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The Leveson Inquiry<br>Witness Statement for Part 1, Module 2

## WITNESS STATEMENT OF BRYAN ADAMS

I, BRYAN ADAMS C/O Bindmans LLP, 275 Gray's Inn Road, London WC1X 8QB, WILL SAY as follows:-

1. I make this statement to assist the Inquiry in relation to Module 2 which deals with relationships between the press and the police and the conduct of each. The facts in this statement are from matters within my own knowledge. Where I refer to matters not within my knowledge, I refer to the source of that knowledge. I attach as Exhibit BA1 a relevant document.
2. I am 52 years old. I was bom in Canada and now live in London. I have been a successful musician for 30 years and as a result my name is well known around the world. I also set up and run the Bryan Adams Foundation which aims to advance education and learning opportunities for children and young people worldwide. Occasionally, the media have been very interested in my career and my life for the past 30 years.
3. Although I frequently engage with the press in connection with my professional life, or to help with fundraising for my charitable work and the Foundation, I have always been very careful to keep my personal life separate. For example, I have never invited the press into my home for features nor do speak about my family or allow the distribution of photos of my daughter.
4. Towards the end of 2008 I was stalked by a Romanian man and his mother who rang my doorbell incessantly, waited on the street (a very small cul de sac with only 2 other houses) outside my front door for me to come out and hung around my house. I confronted them, but could not determine what they wanted other than for me to see this man's drawings of me. My personal
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assistant also spoke to them a few times and once accepted a document from them in the hope that it would be the end of the matter but regrettably it only encouraged them. It continued for a about a month and eventually became very difficult. I finally rang 999 for assistance.
5. The police took details and suggested that I should call them when I next saw the stalker so that they could be there to witness it. I called them the next time the son arrived; I was at a restaurant opposite my house at the time. The son had followed me to the restaurant and I remember he became very excited and so it was useful that the police were there to speak to him. The stalking did stop after the couple were warned to stay away from me. I do not believe that anyone was arrested.
6. However, a few days later I was shocked to discover that news of the stalking was reported in The Sun. I had not discussed the stalker with anyone other than the police except my personal assistant. The online version of the article is at pages 1 and 2 of BA1. I had not consented to this information being made public and I was very annoyed that what I saw as a private issue was being reported without my knowledge or consent. Although I have no proof, and therefore it is of course speculation, I do not believe that there could be any other explanation than the fact that the source must have been someone related to my call to the police. I can see no public interest in this being reported. It was not even accurate - no panic alarm was installed at my house.
7. I do not see why the fact that I am a well known musician should justify anyone leaking this story. I would very much prefer it not to be known that I was stalked at my home in Chelsea. Once reported it will go onto the internet and what I consider to be a private matter, the fact that I was targeted by a stalker, will become public property for ever. In my view it is no one else's business and it could create the risk of copycat crime.
8. I should like to stress that on this occasion we rang 999. On other occasions we have rung a dedicated number for a local police station and have been given discrete and prompt assistance by a specific officer. We have had no
problems with any leaks to the press when we have rung the local police station.
9. In general terms, I take the view that victims of crime should be entitled to confidentiality. If information of this sort is to be released, it should be done for proper public interest reasons, not to satisfy a desire for gossip. There should be a proper procedure so that the rights of victims of crime can be balanced against the public interest and any decision to release information can then be justified later. In my view this would also encourage victims to report crimes and increase confidence in the police. It is potentially damaging to the relationship between the police and individuals for information of this nature to be leaked to the press.

I believe the contents of this statement are true
$\square$
Bryan Adams
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