

being at the front of a crowd trying to get at the injured persons.

A

observed Bridgett as being in the crowd, he had blood coming from his nose.

In interview he said he was first at the landrover, that he was then struck on the nose and then he went home. He denied the sightings of him as one of the crowd. Forensic evidence is available and shows that blood coming from him was found on a sample taken from the right leg of Hamills jeans. No blood from Hamill was found on his clothing although his own blood was, this despite the fact his clothes were not seized until the 6th May.

This is a difficult case. Were it to be alleged by a witness that Bridgett had been seen assaulting Hamill the blood evidence would be strong confirmatory evidence. As it stands this coupled with the police sightings of him at the front of the crowd confirm that his account to the police was not truthful. It shows that he was close enough whilst bleeding to have dripped some blood onto the deceased or that his blood splattered over to Mr Hamill. I do not think the position is presently clear enough and would like further information as to the type of stain and its extent before deciding whether this would be strong enough to be probative of contact. And, to be complete, it does not seem to me that the papers identify the person who punched Bridgett and whether this may have occurred either in the vicinity of Mr Hamill or the person may have been one of Mr Hamill's friends or colleagues who could have contaminated Hamills jeans.

What can be said is that on the available evidence one can show Bridgett was very much involved but the capacity in which he was involved is not as yet clear. I