

**OPEN summary of CLOSED session
15 October 2020**

Witness 1

The Inquiry heard evidence from a retired senior police officer. For the reasons given by the Chair in her ruling dated the 5 March 2020,¹ his evidence was given in CLOSED session. The following is a summary of those parts of his evidence that can be stated in OPEN:

The officer provided a summary of his career. He explained that for a period of 11 years he was the Lead Officer for ACPO on all matters relating to child protection and sex offenders, working at a national level within government departments and other agencies to represent the police service on all aspects of policy and strategy development in those areas.

The officer was asked about his involvement in a Leicestershire Police investigation into historical allegations concerning Lord Janner. He stated that he had no recollection of any of the events of that period and was reliant upon the documentation that had been provided to him to refresh his memory.

When asked, he refuted the suggestion made by another witness to the Inquiry that he had given an instruction not to arrest Greville Janner. He was asked to clarify a series of previous comments in which he had accepted that he could have given such an instruction. He stated that his previous comments were made without the benefit of reviewing all of the documentation and that he could now say “*categorically*” that he did not make that decision.

The officer was also asked about the decision not to prosecute Lord Janner. He stated that there “*...wasn't a cover-up*”. He suggested that there were “*...a lot of other issues...that may have...led to the fact that [Lord Janner] wasn't prosecuted*”, including the culture of the criminal justice system at the time, which he described as being “*fairly brutal in relation to victims making allegations of child sexual abuse*”. He explained that such cases involved “*...very substantial cross-examination, going into lots of detail...confusing children in the witness box and also using any opportunity they could to trip the child up*”. The officer also referred to the practice of defendants using “*...background information as a way of discrediting them*” and “*...lots of applications by defence for disclosure of background files, particularly if they were in care or been involved in the social services*”.

1

<https://www.iicsa.org.uk/key-documents/17767/view/2020.03.05-notice-determination-following-preliminary-hearing-20-february-2020.pdf>



INDEPENDENT INQUIRY CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE

Witness 2

The Inquiry also heard evidence from a Senior Crown Prosecutor from within the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) about his involvement with a Leicestershire Police investigation into historical allegations concerning Lord Janner. For the same reasons, his evidence was also given in CLOSED session. The following is a summary of those parts of his evidence that can be stated in OPEN:

The witness explained that at the time of the investigation he was an Articled Clerk within the CPS. His role was to liaise with the police and to deal with documentation coming into the CPS office in relation to the investigation into Lord Janner. He said that any correspondence or documentation that he created would have been seen and approved by his principal. He explained that he had no decision-making role in relation to the investigation into the allegations concerning Lord Janner.

The witness said that during the investigation further lines of enquiry had been identified and he was concerned that the police had not conducted some of those enquiries. He acknowledged feeling frustrated as a result.

He stated that he thought the decision not to take any action against Lord Janner was right at the time and that he continues to think that now.