

**INQUESTS INTO THE DEATHS ARISING FROM
THE FISHMONGERS' HALL AND LONDON BRIDGE TERROR ATTACK**

**QUESTIONNAIRE FOR JURY DETERMINATIONS
IN THE INQUEST CONCERNING THE DEATH OF
JACK MERRITT**

Notes for the jury

- This questionnaire has been prepared by the Coroner after receiving submissions from Interested Persons. By answering the questions, you will give your determinations on the key factual issues in the case. All are intended to address the central question: by what means and in what circumstances did Jack Merritt and Saskia Jones come by their deaths?
- After the inquests, a completed copy of this questionnaire will form part of the Record of Inquest for each of Jack Merritt and Saskia Jones.
- For a number of the questions, you are asked for a “yes” or “no” answer, and you are then given the option to explain further in a box. You are not obliged to fill in the box. Considerations and issues are then listed which you may want to consider, although you should feel free to give your own answers (provided that you follow the legal directions in these Notes and the Coroner’s summing-up).
- For some of the questions, you are first asked whether there was some error, omission or circumstance that (probably) caused or contributed to the two deaths. If you have answered “no” to that, you are then asked whether the same thing may have caused or contributed to the two deaths. If answering the second part of such a question, you will need to consider whether there is a realistic possibility that an error, omission or circumstance as described caused or contributed to the two deaths.
- You may only say that something contributed to the two deaths if you consider that it made a more than minimal contribution.
- You should only give an answer to a question if all of you agree upon the answer. If you find yourselves unable to agree on an answer to one question, you may move on to the next and return to the question later. If a time comes when the Coroner can accept any answer on which you are not all agreed, you will be told.
- In resolving factual issues, you should give your answers in accordance with the “balance of probabilities”; what is more likely than not. (However please note that if you are deciding whether something may have caused or contributed to the deaths, you should consider whether there is a realistic possibility that it did so (see note above).)

- If you choose to give further explanation in any of the boxes where you are given the option to do so, please follow these directions when writing your responses:
 - a. Your responses should all be directed to answering the question by what means and in what circumstances the deaths occurred. You should not make any statement or comment which does not assist in answering that question.
 - b. It might help you at each stage to consider the cause(s) of the deaths; any defects in systems and practices which contributed to the deaths; and any other factors which are relevant to the circumstances of the deaths.
 - c. You should try to be brief and to the point.
 - d. If you wish to write more than the space in the box permits, you may continue on a separate sheet. At the top of the sheet, you should write the number of the question and the words “Answer Continued”.
 - e. You should not make any comment on any circumstance, act, omission or event unless there is at least a realistic possibility that it caused or contributed to the deaths.
 - f. You should not say anything to the effect that a breach of civil law has been committed or that any named person has committed a crime. Because of this legal rule, when writing any explanations, you should avoid using words and phrases such as “negligence / negligent”, “breach of duty”, “duty of care”, “careless”, “reckless”, “liability”, “guilt / guilty”, “crime / criminal”, “illegal / unlawful”. This rule does not prevent you confirming in question 1 that those who died were unlawfully killed: the proposed form of words in that question avoids naming the person responsible.
 - g. You may use ordinary and non-technical words which express factual judgments. So, you may say that errors or mistakes were made and you may use words such as “failure”, “missed opportunity”, “inappropriate”, “inadequate”, “unsuitable”, “unsatisfactory”, “insufficient”, “omit / omission”, “unacceptable” or “lacking”. Equally, you may indicate in your answer if you consider that particular errors or

mistakes were not made. You may add adjectives, such as “serious” or “important”, to indicate the strength of your findings.

- h. If you are uncertain about what may be written, you may ask a question in writing to the Coroner during your deliberations.

Question 1: Determination on Unlawful Killing of Jack Merritt

Question	Answer
Are you satisfied that, on the balance of probabilities, Jack Merritt was unlawfully killed?	Yes

Important Note:

The Coroner directs that you return an answer of “yes” in response to this question in the answer section, to reflect the primary conclusion that both Saskia Jones and Jack Merritt were unlawfully killed.

This direction is given because the evidence clearly supports that primary conclusion and because it is important that the Records of Inquest record that each of them was unlawfully killed.

Question 2: Basic facts of the attack and the death of Jack Merritt

Do you agree with the following statement, which is intended to summarise the basic facts of the death of Jack Merritt?

“On 29 November 2019, Jack Merritt was at an event at Fishmongers’ Hall in London. The event was held for the five-year anniversary of Learning Together. Jack was at the event as an employee of Cambridge University, and worked for Learning Together.

An attendee of the event, who was on licence having been convicted of an offence under the Terrorism Act 2000, armed with two knives, attacked Jack in the gentlemen’s toilets at Fishmongers’ Hall. Jack suffered a number of injuries when stabbed. This was part of a terrorist attack. The attacker moved from the toilets and began attacking further attendees of the event and a member of staff at Fishmongers’ Hall. Jack moved to a different room at Fishmongers’ Hall and was later removed from the building. His injuries were not survivable. Jack was treated by members of the public, police officers, ambulance staff and HEMS doctors. He was assessed as dead at the scene by a doctor.”

In the box below, please either write that you confirm the statement above or state in what respects you would like it to be amended.

We agree

Question 3: Management of Usman Khan in the Community

<p>Was there any omission or failure in the <u>management of Usman Khan</u> (as an offender in the community) by agencies of the state which contributed to the deaths of Jack Merritt and Saskia Jones?</p> <p>Answer “yes” or “no” in the box opposite.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>If your answer to the question above is “no”, was there any omission or failure in the <u>management of Usman Khan</u> (as an offender in the community) by agencies of the state which <u>may have</u> contributed to the deaths of Jack Merritt and Saskia Jones?</p> <p>Answer “yes” or “no” in the box opposite.</p>	

If you can give an explanation for your answer, please do so in the box below.

- Unacceptable management and lack of accountability.
- Serious deficiencies in the management of Khan by MAPPA.
- Insufficient experience and training.
- Blind spot to Khan’s unique risks due to ‘poster boy’ image.
- Lack of psychological assessment post release from prison.

Please go to the next page for matters which you may wish to bear in mind when answering.

In answering Question 3, you may wish to bear in mind the following considerations and issues:

- The fact that, throughout the time from his release from prison (December 2018) to the time of the attack, Usman Khan was managed by the National Probation Service.
- The fact that, throughout that time, Usman Khan was subject to Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements (“MAPPA”) which involved meetings attended by the National Probation Service, counter-terrorist police, police officers responsible for supervising his Part 4 terrorism notifications and other agencies.
- The facts that Usman Khan (a) had committed a serious terrorist offence in 2010; (b) had been the subject of substantial prison intelligence to the effect that he was involved in radicalising others and violence (including when he was apparently engaging positively with staff, and including in the period before release); and (c) had been released from prison as a Category A High Risk offender, with an OASys rating of Very High Risk to the general public (informed by an ERG assessment expressing significant concerns).
- The fact that Usman Khan had complied with his licence conditions and had apparently engaged positively with those responsible for managing him in the community during 2019.
- The facts that, by November 2019, Usman Khan (a) was living away from the probation hostel; (b) remained unemployed; (c) no longer had visits from mentors; (d) had reportedly become increasingly socially isolated; and (e) had not been doing any actual educational work with Learning Together.
- Whether or not some of those responsible for the assessment and management of Usman Khan in the community were properly trained and experienced and had proper access to information (including intelligence).
- Whether or not there were deficiencies in the management of Usman Khan in the MAPPA process, having regard to (a) the Chair’s level of clearance; (b) arrangements for discussions between the Chair and others on sensitive matters; (c) procedures for decision-making; and (d) procedures for circulation of minutes.

- Whether or not those responsible for the management of Usman Khan in the community took a proper approach to the assessment of the continuing risk he posed, having regard to the available risk assessment tools.
- Whether or not the decision to permit Usman Khan to attend the Learning Together event at Fishmongers' Hall on 29 November 2019 was properly considered and was a reasonable professional decision when it was made (ignoring hindsight).
- Whether or not consideration should have been given to any further measures being taken if Usman Khan was to be permitted to attend the Learning Together event at Fishmongers' Hall on 29 November 2019 (e.g. arranging an escort, having him met en route or ensuring that security measures were taken at the venue) (again, ignoring hindsight).

Question 4: Sharing of Information and Guidance regarding Usman Khan

<p>Was there any omission or failure in the <u>sharing of information and guidance by agencies responsible for monitoring / investigation of Usman Khan</u> which contributed to the deaths of Jack Merritt and Saskia Jones?</p> <p>Answer “yes” or “no” in the box opposite.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>If your answer to the question above is “no”, was there any omission or failure in the <u>sharing of information and guidance by agencies responsible for monitoring / investigation of Usman Khan</u> which <u>may have</u> contributed to the deaths of Jack Merritt and Saskia Jones?</p> <p>Answer “yes” or “no” in the box opposite.</p>	

If you can give an explanation for your answer, please do so in the box below.

<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Missed opportunity for those with expertise and experience to give guidance.
--

Please go to the next page for matters which you may wish to bear in mind when answering.

In answering Question 4, you may wish to bear in mind the following considerations and issues:

- The fact that, throughout the time from his release from prison (December 2018) to the time of the attack, Usman Khan was subject to a priority investigation by the Security Service and West Midlands Police CTU (supported by Staffordshire Police Special Branch).
- The facts that Usman Khan (a) had committed a serious terrorist offence in 2010; (b) had been the subject of substantial prison intelligence to the effect that he was involved in radicalising others and violence (including when he was apparently engaging positively with staff, and including in the period before release); (c) had been the subject of intelligence in late 2018 that he had said that he intended to return to his old ways (terrorist offending) and that he intended to commit an attack after release; and (d) had been released from prison as a Category A High Risk offender, with an OASys rating of Very High Risk to the general public (informed by an ERG assessment expressing significant concerns).
- The facts that Usman Khan had complied with his licence conditions and had apparently engaged positively with those responsible for managing him in the community during 2019.
- The fact that investigation of Usman Khan during 2019 gave rise to no intelligence indicating activity of national security concern.
- The facts that, by November 2019, Usman Khan (a) was living away from the probation hostel; (b) remained unemployed; (c) no longer had visits from mentors; (d) had reportedly become increasingly socially isolated; and (e) had not been doing any actual educational work with Learning Together.
- Whether or not those responsible for the monitoring / investigation of Usman Khan shared information (including intelligence) and guidance properly with other agencies.
- Whether or not those responsible for the monitoring / investigation of Usman Khan should have raised any concerns or given any advice about him being permitted to attend the Learning Together event on 29 November 2019 (ignoring hindsight).

- Whether or not those responsible for the monitoring / investigation of Usman Khan should have given any advice proposing any further measures being taken if Usman Khan was to be permitted to attend the Learning Together event on 29 November 2019 (e.g. arranging an escort, having him met en route or ensuring security measures were taken at the venue) (again, ignoring hindsight).

Question 5: Organisation of and Security Measures for the Event at Fishmongers’ Hall

<p>Was there any omission or any deficiency in the <u>organisation of and security measures for the event at Fishmongers’ Hall</u> which contributed to the deaths of Jack Merritt and Saskia Jones?</p> <p>Answer “yes” or “no” in the box opposite.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>If your answer to the question above is “no”, was there any omission or any deficiency in the <u>organisation of and security measures for the event at Fishmongers’ Hall</u> which <u>may have</u> contributed to the deaths of Jack Merritt and Saskia Jones?</p> <p>Answer “yes” or “no” in the box opposite.</p>	

If you can give an explanation for your answer, please do so in the box below.

- Lack of communication and accountability.
- Inadequate consideration of key guidance between parties.
- Serious deficiencies in the management of Khan by MAPPA.
- Failure to complete event specific risk assessment by any party.

Please go to the next page for matters which you may wish to bear in mind when answering.

In answering Question 5, you may wish to bear in mind the following considerations and issues:

- The fact that Fishmongers' Hall had a number of security measures for the event, including (a) a door requiring opening from inside (with key fob operation); (b) security staff on the door at most times; (c) limitation of entry to invited guests (who were provided on arrival with identity lanyards) and (d) CCTV at the entrance.
- The fact that Fishmongers' Hall did not own or have in place any metal detector or employ any arrangements for bags to be searched on entry.
- The fact that staff of the Fishmongers' Company (a) were aware that all attendees had been invited by the Learning Together programme, but (b) some were also aware that attendees might include ex-offenders who had committed serious criminal offences.
- The fact that the Fishmongers' Company had had a risk register since April 2019 which identified the risk of a lone actor terrorist attack as an important risk to be addressed.
- The facts that (a) Learning Together organised the event, (b) Learning Together staff at the event were employed by the University of Cambridge and (c) Learning Together were aware that Usman Khan was a terrorist offender who had been released as a Category A High Risk prisoner in late 2018.
- Whether or not those involved in organising the Learning Together event properly informed themselves of and assessed the risks of the event and made appropriate arrangements based on any risks (e.g. requesting security measures).
- Whether or not those involved in organising the Learning Together event properly informed the Fishmongers' Company of the persons or types of persons attending the event, having regard to the information they had at the time (including concerning the approval of Usman Khan's attendance at the event by his probation officer).
- Whether or not those responsible for managing and/or for investigating Usman Khan ought to have given any advice on security measures to the Learning Together organisers and/or the Fishmongers' Company.
- Whether or not the Fishmongers' Company ought to have implemented any additional security measures, based on the information it had at the time.