

INDEPENDENT INQUIRY CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE

ANGLICAN CHURCH INVESTIGATION

PETER BALL CASE STUDY

I, June Rodgers, Barrister of 2 Harcourt Buildings, The Temple London EC4Y 9DB, Chancellor of the Diocese of Gloucester, say as follows :-

- 1 I have been Chancellor of the Diocese of Gloucester since 1990.
2. I have read the transcript of the interview I had with Ms Moira Gibb on 15th February 2017 in respect of the Peter Ball enquiry (**INQ000656**). It appears to be accurate. I have nothing more to add to it, save for the following clarifications and additions:-
3. On **Page One (INQ000656_001) Paragraph 5**. From memory I think my Registrar was, by then, trying to contact me by telephone and I him. We managed to speak late that evening. There is a typing error which should read “indecent assault **in** public office”. I think it right to say that we were both concerned that any individual in police custody should be legally advised as soon as possible. As far as I was concerned PB was an individual who needed legal advice. The whole idea of a Bishop, who had been through the selection procedure and in-house Church of England enquiries, facing these charges appeared that evening to be grotesque. I must say that the first thought was that he might be facing allegations from a potential blackmailer. Within a very short time I realised in that I was wrong.

On **Page One (INQ000656_001) Paragraph 7**. To clarify the final paragraph for the avoidance of doubt “**They got in touch with each other**” means myself and the Registrar.

4. On **Page Two (INQ000656_002) paragraph 3**. “**the cathedral authorities turned up**” should read “appeared to become involved”.
5. On **Page 2 (INQ000656_002) Paragraph 6**. I would like to add the following. In respect of the letter from Peter Ball which I referred to in his interview, completely by chance within the last few days while looking for some holiday photographs, from a totally unconnected file two letters from Peter Ball fell out. I exhibit these to this statement marked “JR1” (**ANG000293**) and “JR2” (**ANG000294**). They are dated 2002. Having found them by chance I consider it proper for the sake of completeness to produce them. When I spoke to Ms Gibb I had a memory of one letter only,

and no memory of Peter Ball telephoning me on what appears to have been two occasions. He appears to have done so before he wrote the letter of 13th March 2002. From these two letters it is clear that he was exercised about the caution. In his letter of 25th June 2002 he appears to want me to send "a gentle letter to the police or the CPS". However civil I would have been to him on the telephone, I most certainly did not do as he requested. His subsequent comments about my alleged "harsh words" do not appear to be reflected in these letters

6. Having read his second letter, "JR2" (ANG000294) I did nothing. The legal reality of a caution is so clear that it beggared belief that he was challenging it. The background to what ever was "the condition" attached to the caution I had no knowledge of nor part in that. I assume, as it was being mentioned after his resignation, that he was to go abroad to the mission field, but I really cannot comment on that. I note he writes that he had sent me some papers. Of these I have no memory. I doubt if I even read them. I would have sent them back to him immediately. I have no such papers in my possession.
7. I think it should be pointed out that idea of the church meddling or covering up was more apparent after Peter Ball was dealt with by the caution. It seemed that a great deal of effort was being expended by the Balls and their friends to rehabilitate him, as if the caution was hardly worth worrying about.
8. On **Page 3 (INQ000656_003)**, in the last paragraph again for the sake of clarity, Ball's excuse for "beating teenage boys in the shower" as being "spiritual exercises" would have been laughed at by any jury, had the matter come to a criminal trial. With hindsight, from the point of view of the Church of England, it might have been better to have thrown him to the dogs in a criminal trial so that the outside world could have heard what had been going on. It was not foreseeable that after he had resigned he would continue to pester people to be rehabilitated, people who did not, maybe, know just what he had been doing. I cannot speak about what the Church of England centrally was doing or advising the Diocese of Gloucester. At the end of the day PB, as any individual, was entitled to professional advice as he was facing a criminal charge which would have led to imprisonment. The need to have the liberty of the subject protected was the foremost thought in my mind in the initial 48 hours, not protecting the reputation of the Church of England. How PB's pressure for rehabilitation within the Church of England was subsequently dealt with may be open to criticism.

9. On page 4 (INQ000656_004) When visiting Lambeth Palace in respect of the next episcopal appointment my request was that the Diocese needed a quiet, boring, safe appointment, two children, a Labrador and a goldfish
There had been too much disruption

Statement of Truth

I believe that the facts stated in this witness statement are true.

Signed: _____

DPA

Dated: _____

DPA

3rd June 2018.