

a legal representative would have further alienated those witnesses that had previously made statements. My own opinion was that police would have been accused of pressurising witnesses and trying to distort the facts in order to support the version of events which had been provided by the opposing group. Therefore, it was felt best to make contact through the solicitor.

- (ii) There were ambiguities in the statements of Maureen McCoy and Colin Prunty, both of whom had been in each other's company.
- (iii) Other witnesses had still declined to make themselves available for interview.

I believe the Senior Investigating Officer and Deputy Senior Investigating Officer shared my views on this matter. This is reflected in Policy Log 19 dated 15<sup>th</sup> May 1997. This entry also refers to the liaison with Robert Hamill's family. As previously stated I was finding it difficult to maintain such a liaison and this liaison issue had been brought to the attention of the Senior Investigating Officer and Deputy Senior Investigating Officer.

My following notebook entries refer to these matters:

5<sup>th</sup> June 1997      Liaised with ICPC ref witnesses [REDACTED] & Diane Hamill – no word from either ref meeting tonight. Contacted [REDACTED] office again & left message to confirm attendance tonight. Phoned ICPC ref no acknowledgement... Contacted by phone by Diane Hamill ref murder of her brother Robert Hamill. Asked if Police Officers had been suspended. I related they hadn't & on asking to make contact with Chief Constable I gave police network number & told to inform them of her request. Asked if she was attending tonight for ICPC meeting. She asked if I had received letter from [REDACTED] Sol. Informed her that I hadn't received any letters & despite numerous phone calls I received no return calls. I explained the present state of investigation & outlined court procedure ref bail/charging/conviction. I explained I was willing to speak to her at any time or occasion & that a number of vital