

- that Lunt was not the person he was describing in his statement.
14. In those circumstances, there was clearly insufficient evidence to prosecute Lunt for the murder of Robert Hamill. Senior Counsel so advised. The direction of 29 October 1997 was correct.
 15. There was some evidence of disorderly conduct by Lunt, which led to his detention by [A]. However this conduct was minor, and could not be shown to be related to the murder of Mr Hamill. Senior Counsel advised that a conviction for affray 'might be difficult'. No prosecution was directed of Lunt for any offence. The conduct was so minor that I agree with that decision.
 16. When directing no prosecution of Lunt, further information was sought from police to ascertain if there was any evidence to support Mr Prunty's identification of Forbes. No such evidence was forthcoming, and, having regard to the other evidence, there was clearly insufficient evidence to prosecute Forbes on the basis of that identification.

Stacey Bridgett

17. No prosecution of Bridgett was directed on 19 November 1997.
18. The evidence against Bridgett came from a number of sources.
19. Firstly, he was referred to by witness A. That evidence later became unavailable.
20. Secondly, he was seen by a civilian witness, Jonathan Wright, trading punches with another unidentified person, a bit to the left of the main fight.
21. Thirdly he was seen by a number of police officers. Constable Neill saw him face to face with a male near the landrover, with a bottle of cider in his hand. He later saw Bridgett with blood around his mouth. Constable Cooke saw him at the front of a crowd which was shouting and jeering towards police and the injured persons, who included Mr Hamill. [A]
[A] saw him with blood coming from his nose.
22. Fourthly, there was forensic evidence to prove that a spot of his blood was found on Mr Hamill's jeans.