

<p>1 Tuesday, 5 February 2019</p> <p>2 (10.00 am)</p> <p>3 THE CHAIR: Good morning, everyone, and welcome to Day 2 of</p> <p>4 this public hearing. Ms Karmy-Jones?</p> <p>5 MS KARMY-JONES: Thank you, chair. The witness this</p> <p>6 morning, who sits in the box, is Commander Neil Jerome.</p> <p>7 His witness statement is at tab A1 of the relevant</p> <p>8 bundle, which I hope that you have before you.</p> <p>9 During the course of his evidence, you may also be</p> <p>10 referred to the statement bundle and another short</p> <p>11 bundle that will be handed to you at the relevant time.</p> <p>12 If the witness could be sworn, please.</p> <p>13 MR NEIL ALAN JEROME (sworn)</p> <p>14 Examination by MS KARMY-JONES</p> <p>15 MS KARMY-JONES: Mr Jerome, could you give your full name?</p> <p>16 A. I am Neil Alan Jerome, and I am a commander in the</p> <p>17 Metropolitan Police Service.</p> <p>18 Q. You are attending today to give evidence on behalf of</p> <p>19 the Metropolitan Police Service?</p> <p>20 A. Yes, I am.</p> <p>21 Q. You are, as you have indicated, the commander within the</p> <p>22 MPS and specifically commander of the Specialist Crime</p> <p>23 Unit; is that correct?</p> <p>24 A. That's right.</p> <p>25 Q. Within that unit, there is an investigation called</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 1</p>	<p>1 Operation Winter Key?</p> <p>2 A. There is.</p> <p>3 Q. Tell us what that is, please?</p> <p>4 A. Operation Winter Key is a dedicated unit which comprises</p> <p>5 a number of officers who are able to conduct</p> <p>6 investigations, as well as intelligence functions, as</p> <p>7 well as analytical functions, and their role is to</p> <p>8 conduct historic investigations in relation to child</p> <p>9 sexual abuse that is reported as well as responding to</p> <p>10 requests from the inquiry.</p> <p>11 Q. Can I ask when it was set up?</p> <p>12 A. It was set up in 2015.</p> <p>13 Q. So it was a direct response to the inquiry?</p> <p>14 A. Yes, it was.</p> <p>15 Q. You, yourself, have no direct knowledge of</p> <p>16 the investigations at Ealing Abbey; is that correct?</p> <p>17 A. That's right.</p> <p>18 Q. You didn't play any part in them?</p> <p>19 A. No.</p> <p>20 Q. Have you, however, had an opportunity to review the</p> <p>21 records relating to allegations of child sexual abuse?</p> <p>22 A. Yes, I have.</p> <p>23 Q. You have had quite a long career, many different roles.</p> <p>24 Have you, yourself, had direct experience of</p> <p>25 investigating allegations of child sexual abuse?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 2</p>
<p>1 A. Yes, I have. So I have -- currently, I'm a commander in</p> <p>2 the Metropolitan Police, but prior to that I served in</p> <p>3 Kent Police for 25 years and, as part of my early</p> <p>4 career, I was a detective inspector and a detective</p> <p>5 chief inspector with responsibility for investigation of</p> <p>6 child sexual abuse.</p> <p>7 Q. That presumably included historic allegations?</p> <p>8 A. There weren't coming through, in my particular time</p> <p>9 there, historic allegations. They were current</p> <p>10 investigations.</p> <p>11 Q. Have you, yourself, had direct experience as an</p> <p>12 investigating officer of an historic --</p> <p>13 A. No, I have not.</p> <p>14 Q. But from what you say, have you had knowledge of</p> <p>15 submitting cases for charging decisions --</p> <p>16 A. Yes, I have.</p> <p>17 Q. -- to the Crown Prosecution Service?</p> <p>18 A. Yes.</p> <p>19 Q. Across what period of time? When did you begin,</p> <p>20 yourself, approximately, submitting such cases to the</p> <p>21 Crown Prosecution Service?</p> <p>22 A. So that -- I was a detective inspector from 1998 until</p> <p>23 2000, and then a detective chief inspector until 2006.</p> <p>24 Q. Before becoming a detective inspector, did you come up</p> <p>25 the ranks in the usual way of being a detective</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 3</p>	<p>1 constable, a detective sergeant?</p> <p>2 A. That's right, yes, I did.</p> <p>3 Q. During that period, did you submit cases to the Crown</p> <p>4 Prosecution Service?</p> <p>5 A. I did, yes.</p> <p>6 Q. Not having direct experience of the matters we are</p> <p>7 making enquiry into at Ealing Abbey, you have, I think,</p> <p>8 obtained reports from officers who have been involved in</p> <p>9 the various investigations; is that correct?</p> <p>10 A. That's correct.</p> <p>11 Q. Have you also spoken to those officers?</p> <p>12 A. No, I have not.</p> <p>13 Q. I think you received -- we will come back to these in</p> <p>14 a moment, but you received written reports from</p> <p>15 Detective Sergeant Chris Sloan, Detective Sergeant</p> <p>16 Shaun Richardson, now retired Detective Sergeant</p> <p>17 Gareth Morgan, Detective Sergeant Serena D'Adamo, and</p> <p>18 Detective Sergeant Constable Matt O'Neill?</p> <p>19 A. That's right.</p> <p>20 Q. You have used those reports to provide you with the</p> <p>21 basis of your report?</p> <p>22 A. That's right.</p> <p>23 Q. Did you consider having a meeting with all of them to</p> <p>24 discuss some of the issues raised by this strand of</p> <p>25 the inquiry?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 4</p>

<p>1 A. So, given that the officers are retired, whilst clearly 2 that would be an option, my consideration was what they 3 had provided in written format was sufficient. 4 Q. Are they all retired? 5 A. Not all of them. So D'Adamo is still a serving officer. 6 Q. Can I just ask you about the Metropolitan Police Service 7 in general and the role of police, then, in 8 investigating a case as opposed to the role of the Crown 9 Prosecution Service. Can you help us with that? 10 A. Certainly. So the role of the police is to conduct 11 investigations. They will receive reports of crime from 12 complainants and then, once they have received those, 13 they will then conduct an investigation following those 14 reports, and the investigation is one which -- it has 15 been very much an emerging practice, but the Criminal 16 Procedure and Investigations Act 1996 sets out that the 17 investigation should be looking for what would be termed 18 reasonable lines of enquiry, which may or may not lead 19 to a conviction. It is a search for the truth as 20 opposed to pursuing a single strand of evidence, and we 21 would then present that investigation case, if it 22 reached the threshold, to the Crown Prosecution Service 23 for a decision as to whether that would then be 24 proceeded with charge. 25 Q. That approach has changed with time, hasn't it?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 5</p>	<p>1 A. It has, yes. 2 Q. How much influence do the police have in a charging 3 decision? 4 A. So back before the CPS took the responsibility for 5 charging, that was a police decision. Since the CPS 6 have taken over the charging decision, then -- clearly, 7 the CPS will take reports from the police, but their 8 decision is made independently of the police. 9 Q. Would you agree that the Crown Prosecution Service will 10 often be reliant on the material provided by police? 11 A. Yes, they will. 12 Q. And that the charging decision will ultimately be 13 reliant on how well that material has been assessed? 14 A. Absolutely. 15 Q. Can I just ask you about policies on file, recording and 16 retention, recording of incidents and retention. What 17 is the policy of the Met Police in terms of retaining 18 allegations such as this? 19 A. So the retaining of allegations would be compliant with 20 the national policies in relation to the management of 21 police information, and that categorises the different 22 lengths of time that a report would be kept for. So 23 certainly, for instances of this, then they would be 24 kept -- I think, off the top of my head, they are 25 retained for in excess of 10 years. It may well be</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 6</p>
<p>1 quite considerably longer than that. 2 Q. How are instances of this classified? What do you call 3 them? 4 A. So they would be classified according to the allegations 5 that are made against the law. So we would then 6 generate a crime report that would then have the 7 categorisation according to which particular offence at 8 law we believe may have been broken. 9 Q. Would cases involving allegations of child sexual abuse 10 be given any marker, in terms of level of seriousness? 11 A. So, clearly, they would be taken seriously. There would 12 be no specific marker, as far as my understanding is, on 13 the crime reporting system, but, clearly, the offences 14 that would be categorised would be dealt with as serious 15 offences. 16 Q. Would the officers investigating crimes such as this be 17 specialist officers in any respect? 18 A. So certainly, at the time when some of these 19 investigations were conducted, they were officers who 20 were assigned to the child abuse investigation team, so 21 they were specialist officers. But I can see that in 22 other investigations that they were more general 23 detective officers. 24 Q. When you say "other investigations" -- 25 A. So there was an investigation in 1992. I believe that</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 7</p>	<p>1 to be a general detective officer. 2 Q. We are going to come on to that one in a moment. Can I, 3 though, invite you, and anyone who wishes to, to turn 4 behind divider C1 of our bundle. The reference for 5 this, for those in the public gallery, is OHY006752_001. 6 This is an exhibit that you have provided to us -- 7 A. That's right. 8 Q. -- in which you, or someone assisting you, has compiled 9 details, or a schedule, of the allegations emerging from 10 Ealing Abbey and St Benedict's School -- 11 A. That's right. 12 Q. -- since 1992? 13 A. Yes. 14 Q. It has been put together in date order of when those 15 allegations have come to your attention? 16 A. That's right. 17 Q. In summary, you have found that there were 18 66 allegations? 19 A. Yes. 20 Q. Some relating to the same complainant? 21 A. Yes. 22 Q. If we just look at that, at page 1, just so that we can 23 get a sense of the quantity, there was one allegation in 24 1992 relating to RC-A595? 25 A. Yes.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 8</p>

<p>1 Q. One in 1995? 2 A. Yes. 3 Q. There were seven allegations in 2001 relating to 4 David Pearce, John Maestri and an unnamed monk. Over 5 the page, at line 12, there were four allegations in 6 2004 relating to Laurence Soper and Father Pearce? 7 A. That's right. 8 Q. Over the page, there were two allegations in 2005 9 relating to RC-F282 and F41? 10 A. Yes. 11 Q. There were eight allegations in 2008 relating to, again, 12 Pearce, Maestri and Soper? 13 A. Yes. 14 Q. Over the page, looking at line 26, there were six 15 allegations in 2010 relating to RC-F46 and, again, 16 Maestri and Pearce and Soper, and then, again, Skelton? 17 A. Yes. 18 Q. There were five allegations in 2011 relating to Soper, 19 Pearce, Soper and another monk who is unnamed? 20 A. Yes. 21 Q. Looking at line 37, in 2012, there were seven 22 allegations relating to Soper, RC-F310, RC-F311, 23 RC-F312, Soper and Pearce? 24 A. Yes. 25 Q. There was one allegation in 2013 relating to Soper;</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 9</p>	<p>1 eight allegations in 2014 relating to Pearce and Soper, 2 Maestri, F46, and some unnamed, and F96. At page 8 and 3 line 53, there was one allegation in 2015. And in 2016, 4 there were eight allegations, including against Pearce 5 and Soper, and, in addition to that, there was the 6 conviction of Peter Allott? 7 A. Yes. 8 Q. In 2017 -- this is page 9, line 63 -- there were three 9 allegations, again, in respect of a monk, Soper and 10 Pearce; and there's been one allegation in 2018? 11 A. Yes. 12 Q. My helpful junior, Mr Donmall, said that I had said 13 there were seven allegations in 2001. There were in 14 fact two in 2001 and five of those were in 2003. We can 15 look at the maths. It is an awful lot of allegations, 16 isn't it? 17 A. Yes, it is. 18 Q. Do you consider that there may have been a failing in 19 drawing the strands together of the amount of alleged 20 abuse and actual abuse that took place at Ealing Abbey 21 and St Benedict's School? 22 A. So, certainly, when you look at the totality and you 23 look through each of those allegations that are made and 24 when they are made, being able to draw the links between 25 those, I think we could have done much better at, yes.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 10</p>
<p>1 I can see that, on occasions, the investigating 2 officers -- so, by way of an example, 2004, there is an 3 investigation that takes place and an officer -- the 4 investigating officer of that allegation goes back to 5 the 1992 and also the 2001 allegations to try and draw 6 those links and see if there is any supporting evidence 7 that can be used. So I can see that that takes place. 8 But when you look at the totality of it, then 9 drawing those links, we could have been better at, yes. 10 Q. On the face of what we have seen, there doesn't seem to 11 have been a concerted approach to just say, "What is 12 going on at this institution?" Would you agree that 13 individual cases were, for the most part -- you have 14 mentioned one in 2001 and 2004, but for the most part, 15 were dealt with individually? 16 A. Yes, they were, yes. And the investigating officers 17 were allocated -- whilst there is a degree of 18 consistency in the investigating officers, because many 19 of them haven't moved, those investigations were 20 allocated to those investigating officers as 21 individuals, as opposed to a pool of detectives who 22 would then work on bringing all of those links together. 23 That did not take place until 2015 when 24 Operation Winter Key started, and then I can then see 25 that those links are being drawn together.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 11</p>	<p>1 Q. And that of course culminated in the conviction of 2 Father Soper? 3 A. Yes, it did. 4 Q. The team of officers who worked on a number of these 5 allegations in the early 2000s was quite a small team, 6 wasn't it? 7 A. Yes, it was. 8 Q. Would they have been based in the same office? 9 A. I believe so, yes. 10 Q. So there would have been opportunity for 11 cross-fertilisation of information and discussion about 12 cases that each was investigating? 13 A. Yes, there would have been. I think that, certainly 14 recalling back to those days, officers, I think, would 15 have looked at the complaint that they had in front of 16 them and worked through that, as opposed to thinking 17 wider, albeit that -- again, coming back to the 2004 18 investigation -- I can see that the officer then is 19 thinking broader and saying, "What other supporting 20 evidence can be drawn into that investigation?", and 21 certainly, by the time we get to the investigation into 22 Pearce, in 2008, I can see that the officers then are 23 thinking broader as well. 24 Q. I am, through you, going to deal with some documentary 25 material. It may be a little slow, but please bear with</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 12</p>

<p>1 us. I would like to start by looking at the first of 2 the allegations, that in respect of RC-A595, the 1992 3 allegation. Chair, members of the panel, that should be 4 behind your divider C4. I think the documents behind C4 5 are the Met Police file, or aspects of it, for this 6 case. 7 Before we go into the detail of it, in summary, this 8 was the case of an 11-year-old boy who made 9 a contemporaneous allegation against Father Pearce 10 in June 1992. The allegation, what we know from other 11 evidence, is that on 4 June 1992, Father Pearce covered 12 a health education class for another teacher in which he 13 discussed child abuse, and it seems that was physical, 14 not sexual abuse. We know that took place on 4 June 15 from a statement made by another teacher that is in this 16 file. 17 Can we turn, please, to page 49. This is 18 MPS003066_049, if it can be brought up on the screen. 19 Actually, I'm so sorry, I have given you the wrong 20 reference. It is page 27, forgive me. As we are going 21 to deal with this, I am going to read the statement of 22 RC-A595. There are some redactions in it. 23 The statement is dated 15 June 1992, and the boy's 24 age is given as 10 years old. So I said 11, forgive me. 25 He was 10. He says this:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 13</p>	<p>1 "I live at home with my mother, my dad, I have one 2 sister and another sibling. I have lived at this 3 address since I was born. I have my own bedroom which 4 is at the front of the house. My dad tries to 5 discipline me as much as he can. He never goes 6 overboard. Sometimes, to make me do things, my dad 7 would give me a challenge like he say, 'Climb that 8 tree', to see if I would be able to do it. My dad only 9 smacks me if I am naughty, which is generally on my 10 wrist. Sometimes he makes an action as if he is really 11 going to wallop me, but it is just a little smack and 12 I run away and smile. If he is in a good mood and he 13 smacks me, I would poke my tongue out at him and 14 sometimes he would do the same back to me. But if he is 15 in a bad mood, I would not poke my tongue out at him. 16 I can only remember one occasion when my dad has ever 17 really beaten me and that was with a belt. He didn't 18 really want to do it, but from his point of view it was 19 necessary. I thought it was fair. About a year ago, 20 I was in class 2/2 and another child who was a year 21 older than me, he said that I had taken his cricket bat 22 and then [Mr X] said that I had better go and see the 23 child's teacher. When I got to his teacher, he sent me 24 to Father David. He wasn't there at the time, so I had 25 to go and see the secretary. I told the secretary that</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 14</p>
<p>1 I had taken the bat. Father David walked in and he 2 heard what I had said. He then said, 'Excuse me, did 3 you say that you stole [X's] cricket bat?' I then said, 4 'Yes'. He then told me to come into his office. 5 I thought that he was very unfair because he even never 6 investigate it. He just asked me my phone number and 7 then he rang my mum up and he told my mum to come and 8 collect me. It was open day at the school and my mum 9 and dad were coming to the school. In the car on the 10 way home, my mum said that she was very disgusted with 11 me, which I thought was very fair now, but at the time 12 I was just shocked. When I got home, my dad had his 13 belt ready to belt me. My dad told me to lean over the 14 arm of the settee. He belted me three times on my 15 bottom. It really hurt. My dad was really angry with 16 me that whole weekend. At the time when my dad belted 17 me, I felt it was fair from his point of view, but he 18 regretted it afterwards because I was found innocent of 19 stealing the cricket bat. Before it was fully 20 investigated, Father David said to my mum, 'I hope for 21 your sake that your son is innocent' and what my mum 22 thought by that was that I was guilty before it was 23 fully investigated. But afterwards he sent a letter 24 what was meant to be an apology, but it wasn't, and what 25 I thought was unfair was that he didn't tell anyone that</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 15</p>	<p>1 I was innocent afterwards. Now what I don't like up to 2 this date is that no-one at school trusts me because 3 Father David never announced my innocence. My mum was 4 still very angry at Father David because of this. 5 I attend St Benedict's School five times a week. It is 6 a private Catholic school for boys. I have been going 7 there for six years. I do not like the school because 8 I do not like some of the teachers. But I do like some 9 of the other boys in my class. The headmaster of my 10 school is Father David. He has always been the head 11 since I have been there. He pretends to be nice to me 12 and uses me as a scapegoat to get at my parents. 13 I don't really know why this is. I used to be bullied 14 at school and when I would tell Father David about it, 15 he would just say, 'Boys will be boys'. I can remember 16 on one occasion, when I went up and complained to him 17 with all my cuts and bruises because I was severely 18 bullied, and he just said, 'Boys will be boys' and 19 nothing was ever done about it. 20 "On Thursday, 4 June 1992, we were all in the 21 classroom having a lesson of health education, which was 22 taken by Father David, and the subject of the lesson was 23 child abuse. During the lesson, Father David called me 24 up to his desk and asked me what was wrong. I just 25 said, 'Nothing, sir', and he made me smile. After the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 16</p>

<p>1 lesson had finished, I was walking along the corridor to 2 go to my next lesson, which was music. Father David 3 called me out and said, 'What's wrong?' he said this 4 about ten times and I kept saying, 'Nothing, sir'. He 5 then took me to his office and closed the door. As you 6 walk into his office, there is a two- or three-seater 7 settee on the left. I sat on the settee because 8 Father David had forced me to. He placed his arm around 9 my shoulder and we both sat on the settee. Father David 10 then said [something]. And I said, 'No'. He kept 11 putting words in my mouth ... I said 'No'. He then 12 asked me [things]. I kept on saying 'No'. This went on 13 for nearly 50 minutes, he kept on asking me the same 14 questions over and over again. Father David then got up 15 and opened the door, looked out left and right in a sly 16 way. He then said, 'I will lock the door'. I then 17 heard a click. He then came over to me and told me to 18 get up. Then he told me to take down my shorts and 19 pants. He just said to me, 'Pull down your shorts and 20 pants', so I did. I was just standing with my back 21 towards him. He then started to rub my bottom with his 22 hand. He was pushing and prodding around the entrance 23 to my bottom with his finger. I knew it to be his 24 finger because I saw it. He kept asking if it was 25 hurting. I said, 'No' and he just continued for</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 17</p>	<p>1 a while, pushing and prodding with his finger to my 2 bottom. At the time, because I was frightened, I did 3 not think it was wrong ..."</p> <p>4 I am told that there is an issue with the document 5 feed. It is not the best timing, but I am told that 6 there is an issue with the document feed, perhaps out to 7 the public gallery, so we will need -- I am afraid I am 8 going to have to ask you to take a short break so that 9 that can be rectified so that those in the public 10 gallery can see the document. I'm sorry about that. 11 (10.30 am) 12 (A short break) 13 (10.48 am) 14 MS KARMY-JONES: I am sorry about that intervention, but 15 I understand everything is now working. 16 We were on, initially, MPS003066_030. We will just 17 see if that comes up on our screens. I am not going to 18 re-read the page. In the centre, there is a section 19 that's redacted, and can I clarify that that discussion 20 is about the cricket bat -- sorry, forgive me, it is 21 about the allegation of his father hitting him. 22 The child then went on in the statement to say that 23 after being asked many questions about his father, to 24 which he said, "No", he kept on saying, "No", and after 25 nearly an hour, after nearly 50 minutes, Father David</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 18</p>
<p>1 checked outside the door, looked left and right, and 2 then -- in a sly way, and then he said, "I will lock the 3 door". He heard the lock click and told him to take his 4 shorts and pants down, which the boy did. 5 He then started to rub his bottom with his hand. He 6 was pushing and prodding around the entrance to his 7 bottom with his finger. RC-A595 said he knew it to be 8 his finger because he saw it: 9 "He asked if it was hurting. I said no. He just 10 continued for a while pushing and prodding with his 11 finger to my bottom. I did not think it was wrong, but 12 it did hurt just a bit." 13 Now we are on the next page: 14 "His finger went into my bottom about 1cm. This 15 went on for about three minutes. I then walked away and 16 pulled my shorts and pants up. He then told me, 'It's 17 best if we keep this our secret for now'. I wasn't 18 quite sure about what was going on. I felt really 19 strange. I then left the room after Father David had 20 unlocked the door and had my lunch during the last 21 minutes of the break. I never saw Father David for the 22 rest of that day or that week. I did not see 23 Father David until the following week when he called me 24 to his office for some more interrogation. He did not 25 touch me.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 19</p>	<p>1 "On Thursday, 11 June, I was called again to his 2 office. He told me that he would have to ring 3 Social Services to tell them everything. I was very 4 confused as I did not know what was going on. That 5 afternoon, Pat Allen, a social worker, came to my 6 school. My mother was present and so was Father David. 7 He sat in his chair and was smiling [at me]. I had to 8 tell the social worker. I did not mention what 9 Father David had done to me because she wouldn't let me 10 say anything, only answering the questions she was 11 asking. She seemed to be on Father David's side. That 12 interview lasted for about half an hour and then I came 13 home with my mother. No-one was at home. I then went 14 outside onto the patio and I was very confused about 15 what was going on. 16 "Later that night, I went to my sister's room and 17 I was telling her everything that I could remember. 18 I then told her what Father David had done to me and 19 I went back to my room and went to bed. The next day in 20 the morning my mum was asking questions about what I had 21 told my sister. I then told my mum what Father David 22 had done to me and later that afternoon I was taken to 23 the Ealing Hospital where I was examined. 24 "Everything I have told you about what Father David 25 has done to me is the truth."</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 20</p>

<p>1 He goes on to say that he knows the difference 2 between truth and lies. 3 So that was the account of the child in relation to 4 the incident. The police did take further statements. 5 What we know from those further statements, if I can 6 summarise it for the sake of time, is that it was right 7 that on 4 June Pearce had covered a class, a social 8 sciences or health education class, for the other 9 teacher. After covering the class, he'd spoken to that 10 teacher and told the teacher that he had spoken to A595 11 in his room for an hour. So there was no doubt that 12 there had been a meeting on that day. 13 He expressed concern about the child being 14 physically and emotionally abused by his father, but 15 didn't tell the other teacher that he had examined the 16 boy in any way. 17 For anyone's reference, if they want to check that, 18 it is at page 50, but I don't ask for it to be called 19 up. 20 What he did say to the teacher was he thought he 21 should call Social Services, but instead what he said he 22 would do was speak to the child every day after that to 23 make sure that he was all right. 24 The sister also gave a statement, which is at 25 page 33 for reference, saying that on a date consistent</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 21</p>	<p>1 with 4 June, A595 had expressed distress about Pearce, 2 although he didn't reveal the allegation. He had been 3 very distressed about Pearce. 4 A week after that, he said that Pearce kept calling 5 him into his office. 6 On 11 June, David Pearce arranged a meeting with 7 Social Services and Patricia Allen, who is mentioned in 8 the boy's statement. Pearce was present at that meeting 9 and Ms Allen's statement confirmed that he sat in the 10 boy's full view while the boy was being questioned by 11 her. The boy didn't mention any sexual abuse, but he 12 confirmed what Pearce had said about an allegation of 13 physical abuse against his father. But he became very 14 distressed during the meeting. 15 That night, he told his sister what happened with 16 Pearce the week before, and that is how the chronology 17 develops. 18 The mother -- the boy is then taken to hospital the 19 next day, on the 12th, and on the 15th he makes the 20 statement that we have just read. Turning to some of 21 the documents, the police contacted the social worker, 22 Patricia Allen. If we can turn to page 88 of this 23 bundle, I don't know if it is possible to zoom in. You 24 will see in the text on the left-hand side, there is an 25 entry which is, "Dr [name redacted]". You can see just</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 22</p>
<p>1 above that: 2 "An appointment was then made for the subject to be 3 medically examined at hospital by the doctor. His 4 findings were no medical evidence of sexual abuse or 5 physical abuse." 6 You know, Officer: would it be expected, with an 7 allegation like this, for there to be any findings of 8 physical abuse, necessarily? Any physical evidence? 9 A. Not necessarily. It would very much depend upon, 10 clearly, the nature of that assault that's taken place. 11 And certainly, when you cross-read that across to the 12 statement -- now, clearly, a young boy saying that it 13 was a centimetre may or may not be absolutely correct. 14 Clearly, it will depend upon the nature and extent of 15 that assault that was taking place. 16 Q. And the time that had passed, and in this case he said 17 it took place on the 4th -- 18 A. Yes, albeit -- so that's about just over a week, isn't 19 it? So if there had been some injuries, then you would 20 expect those to be healing, I would have thought. 21 Q. His finding was that there was no medical evidence of 22 sexual abuse or physical abuse, and arrangements were 23 then made for a full statement to be taken from the 24 child on Monday, 15 June. 25 The next comment is this:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 23</p>	<p>1 "Social Services were advised not to inform suspect 2 of the allegation until the statement was taken. 3 Enquiries continue." 4 I will come back to that in a moment. 5 On 15 June, the social worker nonetheless does 6 speak -- forgive me. At the bottom of that page, you 7 can also see that arrangements were made for the suspect 8 to be arrested on the 16th. In her statement, 9 Patricia Allen -- this is MPS003066_045 -- the bottom 10 paragraph on that page: 11 "On Monday, 15 June, I contacted Father Pearce and 12 told him of the allegation made against him." 13 That was the day before Father Pearce was due to be 14 arrested. Would it have been appropriate for her to 15 contact him and tell him of the allegation, in your 16 view? 17 A. In my view, absolutely not. That absolutely runs the 18 risk of tainting any evidence that may be obtained from 19 the suspect. 20 Q. On the same occasion, having told him what the 21 allegation is, she expresses the opinion that he was 22 shocked by the allegation, and she says: 23 "I then asked Father David if he had looked at A595. 24 He said, 'Yes, I'm sorry, I should have mentioned this 25 to you on Thursday.'"</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 24</p>

<p>1 And stated that he had looked at A595's bottom out 2 of concern for him after he had said, presumably, that 3 he had been hit by his father: 4 "I assumed by this that Father David meant that he 5 had looked at A595 on Thursday, the 4th ..." 6 A. Yes. 7 Q. If we can turn to page 89 of the same document, 8 Pat Allen tells the officer -- it is on the right-hand 9 side. It comes over from the previous page, but I won't 10 go to that. But you can see the top line. She said 11 that she had spoken with Father David, who had denied 12 the allegation and apparently was very shocked and 13 surprised. 14 On 16 June, we can see Carol Moore, PC Carol Moore, 15 who is the officer in the case, just below that saying 16 that arrangements were made, Father David attended 17 Ealing Police Station with his solicitor, and was 18 arrested and cautioned: 19 "Father David totally denied the allegation and 20 stated that it was all a fabrication." 21 She then goes on to say: 22 "There was also some inconsistency between the boy's 23 statement, which stated that the incident took place on 24 the 4th. Father David says it was Thursday morning, the 25 11th."</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 25</p>	<p>1 And it was on that occasion Father David admitted to 2 locking the door, "but this was only to stop other 3 people, boys, from bursting into the room." 4 He said that the boy pulled his own pants and shorts 5 down without any instigation from him. So that's after 6 Pat Allen has alerted him to the allegation. 7 PC Moore, if we can turn to page 25, wrote a report 8 which said at paragraph 13: 9 "At the time of writing, RC-A595 wants Father David 10 prosecuted and will attend court to give evidence. He 11 should make an excellent witness and appears thoroughly 12 truthful. His mother and father are most anxious that 13 we prosecute Father David. 14 "It is our view that this matter should be brought 15 before a court." 16 Father David was bailed after this point. 17 A statement was taken from Abbot Soper. That is on 18 pages 6 and 7 of the bundle. In that, Father Soper 19 says: 20 "On about Friday 5 June, Father David mentioned to 21 me that he was concerned about a pupil in the junior 22 school ... Father David saw me again on either Tuesday, 23 the 9th, or Wednesday, the 10th, saying that he was so 24 concerned ... [He] saw me again on Friday, 12 June, 25 possibly the Monday of the 15th ..."</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 26</p>
<p>1 On the next page, a little way down, he says that he 2 contacted the solicitors and arranged for a solicitor to 3 accompany Father David to the arrest and interview on 4 the 15th. He says this, about five lines down: 5 "Having taken advice from a senior advisory governor 6 and our solicitors, I deemed it inappropriate to suspend 7 Father David from his post, partly because the timing of 8 the allegation in my eyes and the eyes of those 9 I consulted, appeared to be a smokescreen for the 10 alleged activity of the father and partly since 11 Father David has been in the community for 22 years, at 12 least 16 of them as a schoolteacher in the senior or 13 junior schools, without any allegation of impropriety of 14 any sort against him. In the light of this I considered 15 it right, at this stage, to give my full support to him 16 as headmaster and in view of the fact that I considered 17 all the above reasons that there was no possible danger 18 to any other children at the school." 19 So we have Soper expressing a view that there was no 20 possible danger to any other children at the school. 21 Should anyone have prevented David Pearce from 22 continuing as a teacher at this stage? 23 A. So certainly the school and those others in a regulatory 24 position I think should have certainly considered, 25 absolutely, the appropriateness of him continuing to</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 27</p>	<p>1 have contact with children following that allegation. 2 Q. We have the report of Police Constable Carol Moore 3 saying that, in her view, the boy was believable and 4 would make a good witness. Should police have done 5 anything at that stage? 6 A. So the police wouldn't have a role in terms of 7 the actual school -- they wouldn't have any position in 8 terms of regulation as to whether Pearce would have 9 access to children. They have clearly informed 10 Social Services and they have informed the school as 11 well. The police wouldn't have any jurisdiction with 12 that school. 13 Q. On 16 June, so before the statement of Soper, the 14 officer sends her case file to the Crown Prosecution 15 Service, and there is a note on page 89, which we looked 16 at, which indicates that she has sent not just the file 17 but all the relevant statements. On 24 June, there is 18 another note saying that the report has been sent as 19 well. Of course, we know that a statement was taken 20 from the other teacher on 24 June, but there is no 21 reference to that having been sent to the Crown 22 Prosecution Service. Indeed, Mr McCabe's advice, the 23 Crown Prosecution Service lawyer who referred to it, 24 doesn't refer to that statement. 25 On 30 June, the child was put on the at-risk</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 28</p>

<p>1 register in relation to allegations of physical abuse by 2 his father. Can we just look at that, please, at 3 page 73. This is the second page of the relevant 4 document. The second paragraph from the top, it's said: 5 "The following day, the father of A595 made 6 a counter-allegation saying A595 had been sexually 7 abused by Father David Pearce. This is being 8 investigated by Southall Police Child Protection Team." 9 On the face of the papers that we have from the 10 police case file, it doesn't actually appear that the 11 father made that allegation at all? 12 A. No. 13 Q. It appears that the child made the allegation, supported 14 by his sister? 15 A. Yes. 16 Q. Supported by his mother, who also noted a week of 17 bedwetting following the time when the alleged incident 18 may have taken place. Is this an illustration -- and 19 I am just asking you to comment -- of a conclusion 20 adverse to the child being jumped to, that the father 21 has made the allegation as a counter-allegation? 22 A. So that is a distinct possibility. My observations of 23 that is that the case conference also did not consider 24 the allegations against Pearce either, so they were only 25 focused on the father. When you relay that across to</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 29</p>	<p>1 the statement of the little boy, he believes that the 2 social worker does not believe him and is on the side of 3 David Pearce. My observation is that that is a very 4 one-sided conference. 5 Q. Does it appear that a decision had been made almost in 6 advance of the charging decision, which we haven't 7 actually got to yet? 8 A. It's very difficult to draw -- for me to draw that 9 conclusion from that at this stage. 10 Q. This is on 30 June, and these comments are made before 11 the charging decision, which was on 14 July. That's at 12 divider -- there are two copies, chair. The first copy 13 we received was illegible. The second copy, which we 14 received a little later, is legible. Your copy should 15 be behind divider 5 at 1. The reference should still be 16 the same document, page 20. 17 Can I give you another reference just to be on the 18 safe side: MPS003529_001. We have the date of 19 14 July 1992. Mr McCabe is the Assistant Branch Crown 20 Prosecutor. Mr McCabe advises -- we can see this on the 21 third and fourth paragraph down. He says: 22 "... there is no corroboration of the indecent 23 assault and no medical evidence available which might 24 confirm that an incident of assault has occurred. Thus 25 the case against Father Pearce depends entirely on the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 30</p>
<p>1 credibility of a 10-year-old boy." 2 Do you agree with that assessment? 3 A. No, I do not, and my reasons for that are -- so there is 4 evidence there of early complaints to the sister and 5 also a change in the little boy's behaviours through the 6 bedwetting as evidenced by the mother, and, further, 7 when the investigating officer's opinions are attached 8 to that, whilst it is not evidence, her opinion, in 9 terms of the truthfulness of that allegation, I think is 10 significant as well. 11 Q. He goes on to say: 12 "I have carefully considered the available evidence 13 and am of the view that it is insufficient to provide 14 a realistic prospect of conviction. In my view, there 15 are matters which may properly be put by the defence to 16 undermine his reliability and credibility and 17 additionally to ascribe to him a motive for telling less 18 than the whole truth." 19 Do you have any observations about that? 20 A. So whilst I think there would be issues with the 21 evidence, so the additional -- the allegation with 22 regards to the father and the lack of medical evidence, 23 those would clearly be issues that would need to be 24 dealt with and would need to be factored in. But when 25 you look in the totality of that, I think that that</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 31</p>	<p>1 would be a strong case, and whilst I don't know the 2 officer and haven't spoken with the officer, going back 3 to 1992, the police had the responsibility, in terms of 4 the investigations. I think that investigating officer 5 clearly thought, whilst this is a complex case, and has 6 made a recommendation that this should go to court, has 7 gone to the CPS for advice to seek that through, and 8 with a very strong recommendation that that should lead 9 to a charge. 10 Q. Over the page, Mr McCabe states that the offences are 11 denied by Father Pearce. Any relevance in that, as far 12 as you are concerned? 13 A. That wouldn't be surprising, in my experience. 14 Q. And then says that there is a conflict between the child 15 and Father Pearce as to the date of the incident. Is 16 there any relevance in that? 17 A. So when you look, clearly a young boy; clearly, in terms 18 of recollection of events and having gone through 19 a traumatic incident, I think our understanding 20 absolutely now is that you wouldn't expect a perfect 21 recollection, and in many respects, if you did get 22 a perfect recollection, then you might be asking some 23 questions as to why it was absolutely perfect. 24 So certainly, looking at that, I would expect for 25 a young boy who has gone through something as traumatic</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 32</p>

<p>1 as that for there to be some degree of inconsistency</p> <p>2 with it.</p> <p>3 Q. There then is reference to the fact, some lines down,</p> <p>4 that RC-A595 delayed one week in making the complaint of</p> <p>5 indecent assault to his sister. Would it be the same,</p> <p>6 that such a delay would not be unexpected in a child</p> <p>7 making an allegation of this nature?</p> <p>8 A. Absolutely not, and I believe that that is covered in</p> <p>9 the statement from the boy that describes his feelings</p> <p>10 and the turmoil that he's going through as a result of</p> <p>11 what has happened to him. I would actually think,</p> <p>12 certainly when you look at some of the other cases, that</p> <p>13 a week is very swift to come forward.</p> <p>14 Q. There are other matters considered in this, and of</p> <p>15 course it is recognised that standards, for want of</p> <p>16 a better word -- that things have changed and the</p> <p>17 guidance given has changed, and we will no doubt hear</p> <p>18 a little bit about that with our next witness.</p> <p>19 But Mr McCabe has also, for example, placed reliance</p> <p>20 on what we have called the cricket bat incident, the</p> <p>21 allegation of theft a year before, and potentially</p> <p>22 suggested that there may be a motive for the boy to lie.</p> <p>23 He also, at the conclusion on page 3, the bottom</p> <p>24 paragraph, says:</p> <p>25 "The defence also no doubt will make great play of</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 33</p>	<p>1 the fact that it is hardly the actions of a man who has</p> <p>2 just indecently assaulted a child to call in</p> <p>3 Social Services, in circumstances where a full</p> <p>4 investigation would be inevitable, and, additionally, to</p> <p>5 inform both the chairman of the governors and the</p> <p>6 child's form master that he proposed to call in the</p> <p>7 appropriate external child protection agency."</p> <p>8 Is that unusual? Would that be unusual behaviour</p> <p>9 for a man who had committed such an offence?</p> <p>10 A. Certainly in my experience, individuals who are</p> <p>11 offenders of these types of offences can be quite</p> <p>12 devious and manipulative in their actions and, to</p> <p>13 ascribe that motivation at the bottom of that page in</p> <p>14 calling Social Services, I think certainly, in my</p> <p>15 experience, that would be -- that would not be the right</p> <p>16 motivation to draw from that.</p> <p>17 Q. He also relies on David Pearce's good character.</p> <p>18 In your view, looking at this now in the round, what</p> <p>19 was the reason for the difference of opinion between the</p> <p>20 Crown Prosecution Service and the Metropolitan Police</p> <p>21 Service in 1992 as to the sufficiency of evidence to</p> <p>22 proceed with the child's case?</p> <p>23 A. So I think, when I look at the case, I can see an</p> <p>24 investigator who has done, in my opinion, a thorough</p> <p>25 investigation and considered the aspects to it.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 34</p>
<p>1 Clearly, the CPS do have to look at a case objectively,</p> <p>2 but I think that -- and I don't know what the CPS</p> <p>3 guidance was at the time, but I think they probably</p> <p>4 looked more at what the issues are and the difficulties</p> <p>5 in mounting a prosecution as opposed to what are the</p> <p>6 things which would actually support a prosecution.</p> <p>7 Q. You said earlier that this was -- I think you meant</p> <p>8 around this allegation -- an inexperienced team; this</p> <p>9 was the one that you identified as the inexperienced</p> <p>10 team. What do you think an experienced team would have</p> <p>11 done differently?</p> <p>12 A. So it's quite possible that, whilst clearly you've got</p> <p>13 the one allegation that's come forward, would they have</p> <p>14 considered whether they were -- this was the tip of</p> <p>15 the iceberg, whether there were others? But that is</p> <p>16 a difficult position, as an investigator, to go through,</p> <p>17 because police in the past have been criticised for</p> <p>18 going on what's been called fishing expeditions as well,</p> <p>19 so you do have to consider what would be a reasonable</p> <p>20 line of enquiry to draw, and it was made in isolation,</p> <p>21 albeit what we now know is that there were other rumours</p> <p>22 that were circulating at the time. But I can see no</p> <p>23 knowledge of the investigator of those other rumours in</p> <p>24 the file. If there were, then I would then consider</p> <p>25 that to be a reasonable line of enquiry.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 35</p>	<p>1 Q. Would it have been reasonable to speak to, say, the</p> <p>2 secretary of David Pearce who was mentioned, or some of</p> <p>3 the other staff members?</p> <p>4 A. I would consider that to be reasonable, yes.</p> <p>5 Q. Because we have heard that there were rumours amongst</p> <p>6 the staff, and we will hear, at this period.</p> <p>7 Given the difference of opinion, what could the</p> <p>8 officer do about progressing the case after the Crown</p> <p>9 Prosecution Service had given the advice which at this</p> <p>10 time wasn't, strictly speaking, a charging decision, it</p> <p>11 was just an advice to the police.</p> <p>12 A. No.</p> <p>13 Q. What could the officer have done?</p> <p>14 A. So when you look at the CPS advice that's come forward,</p> <p>15 I think that pretty much closes down that investigation,</p> <p>16 and there would be very little for that officer to have</p> <p>17 done to have progressed that any further. In fact, in</p> <p>18 many respects, that advice would undermine the</p> <p>19 prosecution.</p> <p>20 Q. We know from the documents that the child was later then</p> <p>21 moved from the school, moved to a different school, and</p> <p>22 by 3 November the family is deregistered and there are</p> <p>23 no more concerns and he appears happy. We also know</p> <p>24 that the child's statement was one of those that was</p> <p>25 later filed as part of the civil claim in respect of A6.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 36</p>

1 We can see from the front sheet, if we turn to
 2 MPS003066_003, we can see that, on 14 September,
 3 Detective Sergeant Gareth Morgan called for the file,
 4 the docket, for information purposes only:
 5 "No additions have been made."
 6 Do you know why that would have been?
 7 **A. No, I do not.**
 8 Q. We can also see that the docket was requested for
 9 information purposes following new allegations against
 10 the same suspect, and that was on 25 September 2004.
 11 We know that in October 2004, A6 lodged civil claim
 12 proceedings against Pearce, within the following month.
 13 A595's case was not prosecuted, but he subsequently
 14 filed for damages and the matter was settled out of
 15 court and he received damages. Is there anything else
 16 that you observe about this file from the police
 17 perspective?
 18 **A. I can see from the 2004 allegation that I have already**
 19 **briefly mentioned that the investigating officer has**
 20 **pulled this 1992 investigation to have a look at and has**
 21 **also looked at previous allegations as well from 2001**
 22 **that were subsequently finished in 2002. So I can see**
 23 **here evidence that that investigating officer is trying**
 24 **to look at other investigations and other allegations**
 25 **that have come before, and I know that, having read that**

Page 37

1 example, if we look at the second line in relation to
 2 RC-F310, if we go across the row, we can see that the
 3 reason the case was no further actioned, or NFAed, was
 4 because the complainant did not want to speak to the
 5 police?
 6 **A. That's right.**
 7 Q. That is something that the police had on a number of
 8 occasions, isn't it, that sometimes complainants didn't
 9 want to take the allegation any further?
 10 **A. That's right, and there are a whole range of quite**
 11 **understandable reasons as to why victims may not wish**
 12 **for the police to become involved, and I think that**
 13 **certainly our emerging practice now is gaining a better**
 14 **understanding and certainly would welcome any further**
 15 **insights from this inquiry into understanding why**
 16 **individuals may not wish to come to report incidents to**
 17 **the police.**
 18 Q. We can also see that, on some occasions, things
 19 progressed quite quickly. So, for instance, with
 20 John Maestri, when he was -- when the matter was brought
 21 to the police's attention in 2003, and this is line 5,
 22 he very swiftly was brought before the court and,
 23 in December 2003, he pleaded guilty.
 24 **A. Yes, he did.**
 25 Q. So he accepted what he had done?

Page 39

1 **officer's investigating crime report, he did try to make**
 2 **contact with the original complainant and their family.**
 3 **Now albeit that that is 12 years subsequent, there**
 4 **clearly are difficulties in getting hold of the original**
 5 **complainant and their family, and that, unfortunately,**
 6 **is unsuccessful. But I can see that attempts were made**
 7 **to go back to 1992, and of course that would then be**
 8 **absolutely relevant and is a reasonable line of enquiry**
 9 **to follow.**
 10 Q. But this case was never prosecuted, was it?
 11 **A. It was not, no.**
 12 Q. Just briefly going back to your large schedule at the
 13 beginning of the bundle, OHY006752, we have looked at
 14 the first, and rest assured I'm not going to look at all
 15 of them in that way at all, but I have summarised to you
 16 the numbers of allegations per year. I just want to
 17 make it clear, as I said when we went through that
 18 exercise, clearly, there are a number of complainants
 19 who make more than one allegation. So 66 is the number
 20 of allegations; it is not necessarily the number of
 21 complainants, is it?
 22 **A. No.**
 23 Q. It is a little less than that?
 24 **A. That's right.**
 25 Q. Also, you can see by looking at the summary -- for

Page 38

1 **A. He did.**
 2 Q. And was dealt with. I'd like now -- and forgive me for
 3 using you as a conduit -- to go through what some others
 4 have said about their dealings with the school. This is
 5 a small bundle, chair, that I think has been made
 6 available to you by Mr Carlyon. I am going to start
 7 with MPS003544, which is DS Gareth Morgan's report to
 8 you on 8 October 2018. I won't go through every line.
 9 It is MPS003542_001. I'm looking at the wrong one,
 10 forgive me. Sorry, mine aren't in the right order.
 11 Thank you very much. Can we go to page 1.
 12 Just to look at this in summary, DS Gareth Morgan,
 13 you told us, is now retired. He worked on the Ealing
 14 and Hillingdon Child Abuse Unit, CAIT, based at
 15 Northwood Police Station between September 2001 and his
 16 retirement in 2016. During that period, he led and
 17 supervised a number of investigations involving
 18 allegations of sexual abuse perpetrated by the monks and
 19 lay teachers of St Benedict's against a number of
 20 pupils. He refers to specific allegations made against
 21 David Pearce, Laurence Soper, RC-F41, 47, Maestri and
 22 Skelton. He says he was sure there were concerns raised
 23 against other monks and lay teachers:
 24 "I have been asked to cover the following areas and
 25 I am relying on my memory in relation to the answers.

Page 40

<p>1 I have not had access to any case papers relating to the 2 allegations in completing this report." 3 Was there any reason why he wasn't provided access 4 to the case papers? 5 A. I don't know. I think that statement wasn't taken by 6 the police. 7 Q. Under the question, the bottom paragraph, he says: 8 "When the referrals were made to the CAIT, I had no 9 difficulty with the current head of St Benedict's School 10 (Chris Cleugh) at the time who provided me with 11 assistance around statements required, providing me with 12 contact details of potential victims/witnesses and 13 implementing necessary safeguarding measures." 14 He goes on to say: 15 "In relation to Ealing Abbey, I liaised with the 16 abbot, Martin Shipperlee. I recall that this was a more 17 difficult relationship. I always had the impression 18 that Abbot Shipperlee's first loyalty was towards the 19 alleged perpetrators rather than the alleged victims in 20 the cases. This may have been due to his personal 21 relationship with the alleged perpetrators, some of whom 22 would have been his peers or managers during his time at 23 the abbey. Certainly early on in the investigation 24 I gained the impression he did not believe the 25 allegations that were being made."</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 41</p>	<p>1 Over the page, he says: 2 "I had a good relationship with the child protection 3 adviser for the Diocese of Westminster, Peter Turner, 4 who was an ex-DI [on his unit]. Peter attended the 5 complex strategy meetings relating to each case and 6 would outline the initial allegations, share his 7 knowledge and implement any safeguarding measures agreed 8 at the meetings. I found Peter to be supportive of 9 the police actions. The strategy meetings were chaired 10 by Ealing Social Services, who were also cooperative 11 throughout the investigations. I can't recall having 12 any liaison with the Department of Education; this may 13 be due to St Benedict's being an independent school." 14 We need to go over the page, please. He says: 15 "This was a difficult investigation due to the 16 number of allegations made against members of the abbey 17 and school over a period of 15 years. Due to this, the 18 investigations were run in a piecemeal fashion dealing 19 with each individual perpetrator. In hindsight, had the 20 police been aware of the number of individuals involved 21 and the connections between them, a more structured 22 response could have been instigated and more resources 23 used. However, as the allegations were stretched over 24 a prolonged period, this was not possible." 25 Do you agree with that last statement?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 42</p>
<p>1 A. Yes, I do. 2 Q. I think these are all reports that were provided to you 3 by the individual officers to assist you with the 4 presentation of your -- the preparation of your 5 statement. They certainly have been provided to us -- 6 A. Yes. 7 Q. -- by the Met Police. Is that correct or not? Do you 8 recall seeing these or not? 9 A. I do recall seeing them. As to at what stage they were 10 taken, I can't recall. 11 Q. The next statement I'd like to look at or report is 12 MPS003543. This is the note or report of Detective 13 Sergeant Serena D'Adamo. Again, I am going to skip 14 through and not read all. Her primary role was as a DS 15 on the enquiry team where she supervised a number of 16 live investigations in allegations of historic child 17 sexual abuse. In September 2016, she was appointed the 18 officer in the case for Operation Dzo, an investigation 19 into allegations of historic abuse perpetrated by former 20 priest Andrew Soper, who, during the relevant period, 21 taught at St Benedict's, Ealing. She was officer in the 22 case through the latter part of the investigation, 23 through the court trial, which concluded 24 in December 2017. She says the operation also touched 25 upon allegations against Father David Pearce which have</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 43</p>	<p>1 also reached conclusion with no criminal charges being 2 brought. 3 She says, below the block question in the middle: 4 "The majority of the contact between police and 5 St Benedict's was carried out by DC Matt O'Neill [and 6 others]. The head teacher Andrew Johnson and school 7 secretary Ruth Wynne were extremely professional and 8 helpful on all occasions, assisting with requests for 9 material held by the school. 10 "In relation to the Abbey itself, contact was 11 established with Abbot Martin Shipperlee, who did not 12 appear to be as transparent as the school. 13 Abbot Shipperlee appeared more concerned with damage 14 limitation in relation to the abbey. Although not 15 obstructive, he did not volunteer any material or 16 information and he only ever provided material upon 17 request. An example of this would relate to a potential 18 complainant." 19 She cites RC-A618: 20 "Abbot Shipperlee was asked for everything that the 21 abbey had in relation to complaints against any member 22 of staff, no information regarding A618 was provided at 23 any time. However, at a later date, it was Ruth Wynne 24 from the school who identified letters of complaints 25 that A618 had made to Abbot Shipperlee.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 44</p>

<p>1 "There was an issue at trial, where Abbot Shipperlee 2 sent a representative to sit in the public gallery. As 3 a witness in the case (who it was decided would not be 4 called), he was receiving daily updates regarding the 5 trial. It was partly due to his actions that HHJ Bate 6 requested that a list of the public gallery be compiled 7 each day. 8 "Other people we took statements from, like Abbot 9 John Arnold in Manchester and Abbot Elias Lorenzo [who 10 were seen in the US] were more open and transparent. 11 "Abbot Shipperlee was asked many times to provide 12 a full copy of the safeguarding plan that was written 13 for Soper in Rome, however he only ever produced an 14 incomplete copy. It was Abbot Lorenzo that eventually 15 provided us with a copy." 16 She speaks about other institutions: 17 "In relation to other institutions, Eva Edohin who 18 we contacted at the Diocese of Westminster was not 19 particularly helpful when asked. [She] initially 20 provided a document which was heavily redacted, so much 21 so that the document had little evidential value to the 22 enquiry. Repeat efforts were made to access more 23 information." 24 She said: 25 "Ealing Social Services safeguarding officers were</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 45</p>	<p>1 cooperative and shared information. 2 "It was necessary to liaise with the data protection 3 department as well as the legal department at Ealing 4 Social Services relating to information held on one of 5 the complainants in the case RC-A591." 6 She goes on and finishes that paragraph, after 7 describing the information, to say: 8 "... the legal department did not furnish police 9 with the information as requested." 10 In your experience, with what you know of these 11 investigations, is there a difficulty in terms of how 12 the various organisations liaise amongst themselves and 13 how information is shared between them? 14 A. So certainly the information sharing, different 15 organisations will have different retention policies, 16 they will have their own different policies. That's why 17 you would expect, certainly now, that there would be 18 a case conference to look at that. It is covered by the 19 Criminal Procedure and Investigations Act which does 20 deal with third party material, and that covers how you 21 can request, but not require, material from third party 22 agencies. 23 Q. Do third party agencies ever provide that material 24 voluntarily without such a request? 25 A. Yes, some do. Absolutely they do. I think there is</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 46</p>
<p>1 a difference between some agencies, who will answer the 2 question and only provide what they have been asked for, 3 and there are differences with other organisations which 4 consider the request much broader, in the round. And 5 you can see evidence of that through those accounts. 6 Q. The issue as far as Abbot Martin's behaviour during the 7 trial of Soper, was that something that was brought to 8 your attention during the course of the trial? 9 A. Not mine personally. I wasn't involved in the trial at 10 the time. 11 Q. One of the things you say in your statement is that, as 12 a result, Abbot Shipperlee did not give evidence. 13 I think, just by way of correction, that's in fact 14 incorrect. I think he did give evidence. 15 A. So my understanding is that his evidence was read, as 16 opposed to gave evidence live. 17 Q. Right. Well, we can clarify that. I think we may find 18 he did in fact -- there was a change of decision. 19 A. Okay. 20 Q. But we will find the relevant reference. 21 Can I go to 2001, please, and divider 6 in your 22 file. I will try to do this very briefly, because 23 I think you have already referred to this. This is 24 2001, when an allegation was brought to the Met Police's 25 attention. The allegation was brought to Met Police's</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 47</p>	<p>1 attention on 22 October 2001 at 3.10 in the afternoon. 2 We can see that on the first page. But if we go to page 3 MPS003014_025, we can see the outline as was given and 4 entered by Gareth Morgan: 5 "Approximately five years ago, a sixth form boy (no 6 details known at present) informed a teacher (no details 7 known at present) at Ealing Abbey School that he had 8 been molested by a monk, Father Pearce, when he was 9 eight years old. It appears that Father Pearce was the 10 head teacher of the junior school at this time. The 11 teacher did not inform anybody of this allegation until 12 early October 2001 when she spoke to 13 Abbot Martin Shipperlee, who is in charge of 14 Ealing Abbey. It was decided to trace the boy and 15 ascertain his views on the subject. The boy, who is now 16 in his mid 20s, [gave an account of the following 17 incidents]: 18 "1. Father Pearce had insisted on drying the boys 19 when they had finished a swimming exercise, ensuring 20 that their genital area was dry. 21 "2. If the boys lost their locker keys during 22 swimming lessons, Father Pearce would check their 23 swimming trunks in search of the keys. 24 "3. When the boy came to see Father Pearce with 25 a rash on the upper part of his body, Father Pearce</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 48</p>

<p>1 insisted on examining his genital area. 2 "4. When the school showers weren't working, 3 Father Pearce stayed and watched the boys showering 4 after the system was fixed." 5 On page 27 -- I won't take you to it, but it says 6 that Martin Shipperlee had told the police that 7 David Pearce was still working at the abbey but had no 8 contact with children. Out of interest, this is 9 30 October 2001. If the abbot said something along 10 those lines, that Pearce was working at the abbey but 11 had no contact with children, would the police carry out 12 any independent checks or would they simply take the 13 word of the abbot? 14 A. That should be referred to Social Services, and then you 15 would then expect for those checks to be made, rather 16 than taking that comment on face value. 17 Q. Did that happen in this instance? 18 A. I can't see anything in the crime report that would 19 indicate that that did take place. 20 Q. At this point, was there any reference to A595's 1992 21 allegation? 22 A. No. 23 Q. The docket we saw doesn't indicate that it was pulled 24 out at this stage, in 2001? 25 A. That's right. It was pulled out later.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 49</p>	<p>1 Q. Would there be any reason why it wasn't brought to the 2 attention of officers dealing with this instance, or 3 they didn't find it? 4 A. I really don't know, without speaking to the officer 5 involved. 6 Q. On page 32 -- in fact, I'm not trying to trick you, but 7 at that stage we move on to 15 November. We can see 8 that in the intervening period a number of other boys' 9 names were given. The mother of another boy has 10 expressed concerns that Pearce still has contact with 11 children. On 13 November, then Detective Sergeant Moore 12 ran a general registry check on Pearce and he found what 13 he calls a trace allegation. At that stage, 14 Abbot Martin tells him that the file would relate to the 15 allegation made by RC-A595. 16 A. Right. 17 Q. So at that point, it appears that Abbot Shipperlee in 18 2001 was aware. I'm sorry, it is page 33. Thank you. 19 You can see it halfway down the page. 20 A. Yes. 21 Q. So it is clear that Abbot Shipperlee was perfectly 22 aware, or certainly had information to pass on to police 23 about the A595 incident? 24 A. It is a little confusing. It says "and Father David" 25 and then the redaction, and the "N/T" stands for "no</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 50</p>
<p>1 trace". It does then -- a comma, and say "Father David 2 Trace" and clearly there was something there. So that 3 is just a little confusing as to why "N/T" would be "no 4 trace" and then it then says "trace", but nonetheless, 5 he does say he requests the file. 6 Q. If I can help you with that, I think what it is saying 7 is a general registry check has been carried out on the 8 complainant, A418, and Father David and A418 has come 9 back no trace? 10 A. Ah, okay, yes. 11 Q. And Father David has come back with a trace? 12 A. I can see that. There is a small full stop after 13 "Father David". 14 Q. DS Morgan has requested the file, he's spoken to 15 Abbot Shipperlee about it. Abbot Shipperlee has said 16 the docket would be in relation to an allegation of 17 abuse by Father David on a schoolboy called RC-A595, 18 which involved a police investigation resulting in there 19 being insufficient evidence to proceed. 20 There is then a discussion with 418, arrangements 21 made for him to attend the child protection team 22 offices, and DS Morgan speaks to someone else, whose 23 name is redacted, who gives an allegation about her son, 24 and she says she felt it was suspicious that 25 Father David had been moved from the position of head at</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 51</p>	<p>1 a moment's notice in 1992. 2 Over the page, she had spoken and received 3 information from one of the parents of the incident 4 involving RC-A598 [sic]. It goes on to say that 5 Laurence Soper was spoken to, recalled the incident and 6 said that Father David had been moved to an 7 administrative post shortly after the incident 8 in December 1992 and said that he would have been moved 9 notwithstanding the allegation against him. 10 A few lines from the bottom, DS Morgan notes that 11 Father David was not challenged by Father Laurence about 12 his behaviour and that Father Laurence is abbot at 13 Ealing -- in respect of the child they are speaking of, 14 A631, that neither party, neither the mother nor the 15 child, wished to make a formal complaint, but they 16 wanted reassurance that Father David didn't have any 17 contact with the junior school. There is the comment 18 that Father David was not challenged by Father Laurence 19 about this behaviour. 20 Should anything have been done at that stage in 21 respect of any of those allegations? 22 A. So I would expect that those would be reasonable lines 23 of enquiry to pursue. Notwithstanding the fact that 24 clearly there are difficulties there with individuals 25 maybe not wanting to speak to the police formally. But</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 52</p>

<p>1 certainly that would be a reasonable line of enquiry to 2 pursue. 3 Q. We can see over the next few pages that a number of 4 telephone messages appear to be left for a number of 5 different boys. We can see a list on 35 of different 6 grown children now who have been contacted, some who are 7 spoken to and confirm the general nature of A41's 8 account, but on page 42, on 3 July 2002, DS Morgan -- 9 and it spreads across two pages -- says this is a report 10 in relation to historic allegation of a sexual nature, 11 at the bottom of the page. 12 A. Yes. 13 Q. On the top of the next page, he says: 14 "Although there have been a variety of rumours in 15 relation to Father David's inappropriate behaviour in 16 relation to the schoolchildren, I have been unable ..." 17 And then to the next page: 18 "... to find evidence of any criminal offences 19 committed by Father David." 20 Do you agree that there was no evidence of criminal 21 offences committed by Father David? 22 A. No, I do not, and my reasons for that are that there was 23 a statement taken from A632 which describes Father David 24 as putting his hands down his trunks and indecently 25 assaulting him. So my assessment of that is that that</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 53</p>	<p>1 is an indecent assault and that is an offence. 2 Q. Further down, he discusses the positions of A418 and 3 A632. He says: 4 "It is fair to say that A418 and A632 are reluctant 5 to give evidence in court and would only be willing if 6 further evidence came to light in relation to 7 Father David." 8 What should the officer do at that point? Is there 9 anything that can be done? 10 A. So just in relation to A632, the statement that he 11 provided at the commencement of that investigation does 12 say in his statement that he would be willing to attend 13 court. What I cannot see from the crime report is what 14 has changed from the beginning -- from that statement 15 having been obtained to then DS Morgan's assessment that 16 he would be unwilling to attend court. So there is 17 nothing further that would indicate that there was 18 a change in that complainant changing their mind about 19 attending court. 20 Coming to your question, there are a range of 21 measures that could be used to support complainants in 22 the giving of their evidence to ensure that they are 23 supported in the giving of evidence and special measures 24 could be applied to assist them in the giving of their 25 evidence.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 54</p>
<p>1 Q. A418 also made a formal statement. It is at 2 OHY006649_015 for those who wish to refer to it. It is 3 behind your tab 8 at page 15. I don't think there is 4 anything in it that suggests that he is unwilling to 5 give evidence. So would your comment apply to him as 6 well? 7 A. I would have to refresh my memory by reading through it. 8 But certainly, if that's the case, then -- what I can't 9 see is what has changed between the giving of those two 10 statements and then the comment that's made in July 11 saying they would be unwilling. 12 Q. I won't ask you to, but those here can look at it if 13 they wish. 14 At page 45, the next page of the document we were 15 looking at, MPS003014_045, we jump to 2004, halfway down 16 the page. I think it is Kevin Hudson appears to have 17 taken over the investigation two years later, and the 18 first entry is that he has contacted the victim A418 "to 19 inform him that I will be continuing the investigation 20 into allegations made against Father Pearce. He is 21 happy to assist the police investigation and attend 22 court, if the evidence is forthcoming." 23 A. Yes. 24 Q. What checks had been made between 2002 and 2004, if any, 25 in respect of whether David Pearce was in contact with</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 55</p>	<p>1 children at the time? 2 A. It's difficult for me to say, without looking at going 3 through all the documentation. I don't think it's 4 recorded at all in anything that I have read. 5 Q. During this period, as you pointed out earlier, there 6 are efforts made to link the case with other 7 allegations. 8 A. Yes. 9 Q. Specifically, with the allegation made by RC-A6, which 10 you are going to come to in a moment. 11 A. Yes. 12 Q. On the bottom of page 51 of this document, the 2004 13 allegations, Kevin Hudson summarises the police 14 conclusions. First of all, he says that the original 15 statement of A418 has not been found. He says messages 16 have been left for A418 and he's not had any answer. 17 This is in August. 18 A. Yes: 19 Q. So a few months later. He says that the family -- A631 20 and the family have spoken to -- and they have refused 21 to be spoken to and seen. He says that 22 Kate Ravenscroft, who was the teacher, was not traced. 23 Do you know at all what efforts were made to trace 24 Kate Ravenscroft? 25 A. It's not clear from that crime report what efforts were</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 56</p>

<p>1 made, I don't think.</p> <p>2 Q. It may be, you see, that she was working at the school</p> <p>3 during this period and was simply a teacher at the</p> <p>4 school. Then there's reference to A595, as you told us</p> <p>5 earlier, who was not traced.</p> <p>6 The conclusion, at page 53, is that the report</p> <p>7 provides only one witness, who is a child [name</p> <p>8 redacted] and no-one is willing or able to support</p> <p>9 a prosecution.</p> <p>10 The contact made with a number of these witnesses</p> <p>11 appears to have been phone calls and messages left.</p> <p>12 Would that be the extent of the police efforts to</p> <p>13 contact these types of witnesses?</p> <p>14 A. So I can see that absolutely that was the case here.</p> <p>15 Other options would have been to have sent letters or to</p> <p>16 call on those individuals. Clearly, you need to then</p> <p>17 just think through doing so, particularly for</p> <p>18 individuals who may have said they don't want any</p> <p>19 further contact with the police. Then, to go around and</p> <p>20 knock on the door as well might be seen as being overly</p> <p>21 oppressive. But certainly those are other options that</p> <p>22 definitely could be considered to try and trace</p> <p>23 individuals to see what evidence they may have.</p> <p>24 Q. It finishes with the enquiries into RC-A6 still not</p> <p>25 being complete and saying that the suspect will return</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 57</p>	<p>1 on bail on 19 October 2004, and then a report will be</p> <p>2 submitted to the Crown Prosecution Service to ascertain</p> <p>3 whether they feel there is sufficient evidence against</p> <p>4 Pearce:</p> <p>5 "This report only provides one potential witness,</p> <p>6 the child."</p> <p>7 And no other victims, as I have said. This takes us</p> <p>8 to divider 8, which is RC-A6. If, before we move on to</p> <p>9 that, I can use the opportunity to read one of our</p> <p>10 witness statements, inquiry witness statements, in the</p> <p>11 statement bundle, behind divider 5. I don't ask for</p> <p>12 this one to be brought up onto the screen. For anyone</p> <p>13 else's reference, it is INQ003799. It is the witness's</p> <p>14 statement to the inquiry, so that we have the full</p> <p>15 context.</p> <p>16 The witness says that he was born in 1980. He</p> <p>17 describes his school and started at St Benedict's,</p> <p>18 Ealing, in 1990. He entered the junior school.</p> <p>19 Throughout his time at the junior school until he moved</p> <p>20 to the middle school, the headmaster was David Pearce:</p> <p>21 "Pearce was known throughout the school during this</p> <p>22 time as 'Gay Dave', which was a reference to his sexual</p> <p>23 proclivities and his sexual interest in prepubescent</p> <p>24 teenage boys.</p> <p>25 "My mother's family are Roman Catholics and, as</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 58</p>
<p>1 a boy and a teenager, I was brought up to be a faithful</p> <p>2 Catholic. During my time at St Benedict's I was</p> <p>3 sexually abused by David Pearce. I'm not sure of</p> <p>4 the precise sequence of the occasions on which I was</p> <p>5 abused but I can recall the various incidents in detail.</p> <p>6 "In summary, what occurred was as follows:</p> <p>7 "Firstly, there were occasions when Pearce touched</p> <p>8 my genitals whilst drying me with a towel after swimming</p> <p>9 lessons held at the local swimming baths.</p> <p>10 "Secondly, on one occasion, Pearce videoed me and</p> <p>11 other members of my class whilst we were taking a shower</p> <p>12 after a PE lesson.</p> <p>13 "Thirdly, on two occasions, Pearce took advantage of</p> <p>14 me when I was alone with him in the school infirmary,</p> <p>15 having been taken ill. On the first of these occasions,</p> <p>16 Pearce unfastened my tie and shirt top button, pulled</p> <p>17 down my trousers and underpants and stared at my</p> <p>18 genitals. On the second occasion, Pearce fondled my</p> <p>19 penis.</p> <p>20 "I will now describe these incidents in greater</p> <p>21 detail.</p> <p>22 "Once a week for one or two terms, my classmates and</p> <p>23 I were taken by Pearce to the local swimming baths for</p> <p>24 a swimming lesson given by a female instructor. The</p> <p>25 days when he took us swimming were known as 'gay days'.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 59</p>	<p>1 "After each lesson, Pearce supervised us in the</p> <p>2 changing rooms. He used to stand in front of us as we</p> <p>3 changed after the lesson and generally he would select</p> <p>4 one or more boys each time to be dried by him</p> <p>5 personally. This was completely unnecessary as we were</p> <p>6 all old enough to dry and dress ourselves.</p> <p>7 "We all used to rush to change at the end of</p> <p>8 the swimming lessons as quickly as possible because we</p> <p>9 all felt uncomfortable being stared at by Pearce and we</p> <p>10 did not want to be selected to be dried by him.</p> <p>11 "Sometimes Pearce would say a boy had not dried</p> <p>12 himself properly and would make him undress and dry</p> <p>13 himself again or Pearce would dry him. On other</p> <p>14 occasions, Pearce would sit on a bench and call a boy</p> <p>15 over to be dried.</p> <p>16 "On the occasions when Pearce 'dried me' he touched</p> <p>17 my genitals with his bare hand under the towel. I felt</p> <p>18 his fingers but the touching was more with the back of</p> <p>19 his hand.</p> <p>20 "I cannot now remember how many incidents there were</p> <p>21 in which Pearce 'dried me' in this way. It was either</p> <p>22 one or two.</p> <p>23 "Each incident lasted for a few seconds. I am</p> <p>24 certain that Pearce's behaviour was not accidental.</p> <p>25 "I felt very uncomfortable with his behaviour in the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 60</p>

<p>1 changing room, but obviously I had no choice but to obey 2 him, as he was both a priest and the headmaster. 3 "Video incident. 4 "On two occasions Pearce insisted that we (meaning 5 me and other boys in my class) had to have a shower 6 after a PE lesson. PE lessons were taken by another 7 teacher, who never required our class to have a shower 8 after PE and never came into the changing rooms. 9 "Pearce had stayed in the changing rooms and watched 10 us undress and shower. On one of those occasions he had 11 a video camera. He had filmed us earlier in the gym 12 during the PE lesson. 13 "I asked him what he was doing with the camera. 14 "He replied that he was making a film about the 15 school and was only going to film the top halves of 16 the boys for parents to see. 17 "He then proceeded to use the camera to film boys, 18 including me, in the showers. He pointed the camera up 19 and down the length of my body when I was in the shower. 20 The filming seemed to go on for a long time, but it 21 could have been just for a minute. 22 "I found it extremely upsetting to be videoed in 23 this way. 24 "When I got home that day, I told my mother that 25 Pearce had videoed me in the shower. My mother tried to</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 61</p>	<p>1 reassure me. She told me not to worry and suggested 2 that what had happened was not serious. I thought my 3 mother was brushing me off. I believe that I had just 4 had to keep quiet about what had happened. She 5 normalised this incident, which led to me being very 6 confused and sort of become more accepting of the other 7 incidents. 8 "Some years later, when I was 15, I had a row with 9 my mother, during which I accused her of not taking the 10 video incident seriously. She told me that that she had 11 in fact spoken to Pearce about the incident at that time 12 and had seen the video of the boys in the showers. She 13 told me the video was very patchy and badly edited. It 14 appeared to her that sections had been edited out, which 15 she believed he had done. I still cannot understand why 16 she did nothing, given that she, herself, believed that 17 something was wrong. My mother believed something had 18 happened. She tried to elicit the information. 19 "The infirmary. 20 "I remember two occasions when I had felt faint in 21 assembly. 22 "Normally Pearce conducted assembly but on both of 23 these occasions there was a music assembly and Pearce 24 was just a bystander. 25 "On both occasions I walked out to go to the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 62</p>
<p>1 infirmary in the school and was followed by Pearce. 2 "On the first occasion I told Pearce that I felt 3 faint. Pearce took me to the infirmary where he told me 4 to lie on the bed on my back. 5 "Pearce then shut the door. 6 "We were alone together in the room. 7 "Pearce then loosened my tie and undid the top 8 button of my shirt. He then undid my shorts and pulled 9 them and my underwear down to his knees, exposing my 10 penis. 11 "He then told me to relax and then stared at my 12 genitals. He was saying things like, it's all right, 13 don't worry, it's normal. 14 "He also said something. I can't remember the 15 detailed words, but it made me feel that I would look 16 stupid if I talked about the incident to anyone like my 17 parents. 18 "He stared at my genitals for some minutes until the 19 end of the assembly could be heard. He then pulled my 20 shorts and underwear back up and we left the room. 21 "The second incident was quite similar to the first, 22 but this time, Pearce, after staring at my genitals, 23 fondled my penis, rubbing the foreskin backwards and 24 forwards a few times, very slowly. Whilst he did this, 25 he said things like 'Don't worry'.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 63</p>	<p>1 "When I got home after the second incident, I barged 2 past my mother and locked myself in the bathroom for 3 three to four hours. My mother tried to coax me out and 4 my father threatened to break the door down, but he 5 stayed out. My parents reacted to this with abuse and 6 verbal violence. 7 "Eventually, I came out on my own accord, but when 8 my parents questioned me, I refused to say what had 9 happened. I couldn't see any point in telling them and 10 I thought that if I told them they would not believe me 11 or be interested. 12 "When I was about ten years old, I was so upset 13 about what Pearce had been doing to me that I tried to 14 take my own life. 15 "About a month after my suicide attempt, I went to 16 confession with a monk from the abbey. This was RC-F41. 17 As I was making confession, I began to cry and had 18 difficulty speaking. RC-F41 came back to my house to 19 look at the situation, but my mother did not like him 20 and he never came back. 21 "I told RC-F41 that I was not getting on with my 22 parents and was having a difficult time at home. I also 23 told him I had attempted to take my own life. 24 "Following this, I saw him on a weekly basis and 25 I talked things through with him. During these</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 64</p>

<p>1 conversations, RC-F41 asked me how Pearce was treating 2 me and did I need to tell him anything else? However, 3 I did not feel able to disclose to him that I had been 4 abused by Pearce. 5 "I had the impression that Pearce and RC-F41 hated 6 each other and RC-F41 seemed to know a lot of what 7 Pearce was doing, having heard himself from other boys 8 about Pearce's antics. 9 "When I was around 8 or 9 my father became quite 10 withdrawn and depressed. This worsened my relationship 11 with my father and I was quite disobedient towards him. 12 "There was an incident at home whilst at 13 St Benedict's junior school. I locked myself in the 14 home bathroom. It was because of the sexual abuse and 15 my family problems took their toll. My mother and 16 father beat the door making threats, my father 17 threatened to break the door down. My mother tried to 18 coax me out with Coca-Cola. I refused to leave. 19 "By the time I was 15, my relationship with my 20 father had broken down. Apart from telling my mother 21 about the video incident, I did not tell either of my 22 parents about the abuse from Pearce." 23 He talks about behaving badly at the age of 11 and 24 setting fireworks off in the streets and being 25 argumentative at school. As a result of the trouble he</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 65</p>	<p>1 was causing at home, in 1994 he was sent to a boarding 2 school: 3 "It was a Catholic School, Worth Abbey. I did not 4 want to go there. I was forced there against my will. 5 The school had yet more monks but this time I was going 6 to live with them. Psychologically, this was worse. 7 Worth was previously a feeder school for Downside and is 8 obviously part of the Benedictine Congregation." 9 He goes on to say that his mother felt Worth would 10 be better and in many ways it was: 11 "My housemaster was a good person", who offered him 12 support. 13 He described some other issues at Worth and that his 14 behaviour deteriorated and, by the age of 14, he was 15 taking drugs. By the age of 15, drinking heavily at 16 weekends when he used to go up to London where he drank 17 and got into fights: 18 "In 1997, I told my GP that I had problems at home, 19 was sleeping badly and that I had sexual problems with 20 my then girlfriend." 21 He found himself vomiting after intercourse and 22 hating being in the same bed as her. He felt his body 23 was dirty and did not like to be touched. He went 24 through a phase of thinking he was gay. 25 His mother took his father's side as a result of</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 66</p>
<p>1 something, and that depressed him more as she had also 2 taken David Pearce's side: 3 "I needed my parents to be on the side of truth." 4 He said, when he was 17, his parents divorced and he 5 told his uncle at that time that he'd been sexually 6 abused but did not identify the perpetrator. He 7 believed that at some stage he also told his housemaster 8 at Worth. 9 Then we move quickly to paragraph 63, for those 10 following. 11 He went to see RC-F41 and he told RC-F41 about his 12 problems with his parents. The monk asked him about his 13 experience with Pearce and he couldn't bring himself to 14 tell RC-F41 what Pearce had done. I say this for 15 completeness: this witness found RC-F41 to be a helpful 16 and kind person: 17 "He regularly asked me how bad I found David Pearce. 18 Sometimes now, after hearing stories, when I look back 19 I wonder if they were colluding together, but at the 20 time RC-F41 seemed to be a generous and nice person." 21 He goes on to say that at the time he had no sense 22 that he'd been involved in that kind of behaviour and 23 finds it difficult to believe. 24 He describes, in the following pages, issues that he 25 had with alcohol, post-traumatic stress disorder and</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 67</p>	<p>1 illness. At paragraph 83, he says: 2 "In 2004, I approached the abbot of St Benedict's, 3 Martin Shipperlee, to complain about Pearce. His 4 response was that the school had always known about his 5 behaviour but had done nothing about it. I was 6 outraged. He just had his hands in his habit and looked 7 nonchalantly at the floor as if in a different world, 8 annoyed I was there. I asked the abbot why they had 9 kept Pearce on. He said if Pearce had been removed it 10 would cause parents to think that Pearce might have 11 sexually abused boys, and it was better, therefore, to 12 keep him on, so parents would not think anything had 13 happened. Taking him out would, or might, raise 14 suspicion. I told him that was completely wrong and he 15 just shrugged his shoulders. The image of the school 16 was more important than stopping sexual abuse. Because 17 of this, the sexual abuse continued. I feel 18 particularly angry and lost because my brain simply 19 cannot compute or understand this type of thinking. 20 "The abbot told me that he had heard rumours about 21 Pearce and of his reputation before Pearce had ceased to 22 be headmaster of the junior school. He told me that 23 Pearce had been arrested and had only been moved from 24 the headmastership when the bursar's position had fallen 25 vacant. Pearce came bursar because he was the only monk</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 68</p>

<p>1 with the administration skills for the job. Worse 2 still, he was later appointed novice master, which is an 3 important position for recruiting new members of their 4 faith. 5 "I decided to report my complaints to the police." 6 He outlines that in February 2004, he made a police 7 statement and was interviewed by DC Hudson: 8 "I had some difficulty in being completely honest 9 with DC Hudson about what had occurred. I did not tell 10 DC Hudson that Pearce had sexually assaulted me when 11 drying me at the swimming baths. 12 "I rang DC Hudson to enquire about the investigation 13 after a large period of silence and was told he was 14 investigating a girl who had suffered more than me, so 15 therefore my case was less important. I felt awful and 16 ashamed about myself." 17 Would that have been an appropriate response, if 18 indeed it was said that way? 19 A. Absolutely not. 20 Q. "By November 2004, I had been told by the police that no 21 criminal prosecution was going to be taken against 22 Pearce. I was extremely upset by this. 23 "Earlier that year, I had also decided that I wanted 24 to get some accountability from the school. I made 25 enquiries and identified a firm of solicitors. Their</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 69</p>	<p>1 file indicates that I contacted them initially on 2 12 March 2004 and met them a few days later. In fact, 3 I think I had probably spoken to them slightly earlier 4 than this. My recollection is that I had phoned them 5 just before contacting the police, and they gave me some 6 free advice on the telephone to the effect that I should 7 make a police complaint. I gave them instructions to 8 initiate a civil claim. This was issued at court on 9 18 October 2004 and, as I understand it, the proceedings 10 were then served in February 2005. 11 "The civil claim against Pearce and St Benedict's 12 made me extremely unpopular in my family, as they were 13 devout Catholics. My uncles and my mother claimed I had 14 initiated and wanted to have a relationship with Pearce. 15 My grandmother refuses to see me. 16 "I found the whole experience of the civil trial 17 very distressing and traumatic. I found it difficult to 18 engage with the legal process. I got palpitations. 19 Because the police were so dismissive of my suffering, 20 I felt it was the right thing to take a civil claim, but 21 I had to do so very much on my own. All of my friends 22 told me not to do it and my family abandoned me. It was 23 as if people felt the Catholic Church were untouchable 24 and the case so big I would be the one to suffer in the 25 end.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 70</p>
<p>1 "After the court case, not one member of my family 2 asked if I was okay. Some of these people are in 3 socially responsible positions. One uncle has been 4 great. 5 "I always had a plan that if I lost the civil case, 6 I would take my own life. That money I won was 7 a lifeline. 8 "My case against Pearce and the school eventually 9 went to trial in 2006. The full judgment of 10 Mr Justice Field in my case can be found." 11 He gives a reference. He quotes Mr Justice Field as 12 saying that he, A6, was an entirely convincing, reliable 13 and credible witness: 14 "He felt my evidence had the ring of truth. He 15 stated that I did not seek to exaggerate or colour my 16 evidence and was prepared to admit where I had done 17 things wrong in life. 18 "The judge also found Pearce to be an unconvincing 19 witness whose evidence appeared to have been carefully 20 rehearsed." 21 And he was awarded damages: 22 "I am aware that following the civil judgment in my 23 case, in 2006 David Pearce went on to abuse another boy 24 who I understand was working at St Benedict's. The fact 25 that the school and the monastery did not take</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 71</p>	<p>1 Mr Justice Field's judgment seriously is indicative of 2 their mentality and their utterly contemptuous approach 3 to child protection. 4 "I am also disappointed that the police did not 5 immediately instigate a criminal prosecution of Pearce 6 following the successful outcome of my civil claim. Had 7 they done so, his final victim might have been 8 protected. 9 "After the court case, my mother, who had refused to 10 be a witness for me and refused to help the police and 11 lawyers in their investigation, read the court judgment. 12 She went ballistic. She castigated me. She was not 13 concerned with my winning, she was solely concerned for 14 how she had been portrayed." 15 He goes on to say that he was cut out of the will 16 and the family inheritance for putting a priest in 17 prison and bringing dirty laundry into the court which 18 was needed to prosecute the priest, and his grandmother 19 has refused to see him: 20 "I was told by my mother that I had been cut out of 21 the will, as had she, but she had put herself back into 22 the will because my grandmother was too old to know 23 exactly what was going on, but she also said that 24 according to my uncles, I had probably provoked and 25 arranged the priest into a sexual relationship. I found</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 72</p>

<p>1 this very depressing and disturbing. I was 10 at the 2 time and I did not understand sex." 3 So forgive me for using you as a conduit in which to 4 read that, do you have any observations about what took 5 place in terms of the police investigation around A6? 6 A. It's clearly very upsetting to listen to that, and the 7 description of that conversation with DC Hudson, that's 8 also very upsetting to hear, and is not appropriate. 9 Q. Can we look at OHY006649_004. This is the advice from 10 Azra Khan of the Senior Crown Prosecution Service dated 11 19 October 2004. She considered the evidence in the 12 statement, the police statement, of A6 in relation to 13 the four incidents that he spoke of whilst a student. 14 As far as the various incidents were concerned, she 15 found that -- she went through each one and found the 16 first two would not have amounted to indecent assault 17 under the old legislation. She said: 18 "He appears to be credible in his account ..." 19 This is the third paragraph -- fourth paragraph 20 down: 21 "... and I have no doubt what he says is accurate. 22 However, he made no recent complaint and there is no 23 medical evidence or any other evidence to corroborate 24 his allegation." 25 Of course she's talking about the incidents in the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 73</p>	<p>1 infirmary at this point. She says: 2 "Although, of course, corroboration is not required 3 in such offences, we do need to be able to prove them 4 beyond reasonable doubt." 5 She goes on to say: 6 "Although Mr Pearce has been the subject of various 7 speculation in the past, it would appear that he has 8 never been charged with any criminal offence and never 9 been convicted of anything." 10 She relies on his being a man of previous good 11 character. She says: 12 "I have to consider whether or not, if the matter 13 was prosecuted, we are likely to secure a conviction. 14 Unfortunately, my conclusion is that we would not be 15 able to secure a conviction as, at best, what we have is 16 the word of the victim against that of the defendant. 17 In the absence of any corroboration, it is with deep 18 regret that I have to conclude that we would not be able 19 to secure a conviction against Mr Pearce for indecent 20 assault relating to the incident described to us on the 21 second occasion." 22 That was the touching of the penis in the infirmary: 23 "As far as the third and fourth incidents are 24 concerned, they would not be criminal offences, though 25 there would appear to be some form of grooming as well.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 74</p>
<p>1 Although the totality of the incident quite clearly 2 states that Mr Pearce was engaging in activity which was 3 no doubt very dubious, unfortunately the law is strict 4 and, if we had been able to charge the defendant with 5 the second incident, we would not have been allowed to 6 call into evidence the third and fourth incident." 7 She therefore concludes and advises that it is not 8 appropriate to prosecute Pearce and says: 9 "Should any further information come to light, then 10 of course I would always be willing to consider the 11 matter afresh. If you wish to discuss the contents of 12 this advice, please do not hesitate to contact the 13 writer." 14 As far as you can tell, was any advice given as to 15 what sort of information might assist the prosecution? 16 Are you aware of any further advice being given by the 17 Senior Crown Prosecutor? 18 A. No, I'm not. I think that's the only advice that was 19 given in that case. 20 Q. Did anyone try and contact her to discuss the advice, as 21 far as you can tell from the file? 22 A. I have to refresh my memory looking through the detail 23 of it. I don't believe that was the case. 24 Q. The CPS lawyer said that the second allegation, the 25 touching of the penis, amounted to an indecent assault</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 75</p>	<p>1 and that A6 was credible and accurate, but said that 2 there was insufficient evidence to charge because of 3 there being no corroborative evidence. What do you make 4 of that? 5 A. So it does ring -- it reminds me of the 1992 allegation 6 and, again, the individual that came forward then is 7 described as being truthful. We have got a similar 8 allegation here that's come forward and, again, in terms 9 of their credibility, and I also note that certainly 10 from the civil case and the judge in that case 11 describing A6 again as being a credible and truthful 12 witness, so on that basis, whilst there are, again, some 13 evidential difficulties with this particular 14 investigation, clearly, you do have an individual coming 15 forward making allegations which, certainly on the face 16 of it, do appear that they would be worthy of 17 progressing to trial. 18 Q. From looking at the file, can you tell whether the CPS 19 Crown Prosecutor was given chapter and verse of 20 the other allegations that had been made between 2001 21 and 2004? Because she refers to there being 22 speculation. 23 A. She does. So, clearly, there is the assumption that she 24 did know about those, but it's difficult from that case 25 file to see whether there are actually specific</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 76</p>

<p>1 references to those previous allegations that have been 2 made. 3 Q. In terms of presenting the case to her for 4 consideration, would it largely have been the file that 5 she was given? 6 A. Yes. 7 Q. So would it be right to say that she would have had to 8 go through it with some care? 9 A. Absolutely. Certainly, when you look at the timescale 10 involved, it would appear that she did do so. 11 Q. But in the body of the advice, which is, if one puts it 12 together, really just about a page long, there is no 13 reference to other allegations that have been collated, 14 and there's only a reference to speculation? 15 A. That's right. 16 Q. She refers to an absence of any corroboration? 17 A. That's right. So whilst we know that DC Hudson did look 18 at the 1992 allegation and also at the previous 19 allegations in 2001/2002, and re-opened the 2001/2002 20 investigation, it doesn't appear as though those have 21 been specifically referenced in that file. Albeit, 22 because she has mentioned the word "speculation", there 23 will be something in there that has caused her to remark 24 on that, clearly. 25 Q. Now, as far as you can tell, were the Met Police aware</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 77</p>	<p>1 of A6's civil claim, which began in 2004 and was 2 resolved finally at the beginning of 2006? 3 A. So we were aware that A6 had requested a copy of his 4 statement. We do receive many requests for copies of 5 individual statements that have been made and we also 6 receive many requests for data access to an individual's 7 information that we hold. We were not an interested 8 party in that civil claim, and I can see nothing in what 9 I have read to say that we were aware of that civil case 10 at the time. Subsequently, we were, thereafter, but not 11 during the case itself. 12 Q. If you had been aware, would an officer have made 13 efforts to discover the outcome of it? 14 A. Yes. 15 Q. A6, in his statement, as we heard, comments that he was 16 disappointed that the case was not re-opened. He's been 17 asked, for completeness, about that, and I am just going 18 to -- we have been provided with what he says. He says: 19 "If the question is, did the police contact me after 20 I won to start this criminal case, the answer is no. 21 The police did not take my win seriously enough to 22 warrant a criminal investigation, I think. I think they 23 started a criminal investigation after pressure was put 24 on them by 'Confessions of a Sceptic' blog writer." 25 Referring to Mr West:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 78</p>
<p>1 "I think that the criminal case was brought to 2 police by other boys. That's my speculation. When the 3 police did contact me, I had little to do with them. 4 A man from the police did interview me after I had won. 5 I don't know how long after. I think it was for the 6 case that they were starting. I believe the case was in 7 the papers after that, after I won the civil case the 8 Daily Mail or the Sun wrote an article 'Devil in the dog 9 collar'. I believe the police did not contact me 10 immediately after I won, only when they needed me for 11 the criminal case." 12 It is plain that the precise sequence of events from 13 that is not 100 per cent clear. We know that police 14 certainly knew by September 2008 and we also know that, 15 following A6's allegation, Pearce was put under 16 restrictive ministry. 17 Do you know, did the police have any involvement in 18 checking how restrictions were maintained and monitored? 19 A. No. 20 Q. What followed after A6 won his claim in 2006? I'm 21 turning to your statement now, if you need assistance. 22 What action did the police take, once they found out? 23 A. What page are you referring to? 24 Q. It begins at paragraph 54. 25 A. So in 2008, we prepared a report to the Crown</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 79</p>	<p>1 Prosecution Service, and that was following further 2 allegations that came forward in 2008. 3 Q. There were allegations from A621, A594, 597, A11, A6, 4 A596 at that time? 5 A. Yes, that's right. 6 Q. Your report on this occasion, did it include details of 7 all the various allegations that had been made? 8 A. Yes, I believe it did, and I also believe that the 9 previous allegation made by A6 in 2004 was also then 10 included in that investigation too. 11 Q. If you look at your paragraph 59, you refer to a report 12 from the diocese's child protection officer, who was 13 then David Tregaskis, who noted that Father David had 14 been the subject of four separate allegations over 15 a period of about four years. In fact, I think if you 16 tally those up, there were more than four. And then 17 writes that: 18 "It's the recommendation of this Commission that in 19 order to protect children and young persons and to 20 protect Father David from any unfounded allegations, 21 certain conditions should be imposed." 22 This included the recommendation that Father David 23 should be allowed to continue in a non-executive role 24 within the monastery, and continues to serve as 25 a chaplain to other religious communities but only as</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 80</p>

<p>1 long as this does not bring him into contact with 2 children and young persons. 3 Despite that, however, recommendations -- despite 4 those recommendations and A6's successful civil claim, 5 there was another complaint, wasn't there? 6 A. Yes, there was. 7 Q. So had the police taken any steps following those 8 comments and the claim to ensure that the 9 recommendations were being followed? 10 A. So that was in a letter that was dated in 2005 that 11 Operation Winter Key obtained, so that would have been 12 post 2015. It's not clear whether we were aware of that 13 letter at the time of it being written. 14 Q. As far as you're aware, did police take any steps to 15 ensure that David Pearce was not in contact with 16 children after 2008? 17 A. After 2008? David Pearce? 18 Q. Yes. 19 A. It's not clear. He was investigated and then prosecuted 20 in 2008 and then subsequent to that. 21 Q. Should the police inform the abbot or a child protection 22 officer at the diocese that allegations have been made 23 in any of these instances? 24 A. I mean, certainly informing the abbot would be -- not 25 necessarily informing the abbot. The abbot would --</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 81</p>	<p>1 that would be a reasonable line of enquiry, to see if 2 there are any other allegations or any other evidence 3 which may assist in the investigation, and certainly 4 making enquiries of the child protection officer as well 5 through the diocese would be a reasonable line of 6 enquiry as well, because that may yield any other 7 evidence too. 8 Q. When you look at the crime reports that we have been 9 through, is there any indication that the police were 10 going back to the abbey and telling the abbey about 11 other allegations that had come up? 12 A. It's not clear. 13 Q. Because it's not just a question of police work, is it; 14 it's a question of safeguarding? 15 A. Yes. 16 Q. And ensuring that the abbey and those with control over 17 the individual know of the allegations such that they 18 can monitor his activities, if necessary? 19 A. That's right. So you would expect -- absolutely right 20 in terms of both the investigation but also the 21 safeguarding role, and not just for the abbey to be 22 informed as well, but other agencies, such as 23 Social Services. 24 Q. Would you agree there appear to be a number of occasions 25 when that wasn't done?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 82</p>
<p>1 A. It would certainly -- there isn't that detailed record 2 to say that that's taken place. Albeit I can see from 3 my chronological table that clearly there were those 4 occasions when that did take place, clearly documented. 5 Q. So on some occasions, there clearly was that form of 6 liaison, but on some perhaps there was less? 7 A. Perhaps. 8 Q. I am going to move on to Laurence Soper and the 9 statement of Detective Sergeant Chris Sloan and 10 Detective Sergeant Shaun Richardson, which is in the 11 small bundle and is at MPS003541. It might be helpful 12 if it is just slightly blown up, please. 13 So DS Chris Sloan and DS Shaun Richardson undertake 14 a number of enquiries with the Catholic Church during 15 the course of this investigation, these beginning 16 in November 2015. So they came much later into the 17 investigation and were part of the Operation Dzo 18 enquiries. 19 In paragraph 4 they say: 20 "The current abbot (Dom Martin Shipperlee) extended 21 the offer of his help and assistance in whatever way he 22 could. He provided the contents left in Soper's room 23 when he fled from Rome along with a great deal of 24 background into Soper, the workings of Ealing Abbey, its 25 relationship with the associated school, as well as how</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 83</p>	<p>1 the Benedictine Order fits in and operates within the 2 structure of the Catholic Church." 3 To clarify the point I raised with you earlier, at 4 paragraph 6, these officers who wrote their statement 5 together say that Dom Shipperlee, at that stage, had no 6 current information about the whereabouts of Soper: 7 "He was formally interviewed as a witness by the 8 Operation Dzo investigating team and subsequently gave 9 evidence at the trial of Soper." 10 A. Mmm. 11 Q. Over the next page, I'm going to deal with liaisons with 12 various individuals at this point in the lead-up to the 13 Soper trial: 14 "From speaking with Dom Shipperlee, it became 15 apparent that the Archdiocese of Westminster undertook 16 safeguarding for Ealing Abbey. The Archdiocese of 17 Westminster is part of the larger secular arm of 18 the Catholic Church as opposed to the religious order 19 limb. 20 "The English Benedictines do not have a safeguarding 21 service themselves." 22 At paragraph 14, he says: 23 "It appeared that the Archdiocese of Westminster 24 safeguarding service were not on top of the Soper case 25 nor very conversant with. The file produced by them,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 84</p>

<p>1 upon the submission of a Data Protection Act request, 2 was historical and not very comprehensive. There was 3 also extensive, some might say excessive, redaction of 4 this material. One page was completely blanked out. 5 "They had no current information about the 6 whereabouts of Soper." 7 Dealing with the Apostolic Nunciature: 8 "[The officers] approached the Apostolic Nunciature 9 in Wimbledon and set up a meeting. This is effectively 10 the Vatican's embassy in the UK. A priest assigned to 11 work here from the Archdiocese of Westminster spoke to 12 us (Father Vincent Brady). 13 "From speaking with him, it became very clear that 14 the Apostolic Nunciature could not assist with the 15 search for Soper. He advised that the Benedictine Order 16 and the Archdiocese of Westminster were the best route 17 to take. 18 "The priest CS and SR [the officers] spoke to was 19 aware of the Soper case but had no current information 20 on his whereabouts. 21 "The Vatican. 22 "During the course of the financial investigation, 23 several formal requests were submitted to the 24 Vatican State via the UK National Crime Agency for 25 intelligence on Soper's banking history with the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 85</p>	<p>1 Vatican Bank. The officers received no replies." 2 Over the page at paragraph 22, "Issues and problems 3 encountered/observed". First of all, "Responsibility 4 for Soper": 5 "It became obvious from the enquiries undertaken by 6 CS and SR that nobody within the Catholic Church would 7 claim to have overall responsibility for Soper. 8 "As far as Ealing Abbey was concerned, Soper was no 9 longer part of their community. Due to the fact he had 10 not returned to Ealing Abbey after he fled from Rome, 11 the abbot, Dom Shipperlee, had invoked relevant sections 12 of Canon law [the universal legal code of 13 the Catholic Church] to expel Soper from Ealing Abbey 14 and thereby the Benedictine Order. 15 "The Archdiocese of Westminster safeguarding team 16 meanwhile appeared to be of the view Ealing Abbey did 17 still have some responsibility for Soper. 18 "As an example, when asked whether there was 19 a current risk assessment in relation to Soper and, if 20 so, what did it say, neither Ealing Abbey nor the 21 Archdiocese of Westminster Safeguarding Service were 22 able to answer this question. It became apparent one 23 did not exist or, if it did, it was not disclosed to us. 24 Soper did not appear to be a 'live' case, rather a filed 25 or dormant one. This was surprising to CS and SR due to</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 86</p>
<p>1 the fact Soper was at large and had an alleged history 2 of offending against minors. 3 "Albeit Soper had been expelled from the 4 Benedictine Order, there was still a question whether 5 Soper was still a priest or not? 6 "This seemed an awkward and difficult question to 7 several parties spoken to, but the conclusion was that 8 Soper was still a priest albeit he could not perform the 9 duties of a priest (say mass, hear confessions, 10 et cetera) due to the fact he was not incardinated with 11 any diocese or order (as far as they knew). 12 "[The officers] were told the reason Soper was still 13 a priest was because he was still an innocent man, as he 14 had not yet stood trial. Therefore, proceedings to 15 laicize him would only tend to be enacted if he was 16 found guilty of the offences alleged. 17 "The next question to follow from this was, who 18 would initiate laicization proceedings against Soper if 19 he was found guilty of the offences alleged? 20 Ealing Abbey appeared to think that this would sit with 21 the Archdiocese of Westminster and the Archdiocese of 22 Westminster appeared to think it would be the 23 responsibility of the Benedictines. Ultimately, the 24 Benedictines appeared to concede it would sit with 25 them."</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 87</p>	<p>1 In terms of safeguarding jurisdiction: 2 "The Archdiocese of Westminster Safeguarding Service 3 only undertakes safeguarding for the Benedictine Order 4 and other religious orders who are located within the 5 Archdiocese of Westminster. In relation to Soper, there 6 appeared to be a sense of confusion at times re 7 jurisdiction and responsibilities. Westminster 8 Safeguarding Service appeared to rely on what they were 9 told by the Benedictines. 10 "Indeed, due to the constraints of Canon law, a very 11 real flaw appears to be that the Archdiocese of 12 Westminster Safeguarding Service do not have any kind of 13 actual or real authority via the local bishop over the 14 Benedictines or any other religious orders for whom they 15 provide a safeguarding service. 16 "A further issue is that of supervision, overview 17 and accountability. Due to the local diocesan 18 arrangement to simply provide safeguarding services for 19 the religious orders located in a particular diocese, it 20 is difficult to see how the Catholic Church is able to 21 obtain a complete safeguarding picture of any of 22 the religious orders with a presence in England and 23 Wales. 24 "At every turn, those [the police] spoke to within 25 the Catholic Church claimed not to have any current or</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 88</p>

<p>1 actionable information or intelligence about Soper. 2 This was somewhat frustrating. [the officers] have no 3 doubt those spoken to were telling the truth. However, 4 it is also clear the information was there to be 5 discovered and disclosed if there had been an appetite 6 to do so. 7 "For example, as is now known, as early as 8 late March 2016, Soper himself sent a letter to the 9 Vatican Bank providing them with his current address in 10 Kosovo. During the time he was at large, Soper had also 11 periodically contacted the Vatican Bank asking for funds 12 to be transferred from his Vatican Bank account to an 13 account he had set up with a bank in Kosovo. 14 "Enclosed is a copy of the financial investigation 15 statement and ... enquiries undertaken and the material 16 examined. Much of the latter was seized from Soper upon 17 his arrest at Luton Airport in August 2016." 18 That was following his extradition: 19 "The statement provides a great deal of financial 20 background in relation to Soper and his contact with the 21 Vatican Bank during the years he was at large." 22 He talks about lessons learned and says: 23 "Manhunt primacy. 24 "In hindsight, the 'manhunt' for Soper should not 25 have been left with the original investigating</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 89</p>	<p>1 child abuse investigating team (CAIT) overseen by 2 a single investigating officer. This task should have 3 been passed to those with specialisms in this area of 4 work, who have a wide range of resources at their 5 disposal. Once this was done, in and 6 around December 2015, and primacy was passed to an MPS 7 major investigation team, Soper was detained in Kosovo 8 within six months. 9 "It was discovered by the major investigation team 10 looking for Soper that he had been circulated as wanted 11 on the UK police national computer. However, this had 12 not been transposed to the European-wide Sirene 13 database. This was rectified upon the MIT taking 14 primacy of the investigation. 15 "Upon his arrest at Luton Airport, Soper's British 16 passport was seized. This revealed he had travelled in 17 and out of Kosovo on a number of occasions to 18 neighbouring countries. However, it appears none of 19 them were part of the Schengen agreement countries." 20 Do you agree with the observations that the manhunt 21 for Soper should not have been left with the original 22 investigating CAIT team? That's at paragraph 38 of this 23 document. 24 A. When it first started, it would have been normal 25 practice for that particular team to carry on with that</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 90</p>
<p>1 manhunt. And I do know that they conducted financial 2 checks and also intelligence checks upon the mobile 3 phone. So I can see that, in addition to circulating 4 him as being wanted and also getting a European arrest 5 warrant, that as the time went on -- and clearly there 6 were other individuals that knew where Soper was at the 7 time, but weren't providing that information to the 8 police -- that as the time progressed, that that should 9 have then progressed to a team that has the more greater 10 knowledge and dedicated resources to continue that 11 manhunt. But certainly, in the initial stages, my 12 observations of the work they did was entirely 13 reasonable and proportionate, but over time, clearly, 14 that should have then passed to a dedicated team. 15 Q. Do you agree that that statement gives rise to a sense 16 of confusion around how each of the different bodies 17 were organised and how they liaised between themselves 18 and where responsibility lay? 19 A. I would say that it gives a very strong sense of that 20 confusion and as to who would have primacy in those 21 circumstances, absolutely it does, and it also -- my 22 reflections of what the officers have written echoes 23 what I said previously, that there are those individuals 24 who answer questions and answer them to the extent of 25 just answering the question, and others who clearly will</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 91</p>	<p>1 then give further information as well, and it's clear 2 that there are individuals who did have information that 3 would have helped the police at quite an early stage 4 that would have led to Soper's arrest at a much earlier 5 stage, but for whatever reason, they did not provide 6 that information to the Metropolitan Police. 7 Q. Abbot Shipperlee knew at the time of Soper's arrest in 8 2011 that Soper had access to a large amount of money, 9 and it's said that that was about £400,000 that had been 10 inherited from his parents which Shipperlee had failed 11 to obtain. The usual Benedictine rules were, it seems, 12 that all money would go to the community and Shipperlee 13 had failed to obtain that money. This is a rule 10 14 question. Do you think that the Metropolitan Police 15 would have bailed Soper and permitted him to leave the 16 United Kingdom and return to the Holy See if 17 Abbot Shipperlee had told the police of Soper's 18 financial means? 19 A. So the decision on whether to bail or not, there are 20 a number of factors at play there. I think the fact 21 that he's got access to a considerable sum of funds, 22 I don't think on its own would have changed that 23 decision. 24 Q. There had been a long string of allegations, and we can 25 see that Soper was bailed over and over again on</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 92</p>

<p>1 a number of different occasions. Do you think those 2 bail decisions were correct and appropriate? 3 A. Certainly the first allegation, Soper voluntarily came 4 back from Rome and, on the subsequent occasions where 5 bail was used, again, he complied with police requests 6 to come back to the United Kingdom. So in those 7 circumstances, and I think it was in your opening 8 statement yesterday about three separate occasions where 9 he did voluntarily, and he complied, come back to the 10 United Kingdom, in those circumstances, when it comes to 11 the issuing of bail, you have to have clear and 12 objective reasons as to why you are imposing bail 13 conditions, whatever those might be. 14 Given that he's complied with police requests thus 15 far, I would see that that would be entirely reasonable, 16 in terms of the conditions that were placed upon him. 17 Q. We've heard that Soper was accused of rape in 2001 by 18 a young man, RC-A420, that he said occurred in the 19 1990s. Was that something that the police were aware of 20 during the early part of these investigations into 21 Soper? 22 A. It's not clear. 23 Q. Your schedule suggests that the police were not aware of 24 the allegation until 2016, so after a number of the bail 25 decisions were made. Do you think that that allegation,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 93</p>	<p>1 which apparently had been made at the time to 2 Abbot Shipperlee, was something that should have been 3 brought to the police's attention? 4 A. I would say so, yes. 5 Q. Detective Sergeant Gregory -- forgive me. I think it 6 must be DC O'Neill, made some observations about 7 disclosure of material to police during the course of 8 the investigations, the later investigations, into Soper 9 and the difficulties that there were with obtaining 10 a supervision plan in relation to Soper from 11 Abbot Shipperlee and suggests that -- the tenor of his 12 evidence appears to be that there was a lack of positive 13 assistance. As far as you're aware, was that a sense 14 that the police had of their dealings with 15 Abbot Shipperlee? 16 A. So, of my reading of the material, there is 17 a consistency between what DC O'Neill has said and what 18 other officers have said too. 19 Q. The Met Police officers involved in Soper's arrest and 20 his release on bail on the last occasion, and indeed 21 earlier occasions, did not photograph him or fingerprint 22 him, and to verify his name and true age before 23 permitting him to leave the United Kingdom and return to 24 the Vatican. Gareth Morgan said on 23 March 2011 that 25 Abbot Shipperlee had informed him that Andrew Soper had</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 94</p>
<p>1 withdrawn cash from the Vatican Bank just before going 2 on the run a couple of weeks previously. Again, do you 3 think the international police manhunt for Soper would 4 have been helped had Abbot Shipperlee or the other 5 senior clerics who knew of this told the British police 6 and foreign police about it at the time? 7 A. Absolutely, yes. 8 Q. In your witness statement, you have said that 9 Abbot Shipperlee was not called to give evidence. We 10 have clarified that. Did the Metropolitan Police, as 11 far as you're aware, experience any difficulty in 12 engaging with or securing the co-operation of 13 the Department for Education in relation to child 14 protection and safeguarding concerns at Ealing Abbey or 15 St Benedict's School? 16 A. Can I just refresh myself from my statement, please? 17 I can see that no difficulties have been noted in 18 relation to dealing with Ealing Social Services. 19 I can't find reference to the Department for Education. 20 I'm just having a read through. 21 Q. So far as you're aware, were there any efforts to 22 contact the Department of Education or liaise with them? 23 A. I don't believe there were. 24 Q. This is a question from one of the core participants: 25 given that historical sexual abuse cases have been</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 95</p>	<p>1 prosecuted very many years after they took place, longer 2 than 15 years in some cases, what prevented the police 3 in the present instance from carrying out such 4 investigations? Was there something different about the 5 recent investigations or prosecutions which was not 6 available at the time? 7 A. I think that certainly our practice and approach to 8 investigations has changed over time, and our 9 understanding as to the nature of historic allegations 10 and the memory of victims and how those individuals then 11 come to report to the police and the building of trust 12 and being in a position where victims feel that they 13 will be taken seriously, those have clearly developed 14 over time, and we are getting better. There is still 15 work for us to do and we welcome the insight of this 16 inquiry in terms of helping shape our practice for the 17 future. 18 What I can see is that the investigations early on 19 looked at those investigations almost in isolation. As 20 time went on, you can see that there is a change in 21 practice to allow those investigations to be linked more 22 thoroughly. 23 Q. In terms of lessons learnt, what would you say are the 24 significant lessons to be learnt by the Met Police and 25 the prosecuting authorities in how a number of these</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 96</p>

1 cases were approached?
 2 **A. So certainly, in terms of linking those investigations**
 3 **together, thinking wider than the investigation that is**
 4 **purely in front of you and considering that, that is**
 5 **a complex area. I have already described some of**
 6 **the criticisms that have been made in terms of fishing**
 7 **expeditions, but considering the wider context for**
 8 **allegations coming forward I think is a lesson to be**
 9 **learned. Winter Key is a good example of where those**
 10 **lessons have been incorporated, where you have**
 11 **a multi-purpose, multi-disciplined team that comes**
 12 **together to look at those. I think that is a welcome**
 13 **development. And separating historic allegations, which**
 14 **are difficult and complex to investigate, to a separate**
 15 **team to be able to do those, as opposed to putting those**
 16 **investigations into a team which is dealing with the**
 17 **here-and-now investigations, I think is also a welcome**
 18 **development as well.**
 19 **MS KARMY-JONES: I have no further questions, chair, unless**
 20 **the chair and panel have any questions?**
 21 **Questions by THE PANEL**
 22 **THE CHAIR: Thank you. I will begin.**
 23 **Commander, I'm still not entirely clear why the**
 24 **police adopted such a piecemeal approach to the**
 25 **66 complaints that were made over several years. They**

Page 97

1 **certainly, when you look at the 2004 allegation, that**
 2 **they did look at the other allegations that had been**
 3 **made. But when you look at the whole, I'd say there**
 4 **isn't any consistency in terms of looking back.**
 5 **THE CHAIR: What's the practice now?**
 6 **A. So the practice now is that, certainly, when you look at**
 7 **Operation Winter Key, you would undertake that analysis**
 8 **through the computer systems. We have now got the**
 9 **police national database which now looks at allegations**
 10 **not just within an individual force but across the**
 11 **country. There is now, through the IT and also through**
 12 **vested practice and training, a much better**
 13 **understanding of what those links could be.**
 14 **MS SHARPLING: I would like to follow on from the chair's**
 15 **question, if I may. Certainly post 1992 and over the**
 16 **early 2000s, you certainly would have had access to**
 17 **intelligence records of some sort, even if there was no**
 18 **national police database. That's correct, isn't it?**
 19 **A. The standard for intelligence was the national**
 20 **intelligence model, which didn't come into effect --**
 21 **whilst there were some forces that used it, and**
 22 **certainly my force in Kent at the time did use**
 23 **intelligence-led policing, it didn't become a national**
 24 **intelligence model until around about 2000, is my**
 25 **understanding. So before that, each individual force**

Page 99

1 do not appear to have identified patterns of
 2 similarities in their analysis of individual cases. Can
 3 you shed any light on this? Can you give us perhaps
 4 your opinion or explanation?
 5 **A. So I think that the practice at the time was to look --**
 6 **an individual would come forward. They would look at**
 7 **that allegation first and then look to see what the**
 8 **quality of that investigation and that evidence was**
 9 **before then maybe looking to broaden it further.**
 10 **Clearly, those allegations are really difficult to**
 11 **progress initially, and that could account then for why,**
 12 **having not gone through that first stage of**
 13 **investigation, that then the others weren't then**
 14 **considered as well. That could be an explanation for**
 15 **those. They would only look for what they've got in**
 16 **front of them, first off, to look at that allegation and**
 17 **then they would then broaden it further. If they**
 18 **couldn't substantiate that allegation to the point of**
 19 **thinking, "Actually, here we have a chargeable offence",**
 20 **they wouldn't then look any further.**
 21 **THE CHAIR: So in those instances, even though there had**
 22 **previously been complaints about the same alleged**
 23 **perpetrator, they would not look at the analysis of**
 24 **the previous complaints?**
 25 **A. I suspect -- certainly there is some evidence,**

Page 98

1 **had its own piecemeal intelligence functions.**
 2 **MS SHARPLING: What I'm getting at is, the officers, after**
 3 **the first few complaints had been recorded by the**
 4 **Metropolitan Police Service, what resources did they**
 5 **have to test whether a particular individual or**
 6 **a particular institution was a cause for concern?**
 7 **A. So I think those would be limited to searches of the**
 8 **crime system, which was in the met called CRIS, as well**
 9 **as doing searches of the registry documents that you**
 10 **have seen through some of the evidence this morning.**
 11 **But it would be limited.**
 12 **MS SHARPLING: I see, thank you. A further question, if**
 13 **I may: there were several potential explanations for**
 14 **Father Pearce's behaviour in 1992 when he referred the**
 15 **boy in question to Social Services because he was**
 16 **allegedly concerned about the boy and his experiences at**
 17 **home. An alternative explanation was that this was done**
 18 **deliberately to deflect attention from himself and onto**
 19 **the father of the boy. My question is, how are the**
 20 **police trained to tell the difference?**
 21 **A. So back then or now?**
 22 **MS SHARPLING: Let's start with back then and go on to now.**
 23 **A. So I don't think there was that training back then, in**
 24 **terms of understanding that motivation.**
 25 **I think now that policing and, of course, society in**

Page 100

1 **general is far more questioning of why individuals may**
 2 **make certain referrals, and certainly my experience now**
 3 **is that policing is far less accepting of things at face**
 4 **value than they were previously.**
 5 MS SHARPLING: Lastly from me, if I may, in relation to
 6 cases where there is a decision not to proceed with
 7 a prosecution or the police may have closed the file
 8 themselves or there may even be an acquittal, am I right
 9 in my understanding that that does not alleviate the
 10 statutory agencies from their obligation to assess the
 11 risk to the child, in any event?
 12 **A. That's absolutely correct, ma'am, yes.**
 13 MS SHARPLING: Thank you:
 14 THE CHAIR: Mr Frank?
 15 MR FRANK: Yes, please. In relation to the document we have
 16 recently been referred to, which is the memorandum from
 17 DS Sloan and Richardson regarding the investigation into
 18 Soper, this is a fairly recent document. It is
 19 dated October of last year. I want to ask you if you
 20 could help us in relation to their reflections -- they
 21 have a section marked "Internal reflection and
 22 learning". Do you see that?
 23 **A. Yes.**
 24 MR FRANK: This is them attempting to learn the lessons of
 25 the errors that took place in relation to Soper. There

Page 101

1 I'm not asking you to name names, but who ought to have
 2 done it?
 3 **A. So you would expect the supervisor to reach a point**
 4 **where they say, "I think I've probably gone as far as**
 5 **I can with the resources and the knowledge that I've**
 6 **got, and I need some assistance and help with this,**
 7 **please".**
 8 MR FRANK: Can you give us any insight at all as to why it
 9 wasn't done?
 10 **A. I really wish I could. But, I'm sorry, I don't, from my**
 11 **reading of the case.**
 12 MR FRANK: Thank you very much. The second point, please:
 13 in relation to the lack of information, paragraph 33,
 14 can we just be clear, because it is somewhat opaque. It
 15 says:
 16 "I spoke to those within the Catholic Church who
 17 claim not to have any current or actionable information
 18 or intelligence ... this was somewhat frustrating ... no
 19 doubt [they] were telling the truth. However, it is
 20 also clear the information was there to be discovered
 21 and disclosed if there had been any appetite to do so."
 22 Could you explain and elucidate what is meant by
 23 "was there to be discovered". Where to be discovered,
 24 do you think?
 25 **A. I think what the officers are referring to there is the**

Page 103

1 are a couple of things I want to ask you to assist us
 2 with to see whether or not this lesson has in fact been
 3 investigated thoroughly and learned.
 4 One of the things they observe in paragraph 38, the
 5 second sentence, in relation to the failure to pass on
 6 the manhunt, as it were, information:
 7 "This task should have been passed to those with
 8 specialisms in this area of work who have a wide range
 9 of resources at their disposal," is what's observed.
 10 Can I ask you to help us with this: firstly, has
 11 anything been done to put in place some procedure to
 12 ensure that in future that task is indeed passed on to
 13 those who have specialisms in that type of work?
 14 **A. So there is a wanted offenders policy, and it may assist**
 15 **the inquiry if we provide a copy of that. My detailed**
 16 **knowledge of that is -- I would need to refresh myself**
 17 **against that.**
 18 **I do know that we do use major investigation teams**
 19 **in manhunt activity. I have got experience of that in**
 20 **my current role. So I do know that it takes place. But**
 21 **I think, in terms of the consistency of that, I would**
 22 **need to refer to the wanted offenders policy and assist**
 23 **the inquiry in that way.**
 24 MR FRANK: Thank you. Just a follow-up question on that
 25 point, though. It says "this should have been done".

Page 102

1 **requests that were made by Soper to access a bank**
 2 **account that would have been within the knowledge of**
 3 **individuals within Rome, and so that is what I think**
 4 **they are referring to. Because he was asking for monies**
 5 **to be transferred to a bank account in Kosovo, that**
 6 **other agencies were clearly aware of, but did not**
 7 **provide that to the police.**
 8 MR FRANK: The lack of appetite to discover that
 9 information, what's that referring to?
 10 **A. I think they are referring to the lack of appetite in**
 11 **those agencies to provide that information to the**
 12 **police.**
 13 MR FRANK: Thank you very much.
 14 THE CHAIR: Thank you. We have no further questions. Thank
 15 you, Commander. We will now rise and take the lunch
 16 break and return at 2.10 pm.
 17 (1.12 pm)
 18 (The short adjournment)
 19 (2.10 pm)
 20 MS KARMY-JONES: Chair, before we begin, can I just say one
 21 thing before I ask this witness any questions. One of
 22 the matters to be covered during the evidence of this
 23 witness, Mr Gregor McGill, is the advice we have already
 24 seen that was provided in 1992 by the Crown Prosecution
 25 Service lawyer Matthew McCabe, and, as you know, other

Page 104

<p>1 advice provided by the CPS during the early 2000s is 2 also going to be briefly looked at during his evidence. 3 I just want to say and put on the record that 4 Ms Sharpling's employment with the Crown Prosecution 5 Service is a matter of public record. She did not have 6 any involvement at all in the advice that Mr McCabe 7 provided in 1992 and, for the sake of completeness, 8 Ms Sharpling did not have any involvement in the 9 requests for further advice in connection with 10 Ealing Abbey in the early 2000s. 11 She is notionally acquainted with Mr McCabe. 12 Through my professional background, I am also 13 professionally slightly acquainted with Mr McCabe due to 14 my practice at the Criminal Bar. All the core 15 participants have been informed of this and none have 16 raised any objection, and I just raise it so that we 17 have it on record for these proceedings. 18 Whilst I am dealing with matters, can I also say 19 that Mr Dixey, on behalf of the Crown Prosecution 20 Service, contacted us and asked us to make 21 a clarification about something that I said in my 22 opening yesterday. It was in relation to A11's 23 allegations. 24 Mr Dixey took issue with something I said at what is 25 on the transcript at page 35, between lines 2 and 14,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 105</p>	<p>1 where I said that A11's allegation was not proceeded 2 with. 3 For clarity, I had earlier in my submissions made it 4 clear that A11's allegation had been not proceeded with 5 at the court, so the Crown Prosecution Service had 6 charged it, it had got to court and the case was 7 abandoned at court. I had said that a little before 8 this paragraph. But to assist, I make it clear that 9 that had in fact happened. 10 Now, Mr McGill is the next witness, if he could be 11 sworn, please. 12 MR GREGOR MCGILL (sworn) 13 Examination by MR KARMY-JONES 14 MS KARMY-JONES: Mr McGill, I think you have given evidence 15 to the inquiry previously -- 16 A. Yes. 17 Q. -- and to the chair and panel. This is not the first 18 statement that you have made for this inquiry? 19 A. No, that's correct. 20 Q. You have made quite a few, haven't you? 21 A. Yes. 22 Q. Your professional background -- I know that you have 23 given evidence about it, but for those who are listening 24 in, you joined the CPS in 1991? 25 A. Yes.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 106</p>
<p>1 Q. About six years after it had been established in 1985? 2 A. Yes. 3 Q. You became a Branch Crown Prosecutor in 2001? 4 A. Yes. 5 Q. You left the Crown Prosecution Service to join 6 Her Majesty's Customs and Excise, and you set up the 7 Serious Organised Crime Division, a Revenue and Customs 8 prosecutions office; is that right? 9 A. That's right, yes. 10 Q. That subsequently merged back with the Crown Prosecution 11 Service, so you rejoined the service? 12 A. I did. 13 Q. At the Crown Prosecution Service, you became head of 14 the Fraud Prosecution Division? 15 A. Yes. 16 Q. You were legal director for the Crown Prosecution 17 Service London in 2010? 18 A. Yes. 19 Q. And from 2012 to 2015, you were head of the Organised 20 Crime Division at the Crown Prosecution Service? 21 A. That's correct. 22 Q. You have been director of legal services since 2016? 23 A. Yes. 24 Q. What does that job actually entail? 25 A. In short, I manage -- up until recently, I managed all</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 107</p>	<p>1 of the chief Crown Prosecutors around the country. 2 I now have a colleague who is another director of legal 3 services, they have halved my role. I am a member of 4 the CPS board and I report directly to the director on 5 matters of case work. In short, my brief is to improve 6 the standard of our casework decision making and our 7 case preparation. 8 Q. Thank you. During the course of your extensive career, 9 how much experience have you, yourself, had with cases 10 such as this, involving allegations of child sexual 11 abuse, in some instances historic allegations? 12 A. I have had a lot as a practising lawyer. When I was in 13 CPS London in the '90s, I was a child abuse specialist, 14 and did that work for about six or seven years. And as 15 a manager and a leader, I am responsible for a number of 16 these operations' oversight. I don't have day-to-day 17 responsibility for them, but I have ultimate 18 responsibility for them as a senior member of the Crown 19 Prosecution Service. 20 Q. Now, the Crown Prosecution Service is the principal 21 authority for prosecutions in England and Wales, and 22 ultimately, through the Director of Public Prosecutions 23 and the Attorney General, is accountable to parliament? 24 A. That's right. 25 Q. What are the Crown Prosecution Service's</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 108</p>

<p>1 responsibilities, looking at your statement?</p> <p>2 A. In short, the police investigate cases. Once an</p> <p>3 investigation is complete, a law enforcement agency, and</p> <p>4 it might not just be the police, we prosecute on behalf</p> <p>5 of a number of law enforcement agencies. We provide</p> <p>6 charging decisions in respect of the more serious cases</p> <p>7 and we take those cases through to ultimate criminal</p> <p>8 trial.</p> <p>9 We also provide what we call early investigative</p> <p>10 advice to law enforcement agencies, so at an early</p> <p>11 stage, if they require advice about how to proceed, we</p> <p>12 will provide that advice pre charge.</p> <p>13 Q. So if a case has complexities or sensitivities, the</p> <p>14 police might come to the CPS and ask for assistance not</p> <p>15 only with the evidence as it stands, but with what</p> <p>16 further enquiries might be made?</p> <p>17 A. Yes, although we can only provide advice. Ultimately,</p> <p>18 the police have the ultimate responsibility for</p> <p>19 investigating those matters. So we don't direct them.</p> <p>20 Q. Do the police frequently disregard the advice or do they</p> <p>21 generally take the advice, when given?</p> <p>22 A. In my experience, they generally take the advice. Being</p> <p>23 frank, they might not always agree with the advice, but</p> <p>24 they accept it.</p> <p>25 Q. The Crown Prosecution Service is governed by the Code</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 109</p>	<p>1 for Crown Prosecutors, and has been since 1986?</p> <p>2 A. Yes.</p> <p>3 Q. That's developing and frequently changed/developed to</p> <p>4 encompass thinking around prosecutions and offending.</p> <p>5 But it in general says that a case should only be</p> <p>6 prosecuted if it satisfies a two-stage test?</p> <p>7 A. Yes.</p> <p>8 Q. That's been relatively consistent, although the wording</p> <p>9 may have changed?</p> <p>10 A. The test has been the same since 1986. The application</p> <p>11 of the test has been subject to different guidelines.</p> <p>12 Q. Just explain the test?</p> <p>13 A. The first stage of the test is the prosecutor has to ask</p> <p>14 themselves whether there's sufficient evidence to</p> <p>15 provide what's known as a realistic prospect of</p> <p>16 a conviction and, by that, that means, is a conviction</p> <p>17 more likely than not?</p> <p>18 If the prosecutor is satisfied that that test is</p> <p>19 satisfied, then, and only then, will they go on to the</p> <p>20 second stage, which is asking themselves, does the</p> <p>21 public interest require a prosecution?</p> <p>22 Q. The Code, as I have said, has changed over the years,</p> <p>23 and you provided a statement for the Ampleforth and</p> <p>24 Downside limb -- I won't take you through it, don't</p> <p>25 worry, at the moment --</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 110</p>
<p>1 A. Okay.</p> <p>2 Q. -- in which you helpfully set out the Code as it has</p> <p>3 changed?</p> <p>4 A. Yes.</p> <p>5 Q. And the guidance that was given in respect of a number</p> <p>6 of different matters, including sexual offences, older</p> <p>7 offences and offences involving child sexual abuse?</p> <p>8 A. Yes.</p> <p>9 Q. In a nutshell, are you able to summarise what the trend</p> <p>10 of the change has been?</p> <p>11 A. It's been quite a profound change, and now what we</p> <p>12 require our prosecutors to do is approach the case in an</p> <p>13 objective -- on an objective basis, looking at the</p> <p>14 merits of the evidence and taking a position as to</p> <p>15 whether they can build a case to build a prosecution.</p> <p>16 In the past, prosecutors -- and if you look at the</p> <p>17 first version of the Code, prosecutors were asking</p> <p>18 themselves about the strength of the evidence and how</p> <p>19 the evidence would be attacked. They still have to</p> <p>20 think of that now, but there's a much more positive</p> <p>21 emphasis on the Code, asking us to look at the merits of</p> <p>22 the evidence and trying to build cases that way.</p> <p>23 Q. Is it implicit in that that part of it, then, is to</p> <p>24 identify where there are holes and failings, weaknesses,</p> <p>25 in the case and to identify what evidence might be</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 111</p>	<p>1 obtained to fill those holes and address those</p> <p>2 weaknesses?</p> <p>3 A. I think it's implicit, yes. Any prosecutor worth their</p> <p>4 salt will look at the strength of the evidence that's</p> <p>5 presented to them, but will also ask themselves -- and</p> <p>6 I paraphrase here -- "If I was defending this case, how</p> <p>7 would I attack it?"</p> <p>8 Q. You say that's a more recent approach. Just help us</p> <p>9 with what the expectation was in years past?</p> <p>10 A. Sorry, the approach now is to really look at the merits</p> <p>11 of the evidence and not become too concerned about the</p> <p>12 weaknesses, but try to strengthen the evidence that you</p> <p>13 have got to provide a realistic prospect of</p> <p>14 a conviction.</p> <p>15 Q. Yes.</p> <p>16 A. Under the old versions of the Code, the prosecutor --</p> <p>17 I set this out in my third statement. The prosecutor</p> <p>18 was required to ask themselves some questions along the</p> <p>19 lines of, "How is this evidence going to stand up in</p> <p>20 court", essentially, and, "Is there any way the evidence</p> <p>21 can be attacked?". So the prosecutor had to use their</p> <p>22 own judgment -- was required to use their own judgment</p> <p>23 as to how they thought the prosecution would stand up in</p> <p>24 court. That meant that prosecutors sometimes could take</p> <p>25 a risk-averse approach because they may put undue weight</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 112</p>

<p>1 on some bits of evidence. 2 Q. Would the kinds of prosecutors who would be dealing with 3 the cases that we have before us here have to have any 4 special form of training or any special form of 5 qualification to make an assessment of the evidence? 6 A. Certainly now we have specialist what we call rape and 7 serious sexual offences prosecutors, and they are in 8 separate units, they are specially trained and they are 9 specialists in making those decisions. 10 When I was prosecuting in the '90s, I was 11 a child abuse specialist and a rape specialist. 12 Q. So they existed then? 13 A. They did. But the training wasn't as detailed and 14 wasn't of the same calibre as it was -- now, from 15 memory, it was a one-day course. Now it's much more 16 intensive than that, including visits to court to see 17 a trial in process, going to a Rape Crisis centre and to 18 a sexual offences centre and having to do some decisions 19 supervised by an experienced sexual offences prosecutor. 20 So it's always -- there's always been some measure 21 of specialisation, but it's much more intense now than 22 it was in the '90s. 23 Q. If a case is to be sent to the Crown Prosecution 24 Service, then or now, was there any sense of continuity 25 as to the unit that a case would be sent to? So, for</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 113</p>	<p>1 example, we are dealing with instances that arose out of 2 the area of Ealing. 3 A. Mmm. 4 Q. Would those cases, when referred, have gone to the same 5 area branch or not? 6 A. Generally, they would. So the area of Ealing -- 7 Matthew McCabe was the Assistant Branch Crown Prosecutor 8 of Ealing, so was the most senior prosecutor in that 9 branch. 10 There were instances -- if a case was of particular 11 complexity or had high-profile aspects, we did have 12 a special casework unit in the centre, and sometimes 13 those cases would be referred there. But, generally, 14 they went on a geographical basis to the local branch. 15 Q. So would a relationship develop between the officers and 16 the local branch? Would they get to know the CPS 17 lawyers? 18 A. Certainly should. It was my experience that they did. 19 Q. Even in those early years, when you were prosecuting in 20 the '90s, would they have been familiar with the lawyers 21 that they took the cases to? So you have mentioned 22 Mr McCabe, he was in a relatively senior position. Is 23 it to be expected that he would have known the team of 24 officers? 25 A. Not necessarily. He would have known some of them. He</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 114</p>
<p>1 would have known some of the officers that perhaps he 2 dealt with on a relatively frequent basis. But, of 3 course, they would take work from the whole division. 4 So you'd have -- you wouldn't just be taking sexual 5 abuse work, you'd be taking just general divisional work 6 as well. So you'd have the full gamut of work that 7 comes from a busy police station. So you'd have 8 robberies, burglaries, public order, all those types of 9 offences. So there'd be a range of work coming in. And 10 there'd be a lot of officers. 11 So you might know some, you wouldn't know all. 12 Q. We have heard that this particular unit that dealt with 13 these cases early on were not a particularly big group. 14 As far as you know, would the CPS office in Ealing at 15 that time have been a large or a small office? 16 A. I simply don't know that because I wasn't in that part 17 of London; I was in South London. 18 Q. So in terms of the roles of the police and the Crown 19 Prosecution Service, the police are usually the ones who 20 receive a complaint through the complainant or another 21 party and then investigate and gather evidence, and then 22 will submit the file of evidence to the Crown 23 Prosecution Service usually with some form of summary 24 document? 25 A. Yeah, they usually provide what's known as an officer's</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 115</p>	<p>1 report. 2 Q. How accurate is that generally? Is there a -- 3 A. They vary. 4 Q. They vary. 5 A. Some are very good. 6 Q. Yes. 7 A. Some, you have to be careful about relying on the 8 officer's report and read the evidence. 9 Q. As a general note -- 10 A. As a general note, and I don't mean to criticise the 11 officers, I would always read the evidence and rely on 12 the evidence rather than the officer's report. 13 Q. In fairness, that's sometimes because the officer's 14 report may be drafted at one stage -- 15 A. Yes. 16 Q. -- and then further evidence may come in at a later 17 stage? 18 A. Yes. 19 Q. And so expressions of fact or opinion may vary -- 20 A. Absolutely. 21 Q. -- by the time it reaches the Crown Prosecution Service? 22 A. Absolutely, and my job is to review the evidence, not 23 the officer's report. 24 Q. Would the Crown Prosecution lawyer themselves engage in 25 any research into previous allegations or would they be</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 116</p>

1 wholly reliant on that file?
 2 **A. Well, it depends. Prosecutors wouldn't go off -- we**
 3 **don't investigate. But if there are obvious questions**
 4 **that arise from the officer's report, some prosecutors**
 5 **would ask those questions.**
 6 Q. In terms of, say, a history of there having been
 7 allegations -- and you were in for the evidence of
 8 Commander Jerome -- would it be open to a Crown
 9 Prosecution Service lawyer to do any form of search
 10 themselves on what cases might have come through their
 11 offices?
 12 **A. It would be very difficult. Certainly, in the '90s,**
 13 **one, we didn't have a computer system, so it would have**
 14 **been a paper -- it was entirely a paper-based system and**
 15 **we had a Rolodex, from memory. Even with our computer**
 16 **system now, we can't search for, say, "Ealing Abbey".**
 17 **We search under two criteria. We are defendant-based so**
 18 **we will search under the defendant's name or we will**
 19 **search under what's known as the unique reference number**
 20 **that the police send the case to us under. Those are**
 21 **the only two ways that we would be able to search, and**
 22 **we would be dependent on the officer telling us if there**
 23 **were linked cases.**
 24 Q. Would you expect to be told about that sort of thing if
 25 there were?

Page 117

1 **offences where the penalty is life imprisonment, they're**
 2 **known as long-term interest cases, and they're kept for**
 3 **much longer.**
 4 Q. And cases involving allegations of child sexual abuse,
 5 how are they categorised?
 6 **A. Well, they would be generally, depending on what the**
 7 **allegation was, they could be destroyed after three**
 8 **years if they were Crown Court cases.**
 9 Q. Do you think that is a satisfactory means of classifying
 10 them, or should those types of cases have a higher
 11 classification, such that the files are retained for
 12 longer?
 13 **A. That would be a lot of files to keep. We used to**
 14 **prosecute 2 million cases a year. Currently we process,**
 15 **I think, just over -- nearly 600 -- 600,000. We have to**
 16 **have a proportionate way of dealing with the retention**
 17 **of files. Actually, since the inquiry has started, this**
 18 **inquiry and other inquiries, we haven't destroyed any**
 19 **files, but our storage facilities are getting full.**
 20 Q. In these days where things can be scanned and put on
 21 a computer system, might that be a means of resolving
 22 these storage issues?
 23 **A. That's resource-intensive and expensive.**
 24 Q. Bearing in mind that in cases of this nature, where
 25 a child has made an allegation or someone makes an

Page 119

1 **A. Yes, it's a relevant factor. You'd hope that you would**
 2 **be told.**
 3 Q. If the URN, the unique reference number, is itself not
 4 linked to any other cases, presumably you won't get any
 5 other cases up on the system that currently exists?
 6 **A. Absolutely. You'd only get it up by the name. So if**
 7 **you knew the name, you could search that way, but it's**
 8 **not foolproof.**
 9 Q. And presumably only if the various pseudonyms might be
 10 included?
 11 **A. Yes.**
 12 Q. In terms of retention of files and recording of events,
 13 how extensive is the Crown Prosecution Service's
 14 retention of files?
 15 **A. We prosecute a lot of cases every year, so we can't keep**
 16 **everything. So generally, on a Magistrate's Court file**
 17 **we will keep it for a year, and then, after that year,**
 18 **it's automatically destroyed, unless there's something**
 19 **on the file to say that it shouldn't be.**
 20 Q. Is there any variation of that where you're dealing with
 21 a certain category or type of offence?
 22 **A. Not really. If you didn't want a file destroyed after**
 23 **12 months, you'd have to put a note on the file not to**
 24 **destroy it. For a Crown Court case, it's three years,**
 25 **but for certain more serious offences, especially those**

Page 118

1 historic allegation, would you agree that experience
 2 shows that these are exactly the kind of cases that may
 3 resurface years down the line?
 4 **A. They could do, but there's a balance that has to be**
 5 **struck here between keeping those cases that need to be**
 6 **kept and not keeping those cases that don't need to be**
 7 **kept. At the moment, we have the balance struck at**
 8 **a certain category of offences and a certain sentence**
 9 **that's been passed. Obviously, if we are asked to think**
 10 **of something else, as a public authority, we would think**
 11 **of something else.**
 12 Q. So, for example, in this case, you searched the file
 13 archives and you were unable to identify the case of
 14 Pearce in 1992 -- that's A595?
 15 **A. Mmm-hmm.**
 16 Q. The case of Pearce in 2004, which was A6, or Soper in
 17 2004?
 18 **A. I believe that's the case, yes.**
 19 Q. Those three.
 20 **A. I think under our guidelines as to file destruction,**
 21 **they would have been properly destroyed in accordance**
 22 **with those instructions.**
 23 Q. The Soper one was the 622 one, which was an allegation
 24 of rape?
 25 **A. Well, that's punishable with life imprisonment, but**

Page 120

<p>1 I simply don't know what happened to that. Because 2 there was no charge of course at that stage. 3 Q. Thank you. Just out of interest, because it's topical, 4 how does the current guidance fit with the General Data 5 Protection Regulation Rules, GDPR? 6 A. I'd have to -- that's a pretty technical question. We 7 have a departmental security officer and a records 8 management unit who have responsibility for ensuring 9 that we abide by the law in respect of those -- that 10 legislation. I simply don't know the answer to that 11 question, but I do know that we abide by it. If that's 12 something that you want further evidence on, I can get 13 evidence from that about what we do. But I personally 14 don't know. 15 Q. I'm going to ask you to look at the file that relates to 16 RC-A595. Now, you have considered this in your 17 statement at paragraph 22 and onwards and you have also 18 had an opportunity to look at a better draft of the 19 advice in relation to whether there was a reasonable 20 prospect of conviction. 21 A. Yes. 22 Q. I selectively don't say "charge advice" because it 23 wasn't really that, was it? It was an advice rather 24 than a charging decision? 25 A. It was an advice. Because at that stage the decision to</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 121</p>	<p>1 charge, in 1992, still vested with the police. 2 Q. Now, you sat in, I think, for the witness evidence of 3 Commander Jerome, so I'm not going to take you -- 4 A. I did. 5 Q. -- through in any detail, but it is at MPS003529. Do 6 you have that in your bundle? Mine is behind C1 at an 7 insert. Yours may be in -- C2. I will just check. 8 This was a later insert when we got the better copy. 9 Yours is behind C2? 10 A. I have it. 11 Q. You have read this, haven't you? 12 A. I have. 13 Q. You have provided us with a separate statement 14 specifically dealing with it? 15 A. I have. 16 Q. At this time, in 1992, the ultimate decision of whether 17 or not to prosecute a case lay with whom? 18 A. Whether to prosecute? 19 Q. Yes. 20 A. The Crown Prosecution Service. 21 Q. When you say that this is not a charging advice per se, 22 if the police disagreed with the decision, was there 23 anything they could do about it? 24 A. Well, theoretically, yes, they could charge the case. 25 They had ultimate sanction as to whether they charged</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 122</p>
<p>1 the case or not. 2 Two things about that. One, that would be something 3 that would cause difficulties in the relationship 4 between the Crown Prosecution Service and the 5 Metropolitan Police, because it would be professionally 6 discourteous. But also it wouldn't gain them much. 7 Because if nothing had changed and the view of the Crown 8 Prosecution Service was still that there was 9 insufficient evidence, the Crown Prosecution Service 10 could simply discontinue the case. 11 Q. If there was evidence that hadn't been considered or 12 further evidence came to light, what would you expect 13 the police to do? 14 A. Generally, what happens is, if there is further 15 evidence -- the Code allows us, if we have made 16 a decision that there's insufficient evidence, if 17 further evidence becomes available and it's sent to us, 18 we can consider that further evidence and make a further 19 decision. 20 Q. So, in terms of this advice, was it final or was it 21 possible for the police to return to ask for the case to 22 be reconsidered? 23 A. I think there's always -- it's always possible to come 24 back if you find further evidence. It doesn't say so 25 here, but that's the practice.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 123</p>	<p>1 Q. Looking at the reasons given by Mr McCabe, and it is the 2 second paragraph on the first page -- I have read it out 3 already, Mr McGill, but for your reference, the lack of 4 corroboration, the lack of medical evidence, the 5 material that could be put to the complainant that would 6 reasonably -- would ascribe a reason for not telling the 7 truth, issues around his credibility. At the top of 8 page 2, there was a concern over a conflict of dates, 9 the question of whether the complainant had delayed in 10 making his allegation by a week. Those were all matters 11 considered. 12 Later in the advice, Mr McCabe looked at the 13 allegation of theft around the cricket bat, and placed 14 some reliance on not only David Pearce's good character, 15 but the fact that the defence would be able to make 16 great play of the fact that his referral to 17 Social Services wasn't the act of a guilty man? 18 A. Mmm. 19 Q. So, looking at those, do you have any observations to 20 make about the nature of the advice? 21 A. I think, if you go to my third statement, I have set it 22 out there, and I think I'd start at paragraph 4 of my 23 statement dated 31 January. Because I think it's 24 important to go to the core documentation, our core 25 document, which Mr McCabe would have had in front of</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 124</p>

1 him, hopefully, or would have had in his mind when he
 2 was making his decision, which is the Code for Crown
 3 Prosecutors.
 4 What that says, and it is set out in paragraph 4:
 5 "The prosecutor must be prepared to look beneath the
 6 surface of the statements. He must also draw, so far as
 7 is possible, on his own experience of how evidence of
 8 the type under consideration is likely to 'stand up' in
 9 court."
 10 So that's essentially how he would be approaching
 11 this, and this is what he would have in mind.
 12 As I say in paragraph 5:
 13 "The direction to prosecutors that they should draw
 14 upon their own experience of how evidence is likely to
 15 'stand up' in court ..."
 16 That's what we were required to do in those days.
 17 Speaking about the things that Mr McCabe took into
 18 consideration, if you go to paragraph 8 of my statement,
 19 there's no corroboration of the indecent assault. Now,
 20 we can talk about whether there was a need for
 21 corroboration. My own view is that, in 1992, there was.
 22 I think that's a valid concern on the part of Mr McCabe,
 23 the fact that there was no corroboration.
 24 Q. In your view, was that need for corroboration
 25 evidential, as it were, as part of the evidential test,

Page 125

1 evidence that was put forward by the suspect,
 2 essentially.
 3 Q. So, in this case, for example, on the face of
 4 the statements, we have the sister, on 4 June,
 5 indicating that her brother had expressed distress and
 6 had disclosed some incidents with David Pearce but not
 7 the relevant one; we have the mother suggesting that he
 8 had been wetting his bed for a week; we have a teacher's
 9 statement saying that David Pearce did indeed cover the
 10 class on 4 June, and it is plain that David Pearce did
 11 not indicate to him that he conducted any examination;
 12 we have the social worker's statement which indicated
 13 that David Pearce suggested to her that he had conducted
 14 an examination on the 4th; and there's a little bit more
 15 as well, isn't there? Would any of that have assisted
 16 this boy in relation to his allegation?
 17 A. I think the one bit there that you have mentioned that
 18 does strengthen the allegation is the failure by
 19 Father David to mention the fact that he examined the
 20 buttocks of the boy.
 21 Q. There's also the fact that, on the social worker's
 22 account, she did take him to mean that that examination
 23 took place on the 4th. She then disclosed the boy's
 24 account to him before he was interviewed and, during the
 25 course of his interview, he then suggested that the

Page 127

1 or was that need for corroboration legal, was it
 2 required by law that there should be corroboration?
 3 A. I think it was required by law, and we can come on -- do
 4 you want me to say why I think it was required by law?
 5 Q. By all means.
 6 A. The need for corroboration of a child's evidence was
 7 abolished in 1988. But the need for a corroboration of
 8 an offence relating to a sexual offence wasn't abolished
 9 in 1988. It was only abolished in 1994, and only came
 10 into -- I think it was only enacted in February 1995.
 11 Between 1988 and 1994, corroboration was still
 12 something that was both actively looked for by the
 13 judiciary, both under statute and under the common law,
 14 where there remained a discretion for the judge to warn
 15 the jury not to convict a suspect on the basis of
 16 the uncorroborated evidence of a child.
 17 So for prosecutors, corroboration in 1992 was still
 18 a very moot point.
 19 Q. In 1992, was it essential that there would have to be
 20 corroboration in a case, then, as far as you're
 21 concerned?
 22 A. Yes.
 23 Q. What would amount to corroboration?
 24 A. Well, that is where I think people take different views.
 25 It's some supporting evidence that supports the primary

Page 126

1 examination had taken place on the 11th.
 2 A. I'm not troubled by that. I actually don't think --
 3 I certainly -- I don't think -- it's certainly not
 4 something that a prosecutor would take into account now.
 5 I'm not even sure that that change of -- that slight
 6 confusion about the date is particularly significant in
 7 1992. He's 10.
 8 Q. And the delay: was that significant in 1992, a delay of
 9 a week?
 10 A. A delay of a week, of itself, is not, I think,
 11 particularly significant. What was significant, if
 12 I may say, is the initial allegation, when he was --
 13 when the boy was with Father David. There was no
 14 reference to any sexual complaint. The allegation was
 15 of physical abuse by the father.
 16 Q. Yes, which the father subsequently agreed had happened?
 17 A. And it was, if I use the word "corroboration" in its
 18 wider sense, corroborated by both the child's sister and
 19 mother, who both accepted that it had happened.
 20 Q. Yes. The boy in his statement subsequently also
 21 outlined that that had happened, though on a lesser
 22 basis than Father Pearce appears to have suggested?
 23 A. Yes, and the boy's statement is somewhat coy about the
 24 nature of that abuse.
 25 Q. One can perhaps imagine that there were difficulties and

Page 128

1 pressures from various areas on him?
 2 **A. Absolutely. Absolutely. I go back: he was 10.**
 3 Q. So bearing all that in mind, what do you say about the
 4 decision that was made in 1992?
 5 **A. I think, on the basis of the Code as it stood at the**
 6 **time, on the basis that there was a credible alternative**
 7 **explanation for the allegation that the boy made, given**
 8 **that that was the first allegation that was made, given**
 9 **that it was made independently to the mother and to the**
 10 **social worker, first of all with no reference to any**
 11 **allegation of sexual assault, I have some sympathy with**
 12 **the decision that Mr McCabe came to, because what the**
 13 **prosecutor has to do is weigh up the evidence and make**
 14 **an objective decision as to the strength of**
 15 **the evidence.**
 16 **Here, you have an allegation of -- being made by**
 17 **a 10-year-old boy against a priest with no previous**
 18 **convictions who, when he first made the allegation,**
 19 **didn't mention any question of sexual abuse.**
 20 **If you were looking to make a charging decision on**
 21 **that case, you would be looking -- if you were defending**
 22 **that case, how would you defend it? And that is where**
 23 **it would be defended.**
 24 Q. What do you say about the officer's view that the boy
 25 was a credible witness?

Page 129

1 **there sufficient evidence to charge?", and you would**
 2 **provide that advice.**
 3 Q. In terms of how cases are looked at today, presented
 4 with an allegation like this, do you think that the
 5 outcome would be the same or not?
 6 **A. I think that's a very difficult question to answer,**
 7 **because -- for a number of reasons. I am going on the**
 8 **evidence that's been provided to me. If I was looking**
 9 **at this case afresh, what I would do is, I'd have -- I'd**
 10 **bring the officer in and I'd have a real conversation**
 11 **with the officer about the strengths and the weaknesses**
 12 **and see if there was anything else that we could do to**
 13 **build the case.**
 14 **When looking at it objectively, just on the papers,**
 15 **I think it's, if I may say so, a decision of its time,**
 16 **it's a decision of 1992 and on the Code in 1992.**
 17 **I still think this would be a challenging case to**
 18 **prosecute now. I think it would be a much more finely**
 19 **balanced decision, but the challenges would still be the**
 20 **same, although we would be able, I think, to advance**
 21 **a better understanding of why a 10-year-old child may**
 22 **act in the way that they act, because we know much more**
 23 **about what the victims of sexual abuse do when they are**
 24 **faced with having to give details of things.**
 25 **So it's a very difficult decision. It's a very**

Page 131

1 **A. Well, I'm always very mindful of the expert opinion of**
 2 **officers. They spend a lot of time with the victims and**
 3 **the witnesses, and they do form a bond with them. It's**
 4 **my experience that officers sometimes take an**
 5 **overoptimistic view of how a person will give their**
 6 **evidence. The job of a prosecutor is to take an**
 7 **objective view, to look at the evidence and ask**
 8 **themselves, "What's the strength? What's the**
 9 **weakness?", and make that balance, and say, if they were**
 10 **defending that case, how would it be defended. And the**
 11 **way this case would be defended would have been,**
 12 **certainly in 1992, for the evidence of the boy to be**
 13 **attacked and to be attacked really quite strongly,**
 14 **because we operate in an adversarial system.**
 15 Q. Now, bearing in mind the fact that the accused was
 16 a teacher at a school with access to a lot of small
 17 children, should any further advice have been given
 18 about monitoring him? Should the CPS have liaised with
 19 any organisations at this stage?
 20 **A. Well, the job of the CPS in 1992, and now, really, is to**
 21 **make decisions on cases brought to it by the police, to**
 22 **make charging decisions and to prosecute cases. Really,**
 23 **it's not for the CPS to make recommendations as to what**
 24 **other agencies should do.**
 25 **So generally, you would be asked for the advice, "Is**

Page 130

1 **borderline case. I don't think the decision to not**
 2 **prosecute -- I don't think I would classify that as**
 3 **wrong. I think that's a perfectly reasonable decision.**
 4 Q. Looking at the guidance that you cited earlier of
 5 a prosecutor looking beneath the surface, as part of
 6 that, should any advice have been given as to what
 7 further enquiries the police could have made? For
 8 example, with teachers or students?
 9 **A. Absolutely. I think we would have -- if I was looking**
 10 **at this case, I would have asked the police to go off**
 11 **and get more statements from more people and find out**
 12 **exactly what was going on at the school, who knew what,**
 13 **whether there was any corroborating evidence.**
 14 **We know now that what Father Pearce was doing was**
 15 **known to quite a few people, so that if the officers had**
 16 **made further enquiries, we might have got further**
 17 **evidence that would substantiate the claim.**
 18 **So I think I would have probably asked for further**
 19 **enquiries to be made.**
 20 Q. So we know from Commander Jerome that, in his view, the
 21 team that dealt with this and the officer who dealt with
 22 this, who was a PC, was relatively inexperienced.
 23 **A. Yes.**
 24 Q. Do you accept that the police might have been assisted
 25 had some cogent advice been given to them as to the

Page 132

<p>1 sorts of enquiries that could be made, could have been 2 made? 3 A. Yes, I have to be careful how I say this: the 4 relationship between the police and the CPS was a lot 5 more fractious in 1992 than it is perhaps in 2019. So 6 some officers would be willing to take advice from 7 prosecutors; other officers might well say, "It's my job 8 to determine what investigations I should make. I don't 9 need a prosecutor to tell me". 10 It was still a relatively short time after the Crown 11 Prosecution Service had been set up. 12 Now, in 2019, there is much more of a team ethos, so 13 if we offer advice to the police, they generally take 14 it. 15 Q. So what would be done in this case now? 16 A. Yes. It's -- there's a whole different approach from 17 all the agencies in both investigating and prosecuting 18 this type of offence now. So it depends -- the answer 19 to your question is, it depends on the individual, and 20 it depends on that strength of the relationship, going 21 back to what you discussed earlier on, about whether 22 you've built up that relationship between prosecutor -- 23 local prosecutor and local police officer. If you have 24 that, it makes things easier. 25 Q. Are efforts being made now for those sorts of</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 133</p>	<p>1 relationships to be built and strengthened? 2 A. Oh, absolutely, yes. There is an awful lot of joint 3 working between local sexual offences investigation 4 teams and local RASSO units and the CPS. 5 Q. What about other agencies? Or is it fairly confined to 6 the police and the units? 7 A. Well, a lot is done with the police and the units. For 8 instance, we have done a lot with counsel about how to 9 prosecute these cases. We have relationships with the 10 local authorities about how we might obtain third party 11 material. And we do an awful lot with the affected 12 communities, so the CPS policy departments do an awful 13 lot of work with victims' groups and sexual offences 14 survivors' groups, and we do more of that in 2019 than 15 we ever did in the early '90s. 16 Q. I'm going to move on to the next advice, which was in 17 respect of RC-A6 in 2004. It should be behind your 18 tab C5? 19 A. This is the advice of Azra Khan? 20 Q. Yes. 21 A. Yes, I have it. 22 Q. You have had an opportunity to look at that? 23 A. Yes. 24 Q. Just for a moment, can I ask you to turn to page 21 and 25 ask for that just to be pulled up on the screen?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 134</p>
<p>1 A. 21 of the same tab? 2 Q. Yes. It is OHY006649_021. 3 A. Yes, I have got that. 4 Q. If we can go to page 21, just to note here that this is 5 the CRIS report. We can see from that the crime type, 6 the allegation, the date it was committed -- said to be 7 between 1990 and 1991 -- and the date it was reported 8 was Thursday, 22 January 2004 at 1.45. 9 A. Yes. 10 Q. By way of reminder, if we go to page 28, we have had the 11 statement read, but this was the allegation in which A6 12 mentioned being taken to the infirmary on two occasions 13 and having his trousers loosened and, on the second 14 occasion, having his penis played with. He also 15 referred to David Pearce bringing a video camera in and 16 videoing the boys and a number of other incidents. 17 Azra Khan's advice is at page 4, and in it she said 18 that no criminal offence would have been committed in 19 respect of the first incident. The second incident 20 would have amounted to indecent assault. So those are 21 looking at the two incidents in the infirmary, the 22 second of which was the actual touching of the penis. 23 She found the boy to be credible in his account and 24 had no doubt that what he says is accurate. However, he 25 made no recent complaint. In this, she didn't refer to</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 135</p>	<p>1 the fact that it had been said he'd spoken to an uncle 2 and she said there was no corroboration and although she 3 qualified that by saying "corroboration is not 4 required", this now being in 2004, "in such offences we 5 do need to be able to prove them beyond reasonable 6 doubt"? 7 A. Yes. 8 Q. She therefore found that, in the absence of any 9 corroboration, with deep regret, she had to conclude 10 that "we would not be able to secure a conviction 11 against Mr Pearce". 12 A. Yes. 13 Q. Do you have any observations about this advice? 14 A. I think I made some observations in my initial 15 statement. 16 Q. You did. I think it's at paragraph 36 of your 17 statement, if that assists you. 18 A. Yes. I think there's a difficulty for a prosecutor. 19 Once you say someone is credible and accurate, you have 20 to ask yourself, well, what is there to undermine their 21 account? I see nothing here in the report that has been 22 set out by the prosecutor that undermines the account. 23 I'm slightly troubled that a prosecutor would say that 24 the complainant is both credible and accurate, but we 25 require further evidence.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 136</p>

<p>1 As you know, in 2004, there was no requirement for 2 corroboration, either legal or evidential. So I think 3 the prosecutor fell into error there. 4 I think, again, this may be a decision of its time. 5 I say that because I think if we were prosecuting this 6 now, the other three allegations I think are allegations 7 that we would use, I think, as part of our case theory, 8 to build up a picture of Father Pearce's behaviour in 9 relation to children. 10 Q. She simply dismisses them, really, as inadmissible? 11 A. Yeah, and I'm not sure that that was right in 2004 12 because the Criminal Justice Act 2003 had come in. 13 Now, it's fair to say that the Criminal Justice Act 14 2003 turned the law on its head in relation to hearsay 15 and also bad character, but now, in respect of some of 16 these other allegations, I would expect us to be looking 17 to see whether we could introduce some of these as part 18 of a bad character application. 19 Now, it may be that in 2004 the jurisprudence on bad 20 character wasn't as well defined as it is now, and I'm 21 confident that if we were looking at this now, we would 22 be looking to build a case around the initial credible 23 and accurate allegation, plus that supporting evidence 24 that supports the behaviour of Father Pearce being -- 25 I characterise it as somewhat odd and not appropriate,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 137</p>	<p>1 which I think builds up a picture for a jury in a trial 2 to consider the overall behaviour of the suspect. 3 Q. There is, in the body of that case file, details of 4 quite a few other allegations that were made by other 5 individuals. Ms Khan seems to dismiss them as 6 speculation. Is it clear from this whether she actually 7 considered the whole of the case file? 8 A. It's not clear to me, certainly. I think there's one 9 other statement in there -- there are two statements, 10 I think, in there, one of which I think is couched in 11 terms that make it less useful, if I can put it that 12 way. There is, "I might have seen this, I may not, 13 I now can't remember". But there is another 14 statement -- I won't say whose name it was -- that gives 15 an allegation of actually witnessing Father Pearce put 16 his hands down a boy's trunks when they were at 17 swimming. On the face of it, that is something else 18 that a prosecutor could -- could consider getting some 19 further information and consider charging or, again, use 20 as a potential for a bad character application. 21 Q. There's also an allegation of him grabbing the waistband 22 of one of the witnesses, of his trousers and pants, and 23 pulling them away and looking down the pants? 24 A. Yes, there's a number of instances in there that if you 25 were looking to build a case, you might ask the police</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 138</p>
<p>1 to go off and make some further enquiries. There's also 2 the inherent strangeness of someone taking a video 3 camera into the showers and saying it's for a school 4 documentary. That's a bit far-fetched, in my opinion. 5 Q. It doesn't appear that that video, in fact, was viewed, 6 I don't think -- 7 A. I don't think it was available. 8 Q. It was found, though -- 9 A. Was it? 10 Q. -- at some stage? 11 A. There is no evidence that it was viewed here. 12 Q. There is a reference to it in either this CRIS report or 13 later on, but definitely it was found and viewed and 14 there is a summary document in one of the reports as to 15 what it contained, and we have heard evidence from one 16 of the boys, through a statement, that his mother saw it 17 and thought it was extremely badly edited -- in fact, 18 I think that was A6? 19 A. So in respect of this advice, I'm not saying -- I can't 20 say whether it was the right decision or not, but what 21 I would say is, I think there were some -- and the 22 officer, Commander Jerome referred to it, I think there 23 were some reasonable lines of enquiry that could have 24 been explored and a decision to not charge this case 25 I think might have been made prematurely. I can't say</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 139</p>	<p>1 what ultimately those reasonable lines of enquiry might 2 have shown, but I think, if I was looking at this, 3 I might have asked the officer to make some further 4 enquiries. 5 Q. In terms of the advice, such as it is, would you expect, 6 effectively, one page to deal with the issues in a case 7 of this nature, where there are, in the background, 8 a number of allegations that have been made? 9 A. Well, again, I think it's of its time. And I think it's 10 interesting that I think we were only asked to make 11 a charging decision in respect of one of 12 the complainants. We weren't asked to make a charging 13 decision on the other people. I won't say the name of 14 the person. I'm sorry, I'm not a core participant so 15 I'm not up to date with the ciphers. I know them by 16 names. But there was one person, and the name is in my 17 statement, that we were asked to make a charging 18 decision for. I think the lawyer has looked at that and 19 said, "I have been asked to make a charging decision in 20 respect of that, and I'm making a charging decision just 21 in respect of that", and perhaps hasn't thought around 22 the other information that may have been available or 23 the other enquiries that perhaps could be made. 24 Q. What steps, if any, as far as you're aware, did the 25 Crown Prosecution Service take as a result of this case</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 140</p>

<p>1 in relation to child protection and safeguarding at 2 Ealing Abbey and St Benedict's School? 3 A. Well, I can't speculate on that. I can only answer that 4 from the basis of the information I have seen. 5 I haven't seen the Crown Prosecution Service did 6 anything. I'm not sure that the Crown Prosecution 7 Service would. They would provide the advice to the 8 police. The police have a duty of safeguarding, not the 9 Crown Prosecution Service. We make decisions on 10 criminal prosecutions. 11 Q. Do you think that if something like this comes to the 12 attention of a Crown Prosecution Service lawyer, they 13 should make enquiry of the police as to what is 14 happening next? Is there any responsibility for the 15 forward-looking approach? 16 A. I'm not sure about responsibility. If I was dealing 17 with this, I might ask some questions. One of 18 the questions I would have asked is, in a place like 19 this, are there any other allegations? It's one of 20 the first questions you ask: is there anything else 21 known about this or is this the first time that there's 22 been an allegation here? 23 Q. Or, "Have you spoken to the staff? Have you spoken to 24 any other students?" 25 A. It's a pretty basic question. It's one of the first</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 141</p>	<p>1 questions you ask. If there's an allegation like this 2 in an institution, one of the first questions you ask 3 is, have there been any others. 4 Q. Was the CPS aware that this complainant, RC-A6, won 5 a civil claim in 2006? I think you've heard the 6 evidence about that. 7 A. There's nothing in the papers to say that we were, and 8 there's nothing to suggest that we should be. We 9 wouldn't necessarily know that. We'd only know if the 10 police told us. 11 Q. At the end of the advice, Ms Khan does say, "If any 12 further information comes to light, I will be willing to 13 consider it"? 14 A. Yes. 15 Q. Although she didn't give any guidance or any advice as 16 to what further information might be considered, if that 17 had been known, do you think that that might have 18 changed the approach taken? 19 A. I don't know. It would depend. It's very difficult to 20 advise in the abstract because prosecution is about 21 judgment and it's about looking at the evidence that 22 you've got and making decisions based on that, and the 23 fact that another tribunal has found a victim, 24 a complainant, persuasive and credible is persuasive, 25 but of course it's a different tribunal with a different</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 142</p>
<p>1 standard of proof. 2 Q. I'm going to turn now to the Soper 2004 matter that 3 related to A622. This should be in your file behind 4 divider C4. The reference for it is OHY006651. If we 5 can, for a moment, just first look at page 3, if we can 6 look at the top of that, we can see the date, the 7 allegation, buggery, committed on 1973 to 1974, but the 8 date reported is 22 January 2004. If you remember, with 9 the last allegation, the date that allegation was 10 reported was 22 January 2004. So this one was reported 11 at 11.00 am, the other one was reported at 1.45 pm, 12 a few hours between the two. 13 Would it be reasonable to hope that two allegations, 14 albeit against different monks, arising out of the same 15 institution might lead to a more holistic approach to 16 any investigation? 17 A. Do you mean by the police? 18 Q. Yes. 19 A. I can't really answer that, because it's a matter for 20 the police. I'm sorry, I don't -- I don't know enough 21 about the way that the unit was set up to know whether 22 there was that cross-fertilisation of knowledge. We do 23 know that it was a problem for the police service 24 nationally, because around about this time there was the 25 problem with Soham, with police forces not being able to</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 143</p>	<p>1 talk to each other. So we know that communication 2 wasn't always set up in a way that was brilliant, but 3 I don't know about that particular investigation team, 4 whether they had the systems and processes in place that 5 would capture this. I do know now they can do it 6 because there's a process whereby they can do this via 7 a project and they can work out whether there are any 8 other allegations, but that didn't -- that wasn't around 9 in the early part of this century. 10 Q. "IU": investigation unit? 11 A. I don't know, but that seems to be a pretty good guess. 12 Q. Looking at them both, it's the same "CPT2-4 west CPU-XN" 13 on both? 14 A. That seems reasonable. 15 Q. Turning just quickly to page 13, please, of this 16 document, just by way of reminder. This allegation is 17 that in -- it was referred by Peter Turner, who had 18 visited A622 in a psychiatric unit, and the allegation 19 was that, in 1973, Soper was a maths/science teacher as 20 well as a Benedictine monk. We know that. That the boy 21 was sent for caning. That Soper then requested the boy 22 to remove his trousers to check for an injury, then 23 forced him over his desk, then masturbated over him. 24 And during the course of the school year, the boy was 25 caned a number of times, and the same occurred, but</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 144</p>

<p>1 during those incidents he was anally penetrated by 2 Soper. The victim was in a unit for depression and 3 could be violent, and it goes on to say: 4 "The suspect is now the retired abbot." 5 At page 14, it's said: 6 "He still resides in the monastery and has no 7 teaching duties but still can wander the campus 8 containing the school grounds. He is not thought to be 9 a risk as he has no direct contact with children. The 10 present abbot, Martin Shipperlee, is well versed in 11 child protection procedures due to other recent events 12 and, even though he's not aware of the allegation, can 13 be trusted to be aware of the risks. If necessary, 14 Soper can be moved from the monastery but wherever he 15 resides would need to be assessed." 16 In your view, looking at this, would you say that 17 it's appropriate for him to have been onsite at this 18 time? 19 A. It's not really a matter for me as a prosecutor, is it? 20 Q. If you'd seen this in a file that you were reviewing, 21 would you have said anything to the officers about it? 22 A. I'm not sure what I could have said. 23 Q. Should he be on site still? 24 A. If the officers had sent me this file, they would have 25 sent me this file to make a decision as to whether there</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 145</p>	<p>1 was sufficient evidence to provide a realistic prospect 2 of conviction and whether he should be prosecuted. They 3 wouldn't be asking me for my advice as to whether he 4 should still be on the premises. That's no part of my 5 function, really. 6 Q. Isn't it part of your function, though, to advise and, 7 certainly by this stage, to provide advice as to the 8 progress of a potential case and further enquiries? So 9 couldn't it fall under that remit? 10 A. The officer is not asking me for advice on his 11 safeguarding responsibilities, he's asking me for advice 12 on my professional obligations as a prosecutor. It's 13 not for me, I don't think, to offer the police officer 14 advice as to how the abbot should deal with those 15 matters. It's my job to look at -- my function is to 16 look at the evidence that's sent to me and to decide 17 whether there's a realistic prospect of a conviction. 18 Q. The advice that was -- 19 A. I have to be careful that I don't go into areas that 20 really exceed my powers. 21 Q. The advice given is referred to, first of all -- well, 22 at different stages. The officer in the case goes to 23 see Claudette Phillips on 5 March. It's noted that 24 Laurence Soper was arrested on 27 July. On 20 August, 25 the officer, DC Gregory, is trying to make an</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 146</p>
<p>1 appointment to see the CPS lawyer, Claudette Phillips, 2 and then on 24 September 2004, he notes in the CRIS 3 report that the "CPS handed the decision in person to me 4 today, 24 September. The decision is not to proceed 5 with criminal proceeding as there is no supporting 6 evidence and therefore insufficient to proceed." 7 We can see a note on the next page, which is page 24 8 of this same document, which you have referred to in 9 your statement at paragraph 42, for your reference. 10 A. Yes, thank you. 11 Q. You have also told us that this is really the first 12 charging decision that we have seen of the three, the 13 first formal decision. What do you make of the decision 14 that was made in this case? 15 A. I think, as I have said in my statement, it's rather 16 brief for an allegation of this seriousness. I think 17 it's somewhat brief. 18 Q. I commented on the last advice by Azra Khan that if you 19 put the pages together, it is a little over one page. 20 This isn't even half a page, is it? It is about a third 21 of a page? 22 A. Yes, it's brief. There's no analysis, I think, of 23 the evidence, and there's no attempt, I think, to 24 analyse what the issues are and see if we can strengthen 25 the case in any respect.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 147</p>	<p>1 There's a statement that the suspect -- sorry, the 2 complainants have suffered psychiatric problems, but we 3 don't know what those psychiatric problems are. 4 Q. Earlier in the CRIS report, it refers to depression, 5 doesn't it? 6 A. Psychiatric problems take many forms. If the 7 psychiatric issues are paranoia or delusional, that 8 could be problematic. Not necessarily fatal, but it 9 could be problematic. Depression doesn't necessarily 10 send up the same warning flags, and it's quite 11 consistent with dealing with what may have happened. 12 Q. To be fair to Ms Phillips, she does say that the 13 psychiatric problems have resulted in his being 14 sectioned under the Mental Health Act? 15 A. Yes. 16 Q. Again, that can relate to a wide variety of situations, 17 can't it? 18 A. Yes. I think if I was faced with this, I would be 19 asking further questions about what the exact 20 psychiatric nature of the illness was and how that 21 manifested itself and how that might affect the person's 22 ability to be able to recollect what had happened 23 properly, and, quite frankly, their ability to stand up 24 to the rigours of a criminal trial. But there's no 25 evidence that that was asked for or considered, and</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 148</p>

<p>1 I think I would have done that.</p> <p>2 Q. There's no suggestion that any surrounding evidence may</p> <p>3 have been considered?</p> <p>4 A. No.</p> <p>5 Q. No suggestion that any advice was given?</p> <p>6 A. No.</p> <p>7 Q. No suggestion that there was any thought of going to the</p> <p>8 school and making enquiries there?</p> <p>9 A. There's no guidance given to the police, there's no</p> <p>10 suggestion of making further enquiries, which I think</p> <p>11 you could make. I don't know, if you sent the police</p> <p>12 off to make those further enquiries, what evidence that</p> <p>13 might give. Again, I think here a decision could have</p> <p>14 been made too quickly, and there were further enquiries</p> <p>15 that could be made.</p> <p>16 I see that the complainant had given the details of</p> <p>17 two persons who he said could substantiate the</p> <p>18 allegations. Look, it's always difficult if someone</p> <p>19 gives names and those people come back and say it didn't</p> <p>20 happen. But I think there was some more scope for</p> <p>21 perhaps making further enquiries to see whether the</p> <p>22 police could widen the circle of people that they spoke</p> <p>23 to to find out whether there was any supporting</p> <p>24 evidence.</p> <p>25 Q. Would you agree that, in 2004, the advices given in both</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 149</p>	<p>1 of these cases were not adequate?</p> <p>2 A. I think they were typical of their time. I think,</p> <p>3 looking back, we don't make our decisions or record our</p> <p>4 decisions now in the way that we did in 2004, and, of</p> <p>5 course, we approach these cases in a completely</p> <p>6 different way in 2019 than we did in 2004.</p> <p>7 So looking back with the benefit of hindsight and</p> <p>8 wearing my 2019 spectacles, I would say I don't think</p> <p>9 they are adequate; but at the time, this is how advices</p> <p>10 were delivered.</p> <p>11 Q. And improvements have been made for a reason?</p> <p>12 A. Yes.</p> <p>13 Q. Because it wasn't good enough, was it?</p> <p>14 A. Well, I don't think anyone deliberately tried to do</p> <p>15 a bad job, but I think there has been a collective</p> <p>16 acceptance by the Crown Prosecution Service that there</p> <p>17 was a different way of looking at these cases and</p> <p>18 a different way of fulfilling our statutory obligations,</p> <p>19 by becoming, I think, much more proactive and working</p> <p>20 collectively with the police to seek to build cases as</p> <p>21 part of a team.</p> <p>22 Q. As far as you're aware, was the Crown Prosecution</p> <p>23 Service involved in any of the bail decisions that were</p> <p>24 made in respect of Laurence Soper?</p> <p>25 A. If it was police bail, no, that would be a decision made</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 150</p>
<p>1 by the custody sergeant. And these were investigations</p> <p>2 made when the matters were under investigation, so they</p> <p>3 would be purely within the ambit of the police.</p> <p>4 Q. I think you have dealt with this, but just one more</p> <p>5 question on the bail decision: if you had been asked</p> <p>6 about a bail decision and had become aware that the</p> <p>7 individual was planning on potentially leaving the</p> <p>8 country and had access to considerable funds, would that</p> <p>9 have been something that would cause you concern?</p> <p>10 A. Well, it is a ground for objection to bail under the</p> <p>11 Bail Act: fear of the defendant failing to surrender to</p> <p>12 custody. So if you had credible intelligence that the</p> <p>13 person had both the means and the opportunity, it is</p> <p>14 something that you would weigh into the pot. You'd have</p> <p>15 to take into account everything else, because you'd have</p> <p>16 to look at the state of your investigation, where you</p> <p>17 were in your investigation, how long your investigation</p> <p>18 was going to take before you completed it. Because if</p> <p>19 you take the decision to charge and bring someone into</p> <p>20 the criminal justice system too quickly, you can put</p> <p>21 yourself under pressure and the investigation can</p> <p>22 suffer. So it's a balancing exercise for the police.</p> <p>23 Q. This is a question from someone else in the room, one of</p> <p>24 the core participants. You may, to a certain extent,</p> <p>25 have addressed it, but I will ask it nonetheless: in</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 151</p>	<p>1 terms of the earlier decisions taken by the Crown</p> <p>2 Prosecution Service in 2004 not to prosecute</p> <p>3 David Pearce and Laurence Soper, do you think that there</p> <p>4 was a cultural change as well as a legal change in the</p> <p>5 way the CPS viewed such prosecutions?</p> <p>6 A. What, since 2004?</p> <p>7 Q. Since 2004. There were decisions not to prosecute in</p> <p>8 2004 and subsequently decisions, as far as David Pearce</p> <p>9 was concerned, in 2009, where he was prosecuted for</p> <p>10 a number of matters, including some of those we have</p> <p>11 looked at today, and David Pearce subsequently, as you</p> <p>12 know, was charged in 2011 and faced trial in 2016?</p> <p>13 A. I think there was certainly a cultural change, and that</p> <p>14 cultural change has taken place since 2010/2011 in the</p> <p>15 whole way that we look at the prosecution of sexual</p> <p>16 offences, both of children and of adults, so that</p> <p>17 cultural change has certainly taken place, and I set</p> <p>18 that out in my statement on the legal guidance and how</p> <p>19 we have changed the way that we approach these cases.</p> <p>20 I think it was a legal change as well, because we</p> <p>21 became aware in the Crown Prosecution Service of</p> <p>22 the breadth of the allegations, and of course, I'm not</p> <p>23 saying that you can never prosecute a case where it's an</p> <p>24 allegation by a complainant against a denial by</p> <p>25 a suspect, but that's quite challenging sometimes. If</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 152</p>

<p>1 you have more than one allegation and those allegations 2 are supportive of the original allegation, that becomes 3 a much more robust, stronger prosecution. 4 So if more allegations become known to the 5 prosecutor, that is a legal change because it affects 6 the strength of the evidence. 7 Q. I have asked you about the engagement with other 8 institutions, but in summary, the Crown Prosecution 9 Service would not then engage with the relevant diocese 10 in a case arising out of a religious institution; is 11 that right? 12 A. We have got no locus to, really. We could make 13 suggestions to the police. We might say, "Look, you 14 might just want to have a word about -- with the diocese 15 about it". But if we went to speak to the diocese, 16 there's no guarantee that they would speak to us because 17 we have got no locus to speak to them. 18 Q. You could equally have a word with the police about 19 someone who has been accused of a serious offence 20 wandering around the school and abbey grounds? 21 A. You could, but the police don't have to take our advice, 22 so it depends on the nature of your relationship with 23 the police. Ultimately, it is their responsibility: 24 they investigate, they safeguard. 25 Q. In terms of dealings with the relevant council, the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 153</p>	<p>1 Department of Education, the Independent Schools 2 Inspectorate, Social Services, would your answer be the 3 same? 4 A. Well, to get Social Services material, we would 5 generally go through the police. Our conduit is 6 generally through the police to obtain this material. 7 Q. Have you got any final observations that you would like 8 to make as to lessons learned from the earlier 9 decisions? 10 A. Well, I think the Crown Prosecution Service has 11 completely changed the way it approaches these cases 12 since 1992 and in 2004. If you look at the way that we 13 have set up our prosecution of these types of offences, 14 we have specialist teams that are full of specially 15 trained lawyers who are expert in making these decisions 16 and understand what we call the myths and stereotypes 17 about how complainants may act in these cases. So our 18 prosecutors understand a lot more about why people act 19 as they do when they have been a victim of a sexual 20 crime. 21 So they're less likely to dismiss their evidence. 22 They will understand what the reasons for it are. 23 So we have changed the way that we have set up our 24 units. Our legal guidance is now really pushing down 25 the line of making our prosecutors take control of</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 154</p>
<p>1 cases, be active, try to build cases and work 2 collectively with the police to identify those 3 reasonable lines of enquiry and identify that evidence 4 that might strengthen the case, and, of course, a big 5 change has been the advent of the Victims' Right to 6 Review scheme, which now, in situations such as this, 7 when the Crown Prosecution Service makes a decision not 8 to prosecute, a person who is qualified as a victim of 9 that decision -- and under the policy that definition is 10 very wide -- can ask for it to be reviewed by an 11 independent prosecutor who will look at the evidence 12 afresh. And if the Crown Prosecution Service have made 13 a wrong decision, that decision can be changed and 14 a prosecution can come from that. And I think that's 15 a very significant change from where we were in 1992 and 16 2004, and of course the Code has changed. 17 The first edition of the Code in 1986, if you read 18 the Code now, it's light-years away from the way it was 19 drafted in 1986. 20 MS KARMY-JONES: Thank you. If there are any questions, 21 I have none further. 22 THE CHAIR: Ms Sharpling? 23 Questions by THE PANEL 24 MS SHARPLING: Thank you, Mr McGill. Just a couple of 25 questions from me, if I may. Does the Crown Prosecution</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 155</p>	<p>1 Service nationally keep statistics on the conviction 2 rate for child sexual abuse cases? 3 A. Yes, it does. 4 MS SHARPLING: Is it possible you could send a copy of that 5 to the solicitor to the inquiry? 6 A. Yes, they are -- 7 MS SHARPLING: "Available on the website", you were going to 8 say? 9 A. We can certainly do that. It comes with a caveat. It 10 is management information, they are not official 11 statistics. 12 MS SHARPLING: I understand that. Do you have any 13 management information in respect of the number of 14 reviews that have been successful in the context of 15 the victims' review application? 16 A. On the top of my head, no, but I'm sure I can provide 17 that information to you. 18 MS SHARPLING: That would be helpful. 19 Secondly, you have used the words "typical of 20 a time" in relation to decisions in 1992 and 2004. If 21 they were typical of the time, is there a suggestion 22 that the deficiencies that you have highlighted in the 23 advices that you have had a look at may be more 24 widespread throughout the CPS as a national service? 25 A. Well, it's difficult for me to speculate on that. When</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 156</p>

1 I say "typical of its time", that's the way these cases
 2 were approached in that time and that's the way the Code
 3 required us to approach them. So I can't speculate as
 4 to whether these cases -- you can take a projection and
 5 say that it will be in other cases. It's perfectly
 6 possible that there may be some other cases that were
 7 approached in this way, yes.

8 MS SHARPLING: Last but not least, a similar question to the
 9 one I asked Commander Jerome: in relation to the case of
 10 Father Pearce in 1992, he reported his concerns about
 11 the boy in question to Social Services out of,
 12 potentially, concern for the boy or, alternatively, it
 13 was a cynical manipulation of the process to deflect
 14 attention from himself.

15 **A. Mmm-hmm.**

16 MS SHARPLING: It's a possibility. I just wondered, in
 17 terms of training for prosecutors, whether that sort of
 18 scenario is played through?

19 **A. Our prosecutors in Rape and Serious Sexual Offences**
 20 **Units get widespread training about the proper approach**
 21 **to decision making under the Code in these cases, and**
 22 **all sorts of scenarios are given to them.**

23 **Whether this is a particular one, I don't know, but**
 24 **they are schooled into avoiding those myths and**
 25 **stereotypes and asking themselves about the merits of**

Page 157

1 (3.36 pm)
 2 (A short break)
 3 (3.52 pm)
 4 MR DONMALL: Good afternoon. We now call Mr Peter Turner.
 5 THE CHAIR: Thank you, Mr Donmall.
 6 MR PETER WILLIAM TURNER (sworn)
 7 Examination by MR DONMALL
 8 MR DONMALL: Mr Turner, good afternoon.
 9 **A. Good afternoon.**
 10 Q. Thank you very much for your patience today, and
 11 I think, as we have already discussed, it is likely that
 12 your evidence is actually going to continue into the
 13 first bit of tomorrow morning.
 14 **A. Yes, I understand that.**
 15 Q. Just a few introductory points, can you give the inquiry
 16 your full name, please?
 17 **A. My name is Peter William Turner.**
 18 Q. You were the child protection officer, and later renamed
 19 the safeguarding adviser, of the Diocese of Westminster
 20 from 2002 to 2014?
 21 **A. That's correct.**
 22 Q. It is in that capacity that you give your evidence
 23 today?
 24 **A. Yes.**
 25 Q. We will be bringing to your attention some documents.

Page 159

1 the evidence and not being sidetracked by sometimes
 2 possible explanations that might be detrimental.
 3 So I'm confident that our training and our
 4 specialist prosecutors know the proper approach to these
 5 cases. Can I be confident that we get every decision
 6 right? No, of course not. But I'm confident that
 7 they're looked at by prosecutors who have the
 8 appropriate training and who have the appropriate skills
 9 to make these decisions.

10 MS SHARPLING: Thank you.
 11 THE CHAIR: We have no further questions. Thank you,
 12 Mr McGill.
 13 (The witness withdrew)
 14 MS KARMY-JONES: I'm conscious of the time, and I can
 15 imagine that -- and I'm grateful for your patience
 16 through that period in not taking an earlier break --
 17 you may wish a break now, but I wondered how late you
 18 were available to sit this evening or whether you wished
 19 to conclude matters so that we can manage the remainder
 20 of our witnesses?

21 THE CHAIR: The latest we would intend to sit to would be
 22 4.30 pm.
 23 MS KARMY-JONES: I think, then, we can at least proceed with
 24 the next witness.
 25 THE CHAIR: Thank you. We will return at 3.50 pm.

Page 158

1 They're in a bundle, but you will appreciate there is
 2 also the facility to put them on the screen to your
 3 right.
 4 **A. Yes.**
 5 Q. A further matter: redactions. The statement that you
 6 have has some redactions upon it.
 7 **A. Yes.**
 8 Q. Passages have been blocked out.
 9 **A. Yes.**
 10 Q. If you have concern in respect of redactions, please
 11 perhaps indicate that concern, without, obviously,
 12 mentioning any names, and then we can deal with that?
 13 **A. Yes.**
 14 Q. It can happen, and it has on occasion happened, that
 15 a name can be stated, and if that happens, then the feed
 16 will be cut and matters can be --
 17 **A. I understand.**
 18 Q. -- taken into -- corrections can be made.
 19 Finally, in respect of your statement, I understand
 20 that there's just one correction that you would like to
 21 make to it in respect of paragraph 40, the small matter
 22 of the date in respect of David Tregaskis's report?
 23 **A. Yes.**
 24 Q. It is a small matter. I wondered whether to trouble you
 25 to correct it, but I think you indicated that, where, at

Page 160

1 paragraph 40, you said it was commissioned by
 2 Abbot Martin on 2 April 2005, you mean that the date of
 3 the report itself was 2 April?
 4 **A. That is correct. That is correct.**
 5 Q. With those preliminary points done, turning then to your
 6 background, before working for the Diocese of
 7 Westminster you worked for the Metropolitan Police for
 8 some, I think, 35 years?
 9 **A. 35, that's correct.**
 10 Q. You had experience in child protection matters?
 11 **A. That's correct.**
 12 Q. In 1996, you were placed in charge of the child
 13 protection team in Havering?
 14 **A. That's correct.**
 15 Q. You later had the same role in Stratford?
 16 **A. Yes.**
 17 Q. You also sat on an Area Child Protection Committee
 18 looking at strategic issues?
 19 **A. In both boroughs.**
 20 Q. In both boroughs. In that work, did you come across
 21 child protection issues involving institutions?
 22 **A. Not with multi-offenders or multi-victims, but obviously**
 23 **I did deal with a single allegation against -- one**
 24 **person against another.**
 25 Q. Had you come across child protection issues involving

Page 161

1 confusion, unintended, as between yourself and -- would
 2 you call him your superior?
 3 **A. Well, he was my line manager.**
 4 Q. Your line manager. We don't need to go to the policy,
 5 but the roles of the CP coordinator and the CP officer,
 6 if I can put it in that shorthand, those were as per the
 7 organisational structures under the COPCA guidance?
 8 **A. Eventually, when they were delivered, because COPCA only**
 9 **started just before I started.**
 10 Q. Yes.
 11 **A. That was in its infancy.**
 12 Q. Turning to your line manager, Monsignor Turner, the
 13 child protection coordinator, what, in practice, did his
 14 job involve?
 15 **A. In practice, most of the investigations and that type of**
 16 **work was my responsibility. He would obviously**
 17 **supervise that. And he would be the conduit to the**
 18 **archbishop.**
 19 Q. I think the COPCA guidance describes the CP officer,
 20 your role, as being responsible for the operations or
 21 implementation of the child protection strategy?
 22 **A. That's correct.**
 23 Q. So you were pretty operational in that role?
 24 **A. That's correct.**
 25 Q. You undertook those roles in light of prevailing

Page 163

1 members of the clergy or religious --
 2 **A. Yes.**
 3 Q. -- before?
 4 **A. Yes.**
 5 Q. Had you had experience of allegations of offending while
 6 members of the clergy were under restrictions?
 7 **A. Not whilst under restrictions, no.**
 8 Q. So you started work for the Diocese of Westminster in
 9 2002, in the immediate aftermath of the Nolan Report?
 10 **A. That is correct.**
 11 Q. Turning to the structure of the child protection team in
 12 the diocese, you were, in the language of COPCA, being
 13 the Catholic Office for the Protection of Children and
 14 Vulnerable Adults, a child protection officer, at least
 15 initially; that was the title?
 16 **A. That is correct.**
 17 Q. And then I think, in 2007, post Cumberlege, it was
 18 renamed to be the safeguarding adviser; is that right?
 19 **A. That's correct, because we took on vulnerable adults as**
 20 **well.**
 21 Q. You were supporting the child protection coordinator,
 22 Monsignor Harry Turner?
 23 **A. That is correct.**
 24 Q. Obviously, there is a certain potential for confusion
 25 there, so please stop me if, in due course, there is

Page 162

1 policies of the Diocese of Westminster?
 2 **A. That's correct.**
 3 Q. And when COPCA created their set of procedures, these
 4 superseded the pre-existing diocesan --
 5 **A. That's correct.**
 6 Q. -- procedures? Now, I hope not to spend too long on
 7 this, but I just want to make a few points in respect of
 8 that prevailing policy, and the first is regards
 9 recording. With apologies to the panel, I don't think
 10 the COPCA policy is in your paper bundle, but if perhaps
 11 page CHC000025 could be brought up, and this is page 27
 12 of the document. The first page is the national policy
 13 for responding to allegations of child abuse in the
 14 Catholic community in England and Wales?
 15 **A. Yes.**
 16 Q. This section, page 27, is detailing the child protection
 17 coordinator and the child protection officers' roles
 18 with regards to responding to allegations?
 19 **A. Correct.**
 20 Q. So the first point I just want to make is regards
 21 records. So we see at 5.2.1 -- I wonder if that could
 22 be highlighted:
 23 "A child protection case file must be created for
 24 every case and a log of actions, events and information
 25 received will be commenced, using the dedicated forms

Page 164

<p>1 for this purpose (See appendix 5)."</p> <p>2 I think, actually, the relevant appendix is</p> <p>3 appendix 6, which is on page 53, if that could be</p> <p>4 brought up, please. To your recollection, is that the</p> <p>5 pro forma for the monitoring -- the recording of</p> <p>6 information in respect of --</p> <p>7 A. The initial recording of it, yes.</p> <p>8 Q. If we could just go forward one page -- I do apologise.</p> <p>9 I went to the wrong -- I think we went to -- did we go</p> <p>10 to 53 first? I meant to go to 53 first. So this is the</p> <p>11 child protection incident/concern report form, obviously</p> <p>12 indicating information received, details of the alleged</p> <p>13 victim/survivor, child or young person, and then, going</p> <p>14 forward two pages to 55 -- it is a three-page form -- we</p> <p>15 have "Actions and further information", which obviously</p> <p>16 is an opportunity to detail the successive actions --</p> <p>17 A. That's correct.</p> <p>18 Q. -- and status of that allegation.</p> <p>19 If we could return, then, to page 27 --</p> <p>20 A. Page 27 of where?</p> <p>21 Q. Sorry, page 27. It will come up. Here we go. So we</p> <p>22 have at 5.2.2:</p> <p>23 "Take possession of any written records made by any</p> <p>24 person in connection with the case and place them on the</p> <p>25 child protection case file."</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 165</p>	<p>1 So there was to be a child -- there was to be</p> <p>2 a record and then there was to be a child protection</p> <p>3 case file where these records were kept?</p> <p>4 A. Yes. It would be all one. You would have the other</p> <p>5 forms that you'd fill in, and then any other papers that</p> <p>6 came in would be on that file.</p> <p>7 Q. Exactly, in the case file.</p> <p>8 A. Yes.</p> <p>9 Q. Exactly. I'm not going to -- everyone will be relieved</p> <p>10 to hear that I am not going to go through all of this.</p> <p>11 But at 5.2.9 in particular, at the bottom, we see:</p> <p>12 "All child protection case files must be kept</p> <p>13 securely and confidentially in an identifiable and</p> <p>14 retrievable form in a system controlled by the CPC or</p> <p>15 CPO which is separate from any personnel file."</p> <p>16 A. That's correct.</p> <p>17 Q. Over the page:</p> <p>18 "Information held in CP case files should be</p> <p>19 cross-referenced within personnel files, but not copied</p> <p>20 into them. Where a copy is made for any purpose, this</p> <p>21 should be kept securely and confidentially ..."</p> <p>22 Then 5.2.10:</p> <p>23 "Child protection case files must be retained for</p> <p>24 a period of 100 years."</p> <p>25 A. Correct.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 166</p>
<p>1 Q. That reflects, doesn't it, the importance of maintaining</p> <p>2 an accurate record of information coming in, actions</p> <p>3 undertaken for a considerable period, given that</p> <p>4 allegations can span a considerable period --</p> <p>5 A. That is correct.</p> <p>6 Q. -- and can come to light -- further allegations can come</p> <p>7 to light in due course?</p> <p>8 The second -- and I should ask, did you use that</p> <p>9 form that we saw in appendix 6 yourself?</p> <p>10 A. Yes, in most cases, yes.</p> <p>11 Q. When you say "in most cases", was the aspiration to use</p> <p>12 them in all cases?</p> <p>13 A. Absolutely.</p> <p>14 Q. When you didn't use the form, what would the reason be?</p> <p>15 A. In some instances, you'd have very little to write on</p> <p>16 it. Anonymous information. You know, you wouldn't use</p> <p>17 that form in its entirety.</p> <p>18 Q. Who, as a matter of practice, administered the case</p> <p>19 files?</p> <p>20 A. Me.</p> <p>21 Q. Second point as to policy. We don't need to turn to it.</p> <p>22 Where there was an allegation by any person or child</p> <p>23 that may be being abused or have been abused or be at</p> <p>24 risk of abuse, there must be referral to the statutory</p> <p>25 authorities immediately upon receipt of information, and</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 167</p>	<p>1 important to ensure that information is referred to both</p> <p>2 police and to Social Services?</p> <p>3 A. That is correct.</p> <p>4 Q. That's right?</p> <p>5 A. That was done.</p> <p>6 Q. That's, I think, echoed in your statement to the</p> <p>7 inquiry.</p> <p>8 The third point, temporary removal from post. We</p> <p>9 see this on the following page, at page 29. 5.4.1:</p> <p>10 "Where an allegation of abuse has been referred to</p> <p>11 the statutory authorities, it is necessary to remove</p> <p>12 a person from relevant roles while an investigation</p> <p>13 takes place. This action does not imply guilt. It</p> <p>14 facilitates the progressing of the investigation without</p> <p>15 interference and removes possible risk to children."</p> <p>16 Then at the bottom of that page, we have, just above</p> <p>17 "Administrative leave", from "Clergy and religious" to</p> <p>18 the bottom. The "Clergy and religious", when we talk in</p> <p>19 respect of the monks at Ealing Abbey, we are talking in</p> <p>20 respect of religious, aren't we?</p> <p>21 A. Correct.</p> <p>22 Q. There's a note that appendix 4 I think which is a notice</p> <p>23 to the religious or clergy should be used, and then,</p> <p>24 further:</p> <p>25 "Administrative leave.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 168</p>

<p>1 "5.4.7. The CPC, together with the CP Commission, 2 will normally make a recommendation to the bishop or 3 Congregation leader ..." 4 Pausing there, in the case of Ealing Abbey, that 5 would be the abbot? 6 A. That's correct. 7 Q. "... that an individual should be placed on 8 administrative leave where an allegation is being 9 investigated by the statutory authorities. They may 10 also do so even in less serious circumstances." 11 A. That's correct. 12 Q. So the expectation under the policy was that if there 13 had been an allegation against a member of Ealing Abbey, 14 it would be first referred to the statutory authorities 15 and then there'd be administrative leave in respect of 16 that monk? 17 A. We would only recommend it. 18 Q. Yes, but that would be your recommendation? 19 A. Yes. 20 Q. What would that constitute in the context of a monk? 21 What does "administrative leave" mean in the context of 22 a monk? 23 A. I've probably got it wrong because I never worked out 24 the workings of the Catholic Church. As far as I would 25 see it, is that he would have no pastoral dealings and</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 169</p>	<p>1 would remain in the monastery. 2 Q. And would he have any contact with children during that 3 period? 4 A. No. 5 Q. I think there's a point in David Tregaskis's report in 6 due course that we will come to and he sheds some light 7 on that. 8 A. Yes. 9 Q. The fourth point, "Pastoral care for the [accused]", and 10 if we can run forward to page 32, 5.10.30: 11 "It is the responsibility of the ... Congregation 12 leader [the abbot] to ensure provision of pastoral 13 support to accused clergy and religious [a monk]. 14 However, it is not appropriate for this person who may 15 need to take 'disciplinary' action in a case also to 16 carry out a pastoral role during the same investigation. 17 He or she should arrange, in consultation with the CPC 18 and CP Commission, for a Pastoral Link person to carry 19 out this function." 20 Is this provision aimed to ensure that there isn't 21 a sort of conflict of role, as it were? 22 A. It is twofold: to ensure there's not a conflict, but 23 also to ensure the accused monk is getting that pastoral 24 support, and, you know, it's difficult to blend the two 25 together.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 170</p>
<p>1 Q. But what is also clear, isn't it, is that it's the 2 Congregation leader who is the person who has 3 disciplinary authority? 4 A. Yes. 5 Q. So insofar as that Congregation leader may have pastoral 6 concerns, also, as the Congregation leader over that 7 monk, in effect, that aspect becomes moved to the person 8 who becomes the Pastoral Link person? 9 A. Yes. 10 Q. Fifth point, turning to the next page, "Risk 11 assessment". At 5.12, "Action at the conclusion of 12 a statutory investigation", and in the passage 13 highlighted, after the conclusion of a statutory 14 investigation, the CPO and the CPC are to "consider 15 whether it is necessary to recommend the commissioning 16 of an expert risk assessment", and there is, in fact, 17 a separate risk assessment policy giving further advice 18 about this? 19 A. That is correct. 20 Q. Would the instruction in due course of David Tregaskis 21 be examples of a risk assessment being -- 22 A. That's correct. 23 Q. -- sought in this manner? Over the page, "Evaluation of 24 risk": 25 "An evaluation of risk is not a one-off event but</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 171</p>	<p>1 should be a continuous process." 2 A. That's correct. 3 Q. Probably so obvious it does not need stating, but that's 4 because matters can change, new allegations can surface? 5 A. Absolutely. 6 Q. The risk should be re-evaluated at each instance? 7 A. Yes. 8 Q. Finally, there was, at least by 2006, a policy -- 9 I think it was entitled "Healing the wound" which set 10 out the position in respect of restrictions and an 11 example covenant of care. 12 It may be that we will see one in respect of F41 and 13 F46 in due course. Bear with me. 14 You have seen the covenants of care for those 15 individuals in preparation for today? 16 A. Yes. 17 Q. We will be looking at them in due course. Did they 18 follow the pro forma that was in the COPCA policy? 19 A. Yes. 20 Q. Before the 2006 policy, was there a pro forma 21 restriction covenant, to your recollection? 22 A. To my recollection, no. 23 Q. So that's the policy background on perhaps the most 24 salient points, or some of them. As the COPCA policies 25 were amended and then in due course replaced by CSAS</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 172</p>

<p>1 policies, were those brought into effect at the Diocese 2 of Westminster? 3 A. Yes. 4 Q. And you sought to undertake your responsibilities in 5 view of those policies and procedures? 6 A. That's correct. 7 Q. In your statement, you set out, helpfully, from 8 paragraphs 15 to 25, the various roles that your office 9 required of you. I'm not going to go through them all 10 now, but if we could turn to paragraph 16, which is 11 DOW000047_004. First: 12 "If an allegation came to my knowledge and 13 Social Services and the police were not involved, 14 I would inform them immediately." 15 We have discussed that. 16 A. Yes. 17 Q. "I would then inform the archbishop or relevant 18 religious superior of the nature of the allegation." 19 So in this context, it would be the abbot? 20 A. The abbot. 21 Q. Abbot Martin. Presumably, that is important so that the 22 abbot can know and understand the nature of 23 the safeguarding concerns that he has responsibility 24 for? 25 A. That's it.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 173</p>	<p>1 Q. "I would inform the diocese insurers of any allegation 2 which could lead to a civil claim against the diocese." 3 Pausing there, in the case of an allegation against 4 a monk at Ealing Abbey, would you have any involvement 5 with the abbey's insurers in that sense? 6 A. No. 7 Q. So that sentence relates to -- 8 A. To diocesan. 9 Q. -- a diocesan matter. You say: 10 "They would then report this to the 11 Charity Commission." 12 Again, in the instance of an allegation against 13 a monk in the abbey, would you have ever made reference 14 to the Charity Commission? 15 A. No. 16 Q. You say you would attend the multi-agency strategy 17 meeting relevant to the allegation. You would advise 18 the abbot what steps should be taken in connection with 19 the accused, whether they should be withdrawn from 20 ministry or whether an announcement should be made to 21 their parish. The abbot was responsible for putting 22 people on administrative leave, withdrawing them from 23 ministry or taking any other action? 24 A. Slightly interrupting, sir, the bit about telling the 25 parish really related to diocesan priests.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 174</p>
<p>1 Q. Okay. 2 A. It wasn't -- it was obviously slightly different with 3 a monk, who wasn't the parish priest. 4 Q. In the instance of Ealing Abbey, the abbot and the monks 5 did, in a sense -- there was the parish of Ealing Abbey? 6 A. Yes. 7 Q. So with that regard, there was a congregation in that 8 parish -- 9 A. Yes. 10 Q. -- people would attend the church? 11 A. Yes. 12 Q. Your point about potentially having an announcement made 13 to that congregation, would that not equally apply to 14 that scenario? 15 A. It would certainly apply if it was the monk who was the 16 parish priest or if it was a monk who regularly took 17 a service, because a few of them did take a regular 18 service. 19 Q. So it might apply -- 20 A. It might apply. 21 Q. -- depending on the context? Okay. Then last, over the 22 page, the last part of that sentence: 23 "My role was purely advisory." 24 In that regard, I mean, wouldn't it be fair to say 25 that, in terms of referring to the social service and</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 175</p>	<p>1 police, your role wasn't purely advisory, you had an 2 executive function to undertake that? 3 A. Oh, yes, absolutely. 4 Q. So when you say your role was purely advisory -- I don't 5 want to put words in your mouth -- what do you mean by 6 that? 7 A. It's advisory to the archbishop or the Congregation 8 leader that this particular person should be removed 9 from ministry temporarily. 10 Q. To put it another way, you didn't, yourself, have any 11 disciplinary responsibility for individuals working -- 12 A. No -- yes. 13 Q. -- at the abbey? 14 A. That's correct. 15 Q. Moving now to the relationship briefly between the 16 diocese and Ealing Abbey, from your arrival in 2002, you 17 were involved with liaising with and giving advice to 18 Abbot Shipperlee? 19 A. Yes. 20 Q. That was consistent with the approach -- I think you 21 have been referred to it in the bundle -- the English 22 Benedictine Congregation Working Party report post 23 Nolan, which had suggested all disclosures, allegations 24 and suspicions, including historic ones, should be 25 immediately referred to the relevant diocesan CPC?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 176</p>

1 **A. Yes.**
 2 Q. So was the practical reality, in the period from 2002
 3 when you arrived, that Ealing Abbey was aligned to
 4 a diocesan CP team?
 5 **A. Yes.**
 6 Q. In 2007, post Cumberlege, you say that Ealing Abbey
 7 formally aligned with the diocese.
 8 **A. Yes.**
 9 Q. Was there any -- sorry.
 10 **A. Can I --**
 11 Q. Yes.
 12 **A. See, this is where it gets confused. It's the monastery**
 13 **at Ealing Abbey aligned with the diocese.**
 14 Q. Yes. You're quite right to point that out. That was my
 15 lax shorthand. But, yes, the monastery, the community
 16 for which Abbot Shipperlee was responsible became
 17 formally aligned --
 18 **A. Yes.**
 19 Q. -- in 2007. I think you say in your witness statement:
 20 "Nothing changed in practical terms from my
 21 perspective in 2007 after this formal alignment", after
 22 Cumberlege?
 23 **A. That is correct. It did change in respect of other**
 24 **religious orders, but not --**
 25 Q. Exactly. Because it may have been the case for other

Page 177

1 "I did not have any formal contact with
 2 St Benedict's School or its governors."
 3 In that respect, Abbot Shipperlee was the chair of
 4 the governors, wasn't he --
 5 **A. He was.**
 6 Q. -- up to mid 2012? You obviously had formal contact
 7 with Abbot Shipperlee?
 8 **A. Oh, yes.**
 9 Q. But it --
 10 **A. But not -- sorry, not on -- in respect of the school.**
 11 Q. Not with him wearing the hat --
 12 **A. Of the school.**
 13 Q. -- of the school. I understand. In a sense, the abbot
 14 had two hats -- I hope I can be forgiven for using
 15 that --
 16 **A. Yes.**
 17 Q. -- mode of analysis -- as the chair of the governors of
 18 the school, and also, obviously, as the abbot of
 19 the community?
 20 **A. That's correct.**
 21 Q. Your evidence is that you liaised with him in his role
 22 as abbot of the community?
 23 **A. Correct.**
 24 Q. In your experience, was there a problem with that
 25 duality of the abbot's role?

Page 179

1 religious orders they hadn't had that pre-existing --
 2 **A. That's correct.**
 3 Q. -- alignment. In Ealing, that was the position. As
 4 a point of detail, Reverend Trood, whose witness
 5 statement I think you have had an opportunity to read --
 6 **A. Yes.**
 7 Q. -- says that there was a formal alignment in 2013 and
 8 exhibits a written agreement from 2013?
 9 **A. Yes.**
 10 Q. Can you help us with that? What was the significance --
 11 **A. I hadn't seen that or knew about that until I was**
 12 **preparing these papers.**
 13 Q. So for your -- from your perspective, at least, from --
 14 really, for the whole period you were involved, there
 15 was informal alignment up to 2007 --
 16 **A. That's correct.**
 17 Q. -- and formal alignment --
 18 **A. That's correct.**
 19 Q. -- thereafter, but, as a matter of practice, things
 20 were --
 21 **A. Didn't change.**
 22 Q. Ran in the same way throughout?
 23 **A. That's correct.**
 24 Q. The relationship with St Benedict's School, just
 25 briefly. Paragraph 35 of your statement:

Page 178

1 **A. With hindsight, I think, yes, there could be a conflict,**
 2 **and that was the thrust of Lord Carile's report, to**
 3 **separate.**
 4 Q. In terms specifically, I suppose, of your interaction
 5 with Abbot Shipperlee -- we will come to the specifics
 6 obviously in due course -- did you ever feel that you
 7 really were wanting to advise him not simply in his
 8 capacity as abbot of the community, but also, in
 9 reality, as the chair of governors of the school?
 10 **A. I wouldn't have thought that that was my position to**
 11 **comment on that.**
 12 Q. I think, in reality, the nature of the cases meant that
 13 the Diocese of Westminster during the period that you
 14 were there did have an informal role in respect of the
 15 school, at least I think you will have seen the
 16 correspondence from your line manager, Monsignor
 17 Harry Turner, in 2005, in respect of the school's
 18 policy?
 19 **A. Yes, but my office are not responsible for schools.**
 20 Q. No.
 21 **A. Albeit, you know, Catholic schools, and people expected**
 22 **us to have that role. But we didn't.**
 23 Q. Maybe, in fairness to you -- and I think this will be my
 24 last question before -- of today, and we will deal with
 25 specifics tomorrow -- perhaps I can take you to that

Page 180

<p>1 letter. It is page BNT000828_002. This is not your 2 letter? 3 A. No. 4 Q. It is of your namesake and line manager Monsignor 5 Harry Turner, 15 June 2005: 6 "I write to you following the most recent meeting of 7 the Diocesan Child Protection Commission and at the 8 request of the members. 9 "In recent years, this child protection office has 10 been dealing with a number of allegations of child abuse 11 made against members of the staff at St Benedict's. 12 Each case has been addressed on an individual basis 13 according to the national procedures established for the 14 Catholic Church." 15 We briefly looked at some of those: 16 "The allegations were not made by any current 17 members of the student body and indeed several of 18 the events were some considerable period of time ago", 19 and so on. 20 Then the next paragraph, really, for the immediate 21 purposes: 22 "Normally, this office does not deal with the matter 23 of abuse in the school context, as schools do not fall 24 within the remit of the Diocesan Commission. The 25 historical cases from St Benedict's, however, came to</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 181</p>	<p>1 our attention insofar as they were about priests from 2 the community in Ealing. The concern of the commission 3 was to establish with you that the school community is 4 currently taking child protection seriously and that the 5 necessary policy and procedures are in place. It would 6 be helpful if you could let me know that the school has 7 a child protection policy and that the responsible 8 persons have been nominated and have undergone 9 training." 10 That is not your letter? 11 A. No. 12 Q. Did you have any knowledge of that letter being written 13 at the time, to your recollection? 14 A. No, not before it was sent, no. 15 Q. There's a reference to the concern of the Diocesan 16 Commission. 17 A. Yes. 18 Q. Would you attend commission -- 19 A. Yes. 20 Q. -- meetings? So is it possible that the commission -- 21 I mean, do you recall the commission having that concern 22 as a collective? 23 A. I don't recall it, but obviously it did take place, but 24 I didn't formulate the letter or anything. 25 Q. So for your own part, did you feel that you had any --</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 182</p>
<p>1 do you recall having any -- considering at all the child 2 protection policies of the school? 3 A. No, because I personally wouldn't have thought it was my 4 responsibility. 5 MR DONMALL: I think that would be a convenient place to 6 break, chair. 7 THE CHAIR: Thank you, Mr Donmall. Thank you, Mr Turner, we 8 will reconvene tomorrow at 10.00 am. 9 MR JACOBS: I have a point to raise very quickly, and 10 I apologise for the time. My clients are concerned that 11 the Apostolic Nuncio issue may not be resolved by the 12 conclusion of this part of the investigation. We are 13 conscious the inquiry is doing everything possible to 14 secure this important material and I am asked to ask if 15 we could be updated on the matter on Thursday morning. 16 We would also be grateful if those who represent the 17 Catholic Church could update the inquiry prior to 18 Thursday morning as to any steps they have taken to 19 facilitate the co-operation of the Nuncio. Thank you. 20 THE CHAIR: Thank you, Mr Jacobs. Ms Karmy-Jones? 21 MS KARMY-JONES: Chair, my learned friend raised this with 22 me briefly at the break and our answer to him then is 23 the same as it is now: we have pressed, and we continue 24 to press, for material from the Apostolic Nuncio, and 25 when that material is available, we will update core</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 183</p>	<p>1 participants. 2 THE CHAIR: Thank you, Ms Karmy-Jones. As I said, we will 3 reconvene tomorrow at 10.00 am. 4 (4.28 pm) 5 (The hearing was adjourned to 6 Wednesday, 6 February 2019 at 10.00 am) 7 8 9 I N D E X 10 11 MR NEIL ALAN JEROME (sworn)1 12 13 Examination by MS KARMY-JONES1 14 15 Questions by THE PANEL97 16 17 MR GREGOR McGILL (sworn)106 18 19 Examination by MR KARMY-JONES106 20 21 Questions by THE PANEL155 22 23 MR PETER WILLIAM TURNER (sworn)159 24 25 Examination by MR DONMALL159</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 184</p>

A				
A1 1:7	abbot 26:17 41:16	13:13,14 16:23	130:15 153:19	174:22
A11 80:3	41:18 44:11,13,20	22:11,13 23:4,5,8	170:9,13,23	admit 71:16
A11's 105:22 106:1	44:25 45:1,8,9,11	23:22,22 29:1	174:19	admitted 26:1
106:4	45:14 47:6,12	40:14,18 43:17,19	acquainted 105:11	adopted 97:24
A41's 53:7	48:13 49:9,13	51:17 64:5 65:14	105:13	adults 152:16
A418 51:8,8 54:2,4	50:14,17,21 51:15	65:22 68:16,17	acquittal 101:8	162:14,19
55:1,18 56:15,16	51:15 52:12 68:2	71:23 90:1 95:25	act 5:16 46:19 85:1	advance 30:6
A594 80:3	68:8,20 81:21,24	108:11,13 111:7	124:17 131:22,22	131:20
A595 21:10 22:1	81:25,25 83:20	113:11 115:5	137:12,13 148:14	advantage 59:13
24:23 25:5 29:5,6	86:11 92:7,17	119:4 128:15,24	151:11 154:17,18	advent 155:5
50:23 57:4 120:14	94:2,11,15,25	129:19 131:23	action 14:10 79:22	adversarial 130:14
A595's 25:1 37:13	95:4,9 145:4,10	156:2 164:13	168:13 170:15	adverse 29:20
49:20	146:14 161:2	167:24 168:10	171:11 174:23	advice 27:5 28:22
A596 80:4	169:5 170:12	181:10,23	actionable 89:1	32:7 36:9,11,14
A6 36:25 37:11	173:19,20,21,22	abused 21:14 29:7	103:17	36:18 70:6 73:9
71:12 73:5,12	174:18,21 175:4	59:3,5 65:4 67:6	actioned 39:3	75:12,14,16,18,20
76:1,11 78:3,15	176:18 177:16	68:11 167:23,23	actions 34:1,12	77:11 104:23
79:20 80:3,9	179:3,7,13,18,22	accept 109:24	42:9 45:5 164:24	105:1,6,9 109:10
120:16 135:11	180:5,8	132:24	165:15,16 167:2	109:11,12,17,20
139:18	abbot's 179:25	acceptance 150:16	active 155:1	109:21,22,23
A6's 78:1 79:15	abide 121:9,11	accepted 39:25	actively 126:12	121:19,22,23,25
81:4	ability 148:22,23	128:19	activities 82:18	122:21 123:20
A618 44:22,25	able 2:5 10:24 14:8	accepting 62:6	activity 27:10 75:2	124:12,20 130:17
A621 80:3	57:8 65:3 74:3,15	101:3	102:19	130:25 131:2
A622 143:3 144:18	74:18 75:4 86:22	access 28:9 41:1,3	actual 10:20 28:7	132:6,25 133:6,13
A631 52:14 56:19	88:20 97:15 111:9	45:22 78:6 92:8	88:13 135:22	134:16,19 135:17
A632 53:23 54:3,4	117:21 124:15	92:21 99:16 104:1	addition 10:5 91:3	136:13 139:19
54:10	131:20 136:5,10	130:16 151:8	additional 31:21	140:5 141:7
abandoned 70:22	143:25 148:22	accidental 60:24	additionally 31:17	142:11,15 146:3,7
106:7	abolished 126:7,8,9	accompany 27:3	34:4	146:10,11,14,18
abbey 2:16 4:7 8:10	absence 74:17	accord 64:7	additions 37:5	146:21 147:18
10:20 41:15,23	77:16 136:8	account 21:3 48:16	address 14:3 89:9	149:5 153:21
42:16 44:10,14,21	absolutely 6:14	53:8 73:18 89:12	112:1	171:17 176:17
48:7,14 49:7,10	23:13 24:17,17	89:13 98:11 104:2	addressed 151:25	advices 149:25
64:16 66:3 82:10	27:25 32:20,23	104:5 127:22,24	181:12	150:9 156:23
82:10,16,21 83:24	33:8 38:8 46:25	128:4 135:23	adequate 150:1,9	advise 142:20
84:16 86:8,10,13	57:14 69:19 77:9	136:21,22 151:15	adjourned 184:5	146:6 174:17
86:16,20 87:20	82:19 91:21 95:7	accountability	adjournment	180:7
95:14 105:10	101:12 116:20,22	69:24 88:17	104:18	advised 24:1 85:15
117:16 141:2	118:6 129:2,2	accountable 108:23	administered	adviser 42:3 159:19
153:20 168:19	132:9 134:2	accounts 47:5	167:18	162:18
169:4,13 174:4,13	167:13 172:5	accurate 73:21	administration	advises 30:20 75:7
175:4,5 176:13,16	176:3	76:1 116:2 135:24	69:1	advisory 27:5
177:3,6,13	abstract 142:20	136:19,24 137:23	administrative	175:23 176:1,4,7
abbey's 174:5	abuse 2:9,21,25 3:6	167:2	52:7 168:17,25	affect 148:21
	7:9,20 10:20,20	accused 62:9 93:17	169:8,15,21	afraid 18:7

afresh 75:11 131:9 155:12	27:8,13 28:1 29:11,13,21 31:9 31:21 33:7,21 35:8,13 37:18 38:19 39:9 47:24 47:25 48:11 49:21 50:13,15 51:16,23 52:9 53:10 56:9 73:24 75:24 76:5 76:8 77:18 79:15 80:9 93:3,24,25 98:7,16,18 99:1 106:1,4 119:7,25 120:1,23 124:10 124:13 127:16,18 128:12,14 129:7,8 129:11,16,18 131:4 135:6,11 137:23 138:15,21 141:22 142:1 143:7,9,9 144:16 144:18 145:12 147:16 152:24 153:1,2 161:23 165:18 167:22 168:10 169:8,13 173:12,18 174:1,3 174:12,17	105:23 108:10,11 116:25 117:7 119:4 137:6,6,16 138:4 140:8 141:19 143:13 144:8 149:18 152:22 153:1,4 162:5 164:13,18 167:4,6 172:4 176:23 181:10,16 alleged 10:19 27:10 29:17 41:19,19,21 87:1,16,19 98:22 165:12 allegedly 100:16 Allen 20:5 22:7,22 24:9 25:8 26:6 Allen's 22:9 alleviate 101:9 allocated 11:17,20 Allott 10:6 allow 96:21 allowed 75:5 80:23 allows 123:15 alternative 100:17 129:6 alternatively 157:12 ambit 151:3 amended 172:25 amount 10:19 92:8 126:23 amounted 73:16 75:25 135:20 Ampleforth 110:23 anally 145:1 analyse 147:24 analysis 98:2,23 99:7 147:22 179:17 analytical 2:7 Andrew 43:20 44:6 94:25 angry 15:15 16:4 68:18 announced 16:3	announcement 174:20 175:12 annoyed 68:8 Anonymous 167:16 answer 47:1 56:16 78:20 86:22 91:24 91:24 121:10 131:6 133:18 141:3 143:19 154:2 183:22 answering 20:10 91:25 answers 40:25 antics 65:8 anxious 26:12 anybody 48:11 anyone's 21:17 Apart 65:20 apologies 164:9 apologise 165:8 183:10 apology 15:24 Apostolic 85:7,8,14 183:11,24 apparent 84:15 86:22 apparently 25:12 94:1 appear 29:10 30:5 44:12 53:4 74:7 74:25 76:16 77:10 77:20 82:24 86:24 98:1 139:5 appeared 27:9 44:13 62:14 71:19 84:23 86:16 87:20 87:22,24 88:6,8 appears 26:11 29:13 36:23 48:9 50:17 55:16 57:11 73:18 88:11 90:18 94:12 128:22 appendix 165:1,2,3 167:9 168:22 appetite 89:5 103:21 104:8,10	application 110:10 137:18 138:20 156:15 applied 54:24 apply 55:5 175:13 175:15,19,20 appointed 43:17 69:2 appointment 23:2 147:1 appreciate 160:1 approach 5:25 11:11 72:2 96:7 97:24 111:12 112:8,10,25 133:16 141:15 142:18 143:15 150:5 152:19 157:3,20 158:4 176:20 approached 68:2 85:8 97:1 157:2,7 approaches 154:11 approaching 125:10 appropriate 24:14 34:7 69:17 73:8 75:8 93:2 137:25 145:17 158:8,8 170:14 appropriateness 27:25 approximately 3:20 48:5 April 161:2,3 archbishop 163:18 173:17 176:7 Archdiocese 84:15 84:16,23 85:11,16 86:15,21 87:21,21 88:2,5,11 archives 120:13 area 48:20 49:1 90:3 97:5 102:8 114:2,5,6 161:17 areas 40:24 129:1
-------------------------------------	---	---	---	---

146:19	104:4 110:20	attacked 111:19	145:12,13 150:22	Bar 105:14
argumentative	111:17,21 146:3	112:21 130:13,13	151:6 152:21	bare 60:17
65:25	146:10,11 148:19	attempt 64:15	awful 10:15 69:15	barged 64:1
arising 143:14	157:25	147:23	134:2,11,12	based 12:8 40:14
153:10	aspect 171:7	attempted 64:23	awkward 87:6	142:22
arm 15:14 17:8	aspects 13:5 34:25	attempting 101:24	Azra 73:10 134:19	basic 141:25
84:17	114:11	attempts 38:6	135:17 147:18	basis 4:21 64:24
Arnold 45:9	aspiration 167:11	attend 16:5 26:10		76:12 111:13
arose 114:1	assault 23:10,15	51:21 54:12,16	B	114:14 115:2
arrange 170:17	30:23,24 33:5	55:21 174:16	back 4:13 6:4 11:4	126:15 128:22
arranged 22:6 27:2	54:1 73:16 74:20	175:10 182:18	12:14,17 14:14	129:5,6 141:4
72:25	75:25 125:19	attended 25:16	17:20 20:19 24:4	181:12
arrangement 88:18	129:11 135:20	42:4	32:2 38:7,12 51:9	bat 14:21 15:1,19
arrangements	assaulted 34:2	attending 1:18	51:11 60:18 63:4	18:20 33:20
23:22 24:7 25:16	69:10	54:19	63:20 64:18,20	124:13
51:20	assaulting 53:25	attention 8:15	67:18 72:21 82:10	bat?' 15:3
arrest 27:3 89:17	assembly 62:21,22	39:21 47:8,25	93:4,6,9 99:4	Bate 45:5
90:15 91:4 92:4,7	62:23 63:19	48:1 50:2 94:3	100:21,22,23	bathroom 64:2
94:19	assess 101:10	100:18 141:12	107:10 123:24	65:14
arrested 24:8,14	assessed 6:13	157:14 159:25	129:2 133:21	baths 59:9,23 69:11
25:18 68:23	145:15	182:1	149:19 150:3,7	bear 12:25 172:13
146:24	assessment 31:2	Attorney 108:23	background 83:24	bearing 119:24
arrival 176:16	53:25 54:15 86:19	August 56:17 89:17	89:20 105:12	129:3 130:15
arrived 177:3	113:5 171:11,16	146:24	106:22 140:7	beat 65:16
article 79:8	171:17,21	authorities 96:25	161:6 172:23	beaten 14:17
ascertain 48:15	assigned 7:20 85:10	134:10 167:25	backwards 63:23	becoming 3:24
58:2	assist 43:3 54:24	168:11 169:9,14	bad 14:15 67:17	150:19
ascribe 31:17 34:13	55:21 75:15 82:3	authority 88:13	137:15,18,19	bed 20:19 63:4
124:6	85:14 102:1,14,22	108:21 120:10	138:20 150:15	66:22 127:8
ashamed 69:16	106:8	171:3	badly 62:13 65:23	bedroom 14:3
asked 15:6 16:24	assistance 41:11	automatically	66:19 139:17	bedwetting 29:17
17:12 18:23 19:9	79:21 83:21 94:13	118:18	bail 58:1 92:19	31:6
24:23 40:24 44:20	103:6 109:14	available 30:23	93:2,5,11,12,24	began 64:17 78:1
45:11,19 47:2	Assistant 30:19	31:12 40:6 96:6	94:20 150:23,25	beginning 38:13
61:13 65:1 67:12	114:7	123:17 139:7	151:5,6,10,11	54:14 78:2 83:15
67:17 68:8 71:2	assisted 127:15	140:22 156:7	bailed 26:16 92:15	begins 79:24
78:17 86:18	132:24	158:18 183:25	92:25	behalf 1:18 105:19
105:20 120:9	assisting 8:8 44:8	avoiding 157:24	balance 120:4,7	109:4
130:25 132:10,18	assists 136:17	awarded 71:21	130:9	behaving 65:23
140:3,10,12,17,19	associated 83:25	aware 42:20 50:18	balanced 131:19	behaviour 34:8
141:18 148:25	assumed 25:4	50:22 71:22 75:16	balancing 151:22	47:6 52:12,19
151:5 153:7 157:9	assumption 76:23	77:25 78:3,9,12	ballistic 72:12	53:15 60:24,25
183:14	assured 38:14	81:12,14 85:19	bank 86:1 89:9,11	66:14 67:22 68:5
asking 17:13,24	at-risk 28:25	93:19,23 94:13	89:12,13,21 95:1	100:14 137:8,24
20:11,20 29:19	attached 31:7	95:11,21 104:6	104:1,5	138:2
32:22 89:11 103:1	attack 112:7	140:24 142:4	banking 85:25	behaviours 31:5

believable 28:3	block 44:3	79:2 135:16	built 133:22 134:1	car 15:9
believe 7:8,25 12:9	blocked 160:8	139:16	bullied 16:13,18	care 77:8 170:9
30:2 33:8 41:24	blog 78:24	boys' 16:15,18 50:8	bundle 1:8,10,11	172:11,14
62:3 64:10 67:23	blown 83:12	Brady 85:12	8:4 22:23 26:18	career 2:23 3:4
75:23 79:6,9 80:8	BNT000828_002	brain 68:18	38:13 40:5 58:11	108:8
80:8 95:23 120:18	181:1	branch 30:19 107:3	83:11 122:6 160:1	careful 116:7 133:3
believed 62:15,16	board 108:4	114:5,7,9,14,16	164:10 176:21	146:19
62:17 67:7	boarding 66:1	breadth 152:22	burglaries 115:8	carefully 31:12
believes 30:1	bodies 91:16	break 18:8,12	bursar 68:25	71:19
belt 14:17 15:13,13	body 48:25 61:19	19:21 64:4 65:17	bursar's 68:24	Carlile's 180:2
belted 15:14,16	66:22 77:11 138:3	104:16 158:16,17	bursting 26:3	Carlyon 40:6
bench 60:14	181:17	159:2 183:6,22	busy 115:7	Carol 25:14,14
beneath 125:5	bond 130:3	brief 108:5 147:16	buttocks 127:20	28:2
132:5	borderline 132:1	147:17,22	button 59:16 63:8	carried 44:5 51:7
Benedict's 8:10	born 14:3 58:16	briefly 37:19 38:12	bystander 62:24	carry 49:11 90:25
10:21 16:5 40:19	boroughs 161:19	47:22 105:2		170:16,18
41:9 42:13 43:21	161:20	176:15 178:25	C	carrying 96:3
44:5 58:17 59:2	bottom 15:15 17:21	181:15 183:22	C1 8:4 122:6	case 5:8,21 13:6,8
65:13 68:2 70:11	17:23 18:2 19:5,7	brilliant 144:2	C2 122:7,9	23:16 25:15 28:14
71:24 95:15 141:2	19:11,14 24:6,9	bring 67:13 81:1	C4 13:4,4 143:4	29:10,23 30:25
178:24 179:2	25:1 33:23 34:13	131:10 151:19	C5 134:18	32:1,5 34:22,23
181:11,25	41:7 52:10 53:11	bringing 11:22	CAIT 40:14 41:8	35:1 36:8 37:13
Benedictine 66:8	56:12 166:11	72:17 135:15	90:1,22	38:10 39:3 41:1,4
84:1 85:15 86:14	168:16,18	159:25	calibre 113:14	42:5 43:18,22
87:4 88:3 92:11	box 1:6	British 90:15 95:5	call 7:2 21:21 34:2	45:3 46:5,18 55:8
144:20 176:22	boy 13:8 19:4 21:16	broaden 98:9,17	34:6 57:16 60:14	56:6 57:14 69:15
Benedictines 84:20	22:10,11,18 23:12	broader 12:19,23	75:6 109:9 113:6	70:24 71:1,5,8,10
87:23,24 88:9,14	26:4 28:3 30:1	47:4	154:16 159:4	71:23 72:9 75:19
benefit 150:7	31:1 32:17,25	broken 7:8 65:20	163:2	75:23 76:10,10,24
best 18:5 19:17	33:9,22 48:5,14	brother 127:5	called 1:25 16:23	77:3 78:9,11,16
74:15 85:16	48:15,24 50:9	brought 13:18	17:3 19:23 20:1	78:20 79:1,6,6,7
better 10:25 11:9	59:1 60:11,14	26:14 39:20,22	21:18 33:20 35:18	79:11 84:24 85:19
14:22 33:16 39:13	71:23 100:15,16	44:2 47:7,24,25	37:3 45:4 51:17	86:24 103:11
66:10 68:11 96:14	100:19 127:16,20	50:1 58:12 59:1	95:9 100:8	106:6 108:5,7
99:12 121:18	128:13,20 129:7	79:1 94:3 130:21	calling 22:4 34:14	109:13 110:5
122:8 131:21	129:17,24 130:12	164:11 165:4	calls 50:13 57:11	111:12,15,25
beyond 74:4 136:5	135:23 144:20,21	173:1	camera 61:11,13,17	112:6 113:23,25
big 70:24 115:13	144:24 157:11,12	bruises 16:17	61:18 135:15	114:10 117:20
155:4	boy's 13:23 22:8,10	brushing 62:3	139:3	118:24 120:12,13
bishop 88:13 169:2	25:22 31:5 127:23	buggery 143:7	campus 145:7	120:16,18 122:17
bit 19:12 33:18	128:23 138:16	build 111:15,15,22	caned 144:25	122:24 123:1,10
127:14,17 139:4	boys 16:6,9,15,18	131:13 137:8,22	caning 144:21	123:21 126:20
159:13 174:24	26:3 48:18,21	138:25 150:20	Canon 86:12 88:10	127:3 129:21,22
bits 113:1	49:3 53:5 58:24	155:1	capacity 159:22	130:10,11 131:9
blanked 85:4	60:4 61:5,16,17	building 96:11	180:8	131:13,17 132:1
blend 170:24	62:12 65:7 68:11	builds 138:1	capture 144:5	132:10 133:15

137:7,22 138:3,7 138:25 139:24 140:6,25 146:8,22 147:14,25 152:23 153:10 155:4 157:9 164:23,24 165:24,25 166:3,7 166:12,18,23 167:18 169:4 170:15 174:3 177:25 181:12 cases 3:15,20 4:3 7:9 11:13 12:12 33:12 41:20 95:25 96:2 97:1 98:2 101:6 108:9 109:2 109:6,7 111:22 113:3 114:4,13,21 115:13 117:10,23 118:4,5,15 119:2 119:4,8,10,14,24 120:2,5,6 130:21 130:22 131:3 134:9 150:1,5,17 150:20 152:19 154:11,17 155:1,1 156:2 157:1,4,5,6 157:21 158:5 167:10,11,12 180:12 181:25 casework 108:6 114:12 cash 95:1 castigated 72:12 categorisation 7:7 categorised 7:14 119:5 categorises 6:21 category 118:21 120:8 Catholic 16:6 59:2 66:3 70:23 83:14 84:2,18 86:6,13 88:20,25 103:16 162:13 164:14 169:24 180:21	181:14 183:17 Catholics 58:25 70:13 cause 68:10 100:6 123:3 151:9 caused 77:23 causing 66:1 cautioned 25:18 caveat 156:9 ceased 68:21 cent 79:13 centimetre 23:13 centre 18:18 113:17,18 114:12 century 144:9 certain 60:24 80:21 101:2 118:21,25 120:8,8 151:24 162:24 certainly 5:10 6:23 7:18 10:22 12:13 12:21 23:11 27:23 27:24 32:24 33:12 34:10,14 39:13,14 41:23 43:5 46:14 46:17 50:22 53:1 55:8 57:21 76:9 76:15 77:9 79:14 81:24 82:3 83:1 91:11 93:3 96:7 97:2 98:25 99:1,6 99:15,16,22 101:2 113:6 114:18 117:12 128:3,3 130:12 138:8 146:7 152:13,17 156:9 175:15 cetera 87:10 chair 1:3,5 13:3 20:7 30:12 40:5 97:19,20,22 98:21 99:5 101:14 104:14,20 106:17 155:22 158:11,21 158:25 159:5 179:3,17 180:9	183:6,7,20,21 184:2 chair's 99:14 chaired 42:9 chairman 34:5 challenge 14:7 challenged 52:11 52:18 challenges 131:19 challenging 131:17 152:25 change 31:5 47:18 54:18 60:7 96:20 111:10,11 128:5 152:4,4,13,14,17 152:20 153:5 155:5,15 172:4 177:23 178:21 changed 5:25 33:16 33:17 54:14 55:9 60:3 92:22 96:8 110:9,22 111:3 123:7 142:18 152:19 154:11,23 155:13,16 177:20 changed/develop... 110:3 changing 54:18 60:2 61:1,8,9 chaplain 80:25 chapter 76:19 character 34:17 74:11 124:14 137:15,18,20 138:20 characterise 137:25 charge 5:24 32:9 48:13 75:4 76:2 109:12 121:2,22 122:1,24 131:1 139:24 151:19 161:12 chargeable 98:19 charged 74:8 106:6 122:25 152:12	charges 44:1 charging 3:15 6:2,5 6:6,12 30:6,11 36:10 109:6 121:24 122:21 129:20 130:22 138:19 140:11,12 140:17,19,20 147:12 Charity 174:11,14 CHC000025 164:11 check 21:17 48:22 50:12 51:7 122:7 144:22 checked 19:1 checking 79:18 checks 49:12,15 55:24 91:2,2 chief 3:5,23 108:1 child 2:8,21,25 3:6 7:9,20 13:13 14:20 16:23 18:22 21:3,13,22 23:24 28:25 29:8,13,20 32:14 33:6 34:2,7 36:20 40:14 42:2 43:16 51:21 52:13 52:15 57:7 58:6 72:3 80:12 81:21 82:4 90:1 95:13 101:11 108:10,13 111:7 113:11 119:4,25 126:16 131:21 141:1 145:11 156:2 159:18 161:10,12 161:17,21,25 162:11,14,21 163:13,21 164:13 164:16,17,23 165:11,13,25 166:1,2,12,23 167:22 181:7,9,10 182:4,7 183:1 child's 14:23 34:6	34:22 36:24 126:6 128:18 children 27:18,20 28:1,9 49:8,11 50:11 53:6 56:1 80:19 81:2,16 130:17 137:9 145:9 152:16 162:13 168:15 170:2 choice 61:1 Chris 4:15 41:10 83:9,13 chronological 83:3 chronology 22:16 church 70:23 83:14 84:2,18 86:6,13 88:20,25 103:16 169:24 175:10 181:14 183:17 ciphers 140:15 circle 149:22 circulated 90:10 circulating 35:22 91:3 circumstances 34:3 91:21 93:7,10 169:10 cited 132:4 cites 44:19 civil 36:25 37:11 70:8,11,16,20 71:5,22 72:6 76:10 78:1,8,9 79:7 81:4 142:5 174:2 claim 36:25 37:11 70:8,11,20 72:6 78:1,8 79:20 81:4 81:8 86:7 103:17 132:17 142:5 174:2 claimed 70:13 88:25 clarification 105:21
---	---	--	---	---

clarified 95:10	coax 64:3 65:18	139:22 157:9	33:4 52:15 70:7	concerted 11:11
clarify 18:19 47:17 84:3	Coca-Cola 65:18	commenced 164:25	73:22 81:5 115:20	conclude 74:18 136:9 158:19
clarity 106:3	code 86:12 109:25 110:22 111:2,17	commencement 54:11	128:14 135:25	concluded 43:23
class 13:12 14:20	111:21 112:16	comment 23:25	complaints 31:4	concludes 75:7
16:9 21:7,8,9	123:15 125:2	29:19 49:16 52:17	44:21,24 69:5	conclusion 29:19 30:9 33:23 44:1
59:11 61:5,7	129:5 131:16	55:5,10 180:11	97:25 98:22,24	57:6 74:14 87:7
127:10	155:16,17,18	commented 147:18	100:3	171:11,13 183:12
classification	157:2,21	comments 30:10	complete 57:25	conclusions 56:14
119:11	cogent 132:25	78:15 81:8	88:21 109:3	conditions 80:21 93:13,16
classified 7:2,4	collar' 79:9	commission 80:18	completed 151:18	conduct 2:5,8 5:10 5:13
classify 132:2	collated 77:13	169:1 170:18	completely 60:5	conducted 7:19 62:22 91:1 127:11
classifying 119:9	colleague 108:2	174:11,14 181:7	68:14 69:8 85:4	127:13
classmates 59:22	collect 15:8	181:24 182:2,16	150:5 154:11	conduit 40:3 73:3 154:5 163:17
classroom 16:21	collective 150:15	182:18,20,21	completeness 67:15	conference 29:23 30:4 46:18
Claudette 146:23	182:22	commissioned	78:17 105:7	confession 64:16,17
147:1	collectively 150:20	161:1	completing 41:2	confessions 78:24 87:9
clear 38:17 50:21	155:2	commissioning	complex 32:5 42:5	confident 137:21 158:3,5,6
56:25 79:13 81:12	colluding 67:19	171:15	97:5,14	confidentially 166:13,21
81:19 82:12 85:13	colour 71:15	committed 34:9	complexities	confined 134:5
89:4 92:1 93:11	come 3:24 4:13 8:2	53:19,21 135:6,18	109:13	confirm 30:24 53:7
93:22 97:23	8:15 15:4,7 24:4	143:7	complexity 114:11	confirmed 22:9,12
103:14,20 106:4,8	33:13 35:13 36:14	Committee 161:17	compliant 6:19	conflict 32:14 124:8 170:21,22
138:6,8 171:1	37:25 39:16 51:8	common 126:13	complied 93:5,9,14	180:1
clearly 5:1 6:6 7:11	51:11 56:10 75:9	communication	comprehensive	confused 20:4,14 62:6 177:12
7:13 23:10,12,14	76:8 82:11 93:6,9	144:1	85:2	confusing 50:24 51:3
28:9 31:23 32:5	96:11 98:6 99:20	communities 80:25	comprises 2:4	confusion 88:6 91:16,20 128:6
32:17,17 35:1,12	109:14 116:16	134:12	compute 68:19	162:24 163:1
38:4,18 51:2	117:10 123:23	community 27:11	computer 90:11	congregation 66:8 169:3 170:11
52:24 57:16 73:6	126:3 137:12	86:9 92:12 164:14	99:8 117:13,15	171:2,5,6 175:7
75:1 76:14,23	149:19 155:14	177:15 179:19,22	119:21	175:13 176:7,22
77:24 83:3,4,5	161:20,25 165:21	180:8 182:2,3	concede 87:24	connection 105:9
91:5,13,25 96:13	167:6,6 170:6	compiled 8:8 45:6	concern 21:13 25:2	
98:10 104:6	180:5	complain 68:3	100:6 124:8	
clergy 162:1,6	comes 18:17 25:9	complainant 8:20	125:22 151:9	
168:17,18,23	93:10 97:11 115:7	38:2,5 39:4 44:18	157:12 160:10,11	
170:13	141:11 142:12	51:8 54:18 115:20	182:2,15,21	
clerics 95:5	156:9	124:5,9 136:24	concerned 26:21,24	
Cleugh 41:10	coming 3:8 12:17	142:4,24 149:16	32:12 44:13 72:13	
click 17:17 19:3	15:9 54:20 76:14	152:24	72:13 73:14 74:24	
clients 183:10	97:8 115:9 167:2	complainants 5:12	86:8 100:16	
Climb 14:7	comma 51:1	38:18,21 39:8	112:11 126:21	
closed 17:5 101:7	commander 1:6,16	46:5 54:21 140:12	152:9 183:10	
closes 36:15	1:21,22 3:1 97:23	148:2 154:17	concerns 36:23	
co-operation 95:12	104:15 117:8	complained 16:16	40:22 50:10 95:14	
183:19	122:3 132:20	complaint 12:15	157:10 171:6	
			173:23	

165:24 174:18 connections 42:21 conscious 158:14 183:13 consider 4:23 10:18 29:23 35:19,24 36:4 47:4 74:12 75:10 123:18 138:2,18,19 142:13 171:14 considerable 92:21 151:8 167:3,4 181:18 considerably 7:1 consideration 5:2 77:4 125:8,18 considered 27:14 27:16,24 31:12 33:14 34:25 35:14 57:22 73:11 98:14 121:16 123:11 124:11 138:7 142:16 148:25 149:3 considering 97:4,7 183:1 consistency 11:18 94:17 99:4 102:21 consistent 21:25 110:8 148:11 176:20 constable 4:1,18 28:2 constitute 169:20 constraints 88:10 consultation 170:17 consulted 27:9 contact 24:15 28:1 38:2 41:12 44:4 44:10 49:8,11 50:10 52:17 55:25 57:10,13,19 75:12 75:20 78:19 79:3 79:9 81:1,15 89:20 95:22 145:9	170:2 179:1,6 contacted 22:21 24:11 27:2 45:18 53:6 55:18 70:1 89:11 105:20 contacting 70:5 contained 139:15 containing 145:8 contemporaneous 13:9 contemptuous 72:2 contents 75:11 83:22 context 58:15 97:7 156:14 169:20,21 173:19 175:21 181:23 continue 24:3 80:23 91:10 159:12 183:23 continued 17:25 19:10 68:17 continues 80:24 continuing 27:22 27:25 55:19 continuity 113:24 continuous 172:1 control 82:16 154:25 controlled 166:14 convenient 183:5 conversant 84:25 conversation 73:7 131:10 conversations 65:1 convict 126:15 convicted 74:9 conviction 5:19 10:6 12:1 31:14 74:13,15,19 110:16,16 112:14 121:20 136:10 146:2,17 156:1 convictions 129:18 convincing 71:12 cooperative 42:10	46:1 coordinator 162:21 163:5,13 164:17 COPCA 162:12 163:7,8,19 164:3 164:10 172:18,24 copied 166:19 copies 30:12 78:4 copy 30:12,13,14 45:12,14,15 78:3 89:14 102:15 122:8 156:4 166:20 core 95:24 105:14 124:24,24 140:14 151:24 183:25 correct 1:23 2:16 4:9,10 23:13 43:7 93:2 99:18 101:12 106:19 107:21 159:21 160:25 161:4,4,9,11,14 162:10,16,19,23 163:22,24 164:2,5 164:19 165:17 166:16,25 167:5 168:3,21 169:6,11 171:19,22 172:2 173:6 176:14 177:23 178:2,16 178:18,23 179:20 179:23 correction 47:13 160:20 corrections 160:18 correspondence 180:16 corridor 17:1 corroborate 73:23 corroborated 128:18 corroborating 132:13 corroboration 30:22 74:2,17 77:16 124:4	125:19,21,23,24 126:1,2,6,7,11,17 126:20,23 128:17 136:2,3,9 137:2 corroborative 76:3 couched 138:10 council 153:25 counsel 134:8 counter-allegation 29:6,21 countries 90:18,19 country 99:11 108:1 151:8 couple 95:2 102:1 155:24 course 1:9 12:1 28:19 33:15 38:7 47:8 73:25 74:2 75:10 83:15 85:22 94:7 100:25 108:8 113:15 115:3 121:2 127:25 142:25 144:24 150:5 152:22 155:4,16 158:6 162:25 167:7 170:6 171:20 172:13,17,25 180:6 court 26:10,15 32:6 37:15 39:22 43:23 54:5,13,16,19 55:22 70:8 71:1 72:9,11,17 106:5 106:6,7 112:20,24 113:16 118:16,24 119:8 125:9,15 covenant 172:11,21 covenants 172:14 cover 40:24 127:9 covered 13:11 21:7 33:8 46:18 104:22 covering 21:9 covers 46:20 coy 128:23 CP 163:5,5,19	166:18 169:1 170:18 177:4 CPC 166:14 169:1 170:17 171:14 176:25 CPO 166:15 171:14 CPS 6:4,5,7 32:7 35:1,2 36:14 75:24 76:18 105:1 106:24 108:4,13 109:14 114:16 115:14 130:18,20 130:23 133:4 134:4,12 142:4 147:1,3 152:5 156:24 CPT2-4 144:12 CPU-XN 144:12 created 164:3,23 credibility 31:1,16 76:9 124:7 credible 71:13 73:18 76:1,11 129:6,25 135:23 136:19,24 137:22 142:24 151:12 cricket 14:21 15:3 15:19 18:20 33:20 124:13 crime 1:22 5:11 7:6 7:13 38:1 49:18 54:13 56:25 82:8 85:24 100:8 107:7 107:20 135:5 154:20 crimes 7:16 criminal 5:15 44:1 46:19 53:18,20 69:21 72:5 74:8 74:24 78:20,22,23 79:1,11 105:14 109:7 135:18 137:12,13 141:10 147:5 148:24 151:20 CRIS 100:8 135:5
--	--	--	---	--

139:12 147:2 148:4 Crisis 113:17 criteria 117:17 criticise 116:10 criticised 35:17 criticisms 97:6 cross-fertilisation 12:11 143:22 cross-read 23:11 cross-referenced 166:19 Crown 3:17,21 4:3 5:8,22 6:9 28:14 28:21,23 30:19 34:20 36:8 58:2 73:10 75:17 76:19 79:25 104:24 105:4,19 106:5 107:3,5,10,13,16 107:20 108:1,18 108:20,25 109:25 110:1 113:23 114:7 115:18,22 116:21,24 117:8 118:13,24 119:8 122:20 123:4,7,9 125:2 133:10 140:25 141:5,6,9 141:12 150:16,22 152:1,21 153:8 154:10 155:7,12 155:25 cry 64:17 CS 85:18 86:6,25 CSAS 172:25 culminated 12:1 cultural 152:4,13 152:14,17 Cumberlege 162:17 177:6,22 current 3:9 41:9 83:20 84:6 85:5 85:19 86:19 88:25 89:9 102:20 103:17 121:4	181:16 currently 3:1 118:5 119:14 182:4 custody 151:1,12 Customs 107:6,7 cut 72:15,20 160:16 cuts 16:17 cynical 157:13 <hr/> D D 184:9 D'Adamo 4:17 5:5 43:13 dad 14:1,4,6,8,16 15:9,12,13,15,16 daily 45:4 79:8 damage 44:13 damages 37:14,15 71:21 danger 27:17,20 data 46:2 78:6 85:1 121:4 database 90:13 99:9,18 date 8:14 16:2 21:25 30:18 32:15 44:23 128:6 135:6 135:7 140:15 143:6,8,9 160:22 161:2 dated 13:23 73:10 81:10 101:19 124:23 dates 124:8 Dave' 58:22 David 9:4 14:24 15:1,20 16:3,4,10 16:14,22,23 17:2 17:8,9,14 18:25 19:19,21,23 20:6 20:9,18,21,24 22:6 24:23 25:4 25:11,16,19,24 26:1,9,13,16,20 26:22 27:3,7,11 27:21 29:7 30:3	34:17 36:2 40:21 43:25 49:7 50:24 51:1,8,11,13,17 51:25 52:6,11,16 52:18 53:19,21,23 54:7 55:25 58:20 59:3 67:2,17 71:23 80:13,13,20 80:22 81:15,17 124:14 127:6,9,10 127:13,19 128:13 135:15 152:3,8,11 160:22 170:5 171:20 David's 20:11 53:15 day 1:3 15:8 19:22 20:19 21:12,22 22:19 24:13 29:5 45:7 61:24 day-to-day 108:16 days 12:14 59:25 70:2 119:20 125:16 days' 59:25 DC 44:5 69:7,9,10 69:12 73:7 77:17 94:6,17 146:25 deal 12:24 13:21 46:20 83:23 84:11 89:19 140:6 146:14 160:12 161:23 180:24 181:22 dealing 42:18 50:2 85:7 95:18 97:16 105:18 113:2 114:1 118:20 119:16 122:14 141:16 148:11 181:10 dealings 40:4 94:14 153:25 169:25 dealt 7:14 11:15 31:24 40:2 115:2 115:12 132:21,21	151:4 December 39:23 43:24 52:8 90:6 decide 146:16 decided 45:3 48:14 69:5,23 decision 5:23 6:3,5 6:6,8,12 30:5,6,11 36:10 47:18 92:19 92:23 101:6 108:6 121:24,25 122:16 122:22 123:16,19 125:2 129:4,12,14 129:20 131:15,16 131:19,25 132:1,3 137:4 139:20,24 140:11,13,18,19 140:20 145:25 147:3,4,12,13,13 149:13 150:25 151:5,6,19 155:7 155:9,13,13 157:21 158:5 decisions 3:15 93:2 93:25 109:6 113:9 113:18 130:21,22 141:9 142:22 150:3,4,23 152:1 152:7,8 154:9,15 156:20 158:9 dedicated 2:4 91:10 91:14 164:25 deemed 27:6 deep 74:17 136:9 defence 31:15 33:25 124:15 defend 129:22 defendant 74:16 75:4 151:11 defendant's 117:18 defendant-based 117:17 defended 129:23 130:10,11 defending 112:6 129:21 130:10	deficiencies 156:22 defined 137:20 definitely 57:22 139:13 definition 155:9 deflect 100:18 157:13 degree 11:17 33:1 delay 33:6 128:8,8 128:10 delayed 33:4 124:9 deliberately 100:18 150:14 delivered 150:10 163:8 delusional 148:7 denial 152:24 denied 25:11,19 32:11 department 42:12 46:3,3,8 95:13,19 95:22 154:1 departmental 121:7 departments 134:12 depend 23:9,14 142:19 dependent 117:22 depending 119:6 175:21 depends 30:25 117:2 133:18,19 133:20 153:22 depressed 65:10 67:1 depressing 73:1 depression 145:2 148:4,9 deregistered 36:22 describe 59:20 described 66:13 74:20 76:7 97:5 describes 33:9 53:23 58:17 67:24 163:19
--	--	---	--	--

describing 46:7 76:11	53:5,5 68:7 91:16 93:1 96:4 110:11 111:6 126:24 133:16 142:25,25 143:14 146:22 150:6,17,18 175:2	disciplinary 171:3 176:11	divorced 67:4 Dixey 105:19,24 docket 37:4,8 49:23 51:16 doctor 23:3 document 18:4,6 18:10 25:7 29:4 30:16 45:20,21 55:14 56:12 90:23 101:15,18 115:24 124:25 139:14 144:16 147:8 164:12 documentary 12:24 139:4 documentation 56:3 124:24 documented 83:4 documents 13:4 22:21 36:20 100:9 159:25 dog 79:8 doing 57:17 61:13 64:13 65:7 100:9 132:14 183:13 Dom 83:20 84:5,14 86:11 Donmall 10:12 159:4,5,7,8 183:5 183:7 184:25 door 17:5,15 19:1,3 19:20 26:2 57:20 63:5 64:4 65:16 65:17 door' 17:16 dormant 86:25 doubt 21:11 33:17 33:25 73:21 74:4 75:3 89:3 103:19 135:24 136:6 DOW000047_004 173:11 Downside 66:7 110:24 Dr 22:25 draft 121:18	disciplined 171:3 176:11 disciplinary' 170:15 discipline 14:5 disclose 65:3 disclosed 86:23 89:5 103:21 127:6 127:23 disclosure 94:7 disclosures 176:23 discontinue 123:10 discourteous 123:6 discover 78:13 104:8 discovered 89:5 90:9 103:20,23,23 discretion 126:14 discuss 4:24 75:11 75:20 discussed 13:13 133:21 159:11 173:15 discusses 54:2 discussion 12:11 18:19 51:20 disgusted 15:10 dismiss 138:5 154:21 dismisses 137:10 dismissive 70:19 disobedient 65:11 disorder 67:25 disposal 90:5 102:9 disregard 109:20 distinct 29:22 distress 22:1 127:5 distressed 22:3,14 distressing 70:17 disturbing 73:1 divider 8:4 13:4 30:12,15 47:21 58:8,11 143:4 division 107:7,14 107:20 115:3 divisional 115:5	drafted 116:14 155:19 drank 66:16 draw 10:24 11:5 30:8,8 34:16 35:20 125:6,13 drawing 10:19 11:9 drawn 11:25 12:20 dress 60:6 dried 60:4,10,11,15 60:16,21 62:18 drinking 66:15 drugs 66:15 dry 48:20 60:6,12 60:13 drying 48:18 59:8 69:11 DS 40:7,12 43:14 51:14,22 52:10 53:8 54:15 83:13 83:13 101:17 duality 179:25 dubious 75:3 due 24:13 41:20 42:13,15,17 45:5 86:9,25 87:10 88:10,17 105:13 145:11 162:25 167:7 170:6 171:20 172:13,17 172:25 180:6 duties 87:9 145:7 duty 141:8 Dzo 43:18 83:17 84:8
E					
E 184:9					
Ealing 2:16 4:7 8:10 10:20 20:23 25:17 40:13 41:15 42:10 43:21 45:25 46:3 48:7,14 52:13 58:18 83:24 84:16 86:8,10,13 86:16,20 87:20					

95:14,18 105:10 114:2,6,8 115:14 117:16 141:2 168:19 169:4,13 174:4 175:4,5 176:16 177:3,6,13 178:3 182:2 earlier 35:7 56:5 57:5 61:11 69:23 70:3 84:3 92:4 94:21 106:3 132:4 133:21 148:4 152:1 154:8 158:16 early 3:3 12:5 31:4 41:23 48:12 89:7 92:3 93:20 96:18 99:16 105:1,10 109:9,10 114:19 115:13 134:15 144:9 easier 133:24 echoed 168:6 echoes 91:22 edited 62:13,14 139:17 edition 155:17 Edohin 45:17 education 13:12 16:21 21:8 42:12 95:13,19,22 154:1 effect 70:6 99:20 171:7 173:1 effectively 85:9 140:6 efforts 45:22 56:6 56:23,25 57:12 78:13 95:21 133:25 eight 9:11 10:1,4 48:9 either 26:22 29:24 60:21 65:21 137:2 139:12 Elias 45:9 elicit 62:18	else's 58:13 elucidate 103:22 embassy 85:10 emerging 5:15 8:9 39:13 emotionally 21:14 emphasis 111:21 employment 105:4 enacted 87:15 126:10 Enclosed 89:14 encompass 110:4 encountered/obs... 86:3 enforcement 109:3 109:5,10 engage 70:18 116:24 153:9 engagement 153:7 engaging 75:2 95:12 England 88:22 108:21 164:14 English 84:20 176:21 enquire 69:12 enquiries 24:3 57:24 69:25 82:4 83:14,18 86:5 89:15 109:16 132:7,16,19 133:1 139:1 140:4,23 146:8 149:8,10,12 149:14,21 enquiry 4:7 5:18 35:20,25 38:8 43:15 45:22 52:23 53:1 82:1,6 139:23 140:1 141:13 155:3 ensure 54:22 81:8 81:15 102:12 168:1 170:12,20 170:22,23 ensuring 48:19 82:16 121:8	entail 107:24 entered 48:4 58:18 entirely 30:25 71:12 91:12 93:15 97:23 117:14 entirety 167:17 entitled 172:9 entrance 17:22 19:6 entry 22:25 55:18 equally 153:18 175:13 error 137:3 errors 101:25 especially 118:25 essential 126:19 essentially 112:20 125:10 127:2 establish 182:3 established 44:11 107:1 181:13 et 87:10 ethos 133:12 European 91:4 European-wide 90:12 Eva 45:17 evaluation 171:23 171:25 evening 158:18 event 101:11 171:25 events 32:18 79:12 118:12 145:11 164:24 181:18 eventually 45:14 64:7 71:8 163:8 evidence 1:9,18 5:20 11:6 12:20 13:11 23:4,8,21 24:18 26:10 30:23 31:4,8,12,21,22 34:21 37:23 47:5 47:12,14,15,16 51:19 53:18,20 54:5,6,22,23,25	55:5,22 57:23 58:3 71:14,16,19 73:11,23,23 75:6 76:2,3 82:2,7 84:9 94:12 95:9 98:8 98:25 100:10 104:22 105:2 106:14,23 109:15 110:14 111:14,18 111:19,22,25 112:4,11,12,19,20 113:1,5 115:21,22 116:8,11,12,16,22 117:7 121:12,13 122:2 123:9,11,12 123:15,16,17,18 123:24 124:4 125:7,14 126:6,16 126:25 127:1 129:13,15 130:6,7 130:12 131:1,8 132:13,17 136:25 137:23 139:11,15 142:6,21 146:1,16 147:6,23 148:25 149:2,12,24 153:6 154:21 155:3,11 158:1 159:12,22 179:21 evidenced 31:6 evidential 45:21 76:13 125:25,25 137:2 ex-DI 42:4 exact 148:19 exactly 72:23 120:2 132:12 166:7,9 177:25 exaggerate 71:15 examination 1:14 106:13 127:11,14 127:22 128:1 159:7 184:13,19 184:25 examined 20:23 21:15 23:3 89:16	127:19 examining 49:1 example 11:2 33:19 39:1 44:17 86:18 89:7 97:9 114:1 120:12 127:3 132:8 172:11 examples 171:21 exceed 146:20 excellent 26:11 excess 6:25 excessive 85:3 Excise 107:6 Excuse 15:2 executive 176:2 exercise 38:18 48:19 151:22 exhibit 8:6 exhibits 178:8 exist 86:23 existed 113:12 exists 118:5 expect 23:20 32:20 32:24 46:17 49:15 52:22 82:19 103:3 117:24 123:12 137:16 140:5 expectation 112:9 169:12 expected 23:6 114:23 180:21 expeditions 35:18 97:7 expel 86:13 expelled 87:3 expensive 119:23 experience 2:24 3:11 4:6 32:13 34:10,15 46:10 67:13 70:16 95:11 101:2 102:19 108:9 109:22 114:18 120:1 125:7,14 130:4 161:10 162:5 179:24
--	---	---	---	--

40:24 48:16 64:24 67:10,24 71:22 72:6 79:15 80:1 81:7 89:18 168:9 181:6 follows 59:6 fondled 59:18 63:23 foolproof 118:8 force 99:10,22,25 forced 17:8 66:4 144:23 forces 99:21 143:25 foreign 95:6 foreskin 63:23 forgive 13:20,24 18:20 24:6 40:2 40:10 73:3 94:5 forgiven 179:14 form 34:6 48:5 74:25 83:5 113:4 113:4 115:23 117:9 130:3 165:11,14 166:14 167:9,14,17 forma 165:5 172:18 172:20 formal 52:15 55:1 85:23 147:13 177:21 178:7,17 179:1,6 formally 52:25 84:7 177:7,17 format 5:3 former 43:19 forms 148:6 164:25 166:5 formulate 182:24 forthcoming 55:22 forward 33:13 35:13 36:14 76:6 76:8,15 80:2 97:8 98:6 127:1 165:8 165:14 170:10 forward-looking 141:15	forwards 63:24 found 8:17 15:18 42:8 50:12 56:15 61:22 66:21 67:15 67:17 70:16,17 71:10,18 72:25 73:15,15 79:22 87:16,19 135:23 136:8 139:8,13 142:23 four 9:5 64:3 73:13 80:14,15,16 fourth 30:21 73:19 74:23 75:6 170:9 fractious 133:5 frank 101:14,15,24 102:24 103:8,12 104:8,13 109:23 frankly 148:23 Fraud 107:14 free 70:6 frequent 115:2 frequently 109:20 110:3 Friday 26:20,24 friend 183:21 friends 70:21 frightened 18:2 front 12:15 14:4 37:1 60:2 97:4 98:16 124:25 frustrating 89:2 103:18 fulfilling 150:18 full 1:15 22:10 23:23 27:15 34:3 45:12 51:12 58:14 71:9 115:6 119:19 154:14 159:16 fully 15:19,23 function 146:5,6,15 170:19 176:2 functions 2:6,7 100:1 funds 89:11 92:21 151:8	furnish 46:8 further 21:4,5 31:6 36:17 39:3,9,14 54:2,6,17 57:19 75:9,16 80:1 88:16 92:1 97:19 98:9,17,20 100:12 104:14 105:9 109:16 116:16 121:12 123:12,14 123:17,18,18,24 130:17 132:7,16 132:16,18 136:25 138:19 139:1 140:3 142:12,16 146:8 148:19 149:10,12,14,21 155:21 158:11 160:5 165:15 167:6 168:24 171:17 future 96:17 102:12	118:16 119:6 123:14 130:25 133:13 154:5,6 generate 7:6 generous 67:20 genital 48:20 49:1 genitals 59:8,18 60:17 63:12,18,22 geographical 114:14 getting 38:4 64:21 91:4 96:14 100:2 119:19 138:18 170:23 girl 69:14 girlfriend 66:20 give 1:15,18 14:7 26:10 27:15 30:17 47:12,14 54:5 55:5 92:1 95:9 98:3 103:8 130:5 131:24 142:15 149:13 159:15,22 given 5:1 7:10 13:19,24 33:17 36:7,9 48:3 50:9 59:24 62:16 75:14 75:16,19 76:19 77:5 93:14 95:25 106:14,23 109:21 111:5 124:1 129:7 129:8 130:17 132:6,25 146:21 149:5,9,16,25 157:22 167:3 gives 51:23 71:11 91:15,19 138:14 149:19 giving 54:22,23,24 55:9 171:17 176:17 go 13:7 14:22,25 17:2 25:10 32:6 35:16 38:7 39:2 40:3,8,11 42:14 47:21 48:2 57:19	61:20 62:25 66:4 66:16 77:8 92:12 100:22 110:19 117:2 124:21,24 125:18 129:2 132:10 135:4,10 139:1 146:19 154:5 163:4 165:8 165:9,10,21 166:10 173:9 goes 11:4 14:5 21:1 25:21 31:11 41:14 46:6 52:4 66:9 67:21 72:15 74:5 145:3 146:22 going 8:2 11:12 12:24 13:20,21 14:11 16:6 18:8 18:17 19:18 20:4 20:15 32:2 33:10 35:18 38:12,14 40:6 43:13 56:2 56:10 61:15 66:5 69:21 72:23 78:17 82:10 83:8 84:11 95:1 105:2 112:19 113:17 121:15 122:3 131:7 132:12 133:20 134:16 143:2 149:7 151:18 156:7 159:12 165:13 166:9,10 173:9 good 1:3 14:12 28:4 34:17 42:2 66:11 74:10 97:9 116:5 124:14 144:11 150:13 159:4,8,9 governed 109:25 governor 27:5 governors 34:5 179:2,4,17 180:9 GP 66:18 grabbing 138:21 grandmother 70:15
G				
		gain 123:6 gained 41:24 gaining 39:13 gallery 8:5 18:7,10 45:2,6 gamut 115:6 Gareth 4:17 37:3 40:7,12 48:4 94:24 gather 115:21 gay 58:22 59:25 66:24 GDPR 121:5 general 5:7 7:22 8:1 50:12 51:7 53:7 101:1 108:23 110:5 115:5 116:9 116:10 121:4 generally 14:9 60:3 109:21,22 114:6 114:13 116:2		

72:18,22	happened 22:15	helped 92:3 95:4	hours 64:3 143:12	41:24 65:5
grateful 158:15	33:11 62:2,4,18	helpful 10:12 44:8	house 14:4 64:18	imprisonment
183:16	64:9 68:13 106:9	45:19 67:15 83:11	housemaster 66:11	119:1 120:25
great 33:25 71:4	121:1 128:16,19	156:18 182:6	67:7	impropriety 27:13
83:23 89:19	128:21 148:11,22	helpfully 111:2	Hudson 55:16	improve 108:5
124:16	160:14	173:7	56:13 69:7,9,10	improvements
greater 59:20 91:9	happening 141:14	helping 96:16	69:12 73:7 77:17	150:11
Gregor 104:23	happens 123:14	here-and-now	hurt 15:15 19:12	inadmissible
106:12 184:17	160:15	97:17	hurting 17:25 19:9	137:10
Gregory 94:5	happy 36:23 55:21	hesitate 75:12		inappropriate 27:6
146:25	Harry 162:22	HHJ 45:5	I	53:15
grooming 74:25	180:17 181:5	high-profile 114:11	iceberg 35:15	incardinated 87:10
ground 151:10	hat 179:11	higher 119:10	identifiable 166:13	incident 21:4 25:23
grounds 145:8	hated 65:5	highlighted 156:22	identified 35:9	29:17 30:24 32:15
153:20	hating 66:22	164:22 171:13	44:24 69:25 98:1	32:19 33:20 50:23
group 115:13	hats 179:14	Hillingdon 40:14	identify 67:6	52:3,5,7 60:23
groups 134:13,14	Havering 161:13	hindsight 42:19	111:24,25 120:13	61:3 62:5,10,11
grown 53:6	head 6:24 16:10	89:24 150:7 180:1	155:2,3	63:16,21 64:1
guarantee 153:16	41:9 44:6 48:10	historic 2:8 3:7,9	ill 59:15	65:12,21 74:20
guess 144:11	51:25 107:13,19	3:12 43:16,19	illegible 30:13	75:1,5,6 135:19
guidance 33:17	137:14 156:16	53:10 96:9 97:13	illness 68:1 148:20	135:19
35:3 111:5 121:4	headmaster 16:9	108:11 120:1	illustration 29:18	incident/concern
132:4 142:15	27:16 58:20 61:2	176:24	image 68:15	165:11
149:9 152:18	68:22	historical 85:2	imagine 128:25	incidents 6:16
154:24 163:7,19	headmastership	95:25 181:25	158:15	39:16 48:17 59:5
guidelines 110:11	68:24	history 85:25 87:1	immediate 162:9	59:20 60:20 62:7
120:20	healing 23:20 172:9	117:6	181:20	73:13,14,25 74:23
guilt 168:13	health 13:12 16:21	hit 25:3	immediately 72:5	127:6 135:16,21
guilty 15:22 39:23	21:8 148:14	hitting 18:21	79:10 167:25	145:1
87:16,19 124:17	hear 33:17 36:6	hold 38:4 78:7	173:14 176:25	include 80:6
gym 61:11	73:8 87:9 166:10	holes 111:24 112:1	implement 42:7	included 3:7 80:10
	heard 15:2 17:17	holistic 143:15	implementation	80:22 118:10
H	19:3 36:5 63:19	Holy 92:16	163:21	including 10:4
habit 68:6	65:7 68:20 78:15	home 14:1 15:10,12	implementing	61:18 111:6
half 20:12 147:20	93:17 115:12	20:13,13 61:24	41:13	113:16 152:10
halfway 50:19	139:15 142:5	64:1,22 65:12,14	implicit 111:23	176:24
55:15	hearing 1:4 67:18	66:1,18 100:17	112:3	incomplete 45:14
halved 108:3	184:5	honest 69:8	imply 168:13	inconsistency
halves 61:15	hearsay 137:14	hope 1:8 15:20	importance 167:1	25:22 33:1
hand 17:22 19:5	heavily 45:20 66:15	118:1 143:13	important 68:16	incorporated 97:10
60:17,19	held 44:9 46:4 59:9	164:6 179:14	69:3,15 124:24	incorrect 47:14
handed 1:11 147:3	166:18	hopefully 125:1	168:1 173:21	indecent 30:22 33:5
hands 53:24 68:6	help 5:9 51:6 72:10	hospital 20:23	183:14	54:1 73:16 74:19
138:16	83:21 101:20	22:18 23:3	imposed 80:21	75:25 125:19
happen 49:17	102:10 103:6	hour 18:25 20:12	imposing 93:12	135:20
149:20 160:14	112:8 178:10	21:11	impression 41:17	indecently 34:2

53:24 independent 42:13 49:12 154:1 155:11 independently 6:8 129:9 indicate 49:19,23 54:17 127:11 160:11 indicated 1:21 127:12 160:25 indicates 28:16 70:1 indicating 127:5 165:12 indication 82:9 indicative 72:1 individual 11:13 42:19 43:3 76:6 76:14 78:5 82:17 98:2,6 99:10,25 100:5 133:19 151:7 169:7 181:12 individual's 78:6 individually 11:15 individuals 11:21 34:10 39:16 42:20 52:24 57:16,18,23 84:12 91:6,23 92:2 96:10 101:1 104:3 138:5 172:15 176:11 inevitable 34:4 inexperienced 35:8 35:9 132:22 infancy 163:11 infirmary 59:14 62:19 63:1,3 74:1 74:22 135:12,21 influence 6:2 inform 24:1 34:5 48:11 55:19 81:21 173:14,17 174:1 informal 178:15 180:14	information 6:21 12:11 37:4,9 44:16,22 45:23 46:1,4,7,9,13,14 50:22 52:3 62:18 75:9,15 78:7 84:6 85:5,19 89:1,4 91:7 92:1,2,6 102:6 103:13,17 103:20 104:9,11 138:19 140:22 141:4 142:12,16 156:10,13,17 164:24 165:6,12 165:15 166:18 167:2,16,25 168:1 informed 28:9,10 48:6 82:22 94:25 105:15 informing 81:24,25 inherent 139:2 inheritance 72:16 inherited 92:10 initial 42:6 91:11 128:12 136:14 137:22 165:7 initially 18:16 45:19 70:1 98:11 162:15 initiate 70:8 87:18 initiated 70:14 injuries 23:19 injury 144:22 innocence 16:3 innocent 15:18 16:1 87:13 innocent' 15:21 INQ003799 58:13 inquiries 119:18 inquiry 2:10,13 4:25 39:15 58:10 58:14 96:16 102:15,23 106:15 106:18 119:17,18 156:5 159:15 168:7 183:13,17	insert 122:7,8 insight 96:15 103:8 insights 39:15 insisted 48:18 49:1 61:4 insofar 171:5 182:1 inspector 3:4,5,22 3:23,24 Inspectorate 154:2 instance 39:19 49:17 50:2 96:3 134:8 172:6 174:12 175:4 instances 6:23 7:2 81:23 98:21 108:11 114:1,10 138:24 167:15 instigate 72:5 instigated 42:22 instigation 26:5 institution 11:12 100:6 142:2 143:15 153:10 institutions 45:16 45:17 153:8 161:21 instruction 171:20 instructions 70:7 120:22 instructor 59:24 insufficient 31:13 51:19 76:2 123:9 123:16 147:6 insurers 174:1,5 intelligence 2:6 85:25 89:1 91:2 99:17,19,20,24 100:1 103:18 151:12 intelligence-led 99:23 intend 158:21 intense 113:21 intensive 113:16 interaction 180:4 intercourse 66:21	interest 49:8 58:23 110:21 119:2 121:3 interested 64:11 78:7 interesting 140:10 interference 168:15 Internal 101:21 international 95:3 interrogation 19:24 interrupting 174:24 intervening 50:8 intervention 18:14 interview 20:12 27:3 79:4 127:25 interviewed 69:7 84:7 127:24 introduce 137:17 introductory 159:15 investigate 15:6 97:14 109:2 115:21 117:3 153:24 investigated 15:20 15:23 29:8 81:19 102:3 169:9 investigating 2:25 3:12 5:8 7:16 11:1,4,16,18,20 12:12 31:7 32:4 37:19,23 38:1 69:14 84:8 89:25 90:1,2,22 109:19 133:17 investigation 1:25 3:5 5:13,14,17,21 7:20,25 11:3 12:18,20,21 34:4 34:25 36:15 37:20 41:23 42:15 43:18 43:22 51:18 54:11 55:17,19,21 69:12 72:11 73:5 76:14	77:20 78:22,23 80:10 82:3,20 83:15,17 85:22 89:14 90:7,9,14 97:3 98:8,13 101:17 102:18 109:3 134:3 143:16 144:3,10 151:2,16,17,17,21 168:12,14 170:16 171:12,14 183:12 investigations 2:6,8 2:16 3:10 4:9 5:11,16 7:19,22 7:24 11:19 32:4 37:24 40:17 42:11 42:18 43:16 46:11 46:19 93:20 94:8 94:8 96:4,5,8,18 96:19,21 97:2,16 97:17 133:8 151:1 163:15 investigative 109:9 investigator 34:24 35:16,23 invite 8:3 invoked 86:11 involve 163:14 involved 4:8 39:12 42:20 47:9 50:5 51:18 67:22 77:10 94:19 150:23 173:13 176:17 178:14 involvement 79:17 105:6,8 174:4 involving 7:9 40:17 52:4 108:10 111:7 119:4 161:21,25 isolation 35:20 96:19 issue 18:4,6 45:1 47:6 88:16 105:24 183:11 issued 70:8 issues 4:24 31:20
--	---	---	---	---

31:23 35:4 66:13 67:24 86:2 119:22 124:7 140:6 147:24 148:7 161:18,21,25 issuing 93:11 IU 144:10	68:22 jurisdiction 28:11 88:1,7 jurisprudence 137:19 jury 126:15 138:1 justice 71:10,11 72:1 137:12,13 151:20	132:12 178:11 knock 57:20 know 13:10,14 16:13 20:4 21:5 22:23 23:6 28:19 32:1 35:2,21 36:20,23 37:6,11 37:25 41:5 46:10 50:4 56:23 65:6 72:22 76:24 77:17 79:5,13,14,17 82:17 91:1 102:18 102:20 104:25 106:22 114:16 115:11,11,14,16 121:1,10,11,14 131:22 132:14,20 137:1 140:15 142:9,9,19 143:20 143:21,23 144:1,3 144:5,11,20 148:3 149:11 152:12 157:23 158:4 167:16 170:24 173:22 180:21 182:6 knowledge 2:15 3:14 35:23 42:7 91:10 102:16 103:5 104:2 143:22 173:12 182:12 known 48:6,7 58:21 59:25 68:4 89:7 110:15 114:23,25 115:1 115:25 117:19 119:2 132:15 141:21 142:17 153:4 knows 21:1 Kosovo 89:10,13 90:7,17 104:5	103:13 104:8,10 124:3,4 laicization 87:18 laicize 87:15 language 162:12 large 38:12 69:13 87:1 89:10,21 92:8 115:15 largely 77:4 larger 84:17 lasted 20:12 60:23 Lastly 101:5 late 89:8 158:17 latest 158:21 laundry 72:17 Laurence 9:6 40:21 52:5,11,12,18 83:8 146:24 150:24 152:3 law 7:5,8 75:3 86:12 88:10 109:3 109:5,10 121:9 126:2,3,4,13 137:14 lawyer 28:23 75:24 104:25 108:12 116:24 117:9 140:18 141:12 147:1 lawyers 72:11 114:17,20 154:15 lax 177:15 lay 40:19,23 91:18 122:17 lead 5:18 32:8 143:15 174:2 lead-up 84:12 leader 108:15 169:3 170:12 171:2,5,6 176:8 lean 15:13 learn 101:24 learned 89:22 97:9 102:3 154:8 183:21 learning 101:22	learnt 96:23,24 leave 65:18 92:15 94:23 168:17,25 169:8,15,21 174:22 leaving 151:7 led 40:16 62:5 92:4 left 17:7,15 19:1,19 53:4 56:16 57:11 63:20 83:22 89:25 90:21 107:5 left-hand 22:24 legal 46:3,8 70:18 86:12 107:16,22 108:2 126:1 137:2 152:4,18,20 153:5 154:24 legible 30:14 legislation 73:17 121:10 length 61:19 lengths 6:22 lesser 128:21 lesson 16:21,22,23 17:1,2 59:12,24 60:1,3 61:6,12 97:8 102:2 lessons 48:22 59:9 60:8 61:6 89:22 96:23,24 97:10 101:24 154:8 Let's 100:22 letter 15:23 81:10 81:13 89:8 181:1 181:2 182:10,12 182:24 letters 44:24 57:15 level 7:10 liaise 46:2,12 95:22 liaised 41:15 91:17 130:18 179:21 liaising 176:17 liaison 42:12 83:6 liaisons 84:11 lie 33:22 63:4 lies 21:2
J	K			
Jacobs 183:9,20 January 124:23 135:8 143:8,10 Jerome 1:6,13,15 1:16 117:8 122:3 132:20 139:22 157:9 184:11 job 69:1 107:24 116:22 130:6,20 133:7 146:15 150:15 163:14 John 9:4 39:20 45:9 Johnson 44:6 join 107:5 joined 106:24 joint 134:2 judge 71:18 76:10 126:14 judgment 71:9,22 72:1,11 112:22,22 142:21 judiciary 126:13 July 30:11,19 53:8 55:10 146:24 jump 55:15 jumped 29:20 June 13:10,11,14 13:23 16:20 20:1 21:7 22:1,6 23:24 24:5,11 25:14 26:20,24 28:13,17 28:20,25 30:10 127:4,10 181:5 junior 10:12 26:21 27:13 48:10 52:17 58:18,19 65:13	Karmy-Jones 1:4,5 1:14,15 18:14 97:19 104:20 106:13,14 155:20 158:14,23 183:20 183:21 184:2,13 184:19 Kate 56:22,24 keep 19:17 62:4 68:12 118:15,17 119:13 156:1 keeping 120:5,6 Kent 3:3 99:22 kept 6:22,24 17:4 17:10,12,13,24 18:24 22:4 68:9 119:2 120:6,7 166:3,12,21 Kevin 55:16 56:13 Key 2:1,4 11:24 81:11 97:9 99:7 keys 48:21,23 Khan 73:10 134:19 138:5 142:11 147:18 Khan's 135:17 kind 67:16,22 88:12 120:2 kinds 113:2 Kingdom 92:16 93:6,10 94:23 knees 63:9 knew 17:23 19:7 79:14 87:11 91:6 92:7 95:5 118:7	L		
		lack 31:22 94:12		

life 64:14,23 71:6 71:17 119:1 120:25	133:23,23 134:3,4 134:10	140:18 152:11 158:7 181:15	making 4:7 33:4,7 61:14 64:17 65:16 76:15 82:4 108:6 113:9 124:10 125:2 140:20 142:22 149:8,10 149:21 154:15,25 157:21	89:15 94:7,16 124:5 134:11 154:4,6 183:14,24 183:25
lifeline 71:7	located 88:4,19	looking 5:17 9:14 9:21 13:1 32:24 34:18 38:25 40:9 55:15 56:2 75:22 76:18 90:10 98:9 99:4 109:1 111:13 124:1,19 129:20 129:21 131:8,14 132:4,5,9 135:21 137:16,21,22 138:23,25 140:2 142:21 144:12 145:16 150:3,7,17 161:18 172:17	man 34:1,9 74:10 79:4 87:13 93:18 124:17	maths 10:15
light 27:14 54:6 75:9 98:3 123:12 142:12 163:25 167:6,7 170:6	locked 64:2 65:13	looks 99:9	managed 107:25 158:19	maths/science 144:19
light-years 155:18	locker 48:21	loosened 63:7 135:13	management 6:20 121:8 156:10,13	Matt 4:18 44:5
limb 84:19 110:24	locking 26:2	Lord 180:2	manager 108:15 163:3,4,12 180:16 181:4	matter 26:14 37:14 39:20 74:12 75:11 105:5 143:2,19 145:19 160:5,21 160:24 167:18 174:9 178:19 181:22 183:15
limitation 44:14	locus 153:12,17	Lorenzo 45:9,14	managers 41:22	matters 4:6 31:15 33:14 104:22 105:18 108:5 109:19 111:6 124:10 146:15 151:2 152:10 158:19 160:16 161:10 172:4
limited 100:7,11	lodged 37:11	lost 48:21 68:18 71:5	Manchester 45:9	Matthew 104:25 114:7
line 9:5,14,21 10:3 10:8 25:10 35:20 35:25 38:8 39:1 39:21 40:8 53:1 82:1,5 120:3 154:25 163:3,4,12 180:16 181:4	log 164:24	lot 10:15 65:6 108:12 115:10 118:15 119:13 130:2,16 133:4 134:2,7,8,11,13 154:18	manhunt 89:23 90:20 91:1,11 95:3 102:6,19	McCabe 30:19,20 32:10 33:19 104:25 105:6,11 105:13 114:7,22 124:1,12,25 125:17,22 129:12
lines 5:18 27:4 33:3 49:10 52:10,22 105:25 112:19 139:23 140:1 155:3	London 66:16 107:17 108:13 115:17,17	loyalty 41:18	manhunt' 89:24	McCabe's 28:22
link 56:6 170:18 171:8	long-term 119:2	lunch 19:20 104:15	manifested 148:21	McGill 104:23 106:10,12,14 124:3 155:24 158:12 184:17
linked 96:21 117:23 118:4	longer 7:1 86:9 96:1 119:3,12	Luton 89:17 90:15	manipulation 157:13	me' 60:16,21
linking 97:2	look 8:22 10:15,22 10:23 11:8 29:2 31:25 32:17 33:12 34:23 35:1 36:14 37:20,24 38:14 39:1 40:12 43:11 46:18 55:12 63:15 64:19 67:18 73:9 77:9,17 80:11 82:8 97:12 98:5,6 98:7,15,16,20,23 99:1,2,3,6 111:16 111:21 112:4,10 121:15,18 125:5 130:7 134:22 143:5,6 146:15,16 149:18 151:16 152:15 153:13 154:12 155:11 156:23	M	manipulative 34:12	mean 81:24 116:10 127:22 143:17 161:2 169:21 175:24 176:5 182:21
link 56:6 170:18 171:8	looked 12:15 17:15 19:1 24:23 25:1,5 28:15 35:4 37:21 38:13 68:6 96:19 105:2 124:12 126:12 131:3	Maestri 9:4,12,16 10:2 39:20 40:21	manner 171:23	means 92:18 110:16 119:9,21 126:5 151:13
linked 96:21 117:23 118:4	looked 12:15 17:15 19:1 24:23 25:1,5 28:15 35:4 37:21 38:13 68:6 96:19 105:2 124:12 126:12 131:3	Magistrate's 118:16	March 70:2 89:8 94:24 146:23	
linking 97:2	longer 7:1 86:9 96:1 119:3,12	major 90:7,9 102:18	marked 101:21	
links 10:24 11:6,9 11:22,25 99:13	looked 12:15 17:15 19:1 24:23 25:1,5 28:15 35:4 37:21 38:13 68:6 96:19 105:2 124:12 126:12 131:3	majority 44:4	marker 7:10,12	
list 45:6 53:5	longer 7:1 86:9 96:1 119:3,12		Martin 41:16 44:11 48:13 49:6 50:14 68:3 83:20 145:10 161:2 173:21	
listen 73:6	long-term 119:2		Martin's 47:6	
listening 106:23	longer 7:1 86:9 96:1 119:3,12		mass 87:9	
little 12:25 14:11 27:1 30:1,14 31:5 33:18 36:16 38:23 45:21 50:24 51:3 79:3 106:7 127:14 147:19 167:15	longer 7:1 86:9 96:1 119:3,12		master 34:6 69:2	
live 14:1 43:16 47:16 66:6	longer 7:1 86:9 96:1 119:3,12		masturbated 144:23	
live' 86:24	longer 7:1 86:9 96:1 119:3,12		material 6:10,13 12:25 44:9,15,16 46:20,21,23 85:4	
lived 14:2	longer 7:1 86:9 96:1 119:3,12			
local 59:9,23 88:13 88:17 114:14,16	longer 7:1 86:9 96:1 119:3,12			

meant 15:24 25:4 35:7 103:22 112:24 165:10 180:12	Metropolitan 1:17 1:19 3:2 5:6 34:20 92:6,14 95:10 100:4 123:5 161:7	165:5	mouth 17:11 176:5	N
measure 113:20	mid 48:16 179:6	monk 9:4,19 10:9 48:8 64:16 67:12 68:25 144:20 169:16,20,22 170:13,23 171:7 174:4,13 175:3,15 175:16	move 50:7 58:8 67:9 83:8 134:16	N 184:9
measures 41:13 42:7 54:21,23	middle 44:3 58:20	moved 11:19 36:21 36:21 51:25 52:6 52:8 58:19 68:23 145:14 171:7	Moving 176:15	N/T 50:25 51:3
medical 23:4,21 30:23 31:22 73:23 124:4	million 119:14	monks 40:18,23 66:5 143:14 168:19 175:4	MPS 1:22 90:6	name 1:15 22:25 51:23 57:7 94:22 103:1 117:18 118:6,7 138:14 140:13,16 159:16 159:17 160:15
medically 23:3	mind 54:18 119:24 125:1,11 129:3 130:15	Monsignor 162:22 163:12 180:16 181:4	MPS003014_025 48:3	names 50:9 103:1 140:16 149:19 160:12
meeting 4:23 21:12 22:6,8,14 85:9 174:17 181:6	mindful 130:1	month 37:12 64:15	MPS003014_045 55:15	namesake 181:4
meetings 42:5,8,9 182:20	mine 40:10 47:9 122:6	months 56:19 90:8 118:23	MPS003066_003 37:2	national 6:20 85:24 90:11 99:9,18,19 99:23 156:24 164:12 181:13
member 44:21 71:1 108:3,18 169:13	ministry 79:16 174:20,23 176:9	mood 14:12,15	MPS003066_030 18:16	nationally 143:24 156:1
members 13:3 36:3 42:16 59:11 69:3 162:1,6 181:8,11 181:17	minors 87:2	Moore 25:14,14 26:7 28:2 50:11	MPS003066_045 24:9	nature 23:10,14 33:7 53:7,10 96:9 119:24 124:20 128:24 140:7 148:20 153:22 173:18,22 180:12
memorandum 101:16	minutes 17:13 18:25 19:15,21 63:18	moot 126:18	MPS003066_049 13:18	naughty 14:9
memory 40:25 55:7 75:22 96:10 113:15 117:15	MIT 90:13	Morgan 4:17 37:3 40:12 48:4 51:14 51:22 52:10 53:8 94:24	MPS003529 122:5	nearly 17:13 18:25 18:25 119:15
Mental 148:14	Mmm 84:10 114:3 124:18	Morgan's 40:7 54:15	MPS003529_001 30:18	necessarily 23:8,9 38:20 81:25 114:25 142:9 148:8,9
mentality 72:2	Mmm-hmm 120:15 157:15	morning 1:3,6 20:20 25:24 100:10 159:13 183:15,18	MPS003541 83:11	needed 67:3 72:18
mention 20:8 22:11 127:19 129:19	mobile 91:2	mother 14:1 20:6 20:13 22:18 26:12 29:16 31:6 50:9 52:14 61:24,25 62:3,9,17 64:2,3 64:19 65:15,17,20 66:9,25 70:13 72:9,20 127:7 128:19 129:9 139:16	MPS003542_001 40:9	
mentioned 11:14 22:7 24:24 26:20 36:2 37:19 77:22 114:21 127:17 135:12	mode 179:17	mother's 58:25	MPS003543 43:12	
mentioning 160:12	model 99:20,24	motivation 34:13 34:16 100:24	MPS003544 40:7	
merged 107:10	molested 48:8	mounting 35:5	multi-agency 174:16	
merits 111:14,21 112:10 157:25	moment 4:14 8:2 24:4 56:10 110:25 120:7 134:24 143:5		multi-disciplined 97:11	
messages 53:4 56:15 57:11	moment's 52:1		multi-offenders 161:22	
met 6:17 13:5 43:7 47:24,25 70:2 77:25 94:19 96:24 100:8	monastery 71:25 80:24 145:6,14 170:1 177:12,15		multi-purpose 97:11	
	Monday 23:24 24:11 26:25		multi-victims 161:22	
	money 71:6 92:8,12 92:13		mum 15:7,7,8,10 15:20,21 16:3 20:20,21	
	monies 104:4		music 17:2 62:23	
	monitor 82:18		myths 154:16 157:24	
	monitored 79:18			
	monitoring 130:18			

79:10 neighbouring 90:18 Neil 1:6,13,16 184:11 neither 52:14,14 86:20 never 14:5 15:5 16:3 19:21 38:10 61:7,8 64:20 74:8 74:8 152:23 169:23 new 37:9 69:3 172:4 NFAed 39:3 nice 16:11 67:20 night 20:16 22:15 No' 17:10,11,12,25 no-one 16:2 20:13 57:8 Nolan 162:9 176:23 nominated 182:8 non-executive 80:23 nonchalantly 68:7 normal 63:13 90:24 normalised 62:5 normally 62:22 169:2 181:22 Northwood 40:15 note 28:15,18 43:12 76:9 116:9,10 118:23 135:4 147:7 168:22 noted 29:16 80:13 95:17 146:23 notes 52:10 147:2 notice 52:1 168:22 notionally 105:11 notwithstanding 52:9,23 November 36:22 50:7,11 69:20 83:16 novice 69:2 now' 19:17	number 2:5 12:4 15:6 38:18,19,20 39:7 40:17,19 42:16,20 43:15 50:8 53:3,4 57:10 82:24 83:14 90:17 92:20 93:1,24 96:25 108:15 109:5 111:5 117:19 118:3 131:7 135:16 138:24 140:8 144:25 152:10 156:13 181:10 numbers 38:16 Nunciature 85:7,8 85:14 Nuncio 183:11,19 183:24 nutshell 111:9 <hr/> O O'Neill 4:18 44:5 94:6,17 obey 61:1 objection 105:16 151:10 objective 93:12 111:13,13 129:14 130:7 objectively 35:1 131:14 obligation 101:10 obligations 146:12 150:18 observation 30:3 observations 29:22 31:19 73:4 90:20 91:12 94:6 124:19 136:13,14 154:7 observe 37:16 102:4 observed 102:9 obstructive 44:15 obtain 88:21 92:11 92:13 134:10	154:6 obtained 4:8 24:18 54:15 81:11 112:1 obtaining 94:9 obvious 86:5 117:3 172:3 obviously 61:1 66:8 120:9 160:11 161:22 162:24 163:16 165:11,15 175:2 179:6,18 180:6 182:23 occasion 14:16 16:16 24:20 26:1 59:10,18 63:2 74:21 80:6 94:20 135:14 160:14 occasions 11:1 39:8 39:18 44:8 59:4,7 59:13,15 60:14,16 61:4,10 62:20,23 62:25 82:24 83:4 83:5 90:17 93:1,4 93:8 94:21 135:12 occurred 30:24 59:6 69:9 93:18 144:25 October 37:11 40:8 48:1,12 49:9 58:1 70:9 73:11 101:19 odd 137:25 offence 7:7 34:9 54:1 74:8 98:19 118:21 126:8,8 133:18 135:18 153:19 offences 7:13,15 32:10 34:11 53:18 53:21 74:3,24 87:16,19 111:6,7 111:7 113:7,18,19 115:9 118:25 119:1 120:8 134:3 134:13 136:4 152:16 154:13 157:19	offenders 34:11 102:14,22 offending 87:2 110:4 162:5 offer 83:21 133:13 146:13 offered 66:11 office 12:8 15:4 17:5,6 19:24 20:2 22:5 107:8 115:14 115:15 162:13 173:8 180:19 181:9,22 officer 3:12 5:5 8:1 11:3,4 12:18 23:6 25:8,15 28:14 32:2,2,4 36:8,13 36:16 37:19,23 43:18,21 50:4 54:8 78:12 80:12 81:22 82:4 90:2 117:22 121:7 131:10,11 132:21 133:23 139:22 140:3 146:10,13 146:22,25 159:18 162:14 163:5,19 officer's 31:7 38:1 115:25 116:8,12 116:13,23 117:4 129:24 officers 2:5 4:8,11 5:1 7:16,17,19,21 7:23 11:2,16,18 11:20 12:4,14,22 43:3 45:25 50:2 84:4 85:8,18 86:1 87:12 89:2 91:22 94:18,19 100:2 103:25 114:15,24 115:1,10 116:11 130:2,4 132:15 133:6,7 145:21,24 officers' 164:17 offices 51:22 117:11	official 156:10 Oh 134:2 176:3 179:8 OHY006649_004 73:9 OHY006649_015 55:2 OHY006649_021 135:2 OHY006651 143:4 OHY006752 38:13 OHY006752_001 8:5 okay 47:19 51:10 71:2 111:1 175:1 175:21 old 13:24 48:9 60:6 64:12 72:22 73:17 112:16 older 14:21 111:6 once 5:12 59:22 79:22 90:5 109:2 136:19 one-day 113:15 one-off 171:25 one-sided 30:4 ones 115:19 176:24 onsite 145:17 onwards 121:17 opaque 103:14 open 15:8 45:10 117:8 opened 17:15 opening 93:7 105:22 operate 130:14 operates 84:1 operation 2:1,4 11:24 43:18,24 81:11 83:17 84:8 99:7 operational 163:23 operations 163:20 operations' 108:16 opinion 24:21 31:8 34:19,24 36:7
---	--	---	---	---

98:4 116:19 130:1 139:4 opinions 31:7 opportunity 2:20 12:10 58:9 121:18 134:22 151:13 165:16 178:5 opposed 5:8,20 11:21 12:16 35:5 47:16 84:18 97:15 oppressive 57:21 option 5:2 options 57:15,21 order 8:14 40:10 80:19 84:1,18 85:15 86:14 87:4 87:11 88:3 115:8 orders 88:4,14,19 88:22 177:24 178:1 organisational 163:7 organisations 46:12,15 47:3 130:19 organised 91:17 107:7,19 original 38:2,4 56:14 89:25 90:21 153:2 ought 103:1 outcome 72:6 78:13 131:5 outline 42:6 48:3 outlined 128:21 outlines 69:6 outraged 68:6 outside 19:1 20:14 overall 86:7 138:2 overboard 14:6 overly 57:20 overoptimistic 130:5 overseen 90:1 oversight 108:16 overview 88:16	P	67:9 68:1 73:19 73:19 79:24 80:11 83:19 84:4,22 86:2 90:22 102:4 103:13 106:8 121:17 124:2,22 125:4,12,18 136:16 147:9 160:21 161:1 173:10 178:25 181:20 paragraphs 173:8 paranoia 148:7 paraphrase 112:6 parents 16:12 52:3 61:16 63:17 64:5 64:8,22 65:22 67:3,4,12 68:10 68:12 92:10 parish 174:21,25 175:3,5,8,16 parliament 108:23 part 2:18 3:3 11:13 11:14 36:25 43:22 48:25 66:8 83:17 84:17 86:9 90:19 93:20 111:23 115:16 125:22,25 132:5 137:7,17 144:9 146:4,6 150:21 175:22 182:25 183:12 participant 140:14 participants 95:24 105:15 151:24 184:1 particular 3:8 7:7 76:13 88:19 90:25 100:5,6 114:10 115:12 144:3 157:23 166:11 176:8 particularly 45:19 57:17 68:18 115:13 128:6,11 parties 87:7	partly 27:7,10 45:5 party 46:20,21,23 52:14 78:8 115:21 134:10 176:22 pass 50:22 102:5 passage 171:12 Passages 160:8 passed 23:16 90:3,6 91:14 102:7,12 120:9 passport 90:16 pastoral 169:25 170:9,12,16,18,23 171:5,8 Pat 20:5 25:8 26:6 patchy 62:13 patience 158:15 159:10 patio 20:14 Patricia 22:7,22 24:9 patterns 98:1 Pausing 169:4 174:3 PC 25:14 26:7 132:22 PE 59:12 61:6,6,8 61:12 Pearce 9:4,6,12,16 9:19,23 10:1,4,10 12:22 13:9,11 21:7 22:1,3,4,6,8 22:12,16 24:11,13 27:21 28:8 29:7 29:24 30:3,25 32:11,15 36:2 37:12 40:21 43:25 48:8,9,18,22,24 48:25 49:3,7,10 50:10,12 55:20,25 58:4,20,21 59:3,7 59:10,13,16,18,23 60:1,9,11,13,14 60:16,21 61:4,9 61:25 62:11,22,23 63:1,2,3,5,7,22	64:13 65:1,4,5,7 65:22 67:13,14,17 68:3,9,9,10,21,21 68:23,25 69:10,22 70:11,14 71:8,18 71:23 72:5 74:6 74:19 75:2,8 79:15 81:15,17 120:14,16 127:6,9 127:10,13 128:22 132:14 135:15 136:11 137:24 138:15 152:3,8,11 157:10 Pearce's 34:17 60:24 65:8 67:2 100:14 124:14 137:8 peers 41:22 penalty 119:1 penetrated 145:1 penis 59:19 63:10 63:23 74:22 75:25 135:14,22 people 26:3 45:8 70:23 71:2 126:24 132:11,15 140:13 149:19,22 154:18 174:22 175:10 180:21 perfect 32:20,22,23 perfectly 50:21 132:3 157:5 perform 87:8 period 3:19 4:3 36:6 40:16 42:17 42:24 43:20 50:8 56:5 57:3 69:13 80:15 158:16 166:24 167:3,4 170:3 177:2 178:14 180:13 181:18 periodically 89:11 permitted 92:15 permitting 94:23
--	----------	--	--	---

perpetrated 40:18 43:19	23:15,17 25:23 29:18 49:19 73:5	poke 14:13,15	policies 6:15,20 46:15,16 164:1	151:7 157:12 175:12
perpetrator 42:19 67:6 98:23	83:2,4 96:1 101:25 102:11,20	police 1:17,19 3:2,3 5:6,7,10 6:2,5,7,8	172:24 173:1,5 183:2	powers 146:20
perpetrators 41:19 41:21	127:23 128:1 141:18 144:4	6:10,17,21 13:5 21:4 22:21 25:17	policing 99:23 100:25 101:3	practical 177:2,20
person 66:11 67:16 67:20 130:5	152:14,17 165:24 168:13 182:5,23	28:2,4,6,11 29:8 29:10 32:3 34:20	policy 6:17 102:14 102:22 134:12	practice 5:15 39:13
140:14,16 147:3 151:13 155:8	183:5	35:17 36:11 37:16 39:5,7,12,17	155:9 163:4 164:8 164:10,12 167:21	90:25 96:7,16,21
161:24 165:13,24 167:22 168:12	placed 17:8 33:19 93:16 124:13	40:15 41:6 42:9 42:20 43:7 44:4	169:12 171:17 172:8,18,20,23	98:5 99:5,6,12
170:14,18 171:2,7 171:8 176:8	161:12 169:7	46:8 49:6,11 50:22 51:18 52:25	180:18 182:5,7	105:14 123:25
person's 148:21	plain 79:12 127:10	55:21 56:13 57:12 57:19 69:5,6,20	pool 11:21	163:13,15 167:18
personal 41:20	plan 45:12 71:5 94:10	70:5,7,19 72:4,10 73:5,12 77:25	portrayed 72:14	178:19
personally 47:9 60:5 121:13 183:3	planning 151:7	78:19,21 79:2,3,4 79:9,13,17,22	position 27:24 28:7 35:16 51:25 68:24	practising 108:12
personnel 166:15 166:19	play 2:18 33:25 92:20 124:16	81:7,14,21 82:9 82:13 88:24 90:11	69:3 96:12 111:14 114:22 172:10	pre 109:12
persons 80:19 81:2 149:17 182:8	played 135:14 157:18	93:5,14,19,23 94:7,14,19 95:3,5	178:3 180:10	pre-existing 164:4 178:1
perspective 37:17 177:21 178:13	pleaded 39:23	95:6,10 96:2,11 96:24 97:24 99:9	positions 54:2 71:3	precise 59:4 79:12
persuasive 142:24 142:24	please 1:12 2:3 12:25 13:17 29:2	99:18 100:4,20 101:7 104:7,12	positive 94:12 111:20	preliminary 161:5
Peter 10:6 42:3,4,8 144:17 159:4,6,17	42:14 47:21 75:12 83:12 95:16	109:2,4,14,18,20 115:7,18,19	possession 165:23	prematurely 139:25
184:23	101:15 103:7,12 106:11 144:15	117:20 122:1,22 123:5,13,21	possibility 29:22 157:16	premises 146:4
phase 66:24	159:16 160:10 162:25 165:4	130:21 132:7,10 132:24 133:4,13	possible 22:23 27:17,20 35:12	preparation 43:4 108:7 172:15
Phillips 146:23 147:1 148:12	plus 137:23	143:23 146:13 149:9,11,22	42:24 60:8 123:21 123:23 125:7	prepared 71:16 79:25 125:5
phone 15:6 57:11 91:3	pm 104:16,17,19 143:11 158:22,25	150:20,25 151:3 151:22 153:13,18	156:4 157:6 158:2 168:15 182:20	79:25 125:5
phoned 70:4	159:1,3 184:4	153:21,23 154:5,6 155:2 161:7 168:2	183:13	preparing 178:12
photograph 94:21	point 14:18 15:17 26:16 49:20 50:17	173:13 176:1 173:13 176:1	possibly 26:25	prepubescent 58:23
physical 13:13 22:13 23:5,8,8,22	54:8 64:9 74:1 84:3,12 98:18	police's 39:21 47:24,25 94:3	post 27:7 52:7 81:12 99:15	presence 88:22
29:1 128:15	102:25 103:3,12 126:18 164:20		162:17 168:8 176:22 177:6	present 5:21 20:6 22:8 48:6,7 96:3
physically 21:14	167:21 168:8 170:5,9 171:10		post-traumatic 67:25	145:10
picture 88:21 137:8 138:1	175:12 177:14 178:4 183:9		pot 151:14	presentation 43:4
piecemeal 42:18 97:24 100:1	pointed 56:5 61:18		potential 41:12 44:17 58:5 100:13	presented 112:5 131:3
place 10:20 11:3,7 11:23 13:14 23:10	points 159:15 161:5 164:7 172:24		138:20 146:8 162:24	presenting 77:3

prevailing 163:25 164:8	109:11 147:4,6 158:23	131:18 132:2 134:9 152:2,7,23 155:8	137:3 138:18 145:19 146:12 153:5 155:11	provides 57:7 58:5 89:19
prevented 27:21 96:2	proceeded 5:24 61:17 106:1,4	prosecuted 26:10 37:13 38:10 74:13 81:19 96:1 110:6 146:2 152:9	prosecutors 108:1 110:1 111:12,16 111:17 112:24 113:2,7 117:2,4 125:3,13 126:17 133:7 154:18,25 157:17,19 158:4,7	providing 41:11 89:9 91:7
previous 25:9 37:21 74:10 77:1 77:18 80:9 98:24 116:25 129:17	proceeding 147:5 proceedings 37:12 70:9 87:14,18 105:17	prosecuting 96:25 113:10 114:19 133:17 137:5	prospect 31:14 110:15 112:13 121:20 146:1,17	provision 170:12 170:20
previously 66:7 91:23 95:2 98:22 101:4 106:15	process 70:18 113:17 119:14 144:6 157:13 172:1	prosecution 3:17 3:21 4:4 5:9,22 6:9 28:14,22,23 34:20 35:5,6 36:9 36:19 57:9 58:2 69:21 72:5 73:10 75:15 80:1 101:7 104:24 105:4,19 106:5 107:5,10,13 107:14,16,20 108:19,20,25 109:25 110:21 111:15 112:23 113:23 115:19,23 116:21,24 117:9 118:13 122:20 123:4,8,9 133:11 140:25 141:5,6,9 141:12 142:20 150:16,22 152:2 152:15,21 153:3,8 154:10,13 155:7 155:12,14,25	protection 29:8 34:7 42:2 46:2 51:21 72:3 80:12 81:21 82:4 85:1 95:14 121:5 141:1 145:11 159:18 161:10,13,17,21 161:25 162:11,13 162:14,21 163:13 163:21 164:16,17 164:23 165:11,25 166:2,12,23 181:7 181:9 182:4,7 183:2	provoked 72:24 pseudonyms 118:9 psychiatric 144:18 148:2,3,6,7,13,20
priest 43:20 61:2 72:16,18,25 85:10 85:18 87:5,8,9,13 129:17 175:3,16	processes 144:4 proclivities 58:23 prodding 17:22 18:1 19:6,10	produced 45:13 84:25	protected 72:8	Psychologically 66:6
priests 174:25 182:1	produced 45:13 84:25	professional 44:7 105:12 106:22 146:12	protection 29:8 34:7 42:2 46:2 51:21 72:3 80:12 81:21 82:4 85:1 95:14 121:5 141:1 145:11 159:18 161:10,13,17,21 161:25 162:11,13 162:14,21 163:13 163:21 164:16,17 164:23 165:11,25 166:2,12,23 181:7 181:9 182:4,7 183:2	public 1:4 8:5 18:7 18:9 45:2,6 105:5 108:22 110:21 115:8 120:10
primacy 89:23 90:6 90:14 91:20	professionally 105:13 123:5	professionally 105:13 123:5	protected 72:8	Pull 17:19
primary 43:14 126:25	profound 111:11	profound 111:11	protection 29:8 34:7 42:2 46:2 51:21 72:3 80:12 81:21 82:4 85:1 95:14 121:5 141:1 145:11 159:18 161:10,13,17,21 161:25 162:11,13 162:14,21 163:13 163:21 164:16,17 164:23 165:11,25 166:2,12,23 181:7 181:9 182:4,7 183:2	pulled 19:16 26:4 37:20 49:23,25 59:16 63:8,19 134:25
principal 108:20	progress 98:11 146:8	progress 98:11 146:8	protection 29:8 34:7 42:2 46:2 51:21 72:3 80:12 81:21 82:4 85:1 95:14 121:5 141:1 145:11 159:18 161:10,13,17,21 161:25 162:11,13 162:14,21 163:13 163:21 164:16,17 164:23 165:11,25 166:2,12,23 181:7 181:9 182:4,7 183:2	pulling 138:23
prior 3:2 183:17	progressed 36:17 39:19 91:8,9	progressed 36:17 39:19 91:8,9	protection 29:8 34:7 42:2 46:2 51:21 72:3 80:12 81:21 82:4 85:1 95:14 121:5 141:1 145:11 159:18 161:10,13,17,21 161:25 162:11,13 162:14,21 163:13 163:21 164:16,17 164:23 165:11,25 166:2,12,23 181:7 181:9 182:4,7 183:2	punishable 120:25
prison 72:17	progressing 36:8 76:17 168:14	progressing 36:8 76:17 168:14	protection 29:8 34:7 42:2 46:2 51:21 72:3 80:12 81:21 82:4 85:1 95:14 121:5 141:1 145:11 159:18 161:10,13,17,21 161:25 162:11,13 162:14,21 163:13 163:21 164:16,17 164:23 165:11,25 166:2,12,23 181:7 181:9 182:4,7 183:2	pupil 26:21
private 16:6	project 144:7	project 144:7	protection 29:8 34:7 42:2 46:2 51:21 72:3 80:12 81:21 82:4 85:1 95:14 121:5 141:1 145:11 159:18 161:10,13,17,21 161:25 162:11,13 162:14,21 163:13 163:21 164:16,17 164:23 165:11,25 166:2,12,23 181:7 181:9 182:4,7 183:2	pupils 40:20
pro 165:5 172:18 172:20	prolonged 42:24	prolonged 42:24	protection 29:8 34:7 42:2 46:2 51:21 72:3 80:12 81:21 82:4 85:1 95:14 121:5 141:1 145:11 159:18 161:10,13,17,21 161:25 162:11,13 162:14,21 163:13 163:21 164:16,17 164:23 165:11,25 166:2,12,23 181:7 181:9 182:4,7 183:2	purely 97:4 151:3 175:23 176:1,4
proactive 150:19	proof 143:1	proof 143:1	protection 29:8 34:7 42:2 46:2 51:21 72:3 80:12 81:21 82:4 85:1 95:14 121:5 141:1 145:11 159:18 161:10,13,17,21 161:25 162:11,13 162:14,21 163:13 163:21 164:16,17 164:23 165:11,25 166:2,12,23 181:7 181:9 182:4,7 183:2	purpose 165:1 166:20
probably 35:3 70:3 72:24 103:4 132:18 169:23 172:3	proper 157:20 158:4	proper 157:20 158:4	protection 29:8 34:7 42:2 46:2 51:21 72:3 80:12 81:21 82:4 85:1 95:14 121:5 141:1 145:11 159:18 161:10,13,17,21 161:25 162:11,13 162:14,21 163:13 163:21 164:16,17 164:23 165:11,25 166:2,12,23 181:7 181:9 182:4,7 183:2	purposes 37:4,9 181:21
problem 143:23,25 179:24	properly 31:15 60:12 120:21 148:23	properly 31:15 60:12 120:21 148:23	protection 29:8 34:7 42:2 46:2 51:21 72:3 80:12 81:21 82:4 85:1 95:14 121:5 141:1 145:11 159:18 161:10,13,17,21 161:25 162:11,13 162:14,21 163:13 163:21 164:16,17 164:23 165:11,25 166:2,12,23 181:7 181:9 182:4,7 183:2	pursue 52:23 53:2
problematic 148:8 148:9	proportionate 91:13 119:16	proportionate 91:13 119:16	protection 29:8 34:7 42:2 46:2 51:21 72:3 80:12 81:21 82:4 85:1 95:14 121:5 141:1 145:11 159:18 161:10,13,17,21 161:25 162:11,13 162:14,21 163:13 163:21 164:16,17 164:23 165:11,25 166:2,12,23 181:7 181:9 182:4,7 183:2	pursuing 5:20
problems 65:15 66:18,19 67:12 86:2 148:2,3,6,13	proposed 34:6	proposed 34:6	protection 29:8 34:7 42:2 46:2 51:21 72:3 80:12 81:21 82:4 85:1 95:14 121:5 141:1 145:11 159:18 161:10,13,17,21 161:25 162:11,13 162:14,21 163:13 163:21 164:16,17 164:23 165:11,25 166:2,12,23 181:7 181:9 182:4,7 183:2	pushing 17:22 18:1 19:6,10 154:24
procedure 5:16 46:19 102:11	prosecute 26:13 72:18 75:8 109:4 118:15 119:14 122:17,18 130:22	prosecute 26:13 72:18 75:8 109:4 118:15 119:14 122:17,18 130:22	protection 29:8 34:7 42:2 46:2 51:21 72:3 80:12 81:21 82:4 85:1 95:14 121:5 141:1 145:11 159:18 161:10,13,17,21 161:25 162:11,13 162:14,21 163:13 163:21 164:16,17 164:23 165:11,25 166:2,12,23 181:7 181:9 182:4,7 183:2	put 8:14 28:25 31:15 72:21 78:23 79:15 102:11 105:3 112:25 118:23 119:20 124:5 127:1 138:11,15 147:19 151:20 160:2 163:6 176:5,10
procedures 145:11 164:3,6 173:5 181:13 182:5			protection 29:8 34:7 42:2 46:2 51:21 72:3 80:12 81:21 82:4 85:1 95:14 121:5 141:1 145:11 159:18 161:10,13,17,21 161:25 162:11,13 162:14,21 163:13 163:21 164:16,17 164:23 165:11,25 166:2,12,23 181:7 181:9 182:4,7 183:2	puts 77:11
proceed 34:22 51:19 101:6			protection 29:8 34:7 42:2 46:2 51:21 72:3 80:12 81:21 82:4 85:1 95:14 121:5 141:1 145:11 159:18 161:10,13,17,21 161:25 162:11,13 162:14,21 163:13 163:21 164:16,17 164:23 165:11,25 166:2,12,23 181:7 181:9 182:4,7 183:2	putting 17:11 53:24

72:16 97:15 174:21	quotes 71:11	reaches 116:21	39:11 53:22 93:12	recruiting 69:3
<hr/> Q <hr/>	<hr/> R <hr/>	reacted 64:5	124:1 131:7	rectified 18:9 90:13
qualification 113:5	raise 68:13 105:16	read 13:21 22:20	154:22	redacted 18:19
qualified 136:3	183:9	37:25 43:14 47:15	reassurance 52:16	22:25 45:20 51:23
155:8	raised 4:24 40:22	56:4 58:9 72:11	reassure 62:1	57:8
quality 98:8	84:3 105:16	73:4 78:9 95:20	recall 41:16 42:11	redaction 50:25
quantity 8:23	183:21	116:8,11 122:11	43:8,9,10 59:5	85:3
question 41:7 44:3	ran 50:12 178:22	124:2 135:11	182:21,23 183:1	redactions 13:22
47:2 54:20 78:19	rang 15:7 69:12	155:17 178:5	recalled 52:5	160:5,6,10
82:13,14 86:22	range 39:10 54:20	reading 55:7 94:16	recalling 12:14	refer 28:24 55:2
87:4,6,17 91:25	90:4 102:8 115:9	103:11	receipt 167:25	80:11 102:22
92:14 95:24 99:15	ranks 3:25	ready 15:13	receive 5:11 78:4,6	135:25
100:12,15,19	rape 93:17 113:6	real 88:11,13	115:20	reference 8:4 13:20
102:24 121:6,11	113:11,17 120:24	131:10	received 4:13,14	21:17,25 28:21
124:9 129:19	157:19	realistic 31:14	5:12 30:13,14	30:15,17 33:3
131:6 133:19	rash 48:25	110:15 112:13	37:15 52:2 86:1	47:20 49:20 57:4
141:25 151:5,23	RASSO 134:4	146:1,17	164:25 165:12	58:13,22 71:11
157:8,11 180:24	rate 156:2	reality 177:2 180:9	receiving 45:4	77:13,14 95:19
questioned 22:10	Ravenscroft 56:22	180:12	recognised 33:15	117:19 118:3
64:8	56:24	really 14:10,17,18	recollect 148:22	124:3 128:14
questioning 101:1	RC-A420 93:18	15:15,15 16:13	recollection 32:18	129:10 139:12
questions 17:14	RC-A591 46:5	19:18 50:4 77:12	32:21,22 70:4	143:4 147:9
18:23 20:10,20	RC-A595 8:24 13:2	98:10 103:10	165:4 172:21,22	174:13 182:15
32:23 91:24 97:19	13:22 19:7 26:9	112:10 118:22	182:13	referenced 77:21
97:20,21 104:14	33:4 50:15 51:17	121:23 130:13,20	recommend 169:17	references 77:1
104:21 112:18	121:16	130:22 137:10	171:15	referral 124:16
117:3,5 141:17,18	RC-A598 52:4	143:19 145:19	recommendation	167:24
141:20 142:1,2	RC-A6 56:9 57:24	146:5,20 147:11	32:6,8 80:18,22	referrals 41:8
148:19 155:20,23	58:8 134:17 142:4	153:12 154:24	169:2,18	101:2
155:25 158:11	RC-A618 44:19	174:25 178:14	recommendations	referred 1:10 28:23
184:15,21	RC-F282 9:9	180:7 181:20	81:3,4,9 130:23	47:23 49:14
quickly 39:19 60:8	RC-F310 9:22 39:2	reason 34:19 39:3	reconsidered	100:14 101:16
67:9 144:15	RC-F311 9:22	41:3 50:1 87:12	123:22	114:4,13 135:15
149:14 151:20	RC-F312 9:23	92:5 124:6 150:11	reconvene 183:8	139:22 144:17
183:9	RC-F41 40:21	167:14	184:3	146:21 147:8
quiet 62:4	64:16,18,21 65:1	reasonable 5:18	record 83:1 105:3,5	168:1,10 169:14
quite 2:23 7:1 12:5	65:5,6 67:11,11	35:19,25 36:1,4	105:17 150:3	176:21,25
19:18 34:11 35:12	67:14,15,20	38:8 52:22 53:1	166:2 167:2	referring 78:25
39:10,19 63:21	RC-F46 9:15	74:4 82:1,5 91:13	recorded 56:4	79:23 103:25
65:9,11 75:1 92:3	re-evaluated 172:6	93:15 121:19	100:3	104:4,9,10 175:25
106:20 111:11	re-opened 77:19	132:3 136:5	recording 6:15,16	refers 40:20 76:21
130:13 132:15	78:16	139:23 140:1	118:12 164:9	77:16 148:4
138:4 148:10,23	re-read 18:18	143:13 144:14	165:5,7	reflection 101:21
152:25 177:14	reach 103:3	155:3	records 2:21 99:17	reflections 91:22
	reached 5:22 44:1	reasonably 124:6	121:7 164:21	101:20
		reasons 27:17 31:3	165:23 166:3	reflects 167:1

refresh 55:7 75:22 95:16 102:16	141:1 156:20 157:9	remark 77:23	reputation 68:21	responding 2:9 164:13,18
refused 56:20 64:8 65:18 72:9,10,19	relationship 41:17 41:21 42:2 65:10	remember 14:16 16:15 20:17 60:20	request 44:17 46:21,24 47:4	response 2:13 42:22 68:4 69:17
refuses 70:15	41:21 42:2 65:10	62:20 63:14	85:1 181:8	responsibilities 88:7 109:1 146:11
regard 175:7,24	65:19 70:14 72:25	138:13 143:8	requested 37:8 45:6 46:9 51:14	173:4
regarding 44:22 45:4 101:17	83:25 114:15	reminder 135:10 144:16	78:3 144:21	responsibility 3:5 6:4 32:3 86:3,7,17
regards 31:22 164:8,18,20	123:3 133:4,20,22	reminds 76:5	requests 2:10 44:8 51:5 78:4,6 85:23	87:23 91:18
register 29:1	153:22 176:15	remit 146:9 181:24	93:5,14 104:1	108:17,18 109:18
registry 50:12 51:7 100:9	178:24	removal 168:8	105:9	121:8 141:14,16
regret 74:18 136:9	relationships 134:1 134:9	remove 144:22 168:11	require 46:21 109:11 110:21	153:23 163:16
regretted 15:18	relatively 110:8 114:22 115:2	removed 68:9 176:8	111:12 136:25	170:11 173:23
regular 175:17	132:22 133:10	removes 168:15	required 41:11 61:7 74:2 112:18	176:11 183:4
regularly 67:17 175:16	relax 63:11	renamed 159:18 162:18	112:22 125:16	responsible 71:3 108:15 163:20
regulation 28:8 121:5	relay 29:25	Repeat 45:22	126:2,3,4 136:4	174:21 177:16
regulatory 27:23	release 94:20	replaced 172:25	157:3 173:9	180:19 182:7
rehearsed 71:20	relevance 32:11,16	replied 61:14	requirement 137:1	rest 19:22 38:14
rejoined 107:11	relevant 1:7,11 28:17 29:3 38:8	replies 86:1	research 116:25	restriction 172:21
relate 44:17 50:14 148:16	43:20 47:20 86:11	report 4:21 6:22 7:6 26:7 28:2,18	resides 145:6,15	restrictions 79:18 162:6,7 172:10
related 143:3 174:25	118:1 127:7 153:9	38:1 39:16 40:7	resolved 78:2 183:11	restrictive 79:16
relates 121:15 174:7	153:25 165:2	41:2 43:11,12	resolving 119:21	result 33:10 47:12 65:25 66:25
relating 2:21 8:20 8:24 9:3,6,9,11,15	168:12 173:17	49:18 53:9 54:13	resource-intensive 119:23	140:25
9:18,22,25 10:1	174:17 176:25	56:25 57:6 58:1,5	resources 42:22 90:4 91:10 100:4	resulted 148:13
41:1 42:5 46:4	reliability 31:16	69:5 79:25 80:6	102:9 103:5	resulting 51:18
74:20 126:8	reliable 71:12	80:11 96:11 108:4	respect 7:17 10:9 13:2 36:25 52:13	resurface 120:3
relation 2:8 6:20 21:3 29:1 39:1	reliance 33:19 124:14	116:1,8,12,14,23	52:21 55:25 109:6	retained 6:25 119:11 166:23
40:25 41:15 44:10	reliant 6:10,13 117:1	117:4 135:5	111:5 121:9	retaining 6:17,19
44:14,21 45:17	relies 34:17 74:10	136:21 139:12	134:17 135:19	retention 6:16,16 46:15 118:12,14
51:16 53:10,15,16	relieved 166:9	147:3 148:4	137:15 139:19	119:16
54:6,10 73:12	religious 80:25 84:18 88:4,14,19	160:22 161:3	140:11,20,21	retired 4:16 5:1,4 40:13 145:4
86:19 88:5 89:20	88:22 153:10	162:9 165:11	147:25 150:24	retirement 40:16
94:10 95:13,18	162:1 168:17,18	170:5 174:10	156:13 160:10,19	retrievable 166:14
101:5,15,20,25	168:20,23 170:13	176:22 180:2	160:21,22 164:7	return 57:25 92:16 94:23 104:16
102:5 103:13	173:18 177:24	reported 2:9 135:7 143:8,10,10,11	165:6 168:19,20	123:21 158:25
105:22 121:19	178:1	157:10	169:15 172:10,12	165:19
127:16 137:9,14	reluctant 54:4	reporting 7:13	177:23 179:3,10	returned 86:10
	rely 88:8 116:11	reports 4:8,14,20 5:11,14 6:7 43:2	180:14,17	reveal 22:2
	relying 40:25 116:7	82:8 139:14	respects 32:21 36:18	
	remain 170:1	represent 183:16		
	remainder 158:19	representative 45:2		
	remained 126:14			

revealed 90:16	180:14,22	122:2 161:17	42:13,17 44:6,9	156:19
Revenue 107:7	roles 2:23 115:18	satisfactory 119:9	44:12,24 48:7,10	seconds 60:23
Reverend 178:4	163:5,25 164:17	satisfied 110:18,19	49:2 52:17 57:2,4	secret 19:17
review 2:20 116:22	168:12 173:8	satisfies 110:6	58:17,18,19,20,21	secretary 14:25,25
155:6 156:15	Rolodex 117:15	saw 17:24 19:8,21	59:14 61:15 63:1	36:2 44:7
reviewed 155:10	Roman 58:25	26:22,24 49:23	65:13,25 66:2,3,5	section 18:18
reviewing 145:20	Rome 45:13 83:23	64:24 139:16	66:7 68:4,15,22	101:21 164:16
reviews 156:14	86:10 93:4 104:3	167:9	69:24 71:8,25	sectioned 148:14
Richardson 4:16	room 19:19 20:16	saying 12:19 17:4	83:25 95:15	sections 62:14
83:10,13 101:17	20:19 21:11 26:3	17:12 18:24 21:25	130:16 132:12	86:11
right 1:24 2:17 4:2	61:1 63:6,20	23:12 25:15 26:23	139:3 141:2	secular 84:17
4:19,22 8:7,11,16	83:22 151:23	28:3,18 29:6 51:6	144:24 145:8	secure 74:13,15,19
9:7 17:15 19:1	rooms 60:2 61:8,9	55:11 57:25 63:12	149:8 153:20	136:10 183:14
21:6,23 27:15	round 34:18 47:4	71:12 127:9 136:3	178:24 179:2,10	securely 166:13,21
34:15 38:24 39:6	route 85:16	139:3,19 152:23	179:12,13,18	securing 95:12
39:10 40:10 47:17	row 39:2 62:8	says 13:25 24:22	180:9,15 181:23	security 121:7
49:25 50:16 63:12	rub 17:21 19:5	25:24 26:19 27:1	182:3,6 183:2	see 7:21 11:1,6,7,24
70:20 77:7,15,17	rubbing 63:23	27:4 30:21 32:14	school's 180:17	12:18,22 14:8,22
80:5 82:19,19	rule 92:13	33:24 40:22 41:7	schoolboy 51:17	14:25 18:10,17
101:8 107:8,9	rules 92:11 121:5	42:1,14 43:24	schoolchildren	19:22 22:24,25
108:24 137:11	rumours 35:21,23	44:3 49:5 50:24	53:16	24:7 25:10,14
139:20 153:11	36:5 53:14 68:20	51:4,24 53:9,13	schooled 157:24	30:20 34:23 35:22
155:5 158:6 160:3	run 14:12 42:18	54:3 56:14,15,19	schools 27:13 154:1	37:1,2,8,18,22
162:18 168:4	95:2 170:10	56:21 58:16 68:1	180:19,21 181:23	38:6,25 39:2,18
177:14	runs 24:17	73:21 74:1,11	schoolteacher	47:5 48:2,3,24
right-hand 25:8	rush 60:7	75:8 78:18,18	27:12	49:18 50:7,19
rigours 148:24	Ruth 44:7,23	84:22 89:22	sciences 21:8	51:12 53:3,5
ring 20:2 71:14		102:25 103:15	scope 149:20	54:13 55:9 57:2
76:5	S	110:5 125:4	screen 13:18 58:12	57:14,23 61:16
rise 91:15 104:15	safe 30:18	135:24 178:7	134:25 160:2	64:9 67:11 70:15
risk 24:18 86:19	safeguard 153:24	scanned 119:20	screens 18:17	72:19 76:25 78:8
101:11 145:9	safeguarding 41:13	scapegoat 16:12	se 122:21	82:1 83:2 88:20
167:24 168:15	42:7 45:12,25	scenario 157:18	search 5:19 48:23	91:3 92:16,25
171:10,16,17,21	82:14,21 84:16,20	175:14	85:15 117:9,16,17	93:15 95:17 96:18
171:24,25 172:6	84:24 86:15,21	scenarios 157:22	117:18,19,21	96:20 98:7 100:12
risk-averse 112:25	88:1,2,3,8,12,15	Sceptic' 78:24	118:7	101:22 102:2
risks 145:13	88:18,21 95:14	schedule 8:9 38:12	searched 120:12	113:16 131:12
robberies 115:8	141:1,8 146:11	93:23	searches 100:7,9	135:5 136:21
robust 153:3	159:19 162:18	scheme 155:6	second 29:3,4	137:17 143:6
role 2:7 5:7,8,10	173:23	Schengen 90:19	30:13 39:1 59:18	146:23 147:1,7,24
28:6 43:14 80:23	sake 15:21 21:6	school 8:10 10:21	63:21 64:1 74:21	149:16,21 164:21
82:21 102:20	105:7	15:8,9 16:2,5,6,7	75:5,24 102:5	165:1 166:11
108:3 161:15	salient 172:24	16:10,14 20:6	103:12 110:20	168:9 169:25
163:20,23 170:16	salt 112:4	26:22 27:18,20,23	124:2 135:13,19	172:12 177:12
170:21 175:23	sanction 122:25	28:7,10,12 36:21	135:22 167:8,21	seeing 43:8,9
176:1,4 179:21,25	sat 17:7,9 20:7 22:9	36:21 40:4 41:9	Secondly 59:10	seek 32:7 71:15

150:20	4:16,17,18 37:3	168:2 173:13	Shaun 4:16 83:10	66:25 67:2,3
seen 11:10 45:10	43:13 50:11 83:9	servicing 5:5	83:13	sidetracked 158:1
56:21 57:20 62:12	83:10 94:5 151:1	set 2:11,12 85:9	shed 98:3	significance 178:10
100:10 104:24	serious 7:14 62:2	89:13 107:6 111:2	sheds 170:6	significant 31:10
138:12 141:4,5	107:7 109:6 113:7	112:17 124:21	sheet 37:1	96:24 128:6,8,11
145:20 147:12	118:25 153:19	125:4 133:11	Shipperlee 41:16	128:11 155:15
172:14 178:11	157:19 169:10	136:22 143:21	44:11,13,20,25	silence 69:13
180:15	seriously 7:11	144:2 152:17	45:1,11 47:12	similar 63:21 76:7
seized 89:16 90:16	62:10 72:1 78:21	154:13,23 164:3	48:13 49:6 50:17	157:8
select 60:3	96:13 182:4	172:9 173:7	50:21 51:15,15	similarities 98:2
selected 60:10	seriousness 7:10	sets 5:16	68:3 83:20 84:5	simply 49:12 57:3
selectively 121:22	147:16	settee 15:14 17:7,7	84:14 86:11 92:7	68:18 88:18
send 117:20 148:10	serve 80:24	17:9	92:10,12,17 94:2	115:16 121:1,10
156:4	served 3:2 70:10	setting 65:24	94:11,15,25 95:4	123:10 137:10
sends 28:14	service 1:17,19	settled 37:14	95:9 145:10	180:7
senior 27:5,12	3:17,21 4:4 5:6,9	seven 9:3,21 10:13	176:18 177:16	single 5:20 90:2
73:10 75:17 95:5	5:22 6:9 28:15,22	108:14	179:3,7 180:5	161:23
108:18 114:8,22	28:23 34:20,21	severely 16:17	Shipperlee's 41:18	sir 174:24
sense 8:23 67:21	36:9 58:2 73:10	sex 73:2	shirt 59:16 63:8	sir' 16:25 17:4
88:6 91:15,19	80:1 84:21,24	sexual 2:9,21,25	shocked 15:12	Sirene 90:12
94:13 113:24	86:21 88:2,8,12	3:6 7:9 13:14	24:22 25:12	sister 14:2 20:21
128:18 174:5	88:15 100:4	22:11 23:4,22	short 1:10 18:8,12	21:24 22:15 29:14
175:5 179:13	104:25 105:5,20	40:18 43:17 53:10	104:18 107:25	31:4 33:5 127:4
sensitivities 109:13	106:5 107:5,11,11	58:22,23 65:14	108:5 109:2	128:18
sent 14:23 15:23	107:13,17,20	66:19 68:16,17	133:10 159:2	sister's 20:16
28:16,18,21 45:2	108:19,20 109:25	72:25 95:25	shorthand 163:6	sit 45:2 60:14 87:20
57:15 66:1 89:8	113:24 115:19,23	108:10 111:6,7	177:15	87:24 158:18,21
113:23,25 123:17	116:21 117:9	113:7,18,19 115:4	shortly 52:7	site 145:23
144:21 145:24,25	122:20 123:4,8,9	119:4 126:8	shorts 17:18,19	sits 1:6
146:16 149:11	133:11 140:25	128:14 129:11,19	19:4,16 26:4 63:8	situation 64:19
182:14	141:5,7,9,12	131:23 134:3,13	63:20	situations 148:16
sentence 102:5	143:23 150:16,23	152:15 154:19	shoulder 17:9	155:6
120:8 174:7	152:2,21 153:9	156:2 157:19	shoulders 68:15	six 9:14 16:7 90:8
175:22	154:10 155:7,12	sexually 29:6 59:3	shower 59:11 61:5	107:1 108:14
separate 80:14 93:8	156:1,24 175:17	67:5 68:11 69:10	61:7,10,19,25	sixth 48:5
97:14 113:8	175:18,25	shape 96:16	showering 49:3	Skelton 9:16 40:22
122:13 166:15	Service's 108:25	share 42:6	showers 49:2 61:18	skills 69:1 158:8
171:17 180:3	118:13	shared 46:1,13	62:12 139:3	skip 43:13
separating 97:13	services 20:3 21:21	sharing 46:14	shown 140:2	sleeping 66:19
September 37:2,10	22:7 24:1 28:10	Sharpling 99:14	shows 120:2	slight 128:5
40:15 43:17 79:14	34:3,14 42:10	100:2,12,22 101:5	shrugged 68:15	slightly 70:3 83:12
147:2,4	45:25 46:4 49:14	101:13 105:8	shut 63:5	105:13 136:23
sequence 59:4	82:23 88:18 95:18	155:22,24 156:4,7	sibling 14:2	174:24 175:2
79:12	100:15 107:22	156:12,18 157:8	sic 52:4	Sloan 4:15 83:9,13
Serena 4:17 43:13	108:3 124:17	157:16 158:10	side 20:11 22:24	101:17
sergeant 4:1,15,15	154:2,4 157:11	Sharpling's 105:4	25:9 30:2,18	slow 12:25

slowly 63:24	89:24 90:7,10,21	113:11,11 154:14	146:7	136:15,17 138:9
sly 17:15 19:2	91:6 92:8,15,25	158:4	stages 91:11 146:22	138:14 139:16
smack 14:11	93:3,17,21 94:8	specialists 113:9	stand 60:2 112:19	140:17 147:9,15
smacks 14:9,13	94:10,25 95:3	specially 113:8	112:23 125:8,15	148:1 152:18
small 12:5 40:5	101:18,25 104:1	154:14	148:23	160:5,19 168:6
51:12 83:11	120:16,23 143:2	specific 7:12 40:20	standard 99:19	173:7 177:19
115:15 130:16	144:19,21 145:2	76:25	108:6 143:1	178:5,25
160:21,24	145:14 146:24	specifically 1:22	standards 33:15	statements 21:4,5
smile 14:12 16:25	150:24 152:3	56:9 77:21 122:14	standing 17:20	28:17 41:11 45:8
smiling 20:7	Soper's 83:22	180:4	stands 50:25	55:10 58:10,10
smokescreen 27:9	85:25 90:15 92:4	specifics 180:5,25	109:15	78:5 125:6 127:4
social 20:3,5,8 21:7	92:7,17 94:19	spectacles 150:8	stared 59:17 60:9	132:11 138:9
21:21 22:7,21	sorry 13:19 18:10	speculate 141:3	63:11,18	states 32:10 75:2
24:1,5 28:10 30:2	18:14,20 24:24	156:25 157:3	staring 63:22	stating 172:3
34:3,14 42:10	40:10 50:18	speculation 74:7	start 13:1 40:6	station 25:17 40:15
45:25 46:4 49:14	103:10 112:10	76:22 77:14,22	78:20 100:22	115:7
82:23 95:18	140:14 143:20	79:2 138:6	124:22	statistics 156:1,11
100:15 124:17	148:1 165:21	spend 130:2 164:6	started 11:24 17:21	status 165:18
127:12,21 129:10	177:9 179:10	spoke 48:12 73:13	19:5 58:17 78:23	statute 126:13
154:2,4 157:11	sort 27:14 62:6	85:11,18 88:24	90:24 119:17	statutory 101:10
168:2 173:13	75:15 99:17	103:16 149:22	162:8 163:9,9	150:18 167:24
175:25	117:24 157:17	spoken 4:11 21:9	starting 79:6	168:11 169:9,14
socially 71:3	170:21	21:10 25:11 32:2	state 85:24 151:16	171:12,13
society 100:25	sorts 133:1,25	51:14 52:2,5 53:7	stated 25:1,20,23	stayed 49:3 61:9
Soham 143:25	157:22	56:20,21 62:11	71:15 160:15	64:5
solely 72:13	sought 171:23	70:3 87:7 89:3	statement 1:7,10	stealing 15:19
solicitor 25:17 27:2	173:4	136:1 141:23,23	13:15,21,23 18:22	steps 81:7,14
156:5	South 115:17	spreads 53:9	21:24 22:8,9,20	140:24 174:18
solicitors 27:2,6	Southall 29:8	SR 85:18 86:6,25	23:12,23 24:2,8	183:18
69:25	span 167:4	St 8:10 10:21 16:5	25:23 26:17 28:13	stereotypes 154:16
somewhat 89:2	speak 21:22 24:6	40:19 41:9 42:13	28:19,24 30:1	157:25
103:14,18 128:23	36:1 39:4 52:25	43:21 44:5 58:17	33:9 36:24 41:5	stole 15:3
137:25 147:17	153:15,16,17	59:2 65:13 68:2	42:25 43:5,11	stood 87:14 129:5
son 15:21 51:23	speaking 36:10	70:11 71:24 95:15	47:11 53:23 54:10	stop 26:2 51:12
Soper 9:6,12,16,18	50:4 52:13 64:18	141:2 178:24	54:12,14 55:1	162:25
9:19,22,23,25	84:14 85:13	179:2 181:11,25	56:15 58:11,14	stopping 68:16
10:1,5,9 12:2	125:17	staff 36:3,6 44:22	69:7 73:12,12	storage 119:19,22
26:17,18 27:19	speaks 45:16 51:22	141:23 181:11	78:4,15 79:21	stories 67:18
28:13 40:21 43:20	special 54:23 113:4	stage 27:15,22 28:5	83:9 84:4 89:15	strand 4:24 5:20
45:13 47:7 52:5	113:4 114:12	30:9 43:9 49:24	89:19 91:15 93:8	strands 10:19
83:8,24 84:6,9,13	specialisation	50:7,13 52:20	95:8,16 106:18	strange 19:19
84:24 85:6,15,19	113:21	67:7 84:5 92:3,5	109:1 110:23	strangeness 139:2
86:4,7,8,13,17,19	specialisms 90:3	98:12 109:11	112:17 121:17	strategic 161:18
86:24 87:1,3,5,8	102:8,13	110:13,20 116:14	122:13 124:21,23	strategy 42:5,9
87:12,18 88:5	specialist 1:22 7:17	116:17 121:2,25	125:18 127:9,12	163:21 174:16
89:1,8,10,16,20	7:21 108:13 113:6	130:19 139:10	128:20,23 135:11	Stratford 161:15

streets 65:24	81:4 156:14	12:19 126:25	T	task 90:2 102:7,12
strength 111:18	successive 165:16	137:23 147:5	tab 1:7 55:3 134:18	taught 43:21
112:4 129:14	suffer 70:24 151:22	149:23 162:21	135:1	teacher 13:12,15
130:8 133:20	suffered 69:14	supportive 42:8	table 83:3	14:23,23 21:9,10
153:6	148:2	153:2	tainting 24:18	21:10,15,20 27:22
strengthen 112:12	suffering 70:19	supports 126:25	take 6:7 11:23	28:20 44:6 48:6
127:18 147:24	sufficiency 34:21	137:24	17:18 18:8 19:3	48:10,11 56:22
155:4	sufficient 5:3 58:3	suppose 180:4	21:4 39:9 49:5,12	57:3 61:7 130:16
strengthened 134:1	110:14 131:1	sure 19:18 21:23	49:19 64:14,23	144:19
strengths 131:11	146:1	40:22 59:3 128:5	70:20 71:6,25	teacher's 127:8
stress 67:25	suggest 142:8	137:11 141:6,16	78:21 79:22 81:14	teachers 16:8 40:19
stretched 42:23	suggested 33:22	145:22 156:16	83:4 85:17 104:15	40:23 132:8
strict 75:3	62:1 127:13,25	surface 125:6 132:5	109:7,21,22	teaching 145:7
strictly 36:10	128:22 176:23	172:4	110:24 112:24	team 7:20 12:4,5
string 92:24	suggesting 127:7	surprised 25:13	115:3 122:3	29:8 35:8,10,10
strong 32:1,8 91:19	suggestion 149:2,5	surprising 32:13	126:24 127:22	43:15 51:21 84:8
stronger 153:3	149:7,10 156:21	86:25	128:4 130:4,6	86:15 90:1,7,9,22
strongly 130:13	suggestions 153:13	surrender 151:11	133:6,13 140:25	90:25 91:9,14
struck 120:5,7	suggests 55:4 93:23	surrounding 149:2	148:6 151:15,18	97:11,15,16
structure 84:2	94:11	survivors' 134:14	151:19 153:21	114:23 132:21
162:11	suicide 64:15	suspect 24:1,7,19	154:25 157:4	133:12 144:3
structured 42:21	sum 92:21	37:10 57:25 98:25	165:23 170:15	150:21 161:13
structures 163:7	summarise 21:6	126:15 127:1	175:17 180:25	162:11 177:4
student 73:13	111:9	138:2 145:4 148:1	182:23	teams 102:18 134:4
181:17	summarised 38:15	152:25	taken 6:6 7:11	154:14
students 132:8	summarises 56:13	suspend 27:6	14:21 15:1 16:22	technical 121:6
141:24	summary 8:17 13:7	suspicion 68:14	20:22 22:18 23:10	teenage 58:24
stupid 63:16	38:25 40:12 59:6	suspicious 176:24	23:23 24:2 26:17	teenager 59:1
subject 16:22 23:2	115:23 139:14	suspicious 51:24	27:5 28:19 29:18	telephone 53:4 70:6
48:15 74:6 80:14	153:8	swift 33:13	41:5 43:10 53:23	tell 2:3 15:25 16:14
110:11	Sun 79:8	swiftly 39:22	55:17 59:15,23	20:3,8 21:15
submission 85:1	superior 163:2	swimming 48:19,22	61:6 67:2 69:21	24:15 65:2,21
submissions 106:3	173:18	48:23 59:8,9,23	81:7 83:2 96:13	67:14 69:9 75:14
submit 4:3 115:22	superseded 164:4	59:24,25 60:8	128:1 135:12	75:21 76:18 77:25
submitted 58:2	supervise 163:17	69:11 138:17	142:18 152:1,14	100:20 133:9
85:23	supervised 40:17	sworn 1:12,13	152:17 160:18	telling 20:17 31:17
submitting 3:15,20	43:15 60:1 113:19	106:11,12 159:6	174:18 183:18	64:9 65:20 82:10
subsequent 38:3	supervision 88:16	184:11,17,23	takes 11:3,7 58:7	89:3 103:19
81:20 93:4	94:10	sympathy 129:11	102:20 168:13	117:22 124:6
subsequently 37:13	supervisor 103:3	system 7:13 49:4	talk 125:20 144:1	174:24
37:22 78:10 84:8	support 27:15 35:6	100:8 117:13,14	168:18	tells 25:8 50:14
107:10 128:16,20	54:21 57:8 66:12	117:16 118:5	talked 63:16 64:25	temporarily 176:9
152:8,11	170:13,24	119:21 130:14	talking 73:25	temporary 168:8
substantiate 98:18	supported 29:13,16	151:20 166:14	168:19	ten 17:4 64:12
132:17 149:17	54:23	systems 99:8 144:4	talks 65:23 89:22	tend 87:15
successful 72:6	supporting 11:6		tally 80:16	tenor 94:11

termed 5:17	27:24 31:9,20,25	172:9 176:20	41:10,22 44:23	142:10 147:11
terms 6:17 7:10	32:4,19 33:11	177:19 178:5	47:10 48:10 56:1	toll 65:15
28:6,8 31:9 32:3	34:14,23 35:2,3,7	180:1,12,15,23	58:19,22 59:2	tomorrow 159:13
32:17 46:11 59:22	35:10 36:15 39:12	183:5	60:4 61:20 62:11	180:25 183:8
73:5 76:8 77:3	40:5 41:5 43:2	thinking 12:16,19	63:22 64:22 65:19	184:3
82:20 88:1 93:16	46:25 47:13,14,17	12:23 66:24 68:19	66:5 67:5,20,21	tongue 14:13,15
96:16,23 97:2,6	47:23 51:6 55:3	97:3 98:19 110:4	73:2 78:10 80:4	top 6:24 25:10 29:4
99:4 100:24	55:16 56:3 57:1	third 30:21 46:20	81:13 89:10 91:5	53:13 59:16 61:15
102:21 115:18	57:17 68:10,12	46:21,23 73:19	91:7,8,13 92:7	63:7 84:24 124:7
117:6 118:12	70:3 75:18 78:22	74:23 75:6 112:17	94:1 95:6 96:6,8	143:6 156:16
123:20 131:3	78:22 79:1,5	124:21 134:10	96:14,20 98:5	topical 121:3
138:11 140:5	80:15 87:20,22	147:20 168:8	99:22 115:15	totality 10:22 11:8
152:1 153:25	92:14,20,22 93:1	Thirdly 59:13	116:21 122:16	31:25 75:1
157:17 175:25	93:7,25 94:5 95:3	thorough 34:24	129:6 130:2	totally 25:19
177:20 180:4	96:7 97:8,12,17	thoroughly 26:11	131:15 133:10	touch 19:25
test 100:5 110:6,10	98:5 100:7,23,25	96:22 102:3	137:4 140:9	touched 43:24 59:7
110:11,12,13,18	102:21 103:4,24	thought 14:19 15:5	141:21 143:24	60:16 66:23
125:25	103:25 104:3,10	15:11,22,25 21:20	145:18 150:2,9	touching 60:18
text 22:24	106:14 111:20	23:20 32:5 62:2	156:20,21 157:1,2	74:22 75:25
thank 1:5 40:11	112:3 119:9,15	64:10 112:23	158:14 181:18	135:22
50:18 97:22	120:9,10,20 122:2	139:17 140:21	182:13 183:10	towel 59:8 60:17
100:12 101:13	123:23 124:21,22	145:8 149:7	times 15:14 16:5	trace 48:14 50:13
102:24 103:12	124:23 125:22	180:10 183:3	17:4 45:11 63:24	51:1,2,4,4,9,11
104:13,14,14	126:3,4,10,24	threatened 64:4	88:6 144:25	56:23 57:22
108:8 121:3	127:17 128:2,3,10	65:17	timescale 77:9	traced 56:22 57:5
147:10 155:20,24	129:5 131:4,6,15	threats 65:16	timing 18:5 27:7	trained 100:20
158:10,11,25	131:17,18,20	three 10:8 15:14	tip 35:14	113:8 154:15
159:5,10 183:7,7	132:1,2,3,9,18	19:15 64:3 93:8	title 162:15	training 99:12
183:19,20 184:2	136:14,16,18	118:24 119:7	today 1:18 131:3	100:23 113:4,13
theft 33:21 124:13	137:2,4,5,6,7	120:19 137:6	147:4 152:11	157:17,20 158:3,8
theoretically	138:1,8,10,10	147:12	159:10,23 172:15	182:9
122:24	139:6,7,18,21,22	three-page 165:14	180:24	transcript 105:25
theory 137:7	139:25 140:2,9,9	three-seater 17:6	told 14:25 15:4,7	transferred 89:12
thing 70:20 104:21	140:10,18 141:11	threshold 5:22	15:13 17:17,18	104:5
117:24	142:5,17 146:13	thrust 180:2	18:4,5 19:3,16	transparent 44:12
things 14:6 17:12	147:15,16,22,23	Thursday 16:20	20:2,18,21,21,24	45:10
33:16 35:6 39:18	148:18 149:1,10	20:1 25:5,24	21:10 22:15 24:12	transposed 90:12
47:11 63:12,25	149:13,20 150:2,2	135:8 183:15,18	24:20 40:13 49:6	traumatic 32:19,25
64:25 71:17 101:3	150:8,14,15,19	Thursday' 24:25	57:4 61:24 62:1	70:17
102:1,4 119:20	151:4 152:3,13,20	tie 59:16 63:7	62:10,13 63:2,3	travelled 90:16
123:2 125:17	154:10 155:14	time 1:11 3:8,19	63:11 64:10,21,23	treating 65:1
131:24 133:24	158:23 159:11	5:25 6:22 7:18	66:18 67:5,7,11	tree' 14:8
178:19	160:25 161:8	12:21 14:24 15:11	68:14,20,22 69:13	Tregaskis 80:13
think 4:7,13 6:24	162:17 163:19	15:16 18:2 21:6	69:20 70:22 72:20	171:20
10:25 12:13,14	164:9 165:2,9	23:16 26:9 29:17	87:12 88:9 92:17	Tregaskis's 160:22
13:4 18:3 19:11	168:6,22 170:5	35:3,22 36:10	95:5 117:24 118:2	170:5

trend 111:9	Turner 42:3 144:17	60:9,25	114:12 115:12	variety 53:14
trial 43:23 45:1,5	159:4,6,8,17	unconvincing	121:8 143:21	148:16
47:7,8,9 70:16	162:22 163:12	71:18	144:10,18 145:2	various 4:9 46:12
71:9 76:17 84:9	180:17 181:5	uncorroborated	United 92:16 93:6	59:5 73:14 74:6
84:13 87:14 109:8	183:7 184:23	126:16	93:10 94:23	80:7 84:12 118:9
113:17 138:1	turning 22:20	undergone 182:8	units 113:8 134:4,6	129:1 173:8
148:24 152:12	79:21 144:15	undermine 31:16	134:7 154:24	vary 116:3,4,19
tribunal 142:23,25	161:5 162:11	36:18 136:20	157:20	Vatican 85:21,24
trick 50:6	163:12 171:10	undermines 136:22	universal 86:12	86:1 89:9,11,12
tried 61:25 64:3,13	two 9:8 10:14 30:12	underpants 59:17	unlocked 19:20	89:21 94:24 95:1
65:17 150:14	53:9 55:9,17	understand 18:15	unnamed 9:4,19	Vatican's 85:10
tries 14:4	59:13,22 60:22	62:15 68:19 70:9	10:2	verbal 64:6
Trood 178:4	61:4 62:20 73:16	71:24 73:2 154:16	unnecessary 60:5	verify 94:22
trouble 65:25	117:17,21 123:2	154:18,22 156:12	unpopular 70:12	verse 76:19
160:24	135:12,21 138:9	159:14 160:17,19	unsuccessful 38:6	versed 145:10
troubled 128:2	143:12,13 149:17	173:22 179:13	untouchable 70:23	version 111:17
136:23	165:14 170:24	understandable	unusual 34:8,8	versions 112:16
trousers 59:17	179:14	39:11	unwilling 54:16	vested 99:12 122:1
135:13 138:22	two- 17:6	understanding	55:4,11	victim 55:18 72:7
144:22	two-stage 110:6	7:12 32:19 39:14	up' 125:8,15	74:16 142:23
true 94:22	twofold 170:22	39:15 47:15 96:9	update 183:17,25	145:2 154:19
trunks 48:23 53:24	type 68:19 102:13	99:13,25 100:24	updated 183:15	155:8
138:16	118:21 125:8	101:9 131:21	updates 45:4	victim/survivor
trust 96:11	133:18 135:5	undertake 83:13	upper 48:25	165:13
trusted 145:13	163:15	99:7 173:4 176:2	upset 64:12 69:22	victims 39:11 41:19
trusts 16:2	types 34:11 57:13	undertaken 86:5	upsetting 61:22	58:7 96:10,12
truth 5:19 20:25	115:8 119:10	89:15 167:3	73:6,8	130:2 131:23
21:2 31:18 67:3	154:13	undertakes 88:3	URN 118:3	victims' 134:13
71:14 89:3 103:19	typical 150:2	undertook 84:15	use 58:9 61:17	155:5 156:15
124:7	156:19,21 157:1	163:25	99:22 102:18	victims/witnesses
truthful 26:12 76:7		underwear 63:9,20	112:21,22 128:17	41:12
76:11	U	undid 63:7,8	137:7 138:19	video 61:3,11 62:10
truthfulness 31:9	UK 85:10,24 90:11	undress 60:12	167:8,11,14,16	62:12,13 65:21
try 11:5 38:1 47:22	ultimate 108:17	61:10	useful 138:11	135:15 139:2,5
57:22 75:20	109:7,18 122:16	undue 112:25	uses 16:12	videoed 59:10
112:12 155:1	122:25	unexpected 33:6	usual 3:25 92:11	61:22,25
trying 37:23 50:6	ultimately 6:12	unfair 15:5,25	usually 115:19,23	videoing 135:16
111:22 146:25	87:23 108:22	unfastened 59:16	115:25	view 14:18 15:17
Tuesday 1:1 26:22	109:17 140:1	unfortunately 38:5	utterly 72:2	22:10 24:16,17
turmoil 33:10	153:23	74:14 75:3		26:14 27:16,19
turn 8:3 13:17	unable 53:16	unfounded 80:20	V	28:3 31:13,14
22:22 25:7 26:7	120:13	unintended 163:1	vacant 68:25	34:18 86:16 123:7
37:1 88:24 134:24	uncle 67:5 71:3	unique 117:19	valid 125:22	125:21,24 129:24
143:2 167:21	136:1	118:3	value 45:21 49:16	130:5,7 132:20
173:10	uncles 70:13 72:24	unit 1:23,25 2:4	101:4	145:16 173:5
turned 137:14	uncomfortable	40:14 42:4 113:25	variation 118:20	viewed 139:5,11,13

152:5	113:13,14 115:16	96:15 97:12,17	wish 39:11,16 55:2	163:16
views 48:15 126:24	121:23 124:17	went 16:16 17:12	55:13 75:11	worked 12:4,16
Vincent 85:12	126:8 137:20	18:22 19:14,15	103:10 158:17	40:13 161:7
violence 64:6	144:2,8 150:13	20:13,16,19,19	wished 52:15	169:23
violent 145:3	175:2,3 176:1	38:17 64:15 66:23	158:18	worker 20:5,8
visited 144:18	179:4	67:11 71:9,23	wishes 8:3	22:21 24:5 30:2
visits 113:16	watched 49:3 61:9	72:12 73:15 91:5	withdrawing	129:10
voluntarily 46:24	way 3:25 11:2	96:20 114:14	174:22	worker's 127:12,21
93:3,9	15:10 17:16 19:2	153:15 165:9,9	withdrawn 65:10	working 18:15 49:2
volunteer 44:15	21:16 27:1 38:15	weren't 3:8 49:2	95:1 174:19	49:7,10 57:2
vomiting 66:21	47:13 60:21 61:23	91:7 98:13 140:12	withdrew 158:13	71:24 134:3
vulnerable 162:14	69:18 83:21	west 78:25 144:12	witness 1:5,7,12	150:19 161:6
162:19	102:23 111:22	Westminster 42:3	26:11 28:4 33:18	176:11,22
	112:20 118:7	45:18 84:15,17,23	45:3 57:7 58:5,10	workings 83:24
W	119:16 130:11	85:11,16 86:15,21	58:10,16 67:15	169:24
waistband 138:21	131:22 135:10	87:21,22 88:2,5,7	71:13,19 72:10	world 68:7
Wales 88:23 108:21	138:12 143:21	88:12 159:19	76:12 84:7 95:8	worry 62:1 63:13
164:14	144:2,16 150:4,6	161:7 162:8 164:1	104:21,23 106:10	110:25
walk 17:6	150:17,18 152:5	173:2 180:13	122:2 129:25	worry' 63:25
walked 15:1 19:15	152:15,19 154:11	wetting 127:8	158:13,24 177:19	worse 66:6 69:1
62:25	154:12,23 155:18	whereabouts 84:6	178:4	worsened 65:10
walking 17:1	157:1,2,7 176:10	85:6,20	witness's 58:13	worth 66:3,7,9,13
wallop 14:11	178:22	whilst 5:1 11:17	witnesses 57:10,13	67:8 112:3
wander 145:7	ways 66:10 117:21	31:8,20 32:1,5	130:3 138:22	worthy 76:16
wandering 153:20	We've 93:17	35:12 59:8,11	158:20	wouldn't 20:9 28:6
want 14:18 21:17	weakness 130:9	63:24 65:12 73:13	witnessing 138:15	28:7,11 32:13,20
33:15 38:16 39:4	weaknesses 111:24	76:12 77:17 99:21	won 71:6 78:20	98:20 115:4,11
39:9 57:18 60:10	112:2,12 131:11	105:18 162:7	79:4,7,10,20	117:2 123:6 142:9
66:4 101:19 102:1	wearing 150:8	wholly 117:1	142:4	146:3 167:16
105:3 118:22	179:11	wide 90:4 102:8	wonder 67:19	175:24 180:10
121:12 126:4	website 156:7	148:16 155:10	164:21	183:3
153:14 164:7,20	Wednesday 26:23	widen 149:22	wondered 157:16	wound 172:9
176:5	184:6	wider 12:17 97:3,7	158:17 160:24	wrist 14:10
wanted 52:16 69:23	week 16:5 19:22,23	128:18	word 33:16 49:13	write 167:15 181:6
70:14 90:10 91:4	22:4,16 23:18	widespread 156:24	74:16 77:22	writer 75:13 78:24
102:14,22	29:16 33:4,13	157:20	128:17 153:14,18	writes 80:17
wanting 52:25	59:22 124:10	William 159:6,17	wording 110:8	writing 26:9
180:7	127:8 128:9,10	184:23	words 17:11 63:15	written 4:14 5:3
wants 26:9	weekend 15:16	willing 54:5,12	156:19 176:5	45:12 81:13 91:22
warn 126:14	weekends 66:16	57:8 75:10 133:6	work 11:22 82:13	165:23 178:8
warning 148:10	weekly 64:24	142:12	85:11 90:4 91:12	182:12
warrant 78:22 91:5	weeks 95:2	Wimbledon 85:9	96:15 102:8,13	wrong 13:19 16:24
wasn't 12:6 14:24	weigh 129:13	win 78:21	108:5,14 115:3,5	18:3 19:11 40:9
15:24 19:17 36:10	151:14	winning 72:13	115:5,6,9 134:13	62:17 68:14 71:17
41:3,5 47:9 50:1	weight 112:25	Winter 2:1,4 11:24	144:7 155:1	132:3 155:13
81:5 82:25 103:9	welcome 1:3 39:14	81:11 97:9 99:7	161:20 162:8	165:9 169:23

wrong?' 17:3	73:1 92:13 128:7	1990 58:18 135:7	39:23 137:12,14	184:6
wrote 26:7 79:8	129:2	1990s 93:19	2004 9:6 11:2,14	20s 48:16
84:4	10-year-old 31:1	1991 106:24 135:7	12:17 37:10,11,18	21 134:24 135:1,4
Wynne 44:7,23	129:17 131:21	1992 7:25 8:12,24	55:15,24 56:12	22 27:11 48:1 86:2
<hr/>	10.00 1:2 183:8	11:5 13:2,10,11	58:1 68:2 69:6,20	121:17 135:8
X	184:3,6	13:23 16:20 30:19	70:2,9 73:11	143:8,10
X 14:22 184:9	10.30 18:11	32:3 34:21 37:20	76:21 78:1 80:9	23 94:24
X's 15:3	10.48 18:13	38:7 49:20 52:1,8	99:1 120:16,17	24 28:17,20 147:2,4
<hr/>	100 79:13 166:24	76:5 77:18 99:15	134:17 135:8	147:7
Y	106 184:17,19	100:14 104:24	136:4 137:1,11,19	25 3:3 26:7 37:10
Yeah 115:25	10th 26:23	105:7 120:14	143:2,8,10 147:2	173:8
137:11	11 13:24 20:1 22:6	122:1,16 125:21	149:25 150:4,6	26 9:14
year 14:19,20	65:23	126:17,19 128:7,8	152:2,6,7,8	27 13:20 49:5
33:21 38:16 69:23	11-year-old 13:8	129:4 130:12,20	154:12 155:16	146:24 164:11,16
101:19 118:15,17	11.00 143:11	131:16,16 133:5	156:20	165:19,20,21
118:17 119:14	11th 25:25 128:1	154:12 155:15	2005 9:8 70:10	28 135:10
144:24	12 9:5 26:24 38:3	156:20 157:10	81:10 161:2	29 168:9
years 3:3 6:25	70:2 118:23	1994 66:1 126:9,11	180:17 181:5	<hr/>
13:24 16:7 27:11	12th 22:19	1995 9:1 126:10	2006 3:23 71:9,23	3
38:3 42:17 48:5,9	13 26:8 50:11	1996 5:16 161:12	78:2 79:20 142:5	3 33:23 36:22 48:24
55:17 62:8 64:12	144:15	1997 66:18	172:8,20	53:8 143:5
80:15 89:21 96:1	14 30:11,19 37:2	1998 3:22	2007 162:17 177:6	3.10 48:1
96:2 97:25 107:1	66:14 84:22	1cm 19:14	177:19,21 178:15	3.36 159:1
108:14 110:22	105:25 145:5	<hr/>	2008 9:11 12:22	3.50 158:25
112:9 114:19	15 13:23 23:24 24:5	2	79:14,25 80:2	3.52 159:3
118:24 119:8	24:11 42:17 50:7	2 1:3 48:21 105:25	81:16,17,20	30 28:25 30:10 49:9
120:3 161:8	55:3 62:8 65:19	119:14 124:8	2009 152:9	31 124:23
166:24 181:9	66:15 96:2 173:8	161:2,3	2010 9:15 107:17	32 50:6 170:10
Yes' 15:4	181:5	2.10 104:16,19	2010/2011 152:14	33 21:25 50:18
yesterday 93:8	155 184:21	2/2 14:20	2011 9:18 92:8	103:13
105:22	159 184:23,25	20 30:16 146:24	94:24 152:12	35 53:5 105:25
yield 82:6	15th 22:19 26:25	2000 3:23 99:24	2012 9:21 107:19	161:8,9 178:25
young 23:12 32:17	27:4	2000s 12:5 99:16	179:6	36 136:16
32:25 80:19 81:2	16 25:14 27:12	105:1,10	2013 9:25 178:7,8	37 9:21
93:18 165:13	28:13 173:10	2001 9:3 10:13,14	2014 10:1 159:20	38 90:22 102:4
<hr/>	16th 24:8	11:5,14 37:21	2015 2:12 10:3	<hr/>
Z	17 67:4	40:15 47:21,24	11:23 81:12 83:16	4
zoom 22:23	18 70:9	48:1,12 49:9,24	90:6 107:19	4 13:11,14 16:20
<hr/>	19 58:1 73:11	50:18 76:20 93:17	2016 10:3 40:16	21:7 22:1 49:2
0	1973 143:7 144:19	107:3	43:17 89:8,17	83:19 124:22
<hr/>	1974 143:7	2001/2002 77:19,19	93:24 107:22	125:4 127:4,10
1	1980 58:16	2002 37:22 53:8	152:12	135:17 168:22
1 8:22 30:15 40:11	1985 107:1	55:24 159:20	2017 10:8 43:24	4.28 184:4
48:18 184:11,13	1986 110:1,10	162:9 176:16	2018 10:10 40:8	4.30 158:22
1.12 104:17	155:17,19	177:2	2019 1:1 133:5,12	40 160:21 161:1
1.45 135:8 143:11	1988 126:7,9,11	2003 10:14 39:21	134:14 150:6,8	400,000 92:9
10 6:25 13:24,25				

418 51:20	83 68:1			
42 53:8 147:9	88 22:22			
45 55:14	89 25:7 28:15			
47 40:21				
49 13:17	<u>9</u>			
4th 23:17 25:5,24 127:14,23	9 10:8 65:9			
<u>5</u>	90s 108:13 113:10 113:22 114:20 117:12 134:15			
5 1:1 26:20 30:15 39:21 58:11 125:12 146:23 165:1	97 184:15			
5.10.30 170:10	9th 26:23			
5.12 171:11				
5.2.1 164:21				
5.2.10 166:22				
5.2.2 165:22				
5.2.9 166:11				
5.4.1 168:9				
5.4.7 169:1				
50 17:13 18:25 21:18				
51 56:12				
53 10:3 57:6 165:3 165:10,10				
54 79:24				
55 165:14				
59 80:11				
597 80:3				
<u>6</u>				
6 26:18 47:21 84:4 165:3 167:9 184:6				
600 119:15				
600,000 119:15				
622 120:23				
63 10:8 67:9				
66 8:18 38:19 97:25				
<u>7</u>				
7 26:18				
73 29:3				
<u>8</u>				
8 10:2 40:8 55:3 58:8 65:9 125:18				