

review the files and submit a report outlining what was required and which additional officers may have been involved.

14. Mr Jackson submitted his report to me on 4 May 2001 (page 27901 – 27908). I then submitted the report to the head of C & D with a recommendation that the investigation be widened and that more officers be dedicated to undertake the work outlined in the report.

15. On 15 May 2001 I had a meeting with the head of C & D where we agreed on staffing levels. I then had the assistance of Chief Inspector Jackson, two Detective Sergeants and a Constable. The inquiry was under my control and direction, with Mr Jackson and the team being responsible for the day to day management of the evidence gathering and file preparation.

16. I was conscious of the need to serve the 17/3s as quickly as possible as the incident had taken place 4 years before. The issue of the delay was raised by Mr [REDACTED] Solicitor for the Police Federation, at each of the interviews conducted by my inquiry with specific reference made to the case for R v MERRILL. This case was concerned with the situation where a delay in notifying an officer could potentially prejudice any future disciplinary conduct hearing.

17. Chief Inspector Jackson and the team opened a file for each officer who was the subject of investigation and placed in those files anything to do with that particular officer, including previous statements. This was used to prepare the questions for the individual officers, which I reviewed and added to as appropriate. Before the interviews took place the questions were passed to Mr Mahaffey at the Police Ombudsman's office for his approval and additions where necessary.

18. All the interviews were recorded on tape. Prior to the interview the officers were allowed to view the contents of their folder. Someone from the Police Ombudsman's office attended for the interviews of key officers. During the investigation we interviewed nine serving police officers. All of the serving