

**METROPOLITAN POLICE SERVICE
(SPECIALIST CRIME DIRECTORATE)**

Subject : The White Report

Reference to Papers :

**SCD5(6) KE
4 High Street South
East Ham
London E6 6ES**

Date: 23rd June 2003

[REDACTED]

I have reviewed all the information to hand including *The White Report*, the analyst's charts and documents that have been provided by the NI CPU. As you are aware, *The White Report* was formulated in 1995 and at that time, a copy was forwarded to the MPS Paedophile Unit. I am not aware what use was made of the Report at that time, but it seems likely from Annex 5 to *The White Report*, that it was sent to or at least discussed with [REDACTED] and [REDACTED], both since retired, and a [REDACTED]. More recently however, in the summer and autumn of 1999, there was discussion between the MPS and the London Borough of Islington (LSI) on whether or not a police investigation into issues raised in the report, should ensue. The main letters between agencies are summarised, as follows:-

Letters between Agencies

Date	Author	Authority	Synopsis
16.08.1999	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED] Islington Council	To DI [REDACTED] - MPS Islington CPU. Examined White Report & attempted to ascertain which allegations have & have not been investigated prior to the report. Asks police to consider whether wider investigation is warranted. Asks for matter to be considered by Sue Akers & offers to attend meeting.

29.09.1999	Paul Curran	Chief Social Services Officer Islington Council	To Det Supt Sue Akers - MPS NW Crime OCU. Refers to previous meeting between parties & formally requests MPS to review <i>The White Report</i> & reach decision as to any grounds for criminal investigations. Offers LBI assistance & implies decision is for police alone.
05.11.1999	[REDACTED]	MPS Islington CPU	To [REDACTED] - [REDACTED] Islington Council. Refers to previous discussions between parties. Police records searched & files examined commensurate with detail in <i>The White Report</i> . Concludes 'insufficient tangible evidence on which to base an holistic enquiry on the scale that would be necessary in the circumstances'.
11.11.1999	Det Supt Akers	MPS 2 Area HQ	To [REDACTED] - [REDACTED] Islington Social Services. Repeat of letter-dated 5.11.99 from [REDACTED] to [REDACTED].

The decision ultimately made by Detective Superintendent AKERS was that there was insufficient tangible evidence on which to base an investigation. Previously, [REDACTED] the LBI Chief Social Services Officer had offered the MPS his assistance but had stressed that the decision on whether or not to prosecute was to be a single agency decision. I would raise two points. In my submission, it was wrong for the MPS to make such a decision without any apparent reference to the prosecuting authority - The Crown Prosecution Service. Input from the CPS would have added a certain legitimacy to whatever decision was ultimately made and I believe such input would have minimised, or at least, greatly deflected any criticism, which might be directed at the MPS over the decision not to proceed. Further, whilst I do not know what, if any, impact the decision had in terms of working relationship between the MPS, in particular the CPU at 'NI', and the LBI Social Services, there can be little doubt that that relationship would have been left on very much stronger footing had the ultimate decision been taken by the CPS and not by the MPS.

Secondly, and this links in to the first point I raised above, there are within the documents, reported 'misgivings' within the LBI at the decision not to investigate further. The Borough has previously been under the scrutiny of the London Evening Standard and the press reports I have reviewed have in some cases been scathing and vitriolic. These reports certainly produced a vociferous response from the then [REDACTED] LBI Council, [REDACTED], now a [REDACTED], which essentially amounted to an attack on the style and content of the journalism itself. In short, there are likely to be scores to settle here which, although

not of direct concern to the MPS, do attach a certain amount of risk should the press acquire a future opportunity to report on alleged failures within LBI Care Homes. I have little doubt that one active line of defence likely to be followed by LBI, would be to respond with, "Well, we told the MPS in 1995 and again in 1999 about our care homes. The MPS told us there was nothing further to investigate". In my conclusion below, I do not suggest that the MPS should be led reluctantly by the nose into a costly and lengthy investigation just because of press interest or because of old conflicts between a section of the press and LBI. But I do warn that should such conflicts surface again, LBI will look to limit its own damage by deflecting blame wherever it can. The MPS provides the target for such deflection, must be alive to that very real possibility and should be fully prepared to defend itself when, not if, the time comes.

I turn now to the information within the documents themselves. DI Shephard reports that Messrs:

- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]

have all been investigated by the NI CPU. Only [REDACTED] (*The White Report* states that no charges were brought against [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] [REDACTED] are named in the papers I have had sight of. I have not yet been given sight of any papers which either confirm that the above named have been investigated or what the results of such investigations were although the appropriate requests have been made of NI CPU. I advise that the various MPS indices be checked to ascertain the results of these investigations to establish the status of such previous investigations and I have caused enquiries to be commenced in that direction, albeit that the information I have to date is limited in the extreme. I note that [REDACTED] [REDACTED] is now reportedly deceased, but if there is to be any future investigation into the activities of the survivors, all of the papers requested of 'NI' CPU will have to be forthcoming, not just some of them.

Next, I can find little reference in the papers to the following having been investigated by police although in the case of [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] *The White Report* @ Annex 2, states otherwise. In the cases of some of these individuals, there is reference within the papers to disciplinary or other forms of disposal effected by LBI. These are dealt with in more detail at Annex A.

- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]

•
•
•
•
•
•
•

The various indices at our disposal will need to be checked to verify whether this is so and all documentation produced as a result will need to be obtained for thorough scrutiny. I have caused such enquiries to be commenced.

I was able to trace three cases, which do appear to have been concluded, and I have had sight of some CR/GN dockets which were supplied by 'NI' CPU. I have had sight of the underlined dockets. These have been minuted, cross-referenced and, for the time being at least, returned to General Registry for safekeeping. The resulted investigations are, namely:

Resulted Investigations

Date	Suspect	Victim(s)	Allegation(s)	Criminal Proceedings	Result
9.3.92	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Buggery, Gross Indecency, Indecent Assault on a male person	Yes (Charged)	[REDACTED]
May 1991	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	USI	Yes (Charged)	21 months imprisonment. [REDACTED]

14.8.97			On a date before July 1976, indecent assault on a person	Yes (Cautioned)	

Cautioned.
Docket returned to General Realstry.

The documents also include details of two further potential suspects and four potential victims. The chart I produce below is as complete as is possible in the circumstances, since I have not had sight of the identified sources and in the cases of [REDACTED] the information is not sourced. The other apparently outstanding suspects/victims are:-

Apparently Outstanding

Date	Suspect	Victim(s)	Allegation(s) / Evidence	Result / Details
?				

?				
?	?		?	
?				

SCD5(6) gained much experience in dealing with protracted investigations of this type through, inter alia, *Operation Mapperton*. Any future Mapperton - style investigation will experience difficulties through:

- Lost files;
- Public Interest Immunity;
- Passage of time and its effect on the willingness and memories (and therefore credibility) of witnesses;
- Adverse case law;
- Human rights defences, most particularly Article 6.

However, LBI (or at least the current/recent management regimes) possess a solid security policy against criticism in that they have asked police to investigate and police have thus far at least, declined to do so. Why did police make this decision at all? Why was the CPS apparently not involved in this decision? The CPS is the prosecuting authority and were so at the time the report was considered. The suggested way forward is to consider:

1. Would the MPS sanction another Mapperton - style protracted investigation?
2. Would the current management of LBI still wish to have a police investigation conducted?
3. Are issues of the passage of time, the retirement or resignation of many staff and missing documentation, singularly or collectively, sufficiently large to have the potential to thwart and therefore undermine the positive decision for, an investigation?
4. Would the CPS be prepared to have an input into the conduct of the investigation?

If the answers to the above are yes, yes, no and yes, then, with some reluctance given the difficulties ahead, I recommend that a decision to proceed should be taken without further delay.



DETECTIVE INSPECTOR

APPENDIX A

PERSONS OF INTERESTS

Subject (P.O.I.) Name / details	Allegation	Observations
[REDACTED]		[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]		See [REDACTED] above
[REDACTED]		See [REDACTED] above
[REDACTED]		See [REDACTED] above
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]

		[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]

APPENDIX B

OUTSTANDING VICTIMS

NAME	ALLEGATION	DETAILS
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]

APPENDIX C

OUTSTANDING ENQUIRIES

ENQUIRY	ACTION TAKEN
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]