

From my personal perspective I was hemmed in a political agenda given that we were at an important point of political transition.

13. Had I applied any pressure in respect of the this case I am certain that the Chief Constable would have “jumped” rather than have to be “pushed”. At that time Sir Ronnie Flanagan was not long in the post and he had previously held the post of Assistant Chief Constable in Complaints and Discipline Department.
14. I have been referred to a note of Greg Mullan at page **27209** which states at the third paragraph down, “*I advised that this aspect was outside the Commissions remit.*” All I can say is that I was not aware of this. I do not wish to be unduly critical but the question to be asked is why? Mr Murnaghan was a professional, a solicitor of standing and to me the failure to supervise that allegation is symptomatic of how the whole organisation worked.
15. I have been informed that DSC McBurney referred the complaint file to the ICPC and the ICPC statement of satisfaction accompanied the file to the DPP. He did not draw to the attention of the DPP the fact that the allegation against Atkinson had not been supervised. Throughout the history of the ICPC it always had the power to withhold statement of satisfaction but it only refused to issue a statement in one case during its existence.
16. The DPP was not notified as a matter of course that the ICPC was supervising a case. It would have appeared at the DPP’s office with the crime file. Of course in complex cases meetings with DPP officials and IO took place, not weekly or monthly, but often enough. Certainly in the case of Robert Hamill there were not those weekly or monthly meetings.
17. I have been referred to a document authored by Mr Langdon at page **39692** which is a note dated 21 July 2000. Scanning the document does trigger a dull recollection of this meeting. At page **39693** at paragraph 10, meeting with chair ICPC. The views I expressed to Anthony Langdon would have been