

[REDACTED]

NOTE FOR FILE

[REDACTED]

HAYMAN

I visited the DPP's office with [REDACTED] on 29 October 1980 to look at the HAYMAN papers. On arrival we were briefed by the Director. Tim Taylor (Assistant Director) and Jeremy Haunton (case officer) were present.

2. He examined a considerable number of documents consisting of police reports, witness statements and 45 loose-leaf files compiled by HAYMAN in manuscript and entitled "Sex Diaries".

[REDACTED]

3. From the prosecution point of view, the case is in 3 parts:-

a. On 7 December 1973 papers were received from Metropolitan Police alleging that HAYMAN and 7 others had committed offences under section 11 of the Post Office Act 1953. On 15 January 1979 it was decided that there would be no prosecution in respect of anyone named in the papers and that those concerned should be cautioned. It was clear that 5 of the accused, including HAYMAN, were members of the Paedophile Information Exchange (PIE).

b. On 14 January 1979 more papers were received from the Metropolitan Police relating to PIE. It was decided that 4 of those concerned with the organising body of PIE should be prosecuted for conspiring to corrupt public morals. On 12 February 1980 they were committed for trial at Wells Street Magistrates Court after oral evidence had been given. The trial is listed for the Central Criminal Court on 5 January 1981.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] HAYMAN, as a member of PIE, used the name "HENDERSON". The depositions in the case refer to "HENDERSON" as being a person with whom witnesses corresponded. In one part of the deposition "HAYMAN" is mentioned. There is no doubt that "HAYMAN" and "HENDERSON" are one and the same.

c. In addition to the prosecution of the 5 organisers, PIE members MORRIS and WARDELL were charged with conspiring to contravene section 11 of the Post Office Act 1953. They appeared at St Albans Crown Court on 17 October 1980, pleaded guilty and were conditionally discharged for 3 years. Both were ordered to pay £300 costs. In his statement WARDELL admitted that he had corresponded with "HENDERSON" regularly from October 1977 to 1978. It is understood that at no time during this case was "HENDERSON" or "HAYMAN" mentioned in court.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]