

**NOTICE OF DETERMINATION
CORE PARTICIPANT APPLICATION**

1. On 5 January 2016 the Inquiry invited anyone who wished to be designated as a core participant in the Cambridge House, Knowl View and Rochdale investigation to make an application to the Solicitor to the Inquiry by 5 February 2016.
2. On 5 February 2016, an application was made by the Chief Constable of Lancashire Police for core participant status in the Cambridge House, Knowl View and Rochdale investigation and for Nitin Borde of Lancashire Legal department to be the recognised legal representative for the purposes of this investigation. This notice sets out my determination of the application.
3. Applications for core participant status are considered under Rule 5 of The Inquiry Rules 2006 which provides:
 - (1) *The chairman may designate a person as a core participant at any time during the course of the inquiry, provided that person consents to being so designated.*
 - (2) *In deciding whether to designate a person as a core participant, the chairman must in particular consider whether –*
 - a. *The person played, or may have played, a direct and significant role in relation to the matters to which the inquiry relates;*
 - b. *The person has a significant interest in an important aspect of the matters to which the inquiry relates; or*
 - c. *The person may be subject to explicit or significant criticism during the inquiry proceedings or in the report, or in any interim report.*
 - (3) *A person ceases to be a core participant on –*
 - a. *the date specified by the chairman in writing; or*
 - b. *the end of the inquiry.*

4. In determining the application, the matters listed in Rule 5(2) must be considered, but the list is not exhaustive and I may also take other relevant matters into account.
5. Having regard to the provisions of Rule 5(2), I am satisfied that the Chief Constable of Lancashire Police should be designated as a core participant in relation to the Cambridge House, Knowl View and Rochdale investigation. In 1970, at a time when Cambridge House came within the boundary of the area policed by Lancashire Police, it carried out an investigation into allegations of sexual abuse made against Cyril Smith by boys who had attended or resided at Cambridge House. The Inquiry is likely to consider aspects of that investigation and whether it was an adequate and appropriate response to the allegations made.
6. For that reason, I consider, for the purposes of Rule 5 (2) (a) that Lancashire Police played a direct and significant role in relation to matters under investigation. On a more general basis, at that time, Lancashire Police would also have been the police force that would have received allegations of abuse of boys who attended or resided at Cambridge House Boys' Hostel. Amongst other matters, the Inquiry's investigation into Cambridge House, Knowl View and Rochdale will consider the extent to which law enforcement agencies were aware of allegations of sexual abuse concerning children who resided at Cambridge House (and potentially other institutions) and failed to take appropriate steps in response to it.
7. I am therefore satisfied, having regard to Rule 5(2)(b) and (c) that Lancashire Police has a significant interest in an important aspect of the matters under investigation and may also be subject to explicit or significant criticism during the inquiry proceedings or in the report, or in any interim report
8. Applications for designation as the recognised legal representative of a core participant are governed by Rules 6 and 7 of the Inquiry Rules 2006, which provide as follows:

6(1) Where -

- (a) a core participant, other than a core participant referred to in rule 7; or
- (b) any other person required or permitted to give evidence or produce documents during the course of the inquiry,

has appointed a qualified lawyer to act on that person's behalf, the chairman must designate that lawyer as that person's recognised legal representative in respect of the inquiry proceedings.

7(1) This rule applies where there are two or more core participants, each of whom seeks to be legally represented, and the chairman considers that -

- (a) their interests in the outcome of the inquiry are similar;*
- (b) the facts they are likely to rely on in the course of the inquiry are similar; and*
- (c) it is fair and proper for them to be jointly represented.*

(2) The chairman must direct that those core participants shall be represented by a single recognised legal representative, and the chairman may designate a qualified lawyer for that purpose.

(3) Subject to paragraph (4), any designation must be agreed by the core participants in question.

(4) If no agreement on a designation is forthcoming within a reasonable period, the chairman may designate an appropriate lawyer who, in his opinion, has sufficient knowledge and experience to act in this capacity.

9. Accordingly, as I am satisfied that Chief Constable of Lancashire Police has appointed Nitin Borde of Lancashire Legal department as their qualified lawyer, I designate Mr Borde as Chief Constable of Lancashire Police recognised legal representative in accordance with Rule 6(1) as I am required by that rule to do.

10. Directions will be given for receipt of applications for an award under section 40(1)(b) of the Inquiries Act 2005 for expenses to be incurred in respect of legal representation at the forthcoming public hearing. Such applications by core participants will be determined in accordance with the Inquiry's Cost Protocol on Legal Representation at Public Expense.

Hon. Dame Lowell Goddard DNZM
Chair, Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Abuse

29 February 2016