

[Redacted]

From: [Redacted]
Sent: 13 July 2000 12:34
To: [Redacted]
Subject: FW: Hamill

m
re 'A', I will be glad to better this.
re 'B' - well done.
I mentioned the possibility of a meeting with CC/AL to Gary Kelly so he will be expected to call.
14/7.

From: Langdon, Anthony
Sent: Thursday, July 13, 2000 12:21:16 PM
To: [Redacted]
Cc: [Redacted]
Subject: Hamill
Auto forwarded by a Rule

I have now read all the material that you copied for me, with the exception of the full Hobson trial transcript, which I hope to read today. I shall not be in the office tomorrow (Friday) but will be in on Monday, when I should like to speak on the phone.

In particular, I want to know what precise knowledge we have about

- a the withdrawn witness statements
- b the new witness statement of 20 June (see Mrs [Redacted]'s minute of 3 July).

It was clear from what you and Mr [Redacted] told me this week (and, indeed, from conversations with others) that we do know a fair amount of detail about both these things, but I assume that this was obtained orally, perhaps from the ICPC. If we can't see the documents themselves, I would at least like to establish exactly how much we know about their contents.

I see, incidentally, from your m/s note to Mr [Redacted] of 16 May covering the curious 'booklet' of documents compiled by some unknown source close to the Hamill campaign that you have discussed some of this (presumably the withdrawn witness statements) with Mr Paul Donnelly, and I would like to know whether it would be appropriate for me, too, to have a word with him. I know absolutely nothing about our relations with the ICPC and will need to be guided.

The above is the main thing that I want to discuss, but I would also like to run over generally how we stand on the recent CAJ report, which seems to be by far the most significant development in the campaign. Am I right in thinking that the report has not yet been analysed in the office, so there are no further documents that I should be expecting about it?

My own initial reaction -and I would value yours too - is that the CAJ report seems generally reliable where it purports to cite documentary sources, and that its criticisms of the police evidence at the Hobson trial, in particular, are rather cogent. Similarly, the section on 'collusion' is probably a correct account of what (and it is a lot) the coroner told the Hamill solicitors about the withdrawn witness statements. I see, incidentally, that the coroner apparently read out extracts of the statements to the solicitors, who therefore know a good deal more about them than I yet do.

Finally, if I might say so, I think that your note about inquiry options and Mr [Redacted]'s about the Lawrence dimension cover all that ground extremely usefully and well.

Anthony Langdon
13 July 2000