



the police officers. It is clear that the family are not helping themselves, although this may well be as a result of the advice they are receiving.

The issue of an independent inquiry was not discussed. I should record that I have no plans to consult colleagues on having one (as happened in the Stephen Lawrence case), especially in circumstances where the family are not co-operating with the investigative process. In any case the processes which are underway would have to be exhausted before I would seriously consider the possibility.

Notwithstanding this, they are clearly upset, not just by the death of their brother, but also by the alleged police inaction (why didn't they intervene/why were no arrests made on the evening or the next morning after the attack/why were no charges brought until after the death etc), and by what they see as a cover-up by the authorities (the police did not want the case to go to court because of the bad publicity it would give/the Hamills fully expected the sixth person charged to be released and believed a recent conversation with Mr Kitson in the DPP's office was simply preparing them for this). I am concerned to make the system stand up to their criticism. I want to defend it where this is possible and, if necessary, to explain why things have happened the way they have and where we have now got to. For example, they may not have received information because it was under investigation.

I should be grateful, therefore, if you would supply me with as much detail as possible on the points in the attached letter and annex so that I can reply to Diane Hamill. I have sought to mark those which I think are for you, and I have also written to the Attorney General. If the matters are sub-judice then I will say so, but I want to answer as many of the points as I can and to be as open as circumstances permit - I think they deserve to be told all we can. I would like to