

made to an MP. In the case of a complaint from an MP, it would generally finish up on my desk.

15. The Superintendent of New Complaints dealt with everything that came through the door and he made the initial decision where the matter went. He was a professionally experienced officer who, I think, one would hold in high esteem for his capability and his honesty and his integrity and his knowledge, both legal and in relation to every aspect of discipline procedures.
16. However, the roles of the DPP and the ICPC need to be considered when looking at discipline. The DPP, certainly in relation to complaints dealing with the public, had a major role to play, as had the ICPC.
17. If it was a complaint that had an involvement of the ICPC, the Superintendent of New Complaints would be responsible for filing the papers with the ICPC and for notification to the ACCs office that the file had been referred. He would also normally appoint the investigating officer. He would refer a complaint, if it was of a criminal nature, to the CID for investigation. For example, if an allegation was made that a policeman had committed a theft, then that was a criminal matter to be investigated before any disciplinary aspect could be considered. In such circumstances, we could not act in relation to discipline in until it was finally disposed of through the criminal procedures.
18. Such a matter would also have been referred to the ICPC which had the option to supervise the investigation. So, the process of the file relating to a criminal offence was CID, DPP, ICPC and then, if necessary, to court. Once the court proceedings had been completed, it was then returned to us for what we called “residual discipline”, that is for any outstanding matters of discipline. That same process applied throughout the country i.e. the United Kingdom.
19. In relation to the power C&D had for suspension of officers that was a matter of consultation with the DCC as to where the case would go.