

**NOTICE OF DETERMINATION
CORE PARTICIPANT APPLICATION**

1. On 27 May 2016 the Inquiry invited anyone who wished to be designated as a core participant in the Roman Catholic investigation to make an application to the Solicitor to the Inquiry by 24 June 2016.
2. An application was made by Jonathan West for core participant status. A provisional ruling declining the application was made on 15 July 2016. Mr West was provided with an opportunity to renew his application at a preliminary hearing on 28 July 2016. He was unable to attend the hearing but Richard Scorer from Slater and Gordon Solicitors made submissions in support of the renewed application on his behalf. The former Chair and Panel, of which I was one, heard those submissions. Since my appointment as Chair I have considered the renewed application and submissions made in support of it, including a further email dated 29 July 2016 provided to the Investigation Lawyer for this investigation. I have consulted with my fellow Panel members and this notice sets out my determination of his application.
3. I have reminded myself of the statutory criteria that govern the determination of core participant status, in Rule 5 of the Inquiry Rules 2006. Mr West relies on the provisions in Rule 5(2)(a) and (b), which direct me to consider whether a person has played a direct and significant role in matters to which the Inquiry relates or whether a person has a significant interest in an important aspect of the matters to which the Inquiry relates. In his renewed application he also relies upon the provisions in Rule 5(2)(c), namely whether a person may be subject to explicit or significant criticism during the inquiry proceedings or in any report, or in any interim report.
4. Mr West is a campaigner who has investigated alleged abuse at Ealing Abbey (where he was a parishioner for a period of time) and to a lesser extent other English Benedictine Congregation institutions. He states that he first became interested in these issues in 2009 having read in his local paper about the conviction of Fr David

Pearce. His application is put on the basis that his interventions in relation to Ealing Abbey, St Benedict's School and Downside Abbey and School have resulted in, inter alia, Independent Schools Inspectorate intervention, revision of safeguarding policies and an Apostolic Visitation.

5. In his renewed application, Mr West sets out two main grounds under which he says he should be designated as a core participant. Firstly, he says that his involvement in St Benedict's, Downside and St Augustine's schools has been "sustained, important and effective" and that there have been occasions when he has had a decisive effect on events which would have proceeded differently without his intervention. Examples he provides of the results of the interventions include the implementation of the independent inquiry into St Benedict's School by Lord Carlile, revision of St Benedict's School safeguarding policy and the Apostolic Visitation. It is too early in the investigation for me to be able to assess whether Mr West's interventions have had the direct effect that he believes they did, but it is apparent that over a period of years he has had significant involvement with a number of English Benedictine Institutions and affiliated institutions.
6. Secondly, Mr West asserts that he may be subject to explicit or significant criticism during the Inquiry proceedings. He has provided a copy of a speech made by the headmaster of St Benedict's school and Mr West refers to a section of the speech which refers to "blog coverage ...hell bent on trying to discredit [St Benedict's School]." Mr West says the comments contained within that speech were directed at him.
7. In the submissions made on Mr West's behalf, Mr Scorer submitted, amongst other matters, that in assessing how St Benedict's, as an institution, responded to allegations of sexual abuse it is important for the Inquiry to understand how they responded to Mr West. It is said that, predominantly through his blog, Mr West is the central campaigner on that issue. Mr Scorer reiterated that it is possible that Mr West may be subject to criticism during the Inquiry, potentially by other core participants, and accordingly should have the opportunity to respond.
8. I have carefully considered the renewed application and the further detail provided by Mr West with his renewal application. Having done so I accept that in his role as a

campaigner in relation to child sexual abuse at schools affiliated with the English Benedictine Congregation, Mr West has played a direct and significant role in relation to the matters to which the Inquiry relates. Additionally, whilst the Inquiry has not been informed that other core participants intend to criticise Mr West for his campaigning and publication of allegations of abuse at various schools, it is clear that that is a possibility and that he may be subject to explicit or significant criticism during the Inquiry proceedings.

9. For these reasons, I consider that Mr West satisfies the criteria for designation as a core participant.

10. I understand that Mr West does not wish to be legally represented and therefore make no direction in relation to his recognised legal representative. Mr West wishes to question witnesses himself and considers that he has sufficient knowledge to do so. Whether or not to seek legal representation is of course a matter for Mr West. He may wish to note that questioning of witnesses will ordinarily be undertaken by Counsel to the Inquiry. Core participants may propose lines of questioning and Mr West would of course be free to do so. It will not, however, be common place for core participants or their representatives to directly ask questions of witnesses. If Mr West does decide to instruct a legal representative then I would be happy to consider an application to recognise his legal representative at that stage.

11. I take this opportunity to draw to Mr West's attention the directions issued at the Preliminary Hearing on 28 July 2016. In particular, if Mr West does decide to instruct a legal representative then he should note the direction that any application for an award of legal expenses under section 40 of the Inquiries Act 2005 must be made by 4pm on 8 September 2016, such application to address the matters set out in paragraph 12 of the Inquiry's costs protocol which is available on the Inquiry's website. I also direct Mr West's attention to the remainder of the directions I made on 16 March as set out on the Inquiry's website.

Professor Alexis Jay
Chair, Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Abuse

19 August 2016