

Ground Floor
19 Ridgeway
Quinton Business Park
Quinton
Birmingham
B32 1AL

T 0300 020 0096
Text Relay 18001 0207 166 3000
E enquiries@policeconduct.gov.uk
W www.policeconduct.gov.uk

23 March 2020

Dear Chief Superintendent Ball

Thank you for your letter of 3 February 2020. Please accept my apologies for the delay in providing you with a response.

I am grateful to you for bringing these issues to my attention. I accept that the quotes referenced at page 48 of the decision document and identified in your letter are wrongly attributed to Mr Thomas.

I have carefully considered whether this materially impacts on the case to answer conclusion reached and have concluded that it does not. The concerns in relation to Mr Thomas were the failings in relation to the investigation into Lord Janner during Operation Dauntless. Those potential failings were initially set out in the notices of investigation served upon him [as set out on p46 of the Case to Answer document]. The evidence in relation to those failings is summarised in the IO's report and the significant failings thereafter summarised in the case to answer decision [between pages 46-49]. The analysis resulting

in the case to answer decision included careful consideration of the contemporaneous documentation, including Mr Thomas' own decision log, evidence of correspondence and communication with the CPS, evidence from DI Barrs and DS Swift-Rollinson and Mr Thomas' own comments when questioned.

The evidence included observations made by Mr Thomas himself in his decision log and in the letter to the CPS dated 24th April 2007.

Mr Thomas stated the following in the document entitled DECISION 13:

"...based on the nature of the allegations, JANNER's approach when previously I/V'd by police [Restriction Order] his public profile & absence of strong corroborative evidence it is HIGHLY UNLIKELY that any evidence supporting the allegations will be gained thro' interview."

"...it is highly unlikely that arrest/search would uncover forensic or other supporting evidence concerning this allegation."

Notwithstanding the fact that there had been no questioning of Lord Janner (who [JA-A8] accused of serious sexual assaults including anal rape and digital anal penetration) and no search of his home for any potential corroborating or incriminating evidence, the covering letter to the CPS from Mr Thomas dated 24 April 2007 stated "we have conducted a full investigation into [JA-A8]'s allegations" and that "due to the passage of time it is unlikely that investigation would uncover any additional fresh evidence."

It was therefore self-evidently Mr Thomas' own view that any interview of Lord Janner was highly unlikely to assist and that the investigation had been "full" and had run its course. Mr Rock's observations, albeit wrongly attributed to Mr Thomas, were not therefore of a different order to the views actually held by Mr Thomas himself.

As I have reached the view that my decision is not materially impacted by the factual errors identified, I do not consider it to be necessary in the circumstances to consider

revisiting my decision. I do acknowledge, however, that it is important that the evidential position is accurately communicated in the Inquiry process. I therefore propose to share a copy of this letter with the lawyer to the Inquiry and will, of course, assist the Inquiry in whatever way they consider appropriate in addressing the issue. I will ensure that you are sighted on this correspondence.

Yours sincerely



DPA

Derrick Campbell

Regional Director

On behalf of the Director General