(10.14 am)

MS PRICE: Good morning, sir. Can you see and hear us?
SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, thank you.
Witness statement of KENNETH WILLIAM DONNELLY adduced
MS PRICE: Sir, before we turn to Mr Daily's evidence, may I please deal with the witness statement of Mr Kenneth Donnelly, who is the current Deputy Crown Agent for Specialist Casework at the Crown Office and Procurator Fiscal Service. For the transcript, his statement can be found at WITN10510100. There is no need to bring that up on screen but I can confirm, sir, that this witness statement has been disclosed to Core Participants.

Mr Donnelly's evidence is relevant, sir, both to Phases 4 and 5 of the Inquiry. For the purposes of Phase 4, can I please indicate that paragraphs 1 to 43 are to be treated as read into the Inquiry's record, although I do not intend to read the content of those paragraphs now. As a result, this evidence may be taken into account by you in due course, even though it has not been the subject of oral evidence during Phase 4.

For the remaining paragraphs in Mr Donnelly's witness statement, namely paragraphs were 44 to 74 , these will either be the subject of oral evidence or 1

27 December 2023.
A. Sorry, can you repeat that.
Q. Do you have an A2 in your bundle?
A. No, I don't.

MS PRICE: Sir, my apologies. We're just obtaining a hard copy of the second statement for insertion in the witness's bundle.
SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, of course.
(Pause)
MS PRICE: Sir, I understand the document is being printed.
I don't know if you would rather we broke for five minutes or whether you're content to remain on screen.
SIR WYN WILLIAMS: No, let's just get it done, and I'm happy to sit here.
MS PRICE: Thank you, sir. (Pause)
Mr Daily, do you now have a copy of the statement in your name, dated 27 December 2023?
A. I do.
Q. Could you turn, please, to page 12 of that statement?
A. Yes.
Q. Is there a visible signature on that copy?
A. Yes, there is.
Q. Is that your signature?
A. It is.
Q. I understand that there are some corrections which you
read into the record in Phase 5. I should also confirm that this witness statement will be published in its entirety on the Inquiry's website after today's hearing.
SIR WYN WILLIAMS: All right, thank you very much.
MS PRICE: Thank you, sir.
May we please call Mr Daily.
SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes.

## ROBERT DAILY (sworn)

Questioned by MS PRICE
MS PRICE: Could you confirm your full name, please, Mr Daily.
A. Robert Daily.
Q. Thank you for coming to the Inquiry to assist it in its work. As you know, I will be asking you questions on behalf of the Inquiry.

You should have hard copies of two witness statements in your name in a bundle in front of you. The first is at tab A1 and is dated 7 November 2023. If you could turn to page 39 of that, please.
A. I have that.
Q. Do you have a copy with a visible signature?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Is that your signature?
A. It is.
Q. The second statement is at tab A2 and is dated
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wish to make to your written evidence in light of documents which have recently been provided to you by the Inquiry; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Would you like to make those corrections?
A. Yes, in my first statement -- sorry, in my second statement I stated at paragraph 25 , "On my first statement, I believe that from 2006 all reports for non-police authorities were required to be submitted to the Crown Office and Procurator Fiscal Service electronically". I asked for that to be amended to -well, I actually say:
"Secondly, I believe the date I gave was likely incorrect. I now think it was from 2009 or 2010, and not 2006. From a document I received last week, it states, from the Crown Office and Procurator Fiscal Service, that all Specialist Reporting Agencies should, from 1 January 2006 be reporting all cases electronically to the Procurator Fiscal."

So it was to change that back again.
And in paragraph 23 of the second request asked me what role I played in preparing the prosecution -- this for William Quarm. I stated:
"The wording of the charge is similar to the wording used when you submit a charge via the SRA website but 4

I cannot recall with certainty if this is something I did."

I can now say that the report would have been submitted via the SRA website, however, I cannot recall if it was myself who submitted it or Raymond Grant who was my ex-colleague?

Also, in my first statement, at paragraph 11, I recall I was temporarily promoted to the role of Investigation Manager in 2000 and I recall I attended some training at that time. Having looked at my statement again, paragraph 69 to 71 described parts of my training in 2005. I would also have been trained on these parts in 2000.
Q. Thank you, Mr Daily. With those corrections made, are the contents of your statements true to the best of your knowledge and belief?
A. Yes, they are.
Q. For the purposes of the transcript, the references for Mr Daily's statements are WITN08940100 and WITN08940200.

Mr Daily, I will not be asking you about every aspect of the witness statements you have provided, which will be published on the Inquiry's website in due course. I will instead be asking about certain specific issues which are addressed in them.
A. Yes.
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you recall?
A. I can't fully recall, it could have been any time
between six months -- maybe more, maybe less. I can't recall.
Q. During had time, were you involved in conducting investigations?
A. Only as a second officer.
Q. At that stage, your temporary role did not become
a permanent one; is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. Is it right that you applied for a further temporary Investigation Manager role in 2004 --
A. Yes.
Q. -- and you were successful in obtaining that position?
A. Yes.
Q. On this occasion, after the six-month temporary period came to an end, you were told your position was being made permanent; is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. This was in around 2005?
A. Yes.
Q. You say in your statement at paragraph 4 that in 2011 your role changed to Security and Investigation Manager?
A. That's correct.
Q. And your current role is that of Security Manager?
A. Yes.
Q. Were these roles the same in substance, albeit different in title?
A. In substance, in 2011, I believe it was, I took on the role of the physical security as well, and that was visiting branches after robberies or burglaries or to give security advice.
Q. I would like to turn, please, to the structure of the Security Team over the time you have worked within it. You say in your statement at paragraph 33 that, when you joined the Security Team, there was a Head of Security and Investigations?
A. Yes.
Q. That Head of Security and Investigations oversaw the Investigation Team --
A. Yes.
Q. -- the Security Team --
A. Yes.
Q. -- the Physical Security Team --
A. Yes.
Q. -- and the Casework Team?
A. I believe so.
Q. At this stage, the Investigation Team dealt solely with criminal investigations and had its own Head of Investigations; is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. You recall there being a restructure in 2008 --
A. Yes.
Q. -- when a senior accurate manager position was introduced?
A. Yes.
Q. Is it right that you recall the Senior Security Manager reporting to the Head of Security --
A. Yes.
Q. -- and overseeing a number of teams within the Security Team?
A. Yes.
Q. Was it at this point that the Fraud Team was created in 2008?
A. The Fraud Team was always there, it was just called Investigation Managers or Investigation Team, I believe. Then we called it the Fraud Team. It was just a change --
Q. A change in name?
A. A change in -- yes.
Q. You recall the Fraud Team being responsible for undertaking investigations?
A. Yes.
Q. Is it also right that when the restructure happened in 2008 you were required to submit your CV? 9
A. Yes.
Q. Do you recall the various restructuring exercises also involving headcount reductions?
A. I don't. I don't recall.
Q. I'm sorry, could you say that again with your voice up a little?
A. I don't recall.
Q. Do you recall any of the restructuring exercises impacting on the workload of Investigators?
A. In 2019? Err --
Q. There were a number you dealt with: 2008, 2011, 2014 to 15 and 2019. In relation to any of those do you recall that impacting upon the workload of Investigators?
A. Investigations had stopped by 2019. That was the only time. 2014, and the other dates, no, there was no impact.
Q. In terms of the geographical structure of the Security Team and where you sat within it, you say at paragraph 10 of your first statement that you have been based in Glasgow throughout the time you have held roles in the Security Team; is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. Does that include the period from 1997 until you took up a permanent Investigator role in 2005?
A. That's correct.
A. Yes.
Q. Was that, in essence, you re-applying for your own job as an Investigator?
A. Yes
Q. You have highlighted in your second statement that the CV you submitted in 2008 erroneously contained your wife's educational achievements; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you realise this and correct this at the time?
A. No.
Q. So it's something that's only come to light in the course of preparing your second statement?
A. Yes
Q. At paragraph 35 of your statement, you say that in 2011, Investigation Managers also took on a physical security role as well as their investigation role?
A. Yes.
Q. That's what you were referring to earlier --
A. Yes.
Q. -- when there was the title change?
A. Yes.
Q. You recall there being further restructures in 2004 to 2005 and in 2009 --
A. Yes.
Q. -- sorry, 2019?
Q. When you held a temporary Investigator role in 2000, were you, at that stage, investigating matters both in England and in Scotland?
A. No, just Scotland.

SIR WYN WILLIAMS: So do I take it, just so that I'm clear from the start, Mr Daily, that the structure of the Security Team which you've described relates to the structure over the whole of the United Kingdom? It wasn't confined to Scotland, your description, was it?
A. That's correct.

SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Thank you.
MS PRICE: Is it right that, since 2005, you have been part of the Security Operations North team.
A. Yes.
Q. You have addressed in your statements and I will be asking you in due course about your involvement in the criminal investigation and prosecution of two individuals: Peter Holmes and William Quarm. Mr Holmes' Post Office branch was based in Newcastle and Mr Quarm's Post Office branch was based in the Outer Hebrides in Scotland. Both of these investigations commenced in 2008. Since 2005, have you been conducting investigations into matters both in England and Scotland?
A. Yes.
Q. In terms of the geographical remit of the Security Operations North team, does that cover the north of England as well as Scotland?
A. It did, yes.
Q. Can you help with a little bit more detail on which parts of the north of England came within your remit or come within your remit?
A. I believe it was Cumbria and over to Newcastle, and upwards.
Q. I'd like to turn, please, to the decision-making process for criminal investigation and prosecution of subpostmasters, their assistants and managers and Post Office employed branch staff in England and Wales, on the one hand, and Scotland, on the other. Could we have on screen, please, paragraph 136 of Mr Daily's first witness statement, that is page 36 of WITN08940100. At paragraph 136, you say this:
"The conduct of investigations in Scotland was similar to England and Wales, the key difference was in the prosecution of cases. As I have described elsewhere in this statement, the prosecuting authority in Scotland is the COPFS."

That's the Crown Office Procurator Fiscal Service; is that right?
A. That's correct.

Policy from 2013, 2014, and 2018. You refer to a flowchart from the first two of those versions and you use that to explain how the process worked in England and Wales, and in Scotland.
A. Yes.
Q. Could we have on screen, alongside Mr Daily's statement, if that's possible at all, POL00031005. We can see that this is the August 2013 version of the Post Office Conduct of Criminal Investigations Policy. Going to the bottom of page 2, please. We see the start of the flowchart you refer to in your statement. It provides, on the left-hand side, a number of sources of a case being raised, including an audit shortage, the Grapevine team -- can you help with which team that was?
A. The Grapevine team, they were our alarm receiving centre to start with, and dealt with any suspicious instances the post office's -- post offices were encouraged to phone them up so we could send out a text blast. In regards to information and regards to enquiries, I can't recall what they would have provided to us.
Q. Also listed as a source are "Contract Managers" and "Client, eg DVLA -- DWP". Going over the page, please, to page 3 of this document, looking down the page we can see a number of steps on the flowchart for process, "Case assigned to Security Team. Is there evidence to 15
Q. "All cases, whether they be police or non-police cases, have to be submitted to the COPFS, who then decide whether to proceed to prosecution or not. In around 2006, it became a requirement that non-police authorities had to report cases through the COPFS Specialist Reporting Agency website. On inputting a case you had to input a charge to proceed to submission."

So that's the date you addressed in correcting your second statement at the outset?
A. That's correct, yeah.
Q. So you believe that that date is, in fact, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. In relation to how cases were submitted to the Crown Office and Procurator Fiscal Service, before the change in 2006, how did that happen?
A. It was a manual report, you had to do a typed report that was similar to the offender report, that was then delivered to the Procurator Fiscal by post or by hand.
Q. You deal with the process followed by Post Office Investigators for criminal investigations at paragraph 59 of your first statement. Could we have that on screen, please. It's page 17.

At paragraph 59 , you say that you have considered three versions of the Conduct of Criminal Investigations 14
proceed?" If the answer is no, then "No Further Action, case to be closed". If yes, "Interview and Compile Evidence".

The next step is "Case Preparation, Phase 1 MG Format", then the next stage is "Team Leader to Review the Case File, Proceed with the case?" If it's no, then it's case closure; "Further action" could be "Further enquiries to be made, File returned to team leader"; if it is yes, then it goes to the Criminal Law Team to review the case file. "Proceed with case?"

No, then it's "No Further Action"; "Further Action" required, there could be further enquiries made, "File returned to the Criminal Law Team and team leader informed"; if yes, then it goes on to Cartwright King to produce the charges.

Is it your evidence that the process in place up to the point of the Criminal Law Team, so stopping short of going to Cartwright King, that that was essentially the same for Scotland as it was for England and Wales, until the introduction of a firm of Scottish solicitors into the process for Scotland in 2013?
A. Yes.
Q. In a Scottish case, before this change, so before the introduction of a Scottish firm of solicitors, you say that a decision was returned to you by the Criminal Law 16

Team -- so this is in paragraph 59 of your statement, we see alongside:
"If the decision was to proceed with prosecution, [you] would submit the file to the [Crown Office and Procurator Fiscal Service]."

Is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. "If the decision was not to proceeded, [then the] case would be closed."
A. That's correct.
Q. This document shows the process in place in 2013. Up to the point of the flowchart where there is consideration of a case by the Criminal Law Team, and not beyond that, was the process any different from 2005 to 2013?
A. With the exception of Cartwright King being involved later on -- I don't know when Cartwright King became involved but you essentially --
Q. Stopping short of Cartwright King and stopping at the stage of it being referred to the Criminal Law Team --
A. Yes.
Q. -- and a decision being made by them as to proceeding, was the process we've looked at in this flowchart the same between 2005 and 2013 or did it differ in any material way?
A. From what I recall, it was the same. 17
Q. Looking then to the training you received in 2005 at paragraph 12 here, you say:
"I recall that when taking up the role of Investigation Manager, I received 4-5 weeks training in the training unit above the Lavender Hill Post Office/Battersea Delivery Office in London. The training was given by Royal Mail Group accredited trainers who that experience of investigations. The training covered the Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984 Codes of Practice, Theft Act, carrying out searches, suspect offender interviews, cognitive witness interviews, taking witness statements (including the use of the Solicitor and Friends forms), the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act, IIMARC, [which you explain in brackets here refers to 'information, intention, method, administration, risk assessment, communications, human rights and other legal issues'] and NPA notifications ('NPA' refers to 'non-police agency', and the notifications refer to notifications we made to the police about the criminal proceedings we undertook.)"

It appears from the list of topics here that this training focused on investigation in England and Wales; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Before we turn to the training you received on
Q. Before we turn to the introduction of Scottish solicitors into the process for Scottish cases in 2013 and the reasons for that, l'd like to deal, please, with the training you had for your role as a Post Office Investigator. That document can come down. Thank you.

In terms of your experience when you first took up a temporary investigation role in 2000, did you have any experience of criminal investigation or criminal law, whether in England and Wales or Scotland, at that point?
A. No.
Q. Could we have on screen, please, paragraph 11 of Mr Daily's first statement. That is page 5. At paragraph 11 you recall attending some training when you were temporarily promoted in 2000. Given the correction you made at the outset of your evidence, should we understand that the following paragraph, which deals with training you received on taking up the role of Investigation Manager in 2005, the training detailed there, was also received in 2000, or was it some lesser version of that training?
A. It was a lesser version of the training. There was parts I can't recall, in 2000 the Regulation of Investigatory Powers, the IIMARC or the NPA notifications. The NPA, the non-police agency -- we only dealt with Scottish cases in 2000, so the team did. 18
investigations in Scotland, I'd like to deal, please, with some of the detail of your initial training on lines of inquiry and disclosure obligations in England and Wales. Could we have on screen, please, page 20 of this statement, paragraph 72. In paragraph 72 you say this:
"Regarding the Investigator's duties in carrying out investigations, I recall during the initial training that we were taught to ensure all evidence is obtained, lines of inquiries are completed, mitigating circumstances are considered and investigated, and interviews are conducted within guidelines. All activities taken were to be recorded on the Event Log."

Were you aware from your initial investigator training that there was an obligation on a criminal investigator to pursue lines of inquiry which pointed away from the guilt of the suspect?
A. Yes.
Q. You go on at paragraph 73 to say this:
"Regarding obtaining evidence in the course of an investigation, also during initial training we were taught that the Investigator must obtain all original documents (for example, in the event of an audit shortage, audit cash sheets, Horizon reports printed at the time of the audit, Branch Trading Statements and 20

Horizon reports produced by the branch)."
The documents to which you refer here, are they the ones you would obtain as an Investigator at a branch, where an audit of the branch had discovered an apparent shortfall.
A. Yes.
Q. You go on at paragraph 74 to deal with obtaining evidence from third parties. You say this:
"The initial training also taught us about obtaining evidence from third parties who might hold relevant evidence. For example, bank statements, if it was suspected a shortfall was due to the monies being deposited into a suspect's bank account using Horizon. Also, ARQ requests to Fujitsu in order to obtain Horizon data in various cases (for example, to investigate deposits into bank accounts in Post Office Card Account cases involving a vulnerable person duped into making multiple withdrawals)."

When you were an Investigator, were you aware that the obligation to pursue lines of inquiry pointing away from, as well as towards, the guilt of a suspect, extended to material in the hands of a third party, for example, Fujitsu?
A. Yes.
Q. At paragraph 75 , you deal with training on disclosure 21
were an Investigator completing disclosure documentation in England and Wales, you were acting as the Disclosure Officer in the case?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you understand from your initial training that this was a distinct role, over and above your role as an Investigator, which imposed on you additional and distinct duties, such as, for example, the obligation to draw material to the attention of the prosecutor where there was any doubt as to whether that might undermine the prosecution case or might reasonably be expected to assist the defence disclosed by the accused?
A. I would have.
Q. I'm sorry, can you repeat that?
A. I would have.
Q. Could we have on screen, please, document reference POL00121680. The top email on this page is an email from Andrew Daley to you, among other Investigators, dated 6 September 2010. It forwards on an email change with the subject line "Committal Papers", asking whether there is any interest in a presentation from a Royal Mail Investigation Procedures and Standards Manager called Mick Matthews, in relation to procedures and standards applying to committal papers.

So if we can scroll down a little, Mick Matthews'
obligations and you say this:
"Regarding an Investigator's disclosure obligations, the initial training taught us that, in England, it is the duty of the Investigator [I think that should be 'to'] provide a record of all information obtained and to disclose all relevant information to the prosecution and defence."

Pausing there, you repeat the second part of this explanation of an Investigator's disclosure obligations, that is to disclose all relevant material to the prosecution and defence at paragraph 117 of your first statement, in the context of disclosure obligations on you in the prosecution of Peter Holmes. You have, however, made a correction to this in your second statement at paragraph 2.8. Is it right that you now recall that the disclosure obligation on a Post Office Investigator in England and Wales was to provide all appropriate material, used and unused, to the Criminal Law Team, who would deal with onwards disclosure to the defence?
A. That's correct.
Q. You have dealt with the need to complete schedules of used and unused material as an Investigator in England and Wales at paragraph 29 of your first statement. Did you understand from your initial training that, when you 22
emails at the bottom of the page, also dated 6 September 2010, was originally sent to lain Murphy and Andy Hayward, and he says:

## "lain/Andy

"I have developed Procedures and Standards in respect of Committal Papers and this has been agreed by the Criminal Law Team. Accordingly the P\&S and the relevant forms are associated with this email.
Arrangements are in hand to publish the documents on SharePoint and the GSD.
"A presentation that is been delivered to RML ..."
Is that Royal Mail Letters?
A. Yes.
Q. "... and PFWW ..."

Parcelforce Worldwide?
A. Yes.
Q. "... Investigators as they do not get the same number of committals as Investigators in [Post Office Limited] so you wish to merely forward this to your Investigators for their information in respect of the procedures and amended forms."

You address this email and the documents which were attached to it at paragraph 78 of your first statement. We needn't pull up on screen, unless you wish to go to it, Mr Daily, but you say that you cannot recall exactly 24
when you received the materials attached to Mick Matthews' original email but your belief is that this would have been the first occasion on which you saw those materials?
A. The materials within his, is it, file? Yes.
Q. The materials to which you were referred for the purposes of making your statement, the attachments to the email, included a new Procedures \& Standards document relating to committal papers dated July 2010; an updated version of a Procedures \& Standards document dealing with disclosure of unused material; and the Criminal Procedure and Investigations Act 1996, and that was dated 1 July 2010; it also attached a copy of the Criminal Procedure and Investigations Act 1996 Code of Practice.

Just to clarify, is it your evidence at paragraph 78 of your statement that you had not received any of these documents, including a copy of the CPIA Code of Practice, before this point in September 2010?
A. Sorry, can I see paragraph 78 again?
Q. Of course, if we can pull up the paragraph on screen, it's paragraph 78 of the first statement and that is page 21. Scrolling down a little, please, at paragraph 77 , you refer to the document we've just looked at, the email from Andrew Daley, dated 25
those attachments that we've just looked at, the first three?
A. Yeah, I can see that.
Q. You say you're asked:
"... where I was based when I received this email, whether this was the first time I had been sent these materials and if any presentation about them was given."

Then you say at 78 :
"The documents relate to some procedures and standards that have been developed in relation to committal papers. At the time I received the email at document [and then the document reference] I was based in Scotland. I can't recall exactly when I received the materials, but it is my belief that this would have been the first occasion on which I saw them."

We'll come on to the presentation and your recollection on that, but my question is in relation to the attachment that is the Code of Practice and whether that is in the same category as the Procedures \& Standards documents, in that you received it for the first time at this stage or whether you had received that document any sooner.
A. I can't recall receiving it before then.
Q. Okay. You also say at paragraph 78 that you cannot recall receiving the presentation referred to in the

6 September 2010, together with its attachments and there are four attachments there. Three of those are ones that l've just referred to. One of them is the CPIA Code of Practice and we can go to that document if it would help to see it? Would that assist --
A. Yes
Q. -- or do you know the document l'm referring to?

If we can just take the attachments in turn, actually, the first is POL00104837. That is the Procedures \& Standards document which Mick Matthews refers to creating, the "Committal and Summary Trial Papers and Processes", July 2010.

The next attachment was POL00104848. This is the "Appendix 1 to P\&S 9.5 Disclosure of Unused Material and the Criminal Procedure and Investigations Act 1996", and that version is dated 1 July 2010.

The next attachment is POL00064059. That is the CPIA Code of Practice. If you need to, we can look at the next page, scrolling down a little, please.
A. Yeah, that's fine. Can I go back to paragraph 78 again, please?
Q. Yes, of course.
A. Can I see the whole --
Q. Paragraph 78 of the statement, page 21 , please. So looking first at 77 . You've looked at the email and 26
email. Do you mean by that the presentation that Mick Matthews was offering?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you recall any discussion as to whether that kind of presentation might be useful for Investigators in the Post Office?
A. Sorry, I don't recall any discussion around it.
Q. Okay. When you took up the permanent Investigator role in 2005, were you given any training on the Horizon system?
A. I don't recall any training on the Horizon system. I do recall, I think, when I was temporary in 2000, we went to a hotel for a day to look at the system, what that called, I can't remember.
Q. You say to look at the system --
A. Yeah, we were --
Q. -- what do you mean by that?
A. We were put in front of terminals and it was in a hotel, I think it was the Swallow Hotel in Glasgow, it was known at that time. I'm not sure what it called, to be honest with you.
Q. Did you receive any other training on the Horizon system apart from that training in the hotel in 2000 ?
A. I don't recall receiving any other training.
Q. Did you ever receive any training on analysis of the 28
data from the Horizon system?
A. No.
Q. You say in your statement at paragraph 31 that, during an investigation, you liaised mainly with Contract Managers, the Former Agents Debt team and Cash Management; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Were you given any guidance in your training on which other teams within the Post Office you should speak to to gather evidence in a case where the Horizon system had shown an apparent shortfall?
A. Not that I recall.
Q. Were you made aware that Product and Branch Accounting or Information Security might have relevant information relating to the operation of the Horizon system?
A. Sorry can you repeat the question, please?
Q. So there are two specific teams I'm asking about, Product and Branch Accounting and Information Security, and I'm asking if you were ever made aware that they might have relevant information when you were looking at the Horizon system and shortfalls shown by it?
A. Now that you've mentioned it, I probably would have been at the time. I was right when I wrote the statement, it's what I could recall at that point in time when I was writing it.
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Scotland.
Q. So was this, in essence, on-the-job training?
A. Yes, it was.
Q. Who provided it?
A. My colleagues within the Investigation Team in the North.
Q. Can you recall who that was now?
A. It would have been Raymond Grant, Shelley Stockdale, they'd have been mentoring me.
Q. How long did this on-the-job training last?
A. Sorry, I'm trying to recall it. I honestly can't recall how long it lasted. I went out and done a few, probably, Second Officer interviews and then been thrown in the deep end, being mentored doing First Officer, and conducting interviews.
Q. The main take-away point for you appears to have been that, at the time in Scotland, a suspect was not offered a solicitor to be present in interview, and that's something which you address elsewhere in your statement and you say changed in 2010, following the decision in Cadder v Her Majesty's Advocate; is that right?
A. That's correct
Q. Setting aside procedural safeguards for interview, did your on-the-job training cover the offences under Scottish law which might be relevant where the Horizon 31
Q. Turning then, please, to training you received on investigations and prosecutions in Scotland. Could we have page 6 of the statement on screen at the moment, please. If we can actually go back to the bottom of the previous page. After dealing with the 4 to 5 weeks' training you received, you say:
"After a few months in my role as an Investigations Manager, I went to Rugby to attend further training, including courtroom training."

In the next paragraph after this, you say at paragraph 13:
"Can also recall being given onsite/field training on Scots Law, with the main difference at the time being that, in Scotland, a suspect was not offered a solicitor to be present at an interview."

When did you receive this onsite or field training on Scots Law?
A. When I joined the team after my training.
Q. So in 2005?
A. Yes.
Q. What format did that training take?
A. It was sitting with fellow Investigators and going out to do investigations, primarily as a second officer. When I say "Scots Law", I probably should correct that and say the Scottish way of dealing with cases, in 30
system showed an apparent shortfall in a branch?
A. I don't recall that being the case.
Q. It may follow: does that mean it didn't cover the elements of any such offences which the prosecution would be required to prove?
A. That's correct.
Q. Turning then, please, to training on disclosure obligations which were applicable in Scotland, could we have on screen, please, page 21 of the statement we have on screen. At the top of the page here, which is a continuation of paragraph 75 from the previous page, you say this:
"I learned on taking up my role in Scotland that it is the duty of the Investigator to do the same as in England, with the exception information is provided to the COPFS. The COPFS considers whether the information meets the disclosure test before disclosing the information. I attended some training on disclosure provided by ..."

There seems to be a gap there. Did you mean to say by an organisation? We'll come to the document in a moment, so that may help you.
A. Erm -- (the witness read to himself)

Yes, the disclosure would have been the -- in relation to the presentation from the Crown Office and 32

Procurator Fiscal Service.
Q. You say:

> "... I have located a copy of the presentation that was given which I exhibit to my statement ..."
A. That's correct.
Q. Could we have on screen, please, the presentation to which you are referring? That reference, POL00129134, please. The Inquiry understands this document to date to May 2009. Can you help with whether that is correct?
A. I honestly -- I think it mentioned a date further on but I can't recall what date it was.
Q. It appears to be a PowerPoint presentation produced by Kirsty McGowan from the Policy Division, Crown Office. Was this training the first training you underwent which dealt specifically with disclosure obligations in Scotland?
A. Yes, I believe so.
Q. In terms of dates, can you recall how long after you took up your permanent role in 2005 you went on this training? As I say, in fairness to you, the Inquiry understand that this dates to May 2009.
A. If I put it into context, if this is the presentation I received in 2009, I would have been aware of disclosure to the Procurator Fiscal before that with my on-the-job training.
"unnecessary delays"; and in big bold capital letters,
"MISCARRIAGES OF JUSTICE". Do you recall this training now?
A. I recall attending -- it was Tulliallan, which was a police college. If you'd asked me to recollect the document without digging it out in the computer, I wouldn't have recollected it but, reading it, yes, I recall the training.
Q. You also refer in your first statement at paragraph 80 to a "Specialist Reporting Agencies -- Disclosure Course", run by the Scottish police college, which you attended on 20 October 2010. Just to clarify, is that the same training as the training that is the subject of these slides or was that a separate training event?
A. No, sorry. I -- when you say this was produced in 2009, I thought that was the training you were talking about in 2010 --
Q. Well, my question for you --
A. -- I think.
Q. -- to two different things in your statement: (i) the training you say you went on and you've discovered the document here --
A. Yeah.
Q. -- in relation to and, in a separate paragraph -- and perhaps we can go to it. It's paragraph 80 of the 35
Q. So you were given some on-the-job training, you say, in relation to disclosure obligations by your colleagues in the team who were mentoring you before this; is that what you're saying?
A. In a roundabout way, we wouldn't sit down and say, "This is disclosure training". It was as the job went on and you had to -- then you were producing your productions, as we call it in Scotland -- it's exhibits in England -that you are just -- you're providing them to the Procurator Fiscal. I don't think anybody really mentioned disclosure that I can recall. It was just something I learned to do and then it was covered by disclosure. I know it was disclosure but we didn't sit down and say, "Let's do disclosure training" to the Procurator Fiscal.
Q. Going to page 5 of this document, please, this sets out what the SRA -- so Specialist Reporting Agency, and the Post Office was a Specialist Reporting Agency at the times you were involved in -- is that right that --
A. Yes. Sorry, that's correct.
Q. "Record ALL relevant information obtained.
"Provide the Crown with all relevant information.
"Pursue all 'reasonable lines of inquiry'."
On page 9, please, the consequences of non-disclosure are set out: "Unnecessary trials"; 34
statement, that's page 22, please.
At paragraph 79, you refer to an email from the 5 October 2010 and an attachment, which was joining instructions, which we'll come on to. You detail the circumstances where you were due to attend the "Specialist Reporting Agencies -- Disclosure Course".
A. Yes.
Q. You say at the following paragraph:
"I believe I was asked to attend the training as I was the Investigation Manager covering Scotland (being based in Scotland at that time). I recall that I did attend on 20 October 2010."

Trying to clarify whether you attended one lot of training on disclosure or two, the PowerPoint presentation we've just looked at, with the big bold "MISCARRIAGES OF JUSTICE", was that a separate training event to this one being discussed here or the same one?
A. The same one.
Q. Could we have on screen, please, the materials which were provided by email ahead of the course you attended on 20 October 2010 -- apologies, you need a reference for that. POL00129145. So we have the date here, 20 October 2010, "Specialist Reporting Agencies -Disclosure Module, Joining Instructions".

Just to be clear, the PowerPoint presentation we 36
were looking at before, do you think that was one that was shown on this course, on 20 October 2010?
A. Yes.
Q. So that was the first time, on 20 October 2010, that you received formal training on disclosure obligations in Scotland --
A. Yes.
Q. -- is that right? Okay.

There is a page providing background to the course on page 9 of this document, please. This refers to Lord Coulsfield's report on disclosure, dated 12 September 2007. It says, four paragraphs down:
"Lord Coulsfield's report was published on 12 September 2007. The report forms the basis for the current Criminal Justice and Licensing Bill 2008 which will create legislation dealing with disclosure which will be enacted in late 2010."

Then over the page, please, scrolling down a little, so we can see the whole page. This deals with the common law duty of disclosure, and it says at the top:
"It must be stressed that disclosure or the principles of disclosure are not a new concept. The principles currently exist in common law and have been emphasised in various stated cases and court decisions."

Then the case of Smith v HMA is referred to. The
2006. I think a copy of this has been quite recently provided to you by the Inquiry; do you know the document I'm referring to?
A. I don't. If you could remind me of it, please.
Q. The reference is WITN10510102. This is the document to which I was referring, Crown Office publication "Reports to the Procurator Fiscal, A Guide for Specialist Reporting Agencies, Seventh Edition".
A. I would have received that, yes.
Q. Can you recall who you would have received that from?

Was it the Post Office or the Crown Office?
A. I think it was the Crown Office.

MS PRICE: Sir, I wonder if that might be a convenient moment for our morning break, please.
SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, of course. What time shall we start? I'm equally --
MS PRICE: 11.35, sir.
SIR WYN WILLIAMS: I mistakenly took myself off screen instead of unmuting myself. I hope you got that, Ms Price.
MS PRICE: Thank you, sir.
SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Right, 11.35, please.
(11.21 am)
(11.36 am)
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## (A short break)

quote has in bold this:
"... it is their duty to put before the Procurator Fiscal everything which may be relevant and material to the issue of whether the suspected party is innocent or guilty. We repeat, it is not for the police to decide what is relevant and material but to give all the information which may be relevant and material."

Then it says this:
"The above decision quite clearly and concisely outlines the duties of the police in criminal investigations. However since that judgment a number of Specialist Reporting Agencies now conduct their own investigations and report directly to the Crown and the common law duty placed upon the police equally apply to SRAs."

Do you recall reading that joining instructions material ahead of the course?
A. Not at the time but I have recently pulled it back out and read that.
Q. Would you have read it ahead of the course?
A. I would have.
Q. In advance of the training session in October 2010, were you ever provided by the Post Office or by the Crown Office and Procurator Fiscal Service with the Crown Office Guide for Specialist Reporting Agencies dated 38

MS PRICE: Hello, sir.
SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Hello.
MS PRICE: Can you see and hear us?
SIR WYN WILLIAMS: I think so.
MS PRICE: Mr Daily, in terms of differences in the procedure governing investigations in England and Wales, on the one hand, and Mr Scotland, on the other, you identify number of these in your statements. In addition to the difference relating to the presence of a solicitor in interview, which we've already touched on, you raise the following in your witness statements. First, you deal with at paragraph 29, and if we could have that on screen, please, that's page 9.

At paragraph 29, you say:
"Regarding disclosure, my role involved disclosing information to solicitors representing suspects prior to an interview. As part of the prosecution process in England I would be required to complete the documents of the type at", and you give two references.

Those are disclosure schedules, aren't they?
A. That's correct.
Q. "... and other disclosure forms. These forms are not required in Scotland."

So this is the first additional difference you refer to.

40

What was required in Scotland, if those schedules of disclosure were not?
A. I can't recall if there were any.
Q. The second additional difference you raise is at paragraph 139 of your statement. If we can have that on screen, please. That's page 37. You say at 139:
"Another differs is that, in England, we are only required to summarise the tape transcripts from an interview, while in Scotland we are required to type out the full tape transcripts from an interview."

So that's another difference that you're highlighting in your statement?
A. That's correct.
Q. Third, you refer to evidential requirements, and this is at paragraph 137. So back one page, please, towards the bottom. Here you say:
"The process also differed in that in Scotland corroboration of evidence is required; you need to have two separate sources of evidence. For example, if a person transacts a deposit into their bank account using Horizon without putting the money in the drawer, the two sources of evidence could be drawn from the Horizon data, bank statements, CCTV or witness evidence."

On this last difference, how did the requirement for 41
knowledgeable about Scots Law. I was concerned that I wasn't receiving the same legal support and I recall that I asked if Scottish solicitors could be sought to assist and advise on whether there was sufficient evidence to submit a file to COPFS. I was advised to identify a suitable firm, and after researching some candidates I identified BTO LLP Solicitors. I believed they would be best suited as they employed number of former Procurators Fiscal and had an office in Glasgow. I recall that I informed Jarnail Singh in POL Legal Services and I believe he contacted them and made arrangements for them to advise me on Scottish cases."

When you say it was recognised by Post Office Legal
Services that they weren't knowledgeable about Scots Law, do you mean that there were no Scottish qualified lawyers within the Criminal Law Team?
A. Correct.
Q. Is it right, therefore, that before to managing to gain approval for BTO Solicitors to advise on Scottish cases in -- would it have been 2013 --
A. From that document, I believe it was.
Q. -- the Criminal Law Team was providing a decision on whether a case should be passed to the Crown Office and Procurator Fiscal Service without being qualified in Scottish law?
corroboration of evidence under Scots Law affect the investigations that you carried out in Scotland?
A. Sorry, could you repeat that, please?
Q. You've discussed at this paragraph the requirement for two sources of evidence, so corroborative evidence. How did this requirement in Scotland impact upon the investigations you carried out in Scotland, as opposed to those in England and Wales?
A. If you could only draw evidence from, for instance, the Horizon data and there was no supporting evidence, then you couldn't proceed with a case.
Q. Whereas, in England and Wales, Horizon data alone would be sufficient, would it?
A. I believe so.
Q. Turning, please, to the change in the process for investigations in Scotland to allow for the involvement of a Scottish firm to solicitors, could we have on screen, please, paragraph 21 of the statement. That is page 7. At paragraph 21, you say this:
"In my performance review for 2013/14, at POL00105145, I refer (at pages 3 and 4) to some work I did to secure specialist legal advice for Scottish casework, when Scottish cases were submitted to POL Legal Services for review. It was recognised within POL Legal Services and the Security Team that they weren't 42
A. I believe so, yes.
Q. Did that concern you at the time?
A. It did concern me more when I was on my own in Scotland, so I'm about -- end of 2008/2009, possibly. I was the only Investigator and I just felt as if, at times,
I would pass a case down to the Criminal Law Team and there wasn't a full understanding of Scots Law. I did approach the subject, prior to 2013, requesting if we can get anyone but it just wasn't forthcoming at that time. I can't recall the dates when I did that.
Q. Can you recall how long before 2013 you raised that?
A. Possibly a couple of years. I just -- I can't be certain.
Q. Can you recall who you raised it with?
A. It would be my line management, first and foremost.
Q. Who, in particular, was that?
A. It was whoever was my line manager at that time. It may have been Andrew Daley, it may have been after him.
Q. When you did raise it, what was the response?
A. I can't recall what the response was but we just didn't get Scottish lawyers on board.
Q. Did BTO's involvement have any impact upon of the volume of recommendations to the Crown Office and Procurator Fiscal Service to prosecute?
A. As in did it increase the number we sent?
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Q. Either way, whether it increased or decreased?
A. It gave a more informed decision on whether it should go forward or not.
Q. Do you consider that Post Office Investigators in Scotland were not adequately supported prior to the appointment of BTO Solicitors to advise in 2013 ?
A. Yes.
Q. Turning, please, to your relationship with the Crown Office and Procurator Fiscal Service, did you have a particular point of contact at the Crown Office and Procurator Fiscal Service?
A. No.
Q. Were you ever asked, following submission of a case to the COPFS, to conduct further enquiries?
A. Yes.
Q. What kind of further enquiries would you be asked to conduct?
A. There are some documents that I was provided with that would be able to detail that. I can't think at this moment in time. It may be -- latterly, it was in regards to Horizon. It -- one of the main things they asked was "When was the money first taken?" or "When was it stolen?" and you had to provide an answer to that, and any information you could give.
Q. So, setting aside what happened after the Second Sight 45
Q. Did you observe any differences in how the Criminal Law Team approached prosecutions, when compared with the Crown Office and Procurator Fiscal Service?
A. Sorry, could you clarify?
Q. For example, in terms of the decision to prosecute, did you observe any difference in approach between the Criminal Law Team in cases in England and Wales and the approach of the Crown Office and Procurator Fiscal Service in Scotland?
A. I'm sorry, my mind's gone blank here. I don't think there was any differences in approach that I can think of. If any further evidence was required, then they approached ourselves in regards to that.
Q. Did you observe any difference in terms of consideration of public interest factors?
A. Not that I'm aware of.
Q. Did you observe any differences in terms of lines of inquiry to be pursued?
A. I would say the Procurator Fiscal was probably more direct because it didn't have an understanding of the workings of the Post Office.
Q. Did you observe any differences in terms of approach to disclosure, over and above the technical differences in disclosure obligations?
A. Not that I'm aware of.
A. I can't recall.
Q. You say at paragraph 14 of your first statement that each year, all managers within the Post Office have to complete a six-month and annual performance and development review. You've been referred to your performance and development review for 2013 to 2014 by the Inquiry and you've commented on that in your statement.

More recently, the Inquiry has provided you with copies of one-to-one meetings with your line manager, Andrew Daley, from 2009. Have you had a chance to look through those 2009 and 2010 documents?
A. I did.
Q. I'd like to look, first, to those one-to-one line manager meetings with Andrew Daley. Could we have on screen, please, POL00333405. This document relates to a meeting on 9 November 2009 covering the period of the last three months.

Under "Update priorities met", it says:
"The following requirements/action points have been met ...
"1. Taken over Raymond's ex-cases, and have registered these via the SRA system, progressing towards PF ..."

Is that Procurator Fiscal?
A. It is, yes.
Q. "... prosecution."

In the box below there are some comments from Mr Daley, which read as follows:
"Following my meeting with Robert, I found that he is a motivated member of the Security Team. He has taken over some difficult cases from Raymond. One case is fairly intricate and has taken to bring to fruition. None of Raymond's cases were reported to the PF, so Robert is under pressure to register them with the PF (online) and progress them to the point of prosecution. He is doing very well processing the stagnant cases and the fruits of his labour will show in the New Year, although PF cases take ages to prosecute, once it's handed over to the PF. Robert also has [very] good ideas and is very motivated. Robert took the opportunity to liaise with the PF and establish whether the PO Fraud Strand can assist them with the a different type of report, etc. He is awaiting a date to meet with the PF. It is also clear that he has a good working relationship with his local CM, Brian Trotter."

Pausing there, who was Brian Trotter.
A. He was the Contracts Manager for Scotland along with Robert Finlay.
Q. Mr Daley goes on:

## is that right?

A. That's correct.
Q. Did you feel under pressure to refer these cases to the Procurator Fiscal, given the apparent backlog and the fact that you were the only Investigator in Scotland?
A. I'm not sure how I felt at the time, to be honest with you. I know -- and I can't recall all the cases that were there or how many it was, I couldn't really say how I felt at the time.
Q. Did you feel that the Investigation Team in Scotland was understaffed?
A. Yes.
Q. Did this have an impact on the quality of your investigations?
A. I don't think so, no.
Q. The next box at the bottom deals with "Progress against Personal Objectives, and the first column sets out the relevant objective, if we can go over the page, please -- and going over one more page, please, to the top there. We can see an objective:
"Recovery of $40 \%$ of monies from investigations conducted to have a positive return rate against investigation element of team." last meeting", it says:
"Robert has at least double the amount of cases, due 49

In the next column, which deals with "Progress since
to volume of cases raised in Scotland and the size of Scotland. Robert is the only Investigator in Scotland. This has placed him under some pressure but he is coping well. Robert has such a good relationship with the CMs and other [Post Office] staff, these cases find their way to him, once detected. I will get the rest of the team to also take on more workload in the Scottish region, so that Robert is not overloaded."

You have referred in your second statement to you and Raymond Grant being the only Investigators in Scotland in 2008; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. It appears that, by this point, in November 2009, you were the only Investigator in Scotland; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Why had none of Mr Grant's cases been reported to the Procurator Fiscal; can you recall?
A. I've no idea.
Q. Did you review these cases before passing them to the Procurator Fiscal's office?
A. I can't recall which stage of the investigation those cases were at. They may have been ready just to be reported, they may not have. I can't recall.
Q. This point in time in November 2009 was before you had had the benefit of any advice from Scottish solicitors; 50
"Exceeding target, see Excel data attached."
Is this a reference to recovery of monies from those who were prosecuted, whether by way of confiscation proceedings or civil recovery?
A. It may not just have been for prosecutions. It may have been those that weren't prosecuted.
Q. Is it right that, as an Investigator, you were set a target for recovery of monies from those who were investigated?
A. Yes.
Q. Was your performance measured in part against your target?
A. Not as a whole. When you investigated someone, you would ask if they were in a position to repay the money. Not everyone was. So it would have been part of the personal development review but not as a whole.
Q. If you had not met your target of recovery of 40 per cent of monies from investigations conducted, would you have been marked down?
A. Not necessarily. It all depends on how you performed in the other parts of your objectives.
Q. It appears from this document that you exceeded your target for this period. How was that rewarded, if at all, by Post Office?
A. It wasn't. It was just part of my targets.
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Q. Going over the page, please, we can see the next box is "Review of Behaviours/Action", and, going over the page again, please, there seemed to be some examples. Are these examples given by you?
A. Yes, they are.
Q. The third example says this:
"Earlston PO. Took on case from colleague. Advised Procurator Fiscal on analysis of Horizon information. Unfortunately she deemed insufficient evidence for theft. Discussed a charge of 'Uttering' ..."

Can you help with what "uttering" is?
A. I couldn't tell you the legal term but "uttering" is basically to produce something you know to be false.
Q. "... as postmaster that had repaid $£ 3,000$. This was considered and accepted. Awaiting outcome of plea from defence."
A. Yeah.
Q. You were providing here an example of you analysing Horizon information. Can you help with what analysis you would have been doing?
A. I can't recall that. It may have been information that was already in the case file when I took it over. I don't recall doing any further work on that case file. I believe it was already with the Procurator Fiscal and it may have been assistance the Procurator Fiscal was 53

Horizon wasn't, then they would consider that to be insufficient evidence because one doesn't help the other, if you --
SIR WYN WILLIAMS: So there had to be two independent pieces of evidence, yes?
A. Yes.

SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes.
MS PRICE: Mr Daily, being aware of the need for corroborative evidence of Horizon data, were there still cases being put forward to the Crown Office and Procurator Fiscal Service relying solely on Horizon data?
A. You say "solely" as in the only evidence?
Q. As in there was not corroborative evidence, there wasn't a second source. The reason I ask, Mr Daily, is it would appear, on one reading of this, that there was analysis of Horizon information that was put forward to the Procurator Fiscal's office and it was deemed insufficient evidence for theft.

So my question is: notwithstanding the need for two sources, were cases still being put forward with one source, Horizon data?
A. No, they wouldn't have been put forward as one source. You'd have put more than one production in, in regards to the -- whether it was a theft or embezzlement. You 55
requesting, in -- regarding Horizon information disclosed.
Q. Where you were doing analysis of Horizon information, were you analysing printouts from the branch, from the Horizon system, or audit data obtained from Fujitsu, or both?
A. I don't recall. I couldn't honestly tell you.
Q. You appear here to have been dissatisfied with the Procurator Fiscal's decision that there was insufficient evidence of theft based on the Horizon data. Was this an issue that came up frequently in Scotland, that Horizon data alone would be deemed insufficient to prove theft?
A. I'm not too sure if that was just due to the Horizon information. That may not have been that. It may have been other evidence as well. I honestly could not say if that was just down to Horizon information. I don't recall.
SIR WYN WILLIAMS: I'm not trying to be too legalistic about this but Horizon information alone would not be sufficient, would it, if there's a requirement for corroboration?
A. That's correct. If they were relying on Horizon and another piece of evidence, whatever that evidence was, and they felt the other piece was sufficient but the 54
would provide the documents to the Procurator Fiscal. The Procurator Fiscal, as with exhibits, would look at those productions and, if it was two of those independent sources were sufficient to proceed to a prosecution, he would take them forward. If there wasn't, then the case would be dropped. You wouldn't just be putting forwards the Horizon data itself, on any case.
Q. Could we have on screen, please, POL00333406. This is another one-to-one meeting, record of a meeting between you and Mr Daley, Andrew Daley. It relates to a meeting on 4 February 2010 by telephone, relating to the previous three months. Mr Daley's comments are recorded in box 3 and read as follows:
"Robert remains one of the top investigators in the Fraud Strand. His keen attitude and commitment is exemplified in the prosecutions and especially the recovery of the loss, (see spreadsheet). Robert is always willing to assist there he can even if this means that he has to travel long distances or work long hours. He has a can do attitude and looks at all the avenues nor to prosecute a case but he is also mindful of the Scottish regional system and the various regional PF idiosyncrasies.
"I am concerned that Robert is trying to do too much 56
in Scotland, and get bogged down. If a wave of Scottish cases arise, (New Horizon rollout findings) these will need to be allocated to other investigators who must attend to them, without Robert assisting (taking statements, etc), otherwise he will just get bogged down with their work."

The reference here to you looking at all avenues to prosecute a case, you say in your first statement at paragraph 64 that you played no role in relation to prosecution decision making. It might appear from that comment that you were actively trying to secure prosecution decisions from the Crown Office and Procurator Fiscal Service; is that right?
A. No, that's not correct at all. I can see how that looks but l'm not sure why my line manager at the time, Andrew Daley, wrote it that way, because all I can do is take a case, look at all the evidence and, if there's sufficient evidence at that time to put it forward to the Procurator Fiscal, that's what I did, and it's the Procurator Fiscal -- you can't persuade a Procurator Fiscal to prosecute. They make that decision independently.
Q. Can you help with why you needed to be mindful of the Scottish legal system and the various regional Procurator Fiscal's idiosyncrasies? 57
through stakeholder engagement, technical elements of inquiries are effectively deployed -- (searches of persons/premises).
"Ensuring full engagement with FIs ..."
Is that Financial Investigators?
A. It is, yes.
Q. "... and police contacts optimising POCA powers to achieve maximum possible recovery (eg monetary recovery/asset recognition).
"Ensure all intervention measures are adopted to recover stolen funds."

It appears here that the target for loss recovery has increased since the 2009 one-to-one meeting record we looked at. Then you were over target, at 40 per cent, and here the objective is 65 per cent. Is that right, that the target was increased by the Post Office?
A. I believe that target was increased after I was sent a document with my objectives for 20 -- I can't remember if it was ' 12 to ' 14 or ' 11 to ' 12 , and it was the same figure of 65 per cent on it. It was increased at some point, yes.
Q. Why was it increased?
A. I can only think it was because of the amount of losses the Post Office was suffering.
A. I'm not sure why he wrote that either. I don't understand what he was talking there -- talking about.
Q. Does the reference to the new Horizon rollout here refer to the rollout of Horizon Online?
A. I believe it would have been, if that's when it was rolled out in 2010.
Q. Was it expected that there would be a wave of cases following its rollout?
A. They were sending not just Auditors, I think it was trainers, in to do cash checks prior to Horizon Online going in. From what I recall, they thought there may be a lot of cash shortages identified when this was getting done.
Q. Could we have on screen, please, POL00105025. This document is the individualised objectives for Security Team members for 2013 to 2014. The objectives for you are set out on pages 128 to 129. Could we go to page 128, please. We can see your name and the first two boxes on this page refer to core behaviours.

Just scrolling down, please, then over to the next page, the third objective is:
"To ensure a robust approach to fraud loss recovery with a return rate of $65 \%$.
"Activity to include:
"Ensure that evidence opportunities are maximised 58
Q. Was this target indicative of the recovery of funds from those being investigated being a high priority within the Post Office?
A. Sorry, can you clarify what you mean there?
Q. This target, and the fact that it had been increased, is that indicative that the recovery of funds from those being investigated was a high priority within the Post Office?
A. It was never looked upon as that when we received our targets or objectives but it would suggest it was.
Q. Was this a target set for all Post Office Investigators?
A. Yes.
Q. It was a target you were aware of because it was part of your performance objectives?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you think this ever influenced the conduct of investigations you were charged with?
A. No.
Q. Could we have on screen, please, POLO0105145. This is a record of your one-to-one performance review with Helen Dickinson for the year 2013/14. If we can go over the page, please, we see "Reviewee", you, and "Review Owner", Helen Dickinson. Was the purpose of the performance review to review performance against the objectives which had been set?
A. Yes.
Q. Could we go, please, to page 2 of this document. Well, we're on page 2 , in fact, so about halfway down the page. You say about halfway down:
"My PDR is completed to timescale ..."
A. Yes.
Q. Then there's a hashtag 160 :
"I have achieved an $86 \%$ recovery $(£ 68,733)$ in my cases."

So it appears from this that you had exceeded your 65 per cent target; is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. To repeat a question I asked before, how was meeting this objective at this stage rewarded by the Post Office?
A. I understand where this is coming from, where we had been given bonuses for recovering money. It was part of our objectives to do so, it didn't necessarily rely on a bonus. We received a bonus every year, regardless.
Q. The bonuses that were received, for whatever reason, were those individual bonuses or team bonuses?
A. No, they were individual bonuses in how you performed over the year, if you've performed better than someone else. So, technically, you could say this went towards but if you speak to individuals within the Investigation 61

Scotland FIs are no longer to be used as a Debt Collecting Agency for external business. I have set up and attended an initial meeting with Police Scotland and Post Office Limited FI ..."

Then we have the same set of symbols:
"The meeting discussed how POL can access recovery from POCA through a complicated legal system. I am currently engaging with the Scottish Business Resilience Centre to ascertain if there are any agreed protocols concerning other Government bodies utilising POCA powers. This is an issue that has never been progressed like the rest of the UK and I am determined to progress this as far as possible to ensure POL Scotland have the same recovery procedures and support as in the rest of the UK.
"This continues to be a work in progress and SBRC are making enquiries to assist POL. I have discussed with BTO Solicitors regarding running a civil case alongside the criminal case to ensure that POL are at the forefront of creditors. A draft is being worked on by BTO to be put to POL for consideration. I am taking all steps to ensure POL can recover funds from subpostmasters."

When you say, "The Crown Office had deemed that Police Scotland [Financial Investigators] were no longer

Team, the Investigation Managers, it was always considered an unfair target because any inquiry you did, any case you did, all you could say to the person, "Were you in a position to repay the money?" If that person didn't have the money, you couldn't get blood out of a stone.
Q. Could we go page 4 of this document, please, about two-thirds of the way down the page is a heading "Financial Investigators". Under this heading, you say this:
"I have long recognised that an FI [Financial Investigator] is required for Scotland as the Crown Office has now deemed that Police Scotland FI ..."

Can you help with that, "rsquo;s"?
A. Unfortunately, it was a system we put it into, when we printed it out, as you can see with 160 plus hashtag ...
Q. Is that Police Scotland --
A. That's a pound --
Q. -- Fls?
A. It's FI and it's Police Scotland Financial Investigation -- Investigators, and there was another name. I can't recall what the other name was but it was just to Scotland Financial Investigators.
Q. So:
"... the Crown Office has now deemed that Police 62
to be used as a Debt Collecting Agency for external business", does this mean that this is how Police Scotland Financial Investigators had been viewed, at least by the Post Office, prior to this?
A. I don't believe that's how they were viewed by the Post Office and I don't think that was in regards to the Post Office, that statement coming out.
Q. How did the Crown Office convey this stance to the Post Office?
A. I can't recall how it was conveyed.
Q. What did you propose, insofar as you can recall, in relation to the use of POCA when you met with Police Scotland?
A. I think it was to ask them about their powers in the recovery of assets or basically cash, and I'm sure that in Scotland you need to -- and I could be wrong -a Section 3, and if -- none of the Financial Investigators had a Section 3. I can't recall what was fully discussed but I think it was along those lines.
Q. You appear to attach significant importance to this issue in your performance review; is that fair?
A. When you write a performance review, you are flowering things up to make it look good, in fairness, and when I say it was the main thing, the main issue for me, it wasn't, as such -- what I did recognise was in England 64
and Wales there was Financial Investigators making recoveries, and I took it with BTO Solicitors, and it was another avenue to look at in regard to a civil case and how we can recover any losses to the Post Office.
Q. Was this issue something you understood to be of significant importance for Senior Managers within the Security Team?
A. Yes, if they were going to put a 65 per cent recovery on it, then they had to view Scotland the same as everyone else.
Q. You refer in your first statement to a financial evaluation form
A. Yes.
Q. Could we have paragraph 18 of Mr Daily's first statement on screen, please. It is page 6 of the first statement. At paragraph 18 you say this:
"In my CV ... I mention the Financial Evaluation
form. Following an interview with a suspect, I was required to complete a Financial Evaluation Sheet. This detailed the suspect's name, the Post Office branch and what they had said about the loss; the form also recorded my opinion on the loss and any financial details given by the suspect, including how they intended to repay any monies. Although I had to complete the form for Scottish cases, it was recognised 65
indication as to the title of the piece is "Postmistress who stole 75,000 to pay back just 1."

Then going back up, please, to Ms Topham's email to you, she says:
"One of my other cases!! Something to cheer you up!!"

What discussions had you had with Ms Topham about this case, about the Seema Misra case, if any?
A. I've no idea because it wasn't my case. I can only think that we had to inform the Former Agents Debt Team if we'd got a recovery, from what I recall, and, if I had informed her that on a case that we hadn't got a recovery, she may have just sent this to me because she wasn't getting in any -- they weren't getting any recovery from that one as well.

Why Zoe sent it to me -- I can't recall why she sent it but the Misra case was not one of my cases.
Q. Okay.

Can you offer any insight into why she thought this was something that might cheer you up?
A. I think that was a sarcastic comment.
Q. That document can come down now. Thank you.

Moving, please, to ARQ data requests. You say in your first statement at paragraph 19 that cases had to be submitted within appropriate timescales and that you 67
that POL Financial Investigators did not have the authority to conduct a financial investigation in Scotland."

Was this form part of the strategy for recovery of monies from those being investigated?
A. Yes, it was.
Q. Was the purpose of this form to assess the chances of recovery of monies?
A. Yes.
Q. So this form, just to be clear, was not a way of trying to follow the money, so to speak, to establish whether, for example, theft had occurred?
A. No, the form itself was -- sorry, the form itself was to try and obtain information on what assets a suspect had and it was passed to Financial Investigators to then follow that through.
Q. Just one more document on this topic, please, could we have on screen, please, POL00057678. This is an email from Zoe Topham to you, dated 3 March 2012. Apologies, that may be the wrong way round, looking at the email below. I think that may be 3 May -- scrolling up, please -- 3 May 2012. It forwards a link, originally sent by Alison Bolsover to you which appears, scrolling down, please, to be a news article relating to the Seema Misra case, and it's www.getsurrey.co.uk/news, and the 66
believe this may have been 12 days from the interview of a suspect; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Was that the case for both England and Wales and Scotland?
A. Yes.
Q. So by 12 days post-interview, you were expected to have filed your investigation report with the Criminal Law Team; is that right?
A. You had to at least provide an interim report, if I recall, because you may not have conducted all your inquiries.
Q. Is it fair to say you had limited time to conduct inquiries before you submitted at least an interim report?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you ever request $A R Q$ data from Fujitsu in an investigation before you submitted your interim or final investigation report to the Criminal Law Team, ie within that 12-day time frame?
A. I may have. There may have been occasions when I didn't and that was recorded in the interim report that had been requested. You had to -- you would not have got the ARQ data back within 12 days, from what I recall, so it would -- if there was any mention, it would be that 68
you'd requested it.
Q. In terms of the circumstances in which ARQ data was sought from Fujitsu, could we have on screen, please, paragraph 89 of Mr Daily's first statement. It is page 24. At paragraph 29, you say this:
"Paragraph 29 of the Request asks ARQ data requested from Fujitsu as a matter of course when a shortfall had been identified and the relevant SPM/SPM's manager(s) or assistant(s)/Crown Office employee(s) attributed the shortfall to problems with Horizon."

In response to that question, you say:
"ARQ data was not requested from Fujitsu as a matter of course. It would any have been requested if it was relevant to an enquiry."

In what circumstances would ARQ data have been considered relevant to an inquiry?
A. It may have been in relation to what we call giro suppression, suppression of someone's bank statements. If it was suspected they were paying money into a bank account -- or it could be a card account enquiry, where you tend to find it was elderly people, a member of the family had noted that there was money being taken from their account and the person had approached a counter and was told that the PIN wasn't working and to put the PIN in again, and the postmaster was suspected of 69
alone, so to speak, would request $A R Q$ data where you thought it might support the prosecution case?
A. Yes, sir.

SIR WYN WILLIAMS: If the suggestion was that it might undermine it, you would send it up the line; is that it?
A. You would include it in the report but you would -I would likely request a statement from Fujitsu in regards to whether there was issues at that branch.
SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Right.
A. That would go with the -- that would be requested through, along with the ARQ data at the time, sir.
MS PRICE: Could we go over the page, please, to paragraph 92. In this paragraph, you are addressing an email in which you requested audit data from Fujitsu and you say in this paragraph that you would only contact Fujitsu if it was specifically required for a case.

Do you mean by this that you would only contact Fujitsu if you were asked to by someone else?
A. I recall, if I remember correctly, after viewing the documents, I'd received a statement from Andy Dunks from Fujitsu. I needed a signed copy of that statement and I went direct to him, only because l'd been copied in on an email with his details on it. That was in relation just to getting a statement signed, I believe that's
stealing the second amount. So you'd be looking for ARQ data to see and request the card details for that, that person's account.

And that would tell you when -- how many transactions were done out of that card account at a time.
Q. Did you ever request ARQ data with the purpose of investigating a suggestion by a subpostmaster or assistant or manager or an employee of the Post Office, that the Horizon system was the cause of an apparent shortfall?
A. In relation to it just being -- that being the problem, I don't recall it just being in regards to that because if there was a -- if they suggested it was a problem with Horizon, then it would be put into the report to be submitted up to the line manager and forwarded on, and I would expect that to be followed through by -- then by Fujitsu. The ARQ data would be, I can only think, in relation to a product we may believe that money was paid into or as I stated previously.

Sorry, I should add to that, if someone had said it was Horizon data, we would have requested a statement from Fujitsu.
SIR WYN WILLIAMS: So the impression I'm getting, and correct it if I'm wrong, Mr Daily, is that you acting 70
what that was. Otherwise, any request for Fujitsu, including statements, went through the Post Office Security Team or the Casework Team, as it was.
Q. I'd like to turn, please, to the investigation and prosecution of Peter Holmes. You deal with this case at paragraphs 97 to 132 of your statement. It's right, isn't it, that you interviewed Mr Holmes following the identification of an apparent shortfall by an audit conducted in September 2008 at the Post Office branch which he managed?
A. Yes.
Q. You also completed an investigation report, in fact two investigation reports, an interim one and a final one --
A. Yes.
Q. -- which were submitted to the Criminal Law Team, and you completed a schedule of non-sensitive unused material in the case, saying in your first statement to the Inquiry that you were the Disclosure Officer in the case; is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. Starting, please, with the interview of Mr Holmes on 19 September 2008, could we have the report of tape recorded interview on screen, please. It is POL00050208. We can see, on the face of this, that the interview was on 19 September, the duration of the 72
interview was 45 minutes. You were listed as the
Interviewing Officer and Christopher Knight was the
Second Interviewing Officer; is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. Going to page 2, please, about halfway down the page,
you asked about Mr Holmes' experience with Horizon and you say:
"And your experience with Horizon how would you rate it?"

Mr Holmes' response was:
"Very slow it's okay, it's an Auditor's tool, that
particular one we had problems with because it was
connected to a telephone line that also had the fax machine connected to it.
"Question: What one's that Jesmond? 15
"Answer: Jesmond and we had BT engineers in looking 16 at the line, we had Horizon engineers in looking at the 17 line and eventually we had to take the fax machine out throw it away and get a new one in provided by Mr Khanna and now ..."

Mr Khanna was the subpostmaster; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. "... and now it seemed to work but there was a time there when it wasn't so slow, it wasn't so good. People using cards just weren't getting through. 73
at it and they found that there was 2 cash declarations made and 1 was well out and at the end of the out 46,000 odd was missing."

You give the exact figure there, and he says:
"Yeah.
"Question: So what can you tell me about the shortage then?
"Answer: I've absolutely no idea.
"Question: No idea?
"Answer: Absolutely no idea unless it's the Horizon that's let us down, I mean there's no one in there stolen 46,000 I haven't got it it's not in my bank account I spent too many years in the police force seeing things go wrong to start stealing money from anybody. I just, I really do not know."
"Question: Why is there 2 cash declarations then?"
"Answer: There was 1 in because I knew that we were showing short and I covered it up.
"Question: Covered what up?
"Answer: The fact that we were short in cash.
"Question: How much by?
"Answer: Not that much erm I can't remember the exact figure.
"Question: Roughly?
"Answer: It started off as 4 or 5,000 .
"Question: What period was that?
"Answer: I suppose 9 months alleged for 3 months."
So we're talking about the beginning of this year,

## December?

"Yeah I'm not very good with times but yes possibly."

Then:
"PH states that they had engineers coming on over a 3-month period."

Over the page, please, towards the bottom at 14.50, we then have a summary:
"PH explains that the computer program is really slow at the end of the day taking up to 1 and half hours. He continued that Doreen leaves about 6.30 pm with him staying until 7.30 pm ."

Later in the interview, you ask Mr Holmes about the apparent shortage found on audit of just over $£ 46,000$. It's page 8 of this document, please, starting at 26.04. You ask:
"Right okay well the situation here then Peter that the audit have come in on 18 September 2008 can you tell me what happened that morning?"
"Answer: Yes Sunil let me in, give me the keys, they Auditors introduced themselves I looked at their passes went into the Post Office and let them have a go 74
"Question: When was that?
"Answer: Oh 6 or 9 months ago.
"Question: When you said it started off 4 or 5,000 what did it creep up to?
"Answer: Well it's up to 46,000 now."
So Mr Holmes was clear in saying that there had been problems with the Horizon system in the branch, necessitating the attendance of an engineer, wasn't he? The first part of the interview that we'd looked at.
A. Yes.
Q. He was suggesting here that the apparent shortfall might have been caused by the Horizon system, wasn't he?
A. Yes.
Q. You deal with this at paragraph 98 of your first statement. Could we have that on screen, please. It's page 27 of the first statement. At paragraph 98 you say this:
"Paragraph 38 of the Request asks me if I was aware of any allegations made by Peter Holmes relating to the reliability of the Horizon IT System and, if so, what I thought the significance of this was. Mr Holmes indicated during interview that the loss may be down to the Horizon system. At the time, I don't believe I would have been aware of the significance of this, as I don't recall being aware of any issues with Horizon at 76
the time. Mr Holmes said he couldn't explain the losses, and [I] didn't believe anyone else in the office had stolen [the] money."

In terms of what you did to investigate the issues being raised by Mr Holmes, we are assisted to some extent by an interim investigation report you completed in October 2008. Could we have that on screen, please, it's POL00050334. If we could go to the second page of this document, please, it is only two pages, just scrolling down to the bottom, we can see the date there, 6 October 2008. About halfway in the middle of this page, you deal with Mr Holmes' account given in interview, and can we scroll up a little, please. You say:
"Mr Holmes denied theft of the money however admitted false accounting over a period of no less than 9 months.
"Horizon data has been requested to ascertain when
Mr Holmes started producing false cash declaration and subsequently false accounts.
"Mr Holmes made allegations the Horizon equipment was faulty over a period of time in early 2008.
A request has been made to ascertain if this was the case.
"These papers are submitted for the current position 77
relation to the system?
A. Yes.
Q. Going, please, to page 7 of this document, the second
line down, you say this:
"Mr Holmes also made allegations the Horizon
equipment was faulty over a period of time in 2008.
This has been checked and the allegations are unfounded."

Going further down the page, please, about
two-thirds of the way down:
"Mr Holmes has attempted to blame the Horizon system
on the shortages, however checks have revealed no problems."

In relation to the checks that you referred to here, you address this at paragraph 104 of your first statement. Can we have that on screen, please, it's page 28. At paragraph 104, you say this:
"Paragraph 44 of the Request asks me to consider my investigation reports ... In particular, my report [that is the interim report] refers to a request being made to ascertain whether Horizon equipment at the Jesmond branch was faulty. I note that at [your final report] at page 7, my report suggest that checks had revealed no problems with Horizon. I cannot recall what checks were carried out in relation to Horizon at the branch, who
to be noted."
So this was an interim investigation report, was it?
A. Yes.
Q. Focusing first on the request you say was made to ascertain whether the Horizon equipment was faulty, you revisit this in your final investigation report. Could we have that on screen, please. It's POL00050832. Going to page 8 of this document, please, which is the last page, we can see that it is dated 30 January 2009.

Going back to page 3, please, the last paragraph on this page. Scrolling down, please, right the way down, please:
"Questions were put to Mr Holmes regarding the [figure of the loss there] shortage discovered at audit. Mr Holmes said the auditors found that there were two cash declarations made and that one was around $£ 46,000$ out. Mr Holmes stated he had no idea what happened to the money, adding it may have been the Horizon system. He further stated nobody in the office had stolen the $£ 46,000$. He then said he didn't have it, it wasn't in his bank account. He further said he had spent too many years in the police force seeing things go wrong, to start stealing money from anyone."

So you put into your investigation report, didn't you, the issues that were being raised by Mr Holmes in 78
carried out the checks or what the results were. I've considered all the documents and can't find anything in relation to the request or the results of the checks."

As you note in your statement here, there is no record that the Inquiry has been able to find to evidence any request for checks to be carried out, what any checks consisted of or what the result of any of those checks were. No material was disclosed in the course of the prosecution of Mr Holmes to show what checks were undertaken or how they were said to refute Mr Holmes' concerns about the Horizon equipment.

You completed the Schedule of Non-sensitive Unused Material in Mr Holmes' case. Could we have that on screen, please, it is POL00051527. Scrolling down to the bottom, please, we can see the date of this, 19 May 2009, as well as your name.

If we can scroll up a little, so we can see the list of material here, casting your eye down the list of material contained in this schedule, is there anything listed which you consider relates to the checks carried out to ascertain whether the Horizon equipment was faulty?
A. No.
Q. Any such material would have been disclosable in these proceedings, wouldn't it?
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A. Yes.
Q. Would you accept that the absence of such material being listed here reflects either a failure in the investigation, ie a failure to properly investigate the issues being raised by Mr Holmes and have those checks carried out, or --
A. No -- sorry --
Q. -- a failure in disclosure on your part?
A. No, I can't say it does. As I stated in my second statement, there would have been a list of exhibits and, without that list of exhibits, I can't say for definite what was disclosed to the Criminal Law Team. I would not have put those comments into my final report if I hadn't conducted them. I don't understand why there's no paperwork there in relation to them. I have asked for the Green file jacket, containing all the paperwork, and I've not been able to obtain that. That would at least give me some indication of how -- of what was requested and what the result of those checks were.
MS PRICE: Sir, that marks a break in subtopics under the case of Mr Holmes. I wonder if it might be convenient to take an early lunch at that point until 1.50?
SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, of course. So we'll break off for lunch until 1.50.

MS PRICE: Thank you, sir.
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A. Yes, I have.
Q. Does that assist with whether there is anything on the list of exhibits that would meet the description of material relating to a request for checks on the equipment at the branch, the nature of those checks or the result of those checks?
A. No.
Q. Okay. Would you accept, therefore, having looked through the Schedule of Unused Material and the list of exhibits, that no material relating to any checks done was, in fact, disclosed in the Holmes case?
A. That's correct.
Q. Would you accept that that reflects either a failure in investigation relating to the checks or a failure in disclosure in the case?
A. A failure in disclosure.
Q. In your interim investigation report, you said that Horizon data had been requested in the case of Peter Holmes and, in your final investigation report, you said that Horizon data requested, covering the period 21 August 2007 to 17 September 2008, had been received and analysed; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. You say in your statement at paragraph 112 that you do not believe you would have said the Horizon data had 83

```
(12.51 pm)
(The Short Adjournment)
(2.15 pm)
MS PRICE: Good afternoon, sir, can you see and hear us?
SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, thank you.
MS PRICE: Apologies for the slight delay in resuming. Sir,
    you will recall just before lunch Mr Daily referred to
    the list of exhibits in the Holmes case and needing to
    see that before being sure what was disclosed to the
    defence. We have, over lunch, been able to provide
    Mr Daily with the list of exhibits. For various
    reasons, I cannot display all of the parts of it on
    screen but I can provide the URNs but Mr Daily has had
    an opportunity to read those and I propose to ask him
    a couple of short questions about that with your
    permission, sir.
SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, of course.
MS PRICE: Mr Daily, just before lunch you referred to the list of exhibits in the Holmes case and not having had the opportunity to see that. We have, over lunch, provided you with four short documents which, together, make up, as we understand it, the list of exhibits in the case.
I should check first: have you had an opportunity to read through those documents?
```
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been requested, received and analysed if this had not been done; is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. Could we have on screen, please, paragraph 132 of Mr Daily's first statement, it is page 35. Towards the bottom of the page, please, paragraph 132, you say:
"I have considered the Court of Appeal judgment, and in particular paragraphs 226 to 230 relating to Mr Holmes. I noted the finding at paragraph 229 that ARQ data was obtained but that it was not clear if it was disclosed. I acknowledge that ARQ data was obtained, but cannot recall whether or not it was disclosed. If it was not disclosed, I cannot now offer a reason why that was."

You have confirmed in your statement that you were the Disclosure Officer in Mr Holmes' case and we've been through the Schedule of Unused Material and you've now had the opportunity to see the list of exhibits. Is there an item on either of those documents which would fit the description of ARQ data obtained from Fujitsu?
A. No, there's not.
Q. Disclosure of any ARQ data would have been the responsibility of the Disclosure Officer; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. If any ARQ data obtained was not disclosed, this would 84
have been a failure in disclosure, would it not?
A. Yes.
Q. Does it remain the case that you cannot offer a reason as to why ARQ data was not disclosed, if it was not?
A. I cannot offer any reason for it. I don't understand why it wasn't picked up by the Criminal Law Team.
Q. The Court of Appeal, in overturning Mr Holmes' conviction, found that there was no investigation into the integrity of the Horizon figures relied on by the Post Office. When Mr Holmes raised the concerns he did in interview, did you make any enquiries, whether of fellow Investigators or those more senior in the Security Team, as to whether others had experienced unexplained losses in their branch accounts or were attributing shortfalls to the Horizon system?
A. I don't believe I did. This was probably the first time I'd actually heard anyone mention in interview that there was a problem with Horizon or that they'd encountered a problem with Horizon.
Q. Were you made aware, by this point, of the outcome of the prosecution of Suzanne Palmer?
A. No, I wasn't aware of that.
Q. That was a case where Mrs Palmer was acquitted having raised Horizon issues in her defence. Nobody had raised that with you?

Royal Mail has conducted a thorough investigation and did not consider any alternative in relation to the allegation.
"3. The accused takes issue with the prosecution about these matters for the following reasons: no other member of staff has been investigated. I have put forward a full explanation of the money passing through my joint Barclays Account."

Having had the opportunity to reflect on this case in preparing to give evidence, would you accept that the investigation conducted by you was not thorough, as is suggested in this defence statement?
A. I would not have put in anything in my report if I hadn't requested it and looked at it, and I understand where you're coming from but I don't understand why it wasn't disclosed -- wasn't on the list of exhibits.
Q. That document can come down, thank you.

In your final investigation report, you commented:
"I would see no reason why we should not proceed with the prosecution of Mr Peter Anthony Holmes."

You say in your statement that you played no role in decision making about prosecutions but it appears that you did here offer a strong view on whether Mr Holmes should be prosecuted; would you accept that?
A. Yes.
A. No.
Q. Had anyone told you of any other cases where apparent shortfalls were being attributed to the Horizon system by this point?
A. Not that I recall.
Q. Could we have on screen, please, POL00052178. This is Mr Holmes' defence statement in the case. In it, scrolling down, please, Mr Holmes admits to false accounting but denies theft. Mr Holmes was ultimately acquitted of theft by direction of the judge. Mr Holmes says this in the first three paragraphs:
"The nature of the accused's defence is: As stated in my interview under caution with representatives of Royal Mail I did not steal any monies from Jesmond Post Office. I believe that either the Horizon system has on occasion been at fault and ultimately created the shortfall by creating incorrect entries. The monies entering the joint Barclays Account are proceeds from my wife's business.
"I do accept that I did falsify documents to cover the discrepancies but this was only because I thought error notices would be generated and that the money was not actually missing.
"2. The accused takes issue with the prosecution in relation to the following matters: I do not believe that 86
Q. You also offered your view on the expert accounting report obtained by the defence in Mr Holmes' case, which dealt among other things, with the question of whether payments into Mr and Mrs Holmes' joint account were from Mrs Holmes' business; do you remember that?
A. Yes.
Q. You deal with this at paragraph 121 of your first statement. Could we have that on screen, please. It's page 33 of that first statement. You say here at paragraph 121:
"I recall receiving the expert accountant's report ... I cannot recall conducting further enquiries or what my response to the report, but having considered the document UKGI00014638 (an email I sent to Juliet McFarlane on 19 August 2009), I can see that I was of the opinion that, without seeing the business's daily takings for the period in question, I couldn't agree with the expert accountant's conclusions."

Could we have on screen, please, the document to which you're referring in this paragraph. It's UKGI00014638. This is the email from you to Juliet McFarlane dated 19 August 2009. At the outset, you say: "In regards to the Expert Accountant's Report ...
"I cannot ascertain how much from the business has been deposited without a full list of daily takings for 88
the period. I have any received extracts."
That seems to be what you're referring to in your witness statement as to your view on the takings. You then set out, at some length, just scrolling down, your observations on the report and you conclude over the page in this way:
"Whereas the Expert Report views the amounts in to the Barclays Account is the takings from the business, my view is the manner in which the deposits are made suggests differently. However without the daily takings for the period I cannot say for certain."

It appears from this email that you wish to see the takings to enable you to rebut what the expert had concluded; is that right?
A. I wouldn't say it was to rebut what the expert said; it was just to confirm what he was saying.
Q. Was it common for you, as an Investigator, to provide comments to assist challenge of an expert report?
A. I was asked to -- if I accepted the expert's report and I don't think I'd be -- it would be right for me to make a comment without actually seeing it.
Q. That document can come down. Thank you.

SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Well, before we leave it, it looks, Mr Daily, that you sent that email on the day before a court hearing. If you look at the last sentence of 89
time in Scotland, was the Lead Officer?
A. That's correct.
Q. This was the point at which, in 2008, you and Mr Grant were the only Post Office Investigators in Scotland; is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. At some point in 2009, Mr Grant left the Post Office and the case file was transferred to you?
A. That's correct.
Q. Could we have paragraph 13 of Mr Daily's second statement on screen, please. It is page 8 of WITN08940200. At paragraph 13 you say:
"Paragraph 16 of the Second Request asks me what investigations were made into Mr Quarm's finances. Having considered the record of the interview which took place on 8.8.08 ... I note that I obtained some financial details from Mr Quarm in order to complete the Financial Evaluation form. Having considered the document ... (a letter Mr Quarm sent to Raymond Grant dated 12.8.08), I can see that Mr Quarm sent bank statements to Raymond Grant, together with a copy of his wife's P60. I don't recall any further investigations Raymond Grant made into Mr Grant's [sic] finances." In terms of your other involvement in the case, in addition to obtaining financial details to complete the 91
it. It's on the next page. You say you were going to take a hard copy of your file to court "tomorrow", yes?
A. Yes, sir.

SIR WYN WILLIAMS: So at court did you ask to see those parts of the underlying material which the expert had used, in order to reach his conclusions?
A. I wasn't required to attend court, sir.

SIR WYN WILLIAMS: So after you sent that email, you were told you needn't attend; is that right?
A. I believe that would be the case, yes, sir.

SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Because, obviously, at the time of the email, you were going to court?
A. Correct, sir

SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Anyway, you didn't go to court?
A. No, I wasn't required to go to court. I think Mr Holmes had pled (sic) guilty to the charges of false accounting after the email. I can't be certain.

SIR WYN WILLIAMS: All right.
MS PRICE: Turning then, please, to the investigation and prosecution of Mr William Quarm. You deal with your involvement in this case at paragraphs 7 to 26 of your second statement, and do feel free to have that in front of you if it assists. Is it right that you were initially involved as the Second Officer in the case, and that Raymond Grant, who was an Investigator at the 90
financial evaluation form, you were present at an interview with Mr Quarm on 7 August 2008; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Could we have the record of that interview on screen, please. The reference is POL00166599. We have the date there, the date of the interview, 7 August 2008, William Quarm being interviewed. 44 minutes of interview, and the Interviewing Officers are listed as Raymond Grant and you. You appear to be the Second Officer in this interview; is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. Could we go, please, to the bottom of page 9 of this document. Three questions up from the bottom, please. Mr Grant asks about the shortage discovered at audit. He says:
"Going on then to what happened at the audit, the Audit Team discovered a shortage which had been declared to me as, excuse me for a second, $£ 40,277.76$ do you agree with the audit findings, were you here when the audit took place?
"Answer: Oh well I was around yeah.
"Question: Yeah and did the Auditors ask you do you agree their findings did you disagree with what they discovered?"
Over the page, please:
"Answer: Well I told them that I wasn't happy
because I was sure there was an error way back in
January February the ATM.
"Question: Right okay.
"Answer: Set up.
"Question: Right when did you get your ATM in?
"Answer: Several years ago.
"Question: Was it and you've had it a couple of
years right [because] some offices are just getting them
now you see that's why I was asking. Now what do you
suspect the error with the ATM was then?
"Answer: I can't remember the details now.
I worked out that the there should have been
a difference and I showed it on the, on the.
"Question: The branch trading statements?
"Answer: Aye for a while and then somebody phoned
Then this seems to be a question from you:
"RD: How much was the difference?
"Answer: I don't remember now.
"Mr Grant: Did you say January this year?
"Answer: January February."
Then you say:
"Right okay. Where were you showing it on the
Then this seems to be a question from you:
"RD: How much was the difference? 20
"Answer: I don't remember now. 21
"Mr Grant: Did you say January this year? 22
"Answer: January February." 23
Then you say: 24
"Right okay. Where were you showing it on the
"Do you ever remember taking money out of the Post
Office to pay an invoice?
"Answer: Not consciously no."
You say: "Not consciously?"
"Answer: No."
Page 33 of this document, please. Raymond Grant
asks about four questions down:
"You're declaring what was actually on hand but then
what you're saying to the Horizon system that you're
making that good is that correct?
"Answer: Yeah.
"Question: Did you in fact put that money in to
make the shortage good?
"Answer: No there's a bank loan to do that.
"Question: There was, is that what this bank loan
that you were waiting on for?
"Answer: Yes.
"Question: Right, right. Now if you're saying that
you made that good, the following day your balance would
be back to zero?
"Answer: Yeah."
Then at page 38 of the transcript there is this.
Mr Grant, four questions down, says:
"Right so this figure is an inflated figure?
"Answer: Yeah.
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"Do you ever remember taking money out of the Post
Office to pay an invoice?
"Answer: Not consciously no."
You say: "Not consciously?"
"Answer: No."
Page 33 of this document, please. Raymond Grant
asks about four questions down:
"You're declaring what was actually on hand but then
what you're saying to the Horizon system that you're
making that good is that correct?
"Answer: Yeah.
"Question: Did you in fact put that money in to make the shortage good?
"Answer: No there's a bank loan to do that.
"Question: There was, is that what this bank loan that you were waiting on for?
"Answer: Yes.
"Question: Right, right. Now if you're saying that you made that good, the following day your balance would be back to zero?
"Answer: Yeah."
Then at page 38 of the transcript there is this.
Mr Grant, four questions down, says:
"Right so this figure is an inflated figure?
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Branch Trading Statement?
"RG [Raymond Grant]: Was it in the suspense account? It must be February [because] that's the one we don't have. I've got January and I've got March and there's nothing on those on the suspense account."

Then there's a discussion about the paperwork that follows.

So Mr Quarm was raising in interview, wasn't he, that he had had concerns about the ATM and errors and there seems to have been a suggestion there was a discussion of this on the phone with someone; is that a fair summary of that?
A. Yes.
Q. Going, then, to page 14 of the document in front of us, about two thirds of the way down the page:
"RG [Raymond Grant]: Right and where did you get the money from to pay those invoices?
"Answer: Well, there was money coming in on a daily basis.

You say:
"Okay and Post Office money was there ever used to pay invoices?
"Answer: Well it must have been or we wouldn't have this situation."

Mr Daily, you:

## 94

"Question: Inflated by yourself?
"Answer: Yes.
"Question: So that it shows less of a shortage is that correct?
"Answer: Yes.
"Question: Because you were expecting this bank loan at any time. If that bank loan had kicked in you would have physically had that money here?
"Answer: Yes."
So Mr Quarm was saying interview, wasn't he, that he was waiting for a bank loan to make good the shortage?
A. That's correct.
Q. You made a statement, or we have a draft statement for the proceedings against Mr Quarm in your name. Can we have that on screen, please. It's POL00166684. This is unsigned and undated, that appears to be a witness statement in your name. Do you recognise that?
A. I do.
Q. In it on page 2, paragraph 2, you say this:
"During this discussion Mr Quarm appeared not to be understanding the questions put to him."

Is this a reference to the interview?
A. Yes.
Q. "He said because of the interview he had ... Mr Quarm was allowed time to do this and confirmed he was in 96
a fit state and wished to continue. It was explained to him that if he felt unwell, then he should say so and the interview would be suspended. He reiterated he was fit to continue."

Just going up, please, a little on this, and further down, apologies, the fourth paragraph:
"Mr Quarm was shown Branch Trading Statements and schedule of the Branch Trading Statements. Mr Quarm confirmed he signed the statements. He explained that they were not an accurate reflection of the cash and stock at the time they were produced. Mr Quarm said he had inflated the cash-on-hand figure, to match what the figure on the Horizon system. He said it was done to disguise the fact that he had taken the money. Mr Quarm said no one else knew of his actions."

That section there, "Mr Quarm has said he inflated the cash-on-hand figure and it was done to disguise the fact that he had taken the money", how do you reconcile that with the account we've just been through in interview that Mr Quarm had been waiting for a bank loan to make good the shortages?
A. Each case is on its own merits. It's -- you've got to understand, I was Second Officer in this case and I'm more there to corroborate what happens and to ask questions and to provide a statement and, in relation to 97
were requested from Fujitsu in this case:
"I don't recall that any Horizon data or ARQ logs were requested."

Then at paragraph 16, in relation to whether any legal advice was obtained, you say you're:
"... not aware of Raymond Grant obtaining any legal advice ... personally [you] do not recall obtaining any legal advice at any stage of the investigation when the case was transferred to me. The only recollection I have about obtaining any legal advice was prompted by my review of the documents that I describe at paragraph 21 ..."

But it's right, isn't it, that that related to the recovery of money after the prosecution?
A. That's correct.
Q. In terms of the disclosure in the case, you deal with this at paragraph 18, and you say this:
"Paragraph 21 of the Second Request asks me who was the Disclosure Officer in this case", and you're asked to explain your role in relation to disclosure.

Having considered the documents you describe there you can see that there was a letter from the COPFS to Raymond Grant on 1 July 2009 "asking him to lodge the productions for the case". But is it right that it was you who submitted the productions to the COPFS --
this, Mr Quarm had admitted that he'd been -- well, using Post Office money to go into his bank account and that was to pay suppliers. I'm not -- I don't really understand what you mean to --
Q. Well, the paragraph below, you make reference, in fairness and in context, to the intention to repay the money when he'd sold his property, and he'd received the loan from the bank. But the characterisation in the paragraph above is the reason for inflating the cash-on-hand figure was to disguise the fact he'd taken the money. What was it that led you to conclude that that was his motivation?
A. I don't understand because the way I'm reading this, Mr Quarm admitted to inflating the cash and it was done to disguise the fact he'd taken the money, and that was to use his suppliers. That's how I'm reading that.
Q. That document can come down now, thank you. Is it right that you cannot recall if any further investigation was required in the Quarm case when it was transferred to you in 2009?
A. That's correct. I don't recall.
Q. Could we have paragraph 15 on Mr Daily's second statement on screen, please. It's page 8. At paragraph 15 you say, in response to the question of whether any Horizon data and, in particular, ARQ logs 98
A. That's correct.
Q. -- on 11 August 2009?
A. That's correct.
Q. Could we have on screen, please, the second document to which you refer in that paragraph, which is POL00166753.

Apologies, sir, we seem to have a technical hitch. I'm sorry to ask, sir, but could we have a couple of minutes just to sort out the document being put up on screen?
SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes. I'll remain where I am but I'll just go off screen for five minutes unless someone alerts me to the fact I can come back earlier.
MS PRICE: Thank you, sir.
( 2.49 pm )

## (A short break)

## ( 2.56 pm )

MS PRICE: Hello, sir. The issue is resolved.
Could we have on screen, please, that document which is referred to in paragraph 15 , the second document which is POL00166753. So this is from you, submitting to the Procurator Fiscal's office, the productions that you addressed in paragraph 15 that we've just looked at. Looking through this list, which lists the productions -- and do take your time to look through.
A. Yes.
Q. Scrolling down a little, please -- is that the end of the document? Over the page.

Looking through the list there, does that assist you with whether ARQ data was obtained from Fujitsu in this case?
A. I didn't see any ARQ data on there.
Q. It's right, isn't it, that this was a case in which

Mr Quarm had raised concerns about the ATM and errors on the system and raised a telephone conversation about those issues. As far as you can recall and see from the documents, were any enquiries made to establish whether there had been any calls, either with a helpline or with Product and Branch Accounting to establish whether his discussion on the phone with someone about the errors was correct?
A. I wouldn't say. As I said, Raymond Grant led the investigation. I've no idea what part I picked this up when Raymond left.
Q. The investigation in Mr Quarm's case was progressing at the same time as Mr Holmes' case. Did it occur to you that both individuals were raising issues relating to the system in their interviews?
A. No, because Mr Quarm said his issues were with the ATM and I don't believe it was mentioned. It was linked to Horizon at the time. So during interview, no. 101

2008 and you accepted that Peter Holmes made it very clear that there were problems with Horizon at the branch and that the apparent shortfalls might be due to Horizon. You've accepted that, haven't you?
A. Yes.
Q. He didn't only say it's the Horizon system that let us down, he said that he thought, he was hoping that the problems, the shortfall, was something that the computer might have done, in his own words; does that ring a bell?
A. Yes.
Q. He also said that the Horizon system has been bloody awful; do you remember him saying that?
A. Yes.
Q. He was quite frank about what he thought about the Horizon system in the Jesmond branch?
A. Yes.
Q. So in your witness statement at paragraph 98 , we don't need to go to it, but you say that Mr Holmes indicated that the loss might be down to the Horizon system and you say:
"At the time, I don't believe I would have been aware of the significance of this as I don't recall there being any issues with Horizon at the time."

You've said in your evidence this afternoon, just 103
Q. In Mr Quarm's case, did you make any enquiries of colleagues or seniors as to whether there were any other reports of errors related to ATMs at the time?
A. As I said, that was Mr Grant's enquiries. He'd have been carrying out those enquiries in this case.
Q. Having had the opportunity to review the documents relating to Mr Holmes' case and Mr Quarm's case, are there any reflections that you have on your involvement in either of those cases?
A. No.

MS PRICE: Sir, those are all the questions that I have for Mr Daily.

Do you have any before I turn to Core Participants?
SIR WYN WILLIAMS: No, thank you, no.
MS PRICE: Mr Jacobs has some questions, sir.

## Questioned by MR JACOBS

MR JACOBS: Thank you, Mr Daily. I represent 157 subpostmasters. Sitting next to me is Marion Holmes, the widow of Peter Holmes, who you've been talking about today.
A. Yes.
Q. As you know or may know, Mr Holmes died in 2015 and his conviction was posthumously overturned in 2021.

Now, we know from evidence this morning and you told Ms Price that you interviewed Mr Holmes on 19 September 102
now, to Ms Price, that you thought this was the first time that this issue had come up; is that right?
A. With myself, yes.
Q. What I have to say to you is that Mrs Holmes and a number of my other clients simply don't believe that. We can't accept that you had no idea that other subpostmasters or assistants had problems with the Horizon system and were raising those in interviews?
A. I can only tell you that when Mr Holmes brought up Horizon interview with myself, from what I recall, that's the first time l've heard someone bring it up in an interview. I wasn't aware of all the other cases that were going ahead. I didn't know -- I don't even know half of these people -- all of the people that have been mentioned here or in this Inquiry. It was never sent down to us.
Q. You were a Security Investigations Manager from 2005; that's right, isn't it?
A. Yes.
Q. So you'd been in post for about three years at this time?
A. Yes.
Q. You said to Ms Price that you weren't aware of the acquittal of Suzanne Palmer in 2007, the year before.
A. Correct.
Q. Were you aware of the Castleton case, which raised the integrity of the Horizon issue?
A. Until this Inquiry started, no.
Q. Were you aware of other cases that had been through the courts?
A. No.
Q. You were part of a team of Investigators, weren't you?
A. Correct.
Q. Did you discuss cases amongst yourselves?
A. Within our own team, yes, we did discuss cases and what your caseloads were but -- we did have team meetings but I don't recall anything being raised about Horizon at that time.
Q. Quite a few people have come to give evidence to the Inquiry who were Post Office Investigators and they've said that there was a message from above "This issue might come up, subpostmasters might raise Horizon points, but the message from the business is that the system is robust"; do you recall that at all?
A. Constantly.
Q. Constantly?
A. Yes.
Q. So what you're saying is that you were told constantly that subpostmasters would raise these issues but that this was the first one that you were involved in where 105
position and then, if you thought it necessary, ask him for consent for a search?
A. It was expected that you'd conduct a search first.
Q. Our clients would say that this particular policy, as you say, or practice, that it was heavy-handed and disproportionate. What would you say to that?
A. The search of Mr Holmes' property? No, it wasn't.
Q. You searched his car, didn't you?
A. Yes, we did.
Q. You looked at his bank account withdrawals and took those away, didn't you?
A. In drawers?
Q. In his house, drawers?
A. I've no idea, I can't remember where they were because I also stated in my statement that I did find an item and then I was a scribe. The people -- the other Investigators who were searching brought the items to myself and noted them down.
Q. You wrote to his bank and you wanted details of Mrs Holmes' and Mr Holmes' bank accounts; that's right, isn't it?
A. That's right, yes.
Q. And you made enquiries or you wanted to make enquiries into his pension, didn't you, to see how much money was in his pension; is that right?
the issue was raised?
A. I can't recall when the Post Office started telling us there was issues with Horizon. I couldn't honestly give you the first date that I was aware of it.
Q. I want to must have on to the home search that you conducted of Mr Holmes' family home and you deal with that at paragraph 101 of your statement. I won't ask that to be put up, I'm aware of the time, but you say:
"The decision to carry out a search followed POL policy. We were instructed to conduct searches to preserve any evidence."

What was that policy?
A. I can't recall the policy word for word but I believe it may even have been part of the compliance, but I can't recall that either. But the instructions were we were to request a search of someone's home where there was a shortage discovered.
Q. Was it normal to go into people's homes, go into their bedrooms and their drawers and take out statements from banks before a postmaster or an assistant had even been interviewed, Mr Daily?
A. If you're asking me if I was comfortable doing that, no, I wasn't comfortable but it was part of the job and it was done voluntarily.
Q. Why didn't you interview Mr Holmes first, establish the 106
A. That's correct.
Q. If I could just ask for a document to go up on screen. This is the Financial Evaluation report, it's POL00043951. If we could perhaps go to the first page, the third paragraph of that. Just wait for it to come up on the screen. It's not very clear, I'm afraid -well, it is now. So the third paragraph says, third substantive paragraph:
"There is nothing evident that would explain how Holmes has disposed of the loss. His wife has her own business making and selling wedding cakes, the possibility exists it has been used for this."
A. Correct.
Q. So you're looking for money that you think has gone, aren't you?
A. Yes.
Q. You're aware, of course, because you've referred to it in your statement, that in the Court of Appeal, your employer, your current employer, the Post Office, accepted and the Court of Appeal found that there was no actual loss in Mr Holmes' case, as opposed to a Horizon generated shortfall; that's right, isn't it?
A. It was in this case, indeed, yeah.
Q. So, effectively, Mr Daily, what you were doing, perhaps you can see it more clearly now, is you were looking for 108
something that was never there in the first place?
A. No, that's not the case at all.
Q. Well, there wasn't a loss; you were looking to see where the money had gone, there --
A. Well, we were looking to see if there was a loss within the branch and the investigations and enquiries were trying to establish where the money was and what caused the loss.
Q. Can we go back to what the Court of Appeal said. The Court of Appeal said that there was no actual loss, as opposed to the Horizon generated shortfall?
A. In hindsight, now the issues with Horizon have arisen, at that time that wasn't the case at all.
Q. Mr Daily, sorry, but it doesn't seem to make sense. What you're saying is that the Post Office accepted before the Court of Appeal, and the Court of Appeal found, that there was never a loss in Mr Holmes' case but you're saying that was the position in 2021 but that wasn't the position at the time?
A. The position in 2021, I believe the Court of Appeal was talking about Horizon and I could be wrong what I'm saying, Horizon -- the issues with Horizon could have caused this loss within the branch. At that time I wasn't aware of it, I was conducting an investigation into a $£ 46,000$ shortage in a branch. 109
to investigate lines of inquiry which are raised before you? Did you think it was so fanciful that it wasn't even worth bothering to look at it?
A. No that wasn't the case, sir.

SIR WYN WILLIAMS: No. So what did you do? In the absence of any success in discovering the whereabouts of the money, what did you do to investigate whether, in fact, there had been a loss?

I think silence --
A. I think -- I'm not really quite sure how to answer that, sir. I mean --
SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Well, did you do anything?
A. -- it was -- sorry?

SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Did you do anything?
A. Yes, we interviewed Mr Holmes, he admitted to false accounting.
SIR WYN WILLIAMS: All right. Thank you.
MR JACOBS: If we could go down to the second page of the document, please, and it's the last box there. Here we go. It says, "Other -- comments":
"The only luxury item that the Holmes [that's the family Holmes) appear to have is the home computer that has been built by a 'friend'. The TV is a Samsung flat screen approximately 26 inches. Peter Holmes' car has a private registration, cost unknown. There is

MS PRICE: Sir, I'm sorry to interrupt but, just to be clear about the Court of Appeal's wording: I think the Court of Appeal's wording was there was no proof of actual loss. Forgive me for being pedantic but just so everyone is clear.
SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Well, it's, I think, clear to me, which is perhaps at least of some importance. The Court of Appeal accepted that it was possible for Horizon to show a loss but that loss was, in fact, illusory and that applies in Mr Holmes' case.
MR JACOBS: Thank you, sir, that's correct and I apologise if I didn't phrase that --
SIR WYN WILLIAMS: But let me ask this question, Mr Jacobs.
As it happens, Mr Daily, your evidence about the searches and investigations you conducted to, as you then thought, as you've told me, discover where the money was, well, they were quite thorough and yet you found nothing. Now, in the light of that, did that not give added credence to Mr Holmes' suggestion that this was generated by the computer, as opposed to being real?
A. Not at the time, sir.

SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Right. Just didn't cross your mind as a possibility?
A. Not at the time, sir.

SIR WYN WILLIAMS: But how does that square with your duty 110
collateral in the family home that is owned by the Holmes. Holmes claimed his wife didn't know of the loss and put his sleepless nights down to his age. Holmes was given a [document in relation to] his wife's business account."

We can take that off the screen now, thanks. The question I want to ask you is: this document is a Financial Evaluation Sheet, isn't it?
A. It is, yes.
Q. You said in your evidence this morning, around about 12.15, that these documents were in order to show that a subpostmaster or person being investigated would have sufficient assets to recover money; is that right?
A. Correct, yes.
Q. You also said it was linked into your bonuses and your targets?
A. No, I didn't say it was linked to my bonuses.
Q. Well, what you said in relation to your targets was that there was a problem because -- I'm just looking at this on the screen now:
"It was always considered an unfair target because any inquiry you did, any case you did, all you could say to the person is 'Were you in a position to repay the money?' If that person didn't have the money you couldn't get blood out of a stone." 112

So what we understand by that is that you're saying that you wanted to ensure that there was money that the subpostmaster or the person accused had that could be got at by the Post Office and that would protect your target; is that right?
A. That's not to say it's to protect the target. I think that's very unfair. As I stated earlier on, the Post Office hit a target. When we conducted an interview, if there was a shortage, we asked if the person was in a position to repay the money. If they weren't in a position to repay the money, we'd ask them how they intend to repay it. If they didn't have the money, they didn't have the money.
Q. You see, Mr Daily, there are two scenarios here. The first scenario is that you were looking for money that you thought had been lost when there was never any proof of such loss -- I hope I've got that right -- and the second is that you were looking to see if Mr Holmes might have had enough assets to pay Post Office for losses that couldn't be proved and, ultimately, didn't exist. That's the position, isn't it?
A. We had to complete the Financial Evaluation Sheet that we were instructed to do and send that to the Financial Investigators for them to make a decision on that. That wasn't my decision, whether someone had enough assets 113
there was no investigation into the integrity of the Horizon figures?
A. No, I don't believe that. I would not have put it into my report if I hadn't requested that information and looked at it.
Q. Do you accept that's what your employer, the Post Office, told the Court of Appeal and that's what the Court of Appeal found?
A. I accept what they've said, yes, but I stand by what I've said here.
Q. The fact, Mr Daily, is that the evidence before the Inquiry shows there were no checks. The evidence in the Schedule of Non-Sensitive Material and the list of exhibits shows that there were no checks. The position of Post Office in the Court of Appeal is that there were no investigations into the integrity of the Horizon figures. That is what the Court of Appeal found. The uncomfortable truth for you is that what you said in your report wasn't true; that's right, isn't it?
A. No, it's not. I maintain my stance on that one and I'd like to see the Green Jacket to see exactly what documentation is in there.
Q. I'm going to ask you about another passage in your investigation report. If we could go, perhaps, to that. It's POL00050832. It's the bottom of page 7 and the top 115
and, as far as proof that there was no loss, as I say, we were investigating a $£ 46,000$ loss. Mr Holmes told us that he was inflating cash figures.
Q. So you were just doing what you were told; is that right?
A. Basically, yes, that's the process.
Q. I want to ask you about Horizon checks. You were referred by Ms Price earlier on this morning to your investigation report and you say:
"Mr Holmes has attempted to blame the Horizon system on the shortages, however checks have revealed no problems."

That was at 12.45, you were taken to that.
Then Ms Price told you that there was no evidence of any checks in the Inquiry. There was nothing in the Schedule of Non-Sensitive Material and we found out this afternoon that there was nothing in the list of exhibits; is that right?
A. Correct.
Q. Again, the Court of Appeal found, and the Post Office, your employer, conceded before the Court of Appeal, there was no investigation into the integrity of the Horizon figures; do you accept that?
A. Sorry, can you repeat that?
Q. The Court of Appeal found that in Peter Holmes' case 114
of page 8 and it's something that Ms Price also took you to today at around 12.45 .

So the bottom of page 7, top of page 8, please:
"Mr Holmes stated he had spent too many years in the police force, seeing things go wrong to start stealing money from anybody. He was also a subpostmaster at Monkseaton for 6/7 years. Taking onboard it is incredulous to think Mr Holmes would allow a large shortage, never mind 11 large shortages to go unreported. The evidence would suggest Mr Holmes has been producing the false accounts since 24 October 2007. There are eleven false accounts produced since then."

So what we have here is we have an assistant at a subpostmaster branch who was a police officer for 12 years with an exemplary record. We have a man who ran a branch at Monkseaton for 6 to 7 years, totally trustworthy, impeccable character. Do you accept that in this investigation report, it demonstrates that Mr Holmes' status as a former policeman should have caused you to take seriously his concerns about what was happening in the Horizon terminal in his branch but, in reality, what you did was you used his reputation and good character against him.
A. No, that's not true.
Q. Many of my clients say that this scandal shows that 116
there has been a culture within Post Office to systematically destroy the reputations of subpostmasters and their assistants. You were part of that culture, weren't you?
A. No.
Q. Finally, Mr Daily, the Court of Appeal found that Peter Holmes' prosecution was an affront to justice; you accept that?
A. Yes.
Q. Tragically, as you know, Mr Holmes died in 2015, before his name could be cleared. Your investigation was money driven and misconceived and led to this miscarriage; that's right, isn't it?
A. No.
Q. In your witness statement at about paragraphs 131 and 132, you say you were asked about what your reflections are on the way the investigation and prosecution of Mr Holmes was conducted by the Post Office and the outcome of the case and your attention was drawn to the judgment of the Court of Appeal in Josephine Hamilton and Others.

All you say, in terms of your reflections, is that you acknowledge that ARQ data was obtained but you can't recall whether or not it was disclosed; if it was disclosed, you can't offer a reason now why that was. 117

I'm asked to ask you, to you accept any personal responsibility for what happened to Mr Holmes?
A. No, I was only doing my job.

MR JACOBS: Thank you. No further questions.
SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Anyone else?
MR HENRY: I have a few questions, sir.

## Questioned by MR HENRY

MR HENRY: Edward Henry, on behalf of Mhari McDougall.
We know, Mr Daily, that prosecutions in England ceased more or less in 2013: there were two in 2013 to 2014; none in 2014 to 2015; and one in 2015 to 2016. Just help us, please. You worked with Mr Bradshaw, didn't you?
A. That's correct.
Q. You worked, also, with Diane Matthews, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And Andrew Wise?
A. Correct.
Q. They were all part of your team. How did they feel about private prosecutions stopping south of the border?
A. Sorry, can you --
Q. How did they feel about private prosecutions stopping south of the border?
A. I don't know.
Q. Really? You didn't discuss it with them?

It's striking, isn't it, that you offer no acknowledgement of your wrongdoing and you offer no apology in your statement? Do you have anything to say about that?
A. As I stated earlier, I believed I'd actually disclosed, it was the first committal bundle I'd ever done in England, it's the only one I've ever done in England, and I thought I'd actually put that data onto it and it's -- obviously I haven't, and that's an error on my part.
Q. Marion Holmes has frequently said that this is her husband Peter's story and not hers. My final question to you is: if Peter Holmes were here today, what would you say to him?
A. From what I have heard last week in the Select Committee from Fujitsu and the evidence I've given, I'd have been pleased he'd have been cleared from any wrongdoing because, throughout all this, we were told that the Horizon system was robust -- I can't recall when they first stated it -- there was no integrity issues, and basically we were getting sent out to just continue doing our jobs. Now, from what I know now, it was wrong, we shouldn't even have been doing any investigations whatsoever.
Q. I'm just going to ask if I have any more questions. 118
A. No.
Q. There wasn't any desire to return to the good old days?
A. No.
Q. Can I just ask you, please, how closely did you work with Diane Matthews and Steve Bradshaw?
A. Diane Matthews, I did one case with her in Scotland. Steve Bradshaw assisted me in several cases in Scotland.
Q. So he assisted you in several cases. How did he assist you; what was his role?
A. He was the Second Officer only.
Q. He was involved in the interviews, presumably?
A. The role of second officer is to corroborate the interview and, if he thinks there's any questions that should be asked, he would ask them.
Q. He had a particular responsibility, didn't he, for assessing requests for ARQ data; isn't that right?
A. I can't answer that in what Steve Bradshaw's responsibilities were.
Q. Well, weren't you ever aware that he was the gatekeeper for ARQ requests?
A. No.
Q. You weren't aware of any guidance given by Jayne Bradbury?
A. Not that I recall.
Q. Not that you recall. Well, so be it. We'll deal with 120

SIR WYN WILLIAMS: So let me be clear about it: did you act as the Lead Investigator from first to last, so to speak, in an English case?
A. Three cases that I can recall.

SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Right, three. That's fine. I just wanted to get clear the extent of your involvement in each jurisdiction. When you said that you were the only Investigator in Scotland, I think what I understand from that is that in Scottish cases, after Mr Grant stopped, you were the person who took the lead in investigations in Scotland but, from time to time, obviously, for example, in interviews, people would come and assist you?
A. Sorry, can you repeat the last part, sir?

SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes. So you would take the lead in all Scottish investigations after Mr Grant ceased to either retire or did something else?
done so?
A. No, I didn't.
Q. Can you say why you didn't do that?
A. I didn't think to raise it with the union.
Q. There has been discussion, in questions earlier today, of the bonus scheme that you were part of. Can you say who approved this bonus scheme for the investigation teams?
A. I can't say for definite who approved it. There would be the management -- not line management, above that, I believe, would write the objectives, and I couldn't say if it was the Head of Security, or above him. I'm honestly not sure who it was who gave the final approval.
Q. Thank you. Just briefly, you were discussing questions with Counsel to the Inquiry about disclosure of information to the Crown Office and Procurator Fiscal Service and I just wanted to ask, if an individual was represented, for instance by the NFSP or the CWU or any other representative body, would you disclose information uncovered, either that's sensitive or non-sensitive information, to them, even if you didn't disclose it all to the Crown Office?
A. No.

MS WATT: Thank you.

SIR WYN WILLIAMS: But, obviously, from time to time, for example in interviews, other investigators would be with you?
A. Yes. Yes, sir.

SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Fine. I've got the picture. Thank you.
Right. Well -- sorry, are there any other questions?
MS PRICE: Sir, yes, Ms Watt has some questions.

## Questioned by MS WATT

MS WATT: Good afternoon, Mr Daily. I represent the NFSP and have a couple of questions for you this afternoon. Can you hear me okay?
A. Yes.
Q. At paragraph 57 of your first witness statement, you mentioned that if the suspect was a member of the NFSP, that you would advise them to contact their rep. I wanted to ask you if you were a member of a trade union at that time?
A. Yes.
Q. Which one was that?
A. It's now -- it was the CMA at the time.
Q. Does it have a different name now?
A. Is it Unison?
Q. Can I ask you if you ever contacted your union to raise questions about Horizon being reported to you by suspects as an issue or if any other Investigators had 122

Those are my questions. Thank you.
SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Thank you, is that it, Ms Price?
MS PRICE: Sir, yes those are all the questions from Core Participants.

I just have one final point, sir, in relation to document references. For the three documents which go together to make up the list of exhibits in the case of Peter Holmes, for the purposes of the transcript, those three references are POL00047282, POL00043861, and POL00043917.
SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Thank you.
Right, well, thank you, Mr Daily, for providing your witness statement and for giving evidence during the course of the day.

I hope, Mrs Holmes, that you will have found at least some of the evidence informative today.

So that brings today's proceedings to a close and we will reconvene at 10.00 tomorrow morning.
MS PRICE: Yes, sir.
( 3.30 pm )
(The hearing adjourned until 10.00 am the following day)
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| MR JACOBS: [4] | 11.35 [2] 39/17 39/22 |  | 21 August [1] 83/21 | 6/7 [1] 116/7 |
| 102/17 110/11 111/18 |  |  |  |  |
| 119/4 | 112 [1] 83 | 28/2 | 226 [1] 84/8 | 5 [1] 58/2 |
| MS PRICE: [30] | 117 [1] |  | 229 [1] 84/9 | 65 per cent [3] 59/15 |
| 1/6 2/5 2/10 3/5 3/10 |  | 2005 [14] 5/12 7/20 |  |  |
| 3/15 12/12 39/13 | 68/7 68 | 10/23 11/24 12/12 | 23 January 202 | 68,733 [1] 61 |
| 39/17 39/21 40/1 40/3 | $37 / 1137 / 14$ <br> 12 years [1] 116/15 <br> 12-day [1] 68/20 | 18/18 19/1 28/9 30/19 |  | 69 [1] |
| 40/5 55/8 71/12 81/20 |  |  | 230 [1] 84/8 |  |
| 81/25 82/4 82/6 82/18 |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 7 \text { August [2] 92/2 } \\ & 92 / 7 \end{aligned}$ |
| 90/19 100/13 100/17 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 12-day [1] 68/20 } \\ & \text { 12.15 [1] } 112 / 11 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} 2006[6] \\ 4 / 18 \\ 14 / 4 \\ 14 / 1639 / 15 \end{array}$ | 24 October |  |
| 102/11 102/15 110/1 $122 / 7$ 124/3 124/19 | $\begin{array}{ll} \mathbf{1 2 . 1 5}[1] & 112 / 11 \\ \mathbf{1 2 . 4 5}[2] & 114 / 13 \end{array}$ | $2007 \text { [5] } 37 / 1237 /$ | 11 | 7 November [1] 2/18 |
| $122 / 7$ 124/3 124/19 MS WATT. [2] 122 | 12.45 ${ }^{116 / 2}$ | $83 / 21 \text { 104/24 116/1 }$ | 26 [1] 90/21 | 7 years [1] 116/16 |
| [2] | 12.51 [1] | 2008 [20] 9/2 9/14 | 26 inches [1] 111/24 | 7.30 pm [1] 74/15 |
|  | 12.8.08 [1] 91/20 | 9/25 10/6 11/11 12/22 | 26.04 [1] 74/18 | 71 [1] 5/ |
| 研 | 121 [2] 88/7 88/10 | 37/15 50/11 72/9 | 27 [1] 76/16 | 72 [2] 20/5 20 |
| 3/13 12/5 12/11 39/1 | 128 [2] 58/17 58/18 | 72/22 74/2 | 27 December [2] 3/1 | 73 [1] |
| 39/18 39/22 40/2 40/4 | 129 [1] 58/17 | 77/11 77/22 | 3/17 | 74 [2] |
| 54/19 55/4 55/7 70/24 | 13 [3] 30/11 91/ | 83/21 91/3 92/2 92 | 28 [1] | [2] 21/25 32/11 |
| 71/4 71/9 81/23 82/5 | 1/12 | 103 | 29 [5] 22/2 | 75,000 [1] 67/2 |
| 82/17 89/23 90/4 90/8 | 131 [1] 11 | 2008/2009 [1] 44/4 | 40/14 | 77 [2] |
| 90/11 90/14 90/18 | $\begin{array}{\|l} 132[4] 72 / 684 / 4 \\ 84 / 6117 / 16 \end{array}$ | 2009 [21] 4/14 10/23 | 3 | 8 [8] 24/23 25/16 |
| 100/10 102/14 |  |  |  | 6/24 $27 / 827$ |
| 110/13 110/22 110/25 | $\begin{cases}136[2] & 1 \\ 137[1] & \end{cases}$ | 48/11 48/16 50/13 | 3 May [ | 79 [1] |
| 111/5 111/12 111/14 | $\begin{aligned} & 137 \text { [1] } 41 / 15 \\ & 139 \text { [2] } 41 / 541 / 6 \end{aligned}$ | 50/24 59/13 78/9 |  |  |
| 111/17 | 14 [4] 42/20 48/1 | 80/16 88/15 88/22 | 3,000 | 8 |
| 121/8 121/12 121/22 | 60/21 94/14 | 91/7 98/20 99/2 | 3.30 [1] |  |
|  | 14 | 10 | 30 January [1] 78 | 80 |
|  | 15 | 2010 [23] | 31 [1] 29 | 86 [1] |
|  | 98/24 100/19 100/22 | 24/2 25/9 25/13 25/19 | 33 [3] | 89 [1] 69 |
| '11 [1] 59/20 | $\begin{aligned} & 157 \text { [1] 102/17 } \\ & 16 \text { [2] } 91 / 1399 / 4 \end{aligned}$ | 31/20 | 35 [2] 10/14 84/5 | 9 |
| '12 [2] 59/20 59/20 |  | 31/2 | $\begin{array}{ll} 36 & \text { [1] } \\ 37 & 13 / 16 \\ \text { [1] } & 41 / 6 \end{array}$ | 9 November [1] <br> $48 / 16$ <br> 9.5 [1] $26 / 14$ <br> 92 [1] $71 / 13$ <br> 97 [1] $72 / 6$ <br> 98 [3] $76 / 1476 / 16$ <br> $103 / 18$ <br> 18 |
| '14 [1] 59/20 | 160 [2] 61/7 62/16 17 [1] 14/23 |  | 37 [1] 41/6 <br> 38 [2] 76/18 95/22 |  |
| 'friend' [1] 11 | 17 [1] 17 Sep | $\begin{aligned} & 23 \text { 37/2 37/4 37/17 } \\ & 22 \text { 48/11 56/12 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 38 \text { [2] } 76 / 1895 / 22 \\ & 39 \text { [1] } 2 / 19 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 'informatior } \\ & \text { 19/15 } \end{aligned}$ |  | 58/6 | 4 |  |
| 'non [1] 19/18 | $\begin{gathered} 18 \text { [3] } \\ 99 / 17 \end{gathered}$ | $10 / 1411$ | 4 February [1] |  |
| 'non-police [1] 19/18 | 18 Sep | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} 10 / 1411 \\ 2012[2] \end{gathered}\right.$ | $\text { 4-5 [1] } 19 / 4$ |  |
| sonable [1] 34/23 |  | 2013 [15 |  | A |
| 'to' [1] | 19 [1] | 1117 | 40 per cent [2] |  |
| 'Uttering' [1] 53/10 | 19 August [2] 88/15 | /8 |  | $3 /$ |
| 'Were [1] 112/23 |  |  |  | able [4] 45/19 8 |
| / |  | 2013/14 [2] 42/2 | 44 [3] 1/24 79/1 | 7 |
| /Crown [1] 69/9 | $\begin{array}{\|l} 72 / 2272 / 25102 / 25 \\ 1979 \text { [1] } 6 / 3 \end{array}$ |  | 45 minutes [1] 73/1 | 12/16 19/20 21/9 27/7 |
| 1 | $1984 \text { [1] 19/10 }$ | 15/1 48/5 58/16 | 46,000 [8] 74/17 75/2 | 29/17 35/16 43/1 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1 January [1] 4/18 } \\ & \text { 1 July [2] 26/16 } \\ & 99 / 23 \end{aligned}$ | 1996 [3] 25/12 25/14 | 1 119/11 | - | 4/ |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 26 / 15 \\ & 1997 \text { [4] 6/8 6/12 } \\ & 6 / 1511 / 23 \end{aligned}$ |  | 78/20 109/25 |  |
|  |  |  | 5 | /8 |
| 1.50 [2] 81/22 81/24 <br> 10 [1] 11/19 |  | 2018 [1] 15/1 | 5 October [1] 36/3 | 74/3 74/14 74/16 7 |
|  | 2 |  |  | 77/11 79/9 80/ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 10.00 [2] 124/18 } \\ & 124 / 21 \end{aligned}$ | 2.15 [1] | 2019 [4] 10/25 11/10 | $57 \text { [1] } 122 / 13$ | 82/15 87/5 87/22 |
| 10.14 [1] | 2.49 [1] 100/142.56 [1] 100/162.8 [1] $22 / 15$20 [2] 20/4 59/1920 October [6] $35 / 12$ | 2 | $59 \text { [3] } 14 / 2214 / 24$ | 2/15 94/6 94/9 94/ |
| 1] 1 |  |  |  |  |
| 104 [2] 79/15 79/17 |  | 18 3/1 | 6 | 103/15 103/15 104/20 |
| 5/7 |  | $2024 \text { [1] 1/1 }$ | 6 October [1] 77/11 | 105/12 109/21 110/2 |
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58/11 63/1 63/16 63/21 64/1 64/16 65/5 66/10 66/20 66/21 66/24 67/25 68/25 69/20 70/1 70/15 70/15 70/17 70/18 71/10 76/22 78/1 80/6 81/21 86/22 87/24 89/2 89/20 89/20 90/10 90/17 92/10 93/19 94/3 95/20 96/16 96/20 97/3 103/3 103/20 106/8 109/21 110/1 113/3 113/20 117/11 120/14 120/25 121/8 122/2 123/10
became [2] 14/4 17/16
because [28] 46/12 47/20 55/2 57/16 59/24 60/13 62/2 67/9 67/13 68/11 70/13 71/23 73/12 75/17 86/21 90/11 93/3 93/10 94/3 96/6 96/24 98/13 101/23 107/14

108/17 112/19 112/21 118/18
become [1] 7/8
bedrooms [1] 106/19 been [107] 1/13 1/22 4/2 5/3 5/12 6/2 7/2 11/19 12/12 12/22
24/6 24/11 25/3 27/6 27/10 27/14 29/22 31/8 31/9 31/13 31/16 32/24 33/23 37/23 39/1 43/20 44/18 44/18 48/4 48/19 50/16 50/22 52/5 52/6 52/15 52/19 53/20 53/21 53/25 54/8
54/15 54/16 55/23 58/5 60/5 60/25 61/17 63/11 64/3 68/1 68/21 68/23 69/8 69/13
69/15 69/17 71/23 76/6 76/12 76/24 77/18 77/23 78/18 79/7 80/5 80/24 81/10 81/17 82/10 83/18 83/21 84/1 84/2 84/16 84/22 85/1 86/16 87/6 88/25 92/18 93/14 94/10 94/23 97/19 97/20 98/1 101/12 102/5 102/19 103/12 103/22 104/15 104/20 105/4 106/14 106/20 108/12 111/8 111/23 113/16 116/11 117/1 118/16 118/17 118/23 121/3 123/5
before [34] 1/6 14/15
16/23 16/23 18/1
19/25 25/19 27/23 32/17 33/24 34/3 37/1 38/2 43/18 44/11
46/21 50/19 50/24 61/13 68/14 68/18 82/7 82/9 82/18 89/23 89/24 102/13 104/24 106/20 109/16 111/1 114/21 115/11 117/10
beginning [1] 74/3 behalf [2] 2/15 119/8 behaviours [2] 53/2

## 58/19

## Behaviours/Action

[1] 53/2
being [47] 3/10 7/17
9/2 9/21 10/22 15/13 17/15 17/19 17/21 21/12 30/12 30/13 31/14 32/2 36/10 36/17 43/24 46/7 50/10 55/8 55/10 55/21 60/2 60/2 60/7 63/20 66/5 69/22 70/12 70/12 70/13
being... [16] 76/25
77/5 78/25 79/20 81/2 81/5 82/9 86/3 92/8
100/8 103/24 105/12
110/4 110/20 112/12
122/24
belief [3] 5/16 25/2 27/14
believe [34] 4/8 4/13
8/4 8/22 9/16 13/8
14/12 33/17 36/9
42/14 43/11 43/21
44/1 53/24 58/5 59/18
64/5 68/1 70/19 71/25
76/23 77/2 83/25
85/16 86/15 86/25
90/10 101/24 103/22
104/5 106/13 109/20
115/3 123/11
believed [2] 43/7 118/5
bell [1] 103/10
below [3] 49/2 66/21 98/5
benefit [1] 50/25
best [2] 5/15 43/8
better [1] 61/23
between [4] 7/3
17/23 47/6 56/10
beyond [1] 17/13
big [2] 35/1 36/15
Bill [1] 37/15
bit [1] $13 / 5$
blame [2] 79/11 114/10
blank [1] 47/10
blast [1] 15/18
blood [2] 62/5 112/25
bloody [1] 103/12
board [1] 44/21
bodies [1] 63/10
body [1] 123/20
bogged [2] 57/1 57/5
bold [3] 35/1 36/15 38/1
Bolsover [1] 66/23 bonus [4] 61/19 61/19 123/6 123/7
bonuses [7] 61/17
61/20 61/21 61/21 61/22 112/15 112/17
border [2] 119/20 119/23
both [7] 1/15 12/2 12/21 12/23 54/6 68/4 101/21
bothering [1] 111/3
bottom [13] 15/10
24/1 30/4 41/16 51/16 74/10 77/10 80/15 84/6 92/13 92/14 115/25 116/3
box [5] 49/2 51/16 53/1 56/14 111/19 boxes [1] 58/19 brackets [1] 19/15 Bradbury [1] 120/23 Bradshaw [3] 119/12 120/5 120/7

## Bradshaw's [1]

120/17
branch [32] 12/19 12/20 13/13 20/25 21/1 21/3 21/4 29/13 29/18 32/1 54/4 65/20 71/8 72/9 76/7 79/22 79/25 83/5 85/14 93/16 94/1 97/7 97/8 101/13 103/3 103/16 109/6 109/23 109/25 116/14 116/16 116/21 branches [1] 8/6 break [5] 39/14 39/24 81/20 81/23 100/15
Brian [2] 49/20 49/21 briefly [1] 123/15 bring [3] 1/11 49/7 104/11
brings [1] 124/17 broke [1] 3/11 brought [2] 104/9 107/17
BT [1] 73/16
BTO [6] 43/7 43/19
45/6 63/18 63/21 65/2
BTO's [1] 44/22
built [1] 111/23
bundle [5] 2/17 3/3
3/7 118/6 121/7
burglaries [1] 8/6
business [10] 63/2 63/8 64/2 86/19 88/5 88/24 89/8 105/18 108/11 112/5
business's [1] 88/16 but [67] 1/12 4/25 17/17 24/25 25/2 27/14 27/17 33/10 34/13 35/7 38/6 38/18 44/9 44/20 50/3 52/16 53/12 54/20 54/25 56/22 57/15 60/10 61/25 62/22 64/19 67/17 71/6 73/23 74/5 82/13 82/13 84/10 84/12 86/9 86/21 87/15 87/22 88/13 95/8 98/8 99/13 99/24 100/7 100/10 103/19 105/11 105/11 105/18 105/24 106/8 106/13 106/14 106/15 106/23 109/14 109/18 109/18 110/1 110/4 110/9 110/13 110/25 115/9 116/21 117/23 121/18

## 122/1

## C

Cadder [1] 31/21
cakes [1] 108/11 call [3] 2/6 34/8 69/17
called [5] 9/15 9/17 23/23 28/14 28/20 calls [1] 101/12 came [3] 7/17 13/6 54/11
can [98] $1 / 31 / 10$ 1/12 1/17 3/2 5/3 6/25 13/5 15/7 15/14 15/23 18/5 23/14 23/25 25/20 25/21 26/4 26/8 26/18 26/20 26/23 27/3 29/16 30/4 30/12 31/7 33/9 33/18 34/11 35/25 37/19 39/10 40/3 41/5 44/9 44/11 44/14 47/11 49/17 50/17 51/18 51/20 53/1 53/11 53/19 56/19 56/21 57/14 57/16 57/23 58/18 59/24 60/4 60/21 62/14 62/16 63/6 63/22 64/11 65/4 67/9 67/19 67/22 70/18 72/24 74/21 75/6 77/10 77/13 78/9 79/16 80/15 80/17 80/17 82/4 82/13 87/17 88/15 89/22 91/20 96/14 98/17 99/22 100/12 101/10 104/9 108/25 109/9 112/6 114/24 119/21 120/4 121/11 121/21 122/11 122/23 123/3 123/6
can't [44] 7/2 7/3
15/19 18/22 27/13 27/23 28/14 31/11 33/11 41/3 44/10 44/12 44/20 45/19 46/12 46/16 46/20 46/25 50/21 50/23
51/7 53/21 57/20 59/19 62/22 64/10 64/18 67/16 75/22 80/2 81/9 81/11 90/17 93/13 104/6 106/2 106/13 106/14 107/14 117/23 117/25 118/19 120/17 123/9
candidates [1] 43/7
cannot [14] 5/1 5/4
24/25 27/24 79/24
82/12 84/12 84/13
85/3 85/5 88/12 88/24
89/11 98/18
capital [1] 35/1 car [2] 107/8 111/24 card [4] 21/16 69/20 70/2 70/5
cards [1] 73/25
carried [7] 42/2 42/7 79/25 80/1 80/6 80/20 81/6
carry [1] 106/9
carrying [4] 19/10
20/7 93/18 102/5
Cartwright [5] 16/14 16/18 17/15 17/16 17/18
case [99] 14/7 15/12 15/25 16/2 16/4 16/6 16/6 16/7 16/10 16/10 cent [6] 52/18 59/15 16/23 17/8 17/13 23/3 23/11 29/10 32/2 37/25 42/11 43/23 44/6 45/13 49/6 53/7 53/22 53/23 56/6 56/8 56/22 57/8 57/17 62/3 63/18 63/19 65/3
66/25 67/8 67/8 67/9 67/12 67/17 68/4 71/2 71/17 72/5 72/17 72/19 77/24 80/13 81/21 82/8 82/19 82/23 83/11 83/15 83/18 84/16 85/3 85/23 86/7 87/9 88/2 90/10 90/21 90/24 91/8 91/24 97/22 97/23 98/19 99/1 99/9 99/16 99/19 99/24 101/5 101/7 101/19 101/20 102/1 102/5 102/7 102/7 105/1 108/21 108/23 109/2 109/13 109/17 110/10 111/4 112/22 114/25 117/19 120/6 121/4 121/5 121/10 124/7
caseloads [1] 105/11 cases [49] 4/18
13/20 14/1 14/1 $14 / 5$ 14/14 18/2 18/25 21/15 21/17 30/25 37/24 42/23 43/12 43/19 46/23 47/7 48/21 49/6 49/8 49/11 49/13 49/25 50/1 50/5 50/16 50/19 50/22 51/3 51/7 55/10 55/21 57/2 58/7 61/9 65/25 67/5 67/17 67/24 86/2 102/9 104/12 105/4 105/9 105/10 120/7 120/8 121/11 121/16 casework [4] 1/9 8/21 42/23 72/3 cash [17] 6/9 20/24
29/5 58/10 58/12

64/15 75/1 75/16 75/20 77/19 78/16 97/10 97/12 97/17 98/10 98/14 114/3 cash-on-hand [3] 97/12 97/17 98/10 casting [1] 80/18 Castleton [1] 105/1 category [1] 27/19 cause [1] 70/10 caused [4] 76/12 109/7 109/23 116/20 caution [1] 86/13 CCTV [1] 41/23 ceased [2] 119/10 121/23

59/15 59/21 61/11 65/8
centre [2] 15/15 63/9
certain [4] 5/23 44/13
89/11 90/17
certainty [1] 5/1 challenge [1] 89/18 chance [1] 48/10 chances [1] 66/7 change [9] 4/20 9/18 9/19 9/20 10/20 14/15 16/23 23/19 42/15
changed [2] 7/23 31/20
character [2] 116/17 116/23
characterisation [1] 98/8
charge [4] 4/24 4/25 14/7 53/10
charged [1] 60/17
charges [2] 16/15 90/16
check [1] 82/24
checked [1] 79/7
checks [24] 58/10
79/12 79/14 79/23
79/24 80/1 80/3 80/6
80/7 80/8 80/10 80/20
81/5 81/19 83/4 83/5
83/6 83/10 83/14
114/7 114/11 114/15 115/12 115/14
cheer [2] 67/5 67/20
Christopher [1] 73/2 circumstances [4] 20/11 36/5 69/2 69/15 civil [3] 52/4 63/18 65/3
claimed [1] 112/2
clarify [5] 25/16 35/12 36/13 47/4 60/4
clear [13] 12/5 36/25
49/19 66/10 76/6
84/10 103/2 108/6
110/1 110/5 110/6
121/8 121/13
cleared [2] 117/11 118/17
clearly [2] 38/9 108/25
clerk [1] 6/5
Client [1] 15/22
clients [3] 104/5 107/4 116/25
close [1] 124/17
closed [2] 16/2 17/9
closely [1] 120/4
closure [1] 16/7
CM [1] 49/20
CMA [1] 122/20
CMs [1] 50/4
Code [5] 25/14 25/18
26/4 26/18 27/18
Codes [1] 19/10
cognitive [1] 19/11
collateral [1] 112/1
colleague [2] 5/6 53/7
colleagues [3] 31/5 34/2 102/2
Collecting [2] 63/2 64/1
college [2] 35/5 35/11
column [2] 51/17 51/24
come [18] 10/11 13/7
18/5 27/16 32/21 36/4 46/13 67/22 74/21 87/17 89/22 98/17 100/12 104/2 105/14 105/17 108/5 121/19
comfortable [2]
106/22 106/23
coming [6] $2 / 13$
61/16 64/7 74/8 87/15 94/18
commenced [1] 12/21
comment [3] 57/11
67/21 89/21
commented [2] 48/6 87/18
comments [5] 49/2
56/13 81/13 89/18
111/20
commitment [1] 56/16
committal [8] 23/20
23/24 24/6 25/9 26/11 27/11 118/6 121/7
committals [1] 24/18
Committee [1] 118/15
common [4] 37/20
37/23 38/14 89/17
communications [1] 19/16
compared [1] 47/2 Compile [1] 16/2 complete [9] 22/22 40/18 48/3 65/19 65/25 91/17 91/25 113/22 121/7
completed [6] 20/10
61/5 72/12 72/16 77/6 80/12
completing [1] 23/1 compliance [1] 106/14
complicated [1] 63/7 computer [5] 35/6 74/12 103/8 110/20 111/22
conceded [1] 114/21 concept [1] 37/22 concern [2] 44/2 44/3
concerned [2] 43/1
56/25
concerning [1] 63/10
concerns [5] 80/11 85/10 94/9 101/8 116/20
concisely [1] 38/9 conclude [2] 89/5 98/11
concluded [1] 89/14 conclusions [2] 88/18 90/6 conduct [12] 13/18 14/25 15/9 38/12 45/14 45/17 46/11 60/16 66/2 68/13 106/10 107/3
conducted [12] 20/12 51/22 52/18 68/11 72/9 81/14 87/1 87/11 106/6 110/15 113/8 117/18 conducting [5] 7/5 12/22 31/15 88/12 109/24
confined [1] 12/9
confirm [4] 1/12 2/1
2/10 89/16
confirmed [3] 84/15 96/25 97/9
confiscation [1] 52/3
connected [2] 73/13 73/14
consciously [2] 95/3 95/4
consent [1] 107/2
consequences [1]
34/24
consider [5] 45/4
55/1 79/18 80/20 87/2
consideration [3]
17/12 47/14 63/21
considered [12]
14/24 20/11 53/15

62/2 69/16 80/2 84/7 88/13 91/15 91/18 99/21 112/21
considers [1] 32/16 consisted [1] 80/7 constantly [3] 105/20 105/21 105/23
contact [4] 45/10 71/16 71/18 122/15 contacted [2] 43/11 122/23
contacts [1] 59/7 contained [2] 10/6 80/19
containing [1] 81/16 content [2] 1/19 3/12
contents [1] 5/15
context [3] 22/12
33/22 98/6
continuation [1] 32/11
continue [3] 97/1
97/4 118/21
continued [1] 74/14
continues [1] 63/16
Contract [2] 15/21 29/4
Contracts [1] 49/22
convenient [2] 39/13 81/21
conversation [1] 101/9
convey [1] 64/8
conveyed [1] 64/10
conviction [2] 85/8 102/23
COPFS [9] 13/22
14/2 14/5 32/16 32/16 43/5 45/14 99/22 99/25
copied [1] 71/23
copies [2] 2/16 48/9
coping [1] 50/3
copy [11] 2/21 3/6
3/16 3/21 25/13 25/18
33/3 39/1 71/22 90/2 91/21
core [4] 1/13 58/19 102/13 124/3
correct [60] 4/3 6/4 6/11 6/14 7/10 7/19 7/24 9/1 10/9 11/22 11/25 12/10 13/25 14/11 14/12 17/7 17/10 22/21 30/24 31/22 32/6 33/5 33/9 34/20 40/21 41/13 43/17 51/2 54/23 57/14 61/12 70/25 72/20 73/4 83/12 84/3 90/13 91/2 91/6 91/9 92/12 95/10 96/4 96/12 98/21 99/15 100/1 100/3 101/15

104/25 105/8 108/1
110/2 110/7 114/20 108/13 110/11 112/14 $114 / 21$ 114/25 115/7 114/19 119/14 119/15 $115 / 8$ 115/15 115/17 119/16 119/18
correcting [1] 14/9
correction [2] 18/14 22/14
corrections [3] 3/25 4/5 5/14
correctly [2] 71/20

## 121/2

corroborate [2]
97/24 120/12
corroboration [3]
41/18 42/1 54/22
corroborative [3]
42/5 55/9 55/14
cost [1] 111/25
could [72] 2/10 2/19 3/19 7/2 11/5 13/14 14/22 15/6 15/18 16/7 16/12 18/11 20/4 23/16 29/24 30/2 32/8 33/6 36/19 39/4 40/12 41/22 42/3 42/9 42/17 43/3 45/24 46/6 46/15 47/4 48/14 54/16 56/9 58/14 58/17 60/19
61/2 61/24 62/3 62/7 64/16 65/14 66/17 69/3 69/20 71/12 72/22 76/15 77/7 77/8 78/6 80/13 84/4 86/6 88/8 88/19 91/10 92/5 92/13 98/22 100/4 100/7 100/18 108/2 108/4 109/21 109/22 111/18 112/22 113/3 115/24 117/11
couldn't [11] 42/11
51/8 53/12 54/7 62/5 77/1 88/17 106/3
112/25 113/20 123/11
Coulsfield's [2]
37/11 37/13
Counsel [1] 123/16
counter [2] 6/5 69/23
couple [5] 44/12
82/15 93/9 100/7 122/10
course [23] 1/21 $3 / 8$
5/23 10/12 12/16 20/20 25/21 26/22 35/11 36/6 36/20 37/2 37/9 38/17 38/20
39/15 69/7 69/13 80/9 81/23 82/17 108/17 124/14
court [29] 37/24 84/7
85/7 89/25 90/2 90/4
90/7 90/12 90/14
90/15 108/18 108/20
109/9 109/10 109/16
109/16 109/20 110/2

117/6 117/20
courtroom [1] 30/9
courts [1] 105/5
cover [4] 13/2 31/24 32/3 86/20
covered [4] 19/9
34/12 75/18 75/19
covering [3] 36/10 48/16 83/20
CPIA [3] 25/18 26/4 26/18
create [1] 37/16 created [2] 9/13 86/16
creating [2] 26/11 86/17
credence [1] 110/19
creditors [1] 63/20
creep [1] 76/4
criminal [36] 6/18
8/24 12/17 13/11
14/21 14/25 15/9 16/9 16/13 16/17 16/25 17/13 17/19 18/8 18/8
19/9 19/20 20/15
22/18 24/7 25/12
25/14 26/15 37/15
38/10 43/16 43/22
44/6 47/1 47/7 63/19
68/8 68/19 72/15
81/12 85/6
cross [1] 110/22
Crown [33] 1/8 1/9
4/10 4/16 13/23 14/14
17/4 32/25 33/13
34/22 38/13 38/23
38/24 39/6 39/11
39/12 43/23 44/23
45/8 45/10 46/10
46/23 47/3 47/8 55/10
57/12 62/12 62/25
63/24 64/8 69/9
123/17 123/23
culture [2] 117/1
117/3
Cumbria [1] 13/8
current [5] 1/8 7/25
37/15 77/25 108/19
currently [2] 37/23 63/8
CV [3] 9/25 10/6 65/17
CWU [1] 123/19
D
daily [37] 2/6 2/8
2/11 2/12 3/16 5/14 5/20 12/6 24/25 40/5 55/8 55/15 70/25 82/7
82/11 82/13 82/18
88/16 88/25 89/10

## D

daily...[17] 89/24
94/18 94/25 102/12 102/17 106/21 108/24 109/14 110/14 113/14 115/11 117/6 119/9 121/3 122/9 124/12 125/5
Daily's [10] 1/6 5/19 13/15 15/6 18/12 65/14 69/4 84/5 91/10 98/22
Daley [10] 23/18 25/25 44/18 48/10 48/14 49/3 49/24
56/11 56/11 57/16
Daley's [1] 56/13 data [46] 21/15 29/1 41/23 42/10 42/12 46/18 46/22 52/1 54/5 54/10 54/12 55/9 55/12 55/22 56/7 67/23 68/17 68/24 69/2 69/6 69/12 69/15 70/2 70/7 70/18 70/22 71/1 71/11 71/14 77/18 83/18 83/20 83/25 84/10 84/11 84/20 84/22 84/25 85/4 98/25 99/2 101/4 101/6 117/23 118/8 120/16
date [14] 4/13 14/9
14/12 33/8 33/10
33/11 36/22 46/8 49/18 77/10 80/15 92/6 92/7 106/4 dated [15] 2/18 2/25 3/17 23/19 24/1 25/9 25/13 25/25 26/16 37/11 38/25 66/19 78/9 88/22 91/20
dates [6] 11/15 33/18 33/21 44/10 46/2 46/4 day [7] 28/13 68/20 74/13 89/24 95/19 124/14 124/21
days [4] 68/1 68/7 68/24 120/2
deal [16] 1/7 14/20 18/3 20/1 21/7 21/25 22/19 40/12 72/5 76/14 77/12 88/7 90/20 99/16 106/6 120/25
dealing [4] 25/11 30/5 30/25 37/16 deals [4] 18/16 37/19 51/16 51/24
dealt [7] 8/23 11/11 15/16 18/25 22/22 33/15 88/3
Debt [4] 29/5 63/1

64/1 67/10
December [3] 3/1 3/17 74/4
decide [2] 14/2 38/5 decision [17] 13/10 16/25 17/3 17/8 17/21 31/20 38/9 43/22 45/2 47/5 54/9 57/10 57/21 87/22 106/9 113/24 113/25
decision-making [1] 13/10
decisions [2] 37/24 57/12
declaration [1] 77/19
declarations [3] 75/1
75/16 78/16
declared [1] 92/18
declaring [1] 95/8
decreased [1] 45/1
deemed [6] 53/9
54/12 55/18 62/13 62/25 63/24
deep [1] 31/14
defence [11] 22/7
22/11 22/20 23/12 53/16 82/10 85/24 86/7 86/12 87/12 88/2
definite [2] 81/11 123/9
delay [1] 82/6
delays [1] 35/1 delivered [2] 14/19 24/11
Delivery [1] 19/6 demonstrates [1] 116/18
denied [1] 77/15 denies [1] 86/9 depends [1] 52/20 deployed [1] 59/2 deposit [1] 41/20 deposited [2] 21/13 88/25
deposits [2] 21/16 89/9
Deputy [1] 1/8
describe [2] 99/11 99/21
described [3] 5/11 12/7 13/20
description [3] 12/9 83/3 84/20
desire [1] 120/2
destroy [1] 117/2
detail [4] 13/5 20/2
36/4 45/19
detailed [2] 18/18 65/20
details [7] 65/23 70/2 71/24 91/17 91/25 93/13 107/19
detected [1] 50/6
determined [1] 63/12
developed [2] 24/5 27/10
development [3]
48/4 48/5 52/16
Diane [3] 119/15
120/5 120/6
Dickinson [2] 60/21 60/23
did [90] 5/2 $7 / 8$ 10/9 13/4 14/16 17/23 18/7 18/25 22/24 23/5 28/22 28/25 30/16 30/21 31/10 31/23 32/20 36/11 41/25 42/6 42/22 44/2 44/3 44/7 44/10 44/19 44/22 44/25 45/9 46/18 46/20 47/1 47/5 47/14 47/17 47/22 48/12 50/19 51/3 51/10 51/13 57/19 62/2 62/3 64/8 64/11 64/25 66/1 68/17 70/7 76/4 77/4 85/10 85/11 85/16 86/14 86/20 87/2 87/23 90/4 92/23 92/24 93/7 93/22 94/16 95/12 101/20 102/1 105/9 105/10 105/11 107/9 107/15 110/18 111/2 111/5
111/7 111/12 111/14 112/22 112/22 116/22 119/19 119/22 120/4 120/6 120/8 121/2 121/8 121/24
didn't [33] 32/3 34/13 44/20 47/20 61/18 62/5 68/21 77/2 78/20 78/24 90/14 101/6 103/6 104/13 106/25 107/8 107/11 107/24 110/12 110/22 112/2 112/17 112/24 113/12 discussed [6] 36/17 113/13 113/20 119/13 $42 / 4$ 53/10 63/6 63/17 119/25 120/15 123/2
123/3 123/4 123/22
died [2] 102/22 117/10
differ [1] 17/23
differed [1] 41/17
difference [11] 13/19 30/13 40/9 40/24 41/4 41/11 41/25 47/6 47/14 93/15 93/20 differences [6] 40/5 47/1 47/11 47/17 47/22 47/23
different [5] 8/2
17/14 35/20 49/17 122/21
differently [1] 89/10 differs [1] 41/7
difficult [1] 49/6
digging [1] 35/6 direct [2] 47/20 71/23 direction [1] 86/10 directly [1] 38/13 disagree [1] 92/24 disclosable [1] 80/24 disclose [4] 22/6 22/10 123/20 123/23 disclosed [16] 1/13 23/12 54/2 80/8 81/12 82/9 83/11 84/11 84/13 84/13 84/25 85/4 87/16 117/24 117/25 118/5
disclosing [2] 32/17 40/15
disclosure [52] 20/3
21/25 22/2 22/9 22/12 22/16 22/19 23/1 23/2 25/11 26/14 32/7 32/17 32/18 32/24 33/15 33/24 34/2 34/6 $34 / 1134 / 1334 / 13$ 34/14 34/25 35/10 36/6 36/14 36/24 37/5 37/11 37/16 37/20 37/21 37/22 40/15 40/20 40/22 41/2 47/23 47/24 72/18 81/8 83/15 83/16 84/16 84/22 84/23 85/1 99/16 99/19 99/20 123/16
discover [1] 110/16
discovered [7] 21/4
35/21 78/14 92/15 92/18 92/25 106/17 discovering [1]
111/6
discrepancies [1]
86/21
discuss [3] 105/9
105/10 119/25

64/19
discussing [1]
123/15
discussion [7] 28/4
28/7 94/6 94/11 96/20
101/14 123/5
discussions [1] 67/7
disguise [4] 97/14
97/17 98/10 98/15
display [1] 82/12
disposed [1] 108/10 disproportionate [1] 107/6
dissatisfied [1] 54/8
distances [1] 56/20
distinct [2] 23/6 23/8
Distribution [1] 6/10
Division [1] 33/13
do [64] 1/19 2/21

2/22 3/3 3/16 3/18 11/2 11/8 11/12 12/5 14/17 24/17 26/7 28/1 28/4 28/11 28/17
30/23 32/14 34/12
34/14 35/2 37/1 38/16 39/2 43/15 45/4 56/21 56/25 57/16 58/10 60/16 61/18 71/18 75/15 83/24 86/20 86/25 88/5 90/22 92/19 92/23 93/11 95/1 95/14 96/17 96/18 96/25 97/18 99/7 100/24 102/13 103/13 105/19 111/5 111/7 111/12 111/14 113/23 114/23 115/6 116/17 118/3 123/3 document [55] 3/10 4/15 15/23 17/11 18/5 23/16 25/9 25/10 25/24 26/4 26/7 26/10 27/12 27/12 27/22 32/21 33/8 34/16 35/6 35/22 37/10 39/2 39/5 43/21 48/15 52/22 58/15 59/19 61/2 62/7 66/17 67/22 74/18 77/9 78/8 79/3 87/17 88/14 88/19 89/22 91/19 92/14 94/14 95/6 98/17 100/4 100/8 100/18 100/19 101/2 108/2 111/19 112/4 112/7 124/6 document in [1] 94/14
documentation [2] 23/1 115/22
documents [24] 4/2
20/23 21/2 24/9 24/22
25/18 27/9 27/20
40/18 45/18 48/11
56/1 71/21 80/2 82/21
82/25 84/19 86/20
99/11 99/21 101/11
102/6 112/11 124/6
does [12] 11/23 13/2 32/3 58/3 64/2 81/9 83/2 85/3 101/3 103/9 110/25 122/21
doesn't [2] 55/2 109/14
doing [11] 31/14
49/11 53/20 53/23
54/3 106/22 108/24
114/4 118/22 118/23
119/3
don't [44] 3/4 3/11 11/4 11/4 11/7 17/16 28/7 28/11 28/24 32/2 34/10 39/4 47/10 51/15 53/23 54/7


122/13
Fls [3] 59/4 62/19 63/1
Fiscal [39] 1/10 4/10 4/16 4/19 13/23 14/15 four [5] 26/2 37/12 14/19 17/5 33/1 33/24 34/10 34/15 38/3 38/24 39/7 43/9 43/24 44/24 45/9 45/11 46/10 46/24 47/3 47/8 47/19 48/24 50/17 51/4 53/8 53/24 53/25 55/11 56/1 56/2 57/13 57/19 57/20 57/21 123/17
Fiscal's [5] 50/20 54/9 55/18 57/25 100/21
fit [3] 84/20 97/1 97/4 five [2] 3/11 100/11 flat [1] 111/23 flowchart [5] 15/2 15/11 15/24 17/12 17/22
flowering [1] 64/22
focused [1] 19/22
Focusing [1] 78/4 follow [3] 32/3 66/11 66/16
followed [3] 14/20 70/17 106/9
following [14] 18/16 31/20 36/8 40/11 45/13 48/19 49/4 58/8 65/18 72/7 86/25 87/5 95/19 124/21
follows [3] 49/3
56/14 94/7
force [3] 75/13 78/22 116/5
forefront [1] 63/20 foremost [1] 44/15 Forgive [1] 110/4 form [11] 65/12 65/18 65/21 65/25 66/4 66/7 66/10 66/13 66/13 91/18 92/1
formal [1] 37/5
format [2] 16/5 30/21 former [4] 29/5 43/9 67/10 116/19 forms [6] 19/13 24/8 24/21 37/14 40/22 40/22
forthcoming [1] 44/9 forward [9] 24/19 45/3 55/10 55/17 55/21 55/23 56/5 57/18 87/7
forwarded [1] 70/16 forwards [3] 23/19 56/7 66/22
found [16] 1/11 49/4 74/17 75/1 78/15 85/8 giro [1] 69/17

108/20 109/17 110/18 give [11] 8/7 38/6 114/16 114/20 114/25 40/19 45/24 74/23 115/8 115/17 117/6 124/15

82/21 95/7 95/23
four paragraphs [1] 37/12
fourth [1] 97/6
frame [1] 68/20
frank [1] 103/15
fraud [7] 9/13 9/15
9/17 9/21 49/17 56/16
58/22
free [1] 90/22
frequently [2] 54/11 118/11
Friends [1] 19/13
front [4] 2/17 28/18
90/22 94/14
fruition [1] 49/7
fruits [1] 49/12
Fujitsu [20] 21/14
21/23 46/18 54/5
68/17 69/3 69/7 69/12
70/18 70/23 71/7
71/14 71/16 71/19
71/22 72/1 84/20 99/1
101/4 118/16
full [6] 2/10 41/10
44/7 59/4 87/7 88/25
fully [2] 7/2 64/19
funds [4] 59/11 60/1
60/6 63/22
further [23] 7/11
10/22 16/1 16/7 16/7 16/11 16/11 16/12
30/8 33/10 45/14
45/16 46/14 47/12
53/23 78/19 78/21
79/9 88/12 91/22 97/5
98/18 119/4

## G

gain [1] 43/18
gap [1] 32/20
gatekeeper [1] 120/19
gather [1] 29/10
gave [3] 4/13 45/2
123/13
generated [4] 86/22
108/22 109/11 110/20
geographical [2]
11/17 13/1
get [13] $3 / 13$ 24/17
44/9 44/21 50/6 57/1
57/5 62/5 73/19 93/7
94/16 112/25 121/13
getting [8] 58/12
67/14 67/14 70/24
71/25 73/25 93/10
118/21

75/4 81/18 87/10
105/14 106/3 110/19
given [18] 18/14 19/7 27/7 28/9 29/8 30/12 33/4 34/1 46/2 46/7 51/4 53/4 61/17 65/23 77/12 112/4 118/16 120/22
giving [1] 124/13
Glasgow [3] 11/20
28/19 43/9
go [36] 20/19 21/7
24/24 26/4 26/20 30/4
35/25 45/2 51/18
58/17 60/21 61/2 62/7
71/10 71/12 74/25
75/14 77/8 78/22
90/14 90/15 92/13
98/2 100/11 103/19
106/18 106/18 108/2
108/4 109/9 111/18
111/20 115/24 116/5
116/9 124/6
goes [3] 16/9 16/14 49/24
going [24] 15/9 15/22
16/18 30/22 34/16
51/19 53/1 53/2 58/11
65/8 67/3 73/5 78/8
78/10 79/3 79/9 90/1
90/12 92/17 94/14
97/5 104/13 115/23
118/25
gone [3] 47/10 108/14 109/4
good [16] 1/3 49/14
49/19 50/4 64/23
73/24 74/5 82/4 95/10
95/13 95/19 96/11
97/21 116/23 120/2
122/9
got [11] 39/19 67/11 67/12 68/23 75/12 94/4 94/4 97/22 113/4
113/17 122/5
governing [1] 40/6
Government [1]
63/10
grade [1] 6/16
Grant [21] 5/5 31/8 50/10 90/25 91/3 91/7 91/19 91/21 91/23 107/5
92/9 92/15 93/22 94/2 hands [1] 21/22
94/16 95/6 95/23 99/6 happen [1] 14/16
99/23 101/16 121/16 happened [6] 9/24 121/23
Grant's [3] 50/16
91/23 102/4
Grapevine [2] 15/13 15/15
Green [2] 81/16
115/21

Group [1] 19/7
GSD [1] 24/10 guidance [2] 29/8 120/22
Guide [2] 38/25 39/7
guidelines [1] 20/12 guilt [2] 20/17 21/21
guilty [2] 38/5 90/16

## H

had [106] 7/5 8/24
11/14 14/5 14/7 14/17 18/4 21/4 25/17 27/6
27/21 29/11 34/7 43/9
45/23 46/23 48/10
50/16 50/24 50/25
52/17 53/14 55/4 60/5
60/25 61/10 61/16 63/24 64/3 64/18 65/9
65/21 65/24 66/12
66/14 67/7 67/7 67/10
67/12 67/24 68/10
68/13 68/22 68/23
69/7 69/22 69/23
70/21 73/12 73/13
73/16 73/17 73/18
74/8 76/6 77/3 78/17
78/19 78/21 79/23
82/13 82/19 82/24
83/18 83/21 83/25
84/1 84/18 85/13
85/24 86/2 87/9 89/13
90/5 90/16 92/18 93/9
94/9 94/9 96/7 96/8
96/24 97/12 97/14
97/18 97/20 98/1
101/8 101/12 102/6
104/2 104/6 104/7
105/4 106/20 109/4
111/8 113/3 113/16 113/19 113/22 113/25 116/4 120/15 121/6 122/25
hadn't [4] 67/12
81/14 87/14 115/4
half [2] 74/13 104/14
halfway [4] 61/3 61/4 73/5 77/11
Hamilton [1] 117/20
hand [9] 13/14 14/19
15/12 24/9 40/7 95/8 97/12 97/17 98/10
handed [2] 49/14
happen [1] 14/16
happened [6] $9 / 24$
45/25 74/22 78/17
92/17 119/2
happening [1]
116/21
happens [2] 97/24
110/14
happy [2] 3/13 93/2

107/5 Hebrides [1] 12/20 held [4] 6/1 6/8 11/20 12/1
Helen [2] 60/21 60/23 Hello [3] 40/1 40/2 100/17
help [11] 13/5 15/14 26/5 32/22 33/9 53/11 53/19 55/2 57/23 62/14 119/12 helpline [1] 101/12 HENRY [3] 119/7 119/8 125/11 her [6] 31/21 67/12 85/24 108/10 118/11 120/6

## Her Majesty's [1]

 31/21here [33] 3/14 19/2 19/15 19/21 21/2 32/10 35/22 36/17 36/22 41/16 47/10 53/18 54/8 57/7 58/3 59/12 59/15 74/20 76/11 79/14 80/4 80/18 81/3 87/23 88/9 92/20 96/8 104/15 111/19 113/14 115/10 116/13 118/13
hers [1] 118/12 high [2] 60/2 60/7 highlighted [1] 10/5 highlighting [1] 41/12
Hill [1] 19/5 him [14] 44/18 50/3 50/6 71/23 74/15 82/14 96/21 97/2 99/23 103/13 107/1 116/23 118/14 123/12 himself [1] 32/23 hindsight [1] 109/12 his [34] $1 / 1025 / 5$ 49/12 49/20 56/16 71/24 78/21 90/6 91/21 97/15 98/2 98/7 98/12 98/16 101/13 101/23 102/22 103/9 107/8 107/10 107/13 107/19 107/24 107/25 108/10 112/2 112/3 112/3 112/4 116/20 116/21 116/22 117/11 120/9
hit [1] 113/8 hitch [1] 100/6 HMA [1] 37/25 hold [1] 21/10 Holmes [64] 12/18 22/13 72/5 72/7 72/21 74/16 76/6 76/19
76/21 77/1 77/5 77/15 77/19 77/21 78/13

78/15 78/17 78/25 79/5 79/11 80/9 81/5 81/21 82/8 82/19 83/11 83/19 84/9 85/10 86/8 86/9 86/10 87/20 87/23 90/15 102/18 102/19 102/22 102/25 103/1 103/19 104/4 104/9 106/25 108/10 111/15 111/21 111/22 112/2 112/2 112/3 113/18 114/2 114/10 116/4 116/8 116/10 117/10 117/18 118/11 118/13 119/2 124/8 124/15
Holmes' [27] 12/18 73/6 73/10 77/12 80/11 80/13 84/16 85/7 86/7 88/2 88/4 88/5 101/20 102/7 106/6 107/7 107/20 107/20 108/21 109/17 110/10 110/19 111/24 114/25 116/19 117/7 121/5
home [5] 106/5 106/6 106/16 111/22 112/1
homes [1] 106/18
honest [2] 28/21 51/6 honestly [6] 31/11 33/10 54/7 54/16 106/3 123/13
hope [3] 39/19
113/17 124/15
hoping [1] 103/7
Horizon [106] 20/24 21/1 21/13 21/14 28/9 28/11 28/22 29/1 29/10 29/15 29/21 31/25 41/21 41/23 42/10 42/12 45/21 46/22 53/8 53/19 54/1 I ask [2] 55/15 54/3 54/5 54/10 54/12 122/23 54/14 54/17 54/20 I asked [3] 4/11 43/3 54/23 55/1 55/9 55/11 61/13 55/17 55/22 56/7 57/2 I attended [2] 5/9 58/3 58/4 58/10 69/10 32/18 70/10 70/15 70/22 I believe [21] 4/8 73/6 73/8 73/17 75/10 4/13 8/4 8/22 9/16 76/7 76/12 76/20 76/23 76/25 77/18 77/21 78/5 78/18 79/5 79/11 79/21 79/24 79/25 80/11 80/21 83/18 83/20 83/25 85/9 85/15 85/18 85/19 85/24 86/3 86/15 95/9 97/13 98/25 99/2 101/25 103/2 103/4 103/6 103/12 103/16 103/20 103/24 104/8 104/10 105/2 105/12 105/17 109/22 110/8 114/7
114/10 114/23 115/2 115/16 116/21 118/19 122/24
hotel [4] 28/13 28/18 28/19 28/23
hours [2] 56/20 74/14
house [1] 107/13
how [44] 6/25 14/14 14/16 15/3 31/10
31/12 33/18 41/25 42/5 44/11 47/1 51/6 51/8 51/8 52/20 52/23
however [7] 5/4
22/14 38/11 77/15
79/12 89/10 114/11
human [1] 19/16
husband [1] 118/12
I
I accept [1] 115/9
I accepted [1] 89/19
l acknowledge [1]
84/11
I actually [1] 4/12
I also [1] 107/15
I am [5] 56/25 63/7
63/12 63/21 100/10
I apologise [1] 110/11 71/25 86/15 90/10 106/13 109/20 123/11 I believed [2] 43/7 118/5
I can [15] 1/12 27/3 34/11 47/11 57/14 57/16 59/24 67/9 70/18 82/13 88/15 91/20 100/12 104/9 121/11
I can't [38] 7/2 7/3

106/3 108/21 109/11 $15 / 19$ 18/22 $27 / 13$ 109/12 109/21 109/22 27/23 28/14 33/11 57/14 61/13 61/22 I could [4] 29/24 63/6 64/2 64/5 64/8 64/16 108/2 109/21 64/10 65/4 65/23 70/4 I couldn't [6] 51/8 73/8 75/21 80/10 53/12 54/7 88/17 81/18 88/24 93/20 106/3 123/11 97/18 98/16 107/24 I covered [1] 75/18 108/9 110/25 111/10 I describe [1] 99/11 113/11 119/19 119/22 I did [12] 5/2 36/11 120/4 120/8 $\quad 42 / 2244 / 744 / 10$

48/12 57/19 64/25 85/16 86/14 107/15 120/6
I didn't [7] 68/21
101/6 104/13 110/12 112/17 123/2 123/4
I do [7] 1/19 2/22
3/18 28/11 86/20
86/25 96/18
I don't [41] 3/4 3/11 11/4 11/4 11/7 17/16 28/7 28/11 28/24 32/2 34/10 39/4 47/10 51/15 53/23 54/7 54/17 58/1 64/5 64/6 70/13 76/23 76/25 81/14 85/5 85/16 87/15 89/20 91/22 93/21 98/3 98/13 98/21 99/2 101/24 103/22 103/23 104/13 105/12 115/3 119/24 I exhibit [1] 33/4 I felt [2] 51/6 51/9 I found [1] 49/4 13/8 33/17 36/9 42/14 I gave [1] 4/13 43/11 43/21 44/1 I go [1] 26/20 53/24 58/5 59/18 I had [4] 27/6 65/24

67/12 121/6 I hadn't [3] 81/14 87/14 115/4
I have [18] $2 / 20$
13/20 24/5 33/3 38/18
61/8 62/11 63/2 81/15 84/7 87/6 89/1 99/10 102/11 104/4 118/15 118/25 119/6
I haven't [2] 75/12 118/9
(41) hard - I haven't

I hear [1] 121/2
I honestly [3] 31/11 33/10 54/16
I hope [3] 39/19 113/17 124/15
I identified [1] 43/7
I joined [1] 30/18
I just [7] 44/5 44/12 75/15 120/4 121/12 123/18 124/5
I knew [1] 75/17
I know [3] 34/13 51/7 118/22
I learned [2] 32/13 34/12
I looked [1] 74/24
I maintain [1] 115/20
I may [1] 68/21
I mean [2] 75/11 111/11
I mention [1] 65/17
I mistakenly [1] 39/18
I needed [1] 71/22
I note [2] 79/22 91/16
I noted [1] 84/9
I now [1] 4/14
I obtained [1] 91/16
I picked [1] 101/17
I played [1] 4/22
I please [1] 1/7
I probably [2] 29/22 30/24
I propose [1] 82/14
I put [1] 33/22
I really [1] 75/15
I recall [16] 5/8 5/9 17/25 19/3 20/8 35/4 35/8 36/11 43/2 43/10 58/11 67/11 68/11 71/20 88/11 104/10
I received [6] 4/15 19/4 27/5 27/11 27/13 33/23
I refer [1] 42/21
I remember [1] 71/20
I represent [2]
102/17 122/9
I said [2] 101/16 102/4
I saw [1] 27/15
I say [4] 30/24 33/20
64/24 114/1
I see [2] 25/20 26/23
I sent [1] 88/14
I should [3] 2/1 70/21 82/24
I showed [1] 93/15
I spent [1] 75/13
I stand [1] 115/9
I stated [6] 4/7 4/23 70/20 81/9 113/7

118/5
suppose [1] 74/2 I take [1] 12/5 I think [20] 22/4
28/12 28/19 33/10 35/19 39/1 39/12 40/4 58/9 64/14 64/19
66/21 67/21 90/15 110/2 110/6 111/9 111/10 113/6 121/15 I thought [4] 35/16 76/21 86/21 118/8 I told [1] 93/2 I took [3] 8/4 53/22 65/2
I turn [1] 102/13 I understand [5] 3/10 3/25 61/16 87/14 121/15
I want [3] 106/5 112/7 114/7
I wanted [1] 122/16 I was [27] 5/8 27/5 27/12 28/12 29/23 29/25 36/9 36/10 39/6 43/1 43/5 44/3 44/4 45/18 59/18 65/18 76/18 88/15 89/19
92/22 93/3 93/11 97/23 106/4 106/22 109/24 119/3
I wasn't [7] 43/2
85/22 90/7 90/15
104/12 106/23 109/24 I went [3] 30/8 31/12 71/23
I will [4] 5/20 5/23 12/15 50/6
I won't [1] 106/7 I wonder [1] 81/21 I worked [1] 93/14 I would [17] 5/12 8/8 23/13 23/15 33/23 38/21 39/9 40/18 44/6 47/19 70/17 71/7 76/24 81/12 87/13 87/19 103/22
I wouldn't [3] 35/7 89/15 101/16
I wrote [1] 29/23
I'd [14] 13/10 18/3 20/1 48/13 71/21 71/23 72/4 85/17 89/20 115/20 118/5 118/6 118/8 118/16 I'II [3] 100/10 100/10 121/4
I'm [40] 3/13 11/5 12/5 23/14 26/7 28/20 29/17 29/19 31/11 39/3 39/16 44/4 46/12 47/10 47/16 47/25 51/6 54/14 54/19 57/15 58/1 64/15

70/24 70/25 74/5 97/23 98/3 98/13 98/16 100/7 106/8 108/6 109/21 110/1 111/10 112/19 115/23 118/25 119/1 123/12 I've [16] 26/3 50/18 67/9 75/8 80/1 81/17 94/4 94/4 101/17 104/11 107/14 113/17 115/10 118/7 118/16 122/5
lain [2] 24/2 24/4
lain/Andy [1] 24/4 idea [9] 50/18 67/9 75/8 75/9 75/10 78/17 101/17 104/6 107/14 ideas [1] 49/15 identification [1] 72/8
identified [3] 43/7 58/12 69/8
identify [2] 40/8 43/6 idiosyncrasies [2]
56/24 57/25
ie [2] 68/20 81/4
ie within [1] 68/20
if [122] $2 / 183 / 115 / 1$ 5/5 15/7 16/1 16/2 16/6 16/8 16/14 17/3 17/8 21/11 23/25 25/21 26/4 26/8 26/18 independently [1] 27/7 29/19 30/4 33/22 57/22
33/22 35/5 39/4 39/13 indicate [1] 1/17 40/12 41/1 41/3 41/5 indicated [2] 76/22 41/19 42/9 43/3 44/5 44/8 46/20 47/12 51/18 52/14 52/17 52/23 54/14 54/17 54/21 54/23 55/3 56/3 56/5 56/19 57/1 57/17 58/5 59/20 60/21 61/23 61/25 62/4 63/9 64/17 65/8 67/8 67/11 67/11 68/10 68/25 69/13 69/19 70/14 70/14 70/21 70/25 71/4 71/16 71/19 71/20 76/18 76/20 77/8 77/23 80/17 81/13 81/21 84/1 84/10 84/13 84/25 85/4 87/13 89/19 89/25 90/23 95/18 96/7 97/2 98/18 106/22 106/22 107/1 108/2 108/4 109/5
110/12 111/18 112/24 113/8 113/9 113/10 113/12 113/18 115/4 115/24 117/24 118/13 118/25 120/13 122/14 122/16 122/23 122/25 informative [1] 123/12 123/18 123/22 124/16
informed [4] 16/14 43/10 45/2 67/12 initial [9] 20/2 20/8
20/14 20/21 21/9 22/3 22/25 23/5 63/3
initially [1] 90/24
innocent [1] 38/4
input [1] 14/7
inputting [1] 14/6
inquiries [4] 20/10
59/2 68/12 68/14
inquiry [25] 1/16 2/13
2/15 4/3 20/3 20/16
21/20 33/8 33/20 39/2
47/18 48/6 48/8 62/2
69/16 72/18 80/5
104/15 105/3 105/15 111/1 112/22 114/15 115/12 123/16
inquiry' [1] 34/23
Inquiry's [3] 1/18 2/3 5/22
insertion [1] 3/6
insight [1] 67/19
insofar [1] 64/11
instance [2] 42/9 123/19
instances [1] 15/16 instead [2] 5/23 39/19
instructed [2] 106/10 113/23
instructions [4] 36/4
36/24 38/16 106/15 insufficient [5] 53/9
54/9 54/12 55/2 55/19
integrity [6] 85/9
105/2 114/22 115/1
115/16 118/20
intend [2] 1/19
113/12
intended [1] 65/24
intention [2] 19/15 98/6
interest [2] 23/21 47/15
interim [9] 68/10
68/14 68/18 68/22 72/13 77/6 78/2 79/20 83/17
interrupt [1] 110/1 intervention [1] 59/10
interview [40] 16/2
30/15 31/18 31/23
40/10 40/17 41/9
41/10 65/18 68/1 68/7
72/21 72/23 72/25
73/1 74/16 76/9 76/22
77/13 85/11 85/17
86/13 91/15 92/2 92/5
92/7 92/8 92/11 94/8
96/10 96/22 96/24
97/3 97/20 101/25
interview... [5]
104/10 104/12 106/25 113/8 120/13
interviewed [5] 72/7
92/8 102/25 106/21
111/15
Interviewing [3] 73/2 73/3 92/9
interviews [10] 19/11
19/12 20/12 31/13
31/15 101/22 104/8 120/11 121/19 122/2
into [33] 1/18 1/21 2/1 12/23 16/20 18/2 21/13 21/16 21/17 33/22 41/20 62/15 67/19 69/19 70/15
70/20 74/25 78/24
81/13 85/8 88/4 91/14 91/23 98/2 106/18 106/18 107/24 109/25 112/15 114/22 115/1 115/3 115/16
intricate [1] 49/7
introduced [2] 9/5 74/24
introduction [3]
16/20 16/24 18/1
investigate [5] 21/15 77/4 81/4 111/1 111/7 investigated [8]
20/11 52/9 52/13 60/2 60/7 66/5 87/6 112/12
investigating [3]
12/2 70/8 114/2
investigation [63]
5/9 6/22 7/12 7/23 8/15 8/23 9/16 9/16 10/15 10/16 12/17 13/11 18/7 18/8 18/18 19/4 19/22 20/21
23/22 29/4 31/5 36/10 50/21 51/10 51/23 61/25 62/1 62/21 66/2 68/8 68/18 68/19 72/4 72/12 72/13 77/6 78/2 78/6 78/24 79/19 81/4 83/14 83/17 83/19
85/8 87/1 87/11 87/18 90/19 98/18 99/8 101/17 101/19 109/24 114/9 114/22 115/1 115/24 116/18 117/11 117/17 121/6 123/7
investigations [42] 6/19 7/6 8/12 8/14 8/24 8/25 9/22 11/14 12/21 12/23 13/18 14/21 14/25 15/9 19/8 20/1 20/8 25/12 25/14 26/15 30/2 30/7 30/23 38/11 38/13 40/6 42/2
$42 / 742 / 16$ 51/14 51/21 52/18 60/17 91/14 91/22 104/17 109/6 110/15 115/16 118/24 121/17 121/23 investigator [27] 10/3 11/24 12/1 18/5 20/14 20/16 20/22 21/3 21/19 22/4 22/17 22/23 23/1 23/7 28/8 32/14 44/5 50/2 50/14 51/5 52/7 62/12 89/17 90/25 121/5 121/9 121/15
Investigator's [3] 20/7 22/2 22/9 investigators [32] 11/9 11/13 14/21 23/18 24/17 24/18 24/19 28/5 30/22 45/4 50/10 56/15 57/3 59/5 60/11 62/9 62/21 62/23 63/25 64/3 64/18 65/1 66/1 66/15 Jacobs [4] 102/15 85/12 91/4 105/7 102/16 110/13 125/9 105/15 107/17 113/24 January [7] 1/1 4/18 122/2 122/25
Investigatory [2] 18/23 19/14
invoice [1] 95/2 invoices [2] 94/17 94/22
involved [10] 6/18 7/5 17/15 17/17 34/19 40/15 90/24 105/25 120/11 121/4 involvement [7] 12/16 42/16 44/22 90/21 91/24 102/8 121/13
involving [2] 11/3 21/17 is [248] isn't [12] 72/7 99/13 101/7 104/18 107/21 108/22 112/8 113/21 115/19 117/13 118/1 120/16
issue [14] 38/4 54/11 63/11 64/21 64/24 65/5 86/24 87/4 100/17 104/2 105/2 105/16 106/1 122/25 issues [16] 5/24 71/8 76/25 77/4 78/25 81/5 85/24 101/10 101/21 101/23 103/24 105/24 106/3 109/12 109/22 118/20
issues' [1] 19/17
it [359]
it's [47] 10/11 14/23 16/6 16/7 16/11 25/22 29/24 34/8 35/25

49/13 57/19 62/20 62/20 66/25 72/6 73/11 73/11 74/18 75/10 75/12 76/5 76/15 77/8 78/7 79/16 88/8 88/20 90/1 96/15 97/22 98/23 99/13 101/7 103/6 108/3 108/6 110/6 111/19 113/6 115/20 115/25 115/25 116/1 118/1 118/7 118/9 122/20 item [3] 84/19 107/15 111/21
items [1] 107/17 its [6] $2 / 2$ 2/13 8/24 26/1 58/8 97/22 itself [3] 56/7 66/13 66/13 J 78/9 93/4 93/22 93/23 94/4
Jarnail [1] 43/10 Jayne [1] 120/22
Jesmond [5] 73/15
73/16 79/21 86/14 103/16

67/13 70/12 70/13 71/25 73/25 74/17
75/15 77/9 82/7 82/18 lawyers [2] 43/16 89/4 89/16 93/10 97/5 44/21
97/19 100/8 100/11 lead [5] 91/1 121/4 100/22 103/25 108/2 121/9 121/17 121/22 108/5 110/1 110/4 leader [3] 16/5 16/8 110/22 112/19 114/4 16/13
118/21 118/25 119/12 learned [2] 32/13 120/4 121/12 123/15 34/12
123/18 124/5
justice [4] 35/2 36/16 68/10 68/14 81/18

| $37 / 15117 / 7$ | $110 / 7124 / 16$ |
| :--- | :--- |

Justice and [1] 37/15 leave [1] 89/23

## K

keen [1] 56/16 117/12
KENNETH [3] $1 / 5$ 1/7 left [3] 15/12 91/7 125/2
key [1] 13/19
keys [1] 74/23
Khanna [2] 73/19

## 73/21

kicked [1] 96/7
kind [2] 28/4 45/16
King [5] 16/14 16/18
17/15 17/16 17/18
Kingdom [1] 12/8
Kirsty [1] 33/13
knew [2] 75/17 97/15
Knight [1] 73/2
know [19] 2/14 3/11
17/16 26/7 34/13 39/2 let [6] 74/23 74/25 51/7 53/13 75/15 $\quad 75 / 11$ 103/6 110/13 102/22 102/22 102/24 121/8
104/13 104/14 112/2
117/10 118/22 119/9 119/24
knowledge [1] 5/16
knowledgeable [2]
43/1 43/14
known [1] 28/20
L
labour [1] 49/12
large [2] 116/8 116/9 last [12] $4 / 1531 / 10$ 41/25 48/17 51/25 78/9 78/10 89/25 111/19 118/15 121/9 121/21
lasted [1] 31/12
late [1] 37/17
later [2] 17/16 74/16
latterly [1] 45/20
Lavender [1] 19/5
law [31] 16/9 16/13
16/17 16/25 17/13
17/19 18/8 22/19 24/7
30/13 30/17 30/24
31/25 37/20 37/23
38/14 42/1 43/1 43/15
43/16 43/22 43/25
44/6 44/7 47/1 47/7
let's [2] $3 / 1334 / 14$
letter [2] 91/19 99/22
letters [2] 24/12 35/1
liaise [1] 49/16
liaised [1] 29/4
Licensing [1] 37/15
light [3] 4/1 10/11 110/18
like [9] $4 / 5$ 8/8 13/10 18/3 20/1 48/13 63/12
72/4 115/21
likely [2] $4 / 1371 / 7$
limited [3] 24/18 63/4 68/13
line [13] 23/20 44/15
44/17 48/9 48/13
57/15 70/16 71/5
73/13 73/17 73/18
79/4 123/10
lines [8] 20/3 20/10
20/16 21/20 34/23
47/17 64/19 111/1
link [1] 66/22
linked [3] 101/24
112/15 112/17
list [19] 19/21 80/17
80/18 81/10 81/11
82/8 82/11 82/19
82/22 83/3 83/9 84/18

| L | M | $80$ | $68$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| list... [7] 87/16 88/25 | machine [2] 73/14 |  |  |  |
| 100/23 101/3 114/17 | 73 |  |  |  |
| 115/13 124/7 | made [28] 5/14 7/18 | materials [7] 25/1 25/4 25/5 25/6 27/7 | $131 /$ | 51/21 52/2 52/8 52/18 65/24 66/5 66/8 86/14 |
| listed [5] 15/21 73/1 80/20 81/3 92/9 | 16/8 16/12 17/21 | 25/4 25/5 25/6 27/7 | mentored [1] 31/14 mentoring [2] 31/9 | $14$ |
| lis |  | matter [2] 69/7 69/12 | 34/3 | Monks |
| little [10] 11/6 13/5 | 75/2 76/19 77/21 | ters [4] 12 | merely | 116/7 |
| 23/25 25/23 26/19 | 77/23 78/4 78/16 79/5 | 12/23 86/25 87/5 | me | month [ |
| 37/18 77/13 80/17 | 791 | M | message [2] 105/16 |  |
| 97/5 101/1 | 91/14 91/23 95/19 |  |  |  |
| LLP [1] | 96/13 101/11 103/1 | /5 120/6 | met [4] 48/18 48/2 | 48/17 56/13 |
| loan [7] 95 |  |  |  |  |
| 96/7 96/7 96/11 97/20 | Mail [5] 19/7 23/22 | maximised [1] 58/25 | method [1] 19/ MG [1] 16/4 | 44/3 45/2 47/19 48 |
| 98/8 | 24/12 86/14 87/1 | maximum [1] 59/8 | $\text { Mhari [1] } 11$ | $50 / 751 / 1955 / 24$ |
| loc | main [5] 30/13 31/16 | may [38] 1/6 1/20 2/6 | Mick [5] 23/23 | 66/17 85/12 9 |
|  |  | 32/3 32/22 33/9 33/21 | 25/1 26/10 28/1 | 108/25 118/25 |
|  |  | 38/3 38/7 44/17 44/18 | middle [1] 77/11 | morning [7] 1/3 |
|  |  | 45/20 46/14 50/22 | might [20] 21/10 | 39/14 74/22 102/24 |
| London [1] 19/6 |  | 50/23 52/5 52/5 53/21 | 23/10 23/11 28/5 | 112/10 114/8 |
| London [1] 19/6 | make [16] 4/1 4/5 | 53/25 54/15 54/15 | 29/14 29/20 31/2 | motivated [2] 49/5 |
| 31/12 33/18 44/11 |  | 58/11 66/20 66/21 | 39/13 57/10 67/20 | 49/15 |
| 56/20 56/20 62/11 | 96/11 97/21 98/5 | 66/21 66/22 67/13 | 71/2 71/4 76/11 81/2 | motivation |
| longer [2] 63/1 63/2 | 102/1 107/23 109/1 | 68/ | 103/3 103/9 103/20 | Moving [1] 67/23 |
| look [12] 26/18 28/13 | 113 | 68/21 69/17 70/19 | 105/17 105/17 113/19 |  |
| 28/15 48/10 48/ | making [9] 13/10 | 80/15 | mind [3] 46/13 | Mr |
| 56/2 57/17 64/23 65/3 | 21/17 25/7 57/10 |  |  | r Bradshaw |
| 89/25 100/24 | 63/17 65/1 87/22 |  |  |  |
| loo | 951 |  | mindful [2] |  |
| 17/22 25/2 | man [1] | McFarlane [2] 88/15 |  | 4/25 40 |
| 27/1 36/15 59/14 60/9 | managed [1] 72/10 |  | minutes [5] 3/12 73/1 | 24/25 40/5 55/8 55/15 |
| 74/24 76/9 83/8 87/14 | management [5] 6/9 |  |  |  |
| 100/22 107/10 115/5 | 29/6 44/15 123/10 |  |  |  |
| looking [20] 15/23 | 123/10 |  |  | 06/21 108/24 |
| 19/1 26/25 29/20 37/1 | manager [21] 5/9 | 74/22 74/23 74/23 | $35 / 2$ | $110 / 14 \text { 113/14 } 1$ |
| 46/1 57/7 66/20 70/1 | 6/23 7/12 7/23 7/25 | 75/6 76/18 79/18 | misconceived [1] |  |
| 73/16 73/17 100/23 | 9/4 9/7 18/18 19/4 |  | misconceived [1] $117 / 12$ | 122/9 |
| 101/3 108/14 108/25 | 23/22 30/8 36/10 | 92/19 92/19 93/18 | Misra [3] 66/25 | $\text { Mr Daily's [10] } 1 / 6$ |
| 109/3 109/5 112/19 | 44/17 48/9 48/14 |  | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \text { Misra [ } \\ 67 / 17 \end{array}$ | $/ 19 \text { 13/15 15/6 18 }$ |
| 113/15 113/18 | 49/22 57/15 69/8 70/9 | 102/18 106/22 |  | $48$ |
| looks [3] 56/21 57/14 | 70/16 104/17 |  |  | 98/22 |
|  | managers [8] 9/16 | 120/7 121/8 122/1 | mistakenly [1] 39/18 | Mr Daley [3] 49/3 |
| Lord [2] 37/10 37/13 | 10/15 13/12 15/21 | mean [11] 28/1 28/17 | mitigating [1] 20/10 | 49/24 56/11 |
| Lord Coulsfield's [1] $37 / 13$ | 29/5 48/2 62/1 65/6 | 32/3 32/20 43/15 60/4 | Module [1] 36/24 | Daley [1] |
| 37/13 | managing [1] 43/18 | 64/2 71/18 75/11 98/4 | moment [6] 30/3 | Donnelly's [2] |
| loss [24] 56/18 58/22 | manner [1] 89/9 | 64/2 | $32 / 2239 / 1445 / 20$ | 1/15 1/23 |
| 59/12 65/21 65/22 | manual [1] 14/17 |  | 46/13 46/1 | Grant [7] 91/3 |
| 76/22 78/14 103/20 108/10 108/21 109/3 | many [6] 51/8 70/4 75/13 78/21 116/4 | measured [1] 52/11 | monetary [1] 59/8 | 1/7 92/15 93/22 |
| /5 109/8 109/10 | 3 78/21 116/4 | measures [1] 59/10 | money [49] 41/21 | 95/23 121/16 121/23 |
| 109/17 109/23 110/4 | March [2] | meet [2] 49/18 83/3 | 45/22 46/2 46/8 52/ | Mr Grant's [3] 50/16 |
| 110/9 110/9 111/8 | Marion [2] 102/18 | meeting [10] 48/16 | 7 62/4 62/5 66/ | 91/23 102/4 |
| 112/2 113/17 114/1 |  | 56 | 70/19 | [ |
| 114/2 | marked [1] 52/19 | 56/10 56/11 59/13 | 75/14 77/3 77/15 | 72/21 74/16 76/6 |
| losses [5] 59/24 65/4 | marks [1] 81/20 | 61/13 63/3 63/6 | 78/18 78/23 86/22 | 7/21 77/1 77/5 77/1 |
| 77/2 85/14 113/20 | match [1] 97/12 | meetings [3] 48/9 | 87/7 94/17 94/18 | 7 |
| [1] 113/16 | material [26] 17/24 |  | 94/21 95/1 95/12 96/8 | 78/17 78/25 79/5 |
| lot [2] 36/13 58/12 |  | meets [1] 32/17 | 97/14 97/18 98/2 98 | 79/11 80/9 81/5 81/2 |
| ch [6] 81/22 81/24 | 22/23 23/9 25/11 | member [5] 49/5 | 99/ | 4/9 85/10 86/8 86/9 |
| 82/7 82/10 82/18 | 26/14 38/3 38/6 38/7 | 22/14 | 107/24 108/14 109/4 | 86/10 87/23 90/15 |
| 82/20 | 38/17 72/17 80/8 | 122/16 | 109/7 110/17 111 | 102/22 102/25 103/1 |
| luxury [1] 111/21 | 80/13 80/18 80/19 | members [1] 58/16 | 112/13 112/24 112/24 | 04/9 106/25 111/15 |
| luxury [1] 111/21 | 80/13 8018 80/19 | mention [3] 65/17 | 113/2 113/10 113/11 | 113/18 114/2 114/10 |

(44) list... - Mr Holmes

Mr Holmes... [6] 116/4 116/8 116/10 117/10 117/18 119/2
Mr Holmes' [20]
12/18 73/6 73/10
77/12 80/11 80/13 84/16 85/7 86/7 88/2 101/20 102/7 106/6 107/7 108/21 109/17 110/10 110/19 116/19 121/5
Mr Jacobs [4] 102/15 102/16 110/13 125/9
Mr Kenneth [1] 1/7
Mr Khanna [2] 73/19 73/21
Mr Peter [1] 87/20
Mr Quarm [19] 91/17
91/19 91/20 92/2 94/8 96/10 96/14 96/20 96/24 97/7 97/8 97/11 97/14 97/16 97/20 98/1 98/14 101/8
101/23
Mr Quarm's [5] 12/19 91/14 101/19 102/1 102/7
Mr Scotland [1] 40/7
Mr William [1] 90/20
Mrs [6] 85/23 88/4
88/5 104/4 107/20
124/15

## Mrs Holmes [2]

104/4 124/15
Mrs Holmes' [3] 88/4 88/5 107/20
Mrs Palmer [1] 85/23
MS [15] 2/9 39/20 67/3 67/7 102/25 104/1 104/23 114/8 114/14 116/1 122/7 122/8 124/2 125/7 125/13
MS PRICE [10] 2/9 39/20 102/25 104/1 104/23 114/8 114/14 116/1 124/2 125/7
Ms Topham [1] 67/7
Ms Watt [1] 122/7
much [8] 2/4 56/25 75/21 75/22 88/24 93/20 107/24 121/1 multiple [1] 21/18
Murphy [1] 24/2 must [6] 20/22 37/21 57/3 94/3 94/23 106/5 my [59] 3/5 4/6 4/6 4/7 5/6 5/7 5/10 5/12 27/14 27/17 30/7 30/18 31/5 32/13 33/4 33/24 35/18 40/15 42/20 44/3 44/15

44/17 47/10 49/4 52/25 55/20 57/15 59/19 61/5 61/8 65/17 65/22 67/5 67/9 67/17 75/12 79/18 79/19 79/23 81/9 81/13 86/13 86/18 87/8 87/13 88/13 89/9 99/11 104/5 107/15 112/17 113/25 115/4 115/20 116/25 118/9 118/12 119/3 124/1 myself [6] $5 / 539 / 18$ 39/19 104/3 104/10 107/18
$\mathbf{N}$
name [13] 2/10 2/17 3/17 9/19 58/18 62/22 62/22 65/20 80/16 96/14 96/17 117/11 122/21
namely [1] 1/24
nature [2] 83/5 86/12 necessarily [2] 52/20 61/18
necessary [1] 107/1
necessitating [1] 76/8
need [10] 1/11 22/22 26/18 36/21 41/18 55/8 55/20 57/3 64/16 103/19
needed [2] 57/23 71/22
needing [1] 82/8 needn't [2] 24/24 90/9
never [7] 60/9 63/11 104/15 109/1 109/17 113/16 116/9
new [6] 25/8 37/22 49/12 57/2 58/3 73/19
New Year [1] 49/12 Newcastle [2] 12/19 13/8
news [2] 66/24 66/25 next [12] 16/4 16/5 26/13 26/17 26/19 30/10 51/16 51/24 53/1 58/20 90/1 102/18
NFSP [3] 122/9 122/14 123/19 nights [1] 112/3 no [101] 1/11 3/4 3/13 6/20 10/10 11/15 11/15 12/4 16/1 16/1 16/6 16/11 16/11 18/10 29/2 35/15 42/10 43/15 45/12 50/18 51/15 55/23
57/9 57/14 60/18 61/22 63/1 63/25

66/13 67/9 75/8 75/9 75/10 75/11 77/16 78/17 79/12 79/23 80/4 80/8 80/23 81/7 81/9 81/15 83/7 83/10 84/21 85/8 85/22 86/1 87/5 87/19 87/21 90/15 95/3 95/5 95/14 97/15 101/17 101/23 101/25 102/10 102/14 102/14 104/6 105/3 105/6 106/22 107/7 107/14 108/20 109/2 109/10 110/3 111/4 111/5 112/17 114/1 114/11 114/14 114/22 notices [1] 86/22 115/1 115/3 115/12 notifications [4] 115/14 115/16 115/20 $18 / 24$ 19/17 19/19 116/24 117/5 117/14 118/1 118/2 118/20 119/3 119/4 120/1 120/3 120/21 121/6 123/2 123/24
nobody [2] 78/19 85/24
non [10] 4/9 14/1 14/4 18/24 34/25 72/16 80/12 114/16 115/13 123/22 non-disclosure [1] 34/25
non-police [4] 4/9 14/1 14/4 18/24
non-sensitive [5]
72/16 80/12 114/16 115/13 123/22
none [5] 46/13 49/8
50/16 64/17 119/11
nor [1] 56/22
normal [1] 106/18
north [5] 12/13 13/2
13/2 13/6 31/6
not [98] 1/19 1/22
4/15 5/20 6/18 7/8 14/3 17/8 17/13 24/17 25/17 28/20 29/12 30/14 31/17 37/22 38/5 38/18 40/22 41/2 45/3 45/5 46/20 47/16 47/25 50/8 50/23 51/6 52/5 52/13 52/15 52/16 52/17 52/20 54/14 54/15 54/16 54/19 54/20 55/14 57/14 57/15 58/1 58/9 66/1 66/10 67/17 68/11 68/23 69/12 74/5 75/12 75/15 75/22 81/13 81/17 82/19 83/25 84/1 84/10 84/12 84/13 84/21 84/25 85/1 85/4 85/4 86/5 86/14 86/23 86/25 87/2 87/11

## 19/19

notwithstanding [1] 55/20
November [4] 2/18 48/16 50/13 50/24
November 2009 [1] 50/24
now [36] 1/20 3/16 4/14 5/3 22/15 29/22 31/7 35/3 38/12 62/13
62/25 67/22 73/20 73/23 76/5 84/13 84/17 93/11 93/11 93/13 93/21 95/18 98/17 102/24 104/1 108/7 108/25 109/12 110/18 112/6 112/20 117/25 118/22 118/22 122/20 122/21
NPA [3] 18/23 18/24 19/17
number [10] 9/10 11/11 15/12 15/24 24/17 38/11 40/8 43/8 44/25 104/5

## 0

objective [5] 51/18 51/20 58/21 59/15 61/14
objectives [10] 51/17
52/21 58/15 58/16
59/19 60/10 60/14
60/25 61/18 123/11
obligation [4] 20/15
21/20 22/16 23/8
obligations [10] 20/3
22/1 22/2 22/9 22/12
32/8 33/15 34/2 37/5
47/24
observations [1]
89/5
observe [5] 47/1 47/6
47/14 47/17 47/22
obtain [6] 20/22 21/3
21/14 46/18 66/14

81/17
obtained [13] 20/9
22/5 34/21 54/5 84/10
84/12 84/20 84/25
88/2 91/16 99/5 101/4
117/23
obtaining [9] 3/5
7/14 20/20 21/7 21/9
91/25 99/6 99/7 99/10
obviously [4] 90/11
118/9 121/18 122/1
occasion [4] 7/16
25/3 27/15 86/16
occasions [1] 68/21
occur [1] 101/20
occurred [1] 66/12
October [11] 35/12
36/3 36/12 36/21
36/23 37/2 37/4 38/22
77/7 77/11 116/11
odd [1] 75/3
off [6] 39/18 75/25
76/3 81/23 100/11 112/6
offences [2] 31/24
32/4
offender [2] 14/18 19/11
offer [8] 67/19 84/13
85/3 85/5 87/23
117/25 118/1 118/2
offered [3] 30/14
31/17 88/1
offering [1] 28/2
office [97] 1/9 4/10 4/16 6/2 6/2 6/13 12/19 12/20 13/13 13/23 14/15 14/20 15/8 17/4 18/4 19/6 19/6 21/16 22/16 24/18 28/6 29/9 32/25
33/13 34/18 38/23
38/24 38/25 39/6
39/11 39/11 39/12
43/9 43/13 43/23 44/23 45/4 45/9 45/10 46/10 46/23 47/3 47/8 47/21 48/2 50/5 50/20 52/24 55/10 55/18 57/12 59/17 59/25 60/3 60/8 60/11 61/15 62/13 62/25 63/4 63/24 64/4 64/6 64/7 64/8 64/9 65/4 65/20 69/9 70/9 72/2 72/9
74/25 77/2 78/19 85/10 86/15 91/4 91/7 94/21 95/2 98/2 100/21 105/15 106/2 108/19 109/15 113/4 113/8 113/19 114/20 115/7 115/15 117/1 117/18 123/17 123/23
office's [1] 15/17

Office/Battersea [1] 19/6
officer [19] 6/16 7/7 23/3 30/23 31/13 31/14 72/18 73/2 73/3 84/16 84/23 90/24 91/1 92/10 97/23 99/19 116/14 120/10 120/12
Officers [1] 92/9
offices [2] 15/17 93/10
Oh [2] 76/2 92/22
okay [11] 27/24 28/8
37/8 67/18 73/11
74/20 83/8 93/5 93/25
94/21 122/11
old [1] 120/2
on [218]
onboard [1] 116/7
once [2] 49/13 50/6
one [49] 7/9 13/14
26/3 36/13 36/17
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60/24 64/21 64/22
99/11 102/6
Reviewee [1] 60/22
revisit [1] 78/6

10/7 11/21 12/12
13/24 17/6 19/23
22/15 29/6 29/23
31/21 34/19 37/8
39/22 43/18 50/11
50/14 51/1 52/7 57/13
59/16 61/11 68/2 68/9 71/9 72/6 72/19 73/3
73/21 74/20 78/11
83/22 84/2 84/23
89/14 89/20 90/9
90/18 90/23 91/5 92/3
92/11 93/5 93/7 93/10
93/25 94/16 95/18
95/18 95/24 98/17
99/13 99/24 101/7
104/2 104/18 107/20
107/22 107/25 108/22
110/22 111/17 112/13
113/5 113/17 114/5
114/18 115/19 117/13
120/16 121/12 122/6 124/12
rights [1] 19/17
ring [1] 103/9
risk [1] 19/16
RML [1] 24/11
robberies [1] $8 / 6$
ROBERT [16] 2/8
2/12 49/4 49/9 49/14
49/15 49/23 49/25
50/2 50/4 50/8 56/15
56/18 56/25 57/4 125/5
robust [3] 58/22
105/19 118/19
role [29] $4 / 225 / 8$
6/22 6/25 7/8 7/12
7/23 7/25 8/5 10/16
10/16 11/24 12/1 18/4
18/7 18/17 19/3 23/6 23/6 28/8 30/7 32/13
33/19 40/15 57/9
87/21 99/20 120/9
120/12
roles [6] 6/1 6/7 6/8
6/9 8/2 11/20
rolled [1] 58/6
rollout [4] 57/2 58/3
58/4 58/8
Roughly [2] 6/25 75/24
round [1] 66/20
roundabout [1] 34/5
Royal [5] 19/7 23/21
24/12 86/14 87/1
rsquo [1] 62/14
Rugby [1] 30/8
run [1] 35/11
running [1] 63/18

## S

safeguards [1] 31/23
said [37] 65/21 70/21
76/3 77/1 78/15 78/20
78/21 80/10 83/17
83/19 83/25 89/15
93/18 96/24 97/11
97/13 97/15 97/16
101/16 101/23 102/4
103/7 103/12 103/25
104/23 105/16 109/9
109/10 112/10 112/15 112/18 115/9 115/10 115/18 118/11 121/3 121/14
same [16] $8 / 2$ 16/19
17/23 17/25 24/17
27/19 32/14 35/13
36/17 36/18 43/2
59/20 63/5 63/14 65/9 101/20
Samsung [1] 111/23
sarcastic [1] 67/21
sat [1] 11/18
saw [2] $25 / 327 / 15$
say [109] 4/12 5/3
7/22 8/10 10/14 11/5
11/18 13/17 14/24
16/24 19/2 20/5 20/19 21/8 22/1 24/25 27/4
27/8 27/24 28/15 29/3
30/6 30/10 30/24
30/25 31/20 32/12
32/20 33/2 33/20 34/1
34/5 34/14 35/15
35/21 36/8 40/14 41/6
41/16 42/19 43/13
47/19 48/1 51/8 54/16
55/13 57/8 61/4 61/24
62/3 62/9 63/24 64/24
65/16 67/23 68/13
69/5 69/11 71/15 73/7
76/16 77/14 78/4 79/4
79/17 81/9 81/11
83/24 84/6 87/21 88/9
88/22 89/11 89/15
90/1 91/12 93/22
93/24 94/20 95/4
96/19 97/2 98/24 99/5
99/17 101/16 103/6 103/19 103/21 104/4 106/8 107/4 107/5 107/6 112/17 112/22 113/6 114/1 114/9 116/25 117/16 117/22 118/3 118/14 121/4 123/3 123/6 123/9 123/12
saying [13] 34/4

72/17 76/6 89/16 95/9 $88 / 8$ 88/19 91/11 92/5 seem [2] 100/6 95/18 96/10 103/13 105/23 109/15 109/18 109/22 113/1
says [14] 24/3 37/12 37/20 38/8 48/18 51/25 53/6 67/4 75/4 86/11 92/16 95/23 108/7 111/20
SBRC [1] 63/16 scandal [1] 116/25 scenario [1] 113/15 scenarios [1] 113/14 schedule [8] 72/16 80/12 80/19 83/9 84/17 97/8 114/16 115/13
schedules [3] 22/22 40/20 41/1 scheme [2] 123/6 123/7 Scotland [69] 12/3 12/4 12/9 12/21 12/24 13/3 13/14 13/18 13/21 15/4 16/19 16/21 18/9 20/1 27/13 30/2 30/14 31/1 31/17 32/8 32/13 33/16 34/8 36/10 36/11 37/6 40/7 40/23 41/1 41/9 41/17 42/2 42/6 42/7 42/16 44/3 45/5 47/9 49/22 50/1 50/2 50/2 50/11 50/14 51/5 51/10 54/11 57/1 62/12 62/13 62/17 62/20 62/23 63/1 63/3 63/13 63/25 64/3 64/13 64/16 65/9 66/3 68/5 91/1 91/4 120/6 120/7 121/15 121/18
Scots [7] 30/13 30/17 30/24 42/1 43/1 43/14 44/7
Scottish [27] 16/20 16/23 16/24 18/1 18/2 18/25 30/25 31/25 35/11 42/17 42/22 42/23 43/3 43/12 43/15 43/19 43/25 44/21 50/7 50/25 56/23 57/1 57/24 63/8 65/25 121/16 121/23 screen [50] 1/12 3/12 13/15 14/23 15/6 18/11 20/4 23/16 24/24 25/21 30/3 32/9 32/10 33/6 36/19 39/18 40/13 41/6 42/18 48/15 56/9 58/14 60/19 65/15 66/18 69/3 72/23 76/15 77/7 78/7 79/16 80/14 82/13 84/4 86/6

96/15 98/23 100/4 100/9 100/11 100/18 108/2 108/6 111/24 112/6 112/20
scribe [1] 107/16 scroll [3] 23/25 77/13 80/17
scrolling [12] 25/23
26/19 37/18 58/20 66/21 66/23 77/10 78/11 80/14 86/8 89/4 101/1
search [6] 106/5
106/9 106/16 107/2 107/3 107/7
searched [1] 107/8 searches [4] 19/11 59/2 106/10 110/15 searching [1] 107/17 second [39] 2/25 3/6
4/6 4/21 7/7 10/5 10/12 14/10 22/8 22/14 30/23 31/13 41/4 45/25 46/9 46/19 46/21 50/9 55/15 70/1 73/3 77/8 79/3 81/9 90/22 90/24 91/10 91/13 92/10 92/19 97/23 98/22 99/18 100/4 100/19 111/18 113/18 120/10 120/12
Secondly [1] $4 / 13$ section [3] 64/17 64/18 97/16
secure [2] 42/22 57/11
security [32] $6 / 12$ 6/15 7/23 7/25 8/5 8/7 8/9 8/11 8/11 8/14 8/17 8/19 9/7 9/8 9/10 10/15 11/17 11/21 12/7 12/13 13/1 15/25 29/14 29/18 42/25 49/5 58/15 65/7 72/3 85/13 104/17 123/12 see [46] 1/3 15/7 15/10 15/24 17/2 25/20 26/5 26/23 27/3 37/19 40/3 51/20 52/1
53/1 56/18 57/14 58/18 60/22 62/16 70/2 72/24 77/10 78/9 80/15 80/17 82/4 82/9 82/20 84/18 87/19 88/15 89/12 90/4 91/20 93/11 99/22 101/6 101/10 107/24 108/25 109/3 109/5 113/14 113/18 115/21 115/21
seeing [5] 75/14
78/22 88/16 89/21 116/5

82/2 82/15 82/21 100/15
Seema [2] 66/24 67/8 shortage [14] 15/13
seemed [2] 53/3
73/23
20/24 74/17 75/7 78/14 92/15 92/18 95/13 96/3 96/11 106/17 109/25 113/9 116/9
shortages [5] 58/12 79/12 97/21 114/11 116/9
shortfall [13] 21/5
21/12 29/11 32/1 69/7 69/10 70/11 72/8
76/11 86/17 103/8 108/22 109/11
shortfalls [4] 29/21 85/15 86/3 103/3
should [17] $2 / 12 / 16$ 4/17 18/15 22/4 29/9
30/24 43/23 45/2
70/21 82/24 87/19 87/24 93/14 97/2 116/19 120/14
shouldn't [1] 118/23
show [4] 49/12 80/9
110/8 112/11
showed [2] 32/1
93/15
showing [2] 75/18 93/25
shown [4] 29/11
29/21 37/2 97/7
shows [5] 17/11 96/3
115/12 115/14 116/25
Service [19] $1 / 10$
4/10 4/17 13/23 14/15 sic [2] 90/16 91/23
17/5 33/1 38/24 43/24 side [1] 15/12
44/24 45/9 45/11 Sight [2] 45/25 46/21
46/10 46/24 47/3 47/9 Sight's [2] 46/9 46/19
55/11 57/13 123/18 signature [4] 2/21
Services [4] 42/24 2/23 3/21 3/23
42/25 43/11 43/14
session [1] 38/22
set [10] 6/7 34/25
52/7 58/17 60/11
60/25 63/2 63/5 89/4
93/6
sets [2] 34/16 51/17
setting [2] 31/23
45/25
Seventh [1] 39/8
several [3] 93/8
120/7 120/8
shall [1] 39/15
SharePoint [1] 24/10
she [6] 53/9 67/4
67/13 67/14 67/16 67/19
Sheet [3] 65/19 112/8
113/22
sheets [1] 20/24
Shelley [1] 31/8
short [9] 16/17 17/18
39/24 75/18 75/20
signed [3] 71/22
71/25 97/9
significance [3]
76/21 76/24 103/23
significant [2] 64/20 65/6
silence [1] 111/9 similar [3] 4/24 13/19 14/18
simply [1] 104/5
since [8] 6/3 12/12 12/22 38/11 51/24 59/13 116/11 116/12
Singh [1] 43/10
sir [43] $1 / 31 / 61 / 12$
1/15 2/5 3/5 3/10 3/15 39/13 39/17 39/21 40/1 71/3 71/11 81/20 81/25 82/4 82/6 82/16 90/3 90/7 90/10 90/13 100/6 100/7 100/13
100/17 102/11 102/15 110/1 110/11 110/21
sir... [11] 110/24
111/4 111/11 119/6 121/6 121/21 122/4 122/7 124/3 124/5 124/19
sit [3] 3/14 34/5
34/13
sitting [2] 30/22
102/18
situation [2] 74/20 94/24
six [3] $7 / 37 / 1648 / 3$ six-month [1] 7/16
size [1] 50/1
sleepless [1] 112/3
slides [1] $35 / 14$
slight [1] 82/6
slow [3] 73/11 73/24
74/13
Smith [1] 37/25
so [92] 4/20 6/18
8/22 10/11 12/5 12/5
14/9 14/12 15/18
16/17 16/23 17/1
18/25 23/25 24/18
26/24 29/17 30/19
31/2 32/22 33/17 34/1
34/17 36/22 37/4
37/19 40/4 40/24
41/11 41/15 42/5
42/14 44/1 44/4 45/25
49/8 50/8 51/15 52/15 55/4 55/20 61/3 61/10 61/18 61/24 62/24 66/10 66/11 68/7 68/24 70/1 70/24 71/1 73/24 73/24 74/3 75/6 76/6 76/20 78/2 78/24 80/17 81/23 90/4 90/8 94/8 95/24 96/3 96/10 97/2 100/20 101/25 103/18 104/20 105/23 108/7 108/14 108/24 110/4 111/2 111/5 113/1 114/4 116/3 116/13 120/8 120/25 121/8 121/9 121/22 123/1 124/17
sold [1] 98/7
solely [3] $8 / 2355 / 11$ 55/13
solicitor [4] 19/13 30/14 31/18 40/10 solicitors [12] 16/20 16/24 18/2 40/16 42/17 43/3 43/7 43/19 45/6 50/25 63/18 65/2
some [26] 3/25 5/10
18/13 18/19 20/2 27/9 32/18 34/1 42/21 43/6 45/18 49/2 49/6 50/3 53/3 59/21 77/5 81/18

89/4 91/7 91/16 93/10 $\quad 115 / 20$ 102/15 110/7 122/7 $\quad$ stand [1] 115/9 $\quad$ still [2] 55/9 55/21 124/16
somebody [1] 93/17 someone [10] 46/14 52/13 61/23 70/21 71/19 94/11 100/11 101/14 104/11 113/25 someone's [2] 69/18 106/16
something [12] 5/1
10/11 31/19 34/12 53/13 65/5 67/5 67/20 103/8 109/1 116/1 121/24
sooner [1] 27/22 sorry [27] $3 / 24 / 6$ 10/25 11/5 23/14 25/20 28/7 29/16 31/11 34/20 35/15 42/3 46/6 47/4 47/10 60/4 66/13 70/21 81/7 100/7 109/14 110/1 111/13 114/24 119/21 121/21 122/6
sort [1] 100/8
sought [2] 43/3 69/3
source [4] 15/21
55/15 55/22 55/23
sources [6] 15/12
41/19 41/22 42/5
55/21 56/4
south [2] 119/20 119/23
speak [5] 29/9 61/25
66/11 71/1 121/10
specialist [12] $1 / 9$
4/17 14/6 34/17 34/18
35/10 36/6 36/23
38/12 38/25 39/7 42/22
specific [3] 5/23 29/17 46/8
specifically [3] 33/15 46/12 71/16
spent [3] 75/13 78/21 116/4
SPM [1] 69/8
SPM's [1] 69/8
SPM/SPM's [1] 69/8 spreadsheet [1] 56/18
square [1] 110/25
SRA [4] 4/25 5/4 34/17 48/22
SRAs [1] 38/15
staff [3] 13/13 50/5 87/6
stage [9] 7/8 8/23 12/2 16/5 17/19 27/21 50/21 61/14 99/8 stagnant [1] 49/11 stakeholder [1] 59/1 stance [2] 64/8
standards [8] 23/22 23/24 24/5 25/8 25/10 26/10 27/10 27/20 start [7] 12/6 15/10 15/16 39/16 75/14 78/23 116/5
started [7] 6/5 6/15
75/25 76/3 77/19 105/3 106/2
starting [3] 6/1 72/21 74/18
state [1] 97/1
stated [13] 4/7 4/23
37/24 70/20 78/17 78/19 81/9 86/12 107/15 113/7 116/4 118/5 118/20
statement [100] 1/5 1/7 1/10 1/13 1/24 2/2 2/25 3/6 3/16 3/19 4/6 4/7 4/8 5/7 5/11 6/7 7/22 8/10 10/5 10/12 10/14 11/19 13/16 13/21 14/10 14/22 15/6 15/11 17/1 18/12 20/5 22/12 22/15 22/24 24/23 25/7 25/17 25/22 26/24 29/3 29/23 30/3 31/19 32/9 33/4 35/9 35/20 36/1 41/5 41/12 42/18 46/14 48/1 48/7 50/9 57/8 64/7 65/11 65/14 65/15 67/24 69/4
70/22 71/7 71/21
71/22 71/25 72/6
$72 / 17$ 76/15 76/16
79/16 80/4 81/10
83/24 84/5 84/15 86/7
87/12 87/21 88/8 88/9 89/3 90/22 91/11 94/1 96/13 96/13 96/17 97/25 98/23 103/18 106/7 107/15 108/18 117/15 118/3 122/13 124/13 125/2
statements [20] 2/17 5/15 5/19 5/21 12/15 19/12 20/25 21/11 40/8 40/11 41/23 57/5 69/18 72/2 91/21 93/16 97/7 97/8 97/9 106/19
states [2] 4/16 74/8
status [1] 116/19
staying [1] 74/15
steal [1] 86/14
stealing [4] 70/1
75/14 78/23 116/5
step [1] 16/4
steps [2] 15/24 63/22
Steve [3] 120/5 120/7

120/17
71/4 94/10 110/19 suggests [1] 89/10 suitable [1] $43 / 6$
suited [1] 43/8
summarise [1] 41/8 summary [3] 26/11 74/11 94/12
Sunil [1] 74/23
suppliers [2] 98/3 98/16
support [3] 43/2 63/14 71/2
supported [1] 45/5
supporting [1] 42/10
suppose [1] $74 / 2$
suppression [2]
69/18 69/18
sure [10] 28/20 51/6
54/14 57/15 58/1
64/15 82/9 93/3
111/10 123/13
suspect [11] 19/11
20/17 21/21 30/14
31/17 65/18 65/23
66/14 68/2 93/12
122/14
suspect's [2] 21/13 65/20
suspected [4] 21/12
38/4 69/19 69/25
suspects [2] 40/16 122/25
suspended [1] 97/3
suspense [2] 94/2 94/5
suspicious [1] 15/16
Suzanne [2] 85/21
104/24
Suzanne Palmer [2]
85/21 104/24
Swallow [1] 28/19
sworn [2] 2/8 125/5
symbols [1] $63 / 5$
system [40] 28/10
28/11 28/13 28/15
28/22 29/1 29/10
29/15 29/21 32/1
46/22 48/22 54/5
56/23 57/24 62/15 63/7 70/10 76/7 76/12
76/20 76/23 78/18
79/1 79/11 85/15 86/3
86/15 95/9 97/13
101/9 101/22 103/6
103/12 103/16 103/20
104/8 105/19 114/10
118/19
systematically [1] 117/2
T
tab [2] 2/18 2/25
take [16] 12/5 26/8
30/21 31/16 49/13
take... [11] 50/7 56/5 57/16 73/18 81/22 90/2 100/24 106/19 112/6 116/20 121/22
take-away [1] 31/16
taken [12] 1/20 20/13 45/22 48/21 49/6 49/7 69/22 97/14 97/18 98/10 98/15 114/13
takes [2] 86/24 87/4
taking [9] 18/17 19/3
19/12 32/13 57/4
63/21 74/13 95/1
116/7
takings [6] 88/17 88/25 89/3 89/8 89/10 89/13
talking [6] 35/16 58/2
58/2 74/3 102/19 109/21
tape [3] 41/8 41/10 72/22
target [19] 52/1 52/8
52/12 52/17 52/23
59/12 59/14 59/16
59/18 60/1 60/5 60/11
60/13 61/11 62/2
112/21 113/5 113/6 113/8
targets [4] 52/25
60/10 112/16 112/18
taught [4] 20/9 20/22 21/9 22/3
team [68] 6/12 6/15 8/9 8/11 8/15 8/17 8/19 8/21 8/23 9/11 9/13 9/15 9/16 9/17 9/21 11/18 11/21 12/7 12/13 13/2 15/14 15/14 15/15 15/25 16/5 16/8 16/9 16/13 16/13 16/17 17/1 17/13 17/19 18/25 22/19 24/7 29/5 30/18 31/5 34/3 42/25 43/16 43/22 44/6 47/2 47/7 49/5 50/7 51/10 51/23 58/16 61/21 62/1 65/7 67/10 68/9 68/19 72/3 72/3 72/15 81/12 85/6 85/13 92/18 105/7
105/10 105/11 119/19
teams [4] 9/10 29/9
29/17 123/8
technical [3] 47/23 59/1 100/6
technically [1] 61/24
telephone [3] 56/12 73/13 101/9
tell [6] 53/12 54/7
70/4 74/21 75/6 104/9
telling [1] 106/2
temporarily [3] 5/8 6/22 18/14 temporary [7] 6/25 7/8 7/11 7/16 12/1 18/7 28/12
tend [1] 69/21
term [1] 53/12
terminal [1] 116/21 terminals [1] 28/18 terms [14] 11/17 13/ 18/6 33/18 40/5 47/5 47/14 47/17 47/22 69/2 77/4 91/24 99/16 117/22
test [1] 32/17
text [1] 15/18
than [4] 46/4 55/24 61/23 77/16
thank [29] $1 / 42 / 4$ 2/5 2/13 3/15 5/14 12/11 18/5 39/21 67/22 81/25 82/5 87/17 89/22 98/17 100/13 102/14 102/17 110/11 111/17 119/4 121/1 122/5 123/15 123/25 124/1 124/2 124/11 124/12
thanks [1] 112/6 that [644]
that I [6] 29/12 43/10 86/5 86/20 93/2 120/24
that's [80] 6/4 6/11 6/14 7/10 7/19 7/24 9/1 10/11 10/18 11/22 11/25 12/10 13/23 13/25 14/9 14/11 15/7 17/7 17/10 22/21 26/20 31/18 31/22 32/6 33/5 34/20 36/1 40/13 40/21 41/6 41/11 41/13 51/2 54/23 57/14 57/19 58/5 61/12 62/18 64/5 71/25 72/20 73/4 75/11 83/12 84/3 91/2 91/6 91/9 92/12 93/11 94/3 96/12 98/16 98/21 99/15 100/1 100/3 104/11 104/18 107/20 107/22 108/1 108/22 109/2 110/11 111/21 113/6 113/7 113/21 114/6 115/6 115/7 115/19 116/24 117/13 118/9 119/14 121/12 123/21
theft [10] 19/10 53/10
54/10 54/13 55/19
55/25 66/12 77/15
86/9 86/10
their [18] 10/16 13/12
24/20 38/2 38/12

41/20 50/5 57/6 64/14 $118 / 19$ 119/19 119/19 | $73 / 25$ | $82 / 25$ | $83 / 9$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | 69/23 74/24 85/14 119/22

92/24 101/22 106/18 they'd [2] 31/9 85/18 106/19 117/3 122/15 they've [2] 105/15 them [28] 5/24 15/18 115/9
17/21 26/3 27/7 27/15 thing [1] 64/24
34/9 43/11 43/12 49/9 things [7] 35/20 49/10 49/17 50/19 45/21 64/23 75/14 56/5 57/4 64/14 74/25 78/22 88/3 116/5 81/14 81/15 93/2 think [38] 4/14 22/4 93/10 107/18 113/11 $28 / 12$ 28/19 33/10 113/24 119/25 120/14 34/10 35/19 37/1 39/1 122/15 123/22
themselves [1] 74/24 then [60] 6/21 9/17 14/2 14/18 16/1 16/5 16/6 16/9 16/11 16/14 17/8 19/1 27/8 27/12 27/23 30/1 31/13 32/7 34/7 34/12 37/18 37/25 38/8 42/10 47/12 55/1 56/6 58/20 59/14 61/7 63/5 65/9 66/15 67/3 70/15 70/17 74/7 74/11 74/20 75/7 75/16 78/20 89/4 90/19 92/17 93/12 93/17 93/19 93/24 94/6 94/14 95/8 95/22 97/2 99/4 107/1 107/16 thorough [3] 87/1 110/16 114/14 116/12 $87 / 11$ 110/17

## there [138]

there's [11] 46/13
54/21 57/17 61/7 75/11 81/14 84/21 94/4 94/6 95/14 120/13
thereafter [1] 6/8 therefore [2] 43/18 83/8
these [21] 1/25 5/13
8/2 12/21 25/17 27/6 35/14 40/8 40/22
48/22 50/5 50/19 51/3
53/4 57/2 77/25 80/24
87/5 104/14 105/24
112/11
they [54] 5/17 14/1 15/15 15/20 21/2 24/17 29/19 40/20 42/25 43/8 43/8 43/14 45/21 46/14 46/18 46/20 47/12 50/22 50/23 52/14 53/5 54/23 54/25 55/1 55/23 57/21 58/9
58/11 61/22 64/5 65/8 65/9 65/21 65/23
67/14 69/19 70/14 74/8 74/24 75/1 80/10 92/24 97/10 97/11 through [18] 14/5 107/14 110/17 113/10 $48 / 11$ 59/1 63/7 66/16
113/11 113/12 113/12 70/17 71/11 72/2

84/17 87/7 97/19 100/23 100/24 101/3 105/4
throughout [2] 11/20 118/18
throw [1] 73/19
thrown [1] 31/13
time [68] 5/10 7/2 7/5
8/9 10/9 11/15 11/20
20/25 27/6 27/11
27/21 28/20 29/23
29/24 30/13 31/17
36/11 37/4 38/18
39/15 44/2 44/10
44/17 45/20 46/13 46/17 50/24 51/6 51/9 57/15 57/18 68/13
68/20 70/6 71/11
73/23 76/23 77/1
77/22 79/6 85/16
90/11 91/1 96/7 96/25
97/11 100/24 101/20
101/25 102/3 103/22
103/24 104/2 104/11
104/21 105/13 106/8
109/13 109/19 109/23
110/21 110/24 121/18
121/18 122/1 122/1
122/17 122/20
times [3] 34/19 44/5 74/5
timescale [1] 61/5
timescales [1] 67/25
title [3] 8/3 10/20 67/1
today [5] 102/20
116/2 118/13 123/5
124/16
today's [2] 2/3 124/17
together [4] 26/1
82/21 91/21 124/7
told [13] 7/17 69/24
86/2 90/9 93/2 102/24
105/23 110/16 114/2
114/4 114/14 115/7
118/18
tomorrow [2] 90/2 124/18
too [6] 54/14 54/19 56/25 75/13 78/21 116/4
took [16] 8/4 10/15
11/23 18/6 28/8 33/19
39/18 49/15 53/7
53/22 65/2 91/15
92/21 107/10 116/1 121/17
tool [1] 73/11
top [7] 23/17 32/10 37/20 51/20 56/15 115/25 116/3
Topham [2] 66/19

| T | 19/25 26/8 72/4 | $\mathbf{u r}$ | $49$ | website [5] 2/3 4/25 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Topham... [1] 67/7 |  | unless [3] 24/24 | 74/5 103/1 108/6 | 5/4 5/22 14/6 |
| Topham's [1] 67/3 |  |  |  |  |
| topic [1] 66/17 | TV [1] 111/23 | unmuting [1] 39 unnecessary [2] | via [3] 4/25 5/4 48/22 view [5] 65/9 87/23 | weeks [1] 19/4 |
| topics [1] 19/21 | two [22] 2/16 12/17 | unnecessary [2] | view [5] 65/9 87/23 88/1 89/3 89/9 | weeks [1] $19 / 4$ weeks' [1] $30 / 5$ |
| totally [1] 116/16 | $15 / 2 \text { 29/17 35/20 }$ | unreport | viewed [2] 64/3 64/5 | $\text { well [33] } 4 / 128 / 5$ |
| touched [1] 40/10 | 36/14 40/19 41/19 | 116/10 | viewing [1] 71/20 | 10/16 13/3 21/21 |
| 41/15 48/22 61/24 | 41/22 42/5 55/4 55/20 | unsigned [1] 96/16 | views [1] 89/7 | 35/18 49/11 50/4 |
| 41/15 48/22 61/24 $74 / 1084 / 5$ | 56/3 58/19 62/8 72/12 | until [8] 6/8 11/23 | visible [2] 2/21 3/21 | 54/16 61/2 67/15 |
|  | 77/9 78/15 79/10 | 16/19 74/15 81/22 | visiting [1] $8 / 6$ | 4/20 75/2 76/5 80/16 |
|  | 94/15 113/14 119/10 | 81/24 105/3 | voice [1] 11/5 | 89/23 92/22 93/ |
|  | two-thirds [2] 62/8 | unused [8] 22/18 | volume [2] 44/2 | 4/18 94/23 98/1 98/5 |
|  | 79/10 | 22/23 25/11 26/14 | 50/1 | 08/7 109/3 109/5 |
| trained [1] 5/12 | type [5] | 72/16 80/12 83 | voluntarily [1] | 10/6 110/17 11 |
| trainers [2] 19/8 | 46/9 46/11 49/1 | 84/17 | 106/2 | 12/18 120/19 120/25 |
| 58/10 |  |  |  |  |
| training [63] 5/10 | U |  | W |  |
| 5/12 18/4 18/13 18/17 | UK | 17/11 18/6 18/17 19/3 |  | 35/21 46/2 46/8 |
| 18/18 18/20 18/21 | UKGI00014638 [2] | 24/24 25/21 28/8 | waiting [3] 95/16 | 71/23 72/2 74/25 |
| 19/1 19/4 19/5 19/7 | 88/14 88/21 | 32/13 33/19 54/11 | 96/11 97/20 | were [170] |
| 19/9 19/22 19/25 20/2 | ultimately [3] 86/9 | 63/2 64/23 66/21 67/3 | Wales [16] 13/13 | weren't [11] 42/25 |
| 20/8 20/15 20/21 21/9 | 86/16 113/20 | 67/6 67/20 70/16 71/5 | 13/19 15/4 16/19 18/9 | $43 / 1452 / 667 / 14$ |
| 21/25 22/3 22/25 23/5 | uncomfortable | 74/13 75/18 75/19 | 19/22 20/4 22/17 | 73/25 104/23 105/7 |
| 28/9 28/11 28/22 | 115/18 | 76/4 76/5 77/13 80/17 | 22/24 23/2 40/6 42/8 | 113/10 117/4 120/19 |
| 28/23 28/24 28/25 | uncovered [1] | 82/22 85/6 92/14 93/6 | 42/12 47/7 65/1 68/4 | 120/22 |
| 29/8 30/1 30/6 30/8 | 123/21 | 93/18 97/5 100/8 | want [3] 106/5 112/7 | what [108] 4/22 |
| 30/9 30/12 30/16 | undated [1] 96/16 | 101/17 104/2 104/9 | 114/7 | 10/18 15/20 17/25 |
|  | under [9] 31/24 42/1 | 104/11 105/17 106/8 | wanted [6] 107 | 28/13 28/17 28/20 |
|  | 48/18 49/9 50/3 51/3 | 108/2 108/6 124/7 | 107/23 113/2 121/13 | 29/24 30/21 33/11 |
| 33/20 33/25 34/1 34/6 | 62/9 81/20 86/13 | Update [1] 48/ | 122/16 123/18 | 34/4 34/17 38/6 39/15 |
| 34/14 35/2 35/8 35/13 | underlying [1] 90/5 | updated [1] 25/10 | was [409] | 41/1 44/19 44/20 |
| $35 / 1335 / 1435 / 16$ | undermine [2] 23/10 | upon [5] 11/13 38/14 | wasn't [38] | 45/16 45/25 46/11 |
|  | 71/5 | 42/6 44/22 60/9 | 44/7 44/9 52/25 55/1 | 53/11 53/19 57/19 |
|  | unders | upwards [1] 13/9 | 55/14 56/6 64/25 67/9 | 58/2 58/11 60/4 62/22 |
|  |  | URNs [1] 82/13 | 67/14 69/24 73/24 | 64/11 64/18 64/25 |
| transacts [1] 41/20 | understand [18] 3/10 | us [13] 1/3 15/20 | 73/24 76/8 76/12 | 65/21 66/14 67/7 |
|  | 3/25 18/16 22/25 23/5 | 21/9 22/3 40/3 75/11 | 78/20 85/6 85/22 | 67/11 68/24 69/15 |
| 5/22 124/8 | 33/21 58/2 61/16 | 82/4 94/14 103/6 | 87/16 87/16 90/7 | 69/17 72/1 73/15 74/ |
| 95/22 124/8 | 81/14 82/22 85/5 | 104/16 106/2 114/2 | 90/15 93/2 94/8 96/10 | 74/22 75/6 75/19 76/4 |
| transcripts [2] | 87/14 87/15 97/23 | 119/12 | 104/12 106/23 107/7 | 76/20 77/4 78/17 |
|  | 98/4 98/13 113/1 | use [4] 15/3 | 109/3 109/13 109/1 | 79/24 80/1 80/6 80/7 |
| sferred [3] 91/8 | 12 | 64/12 98/16 | 109/24 111/2 111/4 | 80/9 81/12 81/18 |
|  | understand | used [9] 4/25 | 113/25 115/19 120/2 | 81/19 82/9 88/12 89/2 |
|  | 44/7 47/20 96/21 | 22/23 63/1 64/1 90/6 | Watt [3] 122/7 122/8 | 89/13 89/15 89/16 |
|  | understands [1] 33/8 | 94/21 108/12 116/22 | 125/13 | 91/13 92/17 92/24 |
| trials [1] $34 / 25$ | understood [1] 65/5 | useful [1] 28/5 | wave [2] 57/1 58 | 93/11 95/8 95/9 95/1 |
| Trotter [2] 49/2 | undertaken [1] 80/10 | using [4] 21/13 41/21 | way [17] 17/24 30/2 | 97/12 97/24 98/4 |
| 49/21 | undertaking [1] 9/22 | 73/25 98/2 | 34/5 45/1 50/6 52/3 | 98/11 101/17 103/15 |
| true [3] 5 | undertook [1] 19/20 | utilising [1] 63/10 | 57/16 62/8 66/10 | 104/4 104/10 105/10 |
| $116 / 24$ | underwent [1] 33/14 | uttering [2] 53/11 | 66/20 78/11 79/10 | 105/23 106/12 107/6 |
|  | unexplained [1] | 53/12 | 89/6 93/3 94/15 98/13 | 108/24 109/7 109/9 |
| 6/17 |  | V |  | /21 111/5 |
| truth [1] 115/18 | 112/21 113/7 |  | we'd [3] 67/11 76/9 | 114/4 115/6 115/7 |
| try [1] 66/14 | Unfortunately [2] | 21/15 37/24 56/23 | 113/11 | 15/9 115/9 115/1 |
| trying [8] 31/11 36/13 | 53/9 62/15 | 57/24 82/11 | we'll [5] 27/16 32/21 | 115/18 115/21 116/13 |
| 46/12 54/19 56/25 | unfounded [1] 79/8 | version [5] 15/ | 36/4 81/23 120/25 | 116/20 116/22 117/16 |
| S7/11 66/10 109/7 | union [3] 122/17 | /20 18/21 25/10 | we're [3] 3/5 61/3 | 18/13 118/15 118/2 |
|  | 122/23 123/4 | 26/16 | 74/3 | 119/2 120/9 120/17 |
| $\begin{array}{ccc} \text { turn [10] } & 1 / 6 & 2 / 19 \\ 3 / 19 & 8 / 8 & 13 / 10 \\ 18 / 1 \end{array}$ | Unison [1] 122/22 unit [2] 6/9 19/5 United [1] 12/8 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { versions [2] } 14 / 25 \\ & 15 / 2 \\ & \text { very [10] } 2 / 449 / 11 \end{aligned}$ | we've [8] 17/22 25/24 27/1 36/15 40/10 84/16 97/19 100/22 | $\begin{aligned} & 121 / 15 \\ & \text { whatever [2] } 54 / 24 \\ & 61 / 20 \end{aligned}$ |



