

consultation, whichever sequence they were in, at which the police expressed the view that it was the influence of Witness A's friends rather than fear. If it had been fear, I would have wanted statements to that effect and considered submitting the evidence under Article 3 of the Criminal Evidence (NI) Order 1988. The police also expressed the view that Witness A could potentially be in danger if she was to be pursued as a witness. I do not have a note of that but that is my recollection of that particular incident.

13. I can confirm I attended a consultation with Witness B on 21 October 1997. I cannot recall where this took place. Prior to the consultation, I was told that the witness was claiming that his statement was not true, and he was reluctant to give evidence. With regards to vulnerability of Witness A and B, the very fact that they were being referred to as Witness A and Witness B was enough to alert me that there was concerns about their safety. I do not doubt that at some stage I would have spoken to the police about their vulnerability.
14. The purpose of the consultation with Witness B was to test the evidence but also to ascertain if this person was going to give any evidence at all.
15. I have been asked if DI Irwin was present at this consultation. It is not in my notes and the only time I recall meeting DI Irwin in relation to witnesses was one trip to Portadown Police Station.
16. Witness B's father was present at the consultation. I recall that he sat with a very long face and looked exceedingly uncomfortable and miserable throughout. At the end of the consultation, he said that his son would not be giving evidence. It was thought by the police that his demeanour was due to the fact he owned a local business and feared a family member giving evidence in a sensitive case would not be good for trade. I can recall being told that he had a shop of some sort which was in the local area although am not 100% certain.