Sent: Tue 05/03/2013 5:59:39 PM (UTC) To: John M Scoti GRO Jamail A Singt GRO Subar Crichfoli GRO Subar Crichfoli GRO Alwen Lyon GRO Subject: New Draft Criminal Enforcement & Prosecution Policy EPP Attachment: POL - Enforcement and Prosecution Policy 040313 HF comments.doc Redraft attached following our last meeting on it. Have taken on board comments from John's team plus those made at the meeting. Some further explanation of changes below: 1. Peterrence – there was previous reference in the "focussed" section of the EPP but has been amended. 2. Cover criminal activity against POL – the policy does cover any type of criminal activity against POL which it then decides to prosecute. 3. Can the investigation be handed over to the Police? — This is possible and is discussed in the Internal Protocol. A couple of additions to this EPP made to also reflect this. 4. Human Rights — in investigating and prosecuting POL is exercising what would generally be considered a public function. Whilst it may not strictly be required to comply with the Human Rights Act (see previous advice from Stephen Hocking), previous criticism around the way in which POL is perceived to manage enforcement and prosecution (and questions in Parliament) has driven this exercise of looking at systems/ procedures and transparency and Beachcrofts therefore suggest the spirit of Art 6 HRA (i.e. due process/ fair trial) should be followed so as to avoid future criticism (and indeed prevent CPS terminating a private prosecution as they are entitled to do). In order to comply with the spirit of the HRA, having a clear and transparent policy and internal protocol is the first step. The next step is of course following it and of course following other requirements on prosecution such as CPIA disclosure, PACE etc. These Acts/ Regs are referenced in the EPP. 5. Departure from Policy — Amended in line with discussions. Any more comments plse or does everyone now agree with this draft? Kind regards hugh flemingtod GRO	From:	Hugh Flemington[IMCEAEX- _O=MMS_OU=EXCHANGE+20ADMINISTRATIVE+20GROUP+20+28FYDIBOHF23SPDLT+29 _CN=RECIPIENTS_CN=HUGH+2EFLEMINGTON14106A9A-9886-403D-BF5B- E08821F432B3@C72A47.ingest.local]				
Suspect: New Draft Criminal Enforcement & Prosecution Policy EPP Attachment: POL - Enforcement and Prosecution Policy 040313 HF comments.doc Redraft attached following our last meeting on it. Have taken on board comments from John's team plus those made at the meeting. Some further explanation of changes below: 1. Deterrence – there was previous reference in the "focussed" section of the EPP but has been amended. 2. Cover criminal activity against POL — the policy does cover any type of criminal activity against POL which it then decides to prosecute. 3. Can the investigation be handed over to the Police? — This is possible and is discussed in the Internal Protocol. A couple of additions to this EPP made to also reflect this. 4. Human Rights — in investigating and prosecuting POL is exercising what would generally be considered a public function. Whilst it may not strictly be required to comply with the Human Rights Act (see previous advice from Stephen Hocking), previous criticism around the way in which POL is perceived to manage enforcement and prosecution (and questions in Parliament) has driven this exercise of looking at systems/ procedures and transparency and Beachcrofts therefore suggest the spirit of Art 6 HRA (i.e. due process/ fair trial) should be followed so as to avoid future criticism (and indeed prevent CPS terminating a private prosecution as they are entitled to do). In order to comply with the spirit of the HRA, having a clear and transparent policy and internal protocol is the first step. The next step is of course following it and of course following other requirements on prosecution such as CPIA disclosure, PACE etc. These Acts/ Regs are referenced in the EPP. 5. Departure from Policy — Amended in line with discussions. Any more comments plse or does everyone now agree with this draft? Kind regards hugh Hugh Flemington I Head of Legal 148 Old Street, LONDON, ECIV 9HQ © GRO	Sent:	Tue 05/03/2013 5:59:39	PM (UTC)			
Attachment: POL - Enforcement and Prosecution Policy 040313 HF comments.doc Redraft attached following our last meeting on it. Have taken on board comments from John's team plus those made at the meeting. Some further explanation of changes below: 1. Deterrence — there was previous reference in the "focussed" section of the EPP but has been amended. 2. Cover criminal activity against POL — the policy does cover any type of criminal activity against POL which it then decides to prosecute. 3. Can the investigation be handed over to the Police? — This is possible and is discussed in the Internal Protocol. A couple of additions to this EPP made to also reflect this. 4. Human Rights — in investigating and prosecuting POL is exercising what would generally be considered a public function. Whilst it may not strictly be required to comply with the Human Rights Act (see previous advice from Stephen Hocking), previous criticism around the way in which POL is perceived to manage enforcement and prosecution (and questions in Parliament) has driven this exercise of looking at systems/ procedures and transparency and Beachcrofts therefore suggest the spirit of Art 6 HRA (i.e. due process/ fair trial) should be followed so as to avoid future criticism (and indeed prevent CPS terminating a private prosecution as they are entitled to do). In order to comply with the spirit of the HRA, having a clear and transparent policy and internal protocol is the first step. The next step is of course following it and of course following other requirements on prosecution such as CPIA disclosure, PACE etc. These Acts/ Regs are referenced in the EPP. 5. Departure from Policy — Amended in line with discussions. Any more comments plse or does everyone now agree with this draft? Kind regards hugh 148 Old Street, LONDON, EC1V 9HQ 148 Old Street, LONDON, EC1V 9HQ	То:	•				
Redraft attached following our last meeting on it. Have taken on board comments from John's team plus those made at the meeting. Some further explanation of changes below: 1. Deterrence — there was previous reference in the "focussed" section of the EPP but has been amended. 2. Cover criminal activity against POL — the policy does cover any type of criminal activity against POL which it then decides to prosecute. 3. Can the investigation be handed over to the Police? — This is possible and is discussed in the Internal Protocol. A couple of additions to this EPP made to also reflect this. 4. Human Rights — in investigating and prosecuting POL is exercising what would generally be considered a public function. Whilst it may not strictly be required to comply with the Human Rights Act (see previous advice from Stephen Hocking), previous criticism around the way in which POL is perceived to manage enforcement and prosecution (and questions in Parliament) has driven this exercise of looking at systems/ procedures and transparency and Beachcrofts therefore suggest the spirit of Art 6 HRA (i.e. due process/ fair trial) should be followed so as to avoid future criticism (and indeed prevent CPS terminating a private prosecution as they are entitled ob). In order to comply with the spirit of the HRA, having a clear and transparent policy and internal protocol is the first step. The next step is of course following it and of course following other requirements on prosecution such as CPIA disclosure, PACE etc. These Acts/ Regs are referenced in the EPP. 5. Departure from Policy — Amended in line with discussions. Any more comments plse or does everyone now agree with this draft? Kind regards hugh 148 Old Street, LONDON, EC1V 9HQ 148 Old Street, LONDON, EC1V 9HQ	Subject:	New Draft Criminal Enf	orcement & Pro	secution Policy EPP		
Have taken on board comments from John's team plus those made at the meeting. Some further explanation of changes below: 1. Deterrence — there was previous reference in the "focussed" section of the EPP but has been amended. 2. Cover criminal activity against POL — the policy does cover any type of criminal activity against POL which it then decides to prosecute. 3. Can the investigation be handed over to the Police? — This is possible and is discussed in the Internal Protocol. A couple of additions to this EPP made to also reflect this. 4. Human Rights — in investigating and prosecuting POL is exercising what would generally be considered a public function. Whilst it may not strictly be required to comply with the Human Rights Act (see previous advice from Stephen Hocking), previous criticism around the way in which POL is perceived to manage enforcement and prosecution (and questions in Parliament) has driven this exercise of looking at systems/ procedures and transparency and Beachcrofts therefore suggest the spirit of Art 6 HRA (i.e. due process/ fair trial) should be followed so as to avoid future criticism (and indeed prevent CPS terminating a private prosecution as they are entitled to do). In order to comply with the spirit of the HRA, having a clear and transparent policy and internal protocol is the first step. The next step is of course following it and of course following other requirements on prosecution such as CPIA disclosure, PACE etc. These Acts/ Regs are referenced in the EPP. 5. Departure from Policy — Amended in line with discussions. Any more comments plse or does everyone now agree with this draft? Kind regards hugh 148 Old Street, LONDON, EC1V 9HQ GRO	Attachment:	POL - Enforcement and	POL - Enforcement and Prosecution Policy 040313 HF comments.doc			
changes below: 1. Deterrence – there was previous reference in the "focussed" section of the EPP but has been amended. 2. Cover criminal activity against POL – the policy does cover any type of criminal activity against POL which it then decides to prosecute. 3. Can the investigation be handed over to the Police? – This is possible and is discussed in the Internal Protocol. A couple of additions to this EPP made to also reflect this. 4. Human Rights — in investigating and prosecuting POL is exercising what would generally be considered a public function. Whilst it may not strictly be required to comply with the Human Rights Act (see previous advice from Stephen Hocking), previous criticism around the way in which POL is perceived to manage enforcement and prosecution (and questions in Parliament) has driven this exercise of looking at systems/ procedures and transparency and Beachrofts therefore suggest the spirit of Art 6 HRA (i.e. due process/ fair trial) should be followed so as to avoid future criticism (and indeed prevent CPS terminating a private prosecution as they are entitled to do). In order to comply with the spirit of the HRA, having a clear and transparent policy and internal protocol is the first step. The next step is of course following it and of course following other requirements on prosecution such as CPIA disclosure, PACE etc. These Acts/ Regs are referenced in the EPP. 5. Departure from Policy — Amended in line with discussions. Any more comments plse or does everyone now agree with this draft? Kind regards hugh Hugh Flemington I Head of Legal 148 Old Street, LONDON, EC1V 9HQ GRO	Redraft attached	d following our last meeting o	n it.			
2. Cover criminal activity against POL — the policy does cover any type of criminal activity against POL which it then decides to prosecute. 3. Can the investigation be handed over to the Police? — This is possible and is discussed in the Internal Protocol. A couple of additions to this EPP made to also reflect this. 4. Human Rights — in investigating and prosecuting POL is exercising what would generally be considered a public function. Whilst it may not strictly be required to comply with the Human Rights Act (see previous advice from Stephen Hocking), previous criticism around the way in which POL is perceived to manage enforcement and prosecution (and questions in Parliament) has driven this exercise of looking at systems/ procedures and transparency and Beachcrofts therefore suggest the spirit of Art 6 HRA (i.e. due process/ fair trial) should be followed so as to avoid future criticism (and indeed prevent CPS terminating a private prosecution as they are entitled to do). In order to comply with the spirit of the HRA, having a clear and transparent policy and internal protocol is the first step. The next step is of course following it and of course following other requirements on prosecution such as CPIA disclosure, PACE etc. These Acts/ Regs are referenced in the EPP. 5. Departure from Policy — Amended in line with discussions. Any more comments plse or does everyone now agree with this draft? Kind regards hugh 148 Old Street, LONDON, EC1V 9HQ GRO		oard comments from John's to	eam plus those r	nade at the meeting. Some fo	urther explanation of	
3. Can the investigation be handed over to the Police? — This is possible and is discussed in the Internal Protocol. A couple of additions to this EPP made to also reflect this. 4. Human Rights — in investigating and prosecuting POL is exercising what would generally be considered a public function. Whilst it may not strictly be required to comply with the Human Rights Act (see previous advice from Stephen Hocking), previous criticism around the way in which POL is perceived to manage enforcement and prosecution (and questions in Parliament) has driven this exercise of looking at systems/ procedures and transparency and Beachcrofts therefore suggest the spirit of Art 6 HRA (i.e. due process/ fair trial) should be followed so as to avoid future criticism (and indeed prevent CPS terminating a private prosecution as they are entitled to do). In order to comply with the spirit of the HRA, having a clear and transparent policy and internal protocol is the first step. The next step is of course following it and of course following other requirements on prosecution such as CPIA disclosure, PACE etc. These Acts/ Regs are referenced in the EPP. 5. Departure from Policy — Amended in line with discussions. Any more comments plse or does everyone now agree with this draft? Kind regards hugh Hugh Flemington I Head of Legal ### Als Old Street, LONDON, EC1V 9HQ GRO GRO	1. <u>Deterrence</u> –	there was previous reference	in the "focussed	" section of the EPP but has b	een amended.	
4. Human Rights — in investigating and prosecuting POL is exercising what would generally be considered a public function. Whilst it may not strictly be required to comply with the Human Rights Act (see previous advice from Stephen Hocking), previous criticism around the way in which POL is perceived to manage enforcement and prosecution (and questions in Parliament) has driven this exercise of looking at systems/ procedures and transparency and Beachcrofts therefore suggest the spirit of Art 6 HRA (i.e. due process/ fair trial) should be followed so as to avoid future criticism (and indeed prevent CPS terminating a private prosecution as they are entitled to do). In order to comply with the spirit of the HRA, having a clear and transparent policy and internal protocol is the first step. The next step is of course following it and of course following other requirements on prosecution such as CPIA disclosure, PACE etc. These Acts/ Regs are referenced in the EPP. 5. Departure from Policy — Amended in line with discussions. Any more comments plse or does everyone now agree with this draft? Kind regards hugh Hugh Flemington I Head of Legal ### 148 Old Street, LONDON, EC1V 9HQ GRO GRO	•		olicy does cover	any type of criminal activity a	gainst POL which it then	
function. Whilst it may not strictly be required to comply with the Human Rights Act (see previous advice from Stephen Hocking), previous criticism around the way in which POL is perceived to manage enforcement and prosecution (and questions in Parliament) has driven this exercise of looking at systems/ procedures and transparency and Beachcrofts therefore suggest the spirit of Art 6 HRA (i.e. due process/ fair trial) should be followed so as to avoid future criticism (and indeed prevent CPS terminating a private prosecution as they are entitled to do). In order to comply with the spirit of the HRA, having a clear and transparent policy and internal protocol is the first step. The next step is of course following it and of course following other requirements on prosecution such as CPIA disclosure, PACE etc. These Acts/ Regs are referenced in the EPP. 5. Departure from Policy — Amended in line with discussions. Any more comments plse or does everyone now agree with this draft? Kind regards hugh Hugh Flemington I Head of Legal 148 Old Street, LONDON, EC1V 9HQ GRO		=		is possible and is discussed in	the Internal Protocol. A	
Any more comments plse or does everyone now agree with this draft? Kind regards hugh Hugh Flemington I Head of Legal 148 Old Street, LONDON, EC1V 9HQ GRO	function. Whilst Stephen Hocking prosecution (and and Beachcrofts future criticism comply with the step is of course	it may not strictly be required g), previous criticism around the d questions in Parliament) has therefore suggest the spirit of and indeed prevent CPS term spirit of the HRA, having a cle following it and of course foll	I to comply with he way in which driven this exer f Art 6 HRA (i.e. inating a private ar and transpare owing other req	the Human Rights Act (see properties of looking at systems/produce process/fair trial) should prosecution as they are entited policy and internal protocest.	evious advice from inforcement and ocedures and transparency be followed so as to avoid led to do). In order to ol is the first step. The next	
Kind regards hugh Hugh Flemington I Head of Legal 148 Old Street, LONDON, EC1V 9HQ GRO	5. Departure fro	om Policy <u>—</u> Amended in line w	vith discussions.			
Hugh Flemington I Head of Legal 148 Old Street, LONDON, EC1V 9HQ GRO	Any more comm	nents plse or does everyone no	ow agree with th	is draft?		
148 Old Street, LONDON, EC1V 9HQ GRO	-					
148 Old Street, LONDON, EC1V 9HQ GRO						
© GRO	Hugh Flemingt	on I Head of Legal				
r	 1	48 Old Street, LONDON, EC1V 9	9HQ	macanassa dili		
\(\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc	©	GRO				
	(a) h	ugh flemington GRO				

- Post Office stories
- @postofficenews

