

Statement made on behalf of: The Commissioner of Police of
the Metropolis

Witness: Philip Williams

Statement No: 2

Exhibits Referred to: PW/2

Date Statement Made: November 2012

The Leveson Inquiry into the Culture Practices and Ethics of the Press

This is the exhibit marked 'PW2' referred to in the statement of Philip Williams,
dated this November 2012.

9⁷/09

Preparation for Gold Group Operation Caryatid

I have been tasked to answer the following five questions by 11am today (9 July 2009).

1. What were the charges?
2. Who did we speak to as potential victims?
3. What was the rationale for the decision at question 2?
4. What did we release to Gordon Taylor for the High Court hearing?
5. What was the view of CPS/DLS with regard to the choice of victims in the trial and was there any separate legal advice taken with regard to the High Court matter.

The answers are based on the best information available at short notice and are caveated accordingly.

1. See indictment attached (A)
- 2 and 3. Det. Supt. Philip Williams (PW now DCS Williams) was the SIO with DCI (now Det. Supt.). Keith Surtees (KS) as the D/SIO. The decision logs for the matter are inaccessible at this time and KS is unavailable out of the MPS.

The rationale for informing potential victims are attached (B). In summary the option selected by PW was as follows.

'To inform all victims i.e. whose voicemails have been called but in priority those identified as potentially high profile (MP, Royal Household, police and military) first'

It is important that the issue of victim status was only truly defined once it was established that their voice mail had been intercepted, not purely read or potentially accessed. The latter two points did not make the individual a victim of interception only the former did. ~~The question of that they may have been a victim of potential personal intrusion is a different one and was not addressed as a separate issue.~~

The fact that the defendants had data identifying the mobile phone number of numerous individuals did not provide sufficient information to conclude they had all been intercepted or even accessed. It is important to appreciate that there were huge technical challenges posed to the service providers to prove interception or access. Many were unable to be answered satisfactorily.

There is a spreadsheet that exists that will allow clarity in relation to who was identified as victims and accordingly who was contacted. This will be available tomorrow morning.

4. This should be answered in conjunction with DLS. The comprehensiveness of the response will be limited as the material referred to is unable to be accessed until tomorrow at the earliest.

5. PW will supply an update of the engagement with CPS. In summary the victims selected for the trial were seen to be a snapshot of the target range of the defendants and

were selected accordingly. It is important to note that CPS was engaged at the highest level at the earliest stages of this investigation and throughout.

Regarding the High Court action DLS were engaged throughout the process with representation by Mr. Andrew Falk (retired). DLS can provide an update of the process. In summary there were applications for disclosure of documents secured during the investigation. Some of these were resisted and limited disclosure was subsequently ordered.

Deputy PM John Prescott - PW and KS without reference to the exact documentation believe that Mr. Prescott was not directly targeted although it is believed that members of his staff may have been. There has been no direct contact with Mr. Prescott and he is not believed on the information available at this time that he was a 'victim of interception'.

Clive Timmons
Detective Chief Superintendent
SO15