



Working together for a safer London

**Freedom of Information Request Reference No:**

I note you seek access to the following information:

Please could you send me all the press releases, press notices and statements issued by the Met's Press Bureau relating to phone hacking from 2005 onwards. As the information I am asking for has already been released into the public domain I hope there will be no reason for delay.

**DECISION**

I have today decided to disclose the located information to you in full.

Please find attached information pursuant to your request in an attachment titled 'Phone Hacking Media Statements.doc.pdf'.

**Specialist Crime Directorate**

## Phone Hacking Media Statements

08/08/2006 20:15

At approx 6am today (08/08/2006) the MPS arrested two men for allegedly carrying out unlawful telephone interceptions.

A 48-year-old man (A) was arrested at his home address in Putney.

The second man, aged 35, (B) was arrested at his home address in Sutton.

A third man, aged 50, (C) was arrested at his home address in Sutton shortly before 9.30am.

All three men were arrested under Section 1 of the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000 and have been taken to central London police stations where they remain in custody.

Police have completed searches at the residential address in Putney and the Sutton address of the 35-year-old man.

They have also completed searches at business addresses in Wapping, Sutton and Chelsea.

Police launched an investigation after concerns were reported to the Met's Royalty Protection Department by members of the Royal Household at Clarence House.

It is focused on alleged repeated security breaches within telephone networks over a significant period of time and the potential impact this may have on protective security around a number of individuals.

The investigation initially focused on complaints from three people within the Royal Household.

As a result of their inquiries police now believe that public figures beyond the Royal Household have had their telephones intercepted, which may have potential security implications.

Police continue to work with the telephone companies concerned and continue to have their full support in attempting to identify any other person whose telephone may have been intercepted.

The investigation is being led by a small team of officers from the Met's Anti-Terrorist Branch, supported by officers from the Specialist Crime Directorate.

Throughout the investigation officers have been liaising closely with the Crown Prosecution Service.

Officers have also been working closely with the Royal Household and have had full support from the telephone companies concerned.

---

09/08/2006 06:38

At approx 6am on Tuesday 08/08/2006 the MPS arrested two men for allegedly carrying out unlawful telephone interceptions.

[A] A 48-year-old man was arrested at his home address in Putney.

[B] The second man, aged 35, was arrested at his home address in Sutton.

[C] A third man, aged 50, was arrested at his home address in Sutton shortly before 9.30am.

All three men were arrested under Section 1 of the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000 and have been taken to central London police stations.

[A] and [B] remain in custody. [C] has been bailed to return to a central London police station on a date in September pending further enquiries.

Police have completed searches at the residential address in Putney and the Sutton address of the 35-year-old man.

They have also completed searches at business addresses in Wapping, Sutton and Chelsea.

Police launched an investigation after concerns were reported to the Met's Royalty Protection Department by members of the Royal Household at Clarence House.

It is focused on alleged repeated security breaches within telephone networks over a significant period of time and the potential impact this may have on protective security around a number of individuals.

The investigation initially focused on complaints from three people within the Royal Household.

As a result of their inquiries police now believe that public figures beyond the Royal Household have had their telephones intercepted, which may have potential security implications.

Police continue to work with the telephone companies concerned and continue to have their full support in attempting to identify any other person whose telephone may have been intercepted.

The investigation is being led by a small team of officers from the Met's Anti-Terrorist Branch, supported by officers from the Specialist Crime Directorate.

Throughout the investigation officers have been liaising closely with the Crown Prosecution Service.

Officers have also been working closely with the Royal Household and have had full support from the telephone companies concerned.

---

09/08/2006 21:30

Clive Goodman, aged 48, (dob 17/09/1957) from Putney, and Glenn Mulcaire, aged 35, (dob of 08/09/1970) of Sutton, were this evening (09/08/2006) charged. They have been released on police bail to appear at Horseferry Road Magistrates Court on Wednesday 16th August 2006 at 09:30.

Clive Goodman and Glenn Mulcaire are jointly charged that:

= On or before 9th August 2006 within the jurisdiction of the CCC intentionally, and without lawful authority, within the United Kingdom, you conspired with Clive Goodman/Glen Mulcaire to intercept communications, namely by agreeing to access individuals telephone voicemail messages, in the course of their transmission by means of a public telecommunication system, contrary to the Criminal Law Act 1977.

Goodman and Mulcaire were also each charged with the following:

= On 03/01/2006 within the jurisdiction of the CCC intentionally, and without lawful authority, within the United Kingdom, intercepted a communication, namely by the access of individuals telephone voicemail, in the course of its transmission by means of a public telecommunication system, contrary to Section 1 of the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000.

= On 24/02/2006 within the jurisdiction of the CCC intentionally, and without lawful authority, within the United Kingdom, intercepted a communication, namely by the access of individuals telephone voicemail, in the course of its transmission by means of a public telecommunication system, contrary to Section 1 of the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000.

= On 20/03/2006 within the jurisdiction of the CCC intentionally, and without lawful authority, within the United Kingdom, intercepted a communication, namely by the access of individuals telephone voicemail, in the course of its transmission by means of a public telecommunication system, contrary to Section 1 of the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000.

= On 28/04/2006 within the jurisdiction of the CCC intentionally, and without lawful authority, within the United Kingdom, intercepted a communication, namely by the access of individuals telephone voicemail, in the course of its transmission by means of a public telecommunication system, contrary to Section 1 of the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000.

= On 08/05/2006 within the jurisdiction of the CCC intentionally, and without lawful authority, within the United Kingdom, intercepted a communication, namely by the access of individuals telephone voicemail, in the course of its transmission by means of a public telecommunication system, contrary to Section 1 of the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000.

= On 15/05/2006 within the jurisdiction of the CCC intentionally, and without lawful authority, within the United Kingdom, intercepted a communication, namely by the access of individuals telephone voicemail, in the course of its transmission by means of a public telecommunication system, contrary to Section 1 of the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000.

=On 23/05/2006 within the jurisdiction of the CCC intentionally, and without lawful authority, within the United Kingdom, intercepted a communication, namely by the access of individuals telephone voicemail, in the course of its transmission by means of a public telecommunication system, contrary to Section 1 of the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000.

= On 30/05/2006 within the jurisdiction of the CCC intentionally, and without lawful authority, within the United Kingdom, intercepted a communication, namely by the access of individuals telephone voicemail, in the course of its transmission by means of a public telecommunication system, contrary to Section 1 of the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000.

---

09/07/2009 10:45

This morning (9 July 2009) the Commissioner, Sir Paul Stephenson, discussed an article in The Guardian newspaper regarding the alleged access of phone messages and data:

He said: "Clearly I am aware of this story and I think as everybody knows this relates to an investigation that the MPS undertook back in 2006. That investigation was undertaken by the Specialist Operations Directorate as it related very much to a matter of complaint from the Royal Household.

"As a result of that I have asked Assistant Commissioner John Yates to establish the facts of that case and look into that detail and I would anticipate making a statement later today perhaps."

---

09/07/2009 17:40

I have been asked by the Commissioner today to establish the facts around our inquiry into the alleged unlawful tapping of mobile phones by Clive Goodman and Glen Mulcaire. I was not involved in the original case and clearly come at this with an independent mind.

Just by way of background. In December 2005, the Met received complaints that mobile phones had been illegally tapped.

We identified that Goodman and Mulcaire were engaged in a sophisticated and wide ranging conspiracy to gather private and personal data, principally about high profile figures. Clearly they benefited financially from these matters.

Our inquiries found that these two men had the ability to illegally intercept mobile phone voice mails, commonly known as phone tapping.

Their potential targets may have run into hundreds of people, but our inquiries showed that they only used the tactic against a far smaller number of individuals.

In January 2007, Goodman and Mulcaire were jailed for four and six months, guilty to conspiring to unlawfully intercept communications.

Mulcaire also pleaded guilty to an additional five charges relating to similar matters.

On sentencing the two men, Mr Justice Gross at the Old Bailey said the case was "not about press freedom, it was about a grave, inexcusable and illegal invasion of privacy."

The police investigation was complex and was carried out in close liaison with the Crown Prosecution Service, Senior Counsel and the telephone companies concerned.

The technical challenges posed to the service providers to establish that there had in fact been interception were very, very, significant.

It is important to recognise that our enquiries showed that in the vast majority of cases there was insufficient evidence to show that tapping had actually been achieved.

Where there was clear evidence that people had been the subject of tapping, they were all contacted by the police.

These people were made aware of the potential compromise to their phones and offered preventative advice.

After extensive consultation with the CPS and Counsel, only a few were subsequently identified as witnesses in the proceedings that followed.

I said earlier in this statement that these two men were engaged in a sophisticated and wide ranging conspiracy to gather personal data about high profile figures. One was a private detective and one was a journalist. It is reasonable therefore to expect them to be in possession of data about such matters as it's part and parcel of their job.

I emphasise that our enquiries were solely concerned with phone tapping. This, as far as we are aware, affected a much smaller pool of people.

There has been a lot of media comment today about the then Deputy Prime Minister John Prescott. This investigation has not uncovered any evidence to suggest that John Prescott's phone had been tapped.

This case has been subject of the most careful investigation by very experienced detectives. It has also been scrutinised in detail by both the CPS and leading Counsel. They have carefully examined all the evidence and prepared the indictments that they considered appropriate.

No additional evidence has come to light since this case has concluded.

I therefore consider that no further investigation is required.

However, I do recognise the very real concerns, expressed today by a number of people, who believe that their privacy may have been intruded upon.

I therefore need to ensure that we have been diligent, reasonable and sensible, and taken all proper steps to ensure that where we have evidence that people have been the subject of any form of phone tapping, or that there is any suspicion that they might have been, that they have been informed.

---

10/07/2009 19:36

Following on from a statement yesterday by AC John Yates in relation to the MPS investigation into unlawful mobile phone tapping by Clive Goodman and Glen Mulcaire the Met has this evening (10/7/2009) begun contacting a number of people.

AC Yates said yesterday that he wanted to ensure that the Met has been diligent and sensible, and taken all proper steps to ensure - that where we have evidence that people have been the subject of any form of phone tapping by Goodman or Mulcaire, or that there is any suspicion that they might have been by the two men - that they have been informed.

The process of contacting people is currently underway and we expect this to take some time to complete.

---

EMBARGOED UNTIL 00.01 ON 24/02/2010

We note the contents of the Select Committee report.

The investigation and subsequent prosecution of Clive Goodman & Glen Mulcaire was carried out in liaison with the Crown Prosecution Service and Queen's Counsel.

The final indictment was the subject of careful deliberation and represented the full range of criminality committed to attract the maximum penalty if proven.

Decisions taken in 2006 regarding the scope of the investigation were based on available evidence, the likelihood of securing successful prosecutions and the policing resources available at the time.

Since then no new evidence has come to light to justify any further investigation, a view endorsed by both the MPS and the DPP. Consequently this case remains closed.

---

03/09/2010 19:14

In response to the statement released by former Home Secretary Alan Johnson an MPS spokesman said:

"In December 2005, the Met received complaints that mobile phones had been illegally tapped.

"Inquiries took place in 2005 and 2006 which resulted in Clive Goodman and Glenn Mulcaire being jailed in January 2007 for conspiring to unlawfully intercept communications. This brought an end to the investigation.

"In July 2009, the MPS examined whether any new evidence had emerged in the media or elsewhere that justified reopening the investigation. The clear view, subsequently endorsed by the Director of Public Prosecutions with leading counsel's advice, was that there was no new evidence and consequently the investigation remains closed.

"There has been no investigation since the convictions of Goodman and Mulcaire."

---

05/09/2010 18:31

Statement by Assistant Commissioner John Yates re phone hacking

Since further allegations in relation to phone hacking first emerged in the Guardian in July 2009, the Metropolitan Police has been very clear about its position and made this public on a number of occasions. The newspaper produced no new evidence for us to consider reopening the case - a position endorsed separately by the DPP and Leading Counsel. We have always said that this position could change if new evidence was produced.

The New York Times contacted the MPS about their investigation. Our stance remains as before. We have repeatedly asked them for any new material that they have for us to consider. We were never made aware of the material from Sean Hoare before the article's publication. We have sought additional information from them and will consider this material, along with Sean Hoare's recent BBC Radio interview, and will consult the CPS on how best to progress it.

Separately, we are aware of the current claims in the media from, amongst others, Lord Prescott about his view that his phone was hacked. There remains to this day no evidence that his phone was hacked by either Mulcaire or Goodman. This is a matter of public record.

Lord Prescott also alleges that the MPS has failed to disclose material to him in a timely way. Lord Prescott has been provided with the information the MPS has in its possession relevant to him. However, we are not permitted to supply the actual documents except under a court direction. This is because the material was obtained for the purpose of a criminal investigation and cannot be used for another purpose, i.e. a civil action. Lord Prescott and his solicitors will be aware of this.

---



07/09/2010 19:11

5/9/2010 Statement by Assistant Commissioner John Yates re phone hacking:

Since further allegations in relation to phone hacking first emerged in the Guardian in July 2009, the Metropolitan Police has been very clear about its position and made this public on a number of occasions. The newspaper produced no new evidence for us to consider reopening the case - a position endorsed separately by the DPP and Leading Counsel. We have always said that this position could change if new evidence was produced.

The New York Times contacted the MPS about their investigation. Our stance remains as before. We have repeatedly asked them for any new material that they have for us to consider. We were never made aware of the material from Sean Hoare before the article's publication. We have sought additional information from them and will consider this material, along with Sean Hoare's recent BBC Radio interview, and will consult the CPS on how best to progress it.

Separately, we are aware of the current claims in the media from, amongst others, Lord Prescott about his view that his phone was hacked. There remains to this day no evidence that his phone was hacked by either Mulcaire or Goodman. This is a matter of public record.

Lord Prescott also alleges that the MPS has failed to disclose material to him in a timely way. Lord Prescott has been provided with the information the MPS has in its possession relevant to him. However, we are not permitted to supply the actual documents except under a court direction. This is because the material was obtained for the purpose of a criminal investigation and cannot be used for another purpose, i.e. a civil action. Lord Prescott and his solicitors will be aware of this.

---

09/09/2010 17:09

We will be considering new material which has recently come to light and will be consulting the CPS

---

12/11/2010 17:04

The Metropolitan Police Service has today (12 November 2010) provided a file to the CPS relating to new material in connection with phone hacking.

This file will now be subject to CPS consideration.

---

10/12/2010 13:39

In view of the CPS advice received by the MPS today, 10 December 2010, in connection with allegations made in the media since 1 September 2010 relating to alleged phone hacking at the News of the World in 2005/6, the MPS investigation will remain closed.

The MPS considered these allegations and carried out a number of inquiries. The MPS submitted a file seeking advice to the CPS on 12 November 2010. The file included statements from people interviewed by officers.

In the advice the CPS said: "In summary, I do not consider that there is now any evidence that would reach the threshold for prosecution set out in the Code for Crown Prosecutors. In my opinion there is insufficient evidence to provide a realistic prospect of conviction against any person identified in the New York Times article. In fact I consider that the available evidence falls well below that threshold."

---

07/01/2011 17:30

The MPS has this evening, Friday, 7 January 2010, written to the News of the World requesting any new material they may have in relation to alleged phone hacking following the suspension of a member of their staff.

---

14/01/2011 16:17

Letter from Acting Deputy Commissioner John Yates sent to the Director of Public Prosecution Keir Starmer on Friday 14 January 2011.

RE: ALLEGATIONS OF PHONE HACKING

I am grateful for the opportunity we had today to discuss the above matter.

We are both aware that there remain outstanding public, legal and political concerns. This is particularly so in relation to the various and recently reported high profile civil cases, as well as the inquiry to be undertaken by the Parliamentary Standards & Privileges Committee.

As a result, I consider it would be wise to invite you to further re-examine all the material collected in this matter. This would also enable you to advise me and assure yourself as to whether there is any existing material which could now form evidence in any future criminal prosecution relating to phone hacking.

The conclusions should be provided to you in the first instance for you to then advise me as to what, if any, further action may be required. We both understand that any future action will always be for the police to consider independently.

John Yates  
Acting Deputy Commissioner

---

24/01/2011 17:26

Letter from Acting Deputy Commissioner John Yates sent to the Director of Public Prosecution Keir Starmer on Friday 14 January 2011.  
RE: ALLEGATIONS OF PHONE HACKING

I am grateful for the opportunity we had today to discuss the above matter.

We are both aware that there remain outstanding public, legal and political concerns. This is particularly so in relation to the various and recently reported high profile civil cases, as well as the inquiry to be undertaken by the Parliamentary Standards & Privileges Committee.

As a result, I consider it would be wise to invite you to further re-examine all the material collected in this matter. This would also enable you to advise me and assure yourself as to whether there is any existing material which could now form evidence in any future criminal prosecution relating to phone hacking.

The conclusions should be provided to you in the first instance for you to then advise me as to what, if any, further action may be required. We both understand that any future action will always be for the police to consider independently.

John Yates  
Acting Deputy Commissioner

---

26/01/2011 16:06

The MPS has today (26 January 2011) received significant new information from News International relating to allegations of phone hacking at the News of the World in 2005/06.

As a result, the MPS is launching a new investigation to consider this material. This work will be carried out by the Specialist Crime Directorate which has been investigating a related phone hacking allegation since September 2010.

Discussions have taken place with the Director of Public Prosecutions in relation to the recently announced role of Alison Levitt QC. It has been agreed that her task will continue and she will evaluate any new evidence and advise as to the progress of the investigation.

The original phone hacking investigation was undertaken by the Counter Terrorism Command in Specialist Operations. However, in view of their current workload and the continuing 'Severe' threat level, it has been agreed that it is no longer appropriate to divert them or Acting Deputy Commissioner John Yates from their main duties and responsibilities. Accordingly, this new investigation will be led by Deputy Assistant Commissioner Sue Akers from the Specialist Crime Directorate.

We will not be making any further comments at this stage.

---

27/01/2011 21:00

Information obtained during a criminal investigation cannot be made available for the purpose of a civil action without a court order. Of course this does not relate to informing a victim, or potential victim, that they have, or may have had their phone hacked.

---

09/02/2011 16:48

Phone Hacking investigation - update on Operation Weeting

The recently formed Specialist Crime Directorate 'Operation Weeting' team is conducting the new investigation into phone hacking whilst adopting a fresh approach towards informing victims and potential victims in this case.

The new evidence recently provided by News International is being considered alongside material already in the Metropolitan Police Service's (MPS) possession to determine which lines of enquiry should be pursued as priorities. At the same time, all actions and decisions taken by the previous investigation are being reviewed and all the evidence gathered to date is being checked to ensure it is catalogued correctly and accurately.

Having begun an analysis of the documents seized in 2006 alongside the new evidence, the team have been able to make some links not previously identified. As a result, the team have also identified some individuals who were previously advised that there was little or no information held by the MPS relating to them within the case papers and exhibits and this is now being reviewed.

At this stage, there is no evidence to suggest that their voice mails were hacked but this will be an important and immediate new line of enquiry. As a result detectives are taking urgent steps to advise them of this development at the earliest opportunity. If any others are identified as possible victims in due course they will also be contacted.

Deputy Assistant Commissioner Sue Akers, leading the new investigation, said: "I am conscious there remains significant interest in this case and we are determined to ensure that we conduct a robust and thorough investigation which will follow the evidence trail to its conclusion.

"We will build on the previous commitment to all those victims whose phones we already have reasonable evidence to believe may have been hacked by establishing or renewing contact with them. With this new investigation we will be as open as we can be and will show them all the information we hold about them, while giving them the opportunity to tell us anything that may be of concern to them.

"In time, we will go beyond this group of individuals and make contact with everyone who

had some of their personal contact details found in the documents seized in 2005. This will ensure all of those who have been affected in some way are made aware of the information we have found relating to them.

"Until I am satisfied that we have validated the data we are re-examining I am not prepared to discuss any of the numbers involved, but I intend to make this information public at the earliest opportunity.

"This is clearly a major task with a considerable amount of work to be done which will take a significant amount of time and resources. We will complete this new investigation as soon as we possibly can, but I am unable to predict at this early stage as to how long it will take to complete.

"It would be inappropriate for me to discuss any further details regarding this case at this time."

-Ends-