

OPUS2

Fishmongers' Hall Inquests

Day 28

May 25, 2021

Opus 2 - Official Court Reporters

Phone: 0203 008 6619

Email: transcripts@opus2.com

Website: <https://www.opus2.com>

1 Tuesday, 25 May 2021
 2 (10.30 am)
 3 (In the absence of the jury)
 4 JUDGE LUCRAFT: Good morning, Mr Hough. Can I, before we
 5 start, just really thank everyone very much indeed for
 6 the various documents which have been provided in
 7 response to the submissions which were circulated on
 8 Friday. I'm conscious, Mr Hough, that quite a lot of
 9 thought has been given to the format of the questions
 10 and the questionnaire and I'm grateful that somebody has
 11 provided me with an updated version of that.
 12 For my part, what I would suggest by way of running
 13 order, subject to any other thoughts, is that I hear
 14 from you first of all, I then hear from the IPs other
 15 than the families next, and then hear from the families
 16 after that. The reason I'm saying that is I have had
 17 the benefit of reading Mr Pitchers' and Mr Armstrong's
 18 documents, I see the approach they take and it seems to
 19 me that they may prefer to respond to anything that is
 20 said by the public authorities before making their
 21 submissions.
 22 MR HOUGH: That's been discussed and I think is convenient
 23 for others as well.
 24 JUDGE LUCRAFT: Thank you.
 25

1

1 Submissions by MR HOUGH QC
 2 MR HOUGH: Sir, as you know, you are now to hear submissions
 3 on determinations to be left to the jury in the inquests
 4 of Saskia Jones and Jack Merritt. At the outset, we ask
 5 that you make an order under section 4(2) of the
 6 Contempt of Court Act 1981, postponing reporting of
 7 today's submissions, including the content of any
 8 written submissions and questionnaire which will have
 9 been disclosed to the media, until after the jury have
 10 returned their determinations. The reason is, as the
 11 subsection requires, to avoid a substantial risk of
 12 prejudice to the administration of justice in the
 13 proceedings. In short, it may affect the deliberations
 14 of the jury if they are made aware of matters such as
 15 any determinations which are not being left to them
 16 before they have returned their conclusions.
 17 You will be aware, sir, that such orders are
 18 commonplace in jury inquests of high profile. I shall
 19 pause to see if anyone has any objection to that order
 20 being made.
 21 JUDGE LUCRAFT: Certainly, Mr Hough, that is an order that
 22 I shall direct.
 23 MR HOUGH: Thank you, sir.
 24 Before I embark on our substantive submissions for
 25 today, I should stress that the great majority of the

2

1 submissions you will hear concern one very important
 2 aspect of this case, namely whether enough was done to
 3 prevent Usman Khan posing a danger to the public.
 4 However, there are two other important dimensions which
 5 should be recognised.
 6 First, at the heart of this case are two young
 7 people whose lives enriched those around them and were
 8 tragically cut short. Each of Jack and Saskia had
 9 a profound commitment to the good of society: Jack in
 10 his work on the education and rehabilitation of
 11 offenders, and Saskia with her research work in the
 12 field of sexual violence and her concerns for victim
 13 support in the justice system.
 14 Secondly, in the first two weeks of this hearing, we
 15 all heard evidence of remarkable courage and compassion:
 16 Steven Gallant, John Crilly, Darryn Frost and
 17 Lukasz Koczocik showed great bravery in fighting off
 18 Khan and subduing him. Members of the public and the
 19 emergency services went to the aid of those injured,
 20 including at a time when the scene was not known to be
 21 safe. The police responded to the emergency with speed,
 22 and firearms officers dealt with Khan at close quarters
 23 when most or all thought that they may be dealing with
 24 an IED. Lives were saved as well as lost in this
 25 terrible attack.

3

1 I make those points sir, to ensure that those
 2 important aspects of the case are not lost in the
 3 submissions of law we make today.
 4 JUDGE LUCRAFT: And, just pausing there, Mr Hough, it's very
 5 likely that those words, or words very similar to those,
 6 will form the start of my summing-up to the jury
 7 tomorrow. It's hugely important that we remember those
 8 points that you have made in the process that we are
 9 embarking on.
 10 MR HOUGH: Yes.
 11 Turning, then, to the submissions for today. You
 12 have received a lengthy document from us, together with
 13 a suggested questionnaire for eliciting the jury's
 14 conclusions. You have received constructive written
 15 submissions from the principal IPs and from Mrs Begum.
 16 Today you should also have received a revised version of
 17 the questionnaire prepared in light of interested
 18 persons' submissions, with a header of "Version 2" in
 19 the top left.
 20 If convenient, sir, I propose to make submissions in
 21 five parts: first of all, legal principles governing the
 22 question whether the procedural obligation under
 23 Article 2 of the European Convention of Human Rights is
 24 engaged in this case; second, submissions on whether the
 25 Article 2 procedural obligation is engaged; third, legal

4

1 principles governing how to elicit the jury's
 2 conclusions; fourth, submissions on how to elicit the
 3 jury's conclusions in this case, and fifthly, and
 4 briefly, our proposals for submissions on and
 5 consideration of a Prevention of Future Deaths Report.
 6 So, first of all, Article 2 and the law. As you
 7 know, sir, the first question for you to resolve today
 8 is whether or not the procedural obligation under
 9 Article 2 is engaged in these two Inquests. In the
 10 event, all interested persons either support or accept
 11 our submission that the procedural obligation is
 12 engaged. I shall therefore deal with matters more
 13 briefly than I otherwise would.
 14 Sir, as we explain at paragraphs 11 and following,
 15 page 15–16 of our document, in your rulings of June
 16 and October 2020 you have previously declined to rule
 17 that the procedural obligation was engaged. The reason,
 18 in short, was that you could not reach a positive
 19 conclusion that it was engaged without receiving further
 20 evidence. However, you made it very clear that you
 21 would keep the issue under review, and that has
 22 happened.
 23 As it's turned out, some of the most important
 24 evidence on matters of most relevance to the issue of
 25 Article 2 engagement emerged in disclosure in the months

5

1 leading to the Inquests hearing or during the hearing
 2 itself.
 3 There has been no disadvantage in the approach you
 4 took, since, as all accept, the scope and rigour of the
 5 Inquests have been sufficient for an Article 2 inquiry.
 6 We address the legal significance of Article 2
 7 engagement to Inquest disputes at paragraph 8 of our
 8 document from page 4. The legal principles aren't in
 9 doubt or dispute, but I'll summarise them briefly now
 10 for the benefit of the wider audience.
 11 As you know very well, sir, Article 2 of the
 12 Convention, right to life, encompasses a procedural
 13 element. This requires that in certain cases where
 14 a death potentially engages the responsibility of the
 15 State, an independent inquiry into the death shall be
 16 held which satisfies Convention requirements. In the
 17 Middleton case, the House of Lords held that the
 18 engagement of Article 2 in this sense has a particular
 19 significance for an Inquest. Where Article 2 is
 20 engaged, the requirement in the statutory provisions for
 21 an Inquest to determine how the deceased person died is
 22 read as meaning by what means and in what circumstances
 23 the person died, rather than simply by what means the
 24 person died, as we set out in paragraph 8(f) of our
 25 document.

6

1 That approach, as Lady Arden put it in the recent
 2 Maughan decision at paragraph 9, opens up the field for
 3 conclusions about underlying or contributory causes. It
 4 may require a coroner to elicit from a jury a more
 5 extensive and judgmental form of narrative conclusion.
 6 The manner of eliciting such a conclusion is for the
 7 coroner's discretion, but it is often done by means of
 8 questions.
 9 This Middleton approach is only adopted in cases
 10 where the Article 2 procedural obligation is engaged in
 11 relation to the death, that was made clear in the Hurst
 12 case. The Article 2 procedural obligation is
 13 automatically engaged in some cases, including where
 14 death is due to suicide in prison, which is, of course,
 15 a closed society controlled by the State.
 16 Otherwise, it is only engaged if, on the evidence,
 17 it is arguable that the State or its agents breached
 18 an Article 2 substantive duty in relation to the death.
 19 The threshold of an arguable case in this context is
 20 low. It's been variously put as "more than fanciful",
 21 "a credible discretion", or "reasonable grounds for
 22 thinking", see paragraph (e) of our document. However,
 23 the precise formulation isn't critical and certainly not
 24 on the facts of this case.
 25 Accordingly, the question for the court now is

7

1 whether on all the evidence there is an arguable case
 2 that one or more of the Article 2 substantive duties has
 3 been breached in relation to each of these deaths.
 4 Importantly for the present case, if you decide that
 5 the Article 2 procedural obligation is engaged, then the
 6 Middleton approach is taken across the board. Therefore
 7 one does not say that the Article 2 obligation is
 8 engaged in relation to one State agency, and therefore
 9 that only the acts and omissions of that agency fall to
 10 be considered as part of the broader formulation of the
 11 "how" question. That's clear from the Sreedharan case
 12 and is, as we understand it, common ground between
 13 ourselves and interested persons.
 14 Let me then turn to Article 2 substantive duties,
 15 which we address at paragraph 9 of our submissions from
 16 page 8. Because you need to determine whether there is
 17 an arguable case that an Article 2 substantive duty has
 18 been breached, the content of those duties is important.
 19 As well as imposing negative duties requiring the State
 20 not to take life except in certain circumstances,
 21 Article 2 imposes two relevant kinds of positive
 22 substantive obligations. First, it imposes a general
 23 duty on the state to establish a framework of laws,
 24 precautions, procedures and means of enforcement, which
 25 will, to the greatest extent reasonably practicable,

8

1 protect life . That general duty operates at a level of
 2 system and process, as distinct from the errors or
 3 omissions of individuals . However, the general duty can
 4 extend to systems, for example, for the selection and
 5 training of staff , and it can involve the detail of
 6 procedures and systems of working . A finding of breach
 7 of the general duty requires , as the Strasbourg court
 8 has said , a concrete assessment of alleged deficiencies .

9 Secondly, Article 2 imposes an operational duty on
 10 the authorities in certain classes of case . Where the
 11 duty applies , it is breached if , first of all , at
 12 a particular point in time, the authorities knew or
 13 ought to have known of a real and immediate risk to life
 14 and, secondly, at that time they failed to take measures
 15 within the scope of their powers which, judged
 16 reasonably, might have been expected to avoid that risk .
 17 In that formulation, a real risk is one which is more
 18 than remote, and an immediate risk is one which is
 19 present and continuing .

20 The duty is capable of applying in the context of
 21 public protection against a person who poses a threat to
 22 the public at large , or a section of the public . We
 23 respectfully agree with the submission of the
 24 Secretaries of State and West Midlands Police that
 25 actual or arguable breach is to be assessed with

1 hindsight excluded, that is both inherent in the
 2 formulation in the duty in the Osman case and is made
 3 even clearer from subsequent authorities including in
 4 particular the Bubbins case .

5 Whether the general duty or the operational duty is
 6 in issue , breach can be established without proof that
 7 it caused the particular death . The test is whether or
 8 not the deceased person lost a substantial chance of
 9 surviving . In our submission, that test applies equally
 10 to the general and operational duties , and when
 11 Lord Brown articulated that case, notably in the
 12 Van Colle case, at paragraph 138, it was evident that he
 13 was speaking more generally rather than one particular
 14 form of duty .

15 Let me then turn to our submissions on whether
 16 Article 2 is engaged . In our document we set out in
 17 great detail the reasons why we say that it is engaged,
 18 on the basis of an arguable breach of the operational
 19 duty by the authorities , and I stress arguable . The
 20 representatives of the Merritt and Jones families agree
 21 with that proposition; the Secretaries of State for the
 22 Home Department and Justice accept it, although not in
 23 relation to any conduct of MI5; Staffordshire Police
 24 also accepts it ; West Midlands Police accepts it,
 25 although not in relation to officers of that force . All

1 other interested persons either agree or raise no
 2 opposition .

3 Sir , you do not need to make a finding that the
 4 operational duty was arguably breached by one or more
 5 particular State agencies , and we would urge you not to
 6 do so for three reasons: first , the Osman test does not
 7 require such a conclusion, it is directed at the
 8 authorities , which may be multiple State agencies acting
 9 in combination, and that is not surprising since
 10 liability under the Convention attaches to a state .

11 Secondly, on the facts of this case, a significant
 12 proportion of the decisions concerning the management of
 13 Usman Khan were taken in a multi-agency forum attended
 14 by the representatives of multiple agencies, namely the
 15 MAPPA panel meetings .

16 Thirdly, as I've already submitted, it does not
 17 matter to the approach whether one agency or several
 18 arguably breached the duty .

19 Let me then summarise very briefly for the wider
 20 audience our submissions on arguable breach of the
 21 operational duty . First , it is at least arguable that
 22 the State agencies responsible for Usman Khan knew or
 23 ought to have known in autumn 2019 that he presented
 24 a risk to the lives of the public which was more than
 25 remote and was present and continuing . Sir, five short

1 points in that regard . First , the last detailed risk
 2 assessment of Khan in the ERG report of April 2018 and
 3 the OASys report of December 2018 resulted in a grading
 4 that he presented a very high risk of serious harm,
 5 indicating a probability of an incident causing serious
 6 harm to the public . That grading remained in place in
 7 the MAPPA documents right up to November 2019 . Even
 8 Mr Bromley and Mr Skelton in May 2019 still graded Khan
 9 as presenting a high risk of serious harm to the public .

10 Second point: there was intelligence from the time
 11 of Khan's release which indicated that he intended to
 12 return to terrorism and a separate strand indicating
 13 that he intended to carry out an attack . There was no
 14 reason to distrust either strand . They resulted in Khan
 15 being subject to a P3 investigation , and , sir , you will
 16 recall the criteria for that .

17 Third point: while Khan did not breach conditions or
 18 act in such a way as to generate adverse reporting after
 19 his release , many witnesses agreed that he continued to
 20 pose a serious risk . MI5 continued to assess
 21 significant risk in formal documents through 2019, while
 22 the analysts at Staffordshire Special Branch took
 23 a similar view . The MAPPA agencies were aware that he
 24 was capable of being manipulative and duplicitous .

25 Fourth point: the MAPPA agencies were sufficiently

1 concerned to prevent him doing the dumper truck course
 2 in August 2019, the very same meeting at which the
 3 Fishmongers' Hall visit was considered. They were
 4 sufficiently concerned to prevent that, even though the
 5 course would have helped Khan search for work, and they
 6 were concerned about it precisely because of the risk of
 7 an attack.

8 Fifth point: in the autumn of 2019, a series of
 9 circumstances combined with the effect that there was
 10 less insight into Khan, and he was becoming more
 11 isolated and more idle, which were identified risk
 12 factors for him. So the mentoring ceased, the Prevent
 13 visits became less frequent, the job search went on and
 14 on without progress, and it was impeded in part because
 15 of the lack of a mentor and supervised internet access,
 16 Khan moved out of the approved premises into his own
 17 flat, which he rarely left. Sir, that's what we say in
 18 relation to the presence of an appreciable real and
 19 immediate risk.

20 Secondly, it's at least arguable that measures
 21 should reasonably have been taken which would at least
 22 have materially increased the chance of Jack and Saskia
 23 surviving 29 November 2019. It is arguable that the
 24 proper response of the MAPPAs agencies should have been
 25 to refuse Khan permission to go to the Learning Together

13

1 event and that it wasn't reasonable to permit him to go.
 2 This was to be an event in a prestigious London venue,
 3 adjacent to the site of a recent terror attack, and
 4 attended by senior figures in the criminal justice
 5 system. Khan was going to be passing through major
 6 train stations. Given Khan's profile, there is
 7 a serious argument that he should not have been
 8 permitted to go bearing in mind those considerations.

9 It's also arguable that the proper response
 10 alternatively should have been to put in place one or
 11 more of various precautionary measures: an escort could
 12 have been arranged, the security measures at the venue
 13 could have been checked, and advice given to the
 14 Fishmongers' Company to have a bag search in place which
 15 Commodore Williamson said would have been accepted if
 16 that advice had been given.

17 Khan could have been met en route by police officers
 18 to assess his demeanour and reaction and to take any
 19 appropriate action. Although some witnesses rejected
 20 some or all of those measures as options others, such as
 21 DS Stephenson, probably the key counter-terrorism
 22 officer at the November 29 MAPPAs meeting, did not.

23 Sir, at paragraph 64 of our document, we also set
 24 out arguments which could be made to the effect that
 25 there was an arguable breach of the general duty. That

14

1 issue is, we accept, less clear cut for reasons we give
 2 at paragraph 62 of our document, but, in our submission,
 3 because you can confidently conclude that there is
 4 an arguable basis for finding a breach of the
 5 operational duty, you do not need to resolve the issue
 6 of the general duty today provided, of course, that you
 7 accept the consensus that Article 2 is engaged on the
 8 principal basis we give.

9 Let me then turn to the determinations and the law
 10 governing determinations. At paragraph 10 of our
 11 document, we set out the principles governing
 12 conclusions in Middleton Inquests, and in brief summary,
 13 we would make five points as to what the law provides.

14 First, the objective must be to elicit the
 15 conclusions of the jury on the key factual issues in the
 16 case. That may be done in various ways, including by
 17 a combination of short form and narrative conclusions,
 18 the latter often elicited by questions. The choice is
 19 for the coroner, who has a substantial margin of
 20 discretion, as our highest court has said in both the
 21 Middleton and Maughan cases.

22 Secondly, any conclusions should generally be
 23 limited to matters which either probably contributed to
 24 death or may realistically have contributed to death.
 25 The test for causal contribution is whether a factor

15

1 more than minimally contributed, see the cases of
 2 Douglas-Williams, Dawson and Tainton.

3 Thirdly, conclusions in a narrative may be
 4 judgmental and language such as "failure" or even
 5 "serious failure" is permissible. However, the
 6 statutory prohibition on a finding appearing to
 7 determine any question of criminal liability of a named
 8 person or any question of civil liability must continue
 9 to be respected.

10 Fourth, conclusions in a narrative should not be
 11 overly long or complicated, and care should be taken to
 12 avoid the risk of complex questions giving rise to
 13 confused or inconsistent answers.

14 Fifthly, conclusions in a narrative should generally
 15 focus on answering the question how the particular death
 16 occurred, rather than addressing matters of high policy.
 17 We set out the principles at rather greater length, as
 18 I say, at paragraph 10 with relevant citation of the
 19 authorities.

20 May we turn then at greatest length to the
 21 determinations and questionnaire in this case. Sir, as
 22 you know, we have proposed a questionnaire for the jury
 23 including five questions which begins with a set of
 24 legal directions or notes for the jury. Interested
 25 persons have in general accepted the overall approach

16

1 while making submissions as to the form of the
 2 questions, primarily questions 3–5. We've prepared
 3 a revised form of questionnaire which seeks to take
 4 account of interested persons' comments and, if I may,
 5 I'll make my submissions by reference to that document.
 6 As I say, the draft questionnaire contains a set of
 7 legal directions at the start on pages 2 to 4. In
 8 response to submissions of interested persons we've made
 9 some proposed changes, which I shall now explain.
 10 In the fifth bullet point on page 2, we have changed
 11 the wording of the test on causal contribution from
 12 "significant rather than minimal" to "more than minimal"
 13 for two reasons, first of all, it is simpler and less
 14 prone to confuse, it doesn't provide the jury with the
 15 word "significant", which is an elastic word with
 16 different meanings in different legal contexts, it gives
 17 them one relatively simple concept. And the second
 18 reason is that that expression matches more precisely
 19 what is said by the courts in Douglas–Williams, Dawson
 20 and Tainton. We have followed the submissions of
 21 Mr Pitchers and Mr Rule in that regard.
 22 If you then turn to page 3, subparagraph (g) under
 23 the last bullet point, we have added the words "missed
 24 opportunity" as a form of words the jury may use. As
 25 Mr Pitchers and Mr Rule submit, that appears in the

17

1 Middleton suggested verdict and also in the
 2 Chief Coroner's guidance. For that reason we add those
 3 words.
 4 We have not, however, adopted the suggestions made
 5 by Mr Pitchers' team that the concept of possible causal
 6 contribution to a death is further glossed with the
 7 words "it could have had a real prospect of altering the
 8 outcome". In our submission, the concept of possible
 9 causal contribution which we've addressed in the early
 10 bullets is already complicated enough for a jury and
 11 adding further glosses only risks adding a layer of
 12 complication and thus confusion to what is already not
 13 a straightforward metaphysical concept. So that's what
 14 we say about the directions.
 15 Question 1 on page 5 asks the jury to confirm that
 16 Jack Merritt and Saskia Jones were unlawfully killed.
 17 It does not, of course, name Usman Khan because of the
 18 statutory prohibition. As we explain in our document,
 19 there is real value in this short–form conclusion being
 20 given, for two reasons. First, and most important, the
 21 conclusions of the jury should recognise the
 22 uncontroversial but important fact that these two young
 23 people were murdered and that the murderer bears
 24 principal responsibility for their deaths.
 25 Secondly, as the Chief Coroner's guidance makes

18

1 clear, a short–form conclusion should be returned
 2 wherever possible, both for statistics and for ease of
 3 reference. All interested persons appear to agree with
 4 this approach and that you can properly direct
 5 a conclusion of unlawful killing in this case, and we've
 6 cited in our document the authorities governing
 7 direction of verdicts where only one conclusion of the
 8 short form options is sustainable.
 9 Questions 2(a) and 2(b) concern the basic facts of
 10 the attack, first of all, in relation to Jack Merritt,
 11 and secondly, in relation to Saskia Jones, they appear
 12 on pages 6 and 7. Each asks the jury to accept or amend
 13 a short narrative passage covering the facts of the
 14 attack on Jack and Saskia respectively. The
 15 representatives of the bereaved families have made
 16 representations as to the form of these passages, as
 17 have the West Midlands Police. We have incorporated all
 18 of those suggestions into the revised drafts.
 19 Turning, then, to questions 3–5, which begin on
 20 page 8. In relation to questions 3–5 generally, we take
 21 a point made by Mr Pitchers' team that it would be best
 22 to steer the jury gently towards giving reasons for
 23 their answers rather than providing us with a series of
 24 unadorned yes or no answers. It is right, and nobody
 25 suggests, that we should insist upon them providing

19

1 answers, it's right that they shouldn't be required to
 2 provide answers, but a more gentle steer in favour of
 3 them doing so is, we accept, justified.
 4 What we've proposed by way of addressing this issue
 5 is to change the wording above the explanation box from
 6 "if you would like to give an explanation for your
 7 answer" to "if you can give an explanation". That
 8 retains the relatively user–friendly structure of the
 9 questions, while encouraging the giving of reasons.
 10 Turning, then, to the detail of question 3, this
 11 question concerns whether the failures or — whether
 12 failures or omissions in the management of Usman Khan by
 13 State agencies occurred and probably or possibly
 14 contributed to the deaths. In the list of factors and
 15 issues, we have made a number of changes reflecting
 16 submissions by interested persons. Sir, in this
 17 question, as in the other questions, you will see that
 18 in our list of factors and issues to assist the jury, we
 19 begin by setting out a number of bullet points detailing
 20 relatively uncontroversial facts which they may wish to
 21 bear in mind, and then formulating a series of questions
 22 or issues which may help them in addressing the primary
 23 question.
 24 As I say, we've made a number of changes to those
 25 bullet points reflecting submissions by interested

20

1 persons, and in general, we've sought to reflect what we
2 consider to be sensible points, but we've sometimes
3 condensed the suggested additions in order to avoid
4 giving the jury too long an exam paper.

5 So on page 9, for question 3, at the third bullet
6 where we set out, in hopefully neutral language, various
7 facts about Khan's background, we have added reference
8 to the fact that there was adverse prison intelligence
9 "at times of Khan's apparent compliance", so making the
10 point that Khan was capable of complying overtly while
11 generating adverse intelligence about what he was doing
12 behind the scenes.

13 We've also added reference to the concerning content
14 of the ERG assessment, which informed the OASys
15 assessment. Those points have been made at the
16 suggestion of the Jones and Merritt families.

17 The fifth bullet is a new bullet point, which refers
18 to arguable matters of concern in autumn 2019, the move
19 from the approved premises, Khan's continued
20 unemployment, the loss of the mentors, and reported
21 social isolation. These reflect points made by
22 Mr Armstrong in particular in his submissions.

23 In the sixth bullet we have expanded the issue
24 concerning the background of those responsible for
25 assessing and managing Khan in the community, so that it

1 refers to the assessment of his risk, not only the
2 management of him, so that it also refers to the
3 training of those responsible, and so that it also
4 refers to access to intelligence as part of the
5 information base. Those, again, reflect points made by
6 the Jones and Merritt families.

7 At the bottom of page 9, seventh bullet, we've added
8 a new bullet point to refer to various deficiencies in
9 the MAPPa process which were suggested during evidence,
10 which the jury may or may not accept but which if they
11 do accept, might conceivably have affected the
12 management of Khan. In doing so, we've again sought to
13 reflect a point made by the Jones family.

14 At the eighth bullet on page 10, in the issue
15 concerning the approach to assessment of risk, we have
16 referred to the available risk assessment tools
17 reflecting a point made by the Merritt family but in
18 somewhat more neutral language.

19 And in the ninth bullet, in line with the
20 submissions of the West Midlands Police, we have changed
21 "correct decision" in relation to the issue about
22 permitting Khan to attend the Learning Together event,
23 to "reasonable professional decision" because we accept
24 that this change of language better reflects the
25 exercise for the jury, which ought to ignore hindsight,

1 so that's question 3.

2 Question 4 begins on page 11, and this question
3 concerns whether failures or omissions on the part of
4 agencies responsible for monitoring or investigating
5 Usman Khan probably or possibly contributed to the
6 deaths. Sir, the submission has been made by the
7 Secretary of State, West Midlands Police and
8 Staffordshire Police, that the real issue to which the
9 questions have been directed in this regard is whether
10 or not those agencies properly shared information,
11 guidance and advice with those responsible for managing
12 Khan in the community. We have not argued, and we don't
13 understand others to argue, that the monitoring and
14 investigation of Khan themselves were materially
15 deficient. That is no doubt primarily because there is
16 no evidence that clear signs of attack—planning or
17 preparation could have been detected before the day
18 prior to the attack. As Witness A explained in evidence
19 that was not challenged, it would have required a higher
20 level of surveillance than Khan justified at the time
21 for those signs of attack preparation on the day before
22 to be spotted.

23 We therefore propose changes to question 4, which
24 focus it upon the sharing of information and guidance by
25 agencies responsible for the monitoring and

1 investigation of Usman Khan.

2 In relation to the way that the matter is put by
3 West Midlands Police, we respectfully don't agree that
4 the question should refer to omissions or failures
5 outside of the MAPPa meetings because we are concerned
6 that that may be a vague formulation that causes
7 confusion in the minds of the jury about what the
8 question is really concerned with. The focus of the
9 question is, and should be, on the conduct of those
10 responsible for monitoring and investigating Usman Khan.
11 And, of course, you will be aware, sir, that proper
12 issues were raised about whether those agencies properly
13 shared information and intelligence with those
14 responsible for managing him on a day-to-day basis. The
15 jury may conclude that there was no error or omission in
16 those regards, but it is a proper issue for the jury.

17 JUDGE LUCRAFT: Mr Hough, looking back to question 3, those
18 points are, to some extent, covered by the addition of
19 bullet point 7 under question 3 and the role of MAPPa
20 within the community.

21 MR HOUGH: That is true, but we regard it as important to
22 have a separate question --

23 JUDGE LUCRAFT: Yes.

24 MR HOUGH: -- question 4, because the jury may legitimately
25 think that there is a question to be asked about the

1 quality of management of Khan bearing in mind what the
 2 MAPPA agencies knew.
 3 JUDGE LUCRAFT: Yes.
 4 MR HOUGH: And then a separate question about whether they
 5 were given proper information by those responsible for
 6 monitoring and investigating Khan. That division of
 7 issues was prefigured in your indicative scope document
 8 which you produced and we respectfully submit that it
 9 makes sense to divide the questions in this way.
 10 JUDGE LUCRAFT: Yes.
 11 MR HOUGH: In the list of factors and issues on page 12, we
 12 have made a number of changes reflecting submissions by
 13 interested persons. In the first bullet point, which
 14 refers to the nature of the investigation of Khan, we
 15 have made changes to express more precisely the
 16 responsibility for the priority operation, namely that
 17 it was run by MI5 and West Midlands CTU, supported by
 18 Staffordshire Special Branch.
 19 In the second bullet, we have made changes which are
 20 in line with those for the equivalent bullet in
 21 question 3, to reflect points made by the Jones and
 22 Merritt families.
 23 We have also made a number of changes to the
 24 description of the two intelligence strands, and those
 25 are to reflect points made by the West Midlands Police

1 and the Secretaries of State.
 2 The fourth bullet point is a new bullet point, which
 3 addresses matters of concern arising by autumn 2019, in
 4 the same form of words as in question 3.
 5 Then in the fifth bullet point, we have made changes
 6 to reflect points made by the Secretary of State and the
 7 West Midlands Police to the effect that the quality of
 8 monitoring an investigation itself is not in issue, but
 9 that there may be an issue concerning the assessment of
 10 Khan and the continuing risk he posed. Sir, we
 11 anticipate that that bullet point may prove to be one of
 12 the issues you have to address today, and that
 13 Mr Beer QC and Ms Leek QC may have some submissions in
 14 that regard.
 15 We then turn to question 5, pages 14 and 15, which
 16 considers whether deficiencies in arrangements for the
 17 Learning Together event probably or possibly contributed
 18 to the deaths. First of all, we have made changes to
 19 the heading and wording of the question to ensure that
 20 it covers the organisation of the event, as well as
 21 security measures since the question was always intended
 22 to cover the sharing of information between
 23 Learning Together and The Fishmongers' Company. In that
 24 respect we have accepted a submission from Mr Pitchers'
 25 team.

1 In the list of factors and issues on page 15, we
 2 have made a number of changes reflecting submissions by
 3 interested persons. Sir, in the first bullet point we
 4 have added some points suggested by the
 5 Fishmongers' Company, which we accept could be
 6 considered additional security measures.
 7 In the second and third bullet points, we have made
 8 some changes to reflect other reasonable points made by
 9 the Fishmongers' Company. We have not gone on to add
 10 what are, with respect, somewhat self-serving arguments
 11 by the company in relation to this section, for example,
 12 referring to other comparable events which they argue
 13 would not have had metal detectors.
 14 In the fourth bullet point we have made a change to
 15 reflect a reasonable point made by the
 16 Fishmongers' Company regarding the timing of the risk
 17 register being produced, but we have not added their
 18 suggested gloss of the lone actor risk, because that is
 19 not an uncontroversial fact and it's not a matter which
 20 was simply accepted by those questioning the witnesses.
 21 The fifth bullet point is new, and it acknowledges
 22 the role of Learning Together in organising the event,
 23 employing staff there, and being aware of Khan's
 24 offending history. If there are questions to be asked
 25 in relation to Learning Together under this question,

1 which we submit there are, then that background is both
 2 uncontroversial and of value to the jury. We have in
 3 this regard adopted points made by the Jones family in
 4 what we hope is a balanced and proportionate form of
 5 words.
 6 The sixth bullet point has been added to raise the
 7 question whether Learning Together informed themselves
 8 of and assessed the risks of the event properly. You
 9 will recall that Learning Together and the University of
 10 Cambridge didn't make a risk assessment of this specific
 11 event and that the point was raised in questioning that
 12 such an exercise may have justified a request being made
 13 for additional security measures. In this respect we
 14 have adopted a submission of Mr Armstrong in adding the
 15 bullet point.
 16 JUDGE LUCRAFT: Just on that particular bullet point, on the
 17 draft I've got, Mr Hough, there's a repeat of the "or
 18 not".
 19 MR HOUGH: I see that, I'm sure that glitch can be taken
 20 out. It's inevitable, perhaps, that some glitches
 21 arise.
 22 JUDGE LUCRAFT: It's the only glitch I've spotted so far.
 23 MR HOUGH: Well, if that proves to be the only typographical
 24 correction, we're very fortunate.
 25 In relation to question 5, and with respect to

1 Mr Griffin's closely argued submissions, we don't
 2 support the argument that the issue of adequacy of
 3 information provided by Learning Together to the
 4 Fishmongers' Company ought not to be left to the jury,
 5 and the reason, in short, is that the evidence on this
 6 issue was not all one way. That can be seen by perusing
 7 pages 79–81 of the transcript for Day 10 where Commodore
 8 Williamson was questioned by me on this point. He began
 9 by saying that the Fishmongers' Company probably --
 10 although he stressed probably -- would not have added
 11 security measures if given all the facts. But then he
 12 accepted at page 80 that if given the facts, the
 13 Fishmongers' Company would have asked questions about
 14 the level of risk and he then said that that no doubt
 15 would have led to an assurance by Learning Together that
 16 the event was low-risk and that the Fishmongers' Company
 17 would have relied upon that assurance.

18 But then at page 81 he accepted that, given that he
 19 would be relying upon Learning Together's view of risk,
 20 while they would be relying upon the
 21 Fishmongers' Company approach to security, that there
 22 was a real risk of risks and concerns falling between
 23 the cracks.

24 This was a nuanced set of answers, but in our
 25 submission, it doesn't simply lead to the conclusion

1 that whatever Learning Together had said about the
 2 profile of individuals, the Fishmongers' Company would
 3 have done absolutely nothing differently. The jury are,
 4 of course, also entitled to bear in mind what measures
 5 the Fishmongers' Company has taken since the attack, and
 6 what Commodore Williamson accepted would have been done
 7 if an event of comparable profile had been presented to
 8 the company now.

9 Sir, in short, as we've submitted, Learning Together
 10 didn't perform a risk assessment of the event to be
 11 arranged, despite employing various staff who would be
 12 present, and it is properly arguable that a sufficient
 13 assessment of the risks should have led to
 14 Learning Together either requesting or suggesting some
 15 security measures, such as a bag search, or highlighting
 16 aspects of risk which would have caused the
 17 Fishmongers' Company to adopt such an expedient.

18 Sir, that's what we say in relation to question 5,
 19 and those are our submissions in relation to the form of
 20 determinations.

21 Finally, and briefly, the proposed process for
 22 arriving at any Prevention of Future Deaths Report. We
 23 set out the governing legal principles from page 50 of
 24 our document. We understand them to be generally
 25 accepted, and I don't propose to extend my submissions

1 today by taking you through them.

2 At page 54, paragraph 84, we set out a proposed set
 3 of directions for submissions on the content of
 4 Prevention of Future Deaths Reports. We note that they
 5 appear to be uncontroversial and we invite you to make
 6 those directions. It is important, we submit, the
 7 public authorities have the opportunity to consider and
 8 respond to points which are suggested as potential areas
 9 of concern before you produce a report, not least
 10 because it is important that your report takes full
 11 account of any changes which have been made
 12 since November 2019. Of course, you heard of a number
 13 of those changes during the course of the evidence, but
 14 you may not have heard of all of such changes.

15 JUDGE LUCRAFT: No, I mean, it's the approach, Mr Hough,
 16 that I adopted in relation to the other Inquests that
 17 I presided over when I was still the Chief Coroner, and
 18 obviously the guidance on Prevention of Future Deaths
 19 Reports was revised as one of the topics that I took on
 20 when I was in post. It's an issue which I entirely
 21 accept is a very important part of this process overall,
 22 and it seems to me that the various submissions which
 23 I read in respect of Prevention of Future Deaths Reports
 24 are all pointing in the same direction, but it seems to
 25 me very important, as you've indicated, to have the

1 views of other IPs before I formulate a report in due
 2 course.

3 MR HOUGH: Yes, and we agree with that, and we agree with
 4 Mr Armstrong's submissions that the process is
 5 an important part of these Inquests --

6 JUDGE LUCRAFT: Yes.

7 MR HOUGH: -- and that it can, moreover, identify matters of
 8 concern which could give rise to future deaths, even if
 9 those matters didn't even possibly contribute to the
 10 deaths of Jack and Saskia.

11 So, sir, those are our submissions at this stage,
 12 unless we can be of any further assistance.

13 JUDGE LUCRAFT: No. That's extremely helpful, thank you
 14 very much indeed, Mr Hough.

15 Going through the various documents that I've got --
 16 I'm looking at Ms Leek, simply because she is in my eye
 17 line. I don't know, Ms Leek, if you want to go next?

18 MS LEEK: Sir, I think Mr Beer might be going next on this
 19 occasion.

20 MR HOUGH: I think Mr Beer is being volunteered, very
 21 generously, from an intra-chambers perspective.

22 JUDGE LUCRAFT: Yes, and he is getting some of his 10,000
 23 steps in.

24 Submissions by MR BEER QC

25 MR BEER: Sir, I didn't actually hear what Ms Leek said but

1 I assume because everyone looked at me that I was being
2 volunteered.

3 JUDGE LUCRAFT: It may be one of those things that it's
4 probably better you didn't hear what she said.

5 MR BEER: Sir, you've got our submissions in writing,
6 I'm not going to repeat them, or even summarise them,
7 but instead take them as read.

8 I know that you will take into account the points
9 that we have made in writing, in particular on the
10 problematic question 4.

11 JUDGE LUCRAFT: Yes.

12 MR BEER: With, if I may say so, his easy charm and realism,
13 Mr Hough has rightly recognised the difficulties with
14 question 4, and so the submissions I've got to make are
15 somewhat shorter than otherwise they might have been,
16 but I still have some supplemental submissions to make,
17 in particular on question 4, and some responsive
18 submissions to those made by other PIPs.

19 By way of route map — and I shan't be long —
20 I will propose to make submissions in this order:
21 firstly, about two general issues, firstly, a response
22 to the submissions made by Mr Pitchers and Mr Armstrong
23 about the arguable breach of the general duty implied in
24 Article 2 of the Convention, and then some submissions
25 about the significance and importance of the

33

1 "considerations" page of the questionnaire that follows
2 each of questions 3, 4 and 5, and then turn to some
3 points of detail in questions 3 and 4.

4 Sir, in relation to breach of the general duty, you
5 will have seen that Mr Armstrong on behalf of Jack's
6 family and Mr Pitchers on behalf of Saskia's family both
7 make submissions to the effect that the general duty
8 implied in Article 2 was arguably breached in this case.
9 I would like to respond very briefly to those
10 submissions.

11 So far as Mr Armstrong's submissions are concerned,
12 it isn't, I think, on analysis necessary to address the
13 extensive citation of authority in paragraphs 17(a) to
14 (c), nor what is said to be the application of that
15 authority to the circumstances of this case in
16 paragraphs 18(a) to (g), for the simple reason that
17 Mr Armstrong does not propose any additional questions
18 to be put to the jury in relation to the alleged breach
19 of the general duty, nor even suggest any additional
20 considerations or bullet points to be added after
21 questions 3, 4 and 5, which might draw out in the jury
22 narrative answers that reflect a breach of the general
23 duty. So for those reasons, I'm not going to address
24 any of the points of law or fact made in relation to the
25 alleged breach of general duty. In short, they go

34

1 nowhere in terms of translation into this questionnaire.

2 The position is slightly different in relation to
3 Mr Pitchers' submissions because they do seek to
4 translate the submissions made in paragraphs 12–14, the
5 submissions he makes first as to the law on general duty
6 and then as to the facts on general duty into the bullet
7 points in the questionnaire itself.

8 However, none of the additional bullet points that
9 are suggested, some of which have been adopted by
10 Mr Hough, affect West Midlands Police directly, and so
11 it's not necessary to make detailed submissions on these
12 points. Instead the response to Mr Pitchers' suggested
13 addition of considerations, extra bullet points, are
14 intended to prompt the jury to bring in adverse
15 conclusions in relation to the general duty are for
16 Ms Leek to answer in relation to Mr Pitchers' points (d)
17 and (e) on page 8, and for Mr Boyle to answer in respect
18 of points (f) and (g) on page 8.

19 I would have said, had I been addressing these more
20 extensively, that the suggestion that there's no
21 requirement to establish any causation resulting from
22 a failure of the State's general systems or operations
23 is wrong, that point is made in paragraph 7 of
24 Mr Pitchers' submissions. None of the three citations
25 given in support of that very broad and over-extensive

35

1 proposition make it good. In addition to the point that
2 Mr Hough made this morning, referring you to
3 paragraph 138 of Lord Brown's speech in Van Colle, which
4 makes it clear that causation is still a requirement
5 even in relation to an alleged breach of the general
6 duty, you might also have reference to what a rather
7 strong Court of Appeal — the President of the
8 Queen's Bench division, then Sir Anthony May,
9 Lord Justice Dyson and Lord Justice Hooper — said in
10 Allen, namely it's implicit in an investigation into a
11 breach of the general duty that what is being
12 investigated caused or may have contributed to the
13 death. The court therefore could not accept the
14 submissions of Mr Thomas that causation is irrelevant in
15 an Article 2 investigation.

16 So, sir, that's all I say about the general duty
17 issue: firstly, it doesn't really touch me, it affects
18 others, so far as Mr Pitchers is concerned, and
19 Mr Armstrong's submissions don't translate into
20 additional questions.

21 Can I turn to my second general submission, please:
22 the importance of the considerations page that follows
23 each of questions 3, 4 and 5. It might, of course, be
24 thought that the most significant issue for you to
25 determine is the form of the questions themselves.

36

1 Instead, however, we would respectfully suggest that of
 2 equal importance are the considerations that your team
 3 have listed in the bullet points that follow each of
 4 questions 3, 4 and 5, and that importance is for both
 5 legal and practical reasons.
 6 At the practical level, as you'll know, sir,
 7 experience suggests that particularly in long inquests
 8 such as these, where the jury has been required to
 9 listen to six weeks of evidence, dense evidence, where
 10 it doesn't have its own documents, it has no transcript
 11 of the evidence that's been given, experience suggests
 12 that juries follow very carefully the suggestions that
 13 you make in your questionnaire as to the facts and
 14 matters that might form the basis of an answer, and in
 15 particular, an adverse answer, to the questions that are
 16 put to them, and so for that practical reason, special
 17 care must be taken to ensure that the considerations are
 18 properly reflective of the evidence, but also that
 19 a Galbraith plus type approach is taken to each of them.
 20 That takes me to the legal reason for such
 21 an approach being necessary, and I would say that it's
 22 necessary to recall quite how it is that in this
 23 coronial jurisdiction, we've reached the position where
 24 these lists of consideration are so important.
 25 Now, the starting point is that the authorities that

1 nearly everyone in this case has cited in their
 2 submissions about there needing to be only an arguable
 3 breach of a positive obligation were all in fact about
 4 the issue of whether an Article 2—compliant
 5 investigation is necessary, rather than the issue of
 6 once such a compliant investigation has taken place,
 7 what test ought to be applied of whether the evidence
 8 that's been heard demonstrates to some level a breach of
 9 the obligation sufficient to ensure or require
 10 an extended narrative being left to the jury.
 11 Now, of course, we've all cited those cases,
 12 Worcestershire, "anything more than fanciful", Maguire,
 13 "a credible suggestion" for different reasons,
 14 Mr Armstrong and Mr Pitchers to show how low the
 15 threshold is and, therefore, how easily it's surpassed,
 16 the State PIPs to show how low the threshold is and the
 17 fact that a concession has been made and therefore the
 18 threshold is passed is of no great matter.
 19 But the point is that these cases are all about
 20 a different issue, and the learning from them has been
 21 cross-applied to the stage of the proceedings that we're
 22 now at. That has a couple of consequences.
 23 The first consequence is that an extended narrative
 24 is opened up to a jury on the basis of mere arguability,
 25 the very low threshold that everyone speaks of. And

1 once that happens, the extended narrative is opened up
 2 for all of us, without regard to whether there has been
 3 an even arguable case of breach against an individual or
 4 an organisation or not, and, indeed, without regard to
 5 whether they're a State actor or not.
 6 The second consequence of the approach that the law
 7 has arrived at is that the jury is not itself asked to
 8 consider any facts or matters relevant to the issue of
 9 whether or not the relevant positive obligation has been
 10 breached, ie whether, in fact, there was a real and
 11 immediate risk of harm, whether there were, in fact,
 12 matters about which the authorities knew or ought to
 13 have known, whether, in fact, the authorities failed to
 14 take steps that, judged reasonably, might have averted
 15 the real and immediate risk of harm. Put another way,
 16 once we're through the arguable breach gateway, we then
 17 move straight to breach, and that's what this
 18 questionnaire does.
 19 Of course, that's not the case in other contexts
 20 when conclusions are left to the jury. We don't decide
 21 that there is sufficient evidence to leave a gross
 22 negligence manslaughter to the jury on the basis of
 23 arguability and then ask them to decide the single issue
 24 of whether or not they find the deceased died by reason
 25 of gross negligence manslaughter. Instead, each of the

1 constituent elements that might lead to that ultimate
 2 conclusion are spelled out for a jury in a questionnaire
 3 and directions that they must find facts to the relevant
 4 standard to establish each of the five building blocks.
 5 So a questionnaire is left that ask them are there facts
 6 that lead to the existence of a duty of care owed to the
 7 deceased or having regard to the risk of death was the
 8 misconduct so grossly negligent that it might be
 9 condemned as the serious crime of manslaughter.
 10 Whereas here, in Article 2 territory, that approach
 11 is put to one side: we move straight from arguability
 12 into failings. The first consequence of that is that,
 13 with respect, we must be especially careful in the
 14 selection and formulation of the lists of
 15 considerations, because they are the building blocks for
 16 the jury. They are the part of the building blocks that
 17 are being suggested to the jury as a permissible route
 18 to answering the headline questions "Yes" or "No".
 19 The second consequence, we submit, is that set out
 20 in paragraph 20 of our written submissions on page 5.,
 21 that clear causation directions ought to be given, not
 22 just generally, because we've no doubt that you will
 23 address the jury in relation to causation generally, but
 24 specifically in relation to the lists of considerations,
 25 ie picking some examples and explaining to the jury how

1 their factual findings may permissibly be translated
 2 into an answer to the overarching question with a first
 3 limb Lewis causation test, questions essentially 3(a),
 4 4(a) and 5(a), and how that must not occur, essentially,
 5 questions 3(b), 4(b) and 5(b).
 6 You will have seen in footnote 3 of our submissions
 7 an alternative suggestion reflecting the true nature of
 8 the exercise that in logic ought to be undertaken, ie
 9 the splitting out of the lists of considerations into
 10 those where there is Galbraith plus evidence, that the
 11 answer to the question contributed on the balance of
 12 probabilities to the deaths, and those where that cannot
 13 be said. We don't pursue that, it's been rejected as
 14 too complicated elsewhere, so that the questionnaire is
 15 split in that way, and questions or considerations that
 16 could go into the first part of each of 3, 4 and 5 are
 17 listed alongside it, questions that can't, on
 18 a Galbraith plus test, satisfy on a balance of
 19 probabilities the causation test go into the second part
 20 of the question.
 21 But what we do say is that, in your summing-up, the
 22 impermissible as well as the permissible routes of
 23 reasoning must be clearly laid out to the jury, ie they
 24 can't simply look at a consideration and think: yes, we
 25 agree with that, and then think: therefore, I answer

1 box 1 "Yes".
 2 To take an example, the distribution of MAPPAs
 3 minutes, that's a new addition. If the jury think that
 4 the system of the distribution of MAPPAs minutes was
 5 wrong, they ought to have been distributed in some other
 6 way, that's there for their consideration now. Can they
 7 use that to answer box 1 in questions 3, and possibly 4,
 8 "Yes"? That will be very hard to say: on the balance of
 9 probabilities a failure to distribute the MAPPAs minutes
 10 in another way, which meant that readers had better
 11 access to them in advance of meetings, probably led to
 12 these two deaths. That's a good example of where
 13 a consideration on analysis could really only go to the
 14 weak causation, second limb Lewis.
 15 Sir, with those general submissions can I turn to
 16 the individual questions, and I'm working from v2 of
 17 Mr Hough's draft. We have made submissions about
 18 question 2 and a reordering of events, and Mr Hough has
 19 kindly taken those on board.
 20 In relation to question 3, please, and in
 21 particular, the considerations page on page 9, there are
 22 three points, please, sir. The first of them is very
 23 small indeed, it's the second bullet point, it's really
 24 the mentioning of the word "arrangements" after the word
 25 "MAPPAs" where the A in MAPPAs stands for arrangements.

1 It's a tiny point.
 2 The second point is in relation to the fourth bullet
 3 point and what should follow it. We've suggested it,
 4 and, sir, I'm working from paragraph 24 of our
 5 submissions, if you could have those open, please.
 6 JUDGE LUCRAFT: Yes.
 7 MR BEER: We suggested, and continue to suggest, the
 8 addition of a fresh bullet point here. It's set out in
 9 paragraph 24. Mr Hough has obviously dealt in his
 10 submissions so far with the reasons that have moved the
 11 Inquest team to make amendments, rather than reasons for
 12 not being so moved, but we say that the suggested
 13 additional bullet point set out in paragraph 24 falls to
 14 be added for all of the reasons set out in paragraph 25.
 15 As matters stand, one has listed in the second
 16 bullet point, the third bullet point, the fourth bullet
 17 point, the fifth bullet point, a series of factors that
 18 tend to point towards Khan showing risk. You've heard
 19 from my clients and from Witness A that a very important
 20 factor is the absence of intelligence. That absence of
 21 intelligence was evidence in itself about the level of
 22 risk that Khan posed. That was despite what's been
 23 described as a proportionate level of coverage
 24 throughout the relevant period. Without the addition of
 25 this bullet point, the relative risk that Khan posed is

1 left unbalanced. Some balance needs to be brought to
 2 bear to this list of considerations.
 3 Sir, the third submission in relation to question 3
 4 is in what is now bullet point 6., so second from the
 5 bottom, and we had suggested the words "some of" be
 6 inserted between the words "not" and "those" so it
 7 reads:
 8 "Whether or not some of those responsible were
 9 properly trained".
 10 That's because the bullet point seems to be focused
 11 on proper concerns being raised about Messrs Johal,
 12 Skelton and members of the Prevent Team, that they were
 13 fresh in their roles, or may have lacked sufficient
 14 experience. Those suggestions or considerations have
 15 not been advanced in relation to those that I represent,
 16 and therefore the addition of those words "some of"
 17 makes it clear that one is not talking about everyone
 18 that was involved in the MAPPAs arrangements, it's fairly
 19 reflective of the evidence that the jury has heard.
 20 Otherwise, the risk is run that everyone is condemned as
 21 maybe lacking proper training and experience.
 22 Sir, can I turn to question 4 then, please. Can we
 23 turn, please, to page 12, and there are two points to
 24 make in relation to the bullet points. In relation to
 25 the third bullet point, we had suggested that the bullet

1 point be split. I'm reading or referring to
 2 paragraph 44 and 45 of our written submissions. The
 3 reason for suggesting this, sir, is that in this
 4 document as a whole, all 14 pages of it, the only
 5 reference to the fact that there was no intelligence at
 6 all indicating any conduct or intentions of any national
 7 security concern is in that subclause at the end of the
 8 third bullet point. As Witness A, DCI Chambers and
 9 others made clear, the absence of such intelligence was
 10 for them a very important consideration. At the moment
 11 it's tucked away as a subclause concerning a separate
 12 issue, a different issue. The suggestions that the jury
 13 ought to consider compliance with the licence conditions
 14 and apparent good overt management ought to be separated
 15 out from the covert investigation that was being
 16 undertaken. It gives proper prominence in a list of
 17 considerations as to risk. That point is made
 18 particularly strong given the additions that have been
 19 made in bullet points 2, 4 and 6, all at the suggestion
 20 of the families, which add in additional factors tending
 21 to suggest Khan presented a high risk of serious harm.
 22 We're not suggesting at all that they be deleted,
 23 they're proper suggestions to have made, but, as I've
 24 said, some balance and order needs to be brought to this
 25 part of the questionnaire.

1 The second submission relates to bullet point 5,
 2 that's the penultimate bullet point at the foot of
 3 page 12, and we say that this ought to be deleted.
 4 Mr Hough has properly recognised the difficulties that
 5 existed with the previous drafting, inviting the jury to
 6 assess the nature, quality and extent of the covert
 7 investigation, but the deletion of what was (a) doesn't
 8 cure that vice. The reasons why that bullet point
 9 should be deleted are those set out in paragraphs 35-37
 10 of our written submissions.
 11 I would add only two things to that. Firstly, the
 12 focus of what Mr Hough has submitted is the issue for
 13 consideration by the jury under question 4 is the
 14 management and sharing of information. This bullet
 15 point does not reflect that. Secondly, what in his
 16 written and oral submissions today is Mr Hough's proper
 17 focus on the management and sharing of information and
 18 intelligence is addressed by bullet points 6, 7 and 8.
 19 Inviting the jury to assess whether or not MI5 and West
 20 Midlands Police took a proper approach to the assessment
 21 of mindset falls into exactly the vice that we set out
 22 in our written submissions: the jury hasn't got
 23 sufficient evidence properly to answer that question,
 24 how would they know, and it would be unsafe for them to
 25 do so.

1 Sir, those are our submissions.
 2 JUDGE LUCRAFT: Thank you very much.
 3 MR HOUGH: Sir, I'm just looking at the time and aware that
 4 we do have transcribers, albeit remote.
 5 JUDGE LUCRAFT: I was going to suggest that we took a break
 6 at that stage because we've been going for an hour and
 7 a quarter and I expect everyone would welcome a break.
 8 What I was just going to just see is to who is
 9 coming next, as it were. Mr Boyle, it looks as if you
 10 are being --
 11 MR BOYLE: I will be very, very brief, sir, but I will do so
 12 after the short break.
 13 JUDGE LUCRAFT: Thank you. We'll sit again in 15 minutes'
 14 time. Thank you.
 15 (11.46 am)
 16 (A short break)
 17 (12.04 pm)
 18 JUDGE LUCRAFT: Mr Boyle.
 19 Submissions by MR BOYLE QC
 20 MR BOYLE: Sir, on page 9 of the second version of the draft
 21 questionnaire, at the sixth bullet point under
 22 question 3, the words "trained and" have been added
 23 before the word "experienced", no doubt to reflect the
 24 well made submissions of my learned friend Mr Pitchers
 25 in relation to the general duty. The addition of those

1 words is unobjectionable.
 2 I had made submissions in relation to the use of the
 3 word "experience" in that same bullet point with regard
 4 to the Prevent officers, and encouraging you to strike
 5 a careful balance in how that particular topic was
 6 summed up to the jury. Can I simply make a similar
 7 observation in relation to the use of the word "trained"
 8 and particularly to remind you, not that you will need
 9 reminding of course, sir, that in relation to the
 10 question of training, there was evidence from Mr Oomer
 11 and, indeed, from ACC Ward about the lack of training on
 12 a national basis, as opposed to that being the lack of
 13 training having been provided by Staffordshire Police,
 14 which was available, but for reasons best known to
 15 Staffs Police wasn't provided, it's a national issue
 16 which is being addressed, happily.
 17 Then finally, I agree with and adopt the compelling
 18 submission made to you just a moment or two ago by
 19 Mr Beer on behalf of West Midlands Police for the need
 20 to individually mark as a consideration/issue that there
 21 was no intelligence during the course of 2019 that
 22 Mr Khan posed a risk to national security.
 23 Sir, those are my submissions.
 24 JUDGE LUCRAFT: Thank you very much indeed, Mr Boyle.
 25 Ms Leek, I think it may now be your turn.

1 Submissions by MS LEEK QC
 2 MS LEEK: Thank you, sir. The Secretaries of State for
 3 Justice and for the Home Department set out their
 4 position in detail in written submissions served
 5 yesterday. Sir, I don't propose to repeat those in any
 6 detail.
 7 What we do propose to do is make brief submissions
 8 as follows: first of all, I will summarise the position
 9 with regard to paragraphs 4(a) to (f) of the submissions
 10 of Counsel to the Inquests, which distill CTI's
 11 position; secondly, I will make brief submissions as to
 12 the role of MI5; thirdly, I will set out our position as
 13 to the submissions of other interested persons;
 14 fourthly, I will make submissions as to the amendment
 15 and revision of the proposed questions and bullet point
 16 matters to be borne in mind by the jury and; fifthly,
 17 I propose to make brief observations as to matters which
 18 we submit ought to be addressed by you in your
 19 summing-up to the jury.
 20 With regard, first of all, to the position in
 21 relation to paragraphs 4(a) to (f) of CTI's submissions,
 22 the Secretaries of State do not dissent from the
 23 submission that Article 2 is engaged. We have made it
 24 clear that this is on the basis of the authorities as
 25 a whole, but we have not specified or identified any

1 specific agency in respect of which we say the threshold
 2 has been met. The reason for this approach, sir, is
 3 because there is unequivocal evidence that it was the
 4 collective responsibility of a number of State agencies
 5 to manage Khan through MAPPAs, even though the Probation
 6 Service was the lead agency.
 7 Sir, with regard to 4(b), we support CTI's position
 8 that it is not necessary to decide whether there is
 9 an arguable case that there was a breach by the State of
 10 the general duty. For the avoidance of doubt, it is not
 11 accepted that there was even an arguable breach and,
 12 sir, I refer to paragraphs 24–32 of our submissions, and
 13 emphasise that to the extent that IPs contend that there
 14 were arguable deficiencies in the way in which Khan was
 15 managed, these bear solely on the operational and not
 16 the systemic duty.
 17 Sir, the general duty, as you know, applies at
 18 a high level of generality. The courts must not
 19 micro-manage procedures. Sir, I don't propose to
 20 address you any further in relation to that.
 21 With regard to 4(c), we agree with Counsel to the
 22 Inquests and all IPs that short-form conclusions of
 23 unlawful killing should be recorded in relation to each
 24 of the deceased for the compelling reasons given by
 25 Mr Hough.

1 Sir, we agree with the proposition that the jury
 2 should be invited to approve or amend the short passages
 3 summarising the immediate circumstances of the deaths.
 4 With regard to 4(e), sir, we agree that the jury
 5 should be invited to answer questions concerning issues
 6 1 and 3, but they should not be invited to answer any
 7 questions concerning the adequacy of the investigation.
 8 Sir, Mr Hough has given a revised set of questions. The
 9 majority of the bullet points take this into account,
 10 but I will address you specifically in relation to
 11 bullet point 5 that my learned friend Mr Beer has
 12 addressed you on already.
 13 Sir, so far as MI5's involvement in the management
 14 of Khan is concerned, I wish to draw your attention to
 15 paragraphs 23(a) to (d) of our submissions which address
 16 paragraph 17 of CTI's submissions. Whilst it is right
 17 to say that the Secretaries of State have accepted that
 18 Article 2 is engaged on the basis of an arguable breach
 19 by the authorities generally, sir, the Secretary of
 20 State for the Home Department does not accept that there
 21 is even an arguable breach of the operational duty so
 22 far as MI5 is concerned.
 23 Sir, while Mr Hough has indicated that he does not
 24 suggest that you make findings in relation to each
 25 individual authority, there are a few points which the

1 Secretary of State seeks to make.
 2 First of all, there is no evidence upon which
 3 a properly directed jury could reach conclusions in
 4 relation to the adequacy or otherwise of the priority
 5 investigation. Sir, the jury is simply not in
 6 a position to make a judgment on the evidence that it
 7 has heard. There is no evidence before the jury to
 8 suggest that MI5 knew or ought to have known of a real
 9 and immediate risk to the lives of attendees at the
 10 Learning Together event or those in the vicinity. The
 11 covert investigation revealed nothing to give any cause
 12 for concern.
 13 Thirdly, MI5 did not form part of the responsible
 14 authority within the MAPPAs structure, nor were they in
 15 any way responsible for the management of Khan within
 16 the MAPPAs framework. Insofar as the covert
 17 investigation revealed anything of national security
 18 concern or relevance, MI5 passed this information to
 19 counter-terrorism policing, whose role it was to be the
 20 bridge into MAPPAs, and, sir, it is understood that this
 21 is accepted by all concerned.
 22 And finally, sir, the decisions about what Khan
 23 should be permitted to do under the licence conditions
 24 or about variation of licence conditions were for the
 25 responsible authority to make within the framework of

1 MAPPA.
 2 Sir, may I make brief observations regarding the
 3 submissions of other interested persons. Sir, may
 4 I start with West Midlands Police. Sir, we adopt and
 5 endorse the submissions that my learned friend, Mr Beer,
 6 has so eloquently made, and in particular, we adopt
 7 section (b) of their written submissions. Sir, we
 8 support the submissions made by West Midlands Police at
 9 paragraphs 20–34, and, sir, we are in full agreement
 10 with the submissions of West Midlands Police concerning
 11 the extent to which the investigation itself should be
 12 included in the bullet points.
 13 Sir, there should be no questions relating to the
 14 adequacy or otherwise of the investigation. As I've
 15 just said, there is insufficient evidence for the jury
 16 to be asked for any determination that assesses the
 17 priority investigation, its quality, nature or extent.
 18 There is simply no evidence upon which the jury can
 19 judge the quality of the investigation. As Mr Beer has
 20 said, this issue fails to meet the Galbraith plus test,
 21 and, sir, we submit that even the revised formulation
 22 regarding the assessment and mindset and risk comes
 23 under the umbrella of investigation. If the issue of
 24 investigation comes out, sir, then that ought to come
 25 out in its entirety as well.

1 Sir, whilst it is accepted that West Midlands Police
 2 had a role in providing advice and raising guidance and
 3 concerns regarding the management of Usman Khan as part
 4 of MAPPA, MI5 did not have such a role and, sir, this
 5 was made clear by Witness A and went unchallenged by any
 6 interested person.
 7 Sir, so far as Saskia Jones' family's submissions
 8 are concerned, in paragraph 13, the family submits that
 9 greater prominence or consideration should be given to
 10 certain systems that were in place at the time. Sir, we
 11 make no submission in relation to the suggestion
 12 regarding the allocation of Khan to Prevent officers,
 13 and I note that Mr Hough has provided a revised
 14 formulation accepting some but rejecting some of the
 15 Jones and Merritt families' submissions. May I just
 16 make these brief points.
 17 First of all, with regard to the issue of their
 18 suggestion that a question should be asked regarding the
 19 failure to ensure that a rigorous ERG 22 assessment was
 20 carried out in the community with psychological input.
 21 First of all, sir, you will recall that the ERG was in
 22 draft form, and not presented to MAPPA. Secondly, there
 23 was no requirement for an ERG at that stage. Thirdly,
 24 there was no requirement for psychological input at that
 25 stage. And, fourthly, it was not a requirement that the

1 person carrying out the ERG should not be the offender
 2 manager. Sir, systems have changed since, as you heard
 3 from Sonia Flynn, but that does not mean that the system
 4 was inadequate at the time.
 5 13(c), Saskia Jones' family submit that it should be
 6 included that the MAPPA chair only had CTC clearance.
 7 Sir, that cannot be said to be a systemic failing. So
 8 far as it is suggested that it was an operational
 9 failing and should be included within the seventh bullet
 10 point under question 3, sir, there is no evidence that
 11 Mr Byford would have received further information but
 12 for the level of his clearance. He made clear that the
 13 level of his clearance had never had any impact on his
 14 ability to receive sensitive evidence.
 15 Sir, with regard to the suggestion at 13(d) that the
 16 lack of a timetabled pre-meet should be included, again,
 17 there is no evidence upon which a jury could conclude
 18 that this caused or contributed in any way to the deaths
 19 or even may possibly have contributed to the deaths.
 20 Sir, those are included in Mr Hough's revised bullet
 21 points, and we submit that it would be inappropriate for
 22 those to be included. The reason they should be
 23 excluded is because the evidence made clear that the
 24 relevant information could have been provided to the
 25 MAPPA process without the pre-meets and without the

1 relevant security clearance, and it was neither of these
 2 which caused the intelligence not to be included.
 3 Sir, so far as the families, Mr Merritt's family's
 4 submissions are concerned, I make a few brief
 5 submissions. First of all, with regard to paragraph 8,
 6 it is not accepted that it is for the jury to point out
 7 any regulatory shortcomings which may have contributed
 8 to the deaths.
 9 Sir, my learned friend Mr Hough has agreed with that
 10 in his submissions and appears to have removed any
 11 questions which deal with alleged regulatory
 12 shortcomings.
 13 Sir, again, I do not propose to address the matters
 14 relating to general duty that are set out in
 15 Mr Armstrong's submissions, we have addressed the law
 16 relating to general duty in our written submissions, and
 17 I don't propose to repeat them here.
 18 Sir, may I now go again to bullet point 5 in
 19 relation to question 4. Sir, the Secretaries of State
 20 adopt and endorse my learned friend Mr Beer's
 21 submissions in relation to that, and we specifically say
 22 that this should come out in its entirety so far as MI5
 23 is concerned. There is no evidence upon which
 24 a properly directed jury could reach a conclusion in
 25 relation to the assessment of mindset or risk by MI5.

1 No evidence was given as to the matters that were
 2 addressed by MI5 regarding mindset or risk, and
 3 extensive evidence was given to the fact that during the
 4 11-month covert priority investigation, nothing of any
 5 concern was raised.
 6 Sir, so far as mindset is concerned, Witness A did
 7 not give evidence about when it would be appropriate to
 8 refer an individual to the Behavioural Science Unit.
 9 Sir, on that basis, there is simply no evidence with
 10 regard to mindset whatsoever.
 11 Sir, if you are minded to keep the bullet point in
 12 in any form at all, MI5's assessment of mindset and risk
 13 should specifically be excluded. And, sir, finally, if
 14 you are going to keep it in in relation to police
 15 authorities and MI5, then it needs to be made absolutely
 16 clear in summing-up that there is no evidence before the
 17 jury as to the nature and extent of MI5's investigation
 18 into these issues before them.
 19 Sir, finally, may I address briefly a few issues
 20 that we suggest you deal with in your summing-up to the
 21 jury. Sir, first of all, MI5's operations are conducted
 22 covertly, whilst MAPPAs operate in the overt world. The
 23 bridge between MI5 and MAPPAs is CT policing. That much
 24 was made clear by Witness A and was agreed by
 25 West Midlands CTU and Staffordshire Special Branch.

57

1 Sir, that is also MAPPAs' stated position and there was
 2 no challenge to that.
 3 Sir, it needs to be made clear that MI5 has no
 4 formal role in the MAPPAs process. All agencies involved
 5 in MAPPAs were aware of that, and proceeding on that
 6 basis.
 7 Sir, thirdly, it follows that the fact it has no
 8 formal role in MAPPAs means that there is no formal role
 9 of feeding MAPPAs with intelligence from MI5.
 10 West Midlands CTU and Staffordshire Police, who had the
 11 second strand of intelligence, both attended all MAPPAs
 12 meetings, saw the MAPPAs Fs, and had all the details
 13 regarding the attendance at Fishmongers' Hall.
 14 Fourthly, CT policing are the bridge between MI5 and
 15 MAPPAs. MI5 shares intelligence with the police and it
 16 is for the police to decide what intelligence they
 17 consider should be fed into the MAPPAs process. Sir, in
 18 the case of Khan, it needs to be made clear that all
 19 intelligence was shared with the police. The only
 20 matter which was not shared in writing with the police
 21 was MI5's assessment, based on a healthy scepticism that
 22 Usman Khan presented a risk of manipulation, and, sir,
 23 you will remember that Witness A said that it was
 24 probably verbally passed in any event. The evidence was
 25 that MI5 were confident that this would have been

58

1 discussed with the police. In any event, sir, this was
 2 plainly considered by MAPPAs, and we refer you to the
 3 minutes of August 2019 in that regard. MAPPAs attendees
 4 from probation to police agree that they would have
 5 treated his compliance with scepticism. Sir, so far as
 6 causation is concerned, there is no issue there.
 7 Sir, MI5 did not receive MAPPAs minutes; they only
 8 received them prior to the Inquest. MI5's role has
 9 never been and is not to quality-assure the MAPPAs
 10 process and to make sure on a regular basis that they
 11 have relevant information, that is simply not their
 12 role.
 13 Sir, notwithstanding all of that, and ignoring the
 14 issue of hindsight, MI5 had no concerns to share about
 15 the trip to Fishmongers' Hall. Even if it is suggested
 16 that it was MI5's role to feed MAPPAs with intelligence,
 17 which, as I have said, is not accepted, there was in
 18 fact nothing to feed in in any event.
 19 Sir, on that basis, we endorse Mr Beer's submission
 20 that a little balance needs to be injected into the
 21 bullet points to reflect the fact that over a period of
 22 11 months, there was no intelligence, evidence or
 23 information to suggest that Usman Khan was planning
 24 an attack, and there was certainly no intelligence to
 25 suggest that he was doing anything to give any cause for

59

1 concern from a national security perspective.
 2 JUDGE LUCRAFT: Thank you.
 3 I think, Mr Griffin, it may be sensible for me to
 4 hear from you next.
 5 Submissions by MR GRIFFIN QC
 6 MR GRIFFIN: Thank you very much, sir.
 7 Sir, you have our written submission, and may I also
 8 start by thanking Counsel to the Inquest for their work
 9 in their submission which has made our approach much
 10 easier.
 11 Sir, there are two areas that I would like to
 12 address. The first -- and both areas relate to bullet
 13 points on the last page of the questionnaire, and they
 14 go to issues of the sufficiency of the information that
 15 Learning Together provided to Fishmongers' Company in
 16 relation to the event at Fishmongers' Hall, and the
 17 additional point that has been inserted into the second
 18 draft of the questionnaire, following the submissions on
 19 behalf of the families in relation to the suggestion
 20 that an appropriate risk assessment wasn't conducted for
 21 the event. So, the bullet points are the fifth, sixth
 22 and seventh bullet points, and my submissions today to
 23 you are confined to those bullet points.
 24 Our submission is that issues of sufficiency of
 25 information provided by Learning Together to

60

1 Fishmongers' Company and of risk assessment should be
2 removed, those bullet points should be removed on the
3 basis that in all of the circumstances they can't
4 arguably be said to have caused or contributed to the
5 deaths of Jack Merritt or Saskia Jones.

6 Sir, the law has been set out by Counsel to the
7 Inquests in their written submission, and summarised
8 again today. A coroner is entitled to exclude from
9 consideration matters which cannot, even arguably, be
10 said to have contributed to the death under
11 consideration, that is at paragraph 8 of Counsel to the
12 Inquest's written submission and, of course, the test in
13 Tainton. Sir, this is set out at paragraph 10 of
14 Counsel to the Inquest's written submission and you will
15 see it also in the submissions from both families and,
16 of course, the test there:

17 "The question is whether, on the balance of
18 probabilities, the conduct in question more than
19 minimally, negligibly or trivially contributed to
20 death..."

21 Sir, it is sometimes suggested that that is a low
22 threshold, but it is a threshold, and in our submission
23 it's an important threshold.

24 Sir, may I start by addressing what is now the
25 seventh bullet point on page 15, relating to the nature

61

1 of the information that Fishmongers' Company provided --
2 sorry, Learning Together provided to
3 Fishmongers' Company, particularly in relation to the
4 persons or the types of persons who might be attending.

5 Sir, our submission you have in writing, and I don't
6 seek now to address you in full, but what I would like
7 to do is to provide a summarised version, and also to
8 attempt to take into account the points that Mr Hough
9 raised earlier on this morning, in relation to our
10 submission.

11 So in relation to that issue, the question or issue
12 of sufficiency of information, we say that the following
13 points are highly relevant. Sir, the Fishmongers' Hall
14 event was flagged with Mr Skelton of probation in
15 advance, details were provided to probation and police
16 about the event -- sir, this is my written submission
17 9(c). If there were additional requirements, for
18 example, if the police had wanted to accompany Mr Khan,
19 they would have been facilitated. So that is the
20 starting point. And it's also relevant that both
21 Drs Ludlow and Armstrong reasonably and understandably
22 relied on probation and on MAPPa to take a view on
23 whether Usman Khan could attend Learning Together events
24 generally, and the Fishmongers' Hall event specifically,
25 and they reasonably understood that his attendance at

62

1 Fishmongers' Hall had been agreed by Mr Skelton and had
2 been agreed by MAPPa.

3 Sir, in their submission at paragraph 55, Counsel to
4 the Inquests' written submission, and summarised to you
5 today, Counsel to the Inquests point to the possible
6 failure of the MAPPa panel properly to consider whether
7 Usman Khan should have been permitted to go at all and
8 if so, what security measures should have been
9 considered.

10 They point to the possibility that had -- well, had
11 MAPPa not permitted Usman Khan's attendance at the event
12 in the same way that he had not been permitted to go to
13 a previous Learning Together event in March of 2019, the
14 risk at Fishmongers' Hall would have been avoided, and
15 had MAPPa put in place security measures of the types
16 that are addressed at paragraph 55, again, the risk may
17 have been avoided and, sir, our submission is this: that
18 is a significant intervening step in the chain of
19 causation, leading to Usman Khan's use of lethal force,
20 and that's a step over which Learning Together had no
21 control, and in relation to which they should not, in
22 our submission, be held accountable.

23 Sir, another relevant background point is the
24 information that Learning Together were receiving from
25 probation about Usman Khan. Sir, we address this in

63

1 a little bit more detail in the written submission at
2 paragraph 10, but for purposes of today, it's sufficient
3 to point to the email sent by Mr Skelton on 28 November,
4 and therefore the day before the event, to Timpson's,
5 copying in Amy Ludlow, and talking about Usman Khan's
6 suitability for a job, which included that he had:

7 "... undergone a comprehensive risk assessment and
8 myself and other agencies feel it appropriate for him to
9 undertake this type of employment if offered and would
10 expect him to make a positive impact."

11 Sir, that's the type of information that was being
12 received in the period before the event at
13 Fishmongers' Hall, and there you can see a reference,
14 specifically, to a comprehensive risk assessment.

15 Sir, specifically in relation to the sufficiency of
16 the information provided by Learning Together to
17 Fishmongers' Company, and this is our written submission
18 at paragraph 11, as Counsel to the Inquests notes, in
19 what is now the third bullet point on page 15:

20 "Some staff of Fishmongers' Company were also aware
21 that attendees at the event might include ex-offenders
22 who had committed serious offences."

23 And, sir, as we note in paragraph 11 of our written
24 submission, and taking into account the submissions made
25 by Mr Hough earlier today, Commodore Williamson's

64

1 evidence is that knowledge that the attendees would
 2 include people with serious previous convictions,
 3 including for serious violence and terrorism, was not in
 4 itself a showstopper, that if the Fishmongers' Company
 5 had asked more proactively about the event, the answer
 6 would have been: it's a low-risk event based on the
 7 information that was known by Learning Together as the
 8 client. And so this chimes with the submission on
 9 behalf of Fishmongers' Company, their written submission
 10 at paragraph 4, that limited, if any, additional
 11 relevant information could have been provided had it
 12 been sought from Learning Together because of the
 13 limited information that organisation had been provided
 14 with.

15 Sir, Commodore Williamson would want to rely on
 16 an appropriate authority to make decisions about what
 17 someone like Usman Khan should or should not do, and so
 18 here we can look to see the kind of information that
 19 would have been of interest -- and this is from the
 20 evidence of Commodore Williamson, and the kind of
 21 information that Drs Armstrong and Ludlow were aware of,
 22 and that was that Usman Khan's attendance at the event
 23 were reviewed by police, probation and others, people
 24 responsible for his supervision and management in the
 25 community, and he had been given permission to attend.

1 Sir, it doesn't call for speculation to ask what
 2 would have happened had Commodore Williamson been put in
 3 touch with Mr Skelton about the possibility of Mr Khan
 4 attending the event. Clearly, the answer would have
 5 been in keeping with the email he had sent the day
 6 before the event, and that Mr Khan had been
 7 risk-assessed for work in the community, and it would
 8 have been safe for him to attend an event of this type.

9 Sir, Mr Hough submitted that it's properly arguable
 10 that a sufficient assessment of risk might have led to
 11 security measures, such as a bag search. Sir, in
 12 considering that submission, one needs to look at the
 13 evidence that the jury have heard about additional
 14 security and what might or might not have been
 15 available. It's relevant to note that
 16 Fishmongers' Company had never previously taken steps
 17 such as a bag search, save possibly in relation to one
 18 visit involving the Prince of Wales, that
 19 Fishmongers' Company owned no knife arches or detector
 20 equipment, nor had they borrowed or rented that type of
 21 equipment previously, that's the evidence of
 22 Mr Stevelman and Mr Williamson. And Mr Hough also
 23 suggested that it would be relevant for the jury to
 24 consider what Fishmongers' Company would do now,
 25 following the attack, but in our submission, that would

1 be reliance on hindsight which does not, in fact, take
 2 matters much further forward.

3 Sir, for those reasons that we submit, there are
 4 matters which cannot -- these are all matters which
 5 cannot even arguably be said to have contributed to the
 6 deaths of Jack Merritt or Saskia Jones. Putting it
 7 differently, the test in Tainton is not met.

8 Sir, a number of the submissions I've made about
 9 sufficiency of information that was being provided or
 10 was provided by Learning Together to
 11 Fishmongers' Company are relevant to the point about
 12 risk assessment, and sir, this is the sixth bullet point
 13 on the final page of the second draft of the
 14 questionnaire, whether or not those involved in
 15 organising the Learning Together event properly informed
 16 themselves of and assessed the risks of the event and
 17 made appropriate arrangements based on any risks, eg
 18 requesting security measures.

19 Sir, the submissions made about the reasonable
 20 reliance on probation and MAPPA are relevant here, as
 21 are the submissions about the information being received
 22 before the event by Learning Together from probation,
 23 and my submission specifically in relation to the risk
 24 assessment process point is that a formal risk
 25 assessment process would not have made a difference in

1 this case on the evidence before the jury. Whilst there
 2 was no formal written risk assessment for the event,
 3 Drs Ludlow and Armstrong visited Fishmongers' Hall in
 4 advance of the event and noted it was a well managed
 5 venue. As the draft questionnaire already notes, and
 6 has been expanded in this regard, Fishmongers' Hall had
 7 a number of security measures in place, sir, that's the
 8 first bullet point now, I think, on page 15. And
 9 Learning Together were dealing with people who had been
 10 given explicit permission by those supervising them in
 11 the community to attend and, as I've said, in relation
 12 to Usman Khan specifically, Learning Together's main
 13 approach for managing risk in this case was relying on
 14 colleagues in probation and MAPPA teams to take a view
 15 on whether he could attend the event.

16 Sir, there was, you may recall, reference in the
 17 questions asked by Mr Hough of Dr Ludlow to a written
 18 risk assessment prepared by Lancaster University, and
 19 the response from Dr Ludlow to whether or not that kind
 20 of risk assessment would have made a difference was, it
 21 wouldn't have made a difference in relation to the
 22 Fishmongers' event. Her evidence is that in all of the
 23 circumstances, a formal risk assessment would not have
 24 prompted any different reflections in respect of the
 25 event at Fishmongers' Hall. Sir, in other words, based

1 on the information available at the time to
 2 Learning Together, its understanding was that inviting
 3 Usman Khan or other ex-offenders or offenders to the
 4 event was not something that would have had the effect
 5 had there been a structured risk assessment of either
 6 leading to additional security measures being put in
 7 place or the invitation to Usman Khan or to others being
 8 withdrawn as too dangerous.

9 Sir, those are the submissions that I make on those
 10 two points, but I should go on just to deal with the
 11 wording of the three bullet points in relation to
 12 question 5 if you are against me, because if you are for
 13 me, I argue that the two bullet points, 6 and 7, should
 14 be removed.

15 Sir, first of all, may I deal with bullet point 5,
 16 and I just had one point of clarification there, which
 17 is at the moment that bullet point refers to the fact
 18 that Learning Together organised the event and employed
 19 staff at the event, and sir, the evidence is not that
 20 Learning Together employed staff, but that they were
 21 employed by the University of Cambridge, and sir, that's
 22 just a point of clarification, I don't make any further
 23 submissions in relation to that bullet point.

24 In relation to bullet point 7, if that is to remain,
 25 sir, what we would suggest is that there would be

1 an additional information attached at the end of the
 2 bullet point just to provide some reasonable balance.

3 Sir, may I do something potentially old-fashioned?
 4 May I hand up a piece of paper?

5 JUDGE LUCRAFT: It might be old-fashioned but it's still
 6 perfectly acceptable. The only difficulty is that
 7 no one else has it. (Handed).

8 MR GRIFFIN: May I explain, what I have suggested is that
 9 some wording be added at the end of bullet point 7.
 10 I have provided the same wording to Mr Hough and I have
 11 spoken with counsel for the families in general terms
 12 about what the wording would include.

13 Sir, there's no particular magic in it, I'm not
 14 wedded to the specific wording, but at the moment bullet
 15 point 7 reads:

16 "... whether or not those involved in organising the
 17 Learning Together event properly informed The
 18 Fishmongers' Company of the persons or types of persons
 19 attending the event."

20 And, sir, I submit that it would, if that is to
 21 remain, be appropriate to add:

22 "... based on the information they had at the time,
 23 including that Usman Khan's attendance at the event had
 24 been approved by probation, and their understanding that
 25 it had also been approved by MAPPA."

1 Sir, those are my submissions.

2 JUDGE LUCRAFT: Thank you very much, Mr Griffin.

3 Mr Hough, I think for the record I should just
 4 confirm that both Mr Baumber and Ms Le Fevre have
 5 indicated that they have no further oral submissions to
 6 add to the written submissions that they have provided.
 7 I know that Ms Le Fevre in particular is on the Zoom
 8 link and was slightly frustrated not to be able to come
 9 on to say that she had nothing to add, so I will say
 10 that for her, but I'm taking the view that I think,
 11 then, all of the other IPs have nothing to add to what
 12 I've seen in writing, and I think that leaves me with
 13 Mr Pitchers and Mr Armstrong. I don't mind which order
 14 they go in. Mr Armstrong, you are on your feet first so
 15 I'm assuming you are coming first.

16 Submissions by MR ARMSTRONG

17 JUDGE LUCRAFT: Yes, it's being specially cleaned again for
 18 you, Mr Armstrong.

19 MR ARMSTRONG: It is the last time I will do it so I feel
 20 there should be an element of ceremony to it. Can
 21 I just indicate that the reason why it's me first is
 22 because we're doing it in question order and I'm going
 23 to address you on questions 3 and 4 --

24 JUDGE LUCRAFT: Yes.

25 MR ARMSTRONG: -- and Mr Pitchers will address you on

1 question 5.

2 Can I indicate as well that certainly so far as my
 3 clients are concerned, we have no comments on
 4 question 2, and my learned friend Mr Hough has very
 5 helpfully taken on our suggestions in relation to
 6 question 2, so I'm not going to address you further in
 7 respect of that.

8 JUDGE LUCRAFT: Yes.

9 MR ARMSTRONG: And can I further adopt my written
 10 submissions, just formally do that, I'm not going to go
 11 through them or repeat them.

12 JUDGE LUCRAFT: Thank you. Can I -- I just want to say
 13 something to you and to Mr Pitchers, what I was minded
 14 to do, if it didn't cause anyone enormous disruption,
 15 was to suggest that we continue to sit until I've heard
 16 from you and from Mr Pitchers, we then rise, because
 17 I suspect that I would like a period of reflection
 18 before I hear Mr Hough in reply, and it may well be that
 19 he too would like to just think about some of the
 20 submissions which have been made on the detail of the
 21 bullet points, for example, on the questions,
 22 I appreciate Mr Griffin's submissions are in particular
 23 about certain things being removed, but I'm just
 24 conscious that, rather like the half an hour we had this
 25 morning before we started, that period was actually

1 quite helpful in focusing people's minds, mine in
 2 particular , on what in fact were the real battlegrounds
 3 amongst you as to what format the questions should be
 4 in .
 5 MR ARMSTRONG: Yes, of course. If it helps, I think
 6 I'm going to be between 20 and 30 minutes, I think
 7 Mr Pitchers is shorter than that.
 8 JUDGE LUCRAFT: Yes. I thought I would say that now because
 9 if anyone is going to scream at me, I'm sure they will
 10 do so, but for my part, I would suggest that we do that.
 11 We'll then break for a proper break for people to have
 12 lunch and a period of reflection .
 13 MR ARMSTRONG: Thank you. Thank you, sir.
 14 What I'm not proposing to do, sir, is address you
 15 yet further on why the operational duty attaches. The
 16 concessions that you've heard are welcome, and they are
 17 proper, and they help the families in terms of
 18 understanding what is happening.
 19 I do want to emphasise two points in relation to
 20 Article 2. One is that whilst we of course accept the
 21 point about hindsight, I would just draw your attention
 22 again to the statement in Van Colle. It's in our
 23 submissions at paragraph 15(d), which is whilst you
 24 judge on the information at the time, it is the
 25 information reasonably knowable at the time, and things

1 like lack of imagination and inertia are not an answer,
 2 and I make that point because on the facts of this case,
 3 we have placed particular emphasis in our questioning
 4 about things like the ERG and the OASys, and what that
 5 told or should have told risk assessors , as well as
 6 information about the intelligence that they already had
 7 and the way that all went into the pool of assessment.
 8 There was nothing hidden about the ERG or the OASys,
 9 that was all free material — that was material that was
 10 freely available , so there is a limit to the force of
 11 the hindsight point in this case, in my submission.
 12 My second point is I do want to just deal briefly
 13 with MI5, just because of the emphasis that has just
 14 been put on keeping them out of the frame, and there's
 15 a limit to the extent to that this needs to trouble us
 16 given that the agreed position based on Sreedharan is
 17 that one shouldn't be singling out individual agencies
 18 anyway, and Ms Leek in particular makes that point very
 19 clear in paragraph 7 and 20 of her written submissions
 20 that it is neither necessary nor desirable to undertake
 21 a detailed analysis of the respective positions or to
 22 micro—analyse the roles and actions of each public
 23 authority .
 24 Sir, we respectfully agree with that, but it sits
 25 uncomfortably with her submission in respect of keeping

1 MI5 out of it. My submission, putting it gently, is
 2 that MI5 may find it new or uncomfortable to have
 3 a light shone into the shadowy position which they often
 4 occupy, but they are just another statutory agency, they
 5 are just a public authority for the purposes of
 6 section 6 of the Human Rights Act just like any other
 7 and that is particularly true in a context where we are
 8 concerned with a participatory process, their
 9 involvement in MAPPA, which is expressly a participatory
 10 process, because risk assessment can be difficult , and
 11 it needs everybody to play a part in it , and so we
 12 submit they are in the frame as much as any other agency
 13 because, so far as the operational duty is concerned,
 14 the accepted position is that there is , at least
 15 arguably, a real and immediate risk of harm from
 16 Mr Khan, and if that is true, then it's MI5 with their
 17 specialist knowledge and expertise in this area know
 18 that or should know that as much as any other agency
 19 around that table should have known about that. The
 20 reason why there is an arguable breach of that in
 21 respect of MI5 is because by not participating , by
 22 simply standing there or sitting there in receiving mode
 23 and not sharing their concerns or not sharing their
 24 judgment, that is leading to poorer decision—making than
 25 might otherwise have been the case.

1 Now, Jonathan Hall QC spoke in terms of a culture
 2 change in relation to MI5, so did Sonia Flynn when that
 3 was put to her. That may be necessary but they are, as
 4 I say, and to repeat, they are an agency and a public
 5 authority like any other.
 6 Sir, I'm not going to address you on the general
 7 duty because, again, it doesn't seem to be necessary.
 8 If the document remains as it is or close to how it is
 9 in its current format, then it has enough that touches
 10 on systems to do the job, and whether they are entirely
 11 systems issues or entirely operational issues , we could
 12 have an argument about where that line is drawn but it
 13 doesn't matter because everybody agrees that once
 14 Article 2 is in , it's in for all purposes.
 15 If that were to change because the document changes,
 16 then I might have a different submission to make, but
 17 I don't think we're going to be in that territory . If
 18 necessary, you've got my written submissions on that.
 19 Can I then move to making some general points on the
 20 questionnaire. These points are all aimed in principle
 21 at achieving balance, which is a word that many people
 22 addressing you this morning have used. Of course this
 23 has to be about central issues and not everything, and
 24 of course this has to be about drawing the line between
 25 not being too directional but also not misdirecting ,

1 including by being unbalanced, and this has, however,
 2 been six weeks of evidence so it's, in my submission, no
 3 difficulty with the documents being quite long. The
 4 issue I'm really flagging is that if some of the
 5 submissions that you've heard from others this morning
 6 succeed and you want to take out certain matters, then
 7 it might be necessary for things that we've suggested
 8 which weren't put in to go back in to maintain the
 9 balance.

10 JUDGE LUCRAFT: Yes.

11 MR ARMSTRONG: And I would make that point in a number of
 12 contexts, but before I do, can I just make a general
 13 point in response to one of the submissions made by
 14 Mr Beer. He made a number of complaints about the way
 15 the coronial jurisdiction works and the way he put it
 16 which was moving to arguability to breach. I just make
 17 the submission that we don't accept that, that's not
 18 what it's doing. This is a fact-finding jurisdiction,
 19 not a liability-finding jurisdiction, and if you don't
 20 have the central facts dealt with, brought out and
 21 recorded, then you're not doing the Article 2 Middleton
 22 job that this process has to do.

23 Fundamentally Mr Beer's suggestion, as I understand
 24 it, is to prop up a submission which is saying: take
 25 care with what you record and what you prompt the jury

1 to consider, and properly apply the Galbraith plus test
 2 to it. That, in my submission, is an uncontroversial
 3 proposition. I don't understand Mr Beer generally to be
 4 suggesting that the Galbraith test is not met in
 5 relation to almost all of those matters, except,
 6 perhaps, with regard to a point that he made about the
 7 MAPPAs minutes and the causative effect of the
 8 calculation of MAPPAs minutes, and I'm just going to deal
 9 with that very quickly, because the key point about the
 10 MAPPAs minutes was that they contained critical
 11 information and in particular, in December 2018
 12 contained, as you will recall, sir, a key prompt about
 13 the strands of intelligence about "old ways", and had
 14 that been properly addressed at the time, there is
 15 an issue that the jury might be interested in, is if
 16 that had been picked up because the MAPPAs minutes had
 17 been circulated properly, it might have led to
 18 an enquiry that led to the discovery of the second
 19 strand of attack aspiration evidence, and that's why,
 20 that's one of the reasons why the circulation of the
 21 MAPPAs minutes might have had or would have had
 22 a particular impact. So that's my point in relation to
 23 that.

24 Going back to the points of detail and achieving the
 25 right balance, can I just make three points in relation

1 to question 3. The first is, my learned friend Mr Hough
 2 has accepted a point that we made about making
 3 a reference to the ERG, and I'm grateful for that. That
 4 point could have gone further, and there was another
 5 point, other points that we put in about the ERG and
 6 another particular bullet that we suggested get added in
 7 relation to the ERG, and we also suggested putting in
 8 a bullet about the fact that Mr Khan's behaviour in
 9 prison often sat alongside periods of apparent polite
 10 engagement with staff and with offending behaviour
 11 programmes.

12 I just remind you of that, because Mr Beer is
 13 anxious, and others -- this was adopted by Ms Leek as
 14 well -- is anxious to remind the jury in the name of
 15 balance about the absence or the apparent absence of
 16 positive intelligence about Mr Khan whilst he was in the
 17 community, and that's paragraphs 24 and 25 of Mr Beer's
 18 written submission.

19 The difficulty with that is, the absence of that
 20 positive material is of limited value in a context where
 21 deception is a noted and oft-repeated particular
 22 concern, and it's even more of limited value in
 23 circumstances where Mr Khan being silent and/or not
 24 doing anything and/or not generating anything is
 25 a feature of his isolation, withdrawal, boredom and lack

1 of purpose, which is expressly a risk factor in several
 2 of the lists that you've seen from leva Cechaviiciute.

3 JUDGE LUCRAFT: I'm glad you got a reference in to her,
 4 Mr Armstrong.

5 MR ARMSTRONG: I'm like a dog who has learned a trick,
 6 aren't I?

7 The point about that is, Mr Beer seeks to remind the
 8 jury of that because it is a positive matter for him and
 9 his client. It's not a -- certainly not an entirely
 10 positive factor. It's also a reminder of the fact that
 11 he wasn't doing anything which was a risk factor and if
 12 you are going to put one in, you may need to put the
 13 other in, that's an issue there.

14 I should also say this: even to the extent that we
 15 are, or the Inquest is concerned with the presence or
 16 otherwise of positive intelligence, and it's being said
 17 there was no intelligence on Mr Khan throughout that
 18 period, it is, of course, the fact that there was no new
 19 positive intelligence about Mr Khan -- and you've heard
 20 from several witnesses that there was no time
 21 constraint, there was no shelf life on the November 2018
 22 two strands of intelligence, so that's my first point in
 23 relation to question 3.

24 My second point about question 3 was we had
 25 submitted a proposed prompt about -- and this is

1 relevant to information—gathering, assessment,
 2 monitoring — we had suggested, and I just remind you of
 3 it because we maintain it, which is that about whether
 4 the agencies properly informed themselves about what in
 5 fact was happening with Learning Together, because you
 6 will remember the questions that have been put on
 7 a number of occasions, including by us, which is that in
 8 fact very little was happening with Learning Together,
 9 there was only those two social occasions, March
 10 and June, otherwise he wasn't using the Chromebook, on
 11 the evidence that the jury has heard, he wasn't doing
 12 any writing, he was just having these slightly fixated
 13 conversations with Lisa Ghiggini, which is probably
 14 redolent of risk rather than anything else.

15 So that's another thing that could go into the
 16 bullet point list under question 3, because it's
 17 relevant to the balancing exercise on risk, when
 18 decisions are taken about allowing him to go to
 19 an event, look at the risks of going to that event but
 20 look at the benefit of going to that event, and that
 21 benefit was very low, both, for example, Mr Byford and
 22 Mr Stephenson said: the thing that was different about
 23 this person was his engagement with the programme, when
 24 there really wasn't, on the evidence, much at all of
 25 a programme going on there.

81

1 My point here really is that is something that could
 2 go in, and it was — all of us no doubt have our
 3 shopping lists about things that we would like to put in
 4 and other people would like to take out, and
 5 I'm reminding you of the things that we would put in if
 6 others were to succeed in taking things out.

7 My final point in relation to question 3 is the
 8 current draft adopts a submission from Mr Beer — and
 9 I seem to be crossing swords with him a lot, that's
 10 always a pleasure — but adopts a submission from
 11 Mr Beer about the difference between "correct" and
 12 "reasonable" — I think it was paragraph 29 of his
 13 submission. I just wanted to say that in our
 14 submission, "correct" is appropriate. It's a simple
 15 word for a simple thing, because it just means "Do you
 16 agree with the decision that was taken about letting him
 17 attend at the Learning Together event". It's been
 18 amended to say "reasonable and professional". That is
 19 implying a degree of deference which is a more
 20 legalistic concept than we need when we are dealing with
 21 the jury. The jury is entitled to say whether or not
 22 they agree or don't agree with that decision and they
 23 can be trusted to make a simple decision on the basis of
 24 the evidence that they've heard, so I would support the
 25 original draft from Counsel to the Inquest rather than

82

1 the amended draft in relation to that. Again, the jury
 2 can be just trusted to deal with that.

3 JUDGE LUCRAFT: One might say you are being friendly and
 4 critical of Mr Beer in that comment.

5 MR ARMSTRONG: Yes, thank you.

6 JUDGE LUCRAFT: I'm sure that phrase will last a long time
 7 in association with Mr Beer.

8 MR ARMSTRONG: Yes, I mean I should say that I wasn't —
 9 I'm not going to address you — I'm resisting the
 10 temptation to address you yet further on the existence
 11 or otherwise of reasonable grounds for arrest when
 12 you've got somebody on a train in a large coat. Mr Beer
 13 and I have crossed swords about that too, and it's back
 14 in Mr Beer's written submissions. I'm very pleased to
 15 see Mr Beer as the defender of civil liberties in this
 16 context, but unless I can assist you further with those
 17 points, I think you've probably got them.

18 Can I turn, then, to question 4. The importance of
 19 question 4 essentially is to move some focus from beyond
 20 the management of Mr Khan by probation and looking at
 21 the activities of others. I support, and I hope I don't
 22 need to go back to it, respectfully, Counsel to the
 23 Inquests' position that the phrasing that was suggested
 24 in a number of the written submissions about "beyond the
 25 MAPPA meetings" doesn't work, because it is — partly

83

1 because it is in part about what those agencies do
 2 within the meetings, and if one invites the jury to
 3 consider things outside the MAPPA meetings, one uses
 4 that phrase, and I can anticipate speculation from
 5 jurors saying: well, who are we talking about? Are we
 6 talking about agencies that we don't actually know
 7 about? So the possibility of that causing all sorts of
 8 trouble is real. So I just wanted to flag that
 9 I particularly support that submission.

10 The key point which I just need to address at
 11 a little bit of length on question 4 is this issue about
 12 the fifth bullet, and Mr Beer's submission supported by
 13 Ms Leek that this comes out altogether.

14 What this is about is that there is insufficient
 15 material before the jury to consider the adequacy of the
 16 assessment in particular of Mr Khan's mindset; that
 17 there's not enough material before them to look at the
 18 investigation or monitoring of Mr Khan's mindset.

19 Now, as I understand it, that is in part because of
 20 the PII submissions that have been made and accepted
 21 that there is material enclosed, and so as a result of
 22 that PII application, there is not enough information
 23 for that to be judged.

24 Now, can I take this a step at a time. First, the
 25 starting point here, in my submission, is that you have

84

1 already ruled that you can properly investigate these
2 matters and that there will be sufficient material in
3 open to allow those matters to be investigated, and that
4 is why we're in an inquest and not in a public inquiry.

5 My submission is, if that's right, it must be right
6 in relation to the conclusions that the jury can draw,
7 as well as it is to the investigation, so it can't be
8 right that the jury can hear it but not rule on it.

9 Your 1 April 2021 ruling looked at this, and it was
10 about -- and it looked at, for example, the 7/7 judicial
11 review in relation to this, and it was about, in that
12 context, your ruling was particularly about not asking
13 questions on a false premise and those sorts of matters,
14 and I just flag that because we have explored all of
15 these matters in questioning and there has been no
16 stopping of questioning in relation to these matters, so
17 there has been no suggestion that we're getting anywhere
18 near misleading, false matters, any conflict between
19 what we're hearing in open and what we're hearing in
20 closed, and the reason for that is, in my respectful
21 submission, that there is a lot of material in open
22 about the consideration of Mr Khan's mindset by the
23 likes of MI5 and West Midlands Police and others.

24 Just by way of example, we have Witness A in
25 paragraphs 135 and 136 of her witness statement, talking

85

1 about them not being able to obtain any insight into
2 Mr Khan's mindset prior to the attack. You will
3 remember also the evidence about MI5 considering but
4 rejecting DS Stephenson's request for a BSU assessment,
5 which was to look at mindset matters, and you will
6 remember what informed that, which was -- in part
7 informed that, which was not just the ERG but
8 Dawn Banner's assessment for the purposes of Special
9 Branch going into the ALM stakeholder meetings.

10 You will also remember that MI5 considered but
11 rejected enhanced coverage of Mr Khan in or around
12 the November JOT, and you'll also remember the exchange
13 between Mr Hough and Witness A towards the end of
14 Witness A's evidence about, in early 2019 there was
15 sufficient coverage to know what purchases Mr Khan had
16 made, in November 2009 they did not have sufficient
17 coverage to learn those matters, so this was all about
18 the levels of coverage and what was known or not known
19 about his mindset.

20 The point about all of that, sir, is this: there is
21 material about them considering mindset, there is
22 material about them considering mindset and the response
23 that they had in terms of the coverage and its
24 proportionality. That is enough material for the jury
25 to consider it.

86

1 Putting that, then, in the legal context, the
2 orthodox approach and the ordinary approach with all of
3 this is that one just leaves out of account altogether
4 anything that's subject to PII. I don't know what's in
5 PII, but anything that's enclosed is just left out of
6 account.

7 The extent to which you can take a different
8 approach is very limited, and very new territory,
9 because it is -- if that was to be in conflict, if the
10 stuff that's in open was to -- and the expression is fly
11 in the face of or create a falsity, giving a false
12 impression of what is in closed, that is a very limited
13 exception for the general rule that we leave it out of
14 account, and the authority for that, as I'm sure you and
15 Mr Hough know very well indeed, is the Crown and
16 Secretary of State v Assistant Deputy Coroner For Inner
17 West London [2011] 1 WLR 2564, that's the 7/7 judicial
18 review, paragraphs 31-33, and I'll just remind you of
19 what paragraph 33 in particular says:

20 "The Coroner is well aware that, in reaching and
21 reasoning her eventual conclusions, she will have to
22 disregard all undisclosed PII material. That is
23 implicit in an earlier passage in her ruling and from a
24 later passage coming after her ruling on another issue
25 which is not the subject of an appeal. It follows that

87

1 I do not think that in the final sentence to which
2 I have referred she was anticipating the possibility of
3 reflecting a finding based on open material because it
4 would fly in the face of the undisclosed, PII material.
5 That would be wrong. She would be bound to base her
6 decision on the open material or, perhaps, to decline to
7 make a decision at all on the issue in question. As to
8 that and its possible consequences it would be
9 inappropriate for us to say more."

10 So that establishes two things, one is the very
11 limited circumstances in which one has regard to what is
12 enclosed, it's only where it flies in the face of what
13 is in open. And if we were in that territory, we are in
14 a very new, very novel, very complex territory where the
15 court in the 7/7 judicial review did not want to go. My
16 submission is simply this: we don't need to go anywhere
17 near any of that in this case because there is ample
18 material in open for the jury to consider the matter
19 that is raised by the fifth bullet in question 4.
20 They've heard material and they can deal with it. So
21 unless I can assist you further in relation to that,
22 that's my submissions on question 4.

23 There is just one last matter, which is this -- I am
24 going to leave question 5 entirely to Mr Pitchers. Can
25 I just make one textual submission, though, which is

88

1 that the fifth bullet on question 5 at the moment refers
 2 to category A and not high risk category A.
 3 Learning Together knew that he was not just cat A but he
 4 was high risk cat A, so I would just suggest that
 5 insertion .
 6 But unless I can assist you further, sir, looking
 7 behind me, which is quite a long way behind me, those
 8 are my submissions.
 9 JUDGE LUCRAFT: Thank you very much indeed, Mr Armstrong.
 10 Mr Pitchers, you have normally come forward at
 11 a time when the sun has been shining on you, so
 12 I'm sorry the weather has turned against you, but that
 13 won't affect the force of your submissions.
 14 Submissions by MR PITCHERS QC
 15 MR PITCHERS: I'll try to bring some sunlight to
 16 proceedings, and I can be relatively brief. The first
 17 point to make, as we have done in our submissions, is we
 18 accept that once you have found an arguable breach of
 19 the operational duty, and that Article 2's procedural
 20 obligation is therefore engaged, there is no need for
 21 you to go on to make determinations about the general
 22 and systemic aspect of that duty, and we don't invite
 23 you to make any further rulings in that regard.
 24 Secondly, sir, by way of preliminary observations,
 25 we're very grateful for version 2 of the questionnaire,

1 which we accept, and which we commend to you.
 2 JUDGE LUCRAFT: Yes.
 3 MR PITCHERS: Sir, we adopt our written submissions insofar
 4 as others seek to challenge version 2, and I also adopt
 5 and endorse the submissions made by Mr Armstrong in
 6 relation to questions 3 and 4, and his reply to what
 7 else you've heard in that regard.
 8 Sir, the area that I will address you on a little
 9 bit further, sir, is in relation to question 5, and this
 10 is essentially simply seeking to support question 5 as
 11 it appears in version 2 of the questionnaire, and to
 12 respond to Mr Griffin's submissions that there should be
 13 revisions to that draft.
 14 Sir, the family of Saskia find it astonishing that
 15 Cambridge University object really to there being any
 16 reference to them or to Learning Together in the
 17 questionnaire. Sir, we take great issue with the
 18 proposition, as developed by Mr Griffin, that there's no
 19 arguable basis for them to be included in the ways that
 20 have been adopted in version 2.
 21 Sir, we say if you stand back from all the evidence
 22 that we've heard, it would be perverse for the
 23 organisers of the event where this attack took place to
 24 be essentially omitted from the questionnaire that is
 25 put before the jury. The steps that they took or didn't

1 take are, we say, clearly central to matters that the
 2 jury should consider.
 3 Sir, in our submission there is ample evidence for
 4 these matters to be left properly before the jury. It
 5 is undisputed that Cambridge University were the
 6 employers of Jack Merritt, and as such, it should also
 7 be accepted that that carried with it clear obligations
 8 to consider the safety and welfare of staff and, in
 9 fact, Dr Armstrong in her evidence at T9, page 120
 10 {Day9/120:10} when asked about duties as employer said
 11 this:
 12 "I think that I realised that I had a duty to
 13 operate in ways that did not put my employees at risk of
 14 harm, or the University of Cambridge's employees who
 15 were working with me."
 16 So we have that aspect with Cambridge University and
 17 Learning Together as employers, but also as organisers
 18 of this event, those responsible for selecting the
 19 invitees, those who had a unique insight into the
 20 identities of those invitees, their status, and, sir,
 21 they of course had knowledge of Khan's history, they had
 22 knowledge of his TACT offending history. Amy Ludlow
 23 volunteered, memorably in evidence, that he was known as
 24 "High Risk Khan". And, in fact, Learning Together,
 25 through Ruth Armstrong, were given an opportunity to

1 learn more about his offending history and the risk
 2 factors that might be associated with him in the email
 3 exchange with Mr Skelton, which is reference
 4 {DC6695/19}.
 5 We say that there is more than a sufficient
 6 evidential basis for the jury to conclude that
 7 Learning Together knew or should have known that Khan
 8 presented particular risks at a mass gathering of this
 9 sort at an iconic London venue.
 10 Now, it's undisputed that there was no risk
 11 assessment performed in relation to the
 12 Fishmongers' Hall event by Learning Together.
 13 Amy Ludlow in her oral evidence at T8, pages 63–64
 14 {Day8/63}, {Day8/64} agreed when shown a risk assessment
 15 in relation to, I think it was remote working, that had
 16 that been brought to their attention they would have
 17 done a risk assessment for the type of event held at
 18 Fishmongers' Hall, and she also agreed at pages 66–67
 19 {Day8/66}, {Day8/67} that if a formal risk assessment
 20 had been done for the Fishmongers' Hall event it would
 21 have undoubtedly identified risks. She went on to say
 22 that she thought those measures to manage him would have
 23 been identical to the measures which were in fact
 24 followed but, of course, that's a matter for the jury to
 25 consider, not just whether there should have been a risk

1 assessment, but what a proper risk assessment would have
 2 produced.
 3 At T9, page 124, {Day9/124}, Dr Armstrong said in
 4 relation to risk assessment:
 5 "... it could have been helpful ... if
 6 Learning Together and Fishmongers' had had a process of
 7 risk assessment that we went through."
 8 And it's right that there was an assumption that
 9 some of the individuals connected with
 10 Fishmongers' Company had some knowledge that there may
 11 be ex-offenders attending, but, sir, we would say no
 12 proper basis for them to conclude that all relevant
 13 staff at Fishmongers' Company who might have input into
 14 security arrangements would know, nor that they would
 15 anticipate that a recently released TACT offender would
 16 be one of the guests arriving at the event without any
 17 escort or any heightened security, and we know that
 18 Learning Together were aware in advance that Khan wasn't
 19 to be escorted by police, because, of course, they were
 20 asked to have somebody meet Khan at Euston, and you will
 21 have heard the evidence from a number of
 22 Learning Together employees that there was a degree of
 23 surprise that there was no escort provided.
 24 It's also not disputed that Learning Together did
 25 effectively nothing to find out what security

1 arrangements would be in place or could be in place.
 2 So, sir, we say these are matters which more than
 3 justify the current draft of question 5. In relation to
 4 what Fishmongers' Company might have done with more
 5 information, I adopt and endorse the submissions of
 6 Mr Hough that you've already heard in this respect.
 7 I just flag up this passage of evidence from Commodore
 8 Williamson at T10 88-89 {Day10/88:23}:
 9 "What we didn't know was Usman Khan. We didn't know
 10 he was a terrorist. He was presented on an attendee
 11 list in alphabetical order by forename, on page 2, I can
 12 visualise it now. We didn't know him from anyone else
 13 who was attending there, just a name on the list. But
 14 he was known to others but not known to
 15 Fishmongers' Hall, and that's the shortfall."
 16 And later in that passage he continued:
 17 "Regrettably it didn't allow us, therefore, to make
 18 any additional precautions or take any, you know, sort
 19 of further advice as to whether that was an appropriate
 20 event to handle."
 21 Just briefly in relation to steps they might have
 22 taken, we know from a previous event in May 2019
 23 involving the Clink charity that there had been
 24 an objection to any sex offenders attending, so there
 25 had been an objection to a particular category of

1 offenders being invited.
 2 We know that there had been a previous bag search
 3 done in relation to a visit by the Prince of Wales.
 4 When Commodore Williamson was asked at T10/104
 5 {Day10/104:22-24} if he had been asked to implement
 6 a bag search or metal detection or to tell the City of
 7 London Police whether he would have done so, he said:
 8 "Yes. At that point we didn't have ownership of
 9 knife arches, but we had trained staff who could have
 10 done a manual search."
 11 And, of course, there's also the evidence of
 12 Mr Stevelman, who said at T6/134 {Day6/134:6-8}
 13 "I think if we'd known, yes, that it was category A
 14 offenders in the building, yes, we might have taken
 15 extra precautions."
 16 And when he was asked at {Day6/134:21} about
 17 a second statement to the police in which he had
 18 suggested that extra security protocols would have been
 19 followed, he said in part:
 20 "Well, maybe a bag search, yes."
 21 Then memorably in relation to further questions
 22 regarding what he would have done if he had had
 23 knowledge about who was attending, he said, this was at
 24 page 144 {Day6/144:22-23}:
 25 "I'll be quite honest, I don't think we'd have even

1 took the booking."
 2 So, of course, these are just submissions not as to
 3 what the findings should be but whether there is
 4 sufficient material to leave them to the jury and, sir,
 5 we say there is more than adequate matter for these
 6 matters to be left to the jury. But, sir, unless I can
 7 assist you further, those are my submissions.
 8 JUDGE LUCRAFT: No. Thank you very much indeed,
 9 Mr Pitchers.
 10 Mr Hough, looking at the clock, I apologise to the
 11 shorthand writers that we've sat on, but we will
 12 break -- I was going to suggest we resume at 2.30; that
 13 gives us just over an hour, and so I would then just
 14 welcome hearing from you in relation to some of the
 15 observations which have been made. It may well be that
 16 there's a v3 of the questionnaire which wings its way
 17 round between now and then.
 18 MR HOUGH: There may well be a v3 by then, yes.
 19 JUDGE LUCRAFT: But, as I say, we'll aim to sit again at
 20 2.30.
 21 Just before I rise, can I -- Mr Pitchers, you are,
 22 as it were, currently in the driving seat in terms of
 23 making the submissions, but I ought to simply record my
 24 appreciation for the quality of the submissions in
 25 written format and which have been amplified in oral

1 submissions this morning. It's clear to me that a lot
 2 of work has gone in over a period of time, but
 3 a relatively short time also from receiving the very
 4 detailed submissions from Counsel to the Inquests. But
 5 can I simply, through you, express my sincere gratitude:
 6 I know that very often the speaker is doing the work of
 7 a number in the team who have helped to compile the
 8 documents, and so through you can I thank just not the
 9 speakers, as it were, but also those who have helped to
 10 write the written submissions which have been provided.
 11 It's greatly appreciated.

12 MR PITCHERS: Thank you, sir. That will be very well
 13 received.

14 JUDGE LUCRAFT: Thank you. I'll rise.
 15 (1.22 pm)
 16 (The short adjournment)
 17 (2.34 pm)

18 JUDGE LUCRAFT: Mr Hough.
 19 Submissions in reply by MR HOUGH QC

20 MR HOUGH: Sir, over the short adjournment we have reflected
 21 upon the oral submissions and we have produced a revised
 22 proposed version of the questionnaire with the header
 23 "Version 3" in the top left. The tracking on that
 24 document shows the changes since version 2. So the
 25 changes made between versions 1 and 2 have been

1 accepted, and changes since then have been shown in
 2 tracking.

3 Sir, what I propose to do is address the submissions
 4 by advocate, focusing upon those submissions which would
 5 propose a change in the questionnaire rather than upon
 6 more general legal submissions, which I probably need
 7 not address at this stage.

8 Sir, beginning with Mr Beer QC, we agree with his
 9 submissions as to the significance of the considerations
 10 which appear after each question, that they are
 11 important and that care should be taken to avoid
 12 proposing issues for the jury to address which they
 13 could not safely answer in one particular direction.

14 We would only quibble with one small point in his
 15 submissions in this regard: we agree that an arguable
 16 breach of a substantive Article 2 duty acts as the
 17 gateway for a broader range of conclusions, the
 18 Middleton approach. However, we would not agree that
 19 the conclusions themselves are related to or should be
 20 related to breach of Article 2 substantive obligations.
 21 Indeed, any finding which appeared to establish a breach
 22 of Article 2 substantive obligations would be contrary
 23 to the statutory bar on findings of civil liability, a
 24 point I think was made by Mr Justice Collins in Anderson
 25 case but I may be wrong about that. So in substance we

1 agree with Mr Armstrong's point in that respect.

2 In relation to Mr Beer's specific points, on
 3 question 3 he rightly proposes a change from "MAPPA
 4 arrangements" to Multi-Agency Public Protection
 5 Arrangements (MAPPA)". We have made that change on
 6 page 9, second bullet.

7 He has proposed adding a bullet to the question 3
 8 considerations, referring to the absence of intelligence
 9 emanating from the investigation. We haven't adopted
 10 that proposal, the reason being that we consider that
 11 that is a point for question 4, which is concerned with
 12 the investigation bodies. Many of those in MAPPA, the
 13 MAPPA process, would have known nothing of the
 14 intelligence position. If you had asked, for example,
 15 Mr Skelton whether there had been any adverse
 16 intelligence on Khan emanating from monitoring, he would
 17 have looked at you quizzically, and for that reason and
 18 to avoid confusion by introducing a factor which would
 19 not have been known to many of those in the MAPPA
 20 process, we haven't added that to question 3. However,
 21 as I'll come to, we do regard that as an important point
 22 for question 4, and we've adopted a proposal by Mr Beer
 23 in that regard.

24 Finally in relation to question 3, Mr Beer suggests
 25 modifying bullet 6 to add "some of" before "those

1 responsible" on the basis that the issue of training and
 2 experience are not relevant for all of those involved in
 3 the MAPPA process. We agree and have made that proposed
 4 change.

5 As to question 4, the third bullet Mr Beer argues
 6 for dividing it so that there are separate
 7 considerations for first of all Khan's compliant
 8 behaviour and, secondly, the lack of adverse
 9 intelligence arising from the investigation. We agree
 10 that that division should be made, first of all, because
 11 we consider that that will make the document easier to
 12 follow for the jury because these are addressing
 13 separate considerations, and also we do take Mr Beer's
 14 point concerning the importance of balance in this
 15 question.

16 At bullet point 5, Mr Beer and Ms Leek, and I think
 17 Mr Boyle as well, argued for the deletion of the bullet.
 18 Mr Armstrong argued for its retention, supported by
 19 Mr Pitchers. So ultimately we found the arguments of
 20 Mr Beer and Ms Leek persuasive, for these reasons: the
 21 reasoning we have adopted does not depend upon the
 22 absence of evidence as a result of the PII decision.
 23 There is substantial evidence of the risk assessments
 24 which were in fact made over time by both MI5 and
 25 West Midlands CTU. The issue as to whether this bullet

1 point should be retained turns on whether the jury could
2 safely conclude that the assessment of risk made by MI5
3 and West Midlands CTU was inadequate.

4 In our submission, the difficulty with any finding
5 being proposed that the assessment of risk by those
6 bodies was inadequate is that they in fact assess the
7 risk of Khan as very high. DCI Chambers, for example,
8 accepted that Khan was a very dangerous man who posed
9 significant risks. That's at {Day26/18}.

10 In Witness A's statement, it was recorded by careful
11 gisting that MI5 made repeated assessments of Khan as
12 presenting a high risk through 2019 and did so in
13 important formal documents.

14 Staffordshire Special Branch, likewise, in all the
15 documents we saw that they produced, the ALM stakeholder
16 minutes, the various iterations of the subject profile,
17 consistently assessed Khan as presenting a high risk,
18 and therefore, in light of those assessments the real
19 issue for the jury is whether those bodies acted
20 properly upon those assessments, whether they should, as
21 a result, have said something more to others, raised
22 concerns about him being permitted to attend the
23 Learning Together event, or proposed further safety
24 measures, but those are the points made in the remaining
25 bullet points, and for that reason we respectfully agree

101

1 with those arguing for the fifth bullet point in our
2 document to be removed.
3 JUDGE LUCRAFT: And I think, just to -- obviously on
4 version 3, it's the sixth bullet point, the addition, or
5 the splitting of the earlier one, but it's clearly
6 marked, crossed through in red on the document.
7 MR HOUGH: Yes. Yes, that's correct. I've referred to it
8 as bullet point 5, because everyone else has so far, but
9 you're quite right, it has turned into bullet point 6
10 just at the same moment as it has disappeared.
11 JUDGE LUCRAFT: Yes.
12 MR HOUGH: Mr Boyle's submission -- principal submission was
13 that the summing-up should refer to the lack of offender
14 management training being a national issue rather than
15 something specific to Staffordshire Police, and we
16 respectfully agree with that submission.

17 Ms Leek QC, apart from the general submissions of
18 law she made, devoted the largest part of her
19 submissions to the question of question 4, bullet point
20 5 or 6, which I have just addressed.

21 The other submission she made, which I should
22 address, was that she suggested that it might be
23 appropriate to remove from question 3 the seventh bullet
24 point concerning deficiencies in the MAPPAs management
25 process, having regard to such matters as the lack of

102

1 pre-meetings.

2 In our submission, the consideration that's been
3 included raises an appropriate issue of deficiencies in
4 the management of Khan in the MAPPAs process, and then
5 sets out matters that the jury may wish to consider in
6 that regard as proper aspects of the process, and for
7 that reason, we would suggest that it be retained.

8 Turning to the submissions of Mr Griffin QC, we
9 respectfully don't agree with the suggestion that
10 Learning Together be erased from the questionnaire
11 entirely, but we do broadly agree with his linguistic
12 amendments to the considerations under question 5. We
13 endorse the submissions of Mr Pitchers QC in respect of
14 the more radical proposals. In short, our submission is
15 that Mr Griffin has made an eloquent argument for why
16 criticisms of his client should not be made, but that he
17 cannot sustain an argument that such criticisms would be
18 unsafe if they were made. Let me deal with the two
19 issues that we have included. First of all, did
20 Learning Together staff properly inform themselves of
21 and properly assess risks? It is common ground that no
22 risk assessment was in fact made of the
23 Learning Together event. As you will recall, and as
24 I referred to in my submissions this morning,
25 I challenged Dr Ludlow as to whether a properly

103

1 conducted risk assessment would in fact have led
2 to serious consideration of safety measures, discussion
3 of safety measures such as a bag search, and ultimately,
4 requesting those measures.

5 The jury may accept her evidence that a proper risk
6 assessment would have made no difference, but it
7 wouldn't be unsafe of them to reject her evidence in
8 that regard, and conclude that it wasn't correct, or at
9 least, it didn't reflect the correct approach to things.

10 Furthermore, as regards Learning Together staff
11 properly informing themselves, Mr Pitchers correctly
12 draws attention to the email in which Learning Together
13 indicated that it was happy to know or not know further
14 information about the antecedents and risks of
15 Usman Khan, however, Dr Armstrong said that had she
16 known further information about Khan's continued bad
17 conduct in prison during 2018, that would have affected
18 her view of him.

19 As to the second issue we've proposed raising by the
20 considerations, were the Learning Together staff
21 properly informing the Fishmongers' Company of the risks
22 of individuals and their antecedents, sir, I would
23 simply reiterate or draw attention to the points I made
24 this morning to the effect that Commodore Williamson's
25 evidence was not straightforward or all one way in this

104

1 regard: there were inconsistencies, tensions or nuances
 2 in it which might lead the jury perfectly safely to
 3 conclude that if Learning Together had drawn attention
 4 to Khan's status as a terrorist offender, particularly
 5 after informing themselves as much as possible of his
 6 behaviour in prison and his antecedents, and had passed
 7 that on to the Fishmongers' Company, that could have
 8 made a difference to the security measures adopted.
 9 Mr Pitchers also made cogent points in that regard.

10 Next, Mr Armstrong. In relation to question 3,
 11 Mr Armstrong has proposed a further bullet point
 12 consideration of whether the agencies involved with
 13 managing Khan informed themselves about his limited
 14 involvement with Learning Together. What we would
 15 propose is that this is added as a further fact in the
 16 bullet point — in the fifth bullet point, so if you
 17 look at page 9, sir, you will see the bullet point
 18 beginning:

19 "The fact that by November 2019..."
 20 And we would suggest adding an (e), and saying:
 21 "... and (e) had not been doing any actual
 22 educational work with Learning Together."

23 We had intended to include that in the bullet point
 24 in question 3 as well as the equivalent in question 4,
 25 but it's only been put into question 4. We'll add that

1 into question 3 as well.

2 The reason we're proposing to do it in that way is
 3 that it is relevant for the jury to know and bear in
 4 mind, as part of their assessment of the approach of the
 5 managing agencies, that Khan was not engaging with
 6 Learning Together, he wasn't doing real educational work
 7 during this period. However, if the jury are asked this
 8 as a freestanding issue, it posits a suggested failure,
 9 which raises very real difficulties in establishing
 10 causal connection. It is at least very difficult to say
 11 that if the State agencies had known that Usman Khan had
 12 not been doing educational work with Learning Together,
 13 they would have behaved differently in their decision to
 14 permit him to go to the London event. In our
 15 submission, it's better to present the jury with that
 16 fact as part of the canvas against which they address
 17 the principal issues rather than suggesting it as
 18 a freestanding issue.

19 Mr Armstrong also takes issue in relation to
 20 question 3, with the penultimate bullet point, and the
 21 fact that we have changed the language from referring to
 22 a "correct decision" to a "reasonable, professional
 23 decision", and he stresses the importance of not
 24 exhibiting undue deference to the decision—making
 25 bodies. The reason that we adopted that form of words

1 in version 2 and have carried it over to version 3 is
 2 that we want to make very sure that the jury does not
 3 take hindsight into account when answering this
 4 particular question, and the danger of using the phrase
 5 "correct decision" is that it is hard for anyone to
 6 regard this decision as correct when viewed through the
 7 prism of hindsight.

8 JUDGE LUCRAFT: Yes.

9 MR HOUGH: Mr Armstrong's submissions on question 4 and the
 10 fifth or sixth bullet point I've already addressed.

11 On question 5, he has suggested adding the words
 12 "high risk" into what Learning Together knew of
 13 Usman Khan, and we agree with that suggestion and have
 14 incorporated it.

15 Finally, sir, Mr Pitchers' submissions, I think
 16 I have already addressed and accepted in toto.

17 JUDGE LUCRAFT: Just — I think the high risk point in fact
 18 related to question 5, didn't it?

19 MR HOUGH: Yes, question 5, if you look down —

20 JUDGE LUCRAFT: It's bullet point 5 on question 5.

21 MR HOUGH: Yes, exactly, yes, it's question 5.

22 So that's what I have to say in reply. I don't know
 23 if any other interested person wishes to pick up
 24 anything following that, or whether I've bored everyone
 25 into submission.

1 Perhaps so. Sir, given the degree of consensus that
 2 has emerged overnight —

3 JUDGE LUCRAFT: Yes.

4 MR HOUGH: — and the approach that's been taken today with
 5 iterative drafts of the questionnaire, we do not know
 6 whether interested persons will expect a detailed
 7 written ruling from you. It may be an exercise which is
 8 not very helpful for you to produce a lengthy written
 9 ruling covering the fact that Article 2 is engaged on
 10 the basis that everyone agrees that it is and everyone
 11 agrees on the basis for engagement.

12 It may also be a somewhat sterile exercise for you
 13 to produce a ruling going through the various linguistic
 14 changes. So what we would propose is that you, either
 15 now or in 15 minutes, or tomorrow morning, at your
 16 preference, indicate your conclusions, and that beyond
 17 that, you only issue a written ruling if there is some
 18 aspect of your decision on which any interested person
 19 wants to see a written ruling and then the ruling can be
 20 focused upon that particular aspect.

21 I don't know if others have any submissions to make
 22 in relation to that proposal.

23 JUDGE LUCRAFT: It doesn't look like it.

24 My preference, personally, Mr Hough, would be to do
 25 it tomorrow morning, rather than this afternoon. And it

1 may well be that what I will do is to suggest that we
 2 sit at 9.45 in the morning just so I can indicate that.
 3 What I will say is that if I were to give until the
 4 first thing on Thursday for anyone to indicate whether
 5 they saw the need for a written ruling, that would at
 6 least give people a day from when I've indicated my
 7 conclusion to think about it.
 8 MR HOUGH: Very good, sir.
 9 I don't know if there's anything else that anyone
 10 wishes to raise before you begin summing-up tomorrow.
 11 If so, this is their opportunity, and they have a little
 12 time to do so.
 13 JUDGE LUCRAFT: Yes. Can I just ask the one question, and
 14 it may well be that others would just like to know,
 15 Mr Hough, but when we parted company with the jury on
 16 Friday, at least I think I indicated to the jury that we
 17 believed that was the end of the evidence, there may be
 18 one or two bits of housekeeping or sorting out to be
 19 done before the summing-up gets underway.
 20 MR HOUGH: Yes, I can address those in turn.
 21 The first concerns a witness statement which was
 22 being prepared and has now been prepared by Mr Boyle's
 23 team, which discusses some versions of the subject
 24 profile, and sets out what are thought to be some
 25 matters that can be drawn from the computer system about

109

1 various versions of the subject profile.
 2 The witness statement itself, if read to the jury,
 3 would leave them scratching their heads, it's not
 4 a document which can be readily understood on its own
 5 terms; it requires some interpretation.
 6 JUDGE LUCRAFT: Even if read beautifully by Mr Moss.
 7 MR HOUGH: Even if read, with the appropriate introduction,
 8 and Mr Moss' trademark pace. No, sir, it would require
 9 some interpretation, and the interpretation of and
 10 explication of the document is not a matter of agreement
 11 between interested persons. This all goes to the
 12 subplot of whether DCI Chambers would have, early on in
 13 the priority operation, seen an official sensitive
 14 version of the subject profile containing the attack
 15 plan strand of intelligence, and therefore deduced from
 16 that that this intelligence was not secret and would
 17 have been fed into the MAPPA process.
 18 You may recall that Mr Boyle suggested to
 19 Mr Chambers that he may not have seen the subject
 20 profile at that early stage, and may not, therefore,
 21 have been justified in drawing that conclusion.
 22 This is plainly something of a dispute between West
 23 Midlands Police and Staffordshire Police. It may be
 24 that it's a subplot that can never be finally resolved
 25 by the jury. What we have said is that unless

110

1 Staffordshire Police and West Midlands Police can arrive
 2 at an agreed position with a document to be read to the
 3 jury which is intelligible on its face, then we wouldn't
 4 propose anything more being read to the jury, but
 5 I'm content for you to be addressed by Mr Boyle or
 6 Mr Beer on that now.
 7 Before I sit down, let me address the other matter,
 8 which is that a witness statement was produced by
 9 Ms Leek's team concerning the even more outré question
 10 of whether the curfew for Usman Khan was put back from
 11 9.00 pm to 11.00 pm in late May 2019 or at the time that
 12 he moved out of the approved premises in September 2019.
 13 The pretty clear evidence is that Khan was still being
 14 signed in at the approved premises at 9.00 pm until he
 15 left it, because that's what the curfew sheets show.
 16 What hasn't been put before the jury very clearly is
 17 precisely when the time of curfew was changed, and the
 18 statement goes some way to doing that. We are more open
 19 to having that read to the jury if Ms Leek would like it
 20 to be read to them: we don't think it's a particularly
 21 significant point, and it may not be one that features
 22 large — that looms large in your summing-up, but,
 23 again, if others wish to address you on that, now is
 24 perhaps the opportunity for them to do so.
 25

111

1 Further submissions by MR BEER QC
 2 MR BEER: I wasn't expecting this.
 3 JUDGE LUCRAFT: No.
 4 MR BEER: Sir, I don't know whether Mr Boyle is actively
 5 asking for the statement to be read or not. If he is,
 6 we'll find out in a moment, we submit that you shouldn't
 7 admit it into evidence, not least because we object to
 8 it and the conditions in Rule 23(1)(a) to (d) aren't
 9 satisfied.
 10 The overarching issue here is whether the second
 11 strand of intelligence was passed on to MAPPA. It has
 12 been established by the evidence that it was not. That
 13 is the important fact, and it has been established by
 14 the evidence heard by this jury.
 15 The jury has additionally heard evidence that
 16 DS Stephenson and DI Hessell knew that the second strand
 17 of intelligence hadn't been broken out, that they had
 18 discussed that fact between themselves, and that
 19 DS Stephenson made a long contemporaneous note in his
 20 policy book of his discussion with DI Hessell that the
 21 second strand of intelligence had not been broken out.
 22 Each of the officers also said that if the
 23 intelligence was to be broken out, that would be
 24 a decision for the SIO, but both of them admitted that
 25 neither of them had raised the issue with the SIO,

112

1 despite the fact that privately they were having their
2 own discussion and noting down in a policy book that the
3 intelligence had not been broken out.

4 For his part, the SIO said that his understanding
5 was that the intelligence had been broken out, because
6 he saw it on the off sen subject profile and there was
7 a cross—reference in the subject profile to a footnote
8 that had an official sensitive information report
9 supporting it .

10 The witness statement from Mr Hessell seems to be
11 advanced to show that the first of Mr Chambers'
12 understandings may not be correct. However, the jury is
13 not being asked to make decisions on micro issues such
14 as these sub—subplots that may be of interest to
15 Staffordshire Police but not to the jury . Put another
16 way: the evidence is not necessary to determine any of
17 the issues that the jury is being asked to decide.

18 You will see that it doesn't feature even
19 peripherally or indirectly in any of the questions that
20 Staffordshire Police submitted for, nor in the
21 questionnaire question 3 that has now been settled.

22 By contrast, if the evidence was to be admitted,
23 then a series of additional questions are likely to
24 arise , to which there are presently no answers on the
25 evidence available to the jury . This evidence is all

1 about the subject profile 's availability on NCIA.
2 Mr Chambers did not say that he viewed the subject
3 profile on NCIA.

4 In his policy book Mr Chambers wrote that he viewed
5 the subject profile on a certain day. What has not been
6 explored is whether he viewed a subsequent subject
7 profile on other occasions and, if so, what version was
8 that? There are just a series of additional questions
9 that arise .

10 Lastly, this is quite aside from the fact that we
11 haven't had the opportunity to explore the accuracy, but
12 probably more importantly the completeness of the
13 evidence which Mr Hessell now wishes to give since
14 receipt of his statement this morning.

15 You will know, sir, that in an earlier part of the
16 case an enquiry was made of my clients as to the extent
17 to which it was possible to interrogate the metadata on
18 the NCIA system to see who looked at what when. We made
19 enquiries of National Counter—Terrorism Policing
20 Headquarters as to whether that was possible or not.
21 The answer came back that it was technically possible
22 but for the reasons set out in communications to your
23 solicitors , it was very difficult and would take a long
24 time. That tends to suggest that the issue of the
25 metadata showing what document was or wasn't uploaded

1 and when, and whether it was viewed by a person at
2 a certain point in time, it may be not quite as
3 straightforward as the page and a half that Mr Hessell
4 put together yesterday. For those reasons, we say the
5 statement shouldn't be read.

6 JUDGE LUCRAFT: Mr Boyle.

7 Further submissions by MR BOYLE QC

8 MR BOYLE: Thank you, sir. Sir, I'm alive to all the issues
9 that my learned friend has just raised in relation to
10 the reading of the statement. I'm taking instructions
11 as to whether I'm going to make a formal application for
12 it to be read. I'm hopeful that I won't need to trouble
13 you with that particular statement.

14 Just by way of very brief background, you will
15 recall how this evidence came about, and it was that
16 Mr Chambers, for the first time in the witness box, as
17 it were, gave oral evidence that because he was aware of
18 the content of an official sensitive subject profile ,
19 that gave him some reassurance that the contents of it
20 either would have been already provided to MAPPa, or
21 could have been provided to MAPPa. The nature of the
22 profile that he'd viewed was not recorded in his
23 disclosure book, and there was no reference to it being
24 an official sensitive subject profile in his witness
25 statement.

1 As a result of giving that oral evidence, I then
2 commissioned those instructing me to see if they could
3 establish whether, in fact, an official sensitive
4 version of the subject profile would have been available
5 to him by 29 November 2018, and that has resulted in the
6 statement which we have obtained from Mr Hessell, but
7 I'm alive to the issues that my learned friend has
8 raised in relation to it, we've discussed them already,
9 Mr Hough was kind enough to make some observations to me
10 this morning about reservations that he had about the
11 statement, and the jury do already have evidence that
12 DCI Cobbett was, herself, capable of providing that
13 information to MAPPa, had that been the case. I'll take
14 instructions, I'll hopefully be able to clarify that
15 later today, but certainly by no later than first thing
16 tomorrow morning.

17 JUDGE LUCRAFT: Thank you very much, Mr Boyle.

18 Ms Leek, is there anything you want to say about the
19 other point at this stage?

20 MS LEEK: Sir, I'm not sure it even warrants a trip up to
21 the front. No, we're not going to invite you to read
22 the statement. It leaves open as many questions as it
23 answers, and this did not form a significant part of the
24 evidence.

25 JUDGE LUCRAFT: Thank you very much.

1 MR HOUGH: Well, there we are, sir, subject to Mr Boyle
 2 confirming instructions, it may well be that there is
 3 nothing more to be provided to the jury.
 4 JUDGE LUCRAFT: Thank you.
 5 Mr Hough, just in terms of the timing tomorrow,
 6 I anticipate that my summing-up will take all of
 7 tomorrow, it's likely to go into Thursday morning, but
 8 I hope it doesn't eat in too much into Thursday morning.
 9 I know that it's very tempting to reduce the summary by
 10 missing out every other word, which is one way of
 11 shortening it, but that might lose some meaning, but
 12 I will endeavour to deliver as comprehensive a review of
 13 the evidence as I can, but also not taking too long over
 14 it.
 15 But I am conscious, obviously, that we appear to
 16 have a very diligent jury who have taken many of their
 17 own notes, and I will certainly be focusing in what
 18 I say in relation to the evidence on the material which
 19 goes to the questions which are really the subject of
 20 questions 3, 4 and 5, and that may come as no surprise
 21 to people, but that's the approach.
 22 But what I will endeavour to do is to break up
 23 tomorrow a little bit, not by talking about something
 24 unrelated to the case, but just simply to break up the
 25 review of that material for the jury so they don't find

117

(The court adjourned until 9.45 am on
Wednesday, 26 May 2021)

1 it too tedious listening to me for a day, but we'll see
 2 how we do and how they cope with doing that.
 3 MR HOUGH: Sir, as regards the questionnaire, we will
 4 produce a clean version of v3 with the further point
 5 added into question 3, which appears in question 4 --
 6 JUDGE LUCRAFT: Yes.
 7 MR HOUGH: -- the reference to Khan not having been doing
 8 any actual educational work at Learning Together, and
 9 we'll add that in, we will produce a clean copy and
 10 we'll circulate that to interested persons in advance of
 11 your indications tomorrow morning.
 12 JUDGE LUCRAFT: Thank you. And the other thing, Mr Hough,
 13 which I mentioned to you, which again I'll say this:
 14 I think the jury may be assisted by having what are the
 15 subject of pages 1, 2, 3 and 4 separate from the
 16 questionnaire that then follows, because rather than
 17 having to flip back all the time when they're looking at
 18 the other questions to have the two, but side-by-side,
 19 I suspect will help them when it comes to dealing with
 20 how they should deal with the questions that are set
 21 out.
 22 MR HOUGH: Yes, sir.
 23 JUDGE LUCRAFT: Very well. We'll sit again tomorrow morning
 24 at 9.45. Thank you.
 25 (3.12 pm)

118

119

INDEX

PAGE

4	Submissions by MR HOUGH QC	2
5	Submissions by MR BEER QC	32
6	Submissions by MR BOYLE QC	47
7	Submissions by MS LEEK QC	49
8	Submissions by MR GRIFFIN QC	60
9	Submissions by MR ARMSTRONG	71
10	Submissions by MR PITCHERS QC	89
11	Submissions in reply by MR HOUGH QC	97
12	Further submissions by MR BEER QC	112
13	Further submissions by MR BOYLE QC	115

120

121

A						
ability (1) 55:14	admit (1) 112:7	amended (2) 82:18 83:1	39:3,16 50:9,11,14	assuming (1) 71:15	bearing (2) 14:8 25:1	86:9 101:14
able (3) 71:8 86:1 116:14	admitted (2) 112:24 113:22	amendment (1) 49:14	51:18,21 66:9 75:20 89:18	assumption (1) 93:8	bears (1) 18:23	bravery (1) 3:17
above (1) 20:5	adopt (9) 30:17 48:17 53:4,6	amendments (2) 43:11	90:19 98:15	assurance (2) 29:15,17	beautifully (1) 110:6	breach (30) 9:6,25 10:6,18
absence (9) 1:3 43:20,20	56:20 72:9 90:3,4 94:5	103:12	arguably (7) 11:4,18 34:8	astonishing (1) 90:14	became (1) 13:13	11:20 12:17 14:25 15:4
45:9 79:15,15,19 99:8	adopted (13) 7:9 18:4	amongst (1) 73:3	61:4,9 67:5 75:15	attached (1) 70:1	becoming (1) 13:10	33:23 34:4,18,22,25
100:22	28:3,14 31:16 35:9 79:13	ample (2) 88:17 91:3	argue (3) 23:13 27:12 69:13	attaches (2) 11:10 73:15	beer (34) 26:13	36:5,11 38:3,8 39:3,16,17
absolutely (2) 30:3 57:15	90:20 99:9,22 100:21	amplified (1) 96:25	argued (4) 23:12 29:1	attack (15) 3:25 12:13 13:7	32:18,20,24,25 33:5,12	50:9,11 51:8,21 75:20
acc (1) 48:11	105:8 106:25	amy (3) 64:5 91:22 92:13	100:17,18	14:3 19:10,14 23:18,21	43:7 46:19 51:11 53:5,19	77:16 89:18 98:16,20,21
accept (19) 5:10 6:4 10:22	adopts (2) 82:8,10	analysis (3) 34:12 42:13	argues (1) 100:5	30:5 59:24 66:25 78:19	77:14 78:3 79:12 80:7	breached (8) 7:17 8:3,18
15:1,7 19:12 20:3	advance (5) 42:11 62:15	74:21	arguing (1) 102:1	86:2 90:23 110:14	82:8,11 83:4,7,12,15 98:8	9:11 11:4,18 34:8 39:10
22:10,11,23 27:5 31:21	68:4 93:18 118:10	analysts (1) 12:22	argument (5) 14:7 29:2	attackplanning (1) 23:16	99:22,24 100:5,16,20	break (9) 47:5,7,12,16
36:13 51:20 73:20 77:17	advanced (2) 44:15 113:11	anderson (1) 98:24	76:12 103:15,17	attempt (1) 62:8	111:6 112:1,2,4 120:5,12	73:11,11 96:12 117:22,24
89:18 90:1 104:5	adverse (7) 12:18 21:8,11	andor (2) 79:23,24	arguments (3) 14:24 27:10	attend (8) 22:22 62:23 65:25	beers (8) 56:20 59:19 77:23	bridge (3) 52:20 57:23 58:14
100:22	35:14 37:15 99:15 100:8	another (9) 39:15 42:10	100:19	66:8 68:11,15 82:17	79:17 83:14 84:12 99:2	brief (10) 15:12 47:11
acceptable (1) 70:6	advice (5) 14:13,16 23:11	63:23 75:4 79:4,6 81:15	arise (3) 28:21 113:24 114:9	101:22	99:25 109:10,19 111:7,16	49:7,11,17 53:2 54:16 56:4
accepted (21) 14:15 16:25	54:2 94:19	87:24 113:15	arising (2) 26:3 100:9	attendance (5) 58:13 62:25	before (30) 1:4,20 2:16,24	89:16 115:14
26:24 27:20 29:12,18	advocate (1) 98:4	answer (17) 20:7 35:16,17	armstrong (34) 21:22 28:14	63:11 65:22 70:23	23:17,21 31:9 32:1 47:23	briefly (9) 5:4,13 6:9 11:19
30:6,25 50:11 51:17 52:21	affect (3) 2:13 35:10 89:13	37:14,15 41:2,11,25 42:7	33:22 34:5,17 38:14 62:21	attended (3) 11:13 14:4	52:7 57:16,18 64:4,12 66:6	30:21 34:9 57:19 74:12
54:1 56:6 59:17 75:14 79:2	affected (2) 22:11 104:17	46:23 51:5,6 65:5 66:4	65:21 68:3	58:11	67:22 68:1 72:18,25 77:12	94:21
84:20 91:7 98:1 101:8	affects (1) 36:17	74:1 98:13 114:21	71:13,14,16,18,19,25 72:9	attendee (1) 94:10	84:15,17 90:25 91:4 96:21	bridge (2) 35:14 89:15
107:16	after (9) 1:16 2:9 12:18	answering (3) 16:15 40:18	73:5,13 77:11 80:4,5	attendees (4) 52:9 59:3	99:25 109:10,19 111:7,16	broad (1) 35:25
accepting (1) 54:14	34:20 42:24 47:12 87:24	107:3	83:5,8 89:9 90:5 91:9,25	64:21 65:1	99:25 109:10,19 111:7,16	broaden (2) 8:10 98:17
accepts (2) 10:24,24	98:10 105:5	answers (9) 16:13 19:23,24	93:3 100:18 104:15	attending (7) 62:4 66:4	begin (3) 19:19 20:19 109:10	broadly (1) 103:11
access (3) 13:15 22:4 42:11	afternoon (1) 108:25	20:1,2 29:24 34:22 113:24	105:10,11 106:19 120:9	70:19 93:11 94:13,24	beginning (2) 98:8 105:18	broken (5) 112:17,21,23
accompany (1) 62:18	again (16) 22:5,12 47:13	116:23	armstrongs (7) 1:17 32:4	95:23	begins (2) 16:23 23:2	113:3,5
accordingly (1) 7:25	55:16 56:13,18 61:8 63:16	antecedents (3) 104:14,22	34:11 36:19 56:15 99:1	attention (6) 51:14 73:21	begun (1) 4:15	bromley (1) 12:8
account (10) 17:4 31:11	71:17 73:22 76:7 83:1	105:6	107:9	92:16 104:12,23 105:3	behalf (5) 34:5,6 48:19	brought (4) 44:1 45:24 77:20
33:8 51:9 62:8 64:24	96:19 111:23 118:13,23	anthony (1) 36:8	around (3) 3:7 75:19 86:11	audience (2) 6:10 11:20	60:19 65:9	92:16
87:3,6,14 107:3	against (5) 9:21 39:3 69:12	anticipate (4) 26:11 84:4	arranged (2) 14:12 30:11	august (2) 13:2 59:3	behaved (1) 106:13	brown (1) 10:11
accountable (1) 63:22	83:3,6,14 107:3	93:15 117:6	arrangements (9) 26:16	authorities (15) 1:20 9:10,12	behaviour (4) 79:8,10 100:8	browns (1) 36:3
accuracy (1) 114:11	agencies (23) 11:5,8,14,22	anticipating (1) 88:2	42:24,25 44:18 67:17	10:3,19 11:8 16:19 19:6	105:6	bsu (1) 86:4
achieving (2) 76:21 78:24	12:23,25 13:24 20:13	anxious (2) 79:13,14	93:14 94:1 99:4,5	31:7 37:25 39:12,13 49:24	behavioural (1) 57:8	building (1) 10:4
acknowledges (1) 27:21	23:4,10,25 24:12 25:2 50:4	anyone (7) 2:19 72:14 73:9	94:12 107:5 109:4,9	51:19 57:15	behind (3) 21:12 89:7,7	bulbs (4) 40:4,15,16 95:14
across (1) 8:6	58:4 64:8 74:17 81:4	94:12 107:5 109:4,9	anything (14) 1:19 38:12	authority (10) 34:13,15	being (46) 2:15,20 12:15,24	bullet (111) 17:10,23
acted (1) 101:19	84:1,6 105:12 106:5,11	52:17 59:25 79:24,24	52:17 59:25 79:24,24	51:25 52:14,25 65:16	18:19 27:17,23 28:12	20:19,25 21:5,17,17,23
acting (1) 11:8	agency (9) 8:8,9 11:17	80:11 81:14 87:4,5 107:24	80:11 81:14 87:4,5 107:24	74:23 75:5 76:5 87:14	32:20 33:1 36:11 37:21	22:7,8,14,19 24:19
action (1) 14:19	50:1,6 75:4,12,18 76:4	109:9 111:4 116:18	109:9 111:4 116:18	automatically (7) 7:13	38:10 40:17 43:12 44:11	25:13,19,20 26:2,2,5,11
actions (1) 74:22	agents (1) 7:17	anyway (1) 74:18	anywhere (2) 85:17 88:16	automn (4) 11:23 13:8 21:18	45:15 47:10 48:12,16	27:3,7,14,21 28:6,15,16
actively (1) 112:4	ago (1) 48:18	apart (1) 102:17	apart (1) 102:17	26:3	64:11 67:9,21 69:6,7 71:17	34:2,9,14 72:21 79:3,8
activities (1) 83:21	agree (28) 9:23 10:20 11:1	apologise (1) 96:10	apologise (1) 96:10	availability (1) 114:1	72:23 76:25 77:1,3 79:23	43:2,8,13,16,16,16,17,25
actor (2) 27:18 39:5	19:3 24:3 32:3,3 41:25	apparent (4) 21:9 45:14	74:14 77:21 89:19	available (7) 22:16 48:14	80:16 83:3 86:1 90:15 95:1	44:4,10,24,25,25 45:8,19
acts (2) 8:9 98:16	48:17 50:21 51:1,4 59:4	79:9,15	98:16,20,22 108:9	66:15 69:1 74:10 113:25	99:10 101:5,22 102:14	46:1,2,8,14,18 47:21 48:3
actual (3) 9:25 105:21 118:8	74:24 82:16,22,22	appeal (2) 36:7 87:25	articulated (1) 10:11	116:4	109:22 111:4,13 113:13,17	49:15 51:9,11 53:12
actually (3) 32:25 72:25 84:6	98:8,15,18 99:1 100:3,9	98:10 117:15	aside (1) 114:10	averted (1) 39:14	115:23	55:9,20 56:18 57:11 59:21
add (11) 18:2 27:9 45:20	101:25 102:16 103:9,11	appeared (1) 98:21	ask (5) 2:4 39:23 40:5 66:1	avoided (1) 50:10	believed (1) 109:17	60:12,21,22,23 61:2,25
46:11 70:21 71:6,9,11	107:13	appearing (1) 16:6	109:13	avoided (2) 63:14,17	bench (1) 36:8	64:19 67:12 68:8
99:25 105:25 118:9	agreed (9) 12:19 56:9 57:24	appears (4) 17:25 56:10	asked (17) 24:25 27:24	aware (12) 2:14,17 12:23	benefit (4) 1:17 6:10	69:11,13,15,17,23,24
added (16) 17:23 21:7,13	63:1,2 74:16 92:14,18	90:11 118:5	29:13 39:7 53:16 54:18	24:11 27:23 47:3 58:5	81:20,21	70:2,9,14 72:21 79:6,8
22:7 27:4,17 28:6 29:10	111:2	application (3) 34:14 84:22	65:5 68:17 91:10 93:20	64:20 65:21 87:20 93:18	bereaved (1) 19:15	81:16 84:12 88:19 89:1
34:20 43:14 47:22 70:9	aid (1) 3:19	115:11	95:4,5,16 99:14 106:7	115:17	best (2) 19:21 48:14	99:6,7,25 100:5,16,17,25
79:6 99:20 105:15 118:5	aim (1) 96:19	aimed (1) 76:20	113:13,17	away (1) 45:11	106:15	101:25 102:1,4,8,9,19,23
adding (6) 18:11,11 28:14	albeit (1) 47:4	albeit (1) 47:4	asking (2) 85:12 112:5		between (16) 8:12 26:22	105:11,16,16,17,23 106:20
99:7 105:20 107:11	alive (2) 115:8 116:7	alleged (5) 9:8 34:18,25 36:5	asks (2) 18:15 19:12		29:22 44:6 57:23 58:14	107:10,20
addition (9) 24:18 35:13	alleged (5) 9:8 34:18,25 36:5	56:11	aspect (5) 3:2 89:22 91:16		73:6 76:24 82:11 85:18	bullets (1) 18:10
36:1 42:3 43:8,24 44:16	56:11	alien (1) 36:10	108:18,20		86:13 96:17 97:25	byford (2) 55:11 81:21
47:25 102:4	allocation (1) 54:12	allow (2) 85:3 94:17	aspects (3) 4:2 30:16 103:6		110:11,22 112:18	
additional (17) 27:6 28:13	allowing (1) 81:18	allowing (1) 81:18	aspiration (1) 78:19		beyond (3) 83:19,24 108:16	
34:17,19 35:8 36:20 43:13	alm (2) 86:9 101:15	almost (1) 78:5	assess (6) 12:20 14:18		bit (4) 64:1 84:11 90:9	
45:20 60:17 62:17 65:10	almost (2) 21:3 45:18	alongside (2) 41:17 79:9	46:6,19 101:6 103:21		117:23	
66:13 69:6 70:1 94:18	address (31) 6:6 8:15 26:12	already (13) 11:16 18:10,12	assessed (4) 9:25 28:8 67:16		bits (1) 109:18	
113:23 114:8	34:12,23 40:23 50:20	51:12 68:5 74:6 85:1 94:6	101:17		blocks (3) 40:4,15,16	
additionally (1) 112:15	51:10,15 56:13 57:19	107:10,16 115:20 116:8,11	assesses (1) 53:16		board (2) 8:6 42:19	
additions (2) 21:3 45:18	60:12 62:6 63:25 71:23,25	18:1 21:13 22:2,3 25:23	assessing (1) 21:25		bodies (4) 99:12 101:6,19	
address (31) 6:6 8:15 26:12	72:6 73:14 76:6 83:9,10	68:13 87:2,8 98:18 104:9	assessment (50) 9:8 12:2		106:25	
34:12,23 40:23 50:20	84:10 90:8 98:3,7,12	106:4 108:4 117:21	21:14,15 22:1,15,16 26:9		book (4) 112:20 113:2 114:4	
51:10,15 56:13 57:19	102:22 106:16 109:20	appropriate (12) 14:19 57:7	28:10 30:10,13 46:20		115:23	
60:12 62:6 63:25 71:23,25	111:7,23	60:20 64:8 65:16 67:17	53:22 54:19 56:25 57:12		booking (1) 96:1	
72:6 73:14 76:6 83:9,10	117:23	70:21 82:14 94:19 102:23	58:21 60:20 61:1 64:7,14		bored (1) 107:24	
84:10 90:8 98:3,7,12	117:23	103:3 110:7	66:10 67:12,24,25		boredom (1) 79:25	
102:22 106:16 109:20	117:23	approve (1) 51:2	68:2,18,20,23 69:5 74:7		borne (1) 49:16	
111:7,23	117:23	approved (6) 13:16 21:19	75:10 81:1 84:16 86:4,8		borrowed (1) 66:20	
addressed (13) 18:9 46:18	117:23	70:24,25 111:12,14	92:11,14,17,19 93:1,1,4,7		both (14) 10:1 15:20 19:2	
48:16 49:18 51:12 56:15	117:23	86:13 87:2,8 98:18 104:9	101:2,5 103:22 104:1,6		28:1 34:6 37:4 58:11 60:12	
57:2 63:16 78:14 102:20	117:23	106:4 108:4 117:21	106:4		61:15 62:20 71:4 81:21	
107:10,16 111:5	117:23	appropriate (12) 14:19 57:7	assessments (4) 100:23		100:24 112:24	
addresses (1) 26:3	117:23	103:3 110:7	101:11,18,20		bottom (2) 22:7 44:5	
addressing (7) 16:16 20:4,22	117:23	arches (2) 66:19 95:9	assessor (1) 74:5		bound (1) 88:5	
35:19 61:24 76:22 100:12	117:23	arden (1) 7:1	assist (5) 20:18 83:16 88:21		box (4) 20:5 42:1,7 115:16	
adequacy (5) 29:2 51:7 52:4	117:23	area (2) 75:17 90:8	89:6 96:7		boyle (18) 35:17	
53:14 84:15	117:23	areas (3) 31:8 60:11,12	assistance (1) 32:12		47:9,11,18,19,20 48:24	
adequate (1) 96:5	117:23	arent (3) 6:8 80:6 112:8	assistant (1) 87:16		100:17 110:18 111:5 112:4	

59:6 63:19
causative (1) 78:7
cause (3) 52:11 59:25 72:14
caused (6) 10:7 30:16 36:12
 55:18 56:2 61:4
causes (2) 7:3 24:6
causing (2) 12:5 84:7
ceased (1) 13:12
cechavacite (1) 80:2
central (3) 76:23 77:20 91:1
ceremony (1) 71:20
certain (8) 6:13 8:20 9:10
 54:10 72:23 77:6 114:5
 115:2
chain (1) 63:18
chair (1) 55:6
challenge (2) 58:2 90:4
challenged (2) 23:19 103:25
chambers (8) 45:8 101:7
 110:12,19 113:11 114:2,4
 115:16
chance (2) 10:8 13:22
change (9) 20:5 22:24 27:14
 76:2,15 98:5 99:3,5 100:4
changed (5) 17:10 22:20
 55:2 106:21 111:17
changes (20) 17:9 20:15,24
 23:23 25:12,15,19,23
 26:5,18 27:2,8 31:11,13,14
 76:15 97:24,25 98:1
 108:14
charity (1) 94:23
charm (1) 33:12
checked (1) 14:13
chief (3) 18:2,25 31:17
chimes (1) 65:8
choice (1) 15:18
chromebook (1) 81:10
circulate (1) 118:10
circulated (2) 1:7 78:17
circulation (1) 78:20
circumstances (9) 6:22 8:20
 13:9 34:15 51:3 61:3 68:23
 79:23 88:11
citation (2) 16:18 34:13
citations (1) 35:24
cited (3) 19:6 38:1,11
city (1) 95:6
civil (3) 16:8 83:15 98:23
clarification (2) 69:16,22
clarify (1) 116:14
classes (1) 9:10
clean (2) 118:4,9
cleaned (1) 71:17
clear (22) 5:20 7:11 8:11
 15:1 19:1 23:16 36:4 40:21
 44:17 45:9 49:24 54:5
 55:12,23 57:16,24 58:3,18
 74:19 91:7 97:1 111:13
clearance (4) 55:6,12,13 56:1
clearer (1) 10:3
clearly (5) 41:23 66:4 91:1
 102:5 111:16
client (3) 65:8 80:9 103:16
clients (3) 43:19 72:3 114:16
clink (1) 94:23
clock (1) 96:10
close (2) 3:22 76:8
closed (3) 7:15 85:20 87:12
closely (1) 29:1
coat (1) 83:12
cobbett (1) 116:12
cogent (1) 105:9
colle (3) 10:12 36:3 73:22
colleagues (1) 68:14
collective (1) 50:4
collins (1) 98:24
combination (2) 11:9 15:17
combined (1) 13:9
come (6) 53:24 56:22 71:8
 89:10 99:21 117:20
comes (4) 53:22,24 84:13
 118:19
coming (3) 47:9 71:15 87:24
commend (1) 90:1
comment (1) 83:4

comments (2) 17:4 72:3
commissioned (1) 116:2
commitment (1) 3:9
committed (1) 64:22
commadore (10) 14:15 29:7
 30:6 64:25 65:15,20 66:2
 94:7 95:4 104:24
common (2) 8:12 103:21
commonplace (1) 2:18
communications (1) 114:22
community (8) 21:25 23:12
 24:20 54:20 65:25 66:7
 68:11 79:17
company (34) 14:14 26:23
 27:5,9,11,16
 29:4,9,13,16,21
 30:2,5,8,17 60:15 61:1
 62:1,3 64:17,20 65:4,9
 66:16,19,24 67:11 70:18
 93:10,13 94:4 104:21
 105:7 109:15
comparable (2) 27:12 30:7
compassion (1) 3:15
compelling (2) 48:17 50:24
compile (1) 97:7
complaints (1) 77:14
completeness (1) 114:12
complex (2) 16:12 88:14
compliance (3) 21:9 45:13
 59:5
compliant (2) 38:6 100:7
complicated (3) 16:11 18:10
 41:14
complication (1) 18:12
complying (1) 21:10
comprehensive (3) 64:7,14
 117:12
computer (1) 109:25
conceivably (1) 22:11
concept (5) 17:17 18:5,8,13
 82:20
concern (12) 3:1 19:9 21:18
 26:3 31:9 32:8 45:7
 52:12,18 57:5 60:1 79:22
concerned (20) 13:1,4,6
 24:5,8 34:11 36:18
 51:14,22 52:21 54:8
 56:4,23 57:6 59:6 72:3
 75:8,13 80:15 99:11
concerning (12) 11:12
 21:13,24 22:15 26:9 45:11
 51:5,7 53:10 100:14
 102:24 111:9
concerns (10) 3:12 20:11
 23:3 29:22 44:11 54:3
 59:14 75:23 101:22 109:21
concession (1) 38:17
concessions (1) 73:16
conclude (8) 15:3 24:15
 55:17 92:6 93:12 101:2
 104:8 105:3
conclusion (13) 5:19 7:5,6
 11:7 18:19 19:1,5,7 29:25
 40:2 56:24 109:7 110:21
conclusions (2) 2:16 4:14
 5:2,3 7:3 15:12,15,17,22
 16:3,10,14 18:21 35:15
 39:20 50:22 52:3 85:6
 87:21 98:17,19 108:16
concrete (1) 9:8
condemned (2) 40:9 44:20
condensed (1) 21:3
conditions (5) 12:17 45:13
 52:23,24 112:8
conduct (5) 10:23 24:9 45:6
 61:18 104:17
conducted (3) 57:21 60:20
 104:1
confident (1) 58:25
confidently (1) 15:3
confined (1) 60:23
confirm (2) 18:15 71:4
confirming (1) 117:2
conflict (2) 85:18 87:9
confuse (1) 17:14
confused (1) 16:13

confusion (3) 18:12 24:7
 99:18
connected (1) 93:9
connection (1) 106:10
conscious (3) 1:8 72:24
 117:15
consensus (2) 15:7 108:1
consequence (4) 38:23 39:6
 40:12,19
consequences (2) 38:22 88:8
consider (18) 21:2 31:7 39:8
 45:13 58:17 63:6 66:24
 78:1 84:3,15 86:25 88:18
 91:2,8 92:25 99:10 100:11
 103:5
consideration (14) 5:5 37:24
 41:24 42:6,13 45:10 46:13
 54:9 61:9,11 85:22 103:2
 104:2 105:12
considerationissue (1) 48:20
considerations (21) 14:8
 34:1,20 35:13 36:22
 37:2,17 40:15,24 41:9,15
 42:21 44:2,14 45:17 98:9
 99:8 100:7,13 103:12
 104:20
considered (6) 8:10 13:3
 27:6 59:2 63:9 86:10
considering (4) 66:12
 86:3,21,22
considers (1) 26:16
consistently (1) 101:17
constituent (1) 40:1
constraint (1) 80:21
constructive (1) 4:14
contained (2) 78:10,12
containing (1) 110:14
contains (1) 17:6
contemporaneous (1) 112:19
contempt (1) 2:6
contend (1) 50:13
content (6) 2:7 8:18 21:13
 31:3 111:5 115:18
contents (1) 115:19
context (7) 7:19 9:20 75:7
 79:20 83:16 85:12 87:1
 77:12
contexts (3) 17:16 39:19
 77:12
continue (3) 16:8 43:7 72:15
continued (5) 12:19,20
 21:19 94:16 104:16
continuing (3) 9:19 11:25
 26:10
contrary (1) 98:22
contrast (1) 113:22
contribute (1) 32:9
contributed (15) 15:23,24
 16:1 20:14 23:5 26:17
 36:12 41:11 55:18,19 56:7
 61:4,10,19 67:5
contribution (4) 15:25 17:11
 18:6,9
contributory (1) 7:3
control (1) 63:21
controlled (1) 7:15
convenient (2) 1:22 4:20
convention (5) 4:23 6:12,16
 11:10 33:24
conversations (1) 81:13
convictions (1) 65:2
cope (1) 118:2
copy (1) 118:9
copying (1) 64:5
coroner (6) 7:4 15:19 31:17
 61:8 87:16,20
coroners (3) 7:7 18:2,25
coronial (2) 37:23 77:15
correct (10) 22:21 82:11,14
 102:7 104:8,9 106:22
 107:5,6 113:12
correction (1) 28:24
correctly (1) 104:11
counsel (13) 49:10 50:21
 60:8 61:6,11,14 63:3,5
 64:18 70:11 82:25 83:22
 97:4

counterterrorism (3) 14:21
 52:19 114:19
couple (1) 38:22
courage (1) 3:15
course (27) 7:14 13:1,5 15:6
 18:17 24:11 30:4 31:12,13
 32:2 36:23 38:11 39:19
 48:9,21 61:12,16 73:5,20
 76:22,24 80:18 91:21
 92:24 93:19 95:11 96:2
courts (2) 17:19 50:18
cover (1) 26:22
coverage (6) 43:23
 86:11,15,17,18,23
covered (1) 24:18
covering (2) 19:13 108:9
covers (1) 26:20
covert (5) 45:15 46:6
 52:11,16 57:4
covertly (1) 57:22
cracks (1) 29:23
create (1) 87:11
credible (2) 7:21 38:13
crilly (1) 3:16
crime (1) 40:9
criminal (2) 14:4 16:7
criteria (1) 12:16
critical (3) 7:23 78:10 83:4
criticisms (2) 103:16,17
crossapplied (1) 38:21
crossed (2) 83:13 102:6
crossing (1) 82:9
crossreference (1) 113:7
crown (1) 87:15
ct (2) 57:23 58:14
ctc (1) 55:6
ctis (4) 49:10,21 50:7 51:16
ctu (5) 25:17 57:25 58:10
 100:25 101:3
culture (1) 76:1
cure (1) 46:8
curfew (3) 111:10,15,17
current (3) 76:9 82:8 94:3
currently (1) 96:22
cut (2) 3:8 15:1

D

d (3) 35:16 51:15 112:8
danger (2) 3:3 107:4
dangerous (2) 69:8 101:8
darryn (1) 3:16
dawn (1) 86:8
dawson (2) 16:2 17:19
day (8) 23:17,21 29:7 64:4
 66:5 109:6 114:5 118:1
day101042224 (1) 95:5
day108823 (1) 94:8
day2618 (1) 101:9
day613421 (1) 95:16
day613468 (1) 95:12
day61442223 (1) 95:24
day863 (1) 92:14
day864 (1) 92:14
day866 (1) 92:19
day867 (1) 92:19
day912010 (1) 91:10
day9124 (1) 93:3
daytoday (1) 24:14
dc669519 (1) 92:4
dci (4) 45:8 101:7 110:12
 116:12
deal (11) 5:12 56:11 57:20
 69:10,15 74:12 78:8 83:2
 88:20 103:18 118:20
dealing (4) 3:23 68:9 82:20
 118:19
dealt (3) 3:22 43:9 77:20
death (14) 6:14,15
 7:11,14,18 10:7 15:24,24
 16:15 18:6 36:13 40:7
 61:10,20
deaths (20) 5:5 8:3 18:24
 20:14 23:6 26:18 30:22
 31:4,18,23 32:8,10 41:12
 42:12 51:3 55:18,19 56:8
 61:5 67:6

deceased (5) 6:21 10:8 39:24
 40:7 50:24
december (2) 12:3 78:11
deception (1) 79:21
decide (6) 8:4 39:20,23 50:8
 58:16 113:17
decision (16) 7:2 22:21,23
 82:16,22,23 88:6,7 100:22
 106:13,22,23 107:5,6
 108:18 112:24
decisionmaking (2) 75:24
 106:24
decisions (5) 11:12 52:22
 65:16 81:18 113:13
decline (1) 88:6
declined (1) 5:16
deduced (1) 110:15
defender (1) 83:15
deference (2) 82:19 106:24
deficiencies (6) 9:8 22:8
 26:16 50:14 102:24 103:3
deficient (1) 23:15
degree (3) 82:19 93:22 108:1
deleted (3) 45:22 46:3,9
deletion (2) 46:7 100:17
deliberations (1) 2:13
deliver (1) 117:12
demeanour (1) 14:18
demonstrates (1) 38:8
dense (1) 37:9
department (3) 10:22 49:3
 51:20
depend (1) 100:21
deputy (1) 87:16
described (1) 43:23
description (1) 25:24
desirable (1) 74:20
despite (3) 30:11 43:22
 113:1
detail (9) 9:5 10:17 20:10
 34:3 49:4,6 64:1 72:20
 78:24
detailed (5) 12:1 35:11
 74:21 97:4 108:6
detailing (1) 20:19
details (2) 58:12 62:15
detected (1) 23:17
detection (1) 95:6
detector (1) 66:19
detectors (1) 27:13
determination (1) 53:16
determinations (8) 2:3,10,15
 15:9,10 16:21 30:20 89:21
determine (5) 6:21 8:16 16:7
 36:25 113:16
developed (1) 90:18
devoted (1) 102:18
di (2) 112:16,20
day2618 (1) 101:9
didit (14) 28:10 30:10
 32:9,25 33:4 72:14 90:25
 94:9,12,17 95:8 104:9
 107:18
died (4) 6:21,23,24 39:24
difference (6) 67:25 68:20,21
 82:11 104:6 105:8
different (10) 17:16,16 35:2
 38:13,20 45:12 68:24
 76:16 81:22 87:7
differs (3) 30:3 67:7
 106:13
difficult (3) 75:10 106:10
 114:23
difficulties (3) 33:13 46:4
 106:9
difficulty (4) 70:6 77:3 79:19
 101:4
diligent (1) 117:16
dimensions (1) 3:4
direct (2) 2:22 19:4
directed (4) 11:7 23:9 52:3
 56:24
direction (3) 19:7 31:24
 98:13
directional (1) 76:25
directions (7) 16:24 17:7
 18:14 31:3,6 40:3,21

directly (1) 35:10
disadvantage (1) 6:3
disappeared (1) 102:10
disclosed (1) 2:9
disclosure (2) 5:25 115:23
discovery (1) 78:18
discretion (3) 7:7,21 15:20
discussed (4) 1:22 59:1
 112:18 116:8
discusses (1) 109:23
discussion (3) 104:2 112:20
 113:2
dispute (2) 6:9 110:22
disputed (1) 93:24
disputes (1) 6:7
disregard (1) 87:22
disruption (1) 72:14
dissent (1) 49:22
distill (1) 49:10
distinct (1) 9:2
distribute (1) 42:9
distributed (1) 42:5
distribution (2) 42:2,4
distrust (1) 12:14
divide (1) 25:9
dividing (1) 100:6
division (3) 25:6 36:8 100:10
document (25) 4:12 5:15
 6:8,25 7:22 10:16 14:23
 15:2,11 17:5 18:18 19:6
 25:7 30:24 45:4 76:8,15
 97:24 100:11 102:2,6
 110:4,10 111:2 114:25
documents (10) 1:6,18
 12:7,21 32:15 37:10 77:3
 97:8 101:13,15
does (13) 8:7 11:6,16 18:17
 34:17 39:18 46:15
 51:20,23 55:3 67:1 100:21
 107:2
doesnt (12) 17:14 29:25
 36:17 37:10 46:7 66:1
 76:7,13 83:25 108:23
 113:18 117:8
dog (1) 80:5
doing (18) 13:1 20:3 21:11
 22:12 59:25 71:22
 77:18,21 79:24 80:11
 81:11 97:6 105:21
 106:6,12 111:18 118:2,7
done (14) 3:2 7:7 15:16
 30:3,6 89:17 92:17,20 94:4
 95:3,7,10,22 109:19
dont (32) 23:12 24:3 29:1
 41:13 49:5 50:19 56:17
 62:5 69:22 71:13 76:17
 77:17,19 78:3 82:22 83:21
 84:6 87:4 88:16 89:22
 95:25 103:9 107:22 108:21
 109:9 111:20 112:4 117:25
doubt (7) 6:9 23:15 29:14
 40:22 47:23 50:10 82:2
douglaswilliams (2) 16:2
 17:19
down (3) 107:19 111:7 113:2
dr (6) 68:17,19 91:9 93:3
 103:25 104:15
draft (13) 17:6 28:17 42:17
 47:20 54:22 60:18 67:13
 68:5 82:8,25 83:1 90:13
 94:3
drafting (1) 46:5
drafts (2) 19:18 108:5
draw (5) 34:21 51:14 73:21
 85:6 104:23
drawing (2) 76:24 110:21
drawn (3) 76:12 105:3
 109:25
draws (1) 104:12
driving (1) 96:22
drs (3) 62:21 65:21 68:3
ds (4) 14:21 86:4 112:16,19
due (2) 7:14 32:1
dumper (1) 13:1
duplicities (1) 12:24

during (7) 6:1 22:9 31:13
 48:21 57:3 104:17 106:7
duties (6) 8:2,14,18,19 10:10
 91:10
duty (47) 7:18 8:17,23
 9:1,3,7,9,11,20
 10:2,5,5,14,19 11:4,18,21
 14:25 15:5,6 33:23
 34:4,7,19,23,25 35:5,6,15
 36:6,11,16 40:6 47:25
 50:10,16,17 51:21
 56:14,16 73:15 75:13 76:7
 89:19,22 91:12 98:16
dyson (1) 36:9

E

e (4) 7:22 35:17 105:20,21
earlier (5) 62:9 64:25 87:23
 102:5 114:15
early (4) 18:9 86:14
 110:12,20
ease (1) 19:2
easier (2) 60:10 100:11
easily (1) 38:15
easy (1) 33:12
eat (1) 117:8
education (1) 3:10
educational (4) 105:22
 106:6,12 118:8
effect (7) 13:9 14:24 26:7
 34:7 69:4 78:7 104:24
effectively (1) 93:25
eg (1) 67:17
eighth (1) 22:14
either (8) 5:10 11:1 12:14
 15:23 30:14 69:5 108:14
 115:20
elastic (1) 17:15
element (2) 6:13 71:20
elements (1) 40:1
elicit (4) 5:1,2 7:4 15:14
elicited (1) 15:18
eliciting (2) 4:13 7:6
eloquent (1) 103:15
eloquently (1) 53

enough (7) 3:2 18:10 76:9
84:17 22 86:24 116:9
enquiries (1) 114:19
enquiry (2) 78:18 114:16
enriched (1) 3:7
ensure (5) 4:1 26:19 37:17
38:9 54:19
entirely (6) 31:20 76:10,11
80:9 88:24 103:11
entirety (2) 53:25 56:22
entitled (3) 30:4 61:8 82:21
equal (1) 37:2
equally (1) 10:9
equipment (2) 66:20,21
equivalent (2) 25:20 105:24
erased (1) 103:10
erg (12) 12:2 21:14
54:19,21,23 55:1 74:4,8
79:3,5,7 86:7
error (1) 24:15
errors (1) 9:2
escort (3) 14:11 93:17,23
escorted (1) 93:19
especially (1) 40:13
essentially (5) 41:3,4 83:19
90:10,24
establish (5) 8:23 35:21 40:4
98:21 116:3
established (3) 10:6
112:12,13
establishes (1) 88:10
establishing (1) 106:9
european (1) 4:23
euston (1) 93:20
even (26) 10:3 12:7 13:4
16:4 32:8,9 33:6 34:19
36:5 39:3 50:5,11 51:21
53:21 55:19 59:15 61:9
67:5 79:22 80:14 95:25
110:6,7 111:9 113:18
116:20
event (61) 5:10 14:1,2 22:22
26:17,20 27:22 28:8,11
29:16 30:7,10 52:10 58:24
59:1,18 60:16,21
62:14,16,24 63:11,13
64:4,12,21 65:5,6,22
66:4,6,8 67:15,16,22
68:2,4,15,22,25 69:4,18,19
70:17,19,23 81:19,19,20
82:17 90:23 91:18
92:12,17,20 93:16
94:20,22 101:23 103:23
106:14
events (3) 27:12 42:18 62:23
eventual (1) 87:21
every (1) 117:10
everybody (2) 75:11 76:13
everyone (11) 1:5 33:1
38:1,25 44:17,20 47:7
102:8 107:24 108:10,10
everything (1) 76:23
evidence (84) 3:15 5:20,24
7:16 8:1 22:9 23:16,18
29:5 31:13 37:9,11,18
38:7 39:21 41:10 43:21
44:19 46:23 48:10 50:3
52:2,6,7 53:15,18
55:10,14,17,23 56:23
57:1,3,7,9,16 58:24 59:22
65:1,20 66:13,21 68:1,22
69:19 77:2 78:19 81:11,24
82:24 86:3,14 90:21
91:3,9,23 92:13 93:21 94:7
95:11 100:22,23
104:5,7,25 109:17 111:13
112:12,14,15
113:16 22:25,25 114:13
115:15,17 116:1,11,24
117:13,18
evident (1) 10:12
evidential (1) 92:6
exactly (2) 46:21 107:21
exam (1) 21:4
example (11) 9:4 27:11
42:2,12 62:18 72:21 81:21

85:10,24 99:14 101:7
examples (1) 40:25
except (2) 8:20 78:5
exception (1) 87:13
exchange (2) 86:12 92:3
exclude (1) 61:8
excluded (3) 10:1 55:23
57:13
exercise (6) 22:25 28:12 41:8
81:17 108:7,12
exhibiting (1) 106:24
existed (1) 46:5
existence (2) 40:6 83:10
exoffenders (3) 64:21 69:3
93:11
expanded (2) 21:23 68:6
expect (3) 47:7 64:10 108:6
expected (1) 9:16
expecting (1) 112:2
expedient (1) 30:17
experience (6) 37:7,11
44:14,21 48:3 100:2
experienced (1) 47:23
expertise (1) 75:17
explain (4) 5:14 17:9 18:18
70:8
explained (1) 23:18
explaining (1) 40:25
explanation (3) 20:5,6,7
explication (1) 110:10
explicit (1) 68:10
explore (1) 114:11
explored (2) 85:14 114:6
express (2) 25:15 97:5
expression (2) 17:18 87:10
expressly (2) 75:9 80:1
extend (2) 9:4 30:25
extended (3) 38:10,23 39:1
extensive (3) 7:5 34:13 57:3
extensively (1) 35:20
extent (11) 8:25 24:18 46:6
50:13 53:11,17 57:17
74:15 80:14 87:7 114:16
extra (3) 35:13 95:15,18
extremely (1) 32:13
eye (1) 32:16

F

f (3) 35:18 49:9,21
face (4) 87:11 88:4,12 111:3
facilitated (1) 62:19
factfinding (1) 77:18
factor (6) 15:25 43:20
80:1,10,11 99:18
factors (8) 13:12 20:14,18
25:11 27:1 43:17 45:20
92:2
factual (2) 15:15 41:1
failed (2) 9:14 39:13
failing (2) 55:7,9
failings (1) 40:12
fails (1) 53:20
failure (7) 16:4,5 35:22 42:9
54:19 63:6 106:8
failures (4) 20:11,12 23:3
24:4
fairly (1) 44:18
fall (1) 8:9
falls (2) 43:13 46:21
false (3) 85:13,18 87:11
falsity (1) 87:11
families (14) 1:15,15 10:20
19:15 21:16 22:6 25:22
95:11 100:22,23
45:20 54:15 56:3 60:19
61:15 70:11 73:17
family (8) 22:13,17 28:3
34:6,6 54:8 55:5 90:14
families (2) 54:7 56:3
fanciful (2) 7:20 38:12
far (15) 28:22 34:11 36:18
43:10 51:13,22 54:7 55:8
56:3,22 57:6 59:5 72:2
75:13 102:8
favour (1) 20:2
feature (2) 79:25 113:18

features (1) 111:21
fed (2) 58:17 110:17
feed (2) 59:16,18
feeding (1) 58:9
feel (2) 64:8 71:19
feet (1) 71:14
fevre (2) 71:4,7
few (3) 51:25 56:4 57:19
field (2) 3:12 7:2
fifth (13) 13:8 17:10 21:17
26:5 27:21 43:17 60:21
84:12 88:19 89:1 102:1
105:16 107:10
fifthly (3) 5:3 16:14 49:16
fighting (1) 3:17
figures (1) 14:4
final (3) 67:13 82:7 88:1
finally (8) 30:21 48:17 52:22
57:13,19 99:24 107:15
110:24
find (7) 39:24 40:3 75:2
90:14 93:25 112:6 117:25
finding (7) 9:6 11:3 15:4
16:6 88:3 98:21 101:4
findings (4) 41:1 51:24 96:3
98:23
firearms (1) 3:22
first (49) 1:14 3:6,14 4:21
5:6,7 8:22 9:11 11:6,21
12:1 15:14 17:13 18:20
19:10 25:13 26:18 27:3
35:5 38:23 40:12 41:2,16
42:22 49:8,20 52:2
54:17,21 56:5 57:21 60:12
68:8 69:15 71:14,15,21
79:1 80:22 84:24 89:16
100:7,10 103:19 109:4,21
113:11 115:16 116:15
firstly (4) 33:21,21 36:17
46:11
fishmongers (49) 13:3 14:14
26:23 27:5,9,16
29:4,9,13,16,21 30:2,5,17
58:13 59:15 60:15,16 61:1
62:1,3,13,24 63:1,14
64:13,17,20 65:4,9
66:16,19,24 67:11
68:3,6,22,25 70:18
92:12,18,20 93:6,10,13
94:4,15 104:21 105:7
five (5) 4:21 11:25 15:13
16:23 40:4
fixated (1) 81:12
flag (3) 84:8 85:14 94:7
flagged (1) 62:14
flagging (1) 77:4
flat (1) 13:17
flies (1) 88:12
flip (1) 118:17
fly (2) 87:10 88:4
flynn (2) 55:3 76:2
focus (6) 16:15 23:24 24:8
46:12,17 83:19
focused (2) 44:10 108:20
focusing (3) 73:1 98:4
117:17
follow (4) 37:3,12 43:3
100:12
followed (3) 17:20 92:24
95:19
following (5) 5:14 60:18
62:12 66:25 107:24
follows (6) 34:1 36:22 49:8
58:7 87:25 118:16
foot (1) 46:2
footnote (2) 41:6 113:7
force (4) 10:25 63:19 74:10
89:13
forename (1) 94:11
form (19) 4:6 7:5 10:14
15:17 17:1,3,24 19:8,16
26:4 28:4 30:19 36:25
37:14 52:13 54:22 57:12
106:25 116:23
formal (10) 12:21 58:4,8,8
67:24 68:2,23 92:19

101:13 115:11
formally (1) 72:10
format (4) 1:9 73:3 76:9
96:25
formulate (1) 32:1
formulating (1) 20:21
formulation (8) 7:23 8:10
9:17 10:2 24:6 40:14 53:21
54:14
fortunate (1) 28:24
forum (1) 11:13
forward (2) 67:2 89:10
found (2) 89:18 100:19
fourth (7) 5:2 12:25 16:10
26:2 27:14 43:2,16
fourthly (3) 49:14 54:25
58:14
frame (2) 74:14 75:12
framework (3) 8:23 52:16,25
free (1) 74:9
freely (1) 74:10
freestanding (2) 106:8,18
frequent (1) 13:13
fresh (2) 43:8 44:13
friday (2) 1:8 109:16
friendly (1) 83:3
front (1) 116:21
frost (1) 3:16
frustrated (1) 71:8
fs (1) 58:12
full (3) 31:10 53:9 62:6
fundamentally (1) 77:23
further (32) 5:19 18:6,11
32:12 50:20 55:11 67:2
69:22 71:5 72:6,9 73:15
79:4 83:10,16 88:21
89:6,23 90:9 94:19 95:21
96:7 101:23 104:13,16
105:11,15 112:1 115:7
118:4 120:12,13
furthermore (1) 104:10
future (6) 5:5 30:22
31:4,18,23 32:8

G

g (3) 17:22 34:16 35:18
galbraith (6) 37:19 41:10,18
53:20 78:1,4
gallant (1) 3:16
gateway (2) 39:16 98:17
gathering (1) 92:8
gave (2) 115:17,19
general (39) 8:22 9:1,3,7
10:5,10 14:25 15:6 16:25
21:1 33:21,23
34:4,7,19,22,25
35:5,6,15,22 36:5,11,16,21
42:15 47:25 50:10,17
56:14,16 70:11 76:6,19
77:12 87:13 89:21 98:6
102:17
generality (1) 50:18
generally (10) 10:13 15:22
16:14 19:20 30:24
40:22,23 51:19 62:24 78:3
generate (1) 12:18
generating (2) 21:11 79:24
generously (1) 32:21
gentle (1) 20:2
gently (2) 19:22 75:1
get (1) 79:6
gets (1) 109:19
getting (2) 32:22 85:17
ghiggini (1) 81:13
gisting (1) 101:11
give (11) 15:1,8 20:6,7 32:8
52:11 57:7 59:25 109:3,6
114:13
given (23) 1:9 14:6,13,16
18:20 25:5 29:11,12,18
35:25 37:11 40:21 45:18
50:24 51:8 54:9 57:1,3
65:25 68:10 74:16 91:25
108:1
gives (3) 17:16 45:16 96:13

giving (6) 16:12 19:22 20:9
21:4 87:11 116:1
glad (1) 80:3
glitch (2) 28:19,22
glitches (1) 28:20
gloss (1) 27:18
glossed (1) 18:6
glosses (1) 18:11
goes (3) 110:11 111:18
117:19
going (29) 14:5 32:15,18
33:6 34:23 47:5,6,8 57:14
71:22 72:6,10 73:6,9
76:6,17 78:8,24 80:12
81:19,20,25 83:9 86:9
88:24 96:12 108:13 115:11
116:21
gone (3) 27:9 79:4 97:2
good (6) 1:4 3:9 36:1 42:12
45:14 109:8
governing (6) 4:21 5:1
15:10,11 19:6 30:23
graded (1) 12:8
grading (2) 12:3,6
grateful (3) 1:10 79:3 89:25
gratitude (1) 97:5
great (5) 2:25 3:17 10:17
38:18 90:17
greater (2) 16:17 54:9
greatest (2) 8:25 16:20
greatly (1) 97:11
griffin (9) 60:3,5,6 70:8 71:2
79:10 103:8,15 120:8
griffins (3) 29:1 72:22 90:12
grocery (2) 39:21,25
gross (1) 40:8
ground (2) 8:12 103:21
grounds (2) 7:21 83:11
guests (1) 93:16
guidance (6) 18:2,25
23:11,24 31:18 54:2

H

hadnt (1) 112:17
half (2) 72:24 115:3
hall (17) 13:3 58:13 59:15
60:16 62:13,24 63:1,14
64:13 68:3,6,25 76:1
92:12,18,20 94:15
hand (1) 70:4
handed (1) 70:7
handle (1) 94:20
happened (2) 5:22 66:2
happening (3) 73:18 81:5,8
happens (1) 39:1
happily (1) 48:16
happy (1) 104:13
hard (2) 42:8 107:5
harm (8) 12:4,6,9 39:11,15
45:21 75:15 91:14
hasnt (2) 46:22 111:16
havent (3) 99:9,20 114:11
having (9) 40:7 48:13 81:12
102:25 111:19 113:1
118:7,14,17
header (2) 4:18 97:22
heading (1) 26:19
headline (1) 40:18
headquarters (1) 114:20
heads (1) 110:3
healthy (1) 58:21
hear (10) 1:13,14,15 2:2 3:1
32:25 33:4 60:4 72:18 85:8
heard (22) 3:15 31:12,14
38:8 43:18 44:19 52:7 55:2
66:13 72:15 73:16 77:5
80:19 81:11 82:24 88:20
90:7,22 93:21 94:6
73:6,9,14 76:6 77:4 78:8
79:3 80:3,5 82:5
83:6,9,9,14 87:14 89:12
111:5 115:8,10,11,12
116:7,20
heightened (1) 93:17
held (4) 6:16,17 63:22 92:17
help (3) 20:22 73:17 118:19

helped (3) 13:5 97:7,9
helpful (4) 32:13 73:1 93:5
108:8
helpfully (1) 72:5
helps (1) 73:5
here (8) 40:10 43:8 56:17
65:18 67:20 82:1 84:25
112:10
herself (1) 116:12
hessell (6) 112:16,20 113:10
114:13 115:3 116:6
hidden (1) 74:8
high (14) 2:18 12:4,9 16:16
45:21 50:18 82:9,4 91:24
101:7,12,17 107:12,17
higher (1) 23:19
highest (1) 15:20
highlighting (1) 30:15
highly (1) 62:13
hindsight (8) 10:1 22:25
59:14 67:1 73:21 74:11
107:3,7
history (4) 27:24 91:21,22
92:1
home (3) 10:22 49:3 51:20
honest (1) 95:25
hooper (1) 36:9
hope (3) 28:4 83:21 117:8
hopeful (1) 115:12
hopefully (2) 21:6 116:14
hough (73) 1:4,8,22
2:1,21,23 4:4,10
24:17,21,24 25:4,11
28:17,19,23 31:15
32:3,7,14,20 33:13 35:10
36:2 42:18 43:9 46:4,12
47:3 50:25 51:8,23 54:13
56:9 62:8 64:25 66:9,22
68:17 70:10 71:3 72:4,18
79:1 86:13 87:15 94:6
96:10,18 97:18,19,20
102:7,12 107:9,19,21
108:4,24 109:8,15,20
110:7 116:9 117:1,5
118:3,7,12,22 120:4,11
houghs (3) 42:17 46:16
55:20
hour (3) 47:6 72:24 96:13
house (1) 6:17
housekeeping (1) 109:18
however (14) 3:4 5:20 7:22
9:3 16:5 18:4 35:8 37:1
77:1 98:18 99:20 104:15
106:7 113:12
hugely (1) 4:7
human (2) 4:23 75:6
hurst (1) 7:11

I

iconic (1) 92:9
identical (1) 92:23
identified (3) 13:11 49:25
92:21
identify (1) 32:7
identities (1) 91:20
idle (1) 13:11
ie (4) 39:10 40:25 41:8,23
ied (1) 3:24
ieva (1) 80:2
ignore (1) 22:25
ignoring (1) 59:13
ill (10) 6:9 17:5 87:18 89:15
95:25 97:14 99:21
116:13,14 118:13
im (41) 1:8,10,16 28:19
32:16 33:6 34:23 42:16
43:4 45:1 47:3 70:13
71:10,15,22 72:6,10,23
73:6,9,14 76:6 77:4 78:8
79:3 80:3,5 82:5
83:6,9,9,14 87:14 89:12
111:5 115:8,10,11,12
116:7,20
imagination (1) 74:1
immediate (8) 9:13,18 13:19
39:11,15 51:3 52:9 75:15

impact (3) 55:13 64:10 78:22
impeded (1) 13:14
impermissible (1) 41:22
implement (1) 95:5
implicit (2) 36:10 87:23
implied (2) 33:23 34:8
implying (1) 82:19
importance (7) 33:25 36:22
37:2,4 83:18 100:14
106:23
important (22) 3:1,4 4:2,7
5:23 8:18 18:20,22 24:21
31:6,10,21,25 32:5 37:24
43:19 45:10 61:23 98:11
99:21 101:13 112:13
importantly (2) 8:4 114:12
imposes (3) 8:21,22 9:9
imposing (1) 8:19
impression (1) 87:12
inadequate (3) 55:4 101:3,6
inappropriate (2) 55:21 88:9
incident (1) 12:5
include (4) 64:21 65:2 70:12
105:23
included (11) 53:12
55:6,9,16,20,22 56:2 64:6
90:19 103:3,19
including (10) 2:7 3:20 7:13
10:3 15:16 16:23 65:3
70:23 77:1 81:7
inconsistencies (1) 105:1
inconsistent (1) 16:13
incorporated (2) 19:17
107:14
increased (1) 13:22
independent (1) 6:15
index (1) 120:2
indexed (5) 71:21 72:2
108:16 109:2,4
indicated (7) 12:11 31:25
51:23 71:5 104:13
109:6,16
indications (3) 12:5,12 45:6
indications (1) 118:11
indicative (1) 25:7
indirectly (1) 113:19
individual (5) 39:3 42:16
51:25 57:8 74:17
individually (1) 48:20
individuals (4) 9:3 30:2 93:9
104:22
inertia (1) 74:1
inevitable (1) 28:20
inform (1) 103:20
information (41) 22:5
23:10,24 24:13 25:5 26:22
29:3 46:14,17 52:18
55:11,24 59:11,23
60:14,25 62:1,12 63:24
64:11,16 65:7,11,13,18,21
67:9,21 69:1 70:1,22
73:24,25 74:6 78:11 84:22
94:5 104:14,16 113:8
116:13
informationgathering (1)
81:1
informed (8) 21:14 28:7
67:15 70:17 81:4 86:6,7
105:13
informing (3) 104:11,21
105:5
inherent (1) 10:1
injected (1) 59:20
injured (1) 3:19
inner (1) 87:16
input (3) 54:20,24 93:13
inquest (9) 6:7,19,21 43:11
59:8 60:8 80:15 82:25 85:4
inquests (19) 2:3,18 5:9
6:1,5 15:12 31:16 32:5
37:7 49:10 50:22
61:7,12,14 63:4,5 64:18
83:23 97:4
inquiry (3) 6:5,15 85:4
inserted (2) 44:6 60:17
insertion (1) 89:5

insight (3) 13:10 86:1 91:19
insist (1) 19:25
insofar (2) 52:16 90:3
instead (4) 33:7 35:12 37:1 39:25
instructing (1) 116:2
instructions (3) 115:10 116:14 117:2
insufficient (2) 53:15 84:14
intelligence (40) 12:10 21:8,11 22:4 24:13 25:24 43:20,21 45:5,9 46:18 48:21 56:2 58:9,11,15,16,19 59:16,22,24 74:6 78:13 79:16 80:16,17,19,22 99:8,14,16 100:9 110:15,16 112:11,17,21,23 113:3,5
intelligible (1) 111:3
intended (5) 12:11,13 26:21 35:14 105:23
intentions (1) 45:6
interest (2) 65:19 113:14
interested (21) 4:17 5:10 8:13 11:1 16:24 17:4,8 19:3 20:16,25 25:13 27:3 49:13 53:3 54:6 78:15 107:23 108:6,18 110:11 118:10
internet (1) 13:15
interpretation (3) 110:5,9,9
interrogate (1) 114:17
intervening (1) 63:18
into (41) 6:15 13:10,16 19:18 33:8 35:1,6 36:10,19 40:12 41:2,9,16,19 46:21 51:9 52:20 57:18 58:17 59:20 60:17 62:8 64:24 74:7 75:3 81:15 86:1,9 91:19 93:13 102:9 105:25 106:1 107:3,12,25 110:17 112:7 117:8 118:5
intrachambers (1) 32:21
introducing (1) 99:18
introduction (1) 110:7
investigate (1) 85:1
investigated (2) 36:12 85:3
investigating (3) 23:4 24:10 25:6
investigation (28) 12:15 23:14 24:1 25:14 26:8 36:10,15 38:5,6 45:15 46:7 51:7 52:5,11,17 53:11,14,17,19,23,24 57:4,17 84:18 85:7 99:9,12 100:9
invitation (1) 69:7
invite (3) 31:5 89:22 116:21
invited (4) 51:2,5,6 95:1
invitees (2) 91:19,20
invites (1) 84:2
inviting (3) 46:5,19 69:2
involve (1) 9:5
involved (6) 44:18 58:4 67:14 70:16 100:2 105:12
involvement (3) 51:13 75:9 105:14
involving (2) 66:18 94:23
ips (6) 1:14 4:15 32:1 50:13,22 71:11
irrelevant (1) 36:14
isnt (2) 7:23 34:12
isolated (1) 13:11
isolation (2) 21:21 79:25
issues (25) 15:15 20:15,18,22 24:12 25:7,11 26:12 27:1 33:21 51:5 57:18,19 60:14,24 76:11,11,23 98:12 103:19 106:17 113:13,17 115:8 116:7
iterations (1) 101:16
iterative (1) 108:5
its (77) 4:4,7 5:23 7:17,20 13:20 14:9 20:1 27:19 28:20,22 31:15,20 33:3

35:11 36:10 37:10,21 38:15 41:13 42:23,23 43:1,8 44:18 45:11 48:15 53:17,25 56:22 61:23 62:20 64:2 65:6 66:9,15 69:2 70:5 71:17,21 73:22 75:16 76:9,14 77:2,18 79:22 80:9,10,16 81:16 82:14,17 83:13 86:23 88:8,12 92:10 93:8,24 96:16 97:1,11 100:18 102:4,5 105:25 106:15 107:20,21 110:3,4,24 111:3,20 117:7,9
itself (8) 6:2 26:8 35:7 39:7 43:21 53:11 65:4 110:2
ive (15) 11:16 28:17,22 32:15 33:14 45:23 53:14 67:8 68:11 71:12 72:15 102:7 107:10,24 109:6

J
jack (11) 2:4 3:8,9 13:22 18:16 19:10,14 32:10 61:5 67:6 91:6
jacks (1) 34:5
job (4) 13:13 64:6 76:10 77:22
johal (1) 44:11
john (1) 3:16
jonathan (1) 76:1
jones (14) 2:4 10:20 18:16 19:11 21:16 22:6,13 25:21 28:3 54:7,15 55:5 61:5 67:6
jot (1) 86:12
judge (59) 1:4,24 2:21 4:4 24:17,23 25:3,10 28:16,22 31:15 32:6,13,22 33:3,11 43:6 47:2,5,13,18 48:24 53:19 60:2 70:5 71:2,17,24 72:8,12 73:8,24 77:10 80:3 83:3,6 89:9 90:2 96:8,19 97:14,18 102:3,11 107:8,17,20 108:3,23 109:13 110:6 112:3 115:6 116:17,25 117:4 118:6,12,23
judged (3) 9:15 39:14 84:23
judgment (2) 52:6 75:24
judgmental (2) 7:5 16:4
judicial (3) 85:10 87:17 88:15
June (2) 5:15 81:10
juries (1) 37:12
jurisdiction (4) 37:23 77:15,18,19
jurors (1) 84:5
jury (119) 1:3 2:3,9,14,18 4:6 7:4 15:15 16:22,24 17:14,24 18:10,15,21 19:12,22 20:18 21:4 22:10,25 24:7,15,16,24 28:2 29:4 30:3 34:18,21 35:14 37:8 38:10,24 39:7,20,22 40:2,16,17,23,25 41:23 42:3 44:19 45:12 46:5,13,19,22 48:6 49:16,19 51:1,4 52:3,5,7 53:15,18 55:17 56:6,24 57:17,21 66:13,23 68:1 77:25 78:15 79:14 80:8 81:11 82:21,21 83:1 84:2,15 85:6,8 86:24 88:18 90:25 91:2,4 92:6,24 96:4,6 98:12 100:12 101:1,19 103:5 104:5 105:2 106:3,7,15 107:2 109:15,16 110:2,25 111:3,4,16,19 112:14,15 113:12,15,17,25 116:11 117:3,16,25 118:14
jurys (3) 4:13 5:1,3
justified (4) 20:3 23:20 28:12 110:21

justify (1) 94:3

K
keep (3) 5:21 57:11,14
keeping (3) 66:5 74:14,25
key (5) 14:21 15:15 78:9,12 84:10
khan (83) 3:3,18,22 11:13,22 12:2,8,14,17 13:5,10,16,25 14:5,17 18:17 20:12 21:10,25 22:12,22 23:5,12,14,20 24:1,10 25:1,6,14 26:10 43:18,22,25 45:21 48:22 50:5,14 51:14 52:15,22 54:3,12 58:18,22 59:23 62:18,23 63:7,25 65:17 66:3,6 68:12 69:3,7 75:16 79:16,23 80:17,19 83:20 86:11 91:24 92:7 93:18,20 94:9 99:16 101:7,8,11,17 103:4 104:15 105:13 106:5,11 107:13 111:10,13 118:7
khans (20) 12:11 14:6 21:7,9,19 27:23 63:11,19 64:5 65:22 70:23 79:8 84:16,18 85:22 86:2 91:21 100:7 104:16 105:4
killed (1) 18:16
killing (2) 19:5 50:23
kind (4) 65:18,20 68:19 116:9
kindly (1) 42:19
kinds (1) 8:21
knew (9) 9:12 11:22 25:2 39:12 52:8 89:3 92:7 107:12 112:16
knife (2) 66:19 95:9
know (36) 2:2 5:7 6:11 16:22 32:17 33:8 37:6 46:24 50:17 71:7 75:17,18 84:6 86:15 87:4,15 93:14,17 94:9,9,12,18,22 95:2 97:6 104:13,13 106:3 107:22 108:5,21 109:9,14 112:4 114:15 117:9
knowable (1) 73:25
knowledge (6) 65:1 75:17 91:21,22 93:10 95:23
known (19) 3:20 9:13 11:23 39:13 48:14 52:8 65:7 75:19 86:18,18 91:23 92:7 94:14,14 95:13 99:13,19 104:16 106:11
koczcocik (1) 3:17

L
lack (9) 13:15 48:11,12 55:16 74:1 79:25 100:8 102:13,25
lacked (1) 44:13
lacking (1) 44:21
lady (1) 7:1
laid (1) 41:23
lancaster (1) 68:18
language (5) 16:4 21:6 22:18,24 106:21
large (4) 9:22 83:12 111:22,22
largest (1) 102:18
last (6) 12:1 17:23 60:13 71:19 83:6 88:23
lastly (1) 114:10
late (1) 111:11
later (4) 87:24 94:16 116:15,15
latter (1) 15:18
layer (1) 18:11
le (2) 71:4,7
lead (5) 29:25 40:1,6 50:6 105:2
leading (4) 6:1 63:19 69:6 75:24
learn (2) 86:17 92:1

learned (10) 47:24 51:11 53:5 56:9,20 72:4 79:1 80:5 115:9 116:7
learning (62) 13:25 22:22 26:17,23 27:22,25 28:7,9 29:3,15,19 30:1,9,14 38:20 52:10 60:15,25 62:2,23 63:13,20,24 64:16 65:7,12 67:10,15,22 68:9,12 69:2,18,20 70:17 81:5,8 82:17 89:3 90:16 91:17,24 92:7,12 93:6,18,22,24 101:23 103:10,20,23 104:10,12,20 105:3,14,22 106:6,12 107:12 118:8
least (10) 11:21 13:20,21 31:9 75:14 104:9 106:10 109:6,16 112:7
leave (5) 39:21 87:13 88:24 96:4 110:3
leaves (3) 71:12 87:3 116:22
led (7) 29:15 30:13 42:11 66:10 78:17,18 104:1
leek (19) 26:13 32:16,17,18,25 35:16 48:25 49:1,2 74:18 79:13 84:13 100:16,20 102:17 111:19 116:18,20 120:7
leeks (1) 111:9
left (14) 2:3,15 4:19 13:17 29:4 38:10 39:20 40:5 44:1 87:5 91:4 96:6 97:23 111:15
legal (12) 4:21,25 6:6,8 16:24 17:7,16 30:23 37:5,20 87:1 98:6
legalistic (1) 82:20
legitimately (1) 24:24
length (3) 16:17,20 84:11
lengthy (2) 4:12 108:8
less (4) 13:10,13 15:1 17:13
let (6) 8:14 10:15 11:19 15:9 103:18 111:7
lethal (1) 63:19
letting (1) 82:16
level (10) 9:1 23:20 29:14 37:6 38:8 43:21,23 50:18 55:12,13
levels (1) 86:18
lewis (2) 41:3 42:14
liability (4) 11:10 16:7,8 98:23
liabilityfinding (1) 77:19
liberties (1) 83:15
licence (3) 45:13 52:23,24
life (5) 6:12 8:20 9:1,13 80:21
light (3) 4:17 75:3 101:18
like (18) 20:6 34:9 60:11 62:6 65:17 72:17,19,24 74:1,4 75:6 76:5 80:5 82:3,4 108:23 109:14 111:19
likely (3) 4:5 113:23 117:7
likes (1) 85:23
likewise (1) 101:14
limb (2) 41:3 42:14
limit (2) 74:10,15
limited (9) 15:23 65:10,13 79:20,22 87:8,12 88:11 105:13
line (5) 22:19 25:20 32:17 76:12,24
linguistic (2) 103:11 108:13
link (1) 71:8
lisa (1) 81:13
list (9) 20:14,18 25:11 27:1 44:2 45:16 81:16 94:11,13
listed (3) 37:3 41:17 43:15
listen (1) 37:9
listening (1) 118:1
lists (6) 37:24 40:14,24 41:9 80:2 82:3
little (7) 59:20 64:1 81:8 84:11 90:8 109:11 117:23
lives (4) 3:7,24 11:24 52:9

logic (1) 41:8
london (5) 14:2 87:17 92:9 95:7 106:14
lone (1) 27:18
long (10) 16:11 21:4 33:19 37:7 77:3 83:6 89:7 112:19 114:23 117:13
look (10) 41:24 65:18 66:12 81:19,20 84:17 86:5 105:17 107:19 108:23
looked (5) 33:1 85:9,10 99:17 114:18
looking (7) 24:17 32:16 47:3 83:20 89:6 96:10 118:17
looks (1) 47:9
looms (1) 111:22
lords (1) 6:17
lose (1) 117:11
loss (1) 21:20
lost (3) 3:24 4:2 10:8
lot (4) 1:8 82:9 85:21 97:1
low (6) 7:20 38:14,16,25 61:21 81:21
lowrisk (2) 29:16 65:6
lucraft (57) 1:4,24 2:21 4:4 24:17,23 25:3,10 28:16,22 31:15 32:6,13,22 33:3,11 43:6 47:2,5,13,18 48:24 60:2 70:5 71:2,17,24 72:8,12 73:8 77:10 80:3 83:3,6 89:9 90:2 96:8,19 97:14,18 102:3,11 107:8,17,20 108:3,23 109:13 110:6 112:3 115:6 116:17,25 117:4 118:6,12,23
ludlow (9) 62:21 64:5 65:21 68:3,17,19 91:22 92:13 103:25
lukasz (1) 3:17
lunch (1) 73:12

M
magic (1) 70:13
maguire (1) 38:12
main (1) 68:12
maintain (2) 77:8 81:3 55:12,13
major (1) 14:5
majority (2) 2:25 51:9
makes (6) 18:25 25:9 35:5 36:4 44:17 74:18
making (6) 1:20 17:1 21:9 76:19 79:2 96:23
man (1) 101:8
manage (2) 50:5 92:22
managed (2) 50:15 68:4
management (16) 11:12 20:12 22:2,12 25:1 45:14 46:14,17 51:13 52:15 54:3 65:24 83:20 102:14,24 103:4
manager (1) 55:2
managing (6) 21:25 23:11 24:14 68:13 105:13 106:5
manipulation (1) 58:22
manipulative (1) 12:24
manner (1) 7:6
manslaughter (3) 39:22,25 40:9
manual (1) 95:10
many (6) 12:19 76:21 99:12,19 116:22 117:16
map (1) 33:19
mappa (69) 11:15 12:7,23,25 13:24 14:22 22:9 24:5,19 25:2 42:2,4,9,25,25 44:18 50:5 52:14,16,20 53:1 54:4,22 55:6,25 57:22,23 58:4,5,8,9,11,12,15,17 59:2,3,7,9,16 62:22 63:2,6,11,15 67:20 68:14 70:25 75:9 78:7,8,10,16,21 83:25 84:3 99:3,5,12,13,19 100:3 102:24 103:4 110:17 112:11 115:20,21 116:13
mappas (1) 58:1

march (2) 63:13 81:9
margin (1) 15:19
mark (1) 48:20
marked (1) 102:6
mass (1) 92:8
matches (1) 17:18
material (20) 74:9,9 79:20 84:15,17,21 85:2,21 86:21,22,24 87:22 88:3,4,6,18,20 96:4 117:18,25
materially (2) 13:22 23:14
matter (13) 11:17 24:2 27:19 38:18 58:20 76:13 80:8 88:18,23 92:24 96:5 110:10 111:7
matters (38) 2:14 5:12,24 15:23 16:16 21:18 26:3 32:7,9 37:14 39:8,12 43:15 49:16,17 56:13 57:1 61:9 67:2,4,4 77:6 78:5 85:2,3,13,15,16,18 86:5,17 91:1,4 94:2 96:6 102:25 103:5 109:25
maughan (2) 7:2 15:21
maybe (2) 44:21 95:20
mean (3) 31:15 55:3 83:8
meaning (2) 6:22 117:11
meanings (1) 17:16
means (6) 6:22,23 7:7 8:24 58:8 82:15
meant (1) 42:10
measures (24) 9:14 13:20 14:11,12,20 26:21 27:6 28:13 29:11 30:4,15 63:8,15 66:11 67:18 68:7 69:6 92:22,23 101:24 104:2,3,4 105:8
media (1) 2:9
meet (2) 53:20 93:20
meeting (2) 13:2 14:22
meetings (8) 11:15 24:5 42:11 58:12 83:25 84:2,3 86:9
members (2) 3:18 44:12
memorably (2) 91:23 95:21
mentioned (1) 118:13
mentioning (1) 42:24
mentor (1) 13:15
mentoring (1) 13:12
mentors (1) 21:20
mere (1) 38:24
merritt (12) 2:4 10:20 18:16 19:10 21:16 22:6,17 25:22 54:15 61:5 67:6 91:6
merritts (1) 56:3
messrs (1) 44:11
met (4) 14:17 50:2 67:7 78:4
metadata (2) 114:17,25
metal (2) 27:13 95:6
metaphysical (1) 18:13
mi5 (34) 10:23 12:20 25:17 46:19 49:12 51:22 52:8,13,18 54:4 56:22,25 57:2,15,23 58:3,9,14,15,25 59:7,14 74:13 75:1,2,16,21 76:2 85:23 86:3,10 100:24 101:2,11
mi5s (7) 51:13 57:12,17,21 58:21 59:8,16
micro (1) 113:13
microanalyse (1) 74:22
micromanage (1) 50:19
middleton (8) 6:17 7:9 8:6 15:12,21 18:1 77:21 98:18
midlands (23) 9:24 10:24 19:17 22:20 23:7 24:3 25:17,25 26:7 30:10 46:20 48:19 53:4,8,10 54:1 57:25 58:10 85:23 100:25 101:3 110:23 111:1
might (32) 9:16 22:11 32:18 33:15 34:21 36:6,23 37:14 39:14 40:1,8 62:4 64:21 66:10,14,14 70:5 75:25 76:16 77:7 78:15,17,21

83:3 92:2 93:13 94:4,21 95:14 102:22 105:2 117:11
mind (7) 14:8 20:21 25:1 30:4 49:16 71:13 106:4
minded (2) 57:11 72:13
minds (2) 24:7 73:1
mindset (15) 46:21 53:22 56:25 57:2,6,10,12 84:16,18 85:22 86:2,5,19,21,22
mine (1) 73:1
minimal (2) 17:12,12
minimally (2) 16:1 61:19
minutes (14) 42:3,4,9 47:13 59:3,7 73:6 78:7,8,10,16,21 101:16 108:15
misconduct (1) 40:8
misdirecting (1) 76:25
misleading (1) 85:18
missed (1) 17:23
missing (1) 117:10
mode (1) 75:22
modifying (1) 99:25
moment (7) 45:10 48:18 69:17 70:14 89:1 102:10 112:6
monitoring (9) 23:4,13,25 24:10 25:6 26:8 81:2 84:18 99:16
months (2) 5:25 59:22
more (38) 5:12 7:4,20 8:2 9:17 10:13 11:4,24 13:10,11 14:11 16:1 17:12,18 20:2 22:18 25:15 35:19 38:12 61:18 64:1 65:5 79:22 82:19 86:9 90:21 92:15 94:2,4 98:5 98:6 101:21 103:14 111:4,9,18 114:12 117:3
moreover (1) 32:7
morning (19) 1:4 36:2 62:9 72:25 76:22 77:5 97:1 103:24 104:24 108:15,25 109:2 114:14 116:10,16 117:8 118:11,23
moor (2) 110:6,8
most (5) 3:23 5:23,24 18:20 36:24
move (5) 21:18 39:17 40:11 76:19 83:19
moved (4) 13:16 43:10,12 111:12
moving (1) 77:16
ms (22) 26:13 32:16,17,18,25 35:16 48:25 49:1,2 71:4,7 74:18 79:13 84:13 100:16,20 102:17 111:9,19 116:18,20 120:7
much (18) 1:5 32:14 47:2 48:24 57:23 60:6,9 67:2 71:2 75:12,18 81:24 89:9 9

near (2) 85:18 88:17
 nearly (1) 38:1
 necessary (12) 34:12 35:11
 37:21,22 38:5 50:8 74:20
 76:3,7,18 77:7 113:16
 need (14) 8:16 11:3 15:5
 48:8,19 80:12 82:20 83:22
 84:10 88:16 89:20 98:6
 109:5 115:12
 needing (1) 38:2
 needs (9) 44:1 45:24 57:15
 58:3,18 59:20 66:12 74:15
 75:11
 negative (1) 8:19
 negligence (2) 39:22,25
 negligent (1) 40:8
 negligibly (1) 61:19
 neither (3) 56:1 74:20
 112:25
 neutral (2) 21:6 22:18
 never (4) 55:13 59:9 66:16
 110:24
 next (6) 1:15 32:17,18 47:9
 60:4 105:10
 ninth (1) 22:19
 nobody (1) 19:24
 none (2) 35:8,24
 nor (7) 34:14,19 52:14 66:20
 74:20 93:14 113:20
 normally (1) 89:10
 notably (1) 10:11
 note (5) 31:4 54:13 64:23
 66:15 112:19
 noted (2) 68:4 79:21
 notes (4) 16:24 64:18 68:5
 117:17
 nothing (10) 30:3 52:11 57:4
 59:18 71:9,11 74:8 93:25
 99:13 117:3
 noting (1) 113:2
 notwithstanding (1) 59:13
 novel (1) 88:14
 november (10) 12:7 13:23
 14:22 31:12 64:3 80:21
 86:12,16 105:19 116:5
 nowhere (1) 35:1
 nuanced (1) 29:24
 nuances (1) 105:1
 number (16) 20:15,19,24
 25:12,23 27:2 31:12 50:4
 67:8 68:7 77:11,14 81:7
 83:24 93:21 97:7

O

oasis (4) 12:3 21:14 74:4,8
 object (2) 90:15 112:7
 objection (3) 2:19 94:24,25
 objective (1) 15:14
 obligation (13) 4:22,25
 5:8,11,17 7:10,12 8:5,7
 38:3,9 39:9 89:20
 obligations (4) 8:22 91:7
 98:20,22
 observation (1) 48:7
 observations (5) 49:17 53:2
 89:24 96:15 116:9
 obtain (1) 86:1
 obtained (1) 116:6
 obviously (4) 31:18 43:9
 102:3 117:15
 occasion (1) 32:19
 occasions (3) 81:7,9 114:7
 occupy (1) 75:4
 occur (1) 41:4
 occurred (2) 16:16 20:13
 october (1) 5:16
 offences (1) 64:22
 offender (4) 55:1 93:15
 102:13 105:4
 offenders (5) 3:11 69:3
 94:24 95:1,14
 offending (4) 27:24 79:10
 91:22 92:1
 offered (1) 64:9
 officer (1) 14:22

officers (6) 3:22 10:25 14:17
 48:4 54:12 112:22
 official (5) 110:13 113:8
 115:18,24 116:3
 often (5) 7:7 15:18 75:3 79:9
 97:6
 oftrepated (1) 79:21
 old (1) 78:13
 oldfashioned (2) 70:3,5
 omission (1) 24:15
 omissions (5) 8:9 9:3 20:12
 23:3 24:4
 omitted (1) 90:24
 once (5) 38:6 39:1,16 76:13
 89:18
 oomer (1) 48:10
 open (11) 43:5 85:3,19,21
 87:10 88:3,6,13,18 111:18
 116:22
 opened (2) 38:24 39:1
 opens (1) 7:2
 operate (1) 91:13
 operates (2) 9:1 57:22
 operation (2) 25:16 110:13
 operational (14) 9:9
 10:5,10,18 11:4,21 15:5
 50:15 51:21 55:8 73:15
 75:13 76:11 89:19
 operations (2) 35:22 57:21
 opportunity (6) 17:24 31:7
 91:25 109:11 111:24
 114:11
 opposed (1) 48:12
 opposition (1) 11:2
 options (2) 14:20 19:8
 oral (7) 46:16 71:5 92:13
 96:25 97:21 115:17 116:1
 order (10) 1:13 2:5,19,21
 21:3 33:20 45:24 71:13,22
 94:11
 orders (1) 2:17
 ordinary (1) 87:2
 organisation (3) 26:20 39:4
 65:13
 organised (1) 69:18
 organisers (2) 90:23 91:17
 organising (3) 27:22 67:15
 70:16
 original (1) 82:25
 orthodox (1) 87:2
 osman (2) 10:2 11:6
 others (18) 1:23 14:20 23:13
 36:18 45:9 65:23 69:7 77:5
 79:13 82:6 83:21 85:23
 90:4 94:14 101:21 108:21
 109:14 111:23
 otherwise (10) 5:13 7:16
 33:15 44:20 52:4 53:14
 75:25 80:16 81:10 83:11
 ought (16) 9:13 11:23 22:25
 29:4 38:7 39:12 40:21 41:8
 42:5 45:13,14 46:3 49:18
 52:8 53:24 96:23
 ourselves (1) 8:13
 outcome (1) 18:8
 outr (1) 111:9
 outset (1) 2:4
 outside (2) 24:5 84:3
 over (9) 31:17 59:21 63:20
 96:13 97:2,20 100:24
 107:1 117:13
 overall (2) 16:25 31:21
 overarching (2) 41:2 112:10
 overextensive (1) 35:25
 overly (1) 16:11
 overnight (1) 108:2
 overt (2) 45:14 57:22
 overtly (1) 21:10
 owed (1) 40:6
 own (5) 13:16 37:10 110:4
 113:2 117:17
 owned (1) 66:19
 ownership (1) 95:8

P

p3 (1) 12:15

pace (1) 110:8
 pages (8) 17:7 19:12 26:15
 29:7 45:4 92:13,18 118:15
 panel (2) 11:15 63:6
 paper (2) 21:4 70:4
 paragraph (34) 6:7,24 7:2,22
 8:15 10:12 14:23 15:2,10
 16:18 31:2 35:23 36:3
 40:20 43:4,9,13,14 45:2
 51:16 54:8 56:5 61:11,13
 63:3,16 64:2,18,23 65:10
 73:23 74:19 82:12 87:19
 paragraphs (13) 5:14
 34:13,16 35:4 46:9 49:9,21
 50:12 51:15 53:9 79:17
 85:25 87:18
 part (25) 1:12 8:10 13:14
 22:4 23:3 31:21 32:5 40:16
 41:16,19 45:25 52:13 54:3
 73:10 75:11 84:1,19 86:6
 95:19 102:18 106:4,16
 113:4 114:15 116:23
 parted (1) 109:15
 participating (1) 75:21
 participatory (2) 75:8,9
 particular (33) 6:18 9:12
 10:4,7,13 11:5 16:15 21:22
 28:16 33:9,17 37:15 42:21
 48:5 53:6 70:13 71:7 72:22
 73:2 74:3,18 78:11,22
 79:6,21 84:16 87:19 92:8
 94:25 98:13 107:4 108:20
 115:13
 particularly (9) 37:7 45:18
 48:8 62:3 75:7 84:9 85:12
 105:4 111:20
 partly (1) 83:25
 parts (1) 4:21
 passage (5) 19:13 87:23,24
 94:7,16
 passages (2) 19:16 51:2
 passed (5) 38:18 52:18 58:24
 105:6 112:11
 passing (1) 14:5
 pause (1) 2:19
 pausing (1) 4:4
 penultimate (2) 46:2 106:20
 people (10) 3:7 18:23
 65:2,23 68:9 73:11 76:21
 82:4 109:6 117:21
 peoples (1) 73:1
 perfectly (2) 70:6 105:2
 perform (1) 30:10
 performed (1) 92:11
 perhaps (5) 28:20 78:6 88:6
 108:1 111:24
 period (9) 43:24 59:21 64:12
 72:17,25 73:12 80:18 97:2
 106:7
 periods (1) 79:9
 peripherally (1) 113:19
 permissible (3) 16:5 40:17
 41:22
 permissibly (1) 41:1
 permission (3) 13:25 65:25
 68:10
 permit (2) 14:1 106:14
 permitted (6) 14:8 52:23
 63:7,11,12 101:22
 permitting (1) 22:22
 person (12) 6:21,23,24 9:21
 10:8 16:8 54:6 55:3 81:23
 107:23 108:18 115:1
 personally (1) 108:24
 persons (21) 4:18 5:10 8:13
 11:1 16:25 17:4,8 19:3
 20:16 21:1 25:13 27:3
 49:13 53:3 62:4,4 70:18,18
 108:6 110:11 118:10
 perspective (2) 32:21 60:1
 persuasive (1) 100:20
 perusing (1) 29:6
 perverse (1) 90:22
 phrase (3) 83:6 84:4 107:4
 phrasing (1) 83:23
 pick (1) 107:23

picked (1) 78:16
 picking (1) 40:25
 piece (1) 70:4
 pii (7) 84:20,22 87:4,5,22
 88:4 100:22
 pips (2) 33:18 38:16
 pitchers (34) 1:17 17:21,25
 18:5 19:21 26:24 33:22
 34:6 35:3,12,16,24 36:18
 38:14 47:24 71:13,25
 72:13,16 73:7 88:24
 89:10,14,15 90:3 96:9,21
 97:12 100:19 103:13
 104:11 105:9 107:15
 120:10
 place (11) 12:6 14:10,14
 38:6 54:10 63:15 68:7 69:7
 90:23 94:1,1
 placed (1) 74:3
 plainly (2) 59:2 110:22
 plan (1) 110:15
 planning (1) 59:23
 play (1) 75:11
 please (6) 36:21 42:20,22
 43:5 44:22,23
 pleased (1) 83:14
 pleasure (1) 82:10
 plus (5) 37:19 41:10,18
 53:20 78:1
 pm (7) 47:17 97:15,17
 111:11,11,14 118:25
 pointing (1) 31:24
 points (64) 4:1,8 12:1 15:13
 20:19,25 21:2,15,21 22:5
 24:18 25:21,25 26:6
 27:4,7,8 28:3 31:8 33:8
 34:3,20,24
 35:7,8,12,13,16,18 37:3
 42:22 44:23,24 45:19
 46:18 51:9,25 53:12 54:16
 55:21 59:21
 60:13,21,22,23 61:2
 62:8,13 69:10,11,13 72:21
 73:19 76:19,20 78:24,25
 79:5 83:17 99:2 101:24,25
 104:23 105:9
 police (43) 3:21 9:24
 10:23,24 14:17 19:17
 22:20 23:7,8 24:3 25:25
 26:7 35:10 46:20
 48:13,15,19 53:4,8,10 54:1
 57:14 58:10,15,16,19,20
 59:1,4 62:15,18 65:23
 85:23 93:19 95:7,17
 102:15 110:23,23 111:1,1
 113:15,20
 policing (4) 52:19 57:23
 58:14 114:19
 policy (4) 16:16 112:20
 113:2 114:4
 polite (1) 79:9
 pool (1) 74:7
 poorer (1) 75:24
 pose (1) 12:20
 posed (5) 26:10 43:22,25
 48:22 101:8
 poses (1) 9:21
 posing (1) 3:3
 position (16) 35:2 37:23
 49:4,8,11,12,20 50:7 52:6
 58:1 74:16 75:3,14 83:23
 99:14 111:2
 positions (1) 74:21
 positive (11) 5:18 8:21 38:3
 39:9 64:10 79:16,20
 80:8,10,16,19
 posits (1) 106:8
 possibility (4) 63:10 66:3
 84:7 88:2
 possible (9) 18:5,8 19:2 63:5
 88:8 105:5 114:17,20,21
 possibly (7) 20:13 23:5 26:17
 32:9 42:7 55:19 66:17
 post (1) 31:20
 postponing (1) 2:6
 potential (1) 31:8

potentially (2) 6:14 70:3
 powers (1) 9:15
 practicable (1) 8:25
 practical (3) 37:5,6,16
 precautionary (1) 14:11
 precautions (3) 8:24 94:18
 95:15
 precise (1) 7:23
 precisely (4) 13:6 17:18
 25:15 111:17
 prefer (1) 1:19
 preference (2) 108:16,24
 prefigured (1) 25:7
 prejudice (1) 2:12
 preliminary (1) 89:24
 premeet (1) 55:16
 premeetings (1) 103:1
 premeets (1) 55:25
 premise (1) 85:13
 premises (4) 13:16 21:19
 111:12,14
 preparation (2) 23:17,21
 prepared (5) 4:17 17:2 68:18
 109:22,22
 presence (2) 13:18 80:15
 present (5) 8:4 9:19 11:25
 30:12 106:15
 presented (8) 11:23 12:4
 30:7 45:21 54:22 58:22
 92:8 94:10
 presenting (3) 12:9
 10:12,17
 presently (1) 113:24
 presided (1) 31:17
 president (1) 36:7
 prestigious (1) 14:2
 pretty (1) 111:13
 prevent (7) 3:3 13:1,4,12
 44:12 48:4 54:12
 prevention (5) 5:5 30:22
 31:4,18,23
 previous (5) 46:5 63:13 65:2
 94:22 95:2
 previously (3) 5:16 66:16,21
 primarily (2) 17:2 23:15
 primary (1) 20:22
 prince (2) 66:18 95:3
 principal (5) 4:15 15:8 18:24
 102:12 106:17
 principle (1) 76:20
 principles (6) 4:21 5:1 6:8
 15:11 16:17 30:23
 priority (3) 23:18 59:8 86:2
 prior (5) 25:16 52:4 53:17
 57:4 110:13
 prism (1) 107:7
 prison (5) 7:14 21:8 79:9
 104:17 105:6
 privately (1) 113:1
 proactively (1) 65:5
 probabilities (4) 41:12,19
 42:9 61:18
 probability (1) 12:5
 probably (14) 14:21 15:23
 20:13 23:5 26:17 29:9,10
 33:4 42:11 58:24 81:13
 83:17 98:6 114:12
 probabtion (12) 5:5 59:4
 62:14,15,22 63:25 65:23
 67:20,22 68:14 70:24
 83:20
 problematic (1) 33:10
 procedural (10) 4:22,25
 5:8,11,17 6:12 7:10,12 8:5
 89:19
 procedures (3) 8:24 9:6
 50:19
 proceeding (1) 58:5
 proceedings (3) 2:13 38:21
 89:16
 process (23) 4:8 9:2 22:9
 30:21 31:21 32:4 55:25
 58:4,17 59:10 67:24,25
 75:8,10 77:22 93:6
 99:13,20 100:3 102:25
 103:4,6 110:17

produce (5) 31:9 108:8,13
 118:4,9
 produced (6) 25:8 27:17
 93:2 97:21 101:15 111:8
 professional (3) 22:23 82:18
 106:22
 profile (18) 2:18 14:6 30:2,7
 101:16 109:24 110:1,14,20
 113:6,7 114:3,5,7
 115:18,22,24 116:4
 profiles (1) 114:1
 profound (1) 3:9
 programme (2) 81:23,25
 programmes (1) 79:11
 progress (1) 13:14
 prohibition (2) 16:6 18:18
 prominence (2) 45:16 54:9
 prompt (4) 35:14 77:25
 78:12 80:25
 prompted (1) 68:24
 prone (1) 17:14
 proof (1) 10:6
 prop (1) 77:24
 proper (17) 13:24 14:9
 24:11,16 25:5 44:11,21
 45:16,23 46:16,20
 73:11,17 93:1,12 103:6
 104:5
 properly (27) 19:4 23:10
 24:12 28:8 30:12 37:18
 44:9 46:4,23 52:3 56:24
 63:6 66:9 67:15 70:17
 78:1,14,17 81:4 85:1 91:4
 101:20 103:20,21,25
 104:11,21
 proportion (1) 11:12
 proportionality (1) 86:24
 proportionate (2) 28:4 43:23
 proposal (3) 99:10,22 108:22
 proposals (2) 5:4 103:14
 propose (16) 4:20 23:13
 30:25 33:20 34:17
 49:5,7,17 50:19 56:13,17
 98:3,5 105:15 108:14
 111:4
 proposed (14) 16:22 17:9
 20:4 30:21 31:2 49:15
 80:25 97:22 99:7 100:3
 101:5,23 104:19 105:11
 proposes (1) 99:3
 proposing (3) 73:14 98:12
 106:2
 proposition (5) 10:21 36:1
 51:1 78:3 90:18
 prospect (1) 18:7
 protect (1) 9:1
 protection (2) 9:21 99:4
 protocols (1) 95:18
 prove (1) 26:11
 proves (1) 28:23
 provide (4) 17:14 20:2 62:7
 70:2
 provided (25) 1:6,11 15:6
 29:3 48:13,15 54:13 55:24
 60:15,25 62:1,2,15 64:16
 65:11,13 67:9,10 70:10
 71:6 93:23 97:10
 115:20,21 117:3
 provides (1) 15:13
 providing (4) 19:23,25 54:2
 116:12
 provisions (1) 6:20
 psychological (2) 54:20,24
 public (15) 1:20 3:13,8
 9:21,22,22 11:24 12:6,9
 31:7 74:22 75:5 76:4 85:4
 99:4
 purchases (1) 86:15
 purpose (1) 80:1
 purposes (4) 64:2 75:5 76:14
 86:8
 pursue (1) 41:13
 putting (4) 67:6 75:1 79:7
 87:1

Q

qc (25) 2:1 26:13,13 32:24
 47:19 49:1 60:5 76:1 89:14
 97:19 98:8 102:17
 103:8,13 112:1 115:7
 120:4,5,6,7,8,10,11,12,13
 quality (6) 25:1 26:7 46:6
 53:17 19 96:24
 qualityassure (1) 59:9
 quarter (1) 47:7
 quarters (1) 3:22
 queens (1) 36:8
 question (107) 4:22 5:7 7:25
 8:11 16:7,8,15 18:15
 20:10,11,17,23 21:5
 23:1,2,2,23
 24:4,8,9,17,19,22,24,25
 25:4,21 26:4,15,19,21
 27:25 28:7,25 30:18
 33:10,14,17 41:2,11,20
 42:18,20 44:3,22 46:13,23
 47:22 48:10 54:18 55:10
 56:19 61:17,18 62:11
 69:12 71:22 72:1,4,6 79:1
 80:23,24 81:16 82:7
 83:18,19 84:11
 88:7,19,22,24 89:1 90:9,10
 94:3 98:10
 99:3,7,11,20,22,24
 100:5,15 102:19,19,23
 103:12 105:10,24,24,25
 106:1,20
 107:4,9,11,18,19,20,21
 109:13 111:9 113:21
 118:5,5
 questioned (1) 29:8
 questioning (5) 27:20 28:11
 74:3 85:15,16
 questionnaire (35) 1:10 2:8
 4:13,17 16:21,22 17:3,6
 34:1 35:1,7 37:13 39:18
 40:2,5 41:14 45:25 47:21
 60:13,18 67:14 68:5 76:20
 89:25 90:11,17,24 96:16
 97:22 98:5 103:10 108:5
 113:21 118:3,16
 questions (55) 1:9 7:8 15:18
 16:12,23 17:2,2 19:9,19,20
 20:9,17,21 23:9 25:9 27:24
 29:13 34:2,3,17,21
 36:20,23,25 37:4,15 40:18
 41:3,5,15,17 42:7,16 49:15
 51:5,7,8 53:13 56:11 68:17
 71:23 72:21 73:3 81:6
 113:21 106:9 95:21
 113:19,23 114:8 116:22
 117:19,20 118:18,20
 quibble (1) 98:14
 quickly (1) 78:9
 quite (9) 1:8 37:22 73:1 77:3
 89:7 95:25 102:9 114:10
 115:2
 quizzically (1) 99:17

R

radical (1) 103:14
 raise (3) 11:1 28:6 109:10
 raised (10) 24:12 28:11
 44:11 57:5 62:9 88:19
 101:21 112:25 115:9 116:8
 raises (2) 103:3 106:9
 raising (2) 54:2 104:19
 range (1) 98:17
 rarely (1) 13:17
 rather (17) 6:23 10:13
 16:16,17 17:12 19:23 36:6
 38:5 43:11 72:24 81:14
 82:25 98:5 102:14 106:17
 108:25 118:16
 reach (3) 5:18 52:3 56:24
 reached (1) 37:23
 reaching (1) 87:20
 reaction (1) 14:18
 read (14) 6:22 31:23 33:7
 110:2,6,7 111:2,4,19,20
 112:5 115:5,12 116:21
 readers (1) 42:10

readily (1) 110:4	105:1,9 107:6	11:14 19:15	riskassessed (1) 66:7	seems (5) 1:18 31:22,24	showed (1) 3:17	sought (3) 21:1 22:12 65:12
reading (3) 1:17 45:1 115:10	regarding (9) 27:16 53:2,22	request (2) 28:12 86:4	risks (13) 18:11 28:8 29:22	44:10 113:10	showing (2) 43:18 114:25	speaker (1) 97:6
reads (2) 44:7 70:15	54:3,12,18 57:2 58:13	requesting (3) 30:14 67:18	30:13 67:16,17 81:19	seen (7) 29:6 34:5 41:6	shown (2) 92:14 98:1	speakers (1) 97:9
real (16) 9:13,17 13:18	95:22	104:4	92:8,21 101:9 103:21	71:12 80:2 110:13,19	shows (1) 97:24	speaking (1) 10:13
18:7,19 23:8 29:22	regards (3) 24:16 104:10	require (4) 7:4 11:7 38:9	104:14,21	104:14,21	showstopper (1) 65:4	speaks (1) 38:25
39:10,15 52:8 73:2 75:15	118:3	110:8	role (12) 24:19 27:22 49:12	selection (2) 9:4 40:14	side (1) 40:11	special (6) 12:22 25:18
84:8 101:18 106:6,9	register (1) 27:17	required (3) 20:1 23:19 37:8	52:19 54:2,4 58:4,8,8	selfserving (1) 27:10	sidebyside (1) 118:18	37:16 57:25 86:8 101:14
42:13,23 77:4 81:24 82:1	regrettably (1) 94:17	requirement (6) 6:20 35:21	59:8,12,16	sen (1) 113:6	signed (1) 111:14	specialist (1) 75:17
90:15 117:19	regular (1) 59:10	36:4 54:23,24,25	roles (2) 44:13 74:22	senior (1) 14:4	significance (4) 6:6,19 33:25	speciality (1) 71:17
really (10) 1:5 24:8 36:17	regularly (2) 56:7,11	requirements (2) 6:16 62:17	round (1) 96:17	sense (2) 6:18 25:9	98:9	specific (5) 28:10 50:1 70:14
42:13,23 77:4 81:24 82:1	rehabilitation (1) 3:10	requires (4) 2:11 6:13 9:7	route (3) 14:17 33:19 40:17	sensible (2) 21:2 60:3	significant (9) 11:11 12:21	99:2 102:15
90:15 117:19	reiterate (1) 104:23	110:5	routes (1) 41:22	sensitive (6) 55:14 110:13	17:12,15 36:24 63:18	specifically (9) 40:24 51:10
reason (23) 1:16 2:10 5:17	reject (1) 104:7	requiring (1) 8:19	ruled (1) 85:1	113:8 115:18,24 116:3	101:9 111:21 116:23	56:21 57:13 62:24
12:14 17:18 18:2 29:5	rejected (3) 14:19 41:13	research (1) 3:11	ruling (11) 85:9,12 87:23,24	sent (2) 64:3 66:5	signs (2) 23:16,21	64:14,15 67:23 68:12
34:16 37:16,20 39:24 45:3	86:11	reservations (1) 116:10	108:7,9,13,17,19,19 109:5	sentence (1) 88:1	silent (1) 79:23	specified (1) 49:25
50:2 55:22 71:21 75:20	rejecting (2) 54:14 86:4	resisting (1) 83:9	rulings (2) 5:15 89:23	separate (7) 12:12 24:22	similar (3) 4:5 12:23 48:6	speculation (2) 66:1 84:4
85:20 99:10,17 101:25	relate (1) 60:12	resolve (2) 5:7 15:5	run (2) 25:17 44:20	25:4 45:11 100:6,13	simple (4) 34:16 82:14,15,23	speech (1) 36:3
103:7 106:2,25	related (3) 98:19,20 107:18	resolved (1) 110:24	running (1) 1:12	118:15	simpler (1) 17:13	speed (1) 3:21
reasonable (11) 7:21 14:1	relates (1) 46:1	respect (15) 26:24 27:10	ruth (1) 91:25	separated (1) 45:14	since (9) 6:4 11:9 26:21 30:5	spelled (1) 40:2
22:23 27:8,15 67:19 70:2	relating (4) 53:13 56:14,16	28:13,25 31:23 35:17		September (1) 111:12	31:12 55:2 97:24 98:1	split (2) 41:15 45:1
82:12,18 83:11 106:22	61:25	40:13 50:1 68:24 72:7	S	series (6) 13:8 19:23 20:21	114:13	splitting (2) 41:9 102:5
82:12,18 83:11 106:22	relation (94) 7:11,18 8:3,8	74:25 75:21 94:6 99:1		43:17 113:23 114:8	sincere (1) 97:5	spoke (1) 76:1
reasonably (7) 8:25 9:16	10:23,25 13:18	103:13	safe (2) 3:21 66:8	serious (12) 12:4,5,9,20 14:7	single (1) 39:23	spoken (1) 70:11
13:21 39:14 62:21,25	19:10,11,20 22:21 24:2	respected (1) 16:9	safety (3) 98:13 101:2 105:2	16:5 40:9 45:21 64:22	singling (1) 74:17	spotted (2) 23:22 28:22
73:25	27:11,25 28:25 30:18,19	respectful (1) 85:20	safety (4) 91:8 101:23	65:2,3 104:2	sio (3) 112:24,25 113:4	sreedharan (2) 8:11 74:16
reasoning (3) 41:23 87:21	31:16 34:4,18,24	respectfully (9) 9:23 24:3	104:2,3	5:1 49:4	sir (171) 2:2,17,23 4:1,20	staff (13) 9:5 27:23 30:11
100:21	35:2,15,16 36:5 40:23,24	25:8 37:1 74:24 83:22	same (7) 13:2 26:4 31:24	service (1) 50:6	15:11 16:17,23 17:6 21:6	64:20 69:19,20 79:10 91:8
reasons (21) 10:17 11:6 15:1	42:20 43:2 44:3,15,24,24	101:25 102:16 103:9	48:3 63:12 70:10 102:10	services (1) 3:19	13:17 14:23 16:21 20:16	93:13 95:9 103:20
17:13 18:20 19:22 20:16	47:25 48:2,7,9 49:21	respect (1) 74:21	20:16 19:11,14 32:10 54:7	set (26) 6:24 10:16 14:23	23:6 24:11 26:10 27:3	104:10,20
34:23 37:5 38:13	50:20,23 51:10,24 52:4	respectively (1) 19:14	55:5 61:5 67:6 90:14	15:11 16:17,23 17:6 21:6	30:9,18 32:11,18,25 33:5	staffordshire (13) 10:23
43:10,11,14 46:8 48:14	54:11 56:19,21,25 57:14	respond (4) 1:19 31:8 34:9	90:12	29:24 30:23 31:2,2 40:19	34:4 36:8,16 37:6 42:15,22	12:22 23:8 25:18 48:13
50:24 67:3 78:20 100:20	60:16,19 62:3,9,11 63:21	90:12	saskias (1) 34:6	43:8,13,14 46:9,21 49:3,12	43:4 44:3,22 45:3	57:25 58:10 101:14 102:15
114:22 115:4	64:15 66:17 67:23	responded (1) 3:21	sat (2) 79:9 96:11	51:8 56:14 61:6,13 114:22	47:1,3,11,20 48:9,23	110:23 111:1 113:15,20
reassurance (1) 115:19	68:11,21 69:11,23,24 72:5	response (9) 1:7 13:24 14:9	satisfied (1) 112:9	118:20	49:2,5 50:2,7,12,17,19	staffs (1) 48:15
recall (9) 12:16 28:9 37:22	73:19 76:2 78:5,22,25 79:7	17:8 33:21 35:12 68:19	satisfies (1) 6:16	sets (2) 103:5 109:24	51:1,4,8,13,19,23	stage (8) 32:11 38:21 47:6
54:21 68:16 78:12 103:23	80:23 82:7 83:1 85:6,11,16	77:13 86:22	satisfy (1) 41:18	setting (1) 20:19	52:5,20,22	54:23,25 98:7 110:20
110:18 115:15	88:21 90:6,9 92:11,15 93:4	responsibility (4) 6:14 18:24	save (1) 66:17	settled (1) 113:21	53:2,3,4,7,9,13,21,24	116:19
receipt (1) 114:14	94:3,21 95:3,21 96:14	25:16 50:4	saved (1) 3:24	seventh (5) 22:7 55:9 60:22	54:1,4,7,10,21	stakeholder (2) 86:9 101:15
receive (2) 55:14 59:7	99:2,24 105:10 106:19	responsible (16) 11:22 21:24	saw (4) 58:12 101:15 109:5	61:25 102:23	55:2,7,10,15,20	stand (2) 43:15 90:21
received (8) 4:12,14,16	108:22 115:9 116:8 117:18	22:3 23:4,11,25 24:10,14	113:6	several (3) 11:17 80:1,20	56:3,9,13,18,19	standard (1) 40:4
55:11 59:8 64:12 67:21	relative (1) 43:25	25:5 44:8 52:13,15,25	saying (5) 1:16 29:9 77:24	sex (1) 94:24	57:6,9,11,13,19,21	standing (1) 75:22
97:13	relatively (5) 17:17 20:8,20	65:24 91:18 100:1	84:5 105:20	sexual (1) 3:12	58:1,3,7,17,22	standings (1) 42:25
receiving (4) 5:19 63:24	89:16 97:3	responsive (1) 33:17	scene (1) 3:20	shadowy (1) 75:3	59:1,5,7,13,19 60:6,7,11	start (6) 1:5 4:6 17:7 53:4
75:22 97:3	release (2) 12:11,19	result (4) 84:21 100:22	scenes (1) 21:12	shall (5) 2:18,22 5:12 6:15	61:6,13,21,24 62:5,13,16	60:8 61:24
recent (2) 7:1 14:3	released (1) 93:15	101:21 116:1	scepticism (2) 58:21 59:5	17:9	63:3,17,23,25 64:11,15,23	started (1) 72:25
recently (1) 93:15	relevance (2) 5:24 52:18	resulted (3) 12:3,14 116:5	science (1) 57:8	shant (1) 33:19	65:15 66:1,9,11	starting (3) 37:25 62:20
recognise (1) 18:21	relevant (22) 8:21 16:18	resulting (1) 35:21	scope (3) 6:4 9:15 25:7	share (1) 59:14	67:3,8,12,19 68:7,16,25	84:25
recognised (3) 3:5 33:13	39:8,9 40:3 43:24 55:24	resume (1) 96:12	scratching (1) 110:3	shared (4) 23:10 24:13	69:9,15,19,21,25	stated (1) 58:1
46:4	56:1 59:11 62:13,20 63:23	retained (2) 101:1 103:7	scream (1) 73:9	58:19,20	70:3,13,20 71:1 73:13,14	statement (18) 73:22 85:25
record (3) 71:3 77:25 96:23	65:11 66:15,23 67:11,20	retains (1) 20:8	search (11) 13:5,13 14:14	shares (1) 58:15	74:24 76:6 78:12 86:20	95:17 101:10 109:21 110:2
recorded (4) 50:23 77:21	81:1,17 93:12 100:2 106:3	retention (1) 100:18	30:15 66:11,17	sharing (6) 23:24 26:22	89:6,24 90:3,8,9,14,17,21	111:8,18 112:5 113:10
101:10 115:22	reliance (2) 67:1,20	return (1) 12:12	95:2,6,10,20 104:3	46:14,17 75:23,23	91:3,20 93:11 94:2 96:4,6	114:14 115:5,10,13,25
red (1) 102:6	relied (2) 29:17 62:22	returned (3) 2:10,16 19:1	seat (1) 96:22	sheets (1) 111:15	97:12,20 98:3,8 104:22	116:6,11,22
redolent (1) 81:14	rely (1) 65:15	revealed (2) 52:11,17	second (28) 4:24 12:10	shelf (1) 80:21	105:17 107:15 108:1 109:8	states (1) 35:22
reduce (1) 117:9	relying (3) 29:19,20 68:13	review (6) 5:21 85:11 87:18	17:17 25:19 27:7 36:21	shining (1) 89:11	110:8 112:4 114:15	stations (1) 14:6
refer (6) 22:8 24:4 50:12	remain (2) 69:24 70:21	88:15 117:12,25	39:6 40:19 41:19 42:14,23	shone (1) 75:3	115:8,8 116:20 117:1	statistics (1) 19:2
57:8 59:2 102:13	remained (1) 12:6	reviewed (1) 65:23	43:2,15 44:4 46:1 47:20	shopping (1) 82:3	118:3,22	status (2) 91:20 105:4
reference (14) 17:5 19:3	remaining (1) 101:24	revised (9) 4:16 17:3 19:18	58:11 60:17 67:13 74:12	short (17) 2:13 3:8 5:18	sit (6) 47:13 72:15 96:19	statutory (5) 6:20 16:6
21:7,13 36:6 45:5 64:13	remains (1) 76:8	31:19 51:8 53:21 54:13	78:18 80:24 95:17 99:6	11:25 15:17 19:8,13 29:5	109:2 114:7 118:23	18:18 75:4 98:23
68:16 79:3 80:3 90:16 92:3	remarkable (1) 3:15	55:20 97:21	104:19 112:10,16,21	30:9 34:25 47:12,16 51:2	site (1) 14:3	steer (2) 19:22 20:2
115:23 118:7	remember (7) 4:7 58:23 81:6	revision (1) 49:15	secondly (13) 3:14 9:9,14	97:3,16,20 103:14	sits (1) 74:24	step (3) 63:18,20 84:24
referred (4) 22:16 88:2 102:7	86:3,6,10,12	revisions (1) 90:13	11:11 13:20 15:22 18:25	shortcomings (2) 56:7,12	sitting (1) 75:22	stephenson (4) 14:21 81:22
103:24	remind (6) 48:8 79:12,14	rightly (2) 33:13 99:3	19:11 46:15 49:11 54:22	shortening (1) 117:11	six (2) 37:9 77:2	112:16,19
referring (5) 27:12 36:2 45:1	80:7 81:2 87:18	rights (2) 4:23 75:6	89:24 100:8	shorter (2) 33:15 73:7	sixth (7) 21:23 28:6 47:21	stephensons (1) 86:4
99:8 106:21	reminder (1) 80:10	rigorous (1) 54:19	secret (1) 110:16	shortfall (1) 94:15	60:21 67:12 102:4 107:10	steps (5) 32:23 39:14 66:16
refers (7) 21:17 22:1,2,4	reminding (2) 48:9 82:5	rigour (1) 6:4	secretaries (7) 9:24 10:21	shortform (3) 18:19 19:1	63:1 64:3 66:3 92:3 99:15	90:25 94:21
25:14 69:17 89:1	remote (4) 9:18 11:25 47:4	rise (5) 16:12 32:8 72:16	26:1 49:2,22 51:17 56:19	50:22	slightly (3) 35:2 71:8 81:12	sterile (1) 108:12
reflect (14) 21:1,21 22:5,13	92:15	risk (90) 2:11 9:13,16,17,18	secretary (5) 23:7 26:6 51:19	shorthand (1) 96:11	small (2) 42:23 98:14	stevelman (2) 66:22 95:12
25:21,25 26:6 27:8,15	remove (1) 102:23	11:24 12:1,4,9,20,21	52:1 87:16	should (68) 2:25 3:5 4:16	social (2) 21:21 81:9	stevenson (1) 3:16
34:22 46:15 47:23 59:21	removed (6) 56:10 61:2,2	13:6,11,19 16:12	section (5) 2:5 9:22 27:11	13:21,24 14:7,10 15:22	society (2) 3:9 7:15	still (6) 12:8 31:17 33:16
104:9	69:14 72:23 102:2	22:1,15,16 26:10 27:16,18	53:7 75:6	16:10,11,14 18:21 19:1,25	solely (1) 50:15	36:4 70:5 111:13
reflected (1) 97:20	rented (1) 66:20	28:10 29:14,19,22	security (24) 14:12 26:21	24:4,9 30:13 43:3 46:9	solicitors (1) 114:23	stopping (1) 85:16
reflecting (7) 20:15,25 22:17	reordering (1) 42:18	30:10,16 39:11,15 40:7	27:6 28:13 29:11,21 30:15	50:23 51:2,5,6 52:23	somebody (3) 1:10 83:12	straight (2) 39:17 40:11
25:12 27:2 41:7 88:3	repeat (6) 28:17 33:6 49:5	43:18,22,25 44:20	45:7 48:22 52:17 56:1 60:1	53:11,13 54:9,18	93:20	straightforward (3) 18:13
reflection (2) 72:17 73:12	56:17 72:11 76:4	45:17,21 48:22 52:9 53:22	63:8,15 66:11,14 67:18	55:1,5,9,16,22 56:22 57:13	someone (1) 65:17	104:25 115:3
reflections (1) 68:24	repeated (1) 101:11	56:25 57:2,12 58:22 60:20	68:7 69:6 93:14,17,25	58:17 61:1,2 63:7,8,21	something (8) 69:4 70:3	strand (8) 12:12,14 58:11
reflective (2) 37:18 44:19	reply (5) 72:18 90:6 97:19	61:1 63:14,16 64:7,14	95:18 105:8	65:17,17 69:10,13 71:3,20	72:13 8	

structured (1) 69:5
 stuff (1) 87:10
 subclause (2) 45:7,11
 subduing (1) 3:18
 subject (21) 1:13 12:15
 87:4,25 101:16 109:23
 110:1,14,19 113:6,7
 114:1,2,5,6 115:18,24
 116:4 117:1,19 118:15
 submit (13) 17:25 25:8 28:1
 31:6 40:19 49:18 53:21
 55:5,21 67:3 70:20 75:12
 112:6
 submits (1) 54:8
 submitted (6) 11:16 30:9
 46:12 66:9 80:25 113:20
 subparagraph (1) 17:22
 subplot (2) 110:12,24
 subsection (1) 2:11
 subsequent (2) 10:3 114:6
 substance (1) 98:25
 substantial (4) 2:11 10:8
 15:19 100:23
 substantive (9) 2:24 7:18
 8:2,14,17,22 98:16,20,22
 subsubplots (1) 113:14
 succeed (2) 77:6 82:6
 sufficiency (5) 60:14,24
 62:12 64:15 67:9
 sufficient (13) 6:5 30:12
 38:9 39:21 44:13 46:23
 64:2 66:10 85:2 86:15,16
 92:5 96:4
 sufficiently (2) 12:25 13:4
 suggest (20) 1:12 34:19 37:1
 43:7 45:21 47:5 51:24 52:8
 57:20 59:23,25 69:25
 72:15 73:10 89:4 96:12
 103:7 105:20 109:1 114:24
 suggested (30) 4:13 18:1
 21:3 22:9 27:4,18 31:8
 35:9,12 40:17 43:3,7,12
 44:5,25 55:8 59:15 61:21
 66:23 70:8 77:7 79:6,7
 81:2 83:23 95:18 102:22
 106:8 107:11 110:18
 suggesting (5) 30:14 45:3,22
 78:4 106:17
 suggestion (13) 21:16 35:20
 38:13 41:7 45:19 54:11,18
 55:15 60:19 77:23 85:17
 103:9 107:13
 suggestions (7) 18:4 19:18
 37:12 44:14 45:12,23 72:5
 suggests (4) 19:25 37:7,11
 99:24
 suicide (1) 7:14
 suitability (1) 64:6
 summarise (4) 6:9 11:19
 33:6 49:8
 summarised (3) 61:7 62:7
 63:4
 summarising (1) 51:3
 summary (2) 15:12 117:9
 summed (1) 48:6
 summingup (10) 4:6 41:21
 49:19 57:16,20 102:13
 109:10,19 111:22 117:6
 sun (1) 89:11
 sunlight (1) 89:15
 supervised (1) 13:15
 supervising (1) 68:10
 supervision (1) 65:24
 supplemental (1) 33:16
 support (10) 3:13 5:10 29:2
 35:25 50:7 53:8 82:24
 83:21 84:9 90:10
 supported (3) 25:17 84:12
 100:18
 supporting (1) 113:9
 sure (7) 28:19 59:10 73:9
 83:6 87:14 107:2 116:20
 surpassed (1) 38:15
 surprise (2) 93:23 117:20
 surprising (1) 11:9
 surveillance (1) 23:20

surviving (2) 10:9 13:23
 suspect (2) 72:17 118:19
 sustain (1) 103:17
 sustainable (1) 19:8
 swords (2) 82:9 83:13
 system (7) 3:13 9:2 14:5
 42:4 55:3 109:25 114:18
 systemic (3) 50:16 55:7
 89:22
 systems (7) 9:4,6 35:22
 54:10 55:2 76:10,11

T

t10 (1) 94:8
 t10104 (1) 95:4
 t6134 (1) 95:12
 t8 (1) 92:13
 t9 (2) 91:9 93:3
 table (1) 75:19
 tact (2) 91:22 93:15
 tainton (4) 16:2 17:20 61:13
 67:7
 taken (19) 8:6 11:13 13:21
 16:11 28:19 30:5 37:17,19
 38:6 42:19 66:16 72:5
 81:18 82:16 94:22 95:14
 98:11 108:4 117:16
 takes (3) 31:10 37:20 106:19
 taking (6) 31:1 64:24 71:10
 82:6 115:10 117:13
 talking (6) 44:17 64:5 84:5,6
 85:25 117:23
 team (9) 18:5 19:21 26:25
 37:2 43:11 44:12 97:7
 109:23 111:9
 teams (1) 68:14
 technically (1) 114:21
 tedious (1) 118:1
 temptation (1) 83:10
 tempting (1) 117:9
 tend (1) 43:18
 tending (1) 45:20
 tends (1) 114:24
 tensions (1) 105:1
 terms (8) 35:1 70:11 73:17
 76:1 86:23 96:22 110:5
 117:5
 terrible (1) 3:25
 territory (5) 40:10 76:17
 87:8 88:13,14
 terror (1) 14:3
 terrorism (2) 12:12 65:3
 terrorist (2) 94:10 105:4
 test (15) 10:7,9 11:6 15:25
 17:11 38:7 41:3,18,19
 53:20 61:12,16 67:7 78:1,4
 textual (1) 88:25
 thank (27) 1:5,24 2:23 32:13
 47:2,13,14 48:24 49:2
 60:2,6 71:2 72:12 73:13,13
 83:5 89:9 96:8 97:8,12,14
 115:8 116:17,25 117:4
 118:12,24
 thanking (1) 60:8
 thats (46) 1:22 8:11 13:17
 18:13 23:1 30:18 32:13
 36:16 37:11 38:8 39:17,19
 42:3,6,12 44:10 46:2 63:20
 64:11 66:21 68:7 69:21
 77:17 78:19,20,22 79:17
 80:13,22 81:15 82:9 85:5
 87:4,5,10,17 88:22 92:24
 94:15 101:9 102:7 103:2
 107:22 108:4 111:15
 117:21
 themselves (11) 23:14 28:7
 36:25 67:16 81:4 98:19
 103:20 104:11 105:5,13
 112:18
 therefore (15) 5:12 8:6,8
 23:23 36:13 38:15,17
 41:25 44:16 64:4 89:20
 94:17 101:18 110:15,20
 74:14 84:17 90:18 95:11
 96:16 109:9

theyre (3) 39:5 45:23 118:17
 theyve (2) 82:24 88:20
 thing (6) 81:15,22 82:15
 109:4 116:15 118:12
 thinking (1) 7:22
 third (10) 4:25 12:17 21:5
 27:7 43:16 44:3,25 45:8
 64:19 100:5
 thirdly (6) 11:16 16:3 49:12
 52:13 54:23 58:7
 thomas (1) 36:14
 though (3) 13:4 50:5 88:25
 thought (6) 1:9 3:23 36:24
 73:8 92:22 109:24
 thoughts (1) 1:13
 threat (1) 9:21
 three (5) 11:6 35:24 42:22
 69:11 78:25
 threshold (9) 7:19
 38:15,16,18,25 50:1
 61:22,22,23
 through (15) 12:21 14:5
 31:1 32:15 39:16 50:5
 72:11 91:25 93:7 97:5,8
 101:12 102:6 107:6 108:13
 throughout (2) 43:24 80:17
 thursday (3) 109:4 117:7,8
 thus (1) 18:12
 time (29) 3:20 9:12,14 12:10
 23:20 47:3,14 54:10 55:4
 69:1 70:22 71:19 73:24,25
 78:14 80:20 83:6 84:24
 89:11 97:2,3 100:24
 109:12 111:11,17 114:24
 115:2,16 118:17
 times (1) 21:9
 timetabled (1) 55:16
 timing (2) 27:16 117:5
 timpsons (1) 64:4
 tiny (1) 43:1
 today (16) 2:25 4:3,11,16
 5:7 15:6 26:12 31:1 46:16
 60:22 61:8 63:5 64:2,25
 108:4 116:15
 todays (1) 2:7
 together (61) 4:12 13:25
 22:22 26:17,23 27:22,25
 28:7,9 29:3,15 30:1,9,14
 52:10 60:15,25 62:2,23
 63:13,20,24 64:16 65:7,12
 67:10,15,22 68:9
 69:2,18,20 70:17 81:5,8
 82:17 89:3 90:16 91:17,24
 92:7,12 93:6,18,22,24
 101:23 103:10,20,23
 104:10,12,20 105:3,14,22
 106:6,12 107:12 115:4
 118:8
 togethers (2) 29:19 68:12
 told (2) 74:5,5
 tomorrow (10) 4:7 108:15,25
 109:10 116:16 117:5,7,23
 118:11,23
 too (9) 21:4 41:14 69:8
 72:19 76:25 83:13
 117:8,13 118:1
 took (8) 6:4 12:22 31:19
 46:20 47:5 90:23,25 96:1
 tools (1) 22:16
 topic (1) 48:5
 topics (1) 31:19
 toto (1) 107:16
 touch (2) 36:17 66:3
 touches (1) 76:9
 towards (3) 19:22 43:18
 86:13
 tracking (2) 97:23 98:2
 trademark (1) 110:8
 tragically (1) 3:8
 train (2) 14:6 83:12
 trained (4) 44:9 47:22 48:7
 95:9
 training (8) 9:5 22:3 44:21
 48:10,11,13 100:1 102:14
 transcribers (1) 47:4
 transcript (2) 29:7 37:10

translate (2) 35:4 36:19
 translated (1) 41:1
 translation (1) 35:1
 treated (1) 59:5
 trick (1) 80:5
 trip (2) 59:15 116:20
 trivially (1) 61:19
 trouble (3) 74:15 84:8
 115:12
 truck (1) 13:1
 true (4) 24:21 41:7 75:7,16
 trusted (2) 82:23 83:2
 try (1) 89:15
 tucked (1) 45:11
 tuesday (1) 1:1
 turn (14) 8:14 10:15 15:9
 16:20 17:22 26:15 34:2
 36:21 42:15 44:22,23
 48:25 83:18 109:20
 turned (3) 5:23 89:12 102:9
 turning (4) 4:11 19:19 20:10
 103:8
 turns (1) 101:1
 type (6) 37:19 64:9,11
 66:8,20 92:17
 types (3) 62:4 63:15 70:18
 typographical (1) 28:23

U

ultimate (1) 40:1
 ultimately (2) 100:19 104:3
 umbrella (1) 53:23
 unadorned (1) 19:24
 unbalanced (2) 44:1 77:1
 unchallenged (1) 54:5
 uncomfortable (1) 75:2
 uncomfortably (1) 74:25
 uncontroversial (1) 18:22
 20:20 27:19 28:2 31:5 78:2
 undergone (1) 64:7
 underlying (1) 7:3
 understand (6) 8:12 23:13
 30:24 77:23 78:3 84:19
 understandably (1) 62:21
 understanding (4) 69:2
 70:24 73:18 113:4
 understandings (1) 113:12
 understood (3) 52:20 62:25
 110:4
 undertake (2) 64:9 74:20
 undertaken (2) 41:8 45:16
 underway (1) 109:19
 undisclosed (2) 87:22 88:4
 undisputed (2) 91:5 92:10
 undoubtedly (1) 92:21
 undue (1) 106:24
 unequivalent (1) 21:20
 unequivocal (1) 50:3
 unique (1) 91:19
 unit (1) 57:8
 university (7) 28:9 68:18
 69:21 90:15 91:5,14,16
 unlawfully (1) 18:16
 unless (6) 32:12 83:16 88:21
 89:6 96:6 110:25
 unobjectionable (1) 48:1
 unrelated (1) 117:24
 unsafe (3) 46:24 103:18
 104:7
 until (5) 2:9 72:15 109:3
 111:14 119:1
 updated (1) 1:11
 uploaded (1) 114:25
 upon (15) 19:25 23:24
 29:17,19,20 52:2 53:18
 55:17 56:23 97:21 98:4,5
 100:21 101:20 108:20
 urge (1) 11:5
 used (1) 76:22
 userfriendly (1) 20:8
 uses (1) 84:3
 using (2) 81:10 107:4
 usman (28) 3:3 11:13,22
 18:17 20:12 23:5 24:1,10
 54:3 58:22 59:23 62:23
 63:7,11,19,25 64:5

65:17,22 68:12 69:3,7
 70:23 94:9 104:15 106:11
 107:13 111:10

V

v (1) 87:16
 v2 (1) 42:16
 v3 (3) 96:16,18 118:4
 vague (1) 24:6
 value (4) 18:19 28:2
 79:20,22
 van (3) 10:12 36:3 73:22
 variation (1) 52:24
 various (11) 1:6 14:11 15:16
 21:6 22:8 30:11 31:22
 32:15 101:16 108:13 110:1
 variously (1) 7:20
 venue (4) 14:2,12 68:5 92:9
 verbally (1) 58:24
 verdict (1) 18:1
 verdicts (1) 19:7
 version (19) 1:11 4:16,18
 47:20 62:7 89:25
 90:4,11,20 97:22,23,24
 102:4 107:1,1 110:14
 114:7 116:4 118:4
 versions (3) 97:25 109:23
 110:1
 vice (2) 46:8,21
 vicinity (1) 52:10
 victim (1) 3:12
 viewed (6) 107:6 114:2,4,6
 115:1,22
 views (1) 32:1
 violence (2) 3:12 65:3
 visit (3) 13:3 66:18 95:3
 visited (1) 68:3
 visits (1) 13:13
 visualise (1) 94:12
 volunteered (3) 32:20 33:2
 91:23

W

wales (2) 66:18 95:3
 wants (1) 108:19
 ward (1) 48:11
 warrants (1) 116:20
 wasnt (13) 14:1 48:15 60:20
 80:11 81:10,11,24 83:8
 93:18 104:8 106:6 112:2
 114:25
 way (28) 1:12 12:18 20:4
 24:2 25:9 29:6 33:19 39:15
 41:15 42:6,10 50:14 52:15
 55:18 63:12 74:7 77:14,15
 85:24 89:7,24 96:16
 104:25 106:2 111:18
 113:16 115:14 117:10
 ways (4) 15:16 78:13 90:19
 91:13
 weak (1) 42:14
 weather (1) 89:12
 wed (2) 95:13,25
 wedded (1) 70:14
 wednesday (1) 119:2
 weeks (3) 3:14 37:9 77:2
 welcome (3) 47:7 73:16
 96:14
 welfare (1) 91:8
 went (6) 3:19 13:13 54:5
 74:7 92:21 93:7
 werent (1) 77:8
 west (24) 9:24 10:24 19:17
 22:20 23:7 24:3 25:17,25
 26:7 35:10 46:19 48:19
 53:4,8,10 54:1 57:25 58:10
 85:23 87:17 100:25 101:3
 110:22 111:1
 weve (23) 17:2,8 18:9 19:5
 20:4,24 21:1,2,13 27:7,12
 30:9 37:23 38:11 40:22
 43:3 47:6 77:7 90:22 96:11
 99:22 104:19 116:8
 whatever (1) 30:1
 whats (2) 43:22 87:4

whatsoever (1) 57:10
 whereas (1) 40:10
 wherever (1) 19:2
 whilst (7) 51:16 54:1 57:22
 68:1 73:20,23 79:16
 whole (2) 45:4 49:25
 whose (2) 3:7 52:19
 wider (2) 6:10 11:19
 williamson (9) 14:15 29:8
 30:6 65:15,20 66:2,22 94:8
 95:4
 williamsons (2) 64:25 104:24
 wings (1) 96:16
 wish (4) 20:20 51:14 103:5
 111:23
 wishes (3) 107:23 109:10
 114:13
 withdrawal (1) 79:25
 withdrawn (1) 69:8
 witness (18) 23:18 43:19
 45:8 54:5 57:6,24 58:23
 85:24,25 86:13,14 101:10
 109:21 110:2 111:8 113:10
 115:16,24
 witnesses (4) 12:19 14:19
 27:20 80:20
 wir (1) 87:17
 wont (2) 89:13 115:12
 worcestershire (1) 38:12
 working (8) 17:11 20:5 26:19
 69:11 70:9,10,12,14
 90:4,11,20 94:11 97:24,25
 work (12) 3:10,11 13:5 60:8
 66:7 83:25 97:2,6 105:22
 106:6,12 118:8
 working (5) 9:6 42:16 43:4
 91:15 92:15
 works (1) 77:15
 world (1) 57:22
 wouldnt (3) 68:21 104:7
 111:3
 write (1) 97:10
 writers (1) 96:11
 writing (6) 33:5,9 58:20 62:5
 71:12 81:12
 written (37) 2:8 4:14 40:20
 45:2 46:10,16,22 49:4 53:7
 56:16 60:7 61:7,12,14
 62:16 63:4 64:1,17,23 65:9
 68:2,17 71:6 72:9 74:19
 76:18 79:18 83:14,24 90:3
 96:25 97:10 108:7,8,17,19
 109:5
 wrong (4) 35:23 42:5 88:5
 98:25
 wrote (1) 114:4

Y

yesterday (2) 49:5 115:4
 yet (2) 73:15 83:10
 youll (2) 37:6 86:12
 young (2) 3:6 18:22
 youre (2) 77:21 102:9
 youve (12) 31:25 33:5 43:18
 73:16 76:18 77:5 80:2,19
 83:12,17 90:7 94:6

Z

zoom (1) 71:7

1

1 (8) 18:15 42:1,7 51:6 85:9
 87:17 97:25 118:15
 10 (6) 15:10 16:18 22:14
 29:7 61:13 64:2
 10000 (1) 32:22
 1030 (1) 1:2
 11 (5) 5:14 23:2 59:22
 64:18,23
 1100 (1) 111:11
 112 (1) 120:12
 1146 (1) 47:15
 115 (1) 120:13
 11month (1) 57:4
 12 (3) 25:11 44:23 46:3

120 (1) 91:9
 1204 (1) 47:17
 1214 (1) 35:4
 122 (1) 97:15
 124 (1) 93:3
 13 (1) 54:8
 135 (1) 85:25
 136 (1) 85:25
 138 (2) 10:12 36:3
 13c (1) 55:5
 13d (1) 55:15
 14 (2) 26:15 45:4
 144 (1) 95:24
 15 (7) 26:15 27:1 47:13
 61:25 64:19 68:8 108:15
 1516 (1) 5:15
 15d (1) 73:23
 17 (1) 51:16
 17a (1) 34:13
 18a (1) 34:16
 1981 (1) 2:6

2

2 (52) 4:18,23,25 5:6,9,25
 6:5,6,11,18,19 7:10,12,18
 8:2,5,7,14,17,21 9:9 10:16
 15:7 17:7,10 33:24 34:8
 36:15 40:10 42:18 45:19
 49:23 51:18 72:4,6 73:20
 76:14 77:21 89:25
 90:4,11,20 94:11 97:24,25
 98:16,20,22 107:1 108:9
 118:15 120:4
 20 (3) 40:20 73:6 74:19
 2009 (1) 86:16
 2011 (1) 87:17
 2018 (6) 12:2,3 78:11 80:21
 104:17 116:5
 2019 (19) 11:23 12:7,8,21
 13:2,8,23 21:18 26:3 31:12
 48:21 59:3 63:13 86:14
 94:22 101:12 105:19
 111:11,12
 2020 (1) 5:16
 2021 (3) 1:1 85:9 119:2
 2034 (1) 53:9
 22 (1) 54:19
 230 (2) 96:12,20
 231a (1) 112:8
 234 (1) 97:17
 23a (1) 51:15
 24 (4) 43:4,9,13 79:17
 2432 (1) 50:12
 25 (3) 1:1 43:14 79:17
 2564 (1) 87:17
 26 (1) 119:2
 28 (1) 64:3
 29 (4) 13:23 14:22 82:12
 116:5
 2a (1) 19:9
 2b (1) 19:9
 2compliant (1) 38:4
 2s (1) 89:19

3

3 (44) 17:22 10:10 21:5 23:1
 24:17,19 25:21 26:4
 34:2,3,21 36:23 37:4
 41:6,16 42:7,20 44:3 47:22
 51:6 55:10 71:23 79:1
 80:23,24 81:16 82:7 90:6
 97:23 99:3,7,20,24
 102:4,23 105:10,24
 106:1,20 107:1 113:21
 117:20 118:5,15
 30 (1) 73:6
 312 (1) 118:25
 3133 (1) 87:18
 32 (1) 120:5
 33 (1) 87:19
 35 (3) 17:2 19:19,20
 3537 (1) 46:9
 3a (1) 41:3
 3b (1) 41:5

4

4 (37) 6:8 17:7 23:2,23
 24:24 33:10,14,17
 34:2,3,21 36:23 37:4 41:16
 42:7 44:22 45:19 46:13
 56:19 65:10 71:23
 83:18,19 84:11 88:19,22
 90:6 99:11,22 100:5
 102:19 105:24,25 107:9
 117:20 118:5,15
 42 (1) 2:5
 44 (1) 45:2
 45 (1) 45:2
 47 (1) 120:6
 49 (1) 120:7
 4a (3) 41:4 49:9,21
 4b (2) 41:5 50:7
 4c (1) 50:21
 4e (1) 51:4

5

5 (32) 18:15 26:15 28:25
 30:18 34:2,21 36:23 37:4
 40:20 41:16 46:1 51:11
 56:18 69:12,15 72:1 88:24
 89:1 90:9,10 94:3 100:16
 102:8,20 103:12
 107:11,18,19,20,20,21
 117:20
 50 (1) 30:23
 54 (1) 31:2
 55 (2) 63:3,16
 5a (1) 41:4
 5b (1) 41:5

6

6 (9) 19:12 44:4 45:19 46:18
 69:13 75:6 99:25 102:9,20
 60 (1) 120:8
 62 (1) 15:2
 6364 (1) 92:13
 64 (1) 14:23
 6667 (1) 92:18

7

7 (9) 19:12 24:19 35:23
 46:18 69:13,24 70:9,15
 74:19
 71 (1) 120:9
 77 (3) 85:10 87:17 88:15
 7981 (1) 29:7

8

8 (8) 6:7 8:16 19:20
 35:17,18 46:18 56:5 61:11
 80 (1) 29:12
 81 (1) 29:18
 84 (1) 31:2
 8889 (1) 94:8
 89 (1) 120:10
 8f (1) 6:24

9

9 (8) 7:2 8:15 21:5 22:7
 42:21 47:20 99:6 105:17
 900 (2) 111:11,14
 945 (3) 109:2 118:24 119:1
 97 (1) 120:11
 9c (1) 62:17