

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

Witness 1

The Inquiry heard evidence from a leading barrister (Queen’s Counsel). 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 witness gave a summary of his career and explained his involvement in a Leicestershire Police investigation into historical allegations concerning Lord Janner.

He said that the fact that Lord Janner was an MP and was well known locally would “*not have made the slightest difference*” to any advice he provided or to his approach towards the investigation. He said that he had advised that Lord Janner should be arrested, his home searched and that he be interviewed under caution. He explained that this advice had been addressed to the Chief Constable because Lord Janner was a person of some prominence. He acknowledged that this advice had subsequently been overtaken by events and that he had later advised against a prosecution.

He also indicated that from his perspective, nobody from the police or the CPS had been placed under any improper, inappropriate or undue pressure to behave in a way that they might not otherwise do, because it was an investigation into Lord Janner.

He said that if he had “*...advised there was a case against Greville Janner, [he] wouldn’t have had any hesitation in saying “prosecute him” and [he] wouldn’t have had any hesitation in being the one to do it*”

1

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

Witness 2

The Inquiry also heard evidence from a retired Chief Law Clerk who had worked for the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS). 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 described his involvement in a Leicestershire Police investigation into historical allegations concerning Lord Janner. He said that he was in regular contact with two of the investigating officers throughout the investigation.

The witness recalled the evidence against Lord Janner. He refuted the suggestion that Lord Janner had been treated with deference, although he acknowledged feeling shocked that somebody with Lord Janner's standing in society was alleged to have been involved in something like this.

He stated that he had the impression that the officers he dealt with were under a degree of pressure from more senior officers who were wary about pursuing Lord Janner. He said this impression was not based on any specific comments made to him by the police officers: "*It was not what was said by the police but what they didn't say*". He said that he felt that "*...there was something holding them back, that at that point they seemed to have gone off the boil*".