

Witness Name: Jeremy John Naunton

Statement No: 1 (5 pages)

Exhibits

Dated

1st December
2018.

THE INDEPENDENT INQUIRY INTO CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE

Witness statement of Jeremy John Naunton

in respect of Sir Peter Hayman

I, Jeremy John Naunton, will say as follows:-

1. The matters about which I am asked relate to a case in respect of Sir David Hayman (alias Peter Henderson);
2. The allegation against Hayman, was referred to the DPP in December 1978 – nearly 40 years ago – and, without sight of the full DPP case file, my recollection of this case is very slim; I am not sure that sight of the file now would help me as I believe that my involvement was very limited.
3. I have no papers whatsoever on the DPP case, other those which I received from the IICSA on the 14 November 2018;
4. the minute of the 21/12/78 is at risk of being read out of context The law applicable was that of 1978; 'Siri' tells me that the 21 December 1978 was a Thursday, i.e. Christmas day was the following Monday;
5. This statement has to be read in the light of the laws, public interests and their applications as they existed in 1978; and
6. other papers sent to me may not be helped by redactions.

I joined the Director of Public Prosecution's office as a practising Solicitor in 1971. The DPP's office was divided into a number of Divisions and the lawyers were moved around at various intervals:

1. I was first assigned to a Division dealing with alleged crimes by police officers, fraud cases and research into legal issues.

2. Between 1973 and 1979 I dealt with a variety of criminal matters which were referred to the DPP.
3. 1979 to 1981 I was a 'Senior Lawyer' dealing with all types of criminal allegations against police officers throughout England and Wales.
4. 1981 to 1986, I was a 'Senior Lawyer' at DPP reviewing serious fraud cases.
5. In 1986 the DPP's office converted to the Crown Prosecution Service.
6. 1986 to 1990 I reviewed cases dealt with centrally and advised/decided on criminal proceedings and advised CPS areas, police and others.
7. 1990 to 1992 I was Head of a Division at CPS Headquarters responsible for a variety of themes, including major disasters, homicide, international crimes and Obscene Publications
8. 1992 to 1995 I was Head of a Division at CPS HQ responsible for dealing with all criminal allegations against police officers in England and Wales (other than traffic offences, generally), such as homicide, deaths in police custody, corruption, Data Protection Act offences.
9. 1995 to 1996 I was an Assistant Chief Crown Prosecutor heading International and Legal Services Division at CPS HQ.
10. In July 1996 I left the CPS and later became (joint) Force Solicitor for Kent Police. I am currently a 'Non-Practising Solicitor'.

My only recollection of the case about Sir David Hayman is that:

1. it related to a package found on a bus;
2. it involved Section 11 of the Post Office Act 1953;
3. He was a senior diplomat involved with Canada;
4. Sir David Napley (Solicitor), of Messrs Kingsley Napley, represented Hayman;
5. it was suggested that Hayman might commit suicide; and
6. the prosecuting decision was made by the Sir Thomas Hetherington, Director of Public Prosecutions, at a meeting with Sir David Napley at which I did not attend.

I have been sent, with a covering letter from IICSA dated 13 November 2018:

1. A statement made by me on the 22 November 2017;
2. A police report received by the Director of Public Prosecution's Registry on 7 December 1978;
3. A DPP internal minute which has my handwriting at the end and the date 21 December 1978; and
4. A redacted statement from a housewife.

As will be appreciated, from the limited papers I have now seen, this matter was referred to the DPP in December 1978 – nearly 40 years ago. Consequently, due to its age, and without seeing the full DPP file, I have very little further recollection of the matter.

I do not know who the A/D MET (Assistant Director Metropolitan Division of the DPP) was at the time and I am not sure I wrote the typed part of the minute. But as I signed the end I guess that I adopted its contents and probably sent it on its way. I do not now remember it and I do not know from where it has *now* come nor whether it was ever sent to A/D MET or to someone else – the file jacket should have indicated that. But I would have thought it would have been seen by the Director with the file. I do not recall any further or subsequent internal minutes responding to the one with my signature at the bottom.

I believe that the Director, Sir Thomas Hetherington, had a meeting with Sir David Napley but I don't know the date. I was not asked to be present and knew nothing about it until it had taken place. Hence, I do not know the details discussed. I do not know who else attended.

At some point following the meeting I must have heard that it had been decided that Hayman would not be prosecuted. Although I cannot recall a reason not to prosecute, I always believed that it was because of the concern that Hayman might commit suicide. Of course, it was The Director's prerogative to make such decisions if he thought fit. Apart from the minute, the bottom of which I signed, I do not recall any other oral or written involvement in the decision making process.

The police report received on 7 December 1978 was probably intended to be an interim report sent to the DPP's office before the Metropolitan Police decided whether to spend more time on the matter.

The sentence: "*As it seems no harm has been done to anyone*" should be read in the context of the minute and of other papers which might have been received from the police, and particularly The Post Office Act 1953, probably section 11 which, by then, was becoming out-dated. I cannot now second-guess or justify the contents of the minute particularly without seeing the rest of the papers that might have then existed. The law then applicable was that which existed in 1978 and not necessarily now. As I recall, Section 11 made it an offence to send an indecent package through the post with a view of creating an offence to protect Post Office employees. If an indecent package had been sent via other carriers there was then no similar offence. As the package was left on a bus in a brief case it could be suggested no harm, *per se*, was done to which the Act was aimed.

I have no recollection of speaking to police officers about this case but I may well have done so as it was not unusual to talk about cases which involved or might involve the DPP's office. The minute ending with my handwriting suggests that I did and concludes with 'the note is based upon the papers and what I have been told by the police' but I cannot remember what was said.