



HAMPSHIRE CONSTABULARY

MINUTE SHEET (No. 1)

H.Q. Ref. No.

Div. Ref. No.

CONFIDENTIAL

Ch Supt Stevens,

Please see attached report for your attention and action as you deem appropriate.

Code A

J James

Detective Superintendent

**HAMPSHIRE CONSTABULARY
HEADQUARTERS**

24 JUN 2002

PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS

*P.174/02 refers
file with C/Supt Clacher-K
as off 15.5.02.*

-2-

Plsd, please pass it to Supt Clacher for his info

**HAMPSHIRE
PROFESSIONAL**

Code A

**MY
IDS**

24 JUN 2002

**CHIEF SUPERINTENDENT
HEAD OF DEPARTMENT**

CONFIDENTIAL



HAMPSHIRE CONSTABULARY

MINUTE SHEET (No. 2)

H.Q. Ref. No.

Div. Ref. No.

HAMPSHIRE CONSTABULARY
HEADQUARTERS

CONFIDENTIAL

28 JUN 2002

PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS

P.174/02 refers
File with C/Supt Clacher 15/5/02

Chief Superintendent Stevens

I note that the Report from John James is dated 19 June 2002. I received it here at Fratton on 27 June. I served regulation 9 notices on John James on 22 May. A letter of complaint from Mr Iain Wilson was addressed to the Chief Constable and dated 17 May 2002, to which you replied on 27th May 2002. Inspector Mark Wise and I called upon Iain Wilson on Thursday 13 June 2002 and took a statement of complaint from him regarding the actions of Superintendent James. My report, together with the CDIs and the statements of *all* complainants will be submitted in the near future. I anticipate that a further regulation 9 notice will be served outlining the details from all of the complainants statements, although the final decision in that respect obviously lies with the DCC and PSD.

I am at a loss as to why Superintendent James felt the necessity to contact Iain Wilson, without at least contacting PSD first. It was well known to him that a group of people surrounding the ROCHESTER case were acting in concert to make collective complaints about him. At the very least it would have been prudent to have had a junior member of the enquiry team approach Mr Wilson (as he has done at various times throughout the enquiry) to ascertain the precise nature of his enquiry at Gosport police station. There is no request that the SIO or Superintendent James himself contact Mr. Wilson. Superintendent James' report goes on to detail a lengthy conversation he had with Mr Wilson in which it is alleged a great deal of information is exchanged about the complaint, the motive behind it and Mr Wilson's dissatisfaction with the original enquiry. Once again I am at a loss as to why Superintendent James felt it necessary to continue a conversation in which the other party had made it clear he had lodged a formal complaint. Any subsequently appointed Investigating Officer may wish to explore this further.

It should be noted that Superintendent James had also been in contact with Ms Emily Yeats, the daughter of the first complainant Mrs JACKSON, on 3rd May 2002 even though he knew a serious complaint had been lodged at PSD, and subsequently passed to me. Emily Yeats lodged a further complaint about that contact by letter dated, 4th May 2002. Whilst he may not have had Regulation 9 forms served on him at that time, he was informed that further contact with the family was unwelcome. Indeed, the service of the regulation 9 forms was intended to safeguard Superintendent James' interests as much as the complainants. Arguably, the service of these forms is intended to avoid the very raw and emotional dialogue that Superintendent James found himself involved in with Mr. WILSON. The allegations he outlines in his report should be dealt with following submission of my full report. In the meantime, you may consider it is in the best interests of all parties involved in this matter to advise Chief Superintendent James to avoid any further contact with any of the original complainants in the ROCHESTER case.

Code A

C/Supt

KQ 27/6/02.

CONFIDENTIAL