

214.

FILE NOTE

At 10.00am on 26 June 2000 Mr [REDACTED] Mr Mullan, D/C/Superintendent McBurney and D/Inspector Irwin met Raymond Kitson at the offices of the Director of Public Prosecutions.

D/C Superintendent McBurney opened the meeting by detailing the background leading to the police decision to re-interview Mr & Mrs McKee. The Investigating Officer highlighted what, for him, were the main issues at present, i.e.:-

- Where police correct in recording a witness statement from Mrs McKee?
- Should police consider interviewing James McKee as a witness, placing before him the fresh evidence secured from his ex-wife?

The above two issues were fleshed out in discussion, with the consensus of opinion being that as James McKee played a central role in the alleged conspiracy, he should be interviewed under caution as a suspect. However, prior to any further interviews being conducted, police need to initiate additional 'actions' to support the evidence now provided by Mrs McKee. In particular:

- a) telephone calls to the Hanvey household during relevant period are to be checked to establish their source
- b) Sky television is to be approached with a view to ascertaining whether the McKee household subscribed to the 'Naseen' fight on 27 April 1992.
- c) S O'Hagan is to be interviewed to ascertain who paid him for services rendered to Mr and Mrs McKee.

The whole thrust of these further enquiries is to gain as much supporting evidence as possible prior to commencing additional interviews.

Mr Kitson expressed his view that, in the circumstances, it would be difficult for the Director of Public Prosecutions to consider giving James McKee immunity from prosecution.

It was agreed that police would proceed with background enquiries and when these were complete, submit a preliminary report to both the Director of Public Prosecutions and Independent Commission for Police Complaints. The question of interviews would pend receipt of this report.

D/Chief Superintendent McBurney expressed his concern over time-lines stating that experience suggest it may take a considerable period for B.T. to come up with the information required. Having said this, the IO assured those present that he would stress the urgency of the case to B.T. and bring as much pressure as he can on that body to forward the information requested, as quickly as possible.

Progress to be reviewed by Mr Mullan on 3 July 2000.



G MULLAN
June 2000