

Witness Name: Mr Richard Gargini

Statement No: 1

Exhibits:

Dated: 9 June 2020

THE INDEPENDENT INQUIRY INTO CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE

Draft Witness Statement of Mr Richard Gargini

I, Mr Richard Gargini , will say as follows:-

1. I am a retired police officer. I retired in 2010 with over 33 years of service in the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS), predominantly in crime investigation and specialist roles.
2. I make this statement in response to a Rule 9 request from the Inquiry dated 22 April 2020.

2015 Police Statement

3. On 13 October 2015 I was interviewed by officers from Metropolitan Police Service's ("MPS") Operation WINTERKEY. A statement was prepared the following day based on the answers I gave in interview [MPS003953] ('my 2015 statement'). I answered the officers' questions honestly to the best of my recollection. A limited number of documents were shown to me during the course of the interview and questions were asked about their content. I had not seen those documents for at least 15 years.
4. Further to the Inquiry's rule 9 request I have been given access to many more documents that have enabled me to refresh my memory and to put matters, including those I was asked about in 2015, into context. As a result, I have come to realise that

the unauthorised disclosure is unknown, however, he believes the source to be a police officer. In further discussion Mr. Goldie accepted that the information may equally have originated from LBL and there is no direct evidence to support his assertion.

In support of his assertion Mr Goldie referred to a conversation with DI Clive Driscoll of the Police Child Protection Team. Mr. Goldie received a faxed collection of papers from DI Driscoll, the content of which bore marked similarities to the content of the newspaper article in question. Mr Goldie was subsequently reassured by Det. Supt. Randall, SW Crime OCU that there were differences in content and the newspaper article. Mr. Goldie accepted this reassurance, however, he did state that DI Driscoll (whom he constantly refers to as Clive) informed him that a Daily Express reporter had been 'sniffing around' the investigation but that he (DI Driscoll) had managed to 'keep the lid' on it.

Mr. Goldie stated that if the leak were inside Lambeth Social services then it could only be a limited number of people who had access to the information and this would be very worrying.

- **DI Clive Driscoll.**

Mr. Goldie referred to highly sensitive and inappropriate remarks made by DI Driscoll in structured meetings. He was particularly concerned about the disclosure of unsubstantiated rumour in relation to prominent politicians in the presence of junior members of the Social Services Department. Mr. Goldie alleges that DI Driscoll has linked a number of senior political figures without foundation. Mr Goldie accepts that DI Driscoll may have acquired this information from an intelligence a source, however, he has concern about the timing and inferences drawn by DI Driscoll.

The identity of the personalities mentioned are sensitive and are known to Commander Orde.

Mr. Goldie asserted that DI Driscoll failed to understand the impact and implications of repeating the names in a structured meeting and therefore the relationship between the CPT and Social Services had been damaged. Mr Goldie concluded by stating that trust and confidentiality had been breached. He then went on to compare the professional approach of the Merseyside officers with whom he has recently met and the potentially damaging approach by DI Driscoll.

- ***Lambeth Social Services position in the light of the ongoing sensitive enquiry***

Mr Goldie feels that Lambeth Social Services are vulnerable to political backlash or fallout in the light of the ongoing enquiry. He feels that current staff members may be particularly vulnerable and stated that he was instrumental in involving and fully co-operating with police investigations in respect of this and other enquiries. He states that progressing the enquiry with DI Driscoll in post would be difficult.

He is concerned that Lambeth Social services will be criticised by an independent enquiry by the SSI in that in 1996 allegations were made by various people and members of Lambeth Social Services did not act upon this information.”

72. Dr GOLDIE provided me with the names of high profile individuals that had been mentioned by DI DRISCOLL. I can now only recall that one of them was: LA-F41
I recall asking Dr GOLDIE if he had any information to substantiate DI DRISCOLL's allegations. He confirmed that he did not, and he stated that he believed they were without foundation.
73. Clearly if Dr GOLDIE had had any evidence or information about criminality by the high profile individuals mentioned by DI DRISCOLL, I would have arranged for a statement to be taken from taken from him. As he did not, there was no reason for me to do so.
74. I have been asked if I conveyed to Dr. GOLDIE that he ought not to repeat any of the matters which DI DRISCOLL had raised (as regards the specific individuals). I have no recollection of doing so. It is quite possible that I reminded Dr GOLDIE of the need for general confidentiality when police enquiries are ongoing in order to preserve the integrity of the investigation. I would have given this kind of reminder to any potential witness. For instance, I note that my Decision 40 dated 12 February 1999 was that Ms KENWARD was to progress the issue of reminding senior Lambeth Council staff of the confidentiality duty.
75. I have been asked whether I considered my tone was threatening when speaking with Dr GOLDIE. I do not consider my tone was threatening when speaking with Dr. GOLDIE. I would have conducted our meeting with a serious and objective approach. I am unaware of any reason why this could have been interpreted as threatening.