

34. The allegation of perverting the course of justice would be a matter for CID under the leadership of CID and direct with DPP and the supervision of that was tied up with ICPC. So this was a matter, for a different department and a different a process, a CID process.
35. G Department had a liaison officer there at CID watching to make sure that any residual discipline was dealt with because the situation is we didn't want people coming back afterwards and saying to us "*You didn't do this, you didn't that.*"
36. I have no knowledge of the matters involving the Reserve Constable and the allegation to pervert the course of justice. I do not know whether that matter was referred to the ICPC. The whole issue is out of my range of knowledge.
37. In terms of who would make the ultimate decision to suspend an officer it would depend on the nature of the allegation. Internal discipline primarily fell to me. It was always the province of the Chief Constable but that was delegated to me with the approval of Secretary of State. The Deputy Chief Constable would have the ultimate say on suspension and would probably have had consultations with the Chief, I am not sure.
38. The Chief Constable did not take the decision to suspend in a vacuum as it was necessary to go over everything. The decision was based on the file submitted to him by Complaints and Discipline and a recommendation. The Deputy Chief Constable would review the matter, make a decision as to whether or not should be suspended, but clearly he would take into account the Complaints and Discipline as well, and also liaise with the Chief Constable. I can not be sure as to what his role would be in relation to the Chief Constable, bearing in mind the Chief Constable would sit in judgment as I have explained.
39. The fact that somebody had been accused of a serious assault and had not been suspended was not really indicative of anything until inquiries had been made. The system had to be flexible enough to cope with a range of circumstances.