

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

Ref. T20177306

IN THE CROWN COURT AT BRADFORD

Exchange Square
Drake Street
Bradford

**Before HIS HONOUR JUDGE DURHAM HALL QC
THE RECORDER OF BRADFORD**

R E G I N A

- v -

**BASHARAT IQBAL KHALIQ, SAEED AKHTAR, YASAR MAJID,
NAVEED AKHTAR, PARVAZE AFZAL AHMED, IZAR KHAN HUSSAIN,
KIERAN HARRIS, ZEESHAN ALI, FAHIM IQBAL, MOHAMMED USMAN**

**MS K MELLY QC and MS S BEATTIE (instructed by the Crown Prosecution Service)
appeared on behalf of the Prosecution**

**MR A IQBAL QC and MR F ARSHAD appeared on behalf of the Defendant Khaliq
MR P MOULSON QC and MR A SHAKOOR appeared on behalf of the Defendant
Saeed Akhtar**

MS G BATTIS appeared on behalf of the Defendant Majid

MR R FRIEZE appeared on behalf of the Defendant Naveed Akhtar

MR A BELL appeared on behalf of the Defendant Ahmed

MS G KELLY appeared on behalf of the Defendant Hussain

MR G WILSON appeared on behalf of the Defendant Harris

MS F HERTZOG appeared on behalf of the Defendant Ali

MR A DALLAS appeared on behalf of the Defendant Iqbal

MR R FERM appeared on behalf of the Defendant Usman

PROCEEDINGS

5 FEBRUARY 2019, 10:08-13:02; 14:12-15:31; 16:47-16:53

REPORTING RESTRICTIONS APPLY:
SECTION 4(2) OF THE CONTEMPT OF COURT ACT 1981
SEXUAL OFFENCES (AMENDMENT) ACT 1992

A

DISCLAIMER: The quality of audio for this hearing is the responsibility of the Court. Poor audio can adversely affect the accuracy, and we have used our best endeavours herein to produce a high-quality transcript.

B

WARNING: reporting restrictions may apply to the contents transcribed in this document, particularly if the case concerned a sexual offence or involved a child. Reporting restrictions prohibit the publication of the applicable information to the public or any section of the public, in writing, in a broadcast or by means of the internet, including social media. Anyone who receives a copy of this transcript is responsible in law for making sure that applicable restrictions are not breached. A person who breaches a reporting restriction is liable to a fine and/or imprisonment. For guidance on whether reporting restrictions apply, and to what information, ask at the court office or take legal advice.

This Transcript is Crown Copyright. It may not be reproduced in whole or in part other than in accordance with relevant licence or with the express consent of the Authority. All rights are reserved.

C

D

E

F

G

H

A

(DISCUSSION OF GENERAL MATTERS)

MR FERM: I'm sorry to have to report that Mr Usman is not here yet. I understand from his co-defendants that he understood it was a 10.30 start.

B

JUDGE DURHAM HALL: Yes. Quite right. Quite right, Mr Ferm.

The first direction I will make is that no defendant on bail will be using the facilities behind that door from now on. You will do as we do. You will wait until there is a break. It also avoids I think a very poor impression. Thank you.

C

MR FERM: Can I make a request in connection with that? I've now had the opportunity to take instructions and have received some further information about the events of yesterday.

D

I've spoken to my learned friend Ms Melly about the investigation into the packages that were found. In normal circumstances I'm told that it will take a week for fingerprint tests to be carried out. It may be that -- I'm being moderately speculative in saying this -- it may be that this issue will arise potentially in evidence during the defence case not directly in relation to Naveed Akhtar but possibly indirectly as a consequence of others' use of it.

E

I understand from Ms Melly that, were you to indicate that it would be helpful for the fingerprint tests to be carried out sooner, that can be done, but it would need your Honour to indicate that that would be a helpful enquiry.

F

JUDGE DURHAM HALL: It is self-evident, Mr Ferm, in this case. Ms Melly need not ask or indeed prompt me. It is self-evident in this case that we need the most urgent attention to such detail in the very unusual context of this case, but, secondly, if anybody wishes to exploit what happened yesterday, then they must not do so, absolutely must not do so without seeking my leave and persuading me that it is a relevant --

G

MR FERM: Yes.

H

JUDGE DURHAM HALL: -- proper and indeed professional way forward. Further, insofar as any of these defendants wish to call evidence, I appreciate that is probably -- what's the phrase -- work in progress, but I can -- I well understand the realities of cases like this,

A

Mr Frieze. If any defendant does give evidence, please no blurting out of any material that you as barristers or lawyers would need to clear with me. Is that not the safest way, Mr Iqbal, Ms Kelly -- Melly and Ms Kelly and Mr Moulson --

B

MR IQBAL: Yes.

JUDGE DURHAM HALL: -- and Mr Bell? Mr Wilson, welcome back. Is that not the safest way forward?

C

MR FERM: If what I understand is being said that there may be an application to introduce reprehensible behaviour, then it would need an application to your Honour in any event.

JUDGE DURHAM HALL: Of course it would. I mean, I just cannot even -- anyway let's not go there for the moment. Yes. It's a section 100 difficult application, difficult made, but it's got to be done properly.

D

MR FERM: Of course.

JUDGE DURHAM HALL: All right. Okay.

MS MELLY: Thank you very much for that helpful indication.

E

JUDGE DURHAM HALL: Yes.

MS MELLY: Thank you.

JUDGE DURHAM HALL: All right. Thank you for letting me see the -- your position statement in relation to the agreed facts. I hope you're all duly impressed that I think I was responding to it before 7 o'clock.

F

MS MELLY: Very impressed indeed.

JUDGE DURHAM HALL: You are right, Mr Moulson. Ms Melly used your and/or the Moulson/ [REDACTED] (sic) draft in order to add to it --

G

MR MOULSON: Yes.

JUDGE DURHAM HALL: -- and I have my own, as you know, clear view about --

MR MOULSON: Yes.

H

JUDGE DURHAM HALL: -- potential ways forward.

A

[REDACTED]

B

MR IQBAL: There is a document with red annotation which we've circulated as between all the advocates.

JUDGE DURHAM HALL: All right. Is that a recent one?

MR IQBAL: Yes. It was drafted this morning. I'll send it.

C

MR DALLAS: Your Honour, there's a hard copy.

JUDGE DURHAM HALL: All right. That's fine. I'll look at it in due course, although I -- does it really add a lot?

D

MR IQBAL: It really responds to the Crown's comments and makes concessions and says that we will agree facts to place balance to these.

JUDGE DURHAM HALL: Fine. For example, let's -- we've got a few minutes and,

Mr Ferm, I don't lock you out or anybody else. I don't think you were here yesterday when we discussed the nuances of agreed facts. This is a -- this is a second stage of an agreed fact process.

E

MR FERM: Yes.

JUDGE DURHAM HALL: We're going to get a big wodge of agreed facts, aren't we, that don't touch upon this?

F

MR FERM: Yes. These largely concern my learned friends Mr Moulson and Mr Iqbal. My position, as you're aware, is more nuanced.

JUDGE DURHAM HALL: Is nuanced.

G

[REDACTED]

H

[REDACTED]

A

[REDACTED]

JUDGE DURHAM HALL: I'll have to deal with it.

MR FERM: Yes. I know I've just sprung it on your Honour --

B

JUDGE DURHAM HALL: No, no, no.

MR FERM: -- this morning.

JUDGE DURHAM HALL: Delightful. Delightful.

MR FERM: It's worth considering.

C

JUDGE DURHAM HALL: I've been dealing with all sorts of material since about 6 o'clock,

Mr Ferm, so you really are the least of the problems, but --

MR FERM: That's as far as I want to go.

D

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

E

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

F

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

G

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

H

[REDACTED]

A

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

B

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

C

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

D

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

E

[REDACTED]

JUDGE DURHAM HALL: Very. So there we are. Thank you.

Thank you. Could we have the jury, please?

(Jury entered court)

F

JUDGE DURHAM HALL: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. We lawyers do like to talk about law. I'm terribly sorry, and also-- but this is the process. No different from real life.

By talking things through we are all I hope saving time and further witnesses, but anyway we have had enough of talking law. We now must move on to your role of listening to the

G

evidence, and the concluding stages of the case are, Ms Melly, to do -- to do what?

MS MELLY: Ms Beattie is now going to read some agreed facts which deal with various parts of evidence that through cooperation at the bar we have agreed. We will then have some

H

statements read and then we'll move into calling the officer in the case.

A

JUDGE DURHAM HALL: That's Officer Riley --

MS MELLY: That's --

B

JUDGE DURHAM HALL: -- we have already seen, who will answer any questions that anybody sees fit or necessary -- they're in charge -- to ask and then we will -- thank you -- thank you very much -- we will hear I suspect Ms Melly close the case.

C

Now I've two further things to say. I may have to give one or two short rulings at that point, so that's probably a good time for a break, and, secondly, you are getting copy -- copies of the agreed facts, a small and I hope perfectly worded volume, but these are very important. They are largely by agreement. There has been some cajoling, but largely by agreement -- in fact, now totally by agreement I think, and behind every proposition and every paragraph there is a witness statement or a witness who can speak to these facts, and you can imagine, ladies and gentlemen, if the prosecution had to call a witness to prove every single proposition, there'd be a lot more witnesses. So the important thing is you treat this as a distillation of hard evidence supported by witnesses, and just as in the case of a witness statement that has been read, you treat these propositions every bit as good as evidence given on oath. Okay?

E

F

I have to do that. I have to say that. It's a requirement, but the good thing is you're getting it in writing. I won't be going back over it at all -- okay -- as with the interviews by-- in broad terms.

READING OF AGREED FACTS

G

MS BEATTIE: Yes. Your Honour, ladies and gentlemen, I'm sure you've already put these behind divider 15, which is the first empty divider that you have.

H

JUDGE DURHAM HALL: Right.

MS BEATTIE: Dealing with these -- and you'll see that they are embedded -- these facts are agreed and accepted by the prosecution and each of the defendants. Ladies and gentlemen, there are some references to dividers and photograph numbers. I'm not going to ask you to

A

turn those up now, because you have the references and you can correlate those at your leisure.

B

1. [Person A] was born on 9th July 1993.

2. [REDACTED]

C

3. The photograph of [Person A] contained in the jury bundle at divider 3, page 1 was taken on 19th September 2012. The photographs of locations and premises shown in the jury bundle were taken following the arrests of the defendants and are not contemporaneous with the offences alleged.

That refers to the premises and photographs taken.

D

4. The photographs of [Location E] -- divider 12 -- were taken on 17th April 2018. The plan of [Location E] in that divider was prepared on the same day and the measurements recorded as shown.

5. The photographs of locations shown in the jury bundle were identified by [Person A] and [Person B] as follows:

E

Divider 4:

The Travelodge where [Person A] saw [Person K].

Divider 5:

F

(1) At page 4 the petrol station where [Person B] and [Person A] went with Basharat Khaliq.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

G

(3) At page 14 the Plaza Hotel.

Divider 6:

At pages 3 to 9, [REDACTED]

Divider 10:

H

Properties identified by [Person A] in relation to Izar Hussain, "Billy Jo Jo":

A

(1) [REDACTED]

(2) 7 [Location F] (the family home).

6. [REDACTED]

B

[REDACTED]

7. The photographs of each of the defendants as contained in the jury bundle were taken at the time of their arrests.

C

8. The events as recorded on the timeline, which you have, are agreed as accurate both as to the time at which they occurred and the events described.

9. On the morning of 25th May 2008 -- and this relates to the Plaza Hotel:

D

(a) At approximately 0030 hours the police received reports of disturbance in Bradford and of eight to nine shots being fired in the East Squire Lane area of the city.

(b) A man was seen on Carlisle Road with a gun.

(c) At 0737 a report was received of a body of a male lying on Esquire Street (?), who was believed to be and was subsequently discovered to be dead.

E

(d) Reports were received thereafter of two males with stab wounds.

10. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

F

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

G

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

H

[REDACTED]

A

[REDACTED]

B

[REDACTED]

C

[REDACTED]

D

11. On 2nd September 2015 officers undertook an open public search of Facebook to ascertain whether or not there were accounts entitled "Princess JG" and "Faz Hairhills" as referenced by [Person A] in her video interview.

That referred to Basharat Khaliq.

E

- (a) Two such accounts existed.
- (b) Screenshots were taken of the profile page of each account.
- (c) The public profile of each Facebook account was examined by investigators.

F

Each Facebook account had a stated number of friends associated with that account as appears on the public profile. No mention of Basharat Khaliq was found on the public profile related to either Facebook account. No further exploration of these accounts were undertaken. It's not possible to establish who opened either of these accounts or the subscriber IP address in relation to them without enquiries being made in the United States. The police did not make those enquiries. It is therefore not possible to link Basharat Khaliq or any other individual with each of these Facebook account profiles.

G

[REDACTED]

H

[REDACTED]

A

[REDACTED]

B

[REDACTED]

C

[REDACTED]

D

[REDACTED]

E

13. Basharat Khaliq has no criminal convictions and has the following two cautions recorded against him:

- (a) 1st December 2003: resist or obstruct a constable on 30th November 2003.
- (b) 30th April 2010: battery on 25th April 2010.

F

[REDACTED]

14. [Person A] took part in police identification procedures and it was recorded by the officer in charge of the identification procedures that:

G

(a) On 19th October 2016 she was asked if she could identify the person who had lived at [REDACTED] Drive and who had been responsible for introducing her to other males and raping at that property and whom she knew as "Sid" and she positively identified the defendant Saeed Akhtar.

H

(b) On 20th January 2017 she was asked if she could identify the person she knew

A

as "Yasar" and she positively identified Yasar Majid.

B

(c) On 19th October 2016 she was asked if she could identify the person whom she knew as Naveed and she positively identified Naveed Akhtar.

C

(d) On 7th November 2016 she was asked if she could identify the person "who had raped her at three locations over an 18 month period and whom she knew "Pav", but whose full name is Parvaze Ahmed, and she positively identified Parvaze Ahmed.

D

(e) On 7th November 2016 she was asked if she could identify the person who had raped her on three occasions at [REDACTED] Drive and at [REDACTED] Road and whom she knew as "Billy", which was the name he had given, but whose name she believed was either Azar Khan or Nazar Khan, and she positively identified Izar Hussain, whom she knew as "Billy".

E

(f) On 20th January 2017 she was asked if she could identify the person who had touched her sexually at an address in Allerton and who had been present at an unknown location when she was raped by another male in an upstairs bathroom and whom she knew as T, but whose full name she was unaware of, and she positively identified Zeeshan Ali.

F

(g) On 20th January 2017 she positively identified the defendant Fahim Iqbal as the "Fahim" mentioned by her in relation to the incident represented by count 22.

(h) On 16th August 2016 she was asked if she could identify the person as being responsible for raping her at [Location C], between 1st April 2011 and 30th July 2011 and whom she knew as "Mani", but whose name she believed to be Mohammed Azlan, and she positively identified Mohammed Usman.

G

15. When each defendant was arrested and interviewed, he was cautioned. This caution is as follows:

H

"You do not have to say anything, but it may harm your defence if you do not mention, when questioned, something which you later rely on in court. Anything you do say may be recorded and given in evidence."

A

16. Basharat Khaliq.

(a) On 10th November 2015 DC Shutler arrested Basharat Khaliq (date of birth 15.9.80) at [REDACTED] Road, (inaudible). He was cautioned and made no reply.

B

(b) On 20th June 2017 he was charged with the offences before the court.

17. Saeed Akhtar.

(a) On 12th October 2016 DC Woodcock arrested Saeed Akhtar (date of birth 26.10.63) at [REDACTED], Bradford on suspicion of rape. He was cautioned and made no reply. Saeed Akhtar had not previously been arrested in relation to these matters.

C

(b) On 21st June 2017 he was charged with the offences before the court.

18. Saeed Akhtar's address, [REDACTED] Drive.

D

It's recorded that the police attended at [REDACTED] Drive, Bradford in relation to [Person A] a total of 16 times. Those attendances were on the following dates:

7th August 2010.

In fact, looking at it, these are all 2010 (inaudible), so I'll read down:

E

7th August.

17th August.

6th September.

18th September.

F

23rd September.

26th September.

30th September.

G

12th October.

17th October.

23rd October.

26th October.

H

29th October.

A

1st November.

4th November.

10th November.

B

11th November.

[Person A] was located at [REDACTED] Drive on the following four days, again all in

2010:

C

7th August.

17th August.

18th September and

23rd September.

D

On the other twelve dates she was not found at the address.

That's the list that you have.

19. On 7th August 2010 [Person A] was aged 17 -- given her date of birth -- and [Person EE] was aged 16, being born on 30th October '93.

E

20. On the dates that [Person A] was found at [REDACTED] Drive there is no record of her being under the influence of alcohol or drugs and no assessment or mention is made in the records as to her state. On the occasions when the police attended [REDACTED] Drive no drugs have been recorded as being found at the address.

F

21. After Saeed Akhtar was given a Harbourers Warning on 11th November 2010 there are no reports located on the West Yorkshire Police computer that [Person A] was believed to be at Saeed Akhtar's address.

G

Ladies and gentlemen, there's a copy of the Harbourers Warning, which it will be convenient to put at the very back of the admissions, and we'll hand those out now.

JUDGE DURHAM HALL: Is it necessary for the jury to be taken through this?

MR MOULSON: Not at all, your Honour. I rather thought there was already a copy of it in the "Saeed Akhtar" section.

H

A

JUDGE DURHAM HALL: It did ring some memory bells with me, but never mind.

MR MOULSON: Page 10 I understand.

JUDGE DURHAM HALL: Page 10.

B

MR MOULSON: Section 2.

JUDGE DURHAM HALL: All right. Look, it's as easy for you to keep it than take it back.

You can turn it over, as I do with most of the documents given to me that aren't relevant.

C

I use them for notes on the back. I don't think they spotted that one. Okay. Or bin it, whichever you choose. Okay? Whichever you choose.

MS BEATTIE: 23. Social care records relating to [Person A] were reviewed. There are no reports of [Person A] being at Sid's house or [REDACTED] Drive, Bradford after 11th November 2010.

D

24. There are no records of police attending at any address relating to Saeed Akhtar in the Girdlington area of Bradford in respect of [Person A].

25. Complaints to the police.

E

Your Honour, ladies and gentlemen, you remember these were raised with the complainant by Mr Moulson and here's a record of those complaints.

The following is recorded on the police systems in relation to when [Person A] contacted them:

F

(a) 23rd January 2009 recorded that complained of assault against a male -- I'll just say "MB", as we're in court.

On 15th July 2010 recorded that she complained of rape by her ex-boyfriend AC.

G

On 25th October 2010 recorded that she complained of stalking by her ex-boyfriend SY.

On 1st November 2010 recorded that she complained of threats being made to her by her ex-boyfriend SY.

H

On 2nd February 2011 she recorded that she complained of theft of her bag saying

A

"She said she was physically and verbally abused as a child, though not sexually abused. However, she claims to have been raped twice at 16 and 17 years old."

27. Electronic devices.

B

The contents of Saeed Akhtar's electronic devices were downloaded and examined by the police and the data recovered related to the period 2016 to 2017 and was outside the indictment period. There was no material on them relating to [Person A] or [Person B]. There was no material on them relating to grooming or child sexual exploitation.

C

28. On 27th August 2014 Daily Mail published a story with a headline "'Child victims of Rotherham sex abuse scandal could be in line for compensation totalling 140 million', says solicitor representing them".

D

29. DCI Terence Long was contacted by Paul Hill, the Bradford Safeguarding Children's Board Manager, on 4th September 2014 in relation to the BBC North's report regarding [Person A]. On the morning of 5th September 2014 DCI Long arranged for Detective Inspector Vanessa Smith to contact [Person A].

E

30. Saeed Akhtar's vehicle.

Saeed Akhtar was the owner of a blue BMW, registration number [REDACTED] during the period on the indictment. It was not a convertible vehicle.

F

31. Previous convictions.

Saeed Akhtar has previous convictions recorded against him. They are:

(a) On 29th June 1983 Saeed Akhtar was convicted at the Bradford Magistrates' Court of an offence of attempted theft of a vehicle.

G

(b) On 21st April 2005 Saeed Akhtar was convicted at the Bradford Magistrates' Court of an offence of possession of class C drug, cannabis.

(c) On 6th July 2006 Saeed Akhtar was convicted at Bradford Magistrates' Court of an offence of possession of class C drug, cannabis.

H

(c) On 18th September 2014 Saeed Akhtar was convicted at the Bradford

A

Magistrates' Court of an offence of battery.

Saeed Akhtar has been cautioned on two occasions:

B

(a) On 16th October 2001 in relation to possession of a class B controlled drug, cannabis.

(b) On 17th August 2010 that should be a Public Order Act offence contrary to section 4 of the Public Order Act, threatening behaviour.

C

32. On 1st November 2016 Yasar Majid (born 5th December '81) attended voluntarily at Trafalgar House Police Station with a solicitor.

On 12th June he was charged with the offences before the court.

D

Yasar Majid does not have any previous convictions or cautions recorded against him.

Naveed Akhtar.

On 12th October 2016 at [REDACTED], Bradford DC Tulson arrested Naveed Akhtar (date of birth 9.3.75) on suspicion of rape. He was cautioned and he made no reply.

E

On 21st June 2017 he was charged with the offences before the court.

In 2010 Eid, which, of course, has been referred to, fell on 10th September, and Eid Al-Adha from 16th to 20th November.

Parvaze Ahmed.

F

On 17th October 2016 at [REDACTED] Road, Bradford DC Riley arrested Parvaze Ahmed (date of birth 16th March 1982) on suspicion of rape. He was cautioned and he made no reply.

G

On 21st June he was charged with the offences before the court.

36. Parvaze Ahmed first obtained a provisional licence on 25th October 2000. His full licence was obtained on 23rd October '15, although he had endorsements in relation to motoring offences prior to that date.

H

Parvaze Ahmed has convictions for:

A

(a) In 2006 three offences of possession of heroin with intent to supply and two offences of possession of crack cocaine with intent to supply.

B

(b) In 2014 an offence of possession of heroin with intent to supply and an offence of possession of crack cocaine with intent to supply.

38. Izar Hussain.

C

On 17th October 2016 at [REDACTED] Road, Bradford DC Tulson arrested Izar Hussain (date of birth 26.7.86) on suspicion of rape. He was cautioned and made no reply.

On 20th June 2017 he was charged with the offences before the court.

39. 7 [Location F], Girdlington, Bradford is Izar Hussain's family home.

D

40. [Person A] was referred and seen by Barnardo's in relation to the management of risks and concerns over going missing and the attendant risks. The Barnardo's records in relation to [Person A] were obtained from 12th July 2010, when she was referred to Barnardo's, to 15th May 2012, when her case was closed. The records do not contain the name of Billy Jo Jo, nor that of any other individual. There is no detailed account or any record of direct discussion or interview with [Person A] in the records held in relation to any sexual complaint/relationship.

E

Izar Hussain applied for a provisional driving licence on 2nd August 2016.

F

Full NHS dental records of Izar Hussain have been obtained, and between 4th July 2002 and 2nd August 2016 there is no record of any attendance or treatment in relation to a damaged gold tooth or any tooth during that time. He had a crown and a gold tooth fitted in 2004 and each was replaced in 2014 and 2016 respectively.

G

The interview, which you remember we looked at on Friday, with Izar Hussain referred to a SIM card. This was examined, but no material of any description was recovered.

Izar Hussain has the following convictions, cautions and reprimands recorded against him:

H

6th July 2001: A reprimand - resist or obstruct a constable.

A

25th July 2002: Izar Hussain pleaded guilty to the following offences:

Supplying a controlled drug of class A, heroin, on 25th May 2002. Plead guilty.

B

Supplying a controlled drug of class A, crack cocaine, on 25th May 2002.

Possessing a controlled drug with intent to supply on 25th May 2002, class A heroin.

C

Possessing a controlled drug with intent to supply of class A, crack cocaine.

It is recorded that the defendant walked into a police station on 11th June 2002 and produced a quantity of heroin and cocaine from his pockets and makes admissions that he is a drug supplier.

D

On further interview he admitted supplying 300 wraps of heroin to a person unknown -- sorry -- to persons unknown in Bradford between 25th May 2002 and 11th June 2002. He pleaded guilty on the basis of "duress and lack of knowledge of the nature of the drug" and this plea was accepted by the prosecution.

E

10th April 2003: interfering with a vehicle on 10th February 2003.

He has the following cautions:

29th September 2004: possessing controlled drug of class C.

19th August 2005: possessing cannabis, a class C controlled drug.

F

47. Zeeshan Ali.

On 22nd November 2016 at Manchester Airport PC Felton arrested Zeeshan Ali (date of birth 6.10.86) on suspicion of rape. He was cautioned. He made no reply.

G

On 22nd June he was charged with the offences before the court.

(c) The incident in which [Person A] spoke to ██████ at CMS and asked to speak to ██████ -- you'll remember that evidence -- when she returned to CMS, and when ██████ contacted ██████ to come into work to speak to her as a result was on Saturday, 2nd October 2010.

H

A

That relates to the allegation she makes against Zeeshan Ali.

B

(d) [REDACTED] Terrace has been Zeeshan Ali's family home since 2008 throughout the period covered by the indictment. This was the address he's always provided to the authorities. There's no record of him ever residing at [Location F].

C

(e) On 25th May 2017 DC Patterson spoke to a man named -- I will just call him "FM" -- who had worked for Ace Budget Taxis, but could not be sure this was in 2010. He said that he was not known as "[REDACTED]". He was called [REDACTED] (?). He stated he had no knowledge or recollection of picking up fares at [REDACTED] Drive or of [Person A] or the trip referred to with T and [REDACTED]. He could not be identified as the taxi driver [REDACTED]. The description given by [Person A] was vague, but he did fit into the right age group. There was no other taxi drivers known as [REDACTED] identified as working at the relevant time for this firm.

D

On 6th December 2007 Zeeshan Ali pleaded guilty to possessing a controlled drug of class A with intent to supply, heroin, possessing a controlled drug of class A with intent to supply, crack cocaine.

E

On 29th January 2008 Zeeshan Ali pleaded guilty to possessing a controlled drug of class A, heroin, possessing a controlled drug of class A, crack cocaine.

48. Kieran Harris.

F

(a) On 23rd November 2016 at [REDACTED], Ravensthorpe PC Shutler arrested Kieran Harris (date of birth 11.4.20) on suspicion of rape. He was cautioned. He made no reply.

G

On 22nd June 2017 he was charged with the offences before the court.

Kieran Harris has the following convictions:

H

(1) 25th September 2016: Racially threatening abuse, insulting words or behaviour to cause fear or provocation of violence on 11th July 2006.

(2) 14th November 2008: Driving offences. No insurance/licence.

(3) 19th June 2013: Battery, April 2012, against a female ex-partner.

A

48. Fahim Iqbal.

On 23rd November 2016 the defendant Fahim Iqbal (date of birth 23.2.91) was arrested in relation to this case on suspicion of rape. He was cautioned. He made no reply.

B

On 4th July 2017 he was charged with the offences before the court.

49. Mohammed Usman.

On 5th June 2016 at Manchester Airport DC Hayes arrested Mohammed Usman (date of birth 29.11.87) on suspicion of rape. He was cautioned. He made no reply.

C

On 20th June 2017 he was charged with the offences before the court.

50. On 10th November 2015 at [REDACTED], the home address of Basharat Khaliq, the police attended and searched the premises and seized exhibits within that property as shown in the photographs in the jury bundle. Items seized include the items photographed and shown in the jury bundle as being so seized.

D

The following data devices linked to Basharat Khaliq were seized by the police at the time of his arrest on 10th November 2015 from the stated locations within [REDACTED]

E

[REDACTED]t:

(a) CR/1: EE nano SIM seized from bedroom 1 under double bed.

(b) CR/2: Pink Sony camera in pink case seized from bedroom 1, left bedside cabinet.

F

(c) CR/3: Pink Nikon camera in blue case seized from bedroom 2, left bedside cabinet.

(d) CR/4: Five USB 1 SD cards seized from left bedside table, bedroom 2.

(e) CR/5: Silver Oregon camera seized from left bedside table, bedroom 2.

G

(f) CR/6: Phone SIM card, Orange network, seized from dressing room, bedroom 2.

(g) CJW/1: SIM card and camera film case seized from Beaker Leaks (?) work bag, dressing room, bedroom 2.

H

A

(h) Nokia phone and charger seized from Beaker Leaks work bag, dressing room, bedroom 2."

That is from the dressing room, bedroom 2.

B

(i) iPhone with a cracked screen seized from Beaker Leaks work bag.

(j) BlackBerry phone in case seized from Beaker Leaks work bag.

(k) Memory card in case and two SIM cards in case seized from Beaker Leaks work bag, dressing room, bedroom 2.

C

(l) An Orange SIM card.

(m) A BlackBerry mobile phone and packaging seized from bottom of the right-hand bedside cabinet in bedroom 2.

D

(n) BlackBerry mobile phone seized from bottom drawer, right-hand cabinet, bedside, bedroom 2.

(o) A Fujitsu laptop seized from under the bed in bedroom 1.

The above data devices were interrogated by the police using specialist software.

E

(a) On a SIM card, part of exhibit CJW/6, which you can see is at (k), which came from Beaker Leaks work bag in the dressing room of bedroom 2, on that SIM card were found the photographs listed at the jury bundle divider 5, page 35. So the photographs you see in there came from that SIM card.

F

(b) [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

G

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

The defendants were interviewed on the dates and times recorded in the interview summaries that you have had read to you and have copies of.

H

55. Finally, the exhibits produced and referred to in this case have all been

A

properly marked and identified, conveyed and produced.

So that concludes the agreed facts.

B

MS MELLY: I'm just going to read some statements, please, before we call the officer in the case.

The first tranche of statements I'm going to deal with deal with some incidents concerning [Person A].

C

STATEMENT OF PC CUMMINS READ

The first is from Police Constable Cummins at I/57. I'm going to try to deal with these incidents chronologically. So this is the first in time. It's -- sorry. This one doesn't concern [Person A], but this is February 2009.

D

The statement is from Police Constable Cummins. It's dated February 2017. He says he is a police officer.

At 6.00 pm on Sunday, 22nd February 2009 he was with another officer and he had cause to stop a green Peugeot motor vehicle in relation to smoke from the pipe.

E

"The registration was [REDACTED]. The vehicle was stopped on [REDACTED] Road in Bradford. The driver of the car identified himself as [REDACTED] (born [REDACTED] January 1981)", not a defendant in this case. "The front seat passenger was Parvaze Ahmed (16th March 1982)", the defendant who has been referred to as 'Pav', "and the rear seat passenger was Izar Hussain", defendant in this case referred to as 'Billy Jo Jo', "his date of birth being 26th July 1986.

F

All the occupants were spoken to and stated they'd all just come from a meal together at the [REDACTED] Restaurant on [REDACTED] Lane in Bradford, and a record of stop was made."

G

Thank you.

STATEMENT OF PC NATHANIEL READ

H

The next statement is from Police Constable Nathaniel at I/50 -- sorry -- I/158.

A

We're moving now to dealing with events in August 2010.

B

Police Constable Nathaniel made a statement on 13th June 2017. He said that on Saturday, 7th August 2010 he was in full uniform in a marked police vehicle. He was asked to attend with another police constable [REDACTED] Drive, Allerton, Bradford, the home address of Saeed Akhtar, on enquiries for two missing people, a [Person A] and [Person EE].

C

"The missing people were located at that address hiding in a cupboard. Enquiries were made with the family support workers place, who had reported them missing, and we were informed they didn't need returning as they were 17 and 18 years old, and the log was updated via our radio messages to the control room."

STATEMENT OF PC FUSHA READ

D

The next statement is from Police Constable Fusha at I/56. Police Constable Fusha made a statement on 6th January 2015 and they say that on 17th August 2010 the officer was working with Police Constable Mark Sommerville. At 1.43 in the afternoon they arrived at [REDACTED] Drive, Allerton, Bradford, having been sent out to that address to check for two missing persons under unauthorised absences from a home in Dewsbury. The two mispers, which is the shorthand for missing persons, were called [Person A] and [Person EE].

E

"I cannot ..."

The statement reads:

F

"I cannot now say if these girls identified themselves to us on arrival, but I can say that they must have done, because the two girls were located at the address along with a male, Saeed Akhtar. Having established the girls were those reported missing, we then took them from the address and met two officers from Dewsbury, whose details I don't now recall, so they could be returned safely to the house. I can say that neither of these girls disclosed to me that any offences had been committed towards them whilst they were with Saeed Akhtar at this address. Had they done so, then without question I would have dealt with this appropriately. The log was updated with my attendance and I completed an intelligence

H

A report with details of what had happened, but I do not have a pocket notebook entry. I can say that there was no -- I can also say there was no difficulty with these girls coming with us.

I cannot now say anything about the demeanour of these girls."

B That was in August 2010. We now move to an event in October 2010. Statement of Dawn Jackson at I/71.

STATEMENT OF PCSO DAWN JACKSON READ

C Dawn Jackson made her statement on 26th February 2015 and she at the time was a Police Community Support Officer based at Dudley Hill Police Station in Bradford. She said this:

D "On 2nd October 2010 at approximately 10.50 at night I was on foot patrol in full uniform on Folly Hall Road, Wibsey, Bradford when I was approached by a female who gave her name as [Person A].

E [Person A1] stated that she was lost and that she was just -- she had just started her period and was wearing white jeans and asked if I had anything. I assume that she meant a tampon or sanitary towel. I said 'no'.

[Person A1] appeared intoxicated. She was unsteady on her feet, had bloodshot eyes and words were slightly slurred, but didn't smell of alcohol.

F [Person A1] then sat on a garden wall. I asked [Person A1] where she lived and she replied, 'I will probably be reported as missing from Dewsbury'. She said she wanted to kill herself.

G I did a check on my radio to confirm she was missing from [Location G1], Dewsbury. I asked her how she'd got to Wibsey if she lives in Dewsbury. [Person A1] replied that she'd walked from Barkerend.

H I asked if there was anyone that could pick her up. [Person A1] stated that her boyfriend Sid could. [Person A1] described Sid as an Asian male older than her and last time she stayed at his house he was arrested. He then gave me a phone number for Sid." Sorry.

A

"She then gave me a phone number for Sid as [REDACTED], which I then rang in the hearing and presence of [Person A1].

B

I spoke to a male and asked, 'Is that Sid?' and he replied 'Yeah'. I told him that I was a PCSO and had [Person A] with me. Sid said he was unable to collect her as she knows what happened last time and that he'd been drinking. As far as I recall there was no further conversation with Sid.

C

As far as I can remember a police officer came and collected [Person A1] to take her back home. Whilst I was with [Person A1] I completed a form and submitted intelligence records.

D

On 9th" -- sorry. "When I returned to the police station I inputted the intelligence form myself on 3rd October 2010. This was within two hours of my conversation with [Person A] and the event was still very fresh in my mind.

E

On 9th January 2015 I accessed the police computer record of this submission and I can confirm that it's the same one as I submitted back on 3rd October 2010, and I refreshed my memory from reading this report prior to making my statement. I made a pocket book note at the time, which I can produce if required. I cannot recall where I originally recorded the phone number that [Person A1] gave me to call Sid on. I will have made the call to Sid on my police issue Airwave or it may have been on a police issue BlackBerry that were in use at the time.

F

G

At the time I spoke to [Person A1] it was raining and dark. Street lights were on and visibility was good. I would describe [Person A1] as being a white female with dark hair in a ponytail. She was of slim build and about 5'4", wearing a light coloured top -- crop top and white jeans. She wasn't wearing a coat and was holding her arms folded tight across her chest as if she was trying to keep warm.

H

I'm not aware that I met her before. I was with her for about half an hour. I would recognise her again. I've not seen her since that date.

A

The male I spoke to on the phone who I was told was called Sid had an Asian Bradford accent. I cannot recall how old he sounded. I did not recognise the voice and I don't recall speaking to him before or since that date."

B

STATEMENT OF INVESTIGATIVE OFFICER COLWELL READ

I now move on to the statements of Investigative Officer Colwell and Nicholas Whitcombe, which are I/67 and I/68.

C

The first statement I'll read is from Investigative Officer Colwell at I/67. He makes his statement on 13th February 2017. He says:

D

"I have full access to various West Yorkshire Police computer systems. On the morning of 13th February 2017 I accessed a copy of a Harbourers Final Warning notice issued to Saeed Akhtar on 11th November 2010. I printed off a copy of this notice and showed it to retired Police Constable Nicholas Whitcombe at 10.20. He recognised the notice as being an exact copy of the one that he'd issued to Mr Akhtar."

E

STATEMENT OF NICHOLAS WHITCOMBE READ

So having told you that Nicholas Whitcombe was shown that document, I'll now read his statement, which is at I/68, a statement dated 13th February 2017. He says this:

F

"Back in November 2010 I was posted as a uniformed officer to the Neighbourhood Policing Team at Lawcroft House Police Station.

G

On 11th November 2010 I was on duty and deployed to attend the address [REDACTED] Drive, Allerton, Bradford. I arrived there at about 9.50 in the morning and spoke to a Saeed Akhtar of that address. I served him with a Harbourers Final Warning notice in respect of [Person A] and he signed the notice in my presence. I had seen -- I have this date", as in "I have today", he says, "seen a copy of the notice and can confirm that it is a true copy of the notice I served on Mr Akhtar. I recognise my signature on the form and produce this document as an exhibit."

H

We'll distribute that in just a moment.

A

"Mr Akhtar told me that he knew the name [Person A] and also that he recalled previous incidents involving her and that he has a detailed knowledge of her. I retained the notice, submitted it for filing when I returned to the police station. I do not recall having any previous knowledge of Saeed Akhtar or meeting him on a previous occasion. I do not recall ever meeting [Person A], the subject of the report. No-one else was at the house when I served the notice on Mr Akhtar."

B

C

Can I just ask for that to be passed around? I don't know if it has been. It has been. I'm told that you have a copy of that. Thank you very much.

STATEMENT OF LINDA RAV READ

D

I'm going to read a statement of [REDACTED] at I/44, please, moving on to a separate topic dealing with Mr Khaliq's employment. Her statement at I/44. She says -- statement dated 9th November 2015 -- that she is the [REDACTED] at the Telegraph and Argus in Bradford. She says:

E

"I've been asked if I can provide a statement to police in request of a man who up until very recently was employed by the Telegraph and Argus. The man is Basharat Iqbal Khaliq, born 15th September 1980. I've never personally met this man but provide some information from his personal record.

F

He worked at the Telegraph and Argus from 8th September 2008, left the company on 30th October 2015. His job description was a cash collector for the new sales department. He was provided with a company car. The most recent vehicle used was a Vauxhall Corsa, registration [REDACTED]. This vehicle was returned to the company when he left.

G

I can state his record shows him as a single male. He had an emergency contact person as a female called [REDACTED] Khaliq. The emergency contact number for her is [REDACTED] landline number and the mobile number given for her ends in the three digits [REDACTED]. The most recent address shown for Mr Khaliq is [REDACTED] Lane, Bradford. This address

H

A is shown from 18th May 2015, with previous addresses of 5 [REDACTED] Lane,
Bradford, and then in October 2009 shown living at [REDACTED] Drive, [REDACTED], Bradford.
B Mr Khaliq has a current mobile telephone number of [REDACTED]. This would be his
personal mobile phone, as he's never been given a company mobile phone. As regards the
previous vehicles Mr Khaliq has used I have only currently got shown a Ford Fiesta ending
[REDACTED] which he was using in 2010."

C STATEMENT OF DETECTIVE CHIEF INSPECTOR LONG READ

The final statement I will read at this stage, your Honour, is the statement of Chief
Inspector Long at I/61. This statement deals with that part of the chronology, your Honour, at
the time [Person A] contacted the BBC and thereafter.

D So the statement is dated 12th July 2016. He says:

"I'm currently a Detective Chief Inspector within West Yorkshire Police and have
worked within the Bradford District for the past three years.

E On 4th September 2015 I was working in my role as Safeguarding Crime
Manager for Bradford District. Part of the duties which I undertook was to work alongside
partner agencies, in particular local authority and health personnel, on safeguarding processes
and focusing on protecting vulnerable people.

F On 4th September 2014 I received a telephone call from Paul Hill, the Bradford
Safeguarding Children's Board Manager. Paul informed me that the Safeguarding Board had
been notified by Joe Inwood, a reporter from BBC Look North, that a woman known to be
[Person A], born 9th July 1993, had been in discussions with Look North and was reporting
being a victim of sexual assault whilst a child in residence at [Location B], Bradford.

G As a result of the information received I asked Paul to forward all details they had
received from Look North by way of an e-mail in order that I could make arrangements for
West Yorkshire Police to make contact with the victim and secure evidence of disclosure
H regarding the sexual offences which she had reported to Look North.

A

At 5.04 pm also on 4th September 2014 I received an e-mail outlining the allegations made by [Person A]. The following morning, 5th September 2014, I made contact with Detective Inspector Vanessa Smith of the allegations made and asked that arrangements be made for suitably trained police officers to make contact with [Person A] and secure the necessary evidence."

B

C

That concludes the statement of Detective Chief Inspector Long, which leads us then, your Honour, to call the evidence of the officer in the case, Helen Riley, who became involved in the investigation following this report to the police in 2014. Thank you.

DC HELEN RILEY (sworn)

Examination-in-chief by MS MELLY

D

MS MELLY: Officer, your full name, please.

A. Detective Constable Helen Riley.

E

Q. Thank you very much. We've used the term, and we might even have abbreviated it in front of the jury, "officer in the case" or "OIC". I just wonder if you could just explain that term to the jury, please, in terms of role in the investigation?

F

A. Yes. My role in this investigation was to record and return relevant material gathered during the course of the investigation under the supervision of the officer in charge and to pursue all reasonable lines of enquiry, whether that pointed to or away from the suspects in the case.

Q. Thank you very much, officer.

G

Now the jury have just heard me read a statement from Detective Chief Inspector Long indicating that on 5th September 2014 he made contact with Detective Inspector Vanessa Smith to ask for suitably trained police officers to make contact with [Person A], and essentially is that the commencement of this then police investigation?

A. It is, yes.

H

Q. All right. Thank you. The jury have heard, however, that [Person A] did speak to two

A

officers, Gatenby and Taylor, prior to this referral. Is that correct?

A. That's correct, yes.

B

Q. All right. In terms of contact with the officers and between 2013 and 2014 had there been any contact between police officers and [Person A] between the meeting with Gatenby and Taylor and then picking this up in 2014 after the Look North?

A. No, there hadn't.

C

Q. Right. Are you able to assist with -- have you looked at the notes from Gatenby and Taylor?

A. Yes, I have.

D

Q. Firstly, I just want to ask you this, please. Was there a record of [Person A]'s views on those original notes as to whether or not she wanted police contact?

A. There was no record of her views.

E

Q. Right. Thank you. Secondly, I just want to ask you this, please. Was the information -- we know that police didn't go back and make further contact with her after that visit from Gatenby and Taylor, but was the information she gave them at that meeting in 2013 -- was it logged on the police computer as intelligence?

A. It was logged on the police computer as intelligence a year later.

F

Q. In 2014 then?

A. Yes.

Q. At around this time or earlier of the referral from Detective Chief Inspector Long?

A. After.

G

Q. Right. Thank you very much. That was all I wanted to ask you, please, but there will be other questions. Thank you.

Cross-examination by MR IQBAL

H

MR IQBAL: Officer, I'm going to ask you, firstly, a few questions about the video interview that you conducted with [Person B].

A

[Redacted text block A]

B

[Redacted text block B]

C

[Redacted text block C]

D

[Redacted text block D]

E

[Redacted text block E]

F

[Redacted text block F]

G

[Redacted text block G]

H

[Redacted text block H]

A

[REDACTED]

B

[REDACTED]

C

[REDACTED]

D

[REDACTED]

months later, have a recollection as to why Tahir Ayoub wasn't present in that third interview?

A. I do.

Q. Was Tahir Ayoub informing you or one of your colleague officers that he could not remain for that third interview with his client?

E

A. Yes, that's correct.

Q. And was he encouraging you to delay that interview to a future time and date?

A. No, that's not correct.

F

Q. All right. We see here that the defendant was left in a position where he didn't have representation. Was there any discussion between you and the defendant as to whether he wanted that interview to be delayed so that he could have legal representation?

G

A. He was asked if he wanted legal representation. That's his right and that's something that's discussed at the beginning of every interview.

Q. I see. So was the position then that he agreed -- is that what you say -- to this third interview continuing without any legal representation?

H

A. He agreed to have the inter... -- well, he didn't agree. He said he would be interviewed

A

without a solicitor.

Q. All right. What is your recollection then of the discussion, if any, between you and Mr Ayoub as to why he wasn't remaining for that third interview?

B

A. If the court would like to hear it, I'm prepared to say.

Q. Well, it depends.

JUDGE DURHAM HALL: Am I being asked that there may be something here I should consider? Are you --

C

MR IQBAL: I'm in the dark as much as your Honour is.

JUDGE DURHAM HALL: Well, you are maybe. The lights are on, but you're asking the question, Mr Iqbal.

D

MR IQBAL: Yes.

JUDGE DURHAM HALL: Sorry. Not being facetious. It's up to you. Do you want to go ahead?

MR IQBAL: We sought clarification of this. We haven't been given any. If the officer has some information, I think it would probably be better we're given it in the normal statement form.

E

JUDGE DURHAM HALL: Ms Melly, we never encourage witnesses to do or say anything because they know. They were there. None of us were, which caution demands perhaps I should hear first. Yes? Shall we do that?

F

MS MELLY: Yes.

JUDGE DURHAM HALL: Could you just give us a moment? Maybe a comfort break might be in order. I'm going to give you a good break as soon as this officer is finished anyway, but go and -- just let me have a word with the parties in -- are you happy with this, Mr Iqbal?

G

MR IQBAL: Yes, of course. Of course.

JUDGE DURHAM HALL: Good.

H

(Jury withdrew from court)

A

[Redacted text block A]

B

[Redacted text block B]

C

[Redacted text block C]

D

[Redacted text block D]

(Public withdrew from court)

E

[Redacted text block E]

F

[Redacted text block F]

G

[Redacted text block G]

H

[Redacted text block H]

A

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

B

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

C

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

D

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

(Public returned)

E

JUDGE DURHAM HALL: Okay. Thank you so much. Mr Iqbal, you can deal with it how you want. Even the truth will only cause amusement, but nothing more.

MR IQBAL: Yes. Thank you.

(Jury returned to court)

F

JUDGE DURHAM HALL: Thanks a lot, ladies. I'm glad I did it, but, I mean, the conspiracy theories, I'm sorry to disappoint you. There is no big deal --

MR IQBAL: No, no.

JUDGE DURHAM HALL: -- but very -- very proper caution. Thank you.

G

MR IQBAL: Slightly amusing perhaps.

Is this the position then, that, in fact, now that we have clarified the position, that between that second and third interview Mr Ayoub had not given himself enough parking time on his car? Is that what had happened?

H

A. Essentially.

A

Q. So, therefore, he'd run out of time, was desperate to leave so he didn't get a parking ticket or the like?

A. Well, I don't know, but he excused himself.

B

Q. So he wanted to leave and he left?

A. Yes.

Q. And then I don't criticise anyone, but the position is that in the third interview the defendant was on his own. Had he had a consultation in between with his solicitor?

C

A. He had and he was asked if he wanted another solicitor.

Q. Yes. Then in the third interview, as we can see, it was very brief. He was simply being asked about telephones, underwear, an application form and some other items that had been seized from his house and he simply made no comment to those questions in that interview.

D

Is that right?

A. That's correct, yes.

Q. Yes. Thank you very much.

E

Cross-examination by MR MOULSON

MR MOULSON: We know that towards the end of August of 2014 there were publications in newspapers about abuse sustained by girls in Rotherham. [Person A1] has given evidence that she knew about those documents -- yes -- and that case -- yes -- and we know that in September 2014 there was then contact by her with Look North, subsequently with solicitors and the police. In broad terms that's the position. Is that a fair statement?

F

A. A fair statement, yes.

Q. Thank you. Is it correct, DC Riley, that your direct involvement with [Person A1] began on 17th November of 2014?

G

A. That's correct.

Q. Thank you, and I think on that occasion you with another detective constable, Detective Dawson, visited [Person A1]. Is that right?

H

A

A. That's right.

Q. And that officer introduced you to [Person A1]?

A. That's correct.

B

Q. Thank you. We know from other records, DC Riley -- and, please, there's no criticism in my questioning of you -- that on that day, ie 17th November of that year, [Person A1] was in contact with a lady by the name of [REDACTED]. Does that name ring a bell with you?

A. It does.

C

Q. Thank you. Could you just confirm, please, that [REDACTED] is a solicitor -- a solicitor employed by a firm called [REDACTED]? Is that right?

A. That's correct.

D

JUDGE DURHAM HALL: Okay. Just -- so in contact with [REDACTED] We've heard -- yes, all heard of [REDACTED]. She's the author of the long memo.

MR MOULSON: She is, your Honour.

JUDGE DURHAM HALL: And she works -- worked and works for?

E

MR MOULSON: Switalskis, your Honour.

JUDGE DURHAM HALL: And Switalskis are a prominent firm of?

MR MOULSON: Solicitors. I don't think there can be any dispute about that.

JUDGE DURHAM HALL: No.

F

MR MOULSON: They act for those seeking compensation. Yes?

JUDGE DURHAM HALL: They can do. That's part of their --

A. Can do I believe, so yes.

JUDGE DURHAM HALL: -- trade, isn't it, Mr Moulson?

G

MR MOULSON: Thank you. Thank you very much indeed.

There's a note that [Person A1] spoke to [REDACTED] of those solicitors indicating that she'd been advised to delay any application for compensation from whatever source until the conclusion of any trial. Yes? I'd just like your help with that, please, DC

H

A

Riley, that issue of compensation.

First of all, did you overhear [Person A1] making that -- that call to [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]?

B

A. No.

Q. No. When you had your meeting, you, DC Dawson and [Person A1] -- yes -- was the issue of compensation discussed?

C

A. At that meeting?

Q. At that meeting?

A. I don't believe so.

JUDGE DURHAM HALL: Or thereabouts?

D

A. On 17th November 2014 I don't believe so.

MR MOULSON: Right, because the note from [REDACTED] reads that [Person A1] had been advised to take a certain course about compensation, ie to wait till after the criminal proceedings.

E

So [Person A1] is reporting to a solicitor some advice -- yes -- and that was the date you and DC Dawson met her. So with that knowledge, DC Riley, does that jog your memory about whether or not compensation had been discussed by [Person A1] with you on that same date?

F

A. On that same date I don't recall compensation was discussed.

JUDGE DURHAM HALL: Right.

MR MOULSON: Is it a possibility it was?

G

A. I wouldn't say so. I have discussed it with her --

Q. Yes.

A. -- but not on that date --

Q. Right.

H

A. -- with me.

A

Q. Do you have a notebook entry referring to this meeting?

A. I do.

B

Q. You do. All right. Well, perhaps we can look at that. We needn't detain matters now, but perhaps if you could produce that to us later in the day, officer, when you've given evidence or tomorrow if it's at another location. Thank you.

C

After your first introduction to [Person A1] on 17th November you had frequent contact with her, did you, DC Riley?

A. I did.

Q. Thank you. By telephone?

A. Yes.

D

Q. Her to you, you to her?

A. Yes.

Q. Yes? Any meetings with her face-to-face outwith the video interviews that you did?

A. Yes.

E

Q. Thank you, and on some -- and on some occasions then was compensation discussed?

A. Yes.

Q. Yes, and was it raised by her or raised by --

A. It was raised by [Person A1] in the first instance --

F

Q. Yes.

A. -- but as a police officer I am obliged to tell people anybody who's reported a crime is entitled to have criminal injuries compensation and there are time limits of two years, and I am obliged to tell that person they are entitled to make a claim. So it was discussed either way --

G

Q. Thank you.

A. -- at some point.

H

Q. Do you know how long after 17th November, if it wasn't on 17th November, that the issue

A

was first raised by [Person A1]?

A. Yes. It was in March 2015.

B

Q. Right. So you'd had a number of contacts with her up until this date in March 2015. Is that right?

A. That's right, yes.

C

Q. We have a note of that date, officer -- sorry -- a note of a date in March, 3rd March of 2015. [Person A] telephoned [REDACTED] at [REDACTED] about her compensation claim. Do you know about that call?

A. I don't believe so.

Q. Right.

D

A. I do know that she made calls and that a compensation claim was discussed with [REDACTED], but I didn't know the content of it --

Q. Right.

A. -- or anything like that --

E

Q. Right.

A. -- at that time.

F

Q. So in terms of -- if you can help us with this, officer -- [Person A1] making calls to the solicitors about compensation, would [Person A1] say to you, for example then, "I've made another call to Switalskis about compensation" or "another call to [REDACTED] about compensation"?

A. I believe she did at various points, but it wasn't incessant. It was just she'd comment on it as what I've said to you or something like that and that's all recorded on the log.

G

Q. All recorded on the log. We have a note of an entry on 3rd April of 2015:

"[Person A] spoke to [REDACTED] of [REDACTED] s Solicitors",

and again it makes reference to advice by you about compensation. Does that

H

help you with the number of times the issue of compensation had been discussed between you

A and [Person A1], because we have an entry November 2014, when you say it wasn't discussed. We've now got to April 2015. Can you give us a broad outline of how many times [Person A1] raised the issue of compensation with you, officer?

B A. If I can refer to my log, I can give you an exact, but it would have been at least once.

Q. At least once. Yes. Do you have a log with you?

A. I do.

C Q. On you?

A. Yes.

Q. Would it take a considerable time to go through this log?

A. No.

D Q. Okay. With your Honour's leave may I?

JUDGE DURHAM HALL: Yes, certainly.

MR MOULSON: Thank you very much. Forgive me. I'm ...

JUDGE DURHAM HALL: Are you all right with this, Mr Moulson?

E MR MOULSON: I am. Thank you.

First of all officer, forgive me. If I can help with you this and give you some time. Please don't feel under any pressure of time. The number of -- does that log reveal the number of contacts you had with [Person A1] from, say, November 2014 to April 2015 --

F A. Yes.

Q. -- approximately?

A. It does.

G Q. How many are there?

A. From April --

Q. November 2014.

H A. Sorry. November '14 there is one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, ten, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20. There's 20 up to February '15.

A

Q. So from November '14 to February '15 there are 20?

A. Yes.

B

Q. Is that number and over that time period a reasonable reflection of how your contact carried on with her -- with her?

A. That's reasonable, yes.

Q. Reasonable?

A. Yes.

C

Q. Thank you. So every three or four months about 20 contacts. Is that fair?

A. It might have been less; it might have been more, depending on the circumstances.

Q. Yes. Thank you. Is that meetings and calls or just calls?

D

A. No. Meetings and calls.

Q. And then the video interviews as well?

A. Yes, and that includes any time I've tried to contact her and there's been no contact. That's recorded within that.

E

Q. Right. Can I just -- sorry. Forgive me. Does your log show how many times [Person A1] told you she had been in touch with Switalskis in that period or not?

A. Yes, it does, yes.

Q. Sorry. Could I just prevail upon you to do the same exercise?

F

A. Sorry. Yes. There are -- there are two contacts in which she has spoken about Switalskis, but she hasn't actually said the vein of that content.

Q. Right.

A. It's been about compensation. She's had contact with her solicitors.

G

Q. Right.

A. That's been the extent of it.

Q. Right. So [Person A1]'s told you she's had contact with Switalskis, but your note doesn't record what that was about?

H

A

A. It does record it, but it wasn't about compensation.

Q. Right. Can I just ask for your response to this note of 3rd April, please --

A. Uh-huh.

B

Q. -- DC Riley? It says -- this is [Person A1] to [REDACTED] er:

"She", [Person A1], "had been advised by DC Riley it would be preferable not to make claims as it would make her, [Person A1], look bad and only in it for the money."

C

Now we all appreciate that you weren't party to this conversation. It's from a file note made by a solicitor, but this course of questioning about this issue has been approved that I ask you about it.

A. Okay.

D

Q. Did you ever say words to that effect to [Person A1]?

A. What I said -- well, first thing is I would never use the words "look bad" as a professional. I wouldn't use that with her.

Q. Right.

E

A. What I have said -- what I did say to [Person A1] was if she chose to make a compensation claim, it would have to be disclosed in any future trial and she would have to be prepared to answer maybe uncomfortable questions about that and her motives. That's the extent of my discussion with her about that, but that was repeated on a number of occasions,

F

and [Person A1]'s words to [REDACTED] are her relaying that information to that.

Q. Thank you. You knew all along, didn't you, that [Person A1] wanted to at some point make a claim for compensation?

A. Yes, that's fair.

G

Q. Right. A different topic, please, officer, and a short one, if I may. Ladies and gentlemen, officer, could I just invite you to turn to page 11 of the agreed facts, please? Do you have those there?

H

A. I don't, no. Sorry. Is it in this bundle?

A

Q. It should be, yes, behind divider 15. Sorry. I think the representative from the Crown Prosecution Service is going to help. Page 11, please, officer, numbering in the bottom -- bottom centre. Thank you.

B

We see the heading, paragraph 5, "Complaint to the police" and there are a number of recorded complaints by [Person A1] to the police at the time at which we're concerned, officer. You understand?

C

A. Yes.

Q. Yes? I hope Ms Beattie yesterday gave to you a document that I was going to ask you some questions on. I'm just going to ask you about two entries if I may, please.

A. Yes.

D

Q. I don't know if you have that document with you?

A. I have, yes.

Q. I don't think there's any dispute about what's on it. All right? If, for example, we just go to paragraph 5(b), on 15th July 2010 in the period with which we are concerned with these defendants, officer, it's recorded that:

E

"[Person A1] complained of rape by her ex-boyfriend, AC."

Yes? We know what the police did about that. Can I just confirm with you that the police took the following steps?

F

Seven days later [Person A1] was video interviewed by the police and she provided details of potential witnesses and the police attempted to contact those witnesses? Thank you.

G

Then just a final example, please. Ladies and gentlemen, if you could turn to page 13, please, and it's letter M. Do you have that, officer?

A. I do, yes.

Q. Thank you very much indeed. Just pausing for a moment, 8th December is between the Heller Abbey(?) visit, as I would call it, by Gatenby and Taylor, July 2013. Obviously we

H

A then have December 2013 and then we have the events towards the end of August/beginning of September/November with which you're more directly involved, officer, but we see at letter M on that date in December 2013 [Person A1] made a complaint of sexual assault --

B yes -- and the police did attend and speak to [Person A1] about that, didn't they?

A. Uh-huh.

Q. Yes. Thank you very much indeed, officer.

C A. Can I expand on that, Mr Moulson, please? She did -- she said she thought she had been sexually assaulted. She didn't actually say she had been.

D Q. Right. My -- so that we don't understand -- misunderstand each other about the premise of the questioning, we have two examples here where [Person A1] made a complaint and the police did what they could to follow up that complaint?

A. Yes.

Q. That's the premise of my question?

E A. Yes. The premise of your questions is fine, but they're two completely different situations as in --

JUDGE DURHAM HALL: But the point is clear. That's fine. Don't worry about it.

MR MOULSON: Thank you. Thank you very much.

A. Thank you.

F JUDGE DURHAM HALL: Does anybody else have any?

MR BELL: No. Thank you.

JUDGE DURHAM HALL: Miss Hertzog.

Cross-examination by MS HERTZOG

G MS HERTZOG: Thank you, your Honour.

JUDGE DURHAM HALL: And you are Zeeshan Ali's barrister?

MS HERTZOG: I am indeed. Yes. Thank you.

H Officer, just a few questions, please, if you could help.

A

Over the course of the many hours of interviews [Person A1], of course, made an allegation against a number of people. Some of them, as we know, are in this dock and before us and a number of them are not, and I think it is right, isn't that, that you've simply not been able to locate everybody against whom she made allegations?

B

A. That's correct.

Q. And you've not been able to effectively identify them. Is that right?

C

A. Yes.

Q. One of those people is a man we've heard of by the name of [REDACTED] who [Person A1] says raped her in a bath the night that she was touched up by a man called T on the breasts and bottom, and that's right, isn't it?

D

A. No, that's not right.

Q. Pardon?

A. No, that's not right.

Q. You've not been able to identify him?

E

A. We have identified him. He's been interviewed.

Q. Very well. You've identified somebody. He was interviewed and he was put on an identification parade?

A. That's correct.

F

Q. And it's right, isn't it, that [Person A1] was not able to pick him out?

A. That's correct.

Q. And so the case against him -- went no further against him?

A. That's correct.

G

Q. But it's your view that you did identify him?

A. As far as we could. It could have been him; it might not have been. Obviously it's been quite a difficult investigation.

H

Q. And so as a result of that and the failure to identify him on the identification parade your

A

investigations concluded at that point in relation to the man called [REDACTED].

A. They have, but we're still look... -- all the time looking to see if -- cross-referencing things when they come into the investigation, the wider investigation.

B

Q. One of the first things you would have done no doubt in relation to that allegation is taken a description of the person called [REDACTED]. Is that right?

A. Yes.

C

Q. And was [Person A1] able to give you a description of him?

A. I believe so. That would have been on her video interview.

Q. Do you recall what that description was?

A. No.

D

Q. Would you be able to get that for us?

A. Yes.

Q. Thank you. We know that on two separate occasions -- there'll be an admission about this in due course -- [Person A1] was driven around the area with two of your colleagues. Is that right?

E

A. That's correct.

Q. And the reason why she was driven around the local area was to try and identify [REDACTED] house, because she'd explained that that had happened at his home address?

F

A. That's right.

Q. And on both of those separate occasions, and, as I say, we'll get the dates of these in due course, [Person A1] was unable to assist in locating the address?

A. That's correct.

G

Q. Thank you very much.

JUDGE DURHAM HALL: Right. Mr Wilson, anything?

MR WILSON: I think there may be a matter of law.

H

JUDGE DURHAM HALL: Okay. Great. Just another quick comfort break. I'm anxious if

A

we can actually finish the witness and then send her on her way, then you can have a longer break. So are you happy to give me -- to follow the drill? I haven't a clue. No disrespect. I'll find out what it is, rule, help, tell you the outcome, as with the parking solicitor problem, or

B

not if it's a legal --

MR WILSON: Not a parking problem.

JUDGE DURHAM HALL: Not a parking problem. All right.

C

MR WILSON: Not yet.

JUDGE DURHAM HALL: Not yet. So thank you. Just give me a couple of minutes.

(Jury withdrew from court)

D

[REDACTED]

E

[REDACTED]

F

[REDACTED]

G

[REDACTED]

H

[REDACTED]

A

[REDACTED]

B

[REDACTED]

C

[REDACTED]

D

[REDACTED]

(Jury returned to court)

JUDGE DURHAM HALL: Well, that was an easy one. The computer said "No".

E

So, Mr Wilson, your witness.

Cross-examination by MR WILSON

MR WILSON: Yes. Thank you very much.

F

Officer, can I just ask you, first of all, about interviews in relation to Fahim Iqbal, because we've got summaries of his two interviews with the police and his prepared statements and the jury have those, but effectively because there were "no comment" to the interviews, there's no reference to the questions, and I just want to ask you about what was put to him, just one specific matter.

G

Can you confirm that during the course of certainly his first interview with the police the allegation that [Person A] makes in her ABE interviews about having sex with Fahim Iqbal and then swapping with somebody else was put to Fahim Iqbal, was it not?

H

A. That's correct.

A

Q. Next, in relation to Kieran Harris -- and if we have our timeline open at page 34 -- I think it's the last page -- can you confirm that the only link between Kieran Harris and [Person A] is that which we find in our timeline at page 34?

B

A. If I could see it, I would be grateful.

Q. Sorry. Have you got the timeline there?

A. I haven't got it.

C

Q. There's an entry under "Kieran Harris".

MS MELLY: Sorry. Which page?

MR WILSON: Page 34. I think it's the last page. Have you got that?

A. The entry on page 34?

D

Q. It relates to a telephone number.

A. Yes.

Q. Now I think as part of the police investigation after 23rd September 2014 [Person A]'s telephone was analysed by the police as part of the investigation?

E

A. That -- that was the one she had then, yes.

Q. And on that telephone was found a number called "Kieran 2". Yes?

A. That's correct.

F

Q. That number relates back to Mr Kieran Harris, because on the occasion in December 2012 I think he made a statement to the police about the matter he gave them a contact number which was the same as was in the contact list of [Person A] when that telephone was examined?

A. That's correct.

G

Q. Thank you. Now can you also confirm this, that in respect of Social Services records, Barnardo's records, police records, CMS records for [Person A], because they've all been looked at by the police during the course of their investigation -- yes -- there is no reference to Kieran in them?

H

A

A. I believe so.

Q. And the first mention of a Kieran is actually to [REDACTED] Solicitors and [REDACTED] during the course of her conference with [REDACTED] on 17th September 2014. Yes?

B

A. 17th September 2014? I'm not sure that's correct. I think she did mention him before.

Q. The first time she mentions anything to the police anyway about a Kieran is in that first ABE interview of 23rd September towards the end of that first interview. Is that correct?

C

A. That's correct. The first time that she speaks about quite a lot of the suspects.

Q. Now during the course of your investigation is it right that a man called [REDACTED] was arrested?

A. That's correct.

D

Q. And he was part of the -- he was a suspect and was put on an identification parade involving [Person A] on 20th January 2017. Is that correct?

A. I believe so, yes.

Q. Can you confirm that he was the only [REDACTED] who was part of an identification parade or procedure involving [Person A] on 20th January 2017?

E

A. Regarding [REDACTED] in particular, yes.

Q. And can -- is it right that the police believe he is a cousin or a second cousin, some relation, of Fahim Iqbal and [REDACTED]?

F

A. That's not right. That is what we've been told, but I can't say for sure.

Q. Well -- but he is the person that's referred to in -- do the police believe he is the person referred to in [Person A]'s interviews as the cousin of Fahim Iqbal and [REDACTED]?

G

A. No. That -- she -- he -- I believe that he was the person referred to, [REDACTED], not just the cousin.

Q. No. What I'm suggesting is she refers to the cousin being with Zub... -- with Fahim Iqbal and [REDACTED]. Yes?

H

A. She also refers to other people being relatives.

A

Q. But is it right that your understanding is that she was referring to [REDACTED] as being some sort of relative of theirs through the course of those interviews? I mean Fahim Iqbal and

B

A. She referred to him as that --

Q. Yes. Thank you very much.

A. -- but I can't say that's correct.

C

Cross-examination by MR DALLAS

MR DALLAS: Just one matter, officer. You've just been asked some questions about the police questioning of Fahim Iqbal. Can I just give some context to it or could you, please?

D

It's correct, isn't it, that the questions that he was asked about the incident involving Kieran Harris allegedly was not the only thing he was being questioned about, was it?

A. No.

E

Q. And in particular, as was your duty, you were questioning him about his entire sexual activity with [Person A1] --

A. Yes.

F

Q. -- to investigate whether that might properly be alleged to be or characterised as an offence --

A. Yes.

Q. -- such as rape?

G

A. That's correct.

Q. And that is why the prepared statement addresses his relationship with her generally.

Thank you.

Cross-examination by MR FERM

H

MR FERM: I have a number of questions for you on behalf of Mohammed Usman.

A First of all, he was arrested at the airport on the evening of 5th June 2016, was he not?

A. Yes.

B Q. And can you confirm that he was, in fact, returning to this country through that airport when he was arrested?

A. Yes.

C Q. And, furthermore, that there is no suggestion at all that he had left the country to go to Pakistan to escape justice?

A. I can't say either way in that regard.

Q. He said he'd been there for a month?

D A. I don't know.

Q. Do you know that he'd been out there to see his wife?

A. I believe so. I don't know.

Q. So he hadn't been circulated as wanted before he went to Pakistan?

E A. That's correct.

Q. Thank you. Well, he was arrested on the evening of 5th and he was interviewed the following day, and he denied throughout his interviews on the following day and thereafter any sexual offence against [Person A]. Is that right?

F A. I believe so.

Q. However, straightaway -- and I'm not going to take time to go to the interviews -- he admitted immediately that he knew [Person A]?

A. He did as a matter of record.

G Q. And he admitted that he'd been to her house in [Location C] --

A. Again that's a matter of record.

Q. -- on more than one occasion?

H A. Yes.

A

Q. And so he never put his identity in issue in relation to himself and [Person A1], did he?

A. No.

Q. And in that sense an identification procedure was not really necessary in his case?

B

A. That may have been the case, but it -- that was the decision that was made by the supervising officer at the time.

Q. It was a police decision to do it?

A. Yes.

C

Q. But not one that was called for by him?

A. Called for by him? No.

Q. Thank you. Now also in the interviews he said that he suffered from asthma?

D

A. I don't recall that. He could have done.

Q. Well, I'll take you to it, if necessary. It's on page 11 of his first interview. Perhaps we ought to look at that. It's just above 42:30.

MS MELLY: It's the paper in front of you.

E

MR FERM: I'll read it out.

"Usman said he thought it was not his scene anymore, drinking and smoking, as he had asthma."

So you all see it and I hope you'll take it from me.

F

Now when somebody is arrested by the police and kept in custody for however short a time, a document called a custody record comes into existence, doesn't it?

A. It does.

G

Q. I think you may have been provided with a copy of his custody record this morning. If not, I ask that you're provided with one now. I think your Honour has one. There's a copy for your Honour, but it's not necessary for the jury to be burdened down with this piece of paper.

JUDGE DURHAM HALL: Thank you.

H

MR FERM: Now I'm looking at this very briefly in relation to asthma. Page 1 shows that it's

A

his custody record, doesn't it?

A. It does.

B

Q. Page 2 I'm now going to come to. When somebody is detained at a police station for interview, personal possessions are examined by the police and sometimes removed from them whilst they're in custody. Is that right?

A. That's correct.

C

Q. I've highlighted it for you under the heading "Property". We find:

"Inhalers, quantity 1, police prevent damage/injury, blue and pink."

A. Yes.

Q. So you understand that that is asthma medication --

D

A. Yes.

Q. -- the blue and pink inhaler. When the interviews of Mohammed Usman ended -- I've finished with the custody record -- please look at it by all means -- I don't invite you to -- he was asked if he would give consent for his medical records to be looked at, wasn't he?

E

A. Yes.

Q. And he gave consent?

A. I'll be led by you. I can't remember at the time.

Q. It's a matter of record again that he did. Have you looked at his medical records?

F

A. Either I would have done or somebody from the investigation team.

Q. And can you confirm that he's been a long-term sufferer from severe asthma?

A. I can't confirm that right now, no.

G

Q. Did you look at his custody record -- sorry -- his medical records -- forgive me -- for that purpose?

A. For that purpose?

Q. Yes, to see how long and how badly he suffered from asthma?

H

A. I wouldn't have done, no.

A

Q. Now I'm going to ask you to look at some documents which are going to go before the jury. Perhaps they may be handed out. The Crown have already got them, your Honour, and the witness should have them. If she has not, then there's a further copy. This will go in due course, but not now, ladies and gentlemen, behind divider 14 in the "Usman" section, but it is more convenient I think for you to keep it out whilst I ask questions about it and then you can put it into section 14 at your convenience.

B

C

Now I've provided to you at this moment what I understand to be three separate documents which have been compiled by the police as records in respect of their attendance at [Location C], on 30th July 2011. Just have a brief look at them and confirm, please, Detective Constable Riley, that these are police records in relation to that event?

D

A. Yes, that's correct.

Q. Thank you. I'm going to start conventionally on page 1. We see in smaller type on page 1 and page 2 a continuation of the same document.

A. That's correct.

E

Q. Before I go into it can you inform the ladies and gentlemen of the jury what pages 1 and 2 are and who compiles them?

A. Page 1 and 2 are copies of a log that has been recorded by the police contact centre when somebody rings up and they make a call. It's all typed on a log essentially.

F

Q. Right. Now looking at page 1, we can see "30th July" at the top "7.24.26", and then the time next to it, "30th July, 9.01" and then "6.20", going across the line, please, "Domestic, non-crim". Do you see that?

A. Yes.

G

Q. Then I'm going to go down the page to the large body of entry here.

"Activity, date, time."

Below this:

H

"30th July 2011, 7.28.16, despatch."

A

Then under "Involved officers":

"David Milner."

At the same time on the next line:

B

"PC Mason."

Are they two officers who were despatched to [Location C1]?

A. Yes.

C

Q. They're not witnesses in this trial, as I understand it. Is that right?

A. That's correct.

Q. Is that because they're no longer available?

A. I don't know if they're no longer available.

D

Q. Very well. They're not witnesses and so we have to go from what is recorded on the log.

Is that right?

A. Yes.

Q. Now 30th July underneath that message sent to Milner:

E

"Violence against the person."

We get that repeated. Then 30th July 2011:

"PC Mark Sommerville."

He's also -- he's not a witness to this case either, is he?

F

A. That's correct.

Q. I'm now going to go down to the incident log. This is 7.25.24, before the officers are despatched. So can we take it that this is something that is given to the telephone operator at the police end?

G

A. Yes.

Q. "My ex-boyfriend called Mani is in my house. He told me to open the door and he walked in."

H

This replicates the timeline entry, doesn't it?

A

A. Yes.

Q. "He has been there 5 o'clock in the morning today. He has urinated over the carpet already and he is very drunk. He has not hit me but has been aggressive towards me and picked up items as though he was going to throw them at me."

B

Turn over, please. Next line:

"I walked up the road from my house, but I can still see it if he leaves."

C

Then further down, 7.50.34:

"Taking male back to home address."

Going down to the bottom, we get three further entries at 9.07 (inaudible).

Now I want to just go back to page 1 and ask you some questions about

D

(inaudible).

"My ex-boyfriend called Mani is in my house. He told me to open the door. He walked in."

We don't find, therefore, in this record, do we, any reference to kicking the door

E

or trying to kick the door down?

A. In this record, no.

Q. Thank you. Bottom entry on this page:

"He has not hit me but has been aggressive towards me and picked up items as though he was going to throw them at me."

F

We don't find here any mention of trying to strangle [Person A1] or pinning her against the wall, do we?

G

A. Not on this record, no.

Q. Or anything about not wanting any sex with him?

A. Not on this record, no.

Q. Or on any previous occasions?

H

A. Not on this record, no.

A

Q. If we turn back to page 2 before we leave this record, I'm going back to 7.50.34:

"Taking male back to home address."

He was not arrested according to this record, was he?

B

A. Not according to this, no.

Q. If he -- if the police had been informed of an offence of strangulation or something similar, or a complaint of rape or unwanted sexual interference, then he should have been arrested, shouldn't he, and not taken back home?

C

A. I cannot answer for what officers have done when they've attended, but I would have expected as a police officer if there had been those allegations, that he would have been arrested.

D

Q. May I turn over, please, to the second document? Can you explain what this document entitled "Current details" is and who makes it up?

A. Yes. When officers attend a report of a crime or an incident that has taken place, we record it as what's called an occurrence, which is an incident log. It's a running log that the investigating officers will record things on or statements will be attached to, etc.

E

Q. If we turn over the page, please, to page 2, towards the bottom we get reports and the author is Mason with a collar number given. That must be one of the officers who is noted on the previous document as attending, must he not?

F

A. I believe so.

Q. Thank you.

G

"Between the times stated the victim has returned from a night out when subject arrives at her home address in drink. Subject walks into her house and due to his drunken statement he's not welcome. Subject drops a glass of drink on to the laminate floor, which causes the glass to break, before collapsing in a drunken state on to a mattress upstairs. The subject is asked to leave by the victim and he becomes verbally abusive towards her and

H

refuses to leave. Police are called and on arrival no offences are disclosed. Subject is

A

removed to home address."

Right? That's the police officer's -- attending police officer's report of the incident, isn't it?

B

Now, please, can we turn to the last document in this series, which is what is called a storm log. Is that right?

A. Yes, that's right.

C

Q. And essentially this is a statutory produced record which effectively reproduces and then continues what came before. Is that right?

A. That's right, but you'll see that the -- that the report at the back and the report at the front are the identical log. They're just printed off in a different way.

D

Q. Thank you, and these are the entirety of the police records about 30th July 2011. Is that right?

A. No. It does refer on the incident log, the subsequent incident log, to say -- says:

"Letter and DV pack sent to the victim along with contact details."

E

So there are --

Q. A domestic violence letter was sent.

A. -- supplemental things which are not attached to this.

F

Q. I'm going to go on to that. A domestic violence letter is a letter that's sent out to try and help people who want to complain about violence in the home setting in their home and tell them how to go about complaining and what support they'll see. Is that right?

A. Yes.

G

Q. Your Honour, I see the time, but if you give me ten minutes --

JUDGE DURHAM HALL: I can't. Thank you. I can't give you ten minutes now. We've been working very hard, Mr Ferm. I'm sorry. These matters have to be gone through at Mr Ferm's discretion. Can you pop back, please, at 2.10? Thank you very much.

H

All right, ladies and gentlemen. I strongly suggest a walk in the fresh air and

A

we'll come back at 2.10. I'm sorry we couldn't have sorted this by 1 o'clock, but I have to --
I've got to go into a meeting, a dreaded meeting. So have pity on me and enjoy an hour and
ten minutes. Thank you.

B

(Jury withdrew from court)

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

C

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

D

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

E

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

F

(Lunch break)

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

G

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

H

[REDACTED]

A

█

████████████████████

██

B

(Jury returned to court)

MR FERM: Earlier I asked you to keep this document out and to put it in at a later stage.

Why not -- why not now if it's convenient before I continue to ask Detective Constable Riley what she responded to? It will go at the back of divider 14.

C

Would you now turn, please, to the admissions behind page 15 -- divider 15 at page 11? Now what I'm asking you about here, Detective Constable, is entry B on this page on 15th July, which is recorded that:

D

"[Person A1] complained of rape by her ex-boyfriend, AC."

Okay? You have I think a defence bundle of documents which was used originally when I was asking [Person A1] questions. Has that been provided to you?

A. I'm sorry. I don't -- I haven't. I don't know what you're referring to.

E

Q. Then I would hope it would be. I was told there was one available in the witness box. It's -- when I find the first page, it's entitled "Mohammed Usman Defence Bundle Index".

MS MELLY: Who said they would be in the witness box?

MR FERM: The usher said it was.

F

MS MELLY: Oh, the usher.

MR FERM: By the side of the witness box.

MS MELLY: We have a spare copy. Is that the same thing in the black folder or not?

MR FERM: It is.

G

A. Thank you.

MR FERM: It should be entitled on its front page, as I say, "Mohammed Usman Defence Bundle Index".

H

A. Sorry. Which page in this?

A

Q. I'd like you, please, to go to page 24. Make sure you've got the right document.

A. No. This is the statement. It's not the right document.

Q. I wonder if the Crown can assist me.

B

MS MELLY: No, I cannot, I'm afraid.

MR FERM: I did understand it was available for the witness.

MS MELLY: We can share one.

C

MR FERM: Right. Just so that we can establish that you do have the right document, is it a document on the front page "Mohammed Usman. Defence Bundle Index"?

A. Yes.

Q. And you'll see that on the index at page 24 there's reference to an "Occurrence Log, rape allegation AC, 5 pages"?

D

A. Yes.

Q. Now my learned friend Mr Moulson has already asked you some questions about the police enquiry into the rape allegation that [Person A1] made on 15th July 2010 and I'm trying to avoid treading in the same tracks whilst I cross-examine you, but can you confirm you've got an Occurrence Log there?

E

A. Yes.

Q. And that's the police document which records the progress of the enquiry?

F

A. That's correct.

Q. It's already been established that seven days after she'd made the complaint and the police had been involved she was taken to a video suite to give an account on film in the same way that we've seen in this case?

G

A. Yes.

Q. The police then set about trying to contact witnesses. However, on 27th June 2010 is it recorded that Detective Constable Smith obtained a statement from [Person A1] stating that she did not want to proceed with any prosecution into her circumstances? You'll find that

H

A

on -- it's on a number of -- page 26 at the bottom.

A. Yes, that's correct.

Q. Yes, and can you confirm that to be the position?

B

A. Yes, that's right.

Q. Subsequently the file was kept open by the police, wasn't it? It wasn't closed off?

A. To follow due process.

C

Q. And eventually it was considered by a senior officer in 2011?

A. Yes, that's correct.

Q. The enquiry had not gone any further after [Person A1] had indicated that she didn't want to proceed with the allegation?

D

A. That's right.

Q. Looking at this document, it would be wrong to say that the police weren't bothered about this allegation of rape, wouldn't it?

A. It would be wrong to say that.

E

Q. Thank you. It was taken seriously?

A. Yes.

Q. Thank you. Now I'd like to go forward a page in our admissions, please, to page 12 and to G at the top, 24th July 2011. Recorded:

F

"She complained of assault and criminal damage against two girls and complained of injury to her mouth."

You'll find the log in relation to that at page 29 in the bundle, and very briefly she was saying that they'd cut her mouth open and cut her hair off, wasn't she?

G

A. Yes.

Q. That's all I want to ask you about that incident.

H

In the course of the interviews with the complainant -- and for your Honour's note we find this at K/3193 -- the name of someone called [Person H] was mentioned for the first

A time -- right --

A. Right.

B Q. -- as someone who had come to [Location C1] in the period when [Person A1] alleged that Mohammed Usman was coming to the house also, and what [Person A1] said in interview to you was you'd interviewed [Person H1]. Was it correct that you'd interviewed [Person H]?

A. I hadn't interviewed her, no.

C Q. Has anybody interviewed [Person H]?

A. Efforts have been made to contact her, but I don't believe she's been interviewed.

Q. So she's not a witness in this case?

A. No.

D Q. Thank you. Moving on, please, in the admissions to page 13, paragraph 26, on 19th June 2012 [Person A] saw a psychiatrist, Dr [REDACTED]. She told Dr [REDACTED] that:

"She said she was physically and verbally abused as a child, though not sexually abused. However, she claims to have been raped twice at 16 and 17 years old."

E I'd like to go to the actual medical note in relation to the 19th June, which you will find at page 3 in the bundle. I'm so sorry. It is page 3. I'm on the wrong page. That's a letter to Dr [REDACTED] (?) at [REDACTED] e Practice about [Person A1] and her having seen Dr [REDACTED] isn't it?

F **A.** It is.

Q. And in the same order that the quotation which has been lifted and put in admission 26 it is recorded that there had been two incidents where [Person A1] had done something believing that somebody had assaulted her when that person hadn't and there were witnesses to confirm -- prepared to confirm that to be the case. Is that right? You'll find it in the third paragraph down.

G **A.** This was --

H Q. "Later it became apparent that this was something imagined and not, in fact, reality when

A the present witnesses were able to inform her", and she goes on, does she not, to mention two further incidents where she was seeing and talking to relatives and friends that weren't there, which involved many members of friends and family on each occasion and lasted between

B one and two hours?

A. This is what [Person A1] has told to Dr [REDACTED] or his observations and I can't comment on that.

C Q. That's the point of my question. I'd like you, please, next to deal with an intel submission which is at J/481 to 482, and let me reintroduce it to the case, because it appeared very early on, in this way.

D On 12th July 2013 we know that Detective Constable Gatenty -- Gatenby -- sorry -- and Detective Constable Taylor go and see [Person A1] in relation to the Heller Abbey enquiry and she made certain disclosures relative to abuse on herself by other people. The intel survey on the evidence we understand was not made until early September 2014. Can you confirm that?

E A. That's correct.

Q. I just want to read the heading to establish what that intel report was directed at. Okay?

"Sexual offences/child sexual exploitation/rape/children/drugs/use/cocaine/vulnerable/adult referred herself."

F A. Yes.

Q. Can you confirm that the name of Mohammed Usman does not appear in that document reproduced from the note of 12th July 2013?

G A. I can't confirm that in the note. I don't have it to hand at the moment.

Q. Take my computer, please, and have a look for it.

JUDGE DURHAM HALL: No, no, no. I can't -- if it's not there, it's not there.

MR FERM: It isn't, your Honour.

H JUDGE DURHAM HALL: Why we're using this officer and using time for this I don't know.

A

If it's not there, it's not there.

MR FERM: There is a point to this.

B

JUDGE DURHAM HALL: I'm sure there's a point. There's a point to everything, Mr Ferm, but can this officer help you?

MR FERM: Yes. Mohammed Usman is not included. We don't have DC Gatenby here. She's ill. That is why I have to ask this officer.

C

MS MELLY: We had Taylor who came and gave evidence.

JUDGE DURHAM HALL: You what? Sorry?

MS MELLY: The officer who was there and was present was available.

MS BEATTIE: He gave evidence.

D

MS MELLY: Yes, Taylor gave evidence, who was present, and this was all put to Taylor.

JUDGE DURHAM HALL: Yes, I thought so. All right. Okay. Fair enough. Good.

MR FERM: I have made the point to the jury.

E

JUDGE DURHAM HALL: Yes. I am not having a go at you. The point may be a good one, but maybe this officer can't really help.

MR FERM: I don't think it's disputed the name does not appear. Thank you.

F

Now finally I'd like to ask you about the position of Switalskis Solicitors. Is it the position that Switalskis have been retained by [Person A1] in relation to the events of her childhood, including the way in which she was allowed to be brought up by Bradford Council?

G

A. I believe that is the case.

Q. And they have been retained for no other purpose that you are aware of. Is that right?

A. I believe that's the case.

Q. As of 2019 as far as Switalskis are concerned they are still acting for her in that role?

A. I can't answer that question, because I have had no contact with them.

H

Q. Is there any other role for which they might be acting for her in 2019 that you are aware

A

of?

A. I'm not aware of them acting for her in 2019. I don't know.

B

Q. And you have had the task of making enquiries direct with Switalskis in relation to this matter, haven't you?

A. Prior to last year, yes.

Q. Yes. Thank you very much.

C

JUDGE DURHAM HALL: Thank you, Mr Ferm. Okay.

Re-examination by MS MELLY

MS MELLY: Thank you. A few things, please, not very many, officer.

D

Dealing with the questions asked on behalf of Saeed Akhtar, you were asked a number of questions just setting out the chronology really in terms of contact with the police and so forth and contact with Look North. I just want to ask you this.

The video that we've seen, they come, as you've explained, after the referral from Look North?

E

A. Yes.

Q. Do we understand that correctly?

A. Yes.

F

Q. All right, and just in terms of the date here, the conversation with Gatenby and Taylor that we just heard about before or after the Look North contact?

A. Before.

G

Q. Thank you. You were asked about the quantity of contact that you'd had with [Person A] and the number of occasions, please. Can you just explain a little about your obligations to a complainant in a case like this?

H

A. Yes, of course. I took primary -- primacy for contact with [Person A1] and, as you know, conducted -- barring two, conducted the interviews. There is something called the victim charter, which -- everybody who it reports a victim of crime is entitled to have service under

A

that charter. One of those is contact with the complainant/victim and that can be agreed over seven, 14, 21, 28 or 56 days.

B

The contact I had with [Person A1] throughout was dependent on where we were in the investigation and essentially as well whether she wanted contact or not. There'd be occasions where I didn't contact her for weeks at her request. That's fine, and there were other occasions where she needed to be updated with things, so it would be more frequent.

C

Q. Thank you, and you were asked about on a number of occasions that [Person A3] had spoken to you about a desire for compensation or wanting to seek compensation.

Firstly, I want to ask you this. Did she express any other views or reasons as to wanting to contact civil solicitors?

D

A. No.

Q. Did she discuss with you feelings or attitude towards the council and responsibility?

A. She did.

Q. Could you just explain that to me?

E

A. Yes. [Person A1] was extremely angry at Social Services. She expressed concern blaming them for what had happened. They hadn't looked after her. She'd been in a children's home and been allowed to get pregnant by another resident. They'd used certain words in the care proceedings involving [Person S1] to describe [Person A1] which she felt extremely insulted by. So she was very angry at Social Services.

F

Q. Did you discuss any way that she could deal with those issues regarding Social Services and care as regards the council? Were you aware of how she could deal with that in terms of her feelings towards the council?

G

A. Well, she could always ask to meet with them and discuss it.

Q. Is that something that you were able to assist her with?

A. No.

H

Q. All right. Thank you. You were asked questions about compensation and I think you said

A fairly in answer to my learned friend Mr Ferm's questions that that was the case, and then you were asked the question if you -- what you knew of the current position. You've explained that you hadn't been in contact with them.

B In terms of whether a compensation claim had actually been -- has been lodged in terms of claiming compensation are you able to answer that?

A. In respect of the solicitors?

C Q. In respect of, firstly, well, criminal injuries compensation? Can you help with that?

A. No. There's no claim lodged I understand.

Q. Right. Now you were asked questions about the comment you explained to [Person A1] that if compensation claims were made, then you would have an obligation to disclose that.

D A. Yes, of course.

Q. All right. So just explain firstly again, please, that advice that you gave to [Person A3] and then I want to ask you why you had to give that to her.

A. Well, I explained to her that it was a matter for her if she wished to make a compensation claim, but she -- we would have to disclose that to defence, and she should be aware that she would have to answer questions about it, be prepared to answer questions.

E

Q. And why did you give her that advice?

A. Because that's generally the case in my experience.

F Q. What is?

A. Whereby if somebody makes a compensation claim --

JUDGE DURHAM HALL: I think -- I think that is just going over the -- into your experience of other cases. The jury will apply their common sense, madam.

G A. Sorry.

JUDGE DURHAM HALL: I don't think that's relevant or admissible.

MS MELLY: All right. Thank you. Have you given that advice -- is this -- on other occasions?

H

A

A. Yes, certainly.

Q. Thank you. Then you were asked questions, please, in relation to Zeeshan Ali, and you were asked questions about what -- whether you could help the jury with the description that

B

[Person A] had given about the man who's not in the dock called [REDACTED]

A. Yes.

Q. Yes. Okay. Were the conversations that [Person A] had with you about [REDACTED] in the course of these videos that we have?

C

A. They were.

Q. Do the defence have the full copies, not just the versions that were played to the jury, of those videos?

D

A. I understand so.

Q. Thank you. Then in respect of Kieran Harris, please -- sorry -- I'll just get my note of this -- you were asked a question -- sorry -- that Kieran's name had first come up in one of those Achieving Best Evidence videos and you agreed that that was the case. Do you recall that?

E

A. I do recall, yes.

Q. All right, and it was the end of that answer that I just wanted to -- I think your volume just tailed off. That you were saying that had been the case, had it, albeit with others?

F

A. Yes.

Q. So just explain that, please.

A. When [Person A1] spoke to PCs Gatenby and Taylor, the information that she gave them -- it wasn't an interview and it wasn't a question about what had happened to her. She just volunteered that information. This is something that she had done prior to the video interviews. When the video interviews were conducted, it was my job to elicit more information from her, and those interviews were quite tough, and as a result of trying to elicit information from her about the alleged abusers then that might have brought about with her

H

A

remembering other names, and this is how it sort of went on really.

Q. Thank you. Then you were asked -- moving on then, please, to Mr Usman, it was suggested to you that he'd been arrested at Manchester Airport. Is that correct?

B

A. Yes.

Q. All right. At the point that he was arrested at Manchester Airport had he been circulated as a wanted person?

C

A. Yes, which is why he was arrested there.

Q. Would that information reach the airport?

A. Yes.

Q. Right. Thank you. Then you were asked about his interview and the fact that Mr Usman admitted the knowledge of [Person A] and didn't require an identification parade. Do you recall those questions?

D

A. Yes, he admitted knowledge of her, yes.

Q. All right. Thank you. Can I just ask you to have a look at the disclosure, please, that was provided? It's on the unused schedule. Is there one there for Mr Ferm?

E

JUDGE DURHAM HALL: You're going to hand that to Mr Ferm I think, Mr Frieze. I'm sorry.

MS MELLY: Mr Ferm -- sorry -- and there's one for His Honour, if he wishes to have it.

F

Thank you.

JUDGE DURHAM HALL: Thank you.

MS MELLY: Thank you.

G

This is -- this is a police document. Is that right?

A. That's correct.

Q. And it's got a title of "Pre-interview Disclosure"?

A. Yes.

H

Q. Document -- is that a document that then the defendant and his solicitor gets before he

A

answers any questions in his police interview?

A. Yes.

B

Q. All right, and so looking at this, was Mr Usman informed in the course of this document -- I won't go through the details of it -- that actually they had evidence in respect of his previous police involvement at [Location C1], [Person A]'s address?

A. No.

C

Q. So if you just have a look at the second page, please.

A. Yes. No. No, it wasn't.

Q. Sorry?

JUDGE DURHAM HALL: Is it there?

D

MS MELLY: Is it there? Can you have a look, please? Under the title of "Disclosure. [Location C1]".

A. Yes.

Q. And then just above the word "Objectives".

E

A. Yes.

Q. Yes? Evidence of that incident, previous police involvement, at [Location C1]?

A. Yes.

F

"There is evidence in relation to previous involvement with your client at [Location C1]."

Yes.

Q. Right, and we can see that that's dated and then -- 6th June '16, 11.34. Yes?

A. Yes, that's right.

G

Q. So that was the information given to Mr Usman's solicitors?

A. Yes.

H

Q. Thank you. Can we look now, please, at the log of the incidents at [Location C], the storm log, please? Do you have either using -- I think you were given the log individually and also

A

within the bundle.

A. Yes.

Q. Right. Thank you. So page 34, please, in the bundle.

B

JUDGE DURHAM HALL: You can just put the point.

MS MELLY: Yes. Have you got it?

A. I've got the logs, yes.

C

Q. All right. So I'm looking at the storm log.

A. Yes.

Q. Thank you. Comment at 7.25, please, in the morning. Yes? That is the time of commencement of this. Yes?

D

A. Yes.

Q. Do you have that?

A. Yes.

Q. Does it indicate there at 7.25 that she was telling police:

E

"He urinated over the carpet already and he's very drunk" --

A. Yes.

Q. -- "and that he has not hit me but has been aggressive towards me, picked up items as though he was going to throw them at me"?

F

A. Yes.

Q. And over the page:

"My friends have said if I call the police -- his friends have said if I call the police, he will break my jaw."

G

A. Yes.

Q. Was that reported to the police?

A. Yes.

H

Q. Right, and did -- and two minutes later:

A

"I walked up the road from my house, but I can still see it if he leaves."

A. Yes.

Q. All right. Are these entries made by the telephone -- by the phone operator?

B

A. They are.

Q. Right. Is there a full log of exactly what was said anywhere?

A. We don't have one. We don't even know if it exists any longer.

C

Q. Right. Thank you. I think you'd already indicated, had you, that that is the extent of the note that we have or the information we have from [Person A]?

A. Yes.

Q. Right. So that's the extent of it. Let's have a look further down the page, please. Can we see that deployment message has been sent 7.29? Is that the police being -- going out essentially, despatched?

D

A. That's right, yes.

Q. Thank you, and then can we see at 7.50 the police were simply taking the male back to his home address?

E

A. Yes.

Q. Right. So thereafter we've got entries at 9 o'clock. Can we see that?

A. Yes.

F

Q. And from your reading of this log then, the entries at 9 o'clock, are we dealing at that stage with entries with information that comes from [Person A] or Mr Usman?

A. Neither.

G

Q. Well, let's have a look then, officer.

JUDGE DURHAM HALL: Did you say "either" or "neither"?

A. Sorry. Neither.

JUDGE DURHAM HALL: Neither.

H

MS MELLY: I'm just going to ask you it in different -- let's have a look. 7.50.34.

A

A. Yes.

Q. Is that the police officer -- 19.38, is that their log taking the male back to his home address?

B

A. Yes, that's right.

Q. Thank you. Then can you go to -- so they're with him taking him back. Then can you look, please, at 9.07.04?

C

A. Yes.

Q. "Male wet himself rather than causing any damage on purpose."

A. Yes.

Q. Do we know who that information comes from?

D

A. That came from 3745, which will be the officer, and it was input by 2714.

Q. Right. Do we know now how we have this established that the male's wet himself?

A. Yes.

Q. Do -- how do we know that? Do we know where that comes from?

E

A. The officer has recorded that on -- if you look further up where it is 9.01.18 --

Q. Yes.

A. -- there's an occurrence recorded which -- I've explained how that works.

Q. Yes.

F

A. That update I believe was on that occurrence. So the officers then put it on the log in order to close it off the system.

Q. Right. So that's their conclusion?

A. Yes.

G

Q. Thank you. I think just one final thing, please. The medical records, they are now available if there's anything specific?

A. Yes.

H

Q. Thank you. Then it was put to you that in K/3193 in a log from [Person A3]'s video

A

interviews, please, that she had told officers that [Person H1] had been interviewed. Do you recall that question?

A. Yes.

B

Q. All right. I know it's not in front of you, but just to use you to confirm what, in fact, it says, please:

"Do you know [Person H1]?"

This is in the word of [Person A].

C

"Do you know [Person H1] (inaudible) and everyone?"

Then the next statement she makes is:

"I think you've interviewed [Person H1] before."

D

A. Okay.

Q. All right. So just wanted to put that.

JUDGE DURHAM HALL: All right. Fine.

MS MELLY: Thank you very much. Thank you.

E

JUDGE DURHAM HALL: Thank you very much, officer. I have no questions. Thank you for coming and thank you very much indeed.

A. Thank you.

JUDGE DURHAM HALL: Thank you. If you need to come back, I'm sure you'll be on it.

F

(Witness withdrew)

JUDGE DURHAM HALL: All right. Any -- I'd like to move on to rather than small details to the bigger picture.

MS MELLY: Yes.

G

JUDGE DURHAM HALL: Can you -- what do you intend to say to the jury now?

MS MELLY: Well, there are two very brief matters to read, which I won't do at this moment, but subject to that and subject to the other very small and discrete matters that you've already

H

outlined in the absence of the jury that will be the evidence in the case.

A

JUDGE DURHAM HALL: Okay. Thank you very much.

B

I have given the prosecutors, of course, you would expect permission to come back maybe tomorrow morning to look at any loose ends, maybe a statement or two, as you've heard, but I don't want to detain you any longer today.

C

What I have to finally do now, having heard those almost magic words, and they're very important words, the Crown are within a millisecond of closing their case, that means the focus shifts from them, if that is the right word. Probably it isn't, but you know what I mean. We've reached the stage where the prosecution have called their evidence. I have some rulings to determine, absolutely standard, and give, absolutely standard and usual at the end of any case, never mind one like that, and I'm going to do that now with everybody's consent. Okay? That's between me and the lawyers. The outcome of my rulings will be, if necessary, shared with you, of course.

D

E

So can you go and leave me for the rest of the day to finalise the legal aspects of the case, and then tomorrow morning we'll see where we go in terms of defence evidence or the like? Okay? So thank you very much. This is an important, as I say, watershed, but do come back can I say to you 10.30 to give me a little wriggle room tomorrow if there's any loose end for me to deal with, and we'll see where we go from there. So thank you very much indeed. We're still very much on schedule, if not in advance of it, so no problem. Thank you.

F

(Jury withdrew from court)

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

G

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

H

[REDACTED]dy

A

[REDACTED]

B

[REDACTED]

C

[REDACTED]

D

[REDACTED]

E

[REDACTED]

F

[REDACTED]

(Court adjourned until 10.00 am on Wednesday, 6th February 2019)

G

eScribers hereby certify that the above is an accurate and complete record of the proceedings or part thereof having used our best skill and ability in its production.

H