126:10

9

9 (2) 3:17 101:9
918b (1) 90:2
930 (3) 1:2 125:20,23
94 (1) 89:24