2 IN PRIVATE 3 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Right, Ms Clarke. Before you make 4 your submissions, I am going to reiterate for the 5 benefit of everyone in the room that there is to be no 6 reporting of this part of the proceedings until further 7 order. 7 The proceedings will be recorded, both video and 9 oral, and the transcript will be taken as usual, but 10 they won't be released until I say they can be. 11 Right. Now, Ms Clarke. 12 MS CLARKE: Mr Chairman, can I start by apologising, first 13 of all, for the late notice of this application. 14 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: It shouldn't have happened as late 15 as this, should it? 16 MS CLARKE: It should not have, no, and I can only apologise 16 raises a number of questions, at least in my mind, about 17 for that. If we could've made this application any 18 sooner, we would've done. I entirely appreciate the 19 position this puts not only you, sir, in, but also your 20 entire legal team, and of course the position that it 21 puts the other legal teams in. The decision to make the 22 application at such short notice was not one that was 23 taken lightly, and has arisen from what we consider to 24 be an urgent situation. If so critarily not something 25 I would intend to repeat again. I would like to  2 during the criminal trial. 3 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: All right. Can I just aky ove are you instructed by? 4 mare you instructed by? 4 mare you instructed by? 4 MS CLARKE: I am instructed by the Metropolitan Police 5 Service, iii. 4 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Is this not a matter for the 6 5 Service, iii. 4 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Well, sir, on a strict reading of the matter, perhaps. 11 perhaps. 12 MS CLARKE: Well, sir, on a strict reading of the matter, perhaps. 13 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Well 14 MS CLARKE: Well, sir, on a strict reading of the matter, perhaps. 14 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Maybe you are, but, you se application, so far as I have been able to consider it, raises a number of questions, at least in my mind, about the nature of the evidence that either of these two wi	, who
4 your submissions, I am going to reiterate for the 5 benefit of everyone in the room that there is to be no 6 reporting of this part of the proceedings until further 7 order. 7 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Is this not a matter for the C 8 The proceedings will be recorded, both video and 9 oral, and the transcript will be taken as usual, but 10 they won't be released until I say they can be. 11 Right. Now, Ms Clarke. 12 MS CLARKE: Mr Chairman, can I start by apologising, first 13 of all, for the late notice of this application. 14 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: It shouldn't have happened as late 15 as this, should it? 16 MS CLARKE: It should not have, no, and I can only apologise 17 for that. If we could've made this application any 18 sooner, we would've done. I entirely appreciate the 19 puts the other legal teams in. The decision to make the 20 application at such short notice was not one that was 21 taken lightly, and has arisen from what we consider to 22 application. It's certainly not something 24 are you instructed by?  MS CLARKE: I am instructed by the Metropolitan Police  Service, sir.  7 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Is this not a matter for the C Service, sir.  7 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Is this not a matter for the C Service, sir.  7 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Is this not a matter for the C Service, sir.  7 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Is the matter, perhaps.  10 perhaps.  11 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Well 12 MS CLARKE: The reality is, sir, that we are a partner 13 agency of the Crown Prosecution Service.  14 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Maybe you are, but, you se 15 application, so far as I have been able to consider it, 16 may Clark E: The relevance been able to consider it, 17 raises a number of questions, at least in my mind, about 18 the nature of the evidence that either of these two 19 proceedings, the nature of the concerns which someone 20 entire legal team, and of course the position that it 21 puts the other legal teams in. The decision to make the 22 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: and it seems to me that the something which the C	, who
4 your submissions, I am going to reiterate for the 5 benefit of everyone in the room that there is to be no 6 reporting of this part of the proceedings until further 7 order. 7 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Is this not a matter for the Control of the proceedings will be recorded, both video and 8 Prosecution Service? 9 oral, and the transcript will be taken as usual, but 10 they won't be released until I say they can be. 11 Right. Now, Ms Clarke. 12 MS CLARKE: Mr Chairman, can I start by apologising, first 13 of all, for the late notice of this application. 14 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: It shouldn't have happened as late 15 as this, should it? 16 MS CLARKE: It should not have, no, and I can only apologise 17 for that. If we could've made this application any 18 sooner, we would've done. I entirely appreciate the 19 puts the other legal teams in. The decision to make the 20 application at such short notice was not one that was 21 taken lightly, and has arisen from what we consider to 22 application. It's certainly not something 24 and are you instructed by?  MS CLARKE: I am instructed by: MS CLARKE: I am instructed by: MS CLARKE: I shin hold a matter for the Concerns decive. SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Is this not a matter for the Concerns of the matter, perhaps.  10 perhaps.  11 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Well 12 MS CLARKE: The reality is, sir, that we are a partner agency of the Crown Prosecution Service.  13 agency of the Crown Prosecution Service.  14 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Maybe you are, but, you se application, so far as I have been able to consider it, raises a number of questions, at least in my mind, about the nature of the evidence that either of these two witnesses may give here, their relevance to the criminal position this puts not only you, sir, in, but also your proceedings, the nature of the concerns which someone has about the criminal proceedings 21 puts the other legal teams in. The decision to make the 22 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: and it seems to me that the 23 taken lightly, and has arisen from what we c	
benefit of everyone in the room that there is to be no reporting of this part of the proceedings until further order.  The proceedings will be recorded, both video and The proceedings will be recorded, both video and The proceedings will be taken as usual, but The won't be released until I say they can be. Right. Now, Ms Clarke.  Ms CLARKE: Well, sir, on a strict reading of the matter, perhaps.  Right. Now, Ms Clarke.  Ms CLARKE: Mr Chairman, can I start by apologising, first of all, for the late notice of this application.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: It shouldn't have happened as late as this, should it?  Ms CLARKE: It should not have, no, and I can only apologise for that. If we could've made this application any sooner, we would've done. I entirely appreciate the position this puts not only you, sir, in, but also your entire legal team, and of course the position that it puts the other legal teams in. The decision to make the application and the matter of the cromer have a partner application, so far as I have been able to consider it, the nature of the evidence that either of these two witnesses may give here, their relevance to the criminal proceedings, the nature of the concerns which someone has about the criminal proceedings  puts the other legal teams in. The decision to make the application at such short notice was not one that was application at such short notice was not one that was application at such short notice was not one that was application at such short notice was not one that was application at such short notice was not one that was application at such short notice was not one that was application at such short notice was not one that was application at such short notice was not one that was application at such short notice was not one that was application at such short notice was not one that was application at such short notice was not one that was application at such short notice was not one that was application at such short notice was not one that was application at such short notice wa	
7 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Is this not a matter for the C 8 The proceedings will be recorded, both video and 9 oral, and the transcript will be taken as usual, but 10 they won't be released until I say they can be. 11 Right. Now, Ms Clarke. 12 MS CLARKE: Mr Chairman, can I start by apologising, first 13 of all, for the late notice of this application. 14 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: It shouldn't have happened as late 15 as this, should it? 16 MS CLARKE: It should not have, no, and I can only apologise 17 for that. If we could've made this application any 18 sooner, we would've done. I entirely appreciate the 19 position this puts not only you, sir, in, but also your 20 entire legal team, and of course the position that it 21 puts the other legal teams in. The decision to make the 22 application at such short notice was not one that was 23 taken lightly, and has arisen from what we consider to 24 be an urgent situation. It's certainly not something 24 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Is this not a matter for the C Prosecution Service?  9 MS CLARKE: Well, sir, on a strict reading of the matter, 10 perhaps.  11 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Well 12 MS CLARKE: The reality is, sir, that we are a partner 13 agency of the Crown Prosecution Service. 14 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Maybe you are, but, you se 15 application, so far as I have been able to consider it, 16 raises a number of questions, at least in my mind, about 17 the nature of the evidence that either of these two 18 witnesses may give here, their relevance to the criminal 19 position this puts not only you, sir, in, but also your 19 proceedings, the nature of the concerns which someone 20 entire legal team, and of course the position to make the 21 MS CLARKE: Yes. 22 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: and it seems to me that the same taken lightly, and has arisen from what we consider to 23 something which the CPS ought to be shouldering. I am 24 be an urgent situation. It's certainly not something	
The proceedings will be recorded, both video and oral, and the transcript will be taken as usual, but they won't be released until I say they can be. Right. Now, Ms Clarke.  MS CLARKE: Mr Chairman, can I start by apologising, first of all, for the late notice of this application.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: It shouldn't have happened as late as this, should it?  MS CLARKE: It should not have, no, and I can only apologise for that. If we could've made this application any sooner, we would've done. I entirely appreciate the position this puts not only you, sir, in, but also your entire legal team, and of course the position that it puts the other legal teams in. The decision to make the taken lightly, and has arisen from what we consider to be an urgent situation. It's certainly not something  8 Prosecution Service? 9 MS CLARKE: Well, sir, on a strict reading of the matter, 10 perhaps. 11 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Well 12 MS CLARKE: The reality is, sir, that we are a partner 13 agency of the Crown Prosecution Service. 14 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Maybe you are, but, you se 15 application, so far as I have been able to consider it, raises a number of questions, at least in my mind, about 16 raises a number of questions, at least in my mind, about 17 the nature of the evidence that either of these two 18 witnesses may give here, their relevance to the criminal 19 position this puts not only you, sir, in, but also your 19 proceedings, the nature of the concerns which someone 20 entire legal team, and of course the position that it 20 has about the criminal proceedings 21 puts the other legal teams in. The decision to make the 22 sir MARTIN MOORE-BICK: and it seems to me that the something which the CPS ought to be shouldering. I am 24 be an urgent situation. It's certainly not something	
oral, and the transcript will be taken as usual, but they won't be released until I say they can be.  Right. Now, Ms Clarke.  MS CLARKE: Mr Chairman, can I start by apologising, first of all, for the late notice of this application.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Well  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: It shouldn't have happened as late as this, should it?  MS CLARKE: It should not have, no, and I can only apologise for that. If we could've made this application any sooner, we would've done. I entirely appreciate the position this puts not only you, sir, in, but also your entire legal team, and of course the position that it puts the other legal teams in. The decision to make the a purgent situation. It's certainly not something  MS CLARKE: Well, sir, on a strict reading of the matter, perhaps.  In perhaps.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Well  MS CLARKE: The reality is, sir, that we are a partner agency of the Crown Prosecution Service.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Maybe you are, but, you se agency of the Crown Prosecution Service.  It sagency of the Crown Prosecution Service.  It should not have, no, and I can only apologise for that. If we could've made this application any for that. If we could've made this application any for that. If we could've made this application any for that. If we could've made this application any for that. If we could've made this application any for that. If we could've made this application any for that. If we could've made this application any for that. If we could've made this application any for the nature of the evidence that either of these two witnesses may give here, their relevance to the criminal proceedings, the nature of the concerns which someone and the rainstrand of the matter, for hat I seems to me that the someone of the crown Prosecution Service.  MS CLARKE: The reality is, sir, that we are a partner agency of the Crown Prosecution Service.  It as a palication, so far as I have been able to consider it, which services and the remain application any for the Crown Prosecution Service.  It	rown
they won't be released until I say they can be.  Right. Now, Ms Clarke.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Well  MS CLARKE: Mr Chairman, can I start by apologising, first  of all, for the late notice of this application.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: It shouldn't have happened as late  sa this, should it?  MS CLARKE: It should not have, no, and I can only apologise  MS CLARKE: It should not have, no, and I can only apologise  for that. If we could've made this application any  sooner, we would've done. I entirely appreciate the  position this puts not only you, sir, in, but also your  entire legal team, and of course the position that it  puts the other legal teams in. The decision to make the  application, so far as I have been able to consider it,  raises a number of questions, at least in my mind, about  the nature of the evidence that either of these two  witnesses may give here, their relevance to the criminal  proceedings, the nature of the concerns which someone  entire legal team, and of course the position that it  puts the other legal teams in. The decision to make the  MS CLARKE: Yes.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Well  MS CLARKE: The reality is, sir, that we are a partner  agency of the Crown Prosecution Service.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Maybe you are, but, you se  application, so far as I have been able to consider it,  raises a number of questions, at least in my mind, about  the nature of the evidence that either of these two  witnesses may give here, their relevance to the criminal  proceedings, the nature of the concerns which someone  about the criminal proceedings  MS CLARKE: Yes.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: and it seems to me that the sems to me that the sems to me that the concerns which the CPS ought to be shouldering. I am  and the all persuaded it's for the police to make	
Right. Now, Ms Clarke.  11 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Well  12 MS CLARKE: Mr Chairman, can I start by apologising, first  13 of all, for the late notice of this application.  14 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: It shouldn't have happened as late  15 as this, should it?  16 MS CLARKE: It should not have, no, and I can only apologise  17 for that. If we could've made this application any  18 sooner, we would've done. I entirely appreciate the  19 position this puts not only you, sir, in, but also your  20 entire legal team, and of course the position that it  21 puts the other legal teams in. The decision to make the  22 application at such short notice was not one that was  23 taken lightly, and has arisen from what we consider to  24 be an urgent situation. It's certainly not something  11 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Well  12 MS CLARKE: The reality is, sir, that we are a partner  13 agency of the Crown Prosecution Service.  14 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Maybe you are, but, you se  15 application, so far as I have been able to consider it,  16 raises a number of questions, at least in my mind, about  17 the nature of the evidence that either of these two  18 witnesses may give here, their relevance to the criminal  19 proceedings, the nature of the concerns which someone  20 entire legal team, and of course the position that it  20 has about the criminal proceedings  21 MS CLARKE: Yes.  22 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: and it seems to me that the something which the CPS ought to be shouldering. I am  24 be an urgent situation. It's certainly not something  25 and a partner  26 MS CLARKE: The reality is, sir, that we are a partner  27 agency of the Crown Prosecution Service.  28 ISIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: and it seems to me that the substance of the criminal proceedings  29 application at such short notice was not one that was  20 and the proceedings  21 and the proceedings  22 application at such short notice was not one that was  23 application at such short notice was not one that was  24 and a partner  25 and a partne	
MS CLARKE: Mr Chairman, can I start by apologising, first of all, for the late notice of this application.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: It shouldn't have happened as late as this, should it?  MS CLARKE: It should not have, no, and I can only apologise for that. If we could've made this application any sooner, we would've done. I entirely appreciate the position this puts not only you, sir, in, but also your entire legal team, and of course the position that it puts the other legal teams in. The decision to make the application and the an urgent situation. It's certainly not something  MS CLARKE: The reality is, sir, that we are a partner agency of the Crown Prosecution Service.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Maybe you are, but, you se application, so far as I have been able to consider it, raises a number of questions, at least in my mind, about the nature of the evidence that either of these two witnesses may give here, their relevance to the criminal proceedings, the nature of the concerns which someone entire legal team, and of course the position that it application at such short notice was not one that was application at such short notice was not one that was application at such short notice was not one that was application at such short notice was not one that was application at such short notice was not one that was application. It's certainly not something and not at all persuaded it's for the police to make	
of all, for the late notice of this application.  If a gency of the Crown Prosecution Service.  If shouldn't have happened as late as this, should it?  If a gency of the Crown Prosecution Service.  If a gen	
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: It shouldn't have happened as late as this, should it?  MS CLARKE: It should not have, no, and I can only apologise for that. If we could've made this application any for that. If we could've made this application any sooner, we would've done. I entirely appreciate the position this puts not only you, sir, in, but also your entire legal team, and of course the position that it puts the other legal teams in. The decision to make the application at such short notice was not one that was taken lightly, and has arisen from what we consider to be an urgent situation. It's certainly not something  Is RMARTIN MOORE-BICK: Maybe you are, but, you se application, so far as I have been able to consider it, raises a number of questions, at least in my mind, about the nature of the evidence that either of these two witnesses may give here, their relevance to the criminal proceedings, the nature of the concerns which someone has about the criminal proceedings  MS CLARKE: Yes.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: and it seems to me that the something which the CPS ought to be shouldering. I am not at all persuaded it's for the police to make	
as this, should it?  15 application, so far as I have been able to consider it,  16 MS CLARKE: It should not have, no, and I can only apologise  17 for that. If we could've made this application any  18 sooner, we would've done. I entirely appreciate the  19 position this puts not only you, sir, in, but also your  20 entire legal team, and of course the position that it  20 has about the criminal proceedings  21 puts the other legal teams in. The decision to make the  22 application at such short notice was not one that was  23 taken lightly, and has arisen from what we consider to  24 be an urgent situation. It's certainly not something  25 application, so far as I have been able to consider it,  application, so far as I have been able to consider it,  application, so far as I have been able to consider it,  application, so far as I have been able to consider it,  application, so far as I have been able to consider it,  application, so far as I have been able to consider it,  application, so far as I have been able to consider it,  application, so far as I have been able to consider it,  application, so far as I have been able to consider it,  application, so far as I have been able to consider it,  application, so far as I have been able to consider it,  application, so far as I have been able to consider it,  application, so far as I have been able to consider it,  application, so far as I have been able to consider it,  application, so far as I have been able to consider it,  application, so far as I have been able to each such as I have been able to	
MS CLARKE: It should not have, no, and I can only apologise for that. If we could've made this application any the nature of the evidence that either of these two sooner, we would've done. I entirely appreciate the position this puts not only you, sir, in, but also your entire legal team, and of course the position that it puts the other legal teams in. The decision to make the application at such short notice was not one that was application at such short notice was not one that was application at such short notice was not one that was application. It's certainly not something  MS CLARKE: It should not have, no, and I can only apologise raises a number of questions, at least in my mind, about the nature of the evidence that either of these two witnesses may give here, their relevance to the criminal proceedings, the nature of the concerns which someone has about the criminal proceedings  MS CLARKE: Yes.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: and it seems to me that the something which the CPS ought to be shouldering. I am not at all persuaded it's for the police to make	, the
for that. If we could've made this application any  17 the nature of the evidence that either of these two  18 sooner, we would've done. I entirely appreciate the  19 position this puts not only you, sir, in, but also your  20 entire legal team, and of course the position that it  21 puts the other legal teams in. The decision to make the  22 application at such short notice was not one that was  23 taken lightly, and has arisen from what we consider to  24 be an urgent situation. It's certainly not something  17 the nature of the evidence that either of these two  18 witnesses may give here, their relevance to the criminal  19 proceedings, the nature of the concerns which someone  20 has about the criminal proceedings  21 MS CLARKE: Yes.  22 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: and it seems to me that the something which the CPS ought to be shouldering. I am  24 not at all persuaded it's for the police to make	
sooner, we would've done. I entirely appreciate the position this puts not only you, sir, in, but also your puts the other legal teams in. The decision to make the application at such short notice was not one that was taken lightly, and has arisen from what we consider to be an urgent situation. It's certainly not something witnesses may give here, their relevance to the criminal proceedings, the nature of the concerns which someone has about the criminal proceedings 21 puts the other legal teams in. The decision to make the 21 MS CLARKE: Yes. 22 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: and it seems to me that the consider to 23 something which the CPS ought to be shouldering. I am 24 be an urgent situation. It's certainly not something 24 not at all persuaded it's for the police to make	
position this puts not only you, sir, in, but also your entire legal team, and of course the position that it 20 has about the criminal proceedings 21 puts the other legal teams in. The decision to make the 21 MS CLARKE: Yes. 22 application at such short notice was not one that was 22 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: and it seems to me that the 23 taken lightly, and has arisen from what we consider to 23 something which the CPS ought to be shouldering. I am 24 be an urgent situation. It's certainly not something 24 not at all persuaded it's for the police to make	
entire legal team, and of course the position that it  20 has about the criminal proceedings  21 puts the other legal teams in. The decision to make the  22 application at such short notice was not one that was  23 taken lightly, and has arisen from what we consider to  24 be an urgent situation. It's certainly not something  20 has about the criminal proceedings  21 MS CLARKE: Yes.  22 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: and it seems to me that the considering of the	
puts the other legal teams in. The decision to make the 21 MS CLARKE: Yes. 22 application at such short notice was not one that was 23 taken lightly, and has arisen from what we consider to 24 be an urgent situation. It's certainly not something 25 MS CLARKE: Yes. 26 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: and it seems to me that the considering of	
22 application at such short notice was not one that was 23 taken lightly, and has arisen from what we consider to 24 be an urgent situation. It's certainly not something 25 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: and it seems to me that the considering of the considering of the shouldering. I am not at all persuaded it's for the police to make	
taken lightly, and has arisen from what we consider to 23 something which the CPS ought to be shouldering. I am 24 be an urgent situation. It's certainly not something 24 not at all persuaded it's for the police to make	
be an urgent situation. It's certainly not something  24 not at all persuaded it's for the police to make	s is
25 Lyould intend to repeat again. Lyould like to 25 on application of this kind	
25 I would intend to repeat again. I would like to 25 an application of this kind.	
Page 1 Page 3	
1 unreservedly apologise for that, sir. 1 MS CLARKE: Sir, the reason why I make an application of	1
2 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: All right, thank you. 2 behalf of the Metropolitan Police Service is we're	
3 Just help me with this though: this application is 3 certainly making it at the request of the Crown	
4 directly made in relation to Mrs Wahabi's evidence? 4 Prosecution Service.	
5 MS CLARKE: It is, yes. 5 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: To put it bluntly, why does	it
6 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: But it's of equal relevance to the 6 matter to the police? It's a matter for the	
7 evidence of Mr Gomes, isn't it? 7 prosecution.	
8 MS CLARKE: It may well be equally relevant to the evidence 8 MS CLARKE: Well, sir, because the police have a profour	ď
9 of Mr Gomes. That rather depends, sir, on when the 9 interest in the administration of justice as well and	
10 criminal trial that I'll come to address you about 10 ensuring we do all we can to try and safeguard the	
happens and when Mr Gomes's evidence happens within that 11 criminal proceedings and to make sure that, where	
12 criminal trial. 12 matters come to our attention that potentially prejudice	
Because the nub of the issue is evidence in the 13 those criminal proceedings, we do what is appropriate	
public inquiry being broadcast before either of those 14 and what we can in order to raise those concerns.	
15 individuals give evidence in the criminal trial. That's 15 Of course, we have status as a CP and the CPS don't.	
the nub of the application. If the criminal trial runs 16 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Yes. But, again, that isn't	
as is planned, which is to start on Monday, it may well 17 relevant, is it, to the course of conduct which is said	
be that Mr Gomes's evidence is heard in that trial 18 to be a potential at least to undermine the	
19 before he is due to come to the public inquiry. 19 administration of justice?	
20 I don't want to cause Mr Gomes any alarm, because 20 MS CLARKE: Sir, I can entirely appreciate that.	
21 I understand he hasn't been told when he is going to be 21 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: I understand why you're he	
22 giving evidence in the criminal trial yet either. So 22 I am grateful for your assistance, but I really think	e and
23 I don't want to set hares running about that. But it's 23 this is something which the CPS ought to be putting	e and
24 certainly our understanding that the intention is for 24 forward on their own behalf, as I see it at the moment	e and
25 the witnesses who are giving evidence in these 25 at least.	e and
Page 2 Page 4	e and

1	MS CLARKE: Sir, can I also add a different logistical	1	MS CLARKE: Yes.
2	dimension to that, which is that the application is	2	SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Go on.
3	being made at extremely short order. The risk of	3	MS CLARKE: I'm reluctant to reveal any particular details
4	seeking for the CPS to make this application would have	4	about that individual because I'm not sure it's
5	potentially meant a further delay in that happening, and	5	necessary in these proceedings or this application.
6	given that the Metropolitan Police Service are here,	6	SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Well, the long and short of it is
7	sir, and you are due to hear from this witness at	7	that he's being prosecuted for fraudulently representing
8	2 o'clock, we were mindful not to encourage any further	8	that he was resident in flat 182; is that right?
9	delay in this particular matter being determined.	9	MS CLARKE: Yes, that's right, sir.
10	So we find ourselves in the position where we are	10	SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: On that basis, obtaining very
11	here and able to make representations, sir, insofar as	11	substantial benefits in cash and kind.
12	you're willing to hear from me about it, but I entirely	12	MS CLARKE: Absolutely, sir, yes.
13	appreciate the position about the CPS being the	13	SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Right.
14	prosecuting authority, but the Metropolitan Police	14	MS CLARKE: It's one of the number of fraud cases that have
15	Service do have an interest in that as well for the	15	received widespread press attention quite rightly
16	reasons I've outlined.	16	following on from of course the terrible events of June
17	SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: All right, thank you.	17	last year.
18	MS CLARKE: Sir, if it's of any assistance whatsoever,	18	This is another fraud trial within those
19	I would be willing to characterise the application as	19	investigations and, of course, this relates to
20	a joint application.	20	Ms Wahabi. Ms Wahabi has provided evidence to the fraud
21	SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: You mean you are now instructed by	21	investigation and, indeed, is intended to be called as
22	the CPS as well?	22	a witness at that trial.
23	MS CLARKE: Well, sir, I'm instructed by the	23	The concern that arises from the CPS is that any
24	SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: You are not, Ms Clarke; you are	24	publication of her evidence may give rise to arguments
25	instructed by the MPS.	25	about the defendant in those proceedings being
	D		D 7
	Page 5		Page 7
1	MS CLARKE: I am. I am.	1	prejudiced in advance of that trial. That is really the
2	SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: For better or worse, that's the	2	issue: her evidence being broadcast or reported on
3	basis on which the application will be.	3	before the outcome of that trial.
4	MS CLARKE: It is, sir. It's joint not in terms of	4	The risk arises because of the potential for any
5	instructions, but certainly the Metropolitan Police	5	such argument being made by that defendant that might
6	fully support the application.	6	derail the listing for that trial.
7	SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: All right. Shall we get to the nub	7	There are statutory time limits that are imposed
8	of it?	8	about an individual's custody, and if this trial doesn't
9	MS CLARKE: Sir, yes.	9	go ahead, the time that the authorities have to detain
10	So the nub of it is that I apply for a restriction	10	this particular defendant will run out and he will need
11	order in respect of Ms Wahabi's evidence to the public	11	to be released at the end of December.
12	inquiry. I seek a restriction on the publication and	12	There is considerable concern that therefore
13	broadcast of her evidence until the conclusion of	13	jeopardising the trial window will potentially give rise
14	a criminal trial that is taking place next Monday. The	14	to the frustration of these proceedings, because there
15	criminal trial is due to run for an estimated four to	15	is a real concern that, if the matter were put off and
16	five days and, therefore, I ask for a restriction simply	16	if this individual had to be released, an application
17	until the conclusion of those proceedings.	17	for bail would be made. If this individual were allowed
18	If I may set out some background about those	18	to be at liberty pending any criminal trial taking
19	particular proceedings.	19	place, there is a serious concern that he would abscond
20	The trial is a fraud trial relating to an allegation	20	and, therefore, the entire process would be frustrated.
21	of fraud by misrepresentation of an individual who is	21	This isn't, sir, an application about the
22	said to have falsely and fraudulently claimed to have	22	Metropolitan Police Service suggesting from our
23	been a resident at flat 182 in Grenfell Tower.	23	perspective that there is an inherent prejudice in
24	SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: I think I have seen the indictment	24	Ms Wahabi's evidence being reported because of the
25	somewhere, yes.	25	different character of the evidence to the inquiry
			5
	Page 6		Page 8

1 versus the character of the evidence in the criminal 2 proceedings. The problem is that there could be 3 arguments made that could jeopardise the listing, and 4 that's really the fundamental problem. 5 Given that the restriction sought is for a very 6 limited amount of time, we would ask for it, as I've 7 said, until Monday, 12 November, just to allow for late 8 running of proceedings on Friday or perhaps jury 9 deliberations tipping over into the Monday. 10 If, of course, matters outside of my control take 11 over and for any other reason the listing is 12 jeopardised, then we would of course need to consider 13 our position about any length of time for any reporting 14 restrictions. 15 But, sir, in essence, that is why we make the 16 application to succeed on, isn't it? 2 application to succeed on, isn't it? 3 MS CLARKE: It is, and I can't possibly make any positive submissions about whether such application would or 4 submissions about whether such application would or 5 wouldn't succeed. The issue is, in my submission, 6 preventing that opportunity in the first place, when the 7 way to prevent it and to ring-fence that evidence is 8 simply to publish the evidence from the inquiry a week 9 later. 10 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Have you given any considerat 11 section 4.2 of the Contempt of Court Act? Not because 12 I'm suggesting it's perhaps directly applicable, but it 13 does seem to me that the principles underlying it and 14 restrictions. 15 MS CLARKE: Well, sir, I would say that you are entitled to 16 rely on section 4.2 of the Contempt of Court Act. The 17 primary legislation, of course, that is the guiding 18 a little difficult to understand. 19 In the ordinary way one would expect an application 20 of this sort to be based on the premise that the witness 21 in question might say something in the course of the 22 inquiry that, if reported, might influence the jury. 23 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: But isn't the problem one of
arguments made that could jeopardise the listing, and that's really the fundamental problem.  Given that the restriction sought is for a very  limited amount of time, we would ask for it, as I've  said, until Monday, 12 November, just to allow for late  running of proceedings on Friday or perhaps jury  deliberations tipping over into the Monday.  If, of course, matters outside of my control take  over and for any other reason the listing is  jeopardised, then we would of course need to consider  our position about any length of time for any reporting  But, sir, in essence, that is why we make the application.  But, sir, in essence, that is why we make the application.  In the ordinary way one would expect an application  of this sort to be based on the premise that the witness  in question might say something in the course of the  avay to prevent it and to ring-fence that evidence is submissions about whether such application would or wouldn't succeed. The issue is, in my submission, preventing that opportunity in the first place, when the submissions about whether such application would or wouldn't succeed. The issue is, in my submission, preventing that opportunity in the first place, when the way to prevent it and to ring-fence that evidence is simply to publish the evidence from the inquiry a week later.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Have you given any considerat  10 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Have you given any considerat 11 section 4.2 of the Contempt of Court Act? Not because 12 I'm suggesting it's perhaps directly applicable, but it does seem to me that the principles underlying it and the case law based on it are apposite to the inquiry.  MS CLARKE: Well, sir, I would say that you are entitled to rely on section 4.2 of the Contempt of Court Act. The primary legislation, of course, that is the guiding principle is section 19 of the Inquiries Act.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: That is what gives me my power 10 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: But isn't the problem one of
that's really the fundamental problem.  Given that the restriction sought is for a very  Given that the restriction sought is for a very  Given that the restriction sought is for a very  Given that the restriction sought is for a very  Given that the restriction sought is for a very  Given that the restriction sought is for a very  Given that the restriction sought is for a very  Given that the restriction sought is for a very  Given that the restriction sought is for a very  Given that the restriction sought is for a very  Given that the restriction sought is for a very  Given that the restriction sought is for a very  Given that the restriction sought is for a very  Given that the restriction sought is for a very  Given that the restriction sought is for a very  Given that the restriction sought is for a very  Given that the restriction would or  Given that the restriction would or  Friday or perhaps jury  Bith of preventing that opportunity in the first place, when the  way to prevent it and to ring-fence that evidence is  simply to publish the evidence from the inquiry a week  later.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Have you given any considerate  Cover and for any other reason the listing is  In section 4.2 of the Contempt of Court Act? Not because  Limit our position about any length of time for any reporting  Goes seem to me that the principles underlying it and  the case law based on it are apposite to the inquiry.  MS CLARKE: Well, sir, I would say that you are entitled to  rely on section 4.2 of the Contempt of Court Act. The  primary legislation, of course, that is the guiding  Principle is section 19 of the Inquiries Act.  In the ordinary way one would expect an application  In the ordinary way one would expect an application  Goes seem to me that the principle is section 4.2 of the Contempt of Court Act. The  primary legislation, of course, that is the guiding  principle is section 19 of the Inquiries Act.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: That is what gives me my power  of this sort to be based on the premise that t
Given that the restriction sought is for a very  6 limited amount of time, we would ask for it, as I've  7 said, until Monday, 12 November, just to allow for late  8 running of proceedings on Friday or perhaps jury  9 deliberations tipping over into the Monday.  10 If, of course, matters outside of my control take  11 over and for any other reason the listing is  12 jeopardised, then we would of course need to consider  13 our position about any length of time for any reporting  14 restrictions.  15 But, sir, in essence, that is why we make the  16 application.  17 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Well, this is something I'm finding  18 a little difficult to understand.  19 In the ordinary way one would expect an application  20 of this sort to be based on the premise that the witness  21 in question might say something in fluence the jury.  22 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: But isn't the problem one of
6 limited amount of time, we would ask for it, as I've 7 said, until Monday, 12 November, just to allow for late 8 running of proceedings on Friday or perhaps jury 9 deliberations tipping over into the Monday. 10 If, of course, matters outside of my control take 11 over and for any other reason the listing is 12 jeopardised, then we would of course need to consider 13 our position about any length of time for any reporting 14 restrictions. 15 But, sir, in essence, that is why we make the 16 application. 17 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Well, this is something I'm finding 18 a little difficult to understand. 19 In the ordinary way one would expect an application 20 of this sort to be based on the premise that the witness 21 in question might say something in the course of the 22 inquiry that, if reported, might influence the jury. 24 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: But isn't the problem one of
said, until Monday, 12 November, just to allow for late  running of proceedings on Friday or perhaps jury  deliberations tipping over into the Monday.  If, of course, matters outside of my control take  over and for any other reason the listing is  jeopardised, then we would of course need to consider  our position about any length of time for any reporting  restrictions.  But, sir, in essence, that is why we make the  application.  But, sir, in essence, that is why we make the  application.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Well, this is something I'm finding  a little difficult to understand.  In the ordinary way one would expect an application  of this sort to be based on the premise that the witness  in question might say something in the course of the  in quiry that, if reported, might influence the jury.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: But isn't the problem one of
running of proceedings on Friday or perhaps jury  deliberations tipping over into the Monday.  If, of course, matters outside of my control take  10
deliberations tipping over into the Monday.  If, of course, matters outside of my control take  over and for any other reason the listing is  jeopardised, then we would of course need to consider  our position about any length of time for any reporting  the case law based on it are apposite to the inquiry.  But, sir, in essence, that is why we make the  application.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Have you given any considerate section 4.2 of the Contempt of Court Act? Not because  12 I'm suggesting it's perhaps directly applicable, but it  does seem to me that the principles underlying it and  the case law based on it are apposite to the inquiry.  MS CLARKE: Well, sir, I would say that you are entitled to  rely on section 4.2 of the Contempt of Court Act. The  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Well, this is something I'm finding  a little difficult to understand.  In the ordinary way one would expect an application  of this sort to be based on the premise that the witness  of this sort to be based on the premise that the witness  in question might say something in the course of the  in question might say something in the course of the  21 MS CLARKE: Yes.  22 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: But isn't the problem one of
If, of course, matters outside of my control take  10
over and for any other reason the listing is jeopardised, then we would of course need to consider our position about any length of time for any reporting lateral restrictions.  But, sir, in essence, that is why we make the application.  But, sir, in essence, that is why we make the lateral restrictions.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Well, this is something I'm finding a little difficult to understand.  In the ordinary way one would expect an application of this sort to be based on the premise that the witness in question might say something in the course of the inquiry.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: But isn't the problem one of
jeopardised, then we would of course need to consider our position about any length of time for any reporting 13 does seem to me that the principles underlying it and 14 restrictions. 15 But, sir, in essence, that is why we make the 16 application. 17 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Well, this is something I'm finding 18 a little difficult to understand. 19 In the ordinary way one would expect an application 19 In the ordinary way one would expect an application 20 of this sort to be based on the premise that the witness 21 in question might say something in the course of the 22 inquiry that, if reported, might influence the jury. 21 In the ordinary Moore would of course and the problem one of 22 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: But isn't the problem one of
our position about any length of time for any reporting 13 does seem to me that the principles underlying it and 14 restrictions. 15 But, sir, in essence, that is why we make the 16 application. 16 rely on section 4.2 of the Contempt of Court Act. The 17 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Well, this is something I'm finding 18 a little difficult to understand. 19 In the ordinary way one would expect an application 20 of this sort to be based on the premise that the witness 21 in question might say something in the course of the 22 inquiry that, if reported, might influence the jury. 21 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: But isn't the problem one of
14 the case law based on it are apposite to the inquiry. 15 But, sir, in essence, that is why we make the 16 application. 16 If rely on section 4.2 of the Contempt of Court Act. The 17 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Well, this is something I'm finding 18 a little difficult to understand. 19 In the ordinary way one would expect an application 20 of this sort to be based on the premise that the witness 21 in question might say something in the course of the 22 inquiry that, if reported, might influence the jury. 23 If MARTIN MOORE-BICK: But isn't the problem one of
But, sir, in essence, that is why we make the application.  But, sir, in essence, that is why we make the application.  But, sir, in essence, that is why we make the application.  But, sir, in essence, that is why we make the application.  But, sir, in essence, that is why we make the application.  But, sir, in essence, that is why we make the application.  But, sir, in essence, that is why we make the application.  But, sir, in essence, that is why we make the application.  But, sir, in essence, that is why we make the application.  But, sir, in essence, that is would say that you are entitled to rely on section 4.2 of the Contempt of Court Act. The application, of course, that is the guiding principle is section 19 of the Inquiries Act.  But MARTIN MOORE-BICK: That is what gives me my power application.  But Martin Moore application of course, that is the guiding principle is section 19 of the Inquiries Act.  But Martin Moore Bick: That is what gives me my power application.  But Martin Moore Bick: But isn't the problem one of application.  But Martin Moore Bick: But isn't the problem one of
application.  16 rely on section 4.2 of the Contempt of Court Act. The 17 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Well, this is something I'm finding 18 a little difficult to understand. 19 In the ordinary way one would expect an application 20 of this sort to be based on the premise that the witness 21 in question might say something in the course of the 22 inquiry that, if reported, might influence the jury. 23 If martin Moore-Bick: But isn't the problem one of
17 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Well, this is something I'm finding 18 a little difficult to understand. 19 In the ordinary way one would expect an application 20 of this sort to be based on the premise that the witness 21 in question might say something in the course of the 22 inquiry that, if reported, might influence the jury. 23 In MARTIN MOORE-BICK: That is what gives me my power restrict reporting. 24 MS CLARKE: Yes. 25 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: But isn't the problem one of
a little difficult to understand.  In the ordinary way one would expect an application  of this sort to be based on the premise that the witness  in question might say something in the course of the  inquiry that, if reported, might influence the jury.  18 principle is section 19 of the Inquiries Act.  19 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: That is what gives me my power restrict reporting.  20 restrict reporting.  21 MS CLARKE: Yes.  22 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: But isn't the problem one of
19 In the ordinary way one would expect an application 20 of this sort to be based on the premise that the witness 21 in question might say something in the course of the 22 inquiry that, if reported, might influence the jury. 23 In the ordinary way one would expect an application 24 restrict reporting. 25 MS CLARKE: Yes. 26 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: But isn't the problem one of
20 of this sort to be based on the premise that the witness 21 in question might say something in the course of the 22 inquiry that, if reported, might influence the jury. 20 restrict reporting. 21 MS CLARKE: Yes. 22 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: But isn't the problem one of
21 in question might say something in the course of the 21 MS CLARKE: Yes. 22 inquiry that, if reported, might influence the jury. 22 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: But isn't the problem one of
22 inquiry that, if reported, might influence the jury. 22 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: But isn't the problem one of
23 But that's not, I think, the basis upon which you put 23 balancing freedom of speech against the risk to the
24 this. 24 administration of justice?
25 MS CLARKE: No, it's a slightly different basis. 25 MS CLARKE: Of course.
Page 9 Page 11
1 age 11
1 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Does that mean whatever she says, in 1 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: So the tests that have been appli
2 a sense the fact of giving evidence is itself a problem? 2 in relation to section 4.2 well, contained in
3 MS CLARKE: Yes, sir, to put it shortly. 3 section 4.2 would seem to me at least to be
4 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Why should that be so?  4 potentially relevant to the exercise that I am being
5 MS CLARKE: Because an argument could be made that the 5 asked to undertake.
6 widespread publication and reporting of Ms Wahabi's 6 MS CLARKE: No, sir, I'm seeking for you, sir, to make that
7 evidence may well influence a jury. 7 balance of the administration of justice versus freedom
8 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: In what way? 8 of speech.
9 MS CLARKE: To the extent that it would prejudice the 9 I'm effectively asking for the right to freedom of
10 defendant, because if jurors were to have considered 10 speech and for these matters to be publicised and
11 Ms Wahabi's evidence and drawn any conclusions about 11 reported on simply to take place after Ms Wahabi has
12 her, or, for example, any particular positive feelings 12 given evidence in the criminal trial. It isn't
towards Ms Wahabi as a consequence of viewing her 13 a wholesale restriction forever, it's on a very limited
14 evidence, the defendant may say that he can't possibly 14 basis.
15 have a fair trial when the jury have already seen this 15 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Well, Ms Clarke, I'm very conce
16 individual giving their evidence live at the public 16 about this application and I think it requires more
17 inquiry about matters that are particularly emotive and 17 careful argument and deliberation than we really have
18 distressing. 18 time to undertake at this moment. I mean, in one sense,
19 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Right. 19 I'm afraid, you're going to succeed in your design
20 What sort of application are you worried about on 20 because it's not now going to be really feasible to take
21 the part of the defendant? 21 Mrs Wahabi's evidence this afternoon.
22 MS CLARKE: I appreciate, sir, that 22 MS CLARKE: Well, sir
23 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: I mean, he would have to apply to 23 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: But there is still Mr Gomes com
24 stay the indictment, wouldn't he? 24 along next week and I think the same principles are
25 MS CLARKE: He would. 25 going to apply in relation to him, aren't they?
D 40
Page 10 Page 12

1	MS CLARKE: They may well do, but it will depend, as I say,	1	been allowing the public to have access is through the		
2	1 0		2 streaming and so forth subject to an application for		
3	possibility at the moment the defendant in that trial	3	a restriction order under section 19, and the criteria		
4	has pleaded not guilty. If the defendant were to plead	4 5	under section 19 is fairly stringent.		
5			SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Mr Thomas, I can assure you that		
6			I've been looking at both sections 18 and section 19.		
	7 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: A wholly different dimension.		Section 19, as you will know yourself, is worded in ways		
	8 MS CLARKE: Sorry, sir?		that might admit of different interpretations, and I'm		
	9 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: A wholly different dimension.		not prepared to say here and now that this does not come		
10	10 MS CLARKE: Yes. So, again, there are unpredictable matters		within section 19, but it's a point which it's perfectly		
11			right to consider, and I hope Ms Clarke has taken it on		
12	Can I say on the issue of frustrating this	12 board. I suspect she has.			
13	afternoon's proceedings, it was absolutely not our	13	MR THOMAS: The point I make, so that I'm not misunderstood,		
14	intention to do that, and I want to apologise if that	14	is so far, the application has not been phrased with any		
15	causes Ms Wahabi any distress, because it certainly was	15	reference to section 19.		
16	not our intention to prevent her from giving her	16	SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Well, that's not quite right. You		
17	evidence this afternoon.	17	haven't seen the written note that I have, have you?		
18	SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Well, I think others in the room	18	When you get it because I am going to direct that you		
19	I am thinking principally, of course, of the legal	19	should get it you'll see that there is reliance		
20	representatives of the core participants ought to be	20	placed on section 19.		
21	better informed about this application, and what I am	21	But I think if this application is going to be		
22	minded to do I also think, if I may say so, that the	22	pursued, notwithstanding the fact that we're now not		
23	press ought to have an opportunity to be heard if they		going to hear evidence from Ms Wahabi this afternoon,		
24	24 wish on it at some length. It's a bit difficult to		it's got to be pursued properly, and my present view is		
25	expect the representatives from the Press Association,		it ought to be pursued by the CPS in their own right,		
	Page 13		Page 15		
1	who may not have too much familiarity with these sorts	,			
			not by the Metropolitan Police Service		
		1 2	not by the Metropolitan Police Service.		
2	of legal proceedings, to argue the press's interest on	2	Yes, Mr Mansfield.		
2 3	of legal proceedings, to argue the press's interest on the hoof like this.	2 3	Yes, Mr Mansfield.  MR MANSFIELD: Yes, I'm obliged. I wonder whether I might,		
2 3 4	of legal proceedings, to argue the press's interest on the hoof like this.  What I am minded to do is to say that we'll adjourn	2 3 4	Yes, Mr Mansfield.  MR MANSFIELD: Yes, I'm obliged. I wonder whether I might, on behalf of Ms Wahabi she's sitting right here.		
2 3 4 5	of legal proceedings, to argue the press's interest on the hoof like this.  What I am minded to do is to say that we'll adjourn this application to be heard on Friday.	2 3 4 5	Yes, Mr Mansfield.  MR MANSFIELD: Yes, I'm obliged. I wonder whether I might, on behalf of Ms Wahabi she's sitting right here.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: I am sorry she's been so		
2 3 4 5 6	of legal proceedings, to argue the press's interest on the hoof like this.  What I am minded to do is to say that we'll adjourn this application to be heard on Friday.  I'm waiting, there is a question mark in my voice,	2 3 4 5 6	Yes, Mr Mansfield.  MR MANSFIELD: Yes, I'm obliged. I wonder whether I might, on behalf of Ms Wahabi she's sitting right here.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: I am sorry she's been so inconvenienced. It is very unsatisfactory.		
2 3 4 5 6 7	of legal proceedings, to argue the press's interest on the hoof like this.  What I am minded to do is to say that we'll adjourn this application to be heard on Friday.  I'm waiting, there is a question mark in my voice, inviting people to stand up and object to Friday.	2 3 4 5 6 7	Yes, Mr Mansfield.  MR MANSFIELD: Yes, I'm obliged. I wonder whether I might, on behalf of Ms Wahabi she's sitting right here.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: I am sorry she's been so inconvenienced. It is very unsatisfactory.  MR MANSFIELD: I'm very concerned about her welfare as		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	of legal proceedings, to argue the press's interest on the hoof like this.  What I am minded to do is to say that we'll adjourn this application to be heard on Friday.  I'm waiting, there is a question mark in my voice, inviting people to stand up and object to Friday.  Yes, someone has.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Yes, Mr Mansfield.  MR MANSFIELD: Yes, I'm obliged. I wonder whether I might, on behalf of Ms Wahabi she's sitting right here.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: I am sorry she's been so inconvenienced. It is very unsatisfactory.  MR MANSFIELD: I'm very concerned about her welfare as a witness, because there are two sets of proceedings,		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	of legal proceedings, to argue the press's interest on the hoof like this.  What I am minded to do is to say that we'll adjourn this application to be heard on Friday.  I'm waiting, there is a question mark in my voice, inviting people to stand up and object to Friday.  Yes, someone has.  MR THOMAS: Sir, can I raise one thing before you finalise	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Yes, Mr Mansfield.  MR MANSFIELD: Yes, I'm obliged. I wonder whether I might, on behalf of Ms Wahabi she's sitting right here.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: I am sorry she's been so inconvenienced. It is very unsatisfactory.  MR MANSFIELD: I'm very concerned about her welfare as a witness, because there are two sets of proceedings, this one and the other one. We haven't been told		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	of legal proceedings, to argue the press's interest on the hoof like this.  What I am minded to do is to say that we'll adjourn this application to be heard on Friday.  I'm waiting, there is a question mark in my voice, inviting people to stand up and object to Friday.  Yes, someone has.  MR THOMAS: Sir, can I raise one thing before you finalise your decision as to when you are going to hear this	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Yes, Mr Mansfield.  MR MANSFIELD: Yes, I'm obliged. I wonder whether I might, on behalf of Ms Wahabi she's sitting right here.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: I am sorry she's been so inconvenienced. It is very unsatisfactory.  MR MANSFIELD: I'm very concerned about her welfare as a witness, because there are two sets of proceedings, this one and the other one. We haven't been told whether it's a fixture I was told informally it is		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	of legal proceedings, to argue the press's interest on the hoof like this.  What I am minded to do is to say that we'll adjourn this application to be heard on Friday.  I'm waiting, there is a question mark in my voice, inviting people to stand up and object to Friday.  Yes, someone has.  MR THOMAS: Sir, can I raise one thing before you finalise your decision as to when you are going to hear this application. It may well be of assistance to you and,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Yes, Mr Mansfield.  MR MANSFIELD: Yes, I'm obliged. I wonder whether I might, on behalf of Ms Wahabi she's sitting right here.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: I am sorry she's been so inconvenienced. It is very unsatisfactory.  MR MANSFIELD: I'm very concerned about her welfare as a witness, because there are two sets of proceedings, this one and the other one. We haven't been told whether it's a fixture I was told informally it is a fixture for Monday.		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	of legal proceedings, to argue the press's interest on the hoof like this.  What I am minded to do is to say that we'll adjourn this application to be heard on Friday.  I'm waiting, there is a question mark in my voice, inviting people to stand up and object to Friday.  Yes, someone has.  MR THOMAS: Sir, can I raise one thing before you finalise your decision as to when you are going to hear this application. It may well be of assistance to you and, indeed, the applicant making this application.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Yes, Mr Mansfield.  MR MANSFIELD: Yes, I'm obliged. I wonder whether I might, on behalf of Ms Wahabi she's sitting right here.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: I am sorry she's been so inconvenienced. It is very unsatisfactory.  MR MANSFIELD: I'm very concerned about her welfare as a witness, because there are two sets of proceedings, this one and the other one. We haven't been told whether it's a fixture I was told informally it is a fixture for Monday.  I wonder whether we might be given a little time		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	of legal proceedings, to argue the press's interest on the hoof like this.  What I am minded to do is to say that we'll adjourn this application to be heard on Friday.  I'm waiting, there is a question mark in my voice, inviting people to stand up and object to Friday.  Yes, someone has.  MR THOMAS: Sir, can I raise one thing before you finalise your decision as to when you are going to hear this application. It may well be of assistance to you and, indeed, the applicant making this application.  What is surprising is that there is a bearing in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Yes, Mr Mansfield.  MR MANSFIELD: Yes, I'm obliged. I wonder whether I might, on behalf of Ms Wahabi she's sitting right here.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: I am sorry she's been so inconvenienced. It is very unsatisfactory.  MR MANSFIELD: I'm very concerned about her welfare as a witness, because there are two sets of proceedings, this one and the other one. We haven't been told whether it's a fixture I was told informally it is a fixture for Monday.  I wonder whether we might be given a little time now, because obviously one way round, having a hearing		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	of legal proceedings, to argue the press's interest on the hoof like this.  What I am minded to do is to say that we'll adjourn this application to be heard on Friday.  I'm waiting, there is a question mark in my voice, inviting people to stand up and object to Friday.  Yes, someone has.  MR THOMAS: Sir, can I raise one thing before you finalise your decision as to when you are going to hear this application. It may well be of assistance to you and, indeed, the applicant making this application.  What is surprising is that there is a bearing in mind what has been asked for is a restriction order, and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Yes, Mr Mansfield.  MR MANSFIELD: Yes, I'm obliged. I wonder whether I might, on behalf of Ms Wahabi she's sitting right here.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: I am sorry she's been so inconvenienced. It is very unsatisfactory.  MR MANSFIELD: I'm very concerned about her welfare as a witness, because there are two sets of proceedings, this one and the other one. We haven't been told whether it's a fixture I was told informally it is a fixture for Monday.  I wonder whether we might be given a little time now, because obviously one way round, having a hearing on Friday when she is supposed to be giving evidence on		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	of legal proceedings, to argue the press's interest on the hoof like this.  What I am minded to do is to say that we'll adjourn this application to be heard on Friday.  I'm waiting, there is a question mark in my voice, inviting people to stand up and object to Friday.  Yes, someone has.  MR THOMAS: Sir, can I raise one thing before you finalise your decision as to when you are going to hear this application. It may well be of assistance to you and, indeed, the applicant making this application.  What is surprising is that there is a bearing in mind what has been asked for is a restriction order, and that is dealt with in section 19 of the Inquiries Act,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Yes, Mr Mansfield.  MR MANSFIELD: Yes, I'm obliged. I wonder whether I might, on behalf of Ms Wahabi she's sitting right here.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: I am sorry she's been so inconvenienced. It is very unsatisfactory.  MR MANSFIELD: I'm very concerned about her welfare as a witness, because there are two sets of proceedings, this one and the other one. We haven't been told whether it's a fixture I was told informally it is a fixture for Monday.  I wonder whether we might be given a little time now, because obviously one way round, having a hearing on Friday when she is supposed to be giving evidence on Monday, may be prolixed to say the least of it. It may		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	of legal proceedings, to argue the press's interest on the hoof like this.  What I am minded to do is to say that we'll adjourn this application to be heard on Friday.  I'm waiting, there is a question mark in my voice, inviting people to stand up and object to Friday.  Yes, someone has.  MR THOMAS: Sir, can I raise one thing before you finalise your decision as to when you are going to hear this application. It may well be of assistance to you and, indeed, the applicant making this application.  What is surprising is that there is a bearing in mind what has been asked for is a restriction order, and that is dealt with in section 19 of the Inquiries Act, it's somewhat surprising that this application has been	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Yes, Mr Mansfield.  MR MANSFIELD: Yes, I'm obliged. I wonder whether I might, on behalf of Ms Wahabi she's sitting right here.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: I am sorry she's been so inconvenienced. It is very unsatisfactory.  MR MANSFIELD: I'm very concerned about her welfare as a witness, because there are two sets of proceedings, this one and the other one. We haven't been told whether it's a fixture I was told informally it is a fixture for Monday.  I wonder whether we might be given a little time now, because obviously one way round, having a hearing on Friday when she is supposed to be giving evidence on Monday, may be prolixed to say the least of it. It may be possible to resolve this this afternoon if, for		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	of legal proceedings, to argue the press's interest on the hoof like this.  What I am minded to do is to say that we'll adjourn this application to be heard on Friday.  I'm waiting, there is a question mark in my voice, inviting people to stand up and object to Friday.  Yes, someone has.  MR THOMAS: Sir, can I raise one thing before you finalise your decision as to when you are going to hear this application. It may well be of assistance to you and, indeed, the applicant making this application.  What is surprising is that there is a bearing in mind what has been asked for is a restriction order, and that is dealt with in section 19 of the Inquiries Act, it's somewhat surprising that this application has been made with no reference to section 19 and whether or not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Yes, Mr Mansfield.  MR MANSFIELD: Yes, I'm obliged. I wonder whether I might, on behalf of Ms Wahabi she's sitting right here.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: I am sorry she's been so inconvenienced. It is very unsatisfactory.  MR MANSFIELD: I'm very concerned about her welfare as a witness, because there are two sets of proceedings, this one and the other one. We haven't been told whether it's a fixture I was told informally it is a fixture for Monday.  I wonder whether we might be given a little time now, because obviously one way round, having a hearing on Friday when she is supposed to be giving evidence on Monday, may be prolixed to say the least of it. It may be possible to resolve this this afternoon if, for example I haven't discussed it with anyone if		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	of legal proceedings, to argue the press's interest on the hoof like this.  What I am minded to do is to say that we'll adjourn this application to be heard on Friday.  I'm waiting, there is a question mark in my voice, inviting people to stand up and object to Friday.  Yes, someone has.  MR THOMAS: Sir, can I raise one thing before you finalise your decision as to when you are going to hear this application. It may well be of assistance to you and, indeed, the applicant making this application.  What is surprising is that there is a bearing in mind what has been asked for is a restriction order, and that is dealt with in section 19 of the Inquiries Act, it's somewhat surprising that this application has been made with no reference to section 19 and whether or not the application actually falls appropriately within	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Yes, Mr Mansfield.  MR MANSFIELD: Yes, I'm obliged. I wonder whether I might, on behalf of Ms Wahabi she's sitting right here.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: I am sorry she's been so inconvenienced. It is very unsatisfactory.  MR MANSFIELD: I'm very concerned about her welfare as a witness, because there are two sets of proceedings, this one and the other one. We haven't been told whether it's a fixture I was told informally it is a fixture for Monday.  I wonder whether we might be given a little time now, because obviously one way round, having a hearing on Friday when she is supposed to be giving evidence on Monday, may be prolixed to say the least of it. It may be possible to resolve this this afternoon if, for example I haven't discussed it with anyone if she's due to give evidence on Monday, she goes and gives		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	of legal proceedings, to argue the press's interest on the hoof like this.  What I am minded to do is to say that we'll adjourn this application to be heard on Friday.  I'm waiting, there is a question mark in my voice, inviting people to stand up and object to Friday.  Yes, someone has.  MR THOMAS: Sir, can I raise one thing before you finalise your decision as to when you are going to hear this application. It may well be of assistance to you and, indeed, the applicant making this application.  What is surprising is that there is a bearing in mind what has been asked for is a restriction order, and that is dealt with in section 19 of the Inquiries Act, it's somewhat surprising that this application has been made with no reference to section 19 and whether or not the application actually falls appropriately within section 19.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Yes, Mr Mansfield.  MR MANSFIELD: Yes, I'm obliged. I wonder whether I might, on behalf of Ms Wahabi she's sitting right here.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: I am sorry she's been so inconvenienced. It is very unsatisfactory.  MR MANSFIELD: I'm very concerned about her welfare as a witness, because there are two sets of proceedings, this one and the other one. We haven't been told whether it's a fixture I was told informally it is a fixture for Monday.  I wonder whether we might be given a little time now, because obviously one way round, having a hearing on Friday when she is supposed to be giving evidence on Monday, may be prolixed to say the least of it. It may be possible to resolve this this afternoon if, for example I haven't discussed it with anyone if she's due to give evidence on Monday, she goes and gives evidence on Monday and not here until after she's given		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	of legal proceedings, to argue the press's interest on the hoof like this.  What I am minded to do is to say that we'll adjourn this application to be heard on Friday.  I'm waiting, there is a question mark in my voice, inviting people to stand up and object to Friday.  Yes, someone has.  MR THOMAS: Sir, can I raise one thing before you finalise your decision as to when you are going to hear this application. It may well be of assistance to you and, indeed, the applicant making this application.  What is surprising is that there is a bearing in mind what has been asked for is a restriction order, and that is dealt with in section 19 of the Inquiries Act, it's somewhat surprising that this application has been made with no reference to section 19 and whether or not the application actually falls appropriately within section 19.  The reason why I stand to my feet I'm neutral on	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Yes, Mr Mansfield.  MR MANSFIELD: Yes, I'm obliged. I wonder whether I might, on behalf of Ms Wahabi she's sitting right here.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: I am sorry she's been so inconvenienced. It is very unsatisfactory.  MR MANSFIELD: I'm very concerned about her welfare as a witness, because there are two sets of proceedings, this one and the other one. We haven't been told whether it's a fixture I was told informally it is a fixture for Monday.  I wonder whether we might be given a little time now, because obviously one way round, having a hearing on Friday when she is supposed to be giving evidence on Monday, may be prolixed to say the least of it. It may be possible to resolve this this afternoon if, for example I haven't discussed it with anyone if she's due to give evidence on Monday, she goes and gives evidence on Monday and not here until after she's given evidence there.		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	of legal proceedings, to argue the press's interest on the hoof like this.  What I am minded to do is to say that we'll adjourn this application to be heard on Friday.  I'm waiting, there is a question mark in my voice, inviting people to stand up and object to Friday.  Yes, someone has.  MR THOMAS: Sir, can I raise one thing before you finalise your decision as to when you are going to hear this application. It may well be of assistance to you and, indeed, the applicant making this application.  What is surprising is that there is a bearing in mind what has been asked for is a restriction order, and that is dealt with in section 19 of the Inquiries Act, it's somewhat surprising that this application has been made with no reference to section 19 and whether or not the application actually falls appropriately within section 19.  The reason why I stand to my feet I'm neutral on this because it doesn't affect my clients, but with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Yes, Mr Mansfield.  MR MANSFIELD: Yes, I'm obliged. I wonder whether I might, on behalf of Ms Wahabi she's sitting right here.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: I am sorry she's been so inconvenienced. It is very unsatisfactory.  MR MANSFIELD: I'm very concerned about her welfare as a witness, because there are two sets of proceedings, this one and the other one. We haven't been told whether it's a fixture I was told informally it is a fixture for Monday.  I wonder whether we might be given a little time now, because obviously one way round, having a hearing on Friday when she is supposed to be giving evidence on Monday, may be prolixed to say the least of it. It may be possible to resolve this this afternoon if, for example I haven't discussed it with anyone if she's due to give evidence on Monday, she goes and gives evidence on Monday and not here until after she's given evidence there.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: That may well be the case, and I see		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	of legal proceedings, to argue the press's interest on the hoof like this.  What I am minded to do is to say that we'll adjourn this application to be heard on Friday.  I'm waiting, there is a question mark in my voice, inviting people to stand up and object to Friday.  Yes, someone has.  MR THOMAS: Sir, can I raise one thing before you finalise your decision as to when you are going to hear this application. It may well be of assistance to you and, indeed, the applicant making this application.  What is surprising is that there is a bearing in mind what has been asked for is a restriction order, and that is dealt with in section 19 of the Inquiries Act, it's somewhat surprising that this application has been made with no reference to section 19 and whether or not the application actually falls appropriately within section 19.  The reason why I stand to my feet I'm neutral on this because it doesn't affect my clients, but with assistance to you, sir, the fundamental principle is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Yes, Mr Mansfield.  MR MANSFIELD: Yes, I'm obliged. I wonder whether I might, on behalf of Ms Wahabi she's sitting right here.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: I am sorry she's been so inconvenienced. It is very unsatisfactory.  MR MANSFIELD: I'm very concerned about her welfare as a witness, because there are two sets of proceedings, this one and the other one. We haven't been told whether it's a fixture I was told informally it is a fixture for Monday.  I wonder whether we might be given a little time now, because obviously one way round, having a hearing on Friday when she is supposed to be giving evidence on Monday, may be prolixed to say the least of it. It may be possible to resolve this this afternoon if, for example I haven't discussed it with anyone if she's due to give evidence on Monday, she goes and gives evidence on Monday and not here until after she's given evidence there.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: That may well be the case, and I see the force of that, and this is why I said I thought		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	of legal proceedings, to argue the press's interest on the hoof like this.  What I am minded to do is to say that we'll adjourn this application to be heard on Friday.  I'm waiting, there is a question mark in my voice, inviting people to stand up and object to Friday.  Yes, someone has.  MR THOMAS: Sir, can I raise one thing before you finalise your decision as to when you are going to hear this application. It may well be of assistance to you and, indeed, the applicant making this application.  What is surprising is that there is a bearing in mind what has been asked for is a restriction order, and that is dealt with in section 19 of the Inquiries Act, it's somewhat surprising that this application has been made with no reference to section 19 and whether or not the application actually falls appropriately within section 19.  The reason why I stand to my feet I'm neutral on this because it doesn't affect my clients, but with assistance to you, sir, the fundamental principle is firstly set out in section 18, which gives a presumption	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Yes, Mr Mansfield.  MR MANSFIELD: Yes, I'm obliged. I wonder whether I might, on behalf of Ms Wahabi she's sitting right here.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: I am sorry she's been so inconvenienced. It is very unsatisfactory.  MR MANSFIELD: I'm very concerned about her welfare as a witness, because there are two sets of proceedings, this one and the other one. We haven't been told whether it's a fixture I was told informally it is a fixture for Monday.  I wonder whether we might be given a little time now, because obviously one way round, having a hearing on Friday when she is supposed to be giving evidence on Monday, may be prolixed to say the least of it. It may be possible to resolve this this afternoon if, for example I haven't discussed it with anyone if she's due to give evidence on Monday, she goes and gives evidence on Monday and not here until after she's given evidence there.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: That may well be the case, and I see the force of that, and this is why I said I thought Ms Clarke had achieved her object by getting this		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	of legal proceedings, to argue the press's interest on the hoof like this.  What I am minded to do is to say that we'll adjourn this application to be heard on Friday.  I'm waiting, there is a question mark in my voice, inviting people to stand up and object to Friday.  Yes, someone has.  MR THOMAS: Sir, can I raise one thing before you finalise your decision as to when you are going to hear this application. It may well be of assistance to you and, indeed, the applicant making this application.  What is surprising is that there is a bearing in mind what has been asked for is a restriction order, and that is dealt with in section 19 of the Inquiries Act, it's somewhat surprising that this application has been made with no reference to section 19 and whether or not the application actually falls appropriately within section 19.  The reason why I stand to my feet I'm neutral on this because it doesn't affect my clients, but with assistance to you, sir, the fundamental principle is firstly set out in section 18, which gives a presumption that these hearings should be heard in public, and the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Yes, Mr Mansfield.  MR MANSFIELD: Yes, I'm obliged. I wonder whether I might, on behalf of Ms Wahabi she's sitting right here.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: I am sorry she's been so inconvenienced. It is very unsatisfactory.  MR MANSFIELD: I'm very concerned about her welfare as a witness, because there are two sets of proceedings, this one and the other one. We haven't been told whether it's a fixture I was told informally it is a fixture for Monday.  I wonder whether we might be given a little time now, because obviously one way round, having a hearing on Friday when she is supposed to be giving evidence on Monday, may be prolixed to say the least of it. It may be possible to resolve this this afternoon if, for example I haven't discussed it with anyone if she's due to give evidence on Monday, she goes and gives evidence on Monday and not here until after she's given evidence there.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: That may well be the case, and I see the force of that, and this is why I said I thought Ms Clarke had achieved her object by getting this application on rather late so that we can't hear		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	of legal proceedings, to argue the press's interest on the hoof like this.  What I am minded to do is to say that we'll adjourn this application to be heard on Friday.  I'm waiting, there is a question mark in my voice, inviting people to stand up and object to Friday.  Yes, someone has.  MR THOMAS: Sir, can I raise one thing before you finalise your decision as to when you are going to hear this application. It may well be of assistance to you and, indeed, the applicant making this application.  What is surprising is that there is a bearing in mind what has been asked for is a restriction order, and that is dealt with in section 19 of the Inquiries Act, it's somewhat surprising that this application has been made with no reference to section 19 and whether or not the application actually falls appropriately within section 19.  The reason why I stand to my feet I'm neutral on this because it doesn't affect my clients, but with assistance to you, sir, the fundamental principle is firstly set out in section 18, which gives a presumption	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Yes, Mr Mansfield.  MR MANSFIELD: Yes, I'm obliged. I wonder whether I might, on behalf of Ms Wahabi she's sitting right here.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: I am sorry she's been so inconvenienced. It is very unsatisfactory.  MR MANSFIELD: I'm very concerned about her welfare as a witness, because there are two sets of proceedings, this one and the other one. We haven't been told whether it's a fixture I was told informally it is a fixture for Monday.  I wonder whether we might be given a little time now, because obviously one way round, having a hearing on Friday when she is supposed to be giving evidence on Monday, may be prolixed to say the least of it. It may be possible to resolve this this afternoon if, for example I haven't discussed it with anyone if she's due to give evidence on Monday, she goes and gives evidence on Monday and not here until after she's given evidence there.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: That may well be the case, and I see the force of that, and this is why I said I thought Ms Clarke had achieved her object by getting this		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	of legal proceedings, to argue the press's interest on the hoof like this.  What I am minded to do is to say that we'll adjourn this application to be heard on Friday.  I'm waiting, there is a question mark in my voice, inviting people to stand up and object to Friday.  Yes, someone has.  MR THOMAS: Sir, can I raise one thing before you finalise your decision as to when you are going to hear this application. It may well be of assistance to you and, indeed, the applicant making this application.  What is surprising is that there is a bearing in mind what has been asked for is a restriction order, and that is dealt with in section 19 of the Inquiries Act, it's somewhat surprising that this application has been made with no reference to section 19 and whether or not the application actually falls appropriately within section 19.  The reason why I stand to my feet I'm neutral on this because it doesn't affect my clients, but with assistance to you, sir, the fundamental principle is firstly set out in section 18, which gives a presumption that these hearings should be heard in public, and the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Yes, Mr Mansfield.  MR MANSFIELD: Yes, I'm obliged. I wonder whether I might, on behalf of Ms Wahabi she's sitting right here.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: I am sorry she's been so inconvenienced. It is very unsatisfactory.  MR MANSFIELD: I'm very concerned about her welfare as a witness, because there are two sets of proceedings, this one and the other one. We haven't been told whether it's a fixture I was told informally it is a fixture for Monday.  I wonder whether we might be given a little time now, because obviously one way round, having a hearing on Friday when she is supposed to be giving evidence on Monday, may be prolixed to say the least of it. It may be possible to resolve this this afternoon if, for example I haven't discussed it with anyone if she's due to give evidence on Monday, she goes and gives evidence on Monday and not here until after she's given evidence there.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: That may well be the case, and I see the force of that, and this is why I said I thought Ms Clarke had achieved her object by getting this application on rather late so that we can't hear		

1					
1	MR MANSFIELD: Well, there is another point here. I don't	1	supported us in these kind of applications, but they		
2	wish to necessarily espouse the possibility that it's		don't!		
3	been done on purpose, but nothing has been said in this	3	So as a multiple loser in this area, particularly		
4			for terrorist trials, it might be said in all		
5	5 today, other than somebody has woken up to maybe custody		seriousness we understand that Mr Gomes and Ms Wahabi		
6	time limits? It could've been done two weeks, three	6	will talk about flat 182, and that's what has brought		
7	7 weeks, four weeks ago, because her evidence has been		you here late. But what's the difference with Roy Smith		
8	8 known in both, and it's really very unfortunate, and it		this morning, or Nadia Jafari last week? That's there,		
9	9 may be you have something to say to the Metropolitan		that's the fraud trial next week, it's not the same.		
10	Police or whoever else about why it's come on now. But		But, sir, if you're minded to adjourn this, all		
11	11 we are dealing with a situation where I would ask for		I would say is what needs to happen very quickly is that		
12	some consideration for the witness.		we are free, one way or another, perhaps through you,		
13	13 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: You don't need to persuade me that		for you to explain exactly what this is about and		
14	it's deeply unsatisfactory that the first I knew of this	14	consider an interim reporting restriction so that		
15	was after the close of play yesterday afternoon, and	15	everyone out there is included in the current		
16	I do think that, as I said already, this is a matter	16	(inaudible).		
17	that the Crown Prosecution Service should come along and	17	I would make a plea for it not to be on Friday		
18	deal with in its own capacity. I would expect, if the	18	because there is so much work that goes on on Friday, as		
19	application is pursued, as it may be because of the	19	you know.		
20	position of Mr Gomes	20	SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: The trouble is finding a date when		
21	MR MANSFIELD: Well, that's true.	21	we can do it without interfering with a very tight		
22	SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: that I shall want to be helped on	22	timetable.		
23	things like custody time limits, what the opportunities	23	MR FRIEDMAN: One is obviously concerned about both the		
24	are for extending custody time limits, what are the	24	witnesses who are willing and able to give evidence as		
25	prospects for the trial, and a number of things of that	25	soon as possible. So that's all I wanted to add.		
	Dago 17		Daga 10		
	Page 17		Page 19		
1	kind, not excluding some of the points I've already	1	SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: All right, thank you. Well, it's		
2	raised about the balancing act and so on, and I think	2	obvious that you don't think I overestimated the		
3	the press ought to be heard as well. And I'll hear	3	prospect of succeeding on any application to discharge		
4	other CP representatives if they want to be heard on it.	4	the indictment.		
5	MR FRIEDMAN: Can I just briefly particularly because	5	MR FRIEDMAN: Well, I stand amongst a group of very		
6	I act for other members of this extended family.	6	experienced losers, where we have had far more prejudice		
7	SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Yes, I know.	1 7			
8	AD EDIEDMAN II ' (1 1 2' Cd 1' c' d	7	to put before the courts and we've lost these cases in		
-	MR FRIEDMAN: Having not had notice of the application, they	8	to put before the courts and we've lost these cases in the European Court of Human Rights as well. So		
9	came up to me before they went on and said, "We've been		•		
		8	the European Court of Human Rights as well. So		
9	came up to me before they went on and said, "We've been	8 9	the European Court of Human Rights as well. So SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: That's all right, Mr Friedman, don't		
9 10	came up to me before they went on and said, "We've been seen by police liaison officers and we know what this is	8 9 10	the European Court of Human Rights as well. So SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: That's all right, Mr Friedman, don't worry.		
9 10 11	came up to me before they went on and said, "We've been seen by police liaison officers and we know what this is about, it's a case about fraud", which rather takes us	8 9 10 11	the European Court of Human Rights as well. So SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: That's all right, Mr Friedman, don't worry. MR FRIEDMAN: It's not custody time limits, it's about the		
9 10 11 12	came up to me before they went on and said, "We've been seen by police liaison officers and we know what this is about, it's a case about fraud", which rather takes us to where we should go right now, because respectfully,	8 9 10 11 12	the European Court of Human Rights as well. So SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: That's all right, Mr Friedman, don't worry. MR FRIEDMAN: It's not custody time limits, it's about the due diligence of the prosecuting authority, and not		
9 10 11 12 13	came up to me before they went on and said, "We've been seen by police liaison officers and we know what this is about, it's a case about fraud", which rather takes us to where we should go right now, because respectfully, if you are thinking of adjourning this, I haven't heard	8 9 10 11 12 13	the European Court of Human Rights as well. So SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: That's all right, Mr Friedman, don't worry.  MR FRIEDMAN: It's not custody time limits, it's about the due diligence of the prosecuting authority, and not about some prejudice that came out beyond their control.		
9 10 11 12 13 14	came up to me before they went on and said, "We've been seen by police liaison officers and we know what this is about, it's a case about fraud", which rather takes us to where we should go right now, because respectfully, if you are thinking of adjourning this, I haven't heard anything now that takes this beyond, with respect, the	8 9 10 11 12 13 14	the European Court of Human Rights as well. So SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: That's all right, Mr Friedman, don't worry.  MR FRIEDMAN: It's not custody time limits, it's about the due diligence of the prosecuting authority, and not about some prejudice that came out beyond their control. So it wouldn't for a moment, in my respectful		
9 10 11 12 13 14 15	came up to me before they went on and said, "We've been seen by police liaison officers and we know what this is about, it's a case about fraud", which rather takes us to where we should go right now, because respectfully, if you are thinking of adjourning this, I haven't heard anything now that takes this beyond, with respect, the bog-standard situation where you make the application in	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	the European Court of Human Rights as well. So SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: That's all right, Mr Friedman, don't worry.  MR FRIEDMAN: It's not custody time limits, it's about the due diligence of the prosecuting authority, and not about some prejudice that came out beyond their control. So it wouldn't for a moment, in my respectful submission, even if there was an application to adjourn		
9 10 11 12 13 14 15	came up to me before they went on and said, "We've been seen by police liaison officers and we know what this is about, it's a case about fraud", which rather takes us to where we should go right now, because respectfully, if you are thinking of adjourning this, I haven't heard anything now that takes this beyond, with respect, the bog-standard situation where you make the application in open court and the judge holds the ring until it's	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	the European Court of Human Rights as well. So SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: That's all right, Mr Friedman, don't worry.  MR FRIEDMAN: It's not custody time limits, it's about the due diligence of the prosecuting authority, and not about some prejudice that came out beyond their control. So it wouldn't for a moment, in my respectful submission, even if there was an application to adjourn the trial, to the trial judge in the Crown Court next week, get anywhere on custody time limits. That's my stance on it.		
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	came up to me before they went on and said, "We've been seen by police liaison officers and we know what this is about, it's a case about fraud", which rather takes us to where we should go right now, because respectfully, if you are thinking of adjourning this, I haven't heard anything now that takes this beyond, with respect, the bog-standard situation where you make the application in open court and the judge holds the ring until it's ultimately determined by saying: I will make a reporting	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	the European Court of Human Rights as well. So SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: That's all right, Mr Friedman, don't worry.  MR FRIEDMAN: It's not custody time limits, it's about the due diligence of the prosecuting authority, and not about some prejudice that came out beyond their control. So it wouldn't for a moment, in my respectful submission, even if there was an application to adjourn the trial, to the trial judge in the Crown Court next week, get anywhere on custody time limits. That's my		
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	came up to me before they went on and said, "We've been seen by police liaison officers and we know what this is about, it's a case about fraud", which rather takes us to where we should go right now, because respectfully, if you are thinking of adjourning this, I haven't heard anything now that takes this beyond, with respect, the bog-standard situation where you make the application in open court and the judge holds the ring until it's ultimately determined by saying: I will make a reporting order on the application itself, but there seems no reason why the people out there shouldn't know what is in its outline a standard application.	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	the European Court of Human Rights as well. So SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: That's all right, Mr Friedman, don't worry.  MR FRIEDMAN: It's not custody time limits, it's about the due diligence of the prosecuting authority, and not about some prejudice that came out beyond their control. So it wouldn't for a moment, in my respectful submission, even if there was an application to adjourn the trial, to the trial judge in the Crown Court next week, get anywhere on custody time limits. That's my stance on it.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Thank you. Yes, Mr Stein.		
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	came up to me before they went on and said, "We've been seen by police liaison officers and we know what this is about, it's a case about fraud", which rather takes us to where we should go right now, because respectfully, if you are thinking of adjourning this, I haven't heard anything now that takes this beyond, with respect, the bog-standard situation where you make the application in open court and the judge holds the ring until it's ultimately determined by saying: I will make a reporting order on the application itself, but there seems no reason why the people out there shouldn't know what is	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	the European Court of Human Rights as well. So SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: That's all right, Mr Friedman, don't worry.  MR FRIEDMAN: It's not custody time limits, it's about the due diligence of the prosecuting authority, and not about some prejudice that came out beyond their control. So it wouldn't for a moment, in my respectful submission, even if there was an application to adjourn the trial, to the trial judge in the Crown Court next week, get anywhere on custody time limits. That's my stance on it.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Thank you. Yes, Mr Stein.  MR STEIN: My bite of the cherry in relation to the basic		
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	came up to me before they went on and said, "We've been seen by police liaison officers and we know what this is about, it's a case about fraud", which rather takes us to where we should go right now, because respectfully, if you are thinking of adjourning this, I haven't heard anything now that takes this beyond, with respect, the bog-standard situation where you make the application in open court and the judge holds the ring until it's ultimately determined by saying: I will make a reporting order on the application itself, but there seems no reason why the people out there shouldn't know what is in its outline a standard application.  Before I sit down, I can't stop myself from saying that on this side and over there, there are barristers	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	the European Court of Human Rights as well. So SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: That's all right, Mr Friedman, don't worry.  MR FRIEDMAN: It's not custody time limits, it's about the due diligence of the prosecuting authority, and not about some prejudice that came out beyond their control. So it wouldn't for a moment, in my respectful submission, even if there was an application to adjourn the trial, to the trial judge in the Crown Court next week, get anywhere on custody time limits. That's my stance on it.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Thank you. Yes, Mr Stein.  MR STEIN: My bite of the cherry in relation to the basic law, it's an exceptional jurisdiction to stay, very		
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	came up to me before they went on and said, "We've been seen by police liaison officers and we know what this is about, it's a case about fraud", which rather takes us to where we should go right now, because respectfully, if you are thinking of adjourning this, I haven't heard anything now that takes this beyond, with respect, the bog-standard situation where you make the application in open court and the judge holds the ring until it's ultimately determined by saying: I will make a reporting order on the application itself, but there seems no reason why the people out there shouldn't know what is in its outline a standard application.  Before I sit down, I can't stop myself from saying that on this side and over there, there are barristers that have never got anywhere near getting a stay or	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	the European Court of Human Rights as well. So SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: That's all right, Mr Friedman, don't worry.  MR FRIEDMAN: It's not custody time limits, it's about the due diligence of the prosecuting authority, and not about some prejudice that came out beyond their control. So it wouldn't for a moment, in my respectful submission, even if there was an application to adjourn the trial, to the trial judge in the Crown Court next week, get anywhere on custody time limits. That's my stance on it.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Thank you. Yes, Mr Stein.  MR STEIN: My bite of the cherry in relation to the basic law, it's an exceptional jurisdiction to stay, very rarely applied.		
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	came up to me before they went on and said, "We've been seen by police liaison officers and we know what this is about, it's a case about fraud", which rather takes us to where we should go right now, because respectfully, if you are thinking of adjourning this, I haven't heard anything now that takes this beyond, with respect, the bog-standard situation where you make the application in open court and the judge holds the ring until it's ultimately determined by saying: I will make a reporting order on the application itself, but there seems no reason why the people out there shouldn't know what is in its outline a standard application.  Before I sit down, I can't stop myself from saying that on this side and over there, there are barristers that have never got anywhere near getting a stay or an adjourned trial on what has been very eloquently	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	the European Court of Human Rights as well. So SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: That's all right, Mr Friedman, don't worry.  MR FRIEDMAN: It's not custody time limits, it's about the due diligence of the prosecuting authority, and not about some prejudice that came out beyond their control. So it wouldn't for a moment, in my respectful submission, even if there was an application to adjourn the trial, to the trial judge in the Crown Court next week, get anywhere on custody time limits. That's my stance on it.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Thank you. Yes, Mr Stein.  MR STEIN: My bite of the cherry in relation to the basic law, it's an exceptional jurisdiction to stay, very rarely applied. In terms of the question of custody time limits,		
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	came up to me before they went on and said, "We've been seen by police liaison officers and we know what this is about, it's a case about fraud", which rather takes us to where we should go right now, because respectfully, if you are thinking of adjourning this, I haven't heard anything now that takes this beyond, with respect, the bog-standard situation where you make the application in open court and the judge holds the ring until it's ultimately determined by saying: I will make a reporting order on the application itself, but there seems no reason why the people out there shouldn't know what is in its outline a standard application.  Before I sit down, I can't stop myself from saying that on this side and over there, there are barristers that have never got anywhere near getting a stay or	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	the European Court of Human Rights as well. So SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: That's all right, Mr Friedman, don't worry.  MR FRIEDMAN: It's not custody time limits, it's about the due diligence of the prosecuting authority, and not about some prejudice that came out beyond their control. So it wouldn't for a moment, in my respectful submission, even if there was an application to adjourn the trial, to the trial judge in the Crown Court next week, get anywhere on custody time limits. That's my stance on it.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Thank you. Yes, Mr Stein.  MR STEIN: My bite of the cherry in relation to the basic law, it's an exceptional jurisdiction to stay, very rarely applied.		
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	came up to me before they went on and said, "We've been seen by police liaison officers and we know what this is about, it's a case about fraud", which rather takes us to where we should go right now, because respectfully, if you are thinking of adjourning this, I haven't heard anything now that takes this beyond, with respect, the bog-standard situation where you make the application in open court and the judge holds the ring until it's ultimately determined by saying: I will make a reporting order on the application itself, but there seems no reason why the people out there shouldn't know what is in its outline a standard application.  Before I sit down, I can't stop myself from saying that on this side and over there, there are barristers that have never got anywhere near getting a stay or an adjourned trial on what has been very eloquently	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	the European Court of Human Rights as well. So SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: That's all right, Mr Friedman, don't worry.  MR FRIEDMAN: It's not custody time limits, it's about the due diligence of the prosecuting authority, and not about some prejudice that came out beyond their control. So it wouldn't for a moment, in my respectful submission, even if there was an application to adjourn the trial, to the trial judge in the Crown Court next week, get anywhere on custody time limits. That's my stance on it.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Thank you. Yes, Mr Stein.  MR STEIN: My bite of the cherry in relation to the basic law, it's an exceptional jurisdiction to stay, very rarely applied. In terms of the question of custody time limits,		

1	would not support an application to extend. This is	1	driving a coach and horses through the remainder of the
2	2 actually a demonstration of failure of due diligence on		timetable at 10 o'clock, unless other arrangements
3	what we have heard in the way the CPS have not acted.	3	have been made of a kind that mean that's it's not
4	So that's that at the moment.	4	pursued, and that's possible.
5	•		MR STEIN: Sir, would you allow this possibility: that we be
6			provided copies of the application as soon as possible,
7	7 to be the potential for putting it over to Friday, which		in other words this afternoon
8	8 would have certainly for him and his family a knock-on		SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: I thought I indicated that.
9	9 effect of the question of: will he be giving evidence on		MR STEIN: and then if, sir, you are available, if there
10	the Monday? Will he also be giving evidence on the	10	are representations that we believe can properly be made
11	Tuesday? And so on.	11	today, that we could return to it this afternoon?
12	What we respectfully invite you to do today, sir, is	12	SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Let's see how we go. I think
13	this: see what we can do today in relation to this		certainly the first step, you must have copies of the
14	application. The first step for that is for us to see	14	I think you'll need the indictment and the written
15	the written application.	15	application. Is there anything else you think you might
16	16 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Yes.		need that I have?
17	MR STEIN: Then we can return back and make some rather more	17	MR STEIN: Case summary may be of assistance.
18	sensible submissions as to the further progress of this	18	SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: I don't have that.
19	application once we have sight of it. It may be that we	19	MS CLARKE: I don't personally have that either, sir.
20	can persuade you, sir, to in fact deal with it today and	20	SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Right.
21	get rid of it. If so	21	Well, Ms Clarke, you have that, have you? You can
22	SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Well, I think there's more to this	22	serve all this material? It's not very bulky.
23	than I ought to deal with, if possible, just on the	23	MS CLARKE: It's not.
24	hoof, because it does raise, in my view, at least some	24	SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Straight away, as soon as possible.
25	quite important questions in relation to the balance	25	MR STEIN: Thank you.
	Page 21		Page 23
	0		<u> </u>
1	between open justice and prejudicing current	1	SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: We'll return to this on Friday at
2	proceedings.	2	10 o'clock.
3	I am concerned about the position of the press as	3	At that stage, either you will appear on behalf of
4	well, because they're the people who are as affected as	4	the CPS or someone else will appear on behalf of the CPS
5	anyone on behalf of the public.	5	in your place, and be prepared to deal with all the
6	So I'm sorry, Mr Stein	6	information we may need in relation to the trial and
7	MR STEIN: We would ask, though, sight of the application	7	other matters regarding this defendant.
8	being the starting point.	8	MS CLARKE: Certainly.
9	SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Yes.	9	SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: All right?
10	MR STEIN: Then the possibility of making further	10	MS CLARKE: Thank you, sir.
11	representations today before we all depart, so at least	11	MR FRIEDMAN: Sir, in terms of the interim position, would
12	we can take stock as to what we've heard so far.	12	you feel that you are in a position today to tell the
13	SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: What I am going to say is I am going	13	people here what the application is about, but make
14	to adjourn this application. I am going to treat	14	an interim order pending its resolution hopefully on
15	Ms Clarke as appearing on behalf of the CPS as a sort of	15	Friday?
16	deputy, I don't know quite how we put it.	16	SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: An interim order of what kind?
17	MR STEIN: Agent, proxy, yes.	17	MR FRIEDMAN: The fact is we've been in closed session here.
18	SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: All right.	18	That's not a situation that we would want to maintain
19	I've already said I think the CPS ought to make this	19	unless absolutely necessary. Therefore, what I am
20	application in their own right. It ought to be served	20	asking for is that you tell the members of the public
21	on all the legal representatives for the witnesses and	21	when they return effectively what the application is
22	the other BSRs core participants.	22	about. There's nothing that has been said here that in
23	I will adjourn it on that basis and continue the	23	my respectful submission can't be said in public, but
24	hearing on Friday I'm sorry about that, but I think	24	that you make a reporting order about it so it's not
25	it's the only sensible thing to do without really	25	reported beyond open court.
	Page 22		Page 24
	FASE ZZ	1	rage 24

	1 I say that because I've never been in a situation in		1 substance of the application, but that it was described		
2	, 11		2 in the terms that you just set out, sir.		
3	has been made, where it hasn't been made in open court	3	SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: There is nothing in the substance of		
4	but that there's been an order to hold the ring. And	5	the application yet, is there? It's still part heard.		
5			MS CLARKE: Not having gone through this process now, sir,		
6	6 that that's the norm no. Well, Mr Mansfield would		no.		
7	7 want a say. Whether it's the norm or not, that's my		SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Yes, Mr Mansfield.		
8	8 application, that effectively you allow this application		MR MANSFIELD: Sorry to make it slightly more difficult.		
9	9 and what has gone on this afternoon to be made public,		Again, I'm concerned with Ms Wahabi's particular		
10	and you can summarise the position when it comes in. We		interests here, and that is that if an interim order is		
11	can be in a position to explain to any client that asks	11	made which doesn't really reveal what it's all about		
12	what it's about, but that you make a reporting order, an	12	other than it's to do with evidence that would've been		
13	interim one, that will then be reviewed.		heard today that might influence other proceedings, it's		
14	That is my application arising out of what's gone on		not going to be difficult for people to work out who is		
15	this afternoon.	15	at the centre of this.		
16	SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: All right. Do you want to say	16	I would submit that there's risk of disproportionate		
17	anything about that, Ms Clarke?	17	prejudice being attached to somebody who is perfectly		
18	MS CLARKE: Well, sir, I think it's a matter for you to deal	18	innocent; in other words, what is the problem that		
19	with whether it would be an interim reporting	19	surrounds her in her giving evidence? In fact, you've		
20	restriction or whether it's just a reporting restriction	20	already, if I may say so, hit the nail on the head:		
21	actually for the time period I've requested. I'm not	21	there isn't any prejudice, in fact, in giving evidence		
22	sure if that's just semantics.	22	here, merely the fact, we've seen it many times		
23	SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: I mean, in a sense your substantive	23	SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Well, I think, to put it in		
24	application doesn't have any content because Mrs Wahabi	24	a nutshell, the suggestion is that if she gives evidence		
25	is not going to give her evidence this afternoon.		and appears to be a very sound and credible witness, it		
Page 25			Page 27		
	1 age 25		1 age 27		
1	MS CLARKE: No.	1	will be said that that will somehow prejudice the		
2	SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: She's not going to give it before	2	defendant, because the jury, all of whom will no doubt		
3	Friday because of our existing timetable.	1 2			
		3	have been watching the live streaming of this inquiry,		
4	MS CLARKE: Yes.	4	will say, "Oh, it's this lady again, we know how		
4 5	SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: When the application resumes on	4 5	will say, "Oh, it's this lady again, we know how brilliant she was on the last occasion", or whatever it		
5 6	SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: When the application resumes on Friday, we'll see where it takes us.	4 5 6	will say, "Oh, it's this lady again, we know how brilliant she was on the last occasion", or whatever it might be.		
5 6 7	SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: When the application resumes on Friday, we'll see where it takes us.  MS CLARKE: Yes.	4 5 6 7	will say, "Oh, it's this lady again, we know how brilliant she was on the last occasion", or whatever it might be.  I have put it perhaps rather unkindly, but I think		
5 6 7 8	SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: When the application resumes on Friday, we'll see where it takes us.	4 5 6 7 8	will say, "Oh, it's this lady again, we know how brilliant she was on the last occasion", or whatever it might be.  I have put it perhaps rather unkindly, but I think that's the nature of the complaint, isn't it?		
5 6 7	SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: When the application resumes on Friday, we'll see where it takes us.  MS CLARKE: Yes.	4 5 6 7 8 9	will say, "Oh, it's this lady again, we know how brilliant she was on the last occasion", or whatever it might be.  I have put it perhaps rather unkindly, but I think		
5 6 7 8 9	SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: When the application resumes on Friday, we'll see where it takes us.  MS CLARKE: Yes.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: The only question is whether	4 5 6 7 8 9	will say, "Oh, it's this lady again, we know how brilliant she was on the last occasion", or whatever it might be.  I have put it perhaps rather unkindly, but I think that's the nature of the complaint, isn't it?  MR MANSFIELD: And of course that SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: In my experience, that's a novel		
5 6 7 8 9 10 11	SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: When the application resumes on Friday, we'll see where it takes us.  MS CLARKE: Yes.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: The only question is whether I maintain a reporting restriction on the proceedings on your application so far.  MS CLARKE: Yes, yes.	4 5 6 7 8 9 10	will say, "Oh, it's this lady again, we know how brilliant she was on the last occasion", or whatever it might be.  I have put it perhaps rather unkindly, but I think that's the nature of the complaint, isn't it?  MR MANSFIELD: And of course that SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: In my experience, that's a novel but still		
5 6 7 8 9 10 11	SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: When the application resumes on Friday, we'll see where it takes us.  MS CLARKE: Yes.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: The only question is whether I maintain a reporting restriction on the proceedings on your application so far.  MS CLARKE: Yes, yes.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: I think what Mr Friedman is	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	will say, "Oh, it's this lady again, we know how brilliant she was on the last occasion", or whatever it might be.  I have put it perhaps rather unkindly, but I think that's the nature of the complaint, isn't it?  MR MANSFIELD: And of course that  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: In my experience, that's a novel but still  MR MANSFIELD: doesn't reflect on the witness at all, but		
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: When the application resumes on Friday, we'll see where it takes us.  MS CLARKE: Yes.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: The only question is whether I maintain a reporting restriction on the proceedings on your application so far.  MS CLARKE: Yes, yes.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: I think what Mr Friedman is suggesting is that I should at least make an open order	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	will say, "Oh, it's this lady again, we know how brilliant she was on the last occasion", or whatever it might be.  I have put it perhaps rather unkindly, but I think that's the nature of the complaint, isn't it?  MR MANSFIELD: And of course that SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: In my experience, that's a novel but still  MR MANSFIELD: doesn't reflect on the witness at all, but if in fact it's all shrouded by the interim order, and		
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: When the application resumes on Friday, we'll see where it takes us.  MS CLARKE: Yes.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: The only question is whether I maintain a reporting restriction on the proceedings on your application so far.  MS CLARKE: Yes, yes.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: I think what Mr Friedman is suggesting is that I should at least make an open order that this part of our proceedings not be reported, and	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	will say, "Oh, it's this lady again, we know how brilliant she was on the last occasion", or whatever it might be.  I have put it perhaps rather unkindly, but I think that's the nature of the complaint, isn't it?  MR MANSFIELD: And of course that SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: In my experience, that's a novel but still  MR MANSFIELD: doesn't reflect on the witness at all, but if in fact it's all shrouded by the interim order, and obviously it would be, we would be very concerned about		
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: When the application resumes on Friday, we'll see where it takes us.  MS CLARKE: Yes.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: The only question is whether I maintain a reporting restriction on the proceedings on your application so far.  MS CLARKE: Yes, yes.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: I think what Mr Friedman is suggesting is that I should at least make an open order that this part of our proceedings not be reported, and tell people that it's because an application was made in	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	will say, "Oh, it's this lady again, we know how brilliant she was on the last occasion", or whatever it might be.  I have put it perhaps rather unkindly, but I think that's the nature of the complaint, isn't it?  MR MANSFIELD: And of course that SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: In my experience, that's a novel but still  MR MANSFIELD: doesn't reflect on the witness at all, but if in fact it's all shrouded by the interim order, and obviously it would be, we would be very concerned about that disproportionate prejudice to her for both		
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: When the application resumes on Friday, we'll see where it takes us.  MS CLARKE: Yes.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: The only question is whether I maintain a reporting restriction on the proceedings on your application so far.  MS CLARKE: Yes, yes.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: I think what Mr Friedman is suggesting is that I should at least make an open order that this part of our proceedings not be reported, and tell people that it's because an application was made in relation to certain evidence on the basis that it might	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	will say, "Oh, it's this lady again, we know how brilliant she was on the last occasion", or whatever it might be.  I have put it perhaps rather unkindly, but I think that's the nature of the complaint, isn't it?  MR MANSFIELD: And of course that SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: In my experience, that's a novel but still  MR MANSFIELD: doesn't reflect on the witness at all, but if in fact it's all shrouded by the interim order, and obviously it would be, we would be very concerned about that disproportionate prejudice to her for both proceedings, as it now turns out.		
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: When the application resumes on Friday, we'll see where it takes us.  MS CLARKE: Yes.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: The only question is whether I maintain a reporting restriction on the proceedings on your application so far.  MS CLARKE: Yes, yes.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: I think what Mr Friedman is suggesting is that I should at least make an open order that this part of our proceedings not be reported, and tell people that it's because an application was made in relation to certain evidence on the basis that it might interfere with proceedings elsewhere.	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	will say, "Oh, it's this lady again, we know how brilliant she was on the last occasion", or whatever it might be.  I have put it perhaps rather unkindly, but I think that's the nature of the complaint, isn't it?  MR MANSFIELD: And of course that  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: In my experience, that's a novel but still  MR MANSFIELD: doesn't reflect on the witness at all, but if in fact it's all shrouded by the interim order, and obviously it would be, we would be very concerned about that disproportionate prejudice to her for both proceedings, as it now turns out.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Well, maybe. I find it a bit		
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: When the application resumes on Friday, we'll see where it takes us.  MS CLARKE: Yes.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: The only question is whether I maintain a reporting restriction on the proceedings on your application so far.  MS CLARKE: Yes, yes.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: I think what Mr Friedman is suggesting is that I should at least make an open order that this part of our proceedings not be reported, and tell people that it's because an application was made in relation to certain evidence on the basis that it might interfere with proceedings elsewhere.  Now, are you going to object to that?	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	will say, "Oh, it's this lady again, we know how brilliant she was on the last occasion", or whatever it might be.  I have put it perhaps rather unkindly, but I think that's the nature of the complaint, isn't it?  MR MANSFIELD: And of course that  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: In my experience, that's a novel but still  MR MANSFIELD: doesn't reflect on the witness at all, but if in fact it's all shrouded by the interim order, and obviously it would be, we would be very concerned about that disproportionate prejudice to her for both proceedings, as it now turns out.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Well, maybe. I find it a bit difficult to see how it could prejudice her, but still,		
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: When the application resumes on Friday, we'll see where it takes us.  MS CLARKE: Yes.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: The only question is whether I maintain a reporting restriction on the proceedings on your application so far.  MS CLARKE: Yes, yes.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: I think what Mr Friedman is suggesting is that I should at least make an open order that this part of our proceedings not be reported, and tell people that it's because an application was made in relation to certain evidence on the basis that it might interfere with proceedings elsewhere.  Now, are you going to object to that?  MR MANSFIELD: Yes	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	will say, "Oh, it's this lady again, we know how brilliant she was on the last occasion", or whatever it might be.  I have put it perhaps rather unkindly, but I think that's the nature of the complaint, isn't it?  MR MANSFIELD: And of course that SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: In my experience, that's a novel but still  MR MANSFIELD: doesn't reflect on the witness at all, but if in fact it's all shrouded by the interim order, and obviously it would be, we would be very concerned about that disproportionate prejudice to her for both proceedings, as it now turns out.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Well, maybe. I find it a bit difficult to see how it could prejudice her, but still, I wouldn't want to do that.		
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: When the application resumes on Friday, we'll see where it takes us.  MS CLARKE: Yes.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: The only question is whether I maintain a reporting restriction on the proceedings on your application so far.  MS CLARKE: Yes, yes.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: I think what Mr Friedman is suggesting is that I should at least make an open order that this part of our proceedings not be reported, and tell people that it's because an application was made in relation to certain evidence on the basis that it might interfere with proceedings elsewhere.  Now, are you going to object to that?  MR MANSFIELD: Yes  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Mr Mansfield, I'll come to that in	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	will say, "Oh, it's this lady again, we know how brilliant she was on the last occasion", or whatever it might be.  I have put it perhaps rather unkindly, but I think that's the nature of the complaint, isn't it?  MR MANSFIELD: And of course that SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: In my experience, that's a novel but still  MR MANSFIELD: doesn't reflect on the witness at all, but if in fact it's all shrouded by the interim order, and obviously it would be, we would be very concerned about that disproportionate prejudice to her for both proceedings, as it now turns out.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Well, maybe. I find it a bit difficult to see how it could prejudice her, but still, I wouldn't want to do that.  MS CLARKE: Sir, may I add one further matter? That if any		
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: When the application resumes on Friday, we'll see where it takes us.  MS CLARKE: Yes.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: The only question is whether I maintain a reporting restriction on the proceedings on your application so far.  MS CLARKE: Yes, yes.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: I think what Mr Friedman is suggesting is that I should at least make an open order that this part of our proceedings not be reported, and tell people that it's because an application was made in relation to certain evidence on the basis that it might interfere with proceedings elsewhere.  Now, are you going to object to that?  MR MANSFIELD: Yes  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Mr Mansfield, I'll come to that in a moment.	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	will say, "Oh, it's this lady again, we know how brilliant she was on the last occasion", or whatever it might be.  I have put it perhaps rather unkindly, but I think that's the nature of the complaint, isn't it?  MR MANSFIELD: And of course that SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: In my experience, that's a novel but still  MR MANSFIELD: doesn't reflect on the witness at all, but if in fact it's all shrouded by the interim order, and obviously it would be, we would be very concerned about that disproportionate prejudice to her for both proceedings, as it now turns out.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Well, maybe. I find it a bit difficult to see how it could prejudice her, but still, I wouldn't want to do that.  MS CLARKE: Sir, may I add one further matter? That if any interim order is to be in place, it will also cover		
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: When the application resumes on Friday, we'll see where it takes us.  MS CLARKE: Yes.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: The only question is whether I maintain a reporting restriction on the proceedings on your application so far.  MS CLARKE: Yes, yes.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: I think what Mr Friedman is suggesting is that I should at least make an open order that this part of our proceedings not be reported, and tell people that it's because an application was made in relation to certain evidence on the basis that it might interfere with proceedings elsewhere.  Now, are you going to object to that?  MR MANSFIELD: Yes  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Mr Mansfield, I'll come to that in a moment.  MS CLARKE: Sorry, sir, I'm trying to listen in two	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	will say, "Oh, it's this lady again, we know how brilliant she was on the last occasion", or whatever it might be.  I have put it perhaps rather unkindly, but I think that's the nature of the complaint, isn't it?  MR MANSFIELD: And of course that  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: In my experience, that's a novel but still  MR MANSFIELD: doesn't reflect on the witness at all, but if in fact it's all shrouded by the interim order, and obviously it would be, we would be very concerned about that disproportionate prejudice to her for both proceedings, as it now turns out.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Well, maybe. I find it a bit difficult to see how it could prejudice her, but still, I wouldn't want to do that.  MS CLARKE: Sir, may I add one further matter? That if any interim order is to be in place, it will also cover publication of the application document itself and any		
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: When the application resumes on Friday, we'll see where it takes us.  MS CLARKE: Yes.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: The only question is whether I maintain a reporting restriction on the proceedings on your application so far.  MS CLARKE: Yes, yes.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: I think what Mr Friedman is suggesting is that I should at least make an open order that this part of our proceedings not be reported, and tell people that it's because an application was made in relation to certain evidence on the basis that it might interfere with proceedings elsewhere.  Now, are you going to object to that?  MR MANSFIELD: Yes  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Mr Mansfield, I'll come to that in a moment.  MS CLARKE: Sorry, sir, I'm trying to listen in two directions at once.	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	will say, "Oh, it's this lady again, we know how brilliant she was on the last occasion", or whatever it might be.  I have put it perhaps rather unkindly, but I think that's the nature of the complaint, isn't it?  MR MANSFIELD: And of course that  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: In my experience, that's a novel but still  MR MANSFIELD: doesn't reflect on the witness at all, but if in fact it's all shrouded by the interim order, and obviously it would be, we would be very concerned about that disproportionate prejudice to her for both proceedings, as it now turns out.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Well, maybe. I find it a bit difficult to see how it could prejudice her, but still, I wouldn't want to do that.  MS CLARKE: Sir, may I add one further matter? That if any interim order is to be in place, it will also cover publication of the application document itself and any documents that we supply as directed by you, sir, so the		
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: When the application resumes on Friday, we'll see where it takes us.  MS CLARKE: Yes.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: The only question is whether I maintain a reporting restriction on the proceedings on your application so far.  MS CLARKE: Yes, yes.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: I think what Mr Friedman is suggesting is that I should at least make an open order that this part of our proceedings not be reported, and tell people that it's because an application was made in relation to certain evidence on the basis that it might interfere with proceedings elsewhere.  Now, are you going to object to that?  MR MANSFIELD: Yes  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Mr Mansfield, I'll come to that in a moment.  MS CLARKE: Sorry, sir, I'm trying to listen in two directions at once.  Yes, that would be appropriate as long as the	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	will say, "Oh, it's this lady again, we know how brilliant she was on the last occasion", or whatever it might be.  I have put it perhaps rather unkindly, but I think that's the nature of the complaint, isn't it?  MR MANSFIELD: And of course that  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: In my experience, that's a novel but still  MR MANSFIELD: doesn't reflect on the witness at all, but if in fact it's all shrouded by the interim order, and obviously it would be, we would be very concerned about that disproportionate prejudice to her for both proceedings, as it now turns out.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Well, maybe. I find it a bit difficult to see how it could prejudice her, but still, I wouldn't want to do that.  MS CLARKE: Sir, may I add one further matter? That if any interim order is to be in place, it will also cover publication of the application document itself and any documents that we supply as directed by you, sir, so the further publication of the application itself and the		
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: When the application resumes on Friday, we'll see where it takes us.  MS CLARKE: Yes.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: The only question is whether I maintain a reporting restriction on the proceedings on your application so far.  MS CLARKE: Yes, yes.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: I think what Mr Friedman is suggesting is that I should at least make an open order that this part of our proceedings not be reported, and tell people that it's because an application was made in relation to certain evidence on the basis that it might interfere with proceedings elsewhere.  Now, are you going to object to that?  MR MANSFIELD: Yes  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Mr Mansfield, I'll come to that in a moment.  MS CLARKE: Sorry, sir, I'm trying to listen in two directions at once.	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	will say, "Oh, it's this lady again, we know how brilliant she was on the last occasion", or whatever it might be.  I have put it perhaps rather unkindly, but I think that's the nature of the complaint, isn't it?  MR MANSFIELD: And of course that  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: In my experience, that's a novel but still  MR MANSFIELD: doesn't reflect on the witness at all, but if in fact it's all shrouded by the interim order, and obviously it would be, we would be very concerned about that disproportionate prejudice to her for both proceedings, as it now turns out.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Well, maybe. I find it a bit difficult to see how it could prejudice her, but still, I wouldn't want to do that.  MS CLARKE: Sir, may I add one further matter? That if any interim order is to be in place, it will also cover publication of the application document itself and any documents that we supply as directed by you, sir, so the		
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: When the application resumes on Friday, we'll see where it takes us.  MS CLARKE: Yes.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: The only question is whether I maintain a reporting restriction on the proceedings on your application so far.  MS CLARKE: Yes, yes.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: I think what Mr Friedman is suggesting is that I should at least make an open order that this part of our proceedings not be reported, and tell people that it's because an application was made in relation to certain evidence on the basis that it might interfere with proceedings elsewhere.  Now, are you going to object to that?  MR MANSFIELD: Yes  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Mr Mansfield, I'll come to that in a moment.  MS CLARKE: Sorry, sir, I'm trying to listen in two directions at once.  Yes, that would be appropriate as long as the	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	will say, "Oh, it's this lady again, we know how brilliant she was on the last occasion", or whatever it might be.  I have put it perhaps rather unkindly, but I think that's the nature of the complaint, isn't it?  MR MANSFIELD: And of course that  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: In my experience, that's a novel but still  MR MANSFIELD: doesn't reflect on the witness at all, but if in fact it's all shrouded by the interim order, and obviously it would be, we would be very concerned about that disproportionate prejudice to her for both proceedings, as it now turns out.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Well, maybe. I find it a bit difficult to see how it could prejudice her, but still, I wouldn't want to do that.  MS CLARKE: Sir, may I add one further matter? That if any interim order is to be in place, it will also cover publication of the application document itself and any documents that we supply as directed by you, sir, so the further publication of the application itself and the		

1	SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Why the indictment, for heaven's	1	position of the press because the press are the nearest		
2	sake?	2	we've got to the public for these purposes.		
3	MS CLARKE: Well, I'm not sure if the indictment is a matter	3	MR MILLETT: Yes.		
4	of public record yet. I'm acting on fairly limited	4	SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Who have a clear interest in the		
5	5 instructions		reporting of the proceedings.		
6	6 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Has there been a plea and directions		MR MILLETT: Yes.		
7 hearing yet?		7	SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: All right?		
8	MS CLARKE: I presume so, but not being CPS counsel	8	MR MILLETT: The other thing is I'm concerned, as I stand		
9	SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: If there's a trial on Monday, I hope	9	here, about the position of the RLRS as opposed to their		
10	there has, that's all I can say.	10	clients. It may be difficult to police a reporting		
11 MS CLARKE: I appreciate the point, but I'm in a difficult		11	restriction once the community of BSRs knows about the		
12	12 position about what I am being asked to do at this		12 substance of the application.		
13	particular point.	13 It's not a point that Ms Clarke has made, and I'm			
14	SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Well, given the fact that I've	14	not making it for her, I'm just trying to steer		
15	directed that the proceedings thus far not be reported	15	a neutral course. But there is of course a difficulty		
16	until further order, I think it would be right to say	16	because one does not want to make orders, and you don't		
17	that you should give copies of the relevant documents to	17	want to make orders, in vain. So in the first instance		
18	the legal representatives of the BSRs in confidence so	18	perhaps we should consider whether or not it goes beyond		
19	that they are not distributed more widely until the	19	those in this room who have heard what has happened so		
20	application has been completed. At that point, we'll	20	far. Clearly there is a process, and clearly people		
21	see where we are.	21	have to see what is being put in the application.		
22	All right? I won't say is everybody happy with	22	One way round that and I don't want to get in the		
23	that, but has everyone got that?	23	way and spoil an already lengthy afternoon is for		
24	MR MILLETT: Mr Chairman, can I take instructions?	24	Ms Clarke to reconfigure the application into a part A		
25 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Yes, please do.		25	and a part B, part A being those matters which she and		
	Page 29		Page 31		
1	(Pause)	1	han alignst (subsequenthat is) decembe abject to being		
1 2	MR MILLETT: Mr Chairman, if the media, whoever they are,	2	her client (whoever that is) doesn't object to being seen by the wider community of core participants, and		
3	are going to make representations at the hearing on	3	those parts which she would insist on being restricted		
4	Friday, then obviously they need the application as	4	to and has a case for restricting to those who are in		
5	well, the formal application in writing.	5	this room.		
	SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: They will.		uns room.		
		6	I anticipate that one of the difficulties is that		
6	·	6	I anticipate that one of the difficulties is that		
7	MR MILLETT: They also need to be subject to that	7	not all BSRs are here, and certainly not all CPs are		
7 8	MR MILLETT: They also need to be subject to that restriction pro tem.	7 8	not all BSRs are here, and certainly not all CPs are here, and I am concerned that we are creating		
7 8 9	MR MILLETT: They also need to be subject to that restriction pro tem.  Rather than it being "the media", it should be	7 8 9	not all BSRs are here, and certainly not all CPs are here, and I am concerned that we are creating a two-speed or three-speed group of core participants		
7 8 9 10	MR MILLETT: They also need to be subject to that restriction pro tem.  Rather than it being "the media", it should be limited to an identified person. I don't know who that	7 8 9 10	not all BSRs are here, and certainly not all CPs are here, and I am concerned that we are creating a two-speed or three-speed group of core participants generally. I only raise that because and I suppose		
7 8 9 10 11	MR MILLETT: They also need to be subject to that restriction pro tem.  Rather than it being "the media", it should be limited to an identified person. I don't know who that is at the moment.	7 8 9 10 11	not all BSRs are here, and certainly not all CPs are here, and I am concerned that we are creating a two-speed or three-speed group of core participants generally. I only raise that because and I suppose it is my job to spoil things a bit but these things		
7 8 9 10 11 12	MR MILLETT: They also need to be subject to that restriction pro tem.  Rather than it being "the media", it should be limited to an identified person. I don't know who that is at the moment.  I'm instructed that the Media Lawyers Group is	7 8 9 10 11 12	not all BSRs are here, and certainly not all CPs are here, and I am concerned that we are creating a two-speed or three-speed group of core participants generally. I only raise that because and I suppose it is my job to spoil things a bit but these things need a bit more thought.		
7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR MILLETT: They also need to be subject to that restriction pro tem.  Rather than it being "the media", it should be limited to an identified person. I don't know who that is at the moment.  I'm instructed that the Media Lawyers Group is a sufficiently identifiable person to be bound by the	7 8 9 10 11 12 13	not all BSRs are here, and certainly not all CPs are here, and I am concerned that we are creating a two-speed or three-speed group of core participants generally. I only raise that because and I suppose it is my job to spoil things a bit but these things need a bit more thought.  So perhaps in the first instance, rather than simply		
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR MILLETT: They also need to be subject to that restriction pro tem.  Rather than it being "the media", it should be limited to an identified person. I don't know who that is at the moment.  I'm instructed that the Media Lawyers Group is a sufficiently identifiable person to be bound by the order to whom the application will be given.	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	not all BSRs are here, and certainly not all CPs are here, and I am concerned that we are creating a two-speed or three-speed group of core participants generally. I only raise that because and I suppose it is my job to spoil things a bit but these things need a bit more thought.  So perhaps in the first instance, rather than simply acceding to Mr Friedman's application that we tell		
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR MILLETT: They also need to be subject to that restriction pro tem.  Rather than it being "the media", it should be limited to an identified person. I don't know who that is at the moment.  I'm instructed that the Media Lawyers Group is a sufficiently identifiable person to be bound by the order to whom the application will be given.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Right. Well, then, it seems to me	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	not all BSRs are here, and certainly not all CPs are here, and I am concerned that we are creating a two-speed or three-speed group of core participants generally. I only raise that because and I suppose it is my job to spoil things a bit but these things need a bit more thought.  So perhaps in the first instance, rather than simply acceding to Mr Friedman's application that we tell everyone who comes in what's been going on, which is		
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR MILLETT: They also need to be subject to that restriction pro tem.  Rather than it being "the media", it should be limited to an identified person. I don't know who that is at the moment.  I'm instructed that the Media Lawyers Group is a sufficiently identifiable person to be bound by the order to whom the application will be given.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Right. Well, then, it seems to me then the material shall be served on the Media Lawyers	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	not all BSRs are here, and certainly not all CPs are here, and I am concerned that we are creating a two-speed or three-speed group of core participants generally. I only raise that because and I suppose it is my job to spoil things a bit but these things need a bit more thought.  So perhaps in the first instance, rather than simply acceding to Mr Friedman's application that we tell everyone who comes in what's been going on, which is unhelpful and too vague and dangerous, we take it		
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR MILLETT: They also need to be subject to that restriction pro tem.  Rather than it being "the media", it should be limited to an identified person. I don't know who that is at the moment.  I'm instructed that the Media Lawyers Group is a sufficiently identifiable person to be bound by the order to whom the application will be given.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Right. Well, then, it seems to me then the material shall be served on the Media Lawyers Group on similar terms of confidence. All right?	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	not all BSRs are here, and certainly not all CPs are here, and I am concerned that we are creating a two-speed or three-speed group of core participants generally. I only raise that because and I suppose it is my job to spoil things a bit but these things need a bit more thought.  So perhaps in the first instance, rather than simply acceding to Mr Friedman's application that we tell everyone who comes in what's been going on, which is unhelpful and too vague and dangerous, we take it a little bit more slowly. And the application document		
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR MILLETT: They also need to be subject to that restriction pro tem.  Rather than it being "the media", it should be limited to an identified person. I don't know who that is at the moment.  I'm instructed that the Media Lawyers Group is a sufficiently identifiable person to be bound by the order to whom the application will be given.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Right. Well, then, it seems to me then the material shall be served on the Media Lawyers Group on similar terms of confidence. All right?  MR MILLETT: I'm told so.	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	not all BSRs are here, and certainly not all CPs are here, and I am concerned that we are creating a two-speed or three-speed group of core participants generally. I only raise that because and I suppose it is my job to spoil things a bit but these things need a bit more thought.  So perhaps in the first instance, rather than simply acceding to Mr Friedman's application that we tell everyone who comes in what's been going on, which is unhelpful and too vague and dangerous, we take it a little bit more slowly. And the application document is reconfigured, it gets circulated to the RLRs who can		
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR MILLETT: They also need to be subject to that restriction pro tem.  Rather than it being "the media", it should be limited to an identified person. I don't know who that is at the moment.  I'm instructed that the Media Lawyers Group is a sufficiently identifiable person to be bound by the order to whom the application will be given.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Right. Well, then, it seems to me then the material shall be served on the Media Lawyers Group on similar terms of confidence. All right?  MR MILLETT: I'm told so.  The other thing is this: obviously the reporting	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	not all BSRs are here, and certainly not all CPs are here, and I am concerned that we are creating a two-speed or three-speed group of core participants generally. I only raise that because and I suppose it is my job to spoil things a bit but these things need a bit more thought.  So perhaps in the first instance, rather than simply acceding to Mr Friedman's application that we tell everyone who comes in what's been going on, which is unhelpful and too vague and dangerous, we take it a little bit more slowly. And the application document is reconfigured, it gets circulated to the RLRs who can then perhaps have some written submissions as to whether		
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR MILLETT: They also need to be subject to that restriction pro tem.  Rather than it being "the media", it should be limited to an identified person. I don't know who that is at the moment.  I'm instructed that the Media Lawyers Group is a sufficiently identifiable person to be bound by the order to whom the application will be given.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Right. Well, then, it seems to me then the material shall be served on the Media Lawyers Group on similar terms of confidence. All right?  MR MILLETT: I'm told so.  The other thing is this: obviously the reporting restriction which you've imposed will apply not just to	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	not all BSRs are here, and certainly not all CPs are here, and I am concerned that we are creating a two-speed or three-speed group of core participants generally. I only raise that because and I suppose it is my job to spoil things a bit but these things need a bit more thought.  So perhaps in the first instance, rather than simply acceding to Mr Friedman's application that we tell everyone who comes in what's been going on, which is unhelpful and too vague and dangerous, we take it a little bit more slowly. And the application document is reconfigured, it gets circulated to the RLRs who can then perhaps have some written submissions as to whether that should go more widely to the clients and the core		
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR MILLETT: They also need to be subject to that restriction pro tem.  Rather than it being "the media", it should be limited to an identified person. I don't know who that is at the moment.  I'm instructed that the Media Lawyers Group is a sufficiently identifiable person to be bound by the order to whom the application will be given.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Right. Well, then, it seems to me then the material shall be served on the Media Lawyers Group on similar terms of confidence. All right?  MR MILLETT: I'm told so.  The other thing is this: obviously the reporting restriction which you've imposed will apply not just to the press but also to any bloggers or people who use	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	not all BSRs are here, and certainly not all CPs are here, and I am concerned that we are creating a two-speed or three-speed group of core participants generally. I only raise that because and I suppose it is my job to spoil things a bit but these things need a bit more thought.  So perhaps in the first instance, rather than simply acceding to Mr Friedman's application that we tell everyone who comes in what's been going on, which is unhelpful and too vague and dangerous, we take it a little bit more slowly. And the application document is reconfigured, it gets circulated to the RLRs who can then perhaps have some written submissions as to whether that should go more widely to the clients and the core participants and then take it from there at the Friday		
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR MILLETT: They also need to be subject to that restriction pro tem.  Rather than it being "the media", it should be limited to an identified person. I don't know who that is at the moment.  I'm instructed that the Media Lawyers Group is a sufficiently identifiable person to be bound by the order to whom the application will be given.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Right. Well, then, it seems to me then the material shall be served on the Media Lawyers Group on similar terms of confidence. All right?  MR MILLETT: I'm told so.  The other thing is this: obviously the reporting restriction which you've imposed will apply not just to the press but also to any bloggers or people who use social media to communicate.	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	not all BSRs are here, and certainly not all CPs are here, and I am concerned that we are creating a two-speed or three-speed group of core participants generally. I only raise that because and I suppose it is my job to spoil things a bit but these things need a bit more thought.  So perhaps in the first instance, rather than simply acceding to Mr Friedman's application that we tell everyone who comes in what's been going on, which is unhelpful and too vague and dangerous, we take it a little bit more slowly. And the application document is reconfigured, it gets circulated to the RLRs who can then perhaps have some written submissions as to whether that should go more widely to the clients and the core participants and then take it from there at the Friday hearing.		
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR MILLETT: They also need to be subject to that restriction pro tem.  Rather than it being "the media", it should be limited to an identified person. I don't know who that is at the moment.  I'm instructed that the Media Lawyers Group is a sufficiently identifiable person to be bound by the order to whom the application will be given.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Right. Well, then, it seems to me then the material shall be served on the Media Lawyers Group on similar terms of confidence. All right?  MR MILLETT: I'm told so.  The other thing is this: obviously the reporting restriction which you've imposed will apply not just to the press but also to any bloggers or people who use social media to communicate.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Yes.	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	not all BSRs are here, and certainly not all CPs are here, and I am concerned that we are creating a two-speed or three-speed group of core participants generally. I only raise that because and I suppose it is my job to spoil things a bit but these things need a bit more thought.  So perhaps in the first instance, rather than simply acceding to Mr Friedman's application that we tell everyone who comes in what's been going on, which is unhelpful and too vague and dangerous, we take it a little bit more slowly. And the application document is reconfigured, it gets circulated to the RLRs who can then perhaps have some written submissions as to whether that should go more widely to the clients and the core participants and then take it from there at the Friday hearing.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Yes. All right.		
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR MILLETT: They also need to be subject to that restriction pro tem.  Rather than it being "the media", it should be limited to an identified person. I don't know who that is at the moment.  I'm instructed that the Media Lawyers Group is a sufficiently identifiable person to be bound by the order to whom the application will be given.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Right. Well, then, it seems to me then the material shall be served on the Media Lawyers Group on similar terms of confidence. All right?  MR MILLETT: I'm told so.  The other thing is this: obviously the reporting restriction which you've imposed will apply not just to the press but also to any bloggers or people who use social media to communicate.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Yes.  MR MILLETT: Yes, yes.	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	not all BSRs are here, and certainly not all CPs are here, and I am concerned that we are creating a two-speed or three-speed group of core participants generally. I only raise that because and I suppose it is my job to spoil things a bit but these things need a bit more thought.  So perhaps in the first instance, rather than simply acceding to Mr Friedman's application that we tell everyone who comes in what's been going on, which is unhelpful and too vague and dangerous, we take it a little bit more slowly. And the application document is reconfigured, it gets circulated to the RLRs who can then perhaps have some written submissions as to whether that should go more widely to the clients and the core participants and then take it from there at the Friday hearing.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Yes. All right.  MR MILLETT: Mr Chairman, I think that is probably		
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR MILLETT: They also need to be subject to that restriction pro tem.  Rather than it being "the media", it should be limited to an identified person. I don't know who that is at the moment.  I'm instructed that the Media Lawyers Group is a sufficiently identifiable person to be bound by the order to whom the application will be given.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Right. Well, then, it seems to me then the material shall be served on the Media Lawyers Group on similar terms of confidence. All right?  MR MILLETT: I'm told so.  The other thing is this: obviously the reporting restriction which you've imposed will apply not just to the press but also to any bloggers or people who use social media to communicate.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Yes.	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	not all BSRs are here, and certainly not all CPs are here, and I am concerned that we are creating a two-speed or three-speed group of core participants generally. I only raise that because and I suppose it is my job to spoil things a bit but these things need a bit more thought.  So perhaps in the first instance, rather than simply acceding to Mr Friedman's application that we tell everyone who comes in what's been going on, which is unhelpful and too vague and dangerous, we take it a little bit more slowly. And the application document is reconfigured, it gets circulated to the RLRs who can then perhaps have some written submissions as to whether that should go more widely to the clients and the core participants and then take it from there at the Friday hearing.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Yes. All right.		
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR MILLETT: They also need to be subject to that restriction pro tem.  Rather than it being "the media", it should be limited to an identified person. I don't know who that is at the moment.  I'm instructed that the Media Lawyers Group is a sufficiently identifiable person to be bound by the order to whom the application will be given.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Right. Well, then, it seems to me then the material shall be served on the Media Lawyers Group on similar terms of confidence. All right?  MR MILLETT: I'm told so.  The other thing is this: obviously the reporting restriction which you've imposed will apply not just to the press but also to any bloggers or people who use social media to communicate.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Yes.  MR MILLETT: Yes, yes.	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	not all BSRs are here, and certainly not all CPs are here, and I am concerned that we are creating a two-speed or three-speed group of core participants generally. I only raise that because and I suppose it is my job to spoil things a bit but these things need a bit more thought.  So perhaps in the first instance, rather than simply acceding to Mr Friedman's application that we tell everyone who comes in what's been going on, which is unhelpful and too vague and dangerous, we take it a little bit more slowly. And the application document is reconfigured, it gets circulated to the RLRs who can then perhaps have some written submissions as to whether that should go more widely to the clients and the core participants and then take it from there at the Friday hearing.  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Yes. All right.  MR MILLETT: Mr Chairman, I think that is probably		

1	assists in some way.	1	SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: No, no, you wouldn't want to be		
2	2 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Mr Stein is going to tell me why		2 unreasonable, would you?		
3	it's very helpful.	3	MR STEIN: Of course not. I try not to be.		
4	MR STEIN: Well, the difficulty we have at the moment is not	4	SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Yes, I think that makes good sense,		
5	5 having sight of it we don't know whether there's		unless Mr Millett is going to spoil it again.		
6	anything objectionable at all in the application so far	6	MR MILLETT: No, I'm not going to spoil it at all.		
7			I was just going to make one other point which is		
8	So, Mr Chairman, you do have that, you would be able	8	those in this room understand at least mostly, I think,		
9	to look at it now and be able to come to a conclusion as	9	that these proceedings are those which do not involve		
10	to whether or not it cannot just be given to us	10	Mrs Wahabi in any adverse way. I think it's important		
11	, c		that whatever is said outside this room it is made		
	Secondly, on what can be said when we regroup in		2 absolutely clear that Mrs Wahabi is a witness in other		
13	public, there seems to us to be no harm in saying		proceedings and is not involved in any pejorative		
14			14 fashion.		
15	place next week and there have been discussions about		SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: I shall prefer to say nothing about		
16	that. There does not need to be an in-depth examination		Mrs Wahabi because I think that you're right, we don't		
17	of what has happened here.	17	want to embarrass her in any respect whatsoever, she's		
18	Thirdly, we would be assisted by a copy of the	18	already suffered from having to come to give evidence		
19	transcript of this afternoon's proceedings so that we	19	this afternoon to be told that she won't be needed		
20	can reflect on what has been said so far. All of this	20	today. I think the less said about her specifically the		
21	has been gathering pace this afternoon.	21	better.		
22	Finally, would you please order that if the CPS are	22	I'm minded to tell the public simply that I had to		
23	to make an application that they do so within	23	deal with an application which concerned the		
24	a particular timescale. That may be by 1 o'clock	24	relationship between the inquiry and certain other		
25	tomorrow afternoon.	25	proceedings		
	Page 33		Page 35		
1	SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Well, I had rather taken it that the	1	MR MILLETT: Yes, that would be helpful.		
2	existing application would stand as the CPS application,	2	SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: which had to be held in private.		
3	and I think it should, unless and for good reason to the	3	MR MILLETT: That would be helpful.		
4	contrary.	4	SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Right, well then I will I hope		
5	MR STEIN: Well, bear in mind that there is no	5	someone has made a note of all these orders I'm making.		
6	representative here. We have to an extent considered	6	MR MILLETT: My junior hasn't!		
7	a little lightly the position of counsel who is	7	SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: I am going to say that if the CPS		
8	representing the police today, but there is in fact no	8	wishes to pursue this application it must do so in		
9	representation from the CPS here today making any points	9	writing by 1 o'clock tomorrow. That application is to		
10	on their behalf. We are anticipating the potential for	10	be served on the inquiry and on the legal		
11	an application, it will be a CPS application, not	11	representatives for all the BSR core participants, but		
12	Ms Clarke. So the position we would respectfully invite	12	worded a bit more elegantly than that in due course, but		
13	you, sir, to come to is that they should, if they are	13	that is effectively what it will say.		
14	making the application they may, after having	14	There will be a little time for consideration of		
15	consideration of what's been said today, and indeed	15	where we're going with this given that now Mrs Wahabi		
16	perhaps the obvious difficulties with the nature of this	16	won't be giving her evidence probably, I think, until		
17	application that it's all based upon a fairly unlikely	17	the middle or the end of next week.		
18	series of circumstances all coming together, they may	18	MR MILLETT: Mr Chairman, a point of mechanics, but it's		
19	reflect on it and, for good reason, not make the	19	important. The application should be served on the		
20	application. But, if they are, can we not have it by	20	inquiry and we will provide it to the relevant RLRs.		
21	1 o'clock tomorrow?	21	SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: There are practical reasons for		
22	SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Yes, you are going to need it by	22	that.		
23	1 o'clock tomorrow if we're going to come back here on	23	MR MILLETT: Yes, there are.		
24	Friday.	24	SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Yes. We will distribute it to the		
25	MR STEIN: I was tempted to say 10 o'clock, but	25	RLRs.		
	Dago 24		Daga 26		
	Page 34		Page 36		

1	Now, in relation to the transcript of this
2	afternoon, if, as I hope arrangements can be made to
3	provide it to a limited class of people, I think that
4	would be helpful. I would like to see one, and I think
5	the RLRs for the BSRs should also have access to it, but
6	that it not be made available more widely. All right?
7	Good.
8	Thank you all very much for your help.
9	At this stage we could ask the public to come back
10	in, if they're still sorry, I am getting a message
11	from the corner.
12	THE USHER: We need ten minutes to reset everything.
13	SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Right, we have to reset everything.
14	Well, in that case I'll rise now and we'll resume
15	this at 10 o'clock on Friday.
16	We shall, for the avoidance of any doubt, be sitting
17	in private when we resume, unless any order is made to
18	the contrary. All right?
19	Good. Thank you all very much.
20	(3.15 pm)
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
	Page 37
	1 1150 01

A able 3:15 5:11         allowing 15:1 amount 9:6 anticipate 32:6 anticipate 32:6 anticipating 34:10 absolutely 7:12 13:13 24:19 35:12 acceding 32:14 access 14:25 15:1 appear 24:3,4 appearing 22:15 achieved 16:23 act 11:11,16,18 14:15 18:2,6 acted 21:3 acting 29:4 add 5:1 13:5 19:25 28:20 address 2:10 adjourn 14:4 19:10 20:15 22:14,23 adjourned 18:24 adjourned 18:24 adjourned 18:24 adjourned 18:24 adjourned 18:13 administration 4:9 4:19 11:24 12:7 admit 15:8 advance 8:1 adverse 35:10 at 91:12,17 affect 14:21         14:18 allowing 15:1 area 19:3 area 19:3 bearing 14:13 behalf 4:2,24 16:4 21:5 22:5,15 24:3 29:24 30:2 32 32:10 believe 23:10 beter 6:2 13:21 bete	224 2:1 9 2 9 0 1,4
abscond 8:19	2:1 9 2:9 0:1,4
abscond 8:19 absolutely 7:12 13:13 24:19 35:12 acceding 32:14 access 14:25 15:1 37:5 achieved 16:23 act 11:11,16,18 14:15 18:2,6 acted 21:3 acting 29:4 add 5:1 13:5 19:25 28:20 address 2:10 adjourn 14:4 19:10 20:15 22:14,23 adjourned 18:24 adjourning 18:13 administration 4:9 4:19 11:24 12:7 admit 15:8 advance 8:1 absolutely 7:12 13:14 apologise 1:16 2:1 13:14 apologising 1:12 appear 24:3,4 appears 27:25 appears 27:25 applicable 11:12 application 1:13,17 seking 29:4 adjourned 18:24 adjourning 18:13 administration 4:9 4:19 11:24 12:7 admit 15:8 advance 8:1 absolutely 7:12 13:14 apologise 1:16 2:1 12:17 argument 8:5 10:5 12:17 arguments 7:24 9:3 arisen 1:23 arisen 1:23 arisen 1:23 arisen 2:34 arisen 2:3 35:21 better 6:2 13:21 circulated 32:1 circulated 32:1 circulated 32:1 circulated 32:1 circulated 32:1 29:12 asked 12:5 14:14 29:12 asked 12:5 14:14 29:12 asking 12:9 24:20 asks 25:11 assistance 4:22 bite 20:21 bite	2:1 9 2:9 0:1,4
absolutely 7:12 13:13 24:19 35:12 acceding 32:14 access 14:25 15:1 37:5 achieved 16:23 act 11:11,16,18 14:15 18:2,6 acted 21:3 act 29:4 add 5:1 13:5 19:25 28:20 address 2:10 adjourn 14:4 19:10 20:15 22:14,23 adjourned 18:24 adjourning 18:13 administration 4:9 20:15 22:14,23 adjourned 18:24 adjourning 18:13 administration 4:9 4:19 11:24 12:7 admit 15:8 advance 8:1 advance 8:1 acceding 32:14 apologise 1:16 2:1 13:14 arguments 7:24 9:3 arisen 1:23 arisen 7:23 8:4 arising 25:14 arising 25:14 arrangements 23:2 37:2 arrangements 23:2 arrangements 23:2 asked 12:5 14:14 29:12 asked 12:5 14:14 29:12 asked 12:5 14:14 29:12 asking 12:9 24:20 asks 25:11 bit 20:21 bit 20:21 3:12,21 4:18, 20:13 24:25 31:18 bit 13:24 28:17 32:11,12,17 36:12 bite 20:21 3:12,21 4:18, 32:11,12,17 36:12 bite 20:21 bite 20:21 3:12,21 4:18, 3:12,21 4:18, 3:18 characters 2:5 characters 2:5 characterise 5: characterise 5: characterise 5: cherry 20:21 circulated 32:1 35:21  35:21  35:21 bit 13:24 28:17 32:17,12,17 36:12 bite 20:21 3:12,21 4:18, 3:12,21 4:18, 3:18 claimed 6:22 Clarke 1:3,11,1 16:25,8 3:5 5:1,18,23,24 0 6:9 7:1,3,9,12 bite 20:21 5:1,18,23,24 0 6:9 7:1,3,9,12 bite 20:	2:1 9 2:9 0:1,4
13:13 24:19 35:12 acceding 32:14 apologising 1:12 appear 24:3,4 appearing 22:15 achieved 16:23 act 11:11,16,18 14:15 18:2,6 acted 21:3 acting 29:4 add 5:1 13:5 19:25 28:20 address 2:10 adjourn 14:4 19:10 20:15 22:14,23 adjourned 18:24 adjourning 18:13 administration 4:9 4:19 11:24 12:7 admit 15:8 advance 8:1 acced 32:10 13:14 arguments 7:24 9:3 arisen 1:23 arisen 1:23 arisen 2:23 8:4 arisen 2:23 8:4 arisen 25:14 arising 25:14 arising 25:14 arising 25:14 arising 25:14 arrangements 23:2 37:2 asked 12:5 14:14 20:13 24:25 31:18 beyond 18:14 20:13 24:25 31:18 bit 13:24 28:17 32:11,17 36:12 bite 20:21 32:11,17 36:12 bloggers 30:21 5:1,18,23,24 00:15 22:14,23 adjourned 18:24 adjourning 18:13 administration 4:9 4:19 11:24 12:7 admit 15:8 advance 8:1 23:15 24:13,21 arisen 1:23 arisen 1	9 2 9 0 1,4
acceding 32:14 appear 24:3,4 appears 27:25 achieved 16:23 appears 27:25 applicable 11:12 applicable 11:12 application 1:13,17 acting 29:4 add 5:1 13:5 19:25 28:20 address 2:10 adjourn 14:4 19:10 20:15 22:14,23 adjourned 18:24 adjourning 18:13 administration 4:9 4:19 11:24 12:7 admit 15:8 advance 8:1 adverse 35:10 achieved 16:23 appears 27:25 application 1:15:12 arisen 1:23 arisen 1:23 arisen 1:23 arisen 1:23 arisen 1:23 arisen 1:23 arisen 25:14 arising 25:14 arising 25:14 arising 25:14 arising 25:14 better 6:2 13:21 circulated 32:1 beyond 18:14 20:13 24:25 31:18 beyond 18:14 20:13 24:25 31:18 beyond 18:14 20:13 24:25 31:18 beyond 18:14 29:12 asking 12:9 24:20 asking 12:	9 2 9 0 1,4
access 14:25 15:1         appear 24:3,4         arises 7:23 8:4         benefits 7:11         cherry 20:21           achieved 16:23         appears 27:25         applicable 11:12         arrangements 23:2         35:21         circulated 32:1           acted 21:3         application 1:13,17         asked 12:5 14:14         20:13 24:25 31:18         claimed 6:22           add 5:1 13:5 19:25         application 1:13,17         asking 12:9 24:20         bit 13:24 28:17         Clarke 1:3,11,1           adjourn 14:4 19:10         5:20 6:3,6 7:5         8:16,21 9:16,19         5:18 14:11,22         bluntly 4:5         6:9 7:1,3,9,12           adjourned 18:24         15:2,14,21 16:24         assisted 33:18         assisted 33:18         bog-standard         10:25 11:3,15           administration 4:9         17:4,19 18:8,15         18:18,20 20:3,15         attached 27:17         briefly 18:5         briefly 18:5         briefly 18:5         23:21,23 24:8           adwance 8:1         22:7,14,20 23:6         23:15 24:13,21         authorities 8:9         brought 19:6         28:20 29:3,8,           adverse 35:10         23:15 24:13,21         20:10:20:3,15         authority 5:14         brought 19:6	2 9 0 1,4
act 11:11,16,18 appearing 22:15 applicable 11:12 application 1:13,17 acting 29:4 add 5:1 13:5 19:25 28:20 address 2:10 adjourn 14:4 19:10 20:15 22:14,23 adjourned 18:24 adjourning 18:13 administration 4:9 4:19 11:24 12:7 admit 15:8 advance 8:1 adverse 35:10  actios 29:15 application 22:15 application 1:13,17 acting 29:4 application 1:13,17 1:16 2:5,8 3:5 application 1:13,17 asked 12:5 14:14 20:13 24:25 31:18 beyond 18:14 20:13 24:25 31:18 bit 13:24 28:17 application 1:13,17 asking 12:9 24:20 asking 12:9 24:20 asks 25:11 assistance 4:22 bloggers 30:21 bit 20:21 bluntly 4:5 board 15:12 board 15:12 board 15:12 board 15:12 board 15:12 board 30:13 11:25 12:6,15 attached 27:17 admit 15:8 advance 8:1 adverse 35:10 2:11,14,15,19 authorities 8:9 adverse 35:10 2:215 24:13,21 application 1:13,17 arising 25:14 arrangements 23:2 35:21 beyond 18:14 20:13 24:25 31:18 bit 13:24 28:17 32:11,12,17 36:12 bit 20:21 5:1,18,23,24 0 5:18 14:11,22 20:15 20:11,12,17 36:12 bluntly 4:5 board 15:12 board 15:12 board 15:12 board 15:12 bog-standard 18:15 11:25 12:6,15 attached 27:17 attention 4:12 7:15 authorities 8:9 broadcast 2:14 6:13 8:2 26:11,22 27:5 authorities 8:9 authority 5:14 brought 19:6 28:20 29:3,8,	2 9 80 1,4
achieved 16:23 applicable 11:12 applicable 11:12 application 1:13,17 acting 29:4 add 5:1 13:5 19:25 28:20 address 2:10 adjourn 14:4 19:10 20:15 22:14,23 adjourned 18:24 adjourning 18:13 administration 4:9 4:19 11:24 12:7 admit 15:8 advance 8:1 adverse 35:10 acting 12:9 24:20 23:15 24:15:24;13,21 acting 29:4 advance 8:1 acting 29:4 application 1:13,17 29:12 asked 12:5 14:14 20:13 24:25 31:18 beyond 18:14 20:13 24:25 31:18 beyond 18:14 20:13 24:25 31:18 bit 13:24 28:17 32:11,12,17 36:12 bit 20:21 3:12,21 4:18, 32:11,12,17 36:12 bit 20:21 3:12,21 4:18, 32:11,12,17 36:12 bit 20:21 5:1,18,23,24 doi:10.20.11:2,4 23:17 board 15:12 board 15:12 board 15:12 board 15:12 bog-standard 18:25 bound 30:13 13:1,8,10 15: attached 27:17 attention 4:12 7:15 admit 15:8 advance 8:1 adverse 35:10 23:15 24:13,21 authority 5:14 applicable 11:12 37:2 beyond 18:14 20:13 24:25 31:18 bit 13:24 28:17 32:11,12,17 36:12 bit 20:21 3:12,21 4:18, 32:11,12,17 36:12 bit 20:21 3:12,21 4:18, 32:11,12,27 36:12 bit 20:21 3:12,21 4:18, 32:11,12,27 36:12 bit 20:21 3:12,21 4:18, 32:11,12,21 3:12,21 4:18, 32:11,12,21 3:12,21 4:18, 32:11,12,21 3:12,21 4:18, 32:11,12,21 3:12,21 4:18, 32:11,12,21 3:12,21 4:18, 32:11,12,21 3:12 5:11,12,21 3:12 5:12,13,15 3:12 bit 20:21 3:12,21 4:18, 32:11,12,21 3:12 5:11,12,21 3:12 5:11,12,21 3:12 5:11,12,21 3:12 5:11,12,21 3:12 5:11,12,21 3:12 5:11,12,21 3:12 5:11,12,21 3:12 5:11,12,21 3:12 5:11,12,21 3:12 5:11,12,21 3:12 5:12,13,15 3:12 bit 20:21 3:12,21 4:18, 32:11,12,17 36:12 bit 20:21 3:12,21 4:18, 32:11 bit 20:21 3:12,21 4:18, 32:11 bit 20:21 3:12,21 4:18, 32:11 bit	2 9 0 1,4
act 11:11,16,18         applicable 11:12         37:2         beyond 18:14         34:18           acted 21:3         application 1:13,17         acting 29:4         acting 29:4         acting 29:4         bit 13:24 28:17         Clarke 1:3,11,1           add 5:1 13:5 19:25         3:25 4:1 5:2,4,19         asking 12:9 24:20         asking 12:9 24:20         32:11,12,17 36:12         1:16 2:5,8 3:5           28:20         3:25 4:1 5:2,4,19         assistance 4:22         bloggers 30:21         5:1,18,23,24 6           adjourn 14:4 19:10         20:15 22:14,23         12:16 13:21 14:5         assisted 33:18         bloggers 30:21         bluntly 4:5         6:9 7:1,3,9,12           adjourned 18:24         4:11,12,16,18         assisted 33:18         assisted 33:18         bog-standard         10:25 11:3,15           4:19 11:24 12:7         18:18,20 20:3,15         assure 15:5         bound 30:13         13:1,8,10 15:           admit 15:8         15:2,14,21 16:24         Association 13:25         briefly 18:5         briefly 18:5         16:23 22:15 2           admit 15:8         22:7,14,20 23:6         authorities 8:9         authorities 8:9         6:13 8:2         26:11,22 27:5           adverse 35:10         25:20 29:3,8,	9 20 1,4
act 11:15, 18:2,6       applicant 14:12       asked 12:5 14:14       20:13 24:25 31:18       claimed 6:22         acting 29:4       acting 29:4       acting 29:4       acting 29:4       asking 12:9 24:20       asking 12:9 24:20       asking 12:9 24:20       asks 25:11       bit 13:24 28:17       32:11,12,17 36:12       1:16 2:5,8 3:5         28:20       acting 29:4       acting 29:4       asking 12:9 24:20       asks 25:11       bit 20:21       3:12,21 4:1,8       1:16 2:5,8 3:5         address 2:10       adjourn 14:4 19:10       acting 29:4       acting 29:4       assistance 4:22       bite 20:21       bite 20:21       3:12,21 4:1,8       5:1,18,23,24 6       6:9 7:1,39,12       18:15       18:15       18:15       18:15 </th <th>9 20 1,4</th>	9 20 1,4
acted 21:3         application 1:13,17         29:12         bit 13:24 28:17         Clarke 1:3,11,1           acting 29:4         add 5:1 13:5 19:25         3:25 4:1 5:2,4,19         asking 12:9 24:20         bit 20:21         3:12,21 4:1,8           28:20         3:25 4:1 5:2,4,19         assistance 4:22         bloggers 30:21         5:1,18,23,24 6           adjourn 14:4 19:10         8:16,21 9:16,19         10:20 11:2,4         23:17         board 15:12         9:25 10:3,5,9           adjourned 18:24         14:11,12,16,18         15:2,14,21 16:24         Association 13:25         bound 30:13         13:1,8,10 15:           administration 4:9         17:4,19 18:8,15         18:18,20 20:3,15         attached 27:17         briefly 18:5         briefly 18:5         16:23 22:15 2         23:21,23 24:8           advance 8:1         22:7,14,20 23:6         authorities 8:9         authority 5:14         brought 19:6         28:20 29:3,8,	9 20 1,4
acting 29:4       1:22 2:3,16 3:15       asking 12:9 24:20       32:11,12,17 36:12       1:16 2:5,8 3:5         add 5:1 13:5 19:25       3:25 4:1 5:2,4,19       asks 25:11       bite 20:21       3:12,21 4:1,8         adjourn 14:4 19:10       5:20 6:3,6 7:5       assistance 4:22       bloggers 30:21       5:1,18,23,24 6         adjourn 14:4 19:10       10:20 11:2,4       23:17       board 15:12       board 15:12       9:25 10:3,5,9         adjourned 18:24       14:11,12,16,18       assisted 33:18       bog-standard       10:25 11:3,15         adjourning 18:13       15:2,14,21 16:24       Association 13:25       bound 30:13       13:1,8,10 15:         administration 4:9       17:4,19 18:8,15       18:18,20 20:3,15       attached 27:17       briefly 18:5       briefly 18:5         admit 15:8       22:7,14,20 23:6       authorities 8:9       broadcast 2:14       6:13 8:2       26:11,22 27:5         adverse 35:10       23:15 24:13,21       authority 5:14       brought 19:6       28:20 29:3,8,	9 20 1,4
add 5:1 13:5 19:25       3:25 4:1 5:2,4,19       asks 25:11       bite 20:21       3:12,21 4:1,8         address 2:10       8:16,21 9:16,19       5:18 14:11,22       bluntly 4:5       6:9 7:1,3,9,12         adjourn 14:4 19:10       10:20 11:2,4       23:17       board 15:12       9:25 10:3,5,9         adjourned 18:24       14:11,12,16,18       assisted 33:18       bog-standard       10:25 11:3,15         adjourning 18:13       15:2,14,21 16:24       Association 13:25       bound 30:13       13:1,8,10 15:         administration 4:9       17:4,19 18:8,15       assure 15:5       briefly 18:5       16:23 22:15 2         admit 15:8       21:1,14,15,19       attention 4:12 7:15       broadcast 2:14       25:17,18 26:1         advence 8:1       22:7,14,20 23:6       authorities 8:9       brought 19:6       28:20 29:3,8         adverse 35:10       23:15 24:13,21       authority 5:14       Brought 19:6       28:20 29:3,8	0
28:20 address 2:10 adjourn 14:4 19:10 20:15 22:14,23 adjourned 18:24 adjourning 18:13 administration 4:9 4:19 11:24 12:7 admit 15:8 advance 8:1 adverse 35:10  5:20 6:3,6 7:5 8:16,21 9:16,19 10:20 11:2,4 23:17 assisted 33:18 assists 33:1 15:2,14,21 16:24 Association 13:25 assure 15:5 assure 15:5 attached 27:17 attention 4:12 7:15 authorities 8:9 authority 5:14  bloggers 30:21 bluntly 4:5 board 15:12 9:25 10:3,5,9,1 6:9 7:1,3,9,12 bogers 30:21 bluntly 4:5 board 15:12 9:25 10:3,5,9,1 10:25 11:3,15 11:25 12:6,15 bound 30:13 13:1,8,10 15: 16:23 22:15 2 attached 27:17 brilliant 28:5 briefly 18:5 briefly 18:5 16:23 22:15 2 23:21,23 24:8 authorities 8:9 authorities 8:9 bloggers 30:21 bluntly 4:5 board 15:12 boge-standard 10:25 11:3,15 11:25 12:6,15 briefly 18:5 briefly 18:5 6:13 8:2 25:17,18 26:1	1,4
address 2:10       8:16,21 9:16,19       5:18 14:11,22       bluntly 4:5       6:9 7:1,3,9,12         adjourn 14:4 19:10       10:20 11:2,4       23:17       board 15:12       9:25 10:3,5,9,         20:15 22:14,23       12:16 13:21 14:5       assisted 33:18       bog-standard       10:25 11:3,15         adjourned 18:24       14:11,12,16,18       assists 33:1       18:15       11:25 12:6,15         administration 4:9       17:4,19 18:8,15       Association 13:25       bound 30:13       briefly 18:5       16:23 22:15 2         admit 15:8       15:1,14,15,19       attached 27:17       broadcast 2:14       25:17,18 26:1         advance 8:1       22:7,14,20 23:6       authorities 8:9       6:13 8:2       26:11,22 27:5         adverse 35:10       25:24:13,21       authority 5:14       brought 19:6       28:20 29:3,8,7	
adjourn 14:4 19:10       10:20 11:2,4       23:17       board 15:12       9:25 10:3,5,9,9         adjourned 18:24       12:16 13:21 14:5       assisted 33:18       bog-standard       10:25 11:3,15         adjourning 18:13       15:2,14,21 16:24       Association 13:25       bound 30:13       13:1,8,10 15:         administration 4:9       17:4,19 18:8,15       assure 15:5       briefly 18:5       briefly 18:5       16:23 22:15 2         admit 15:8       21:1,14,15,19       attention 4:12 7:15       broadcast 2:14       25:17,18 26:1         advance 8:1       22:7,14,20 23:6       authorities 8:9       6:13 8:2       brought 19:6       28:20 29:3,8,         adverse 35:10       25:2,2,2,2,2,2,2,2,2,3,2,2,3,2,3,3,3,3,3,3	14
adjourn 14.4 19.10       20:15 22:14,23       12:16 13:21 14:5       assisted 33:18       bog-standard       10:25 11:3,15         adjourned 18:24       14:11,12,16,18       assists 33:1       18:15       11:25 12:6,15         adjourning 18:13       15:2,14,21 16:24       Association 13:25       bound 30:13       13:1,8,10 15:         administration 4:9       17:4,19 18:8,15       assure 15:5       briefly 18:5       16:23 22:15 2         admit 15:8       21:1,14,15,19       attention 4:12 7:15       broadcast 2:14       25:17,18 26:1         advance 8:1       22:7,14,20 23:6       authorities 8:9       6:13 8:2       26:11,22 27:5         adverse 35:10       23:15 24:13,21       authority 5:14       brought 19:6       28:20 29:3,8,7	
adjourned 18:24       14:11,12,16,18       assists 33:1       18:15         adjourning 18:13       15:2,14,21 16:24       Association 13:25       bound 30:13       13:1,8,10 15:1         administration 4:9       17:4,19 18:8,15       assure 15:5       briefly 18:5       16:23 22:15 2         admit 15:8       21:1,14,15,19       attention 4:12 7:15       broadcast 2:14       25:17,18 26:1         advance 8:1       22:7,14,20 23:6       authorities 8:9       6:13 8:2       26:11,22 27:5         adverse 35:10       25:24:13,21       authority 5:14       brought 19:6       28:20 29:3,8,7	
adjourning 18:13       15:2,14,21 16:24       Association 13:25       bound 30:13       13:1,8,10 15:         administration 4:9       17:4,19 18:8,15       assure 15:5       briefly 18:5       16:23 22:15 2         admit 15:8       21:1,14,15,19       attention 4:12 7:15       broadcast 2:14       25:17,18 26:1         advance 8:1       22:7,14,20 23:6       authorities 8:9       6:13 8:2       26:11,22 27:5         adverse 35:10       25:2,2,2,2,2,2,3,2,4,2,4,2,4       20:12       Drought 19:6       28:20 29:3,8,7	
administration 4:9       17:4,19 18:8,15       assure 15:5       briefly 18:5       16:23 22:15 2         4:19 11:24 12:7       18:18,20 20:3,15       attached 27:17       brilliant 28:5       23:21,23 24:8         admit 15:8       21:1,14,15,19       attention 4:12 7:15       broadcast 2:14       25:17,18 26:1         advance 8:1       22:7,14,20 23:6       authorities 8:9       6:13 8:2       brought 19:6       28:20 29:3,8,7         adverse 35:10       25:2,2,2,2,2,2,2,2,2,2,2,2,2,2,2,2,2,2,2	
4:19 11:24 12:7  admit 15:8  advance 8:1  adverse 35:10  18:18,20 20:3,15  21:1,14,15,19  22:7,14,20 23:6  23:21,23 24:8  attached 27:17  brilliant 28:5  23:21,23 24:8  25:17,18 26:1  authorities 8:9  authority 5:14  brought 19:6  28:20 29:3,8,	
admit 15:8 advance 8:1 adverse 35:10  21:1,14,15,19 22:7,14,20 23:6 22:7,14,20 23:6 23:15 24:13,21 25:17,18 26:1 25:17,18 26:1 25:17,18 26:1 26:11,22 27:5 26:11,22 27:5 26:11,22 27:5 26:12,22 27:5 26:13,22 27:5 2	
advance 8:1 adverse 35:10	
advance 3.1 adverse 35:10  23:15 24:13,21  authority 5:14  brought 19:6  28:20 29:3,8,	.,,
27 2 0 0 14 24 20 12 PCD 26 11	1
Laffort 14:21   25:2.8.8.14.24   20:12   LBSK 30:11   31:13:24-34:1	
affect 14:21 afraid 12:19	
afternoon 12:21 28:22,24 29:20 avoidance 37:16 31:11 32:7 37:5 clear 31:4 35:12	
13:17 15:23 16:16 30:4.5.14 31:12 bulky 23:22 clearly 31:20.20	
17:15 23:7 11 31:21,24 32:14,17 B client 25:11 32:	
$\begin{bmatrix} 17.13 & 23.7, 11 \\ 25.9 & 15.25 & 31.23 \end{bmatrix}$ 33:6,23 34:2,2,11   <b>B</b> 31:25   <b>C</b>   clients 14:21 31	
33:21,25 35:19 34:11,14,17,20 back 21:17 34:23 called 7:21 32:20	
35:23 36:8,9,19 37:9 capacity 17:18 close 17:15	
afternoon's 13:13   applications 19:1   background 6:18   careful 12:17   closed 24:17	
applied 12:1 20:23   bail 8:17   case 11:14 16:21   coach 23:1	
agency 3:13   apply 6:10 10:23   balance 12:7 21:25   18:11 23:17 32:4   come 2:10,19 4	12
Agent 22:17   12:25 30:20   balancing 11:23   37:14   15:9 17:10,17	
apposite 11:14   18:2   cases 7:14 20:7   26:20 33:9 34	13
agree 25.5   appreciate 1:18   barristers 18:22   cash 7:11   34:23 35:18 3	
ahead 8:9   4:20 5:13 10:22   based 9:20 11:14   cause 2:20   comes 25:10 32	15
alarm 2·20   29:11   34:17   causes 13:15   coming 12:23	
allegation 6:20 appropriate 4:13 basic 20:21 centre 27:15 34:18	
allow 9:7 23:5 25:8   26:24   basis 6:3 7:10 9:23   certain 26:16 35:24   communicate	
allowed 8:17   appropriately   9:25 12:14 22:23   certainly 1:24 2:24   30:22	
26:16 4:3 6:5 13:15	

				1 486 37
community 31:11	9:21 11:17,25	deliberation 12:17	32:17	27:19,21,24 35:18
32:2	13:2,19 28:9	deliberations 9:9	documents 28:23	36:16
complaint 28:8	31:15,15 35:3	demonstration	29:17	exactly 19:13
completed 29:20	36:12	21:2	doubt 28:2 37:16	examination 33:16
concentrated 30:25	<b>court</b> 11:11,16	depart 22:11	drawn 10:11	example 10:12
concern 7:23 8:12	18:16 20:8,16	depend 13:1	driving 23:1	16:17
8:15,19	24:25 25:2,3	depends 2:9	due 2:19 5:7 6:15	exceptional 20:22
concerned 12:15	courts 20:7	<b>deputy</b> 22:16	16:18 20:12 21:2	excluding 18:1
16:7 19:23 22:3	cover 28:21	derail 8:6	36:12	exercise 12:4
27:9 28:14 31:8	<b>CP</b> 4:15 18:4	described 27:1		<b>existing</b> 26:3 34:2
32:8 35:23	<b>CPs</b> 3:23 4:15,23	design 12:19	E	<b>expect</b> 9:19 13:25
concerns 3:19 4:14	5:4,13,22 7:23	details 7:3	early 3:1	17:18
conclusion 6:13,17	15:25 21:3 22:15	detain 8:9	effect 21:9	experience 28:10
33:9	22:19 24:4,4 29:8	determined 5:9	effectively 12:9	experienced 20:6
conclusions 10:11	32:7 33:22 34:2,9	18:17	24:21 25:8 36:13	experiencing 21:6
conduct 4:17	34:11 36:7	difference 19:7	either 2:14,22 3:17	explain 19:13
confidence 29:18	creating 32:8	different 5:1 8:25	23:19 24:3	25:11
30:17	credible 27:25	9:25 13:5,7,9 15:8	elegantly 36:12	extend 21:1
consequence 10:13	<b>criminal</b> 2:10,12,15	<b>difficult</b> 9:18 11:1	eloquently 18:24	extended 18:6
<b>consider</b> 1:23 3:15	2:16,22 3:2,18,20	13:24 27:8,14	embarrass 35:17	extending 17:24
9:12 15:11 19:14	4:11,13 6:14,15	28:18 29:11 31:10	emotive 10:17	<b>extent</b> 10:9 34:6
31:18	8:18 9:1 12:12	difficulties 32:6	encourage 5:8	extremely 5:3
considerable 8:12	25:2	34:16	ensuring 4:10	
consideration	criteria 15:3	difficulty 31:15	entire 1:20 8:20	<b>F</b>
11:10 17:12 34:15	Crown 3:7,13 4:3	33:4	<b>entirely</b> 1:18 4:20	<b>fact</b> 10:2 15:22
36:14	17:17 20:16 25:2	diligence 20:12	5:12	21:20 24:17 27:19
considered 10:10	<b>current</b> 19:15 22:1	21:2	entitled 11:15	27:21,22 28:13
34:6	currently 21:6	dimension 5:2 13:5	equal 2:6	29:14 34:8
contained 12:2	<b>custody</b> 8:8 17:5,23	13:7,9	equally 2:8	failure 21:2
<b>Contempt</b> 11:11,16	17:24 20:11,17,24	direct 15:18 21:5	espouse 17:2	<b>fair</b> 10:15
content 25:24		directed 28:23	essence 9:15	<b>fairly</b> 15:4 29:4
continue 22:23	<b>D</b>	29:15	estimated 6:15	34:17
contrary 34:4	dangerous 32:16	directions 26:23	European 20:8	<b>falls</b> 14:18
37:18	<b>date</b> 19:20	29:6	events 7:16	falsely 6:22
<b>control</b> 9:10 20:13	<b>days</b> 6:16	<b>directly</b> 2:4 11:12	everybody 29:22	familiarity 14:1
<b>copies</b> 23:6,13	<b>deal</b> 17:18 21:20,23	discharge 20:3	<b>evidence</b> 2:4,7,8,11	<b>family</b> 18:6 21:8
29:17	24:5 25:18 35:23	discussed 16:17	2:13,15,18,22,25	<b>far</b> 3:15 15:14 20:6
<b>copy</b> 33:18	dealing 17:11	discussions 33:15	3:1,17 6:11,13	22:12 26:10 29:15
core 13:20 22:22	<b>dealt</b> 14:15	disproportionate	7:20,24 8:2,24,25	31:20 33:6,20
32:2,9,20 36:11	December 8:11	27:16 28:15	9:1 10:2,7,11,14	fashion 35:14
<b>corner</b> 37:11	<b>decision</b> 1:21 14:10	distress 13:15	10:16 11:7,8	feasible 12:20
<b>could've</b> 1:17 17:6	deeply 17:14	distressing 10:18	12:12,21 13:17	feel 24:12
<b>counsel</b> 29:8 34:7	<b>defendant</b> 7:25 8:5	distribute 36:24	15:23 16:14,18,19	feelings 10:12
<b>course</b> 1:20 4:15,17	8:10 10:10,14,21	distributed 29:19	16:20 17:7 19:24	feet 14:20
7:16,19 9:10,12	13:3,4 24:7 28:2	document 28:22	20:25 21:9,10	finalise 14:9
	<b>delay</b> 5:5,9		25:25 26:16 27:12	Finally 33:22
	<u> </u>	1	<u> </u>	<u>'</u>

	I	1	I	<u> </u>
<b>find</b> 5:10 28:17	generally 32:10	31:19 33:17	indicated 23:8	investigation 7:21
<b>finding</b> 9:17 19:20	33:14	happening 5:5	indictment 6:24	investigations 7:19
<b>first</b> 1:12 11:6	<b>getting</b> 16:23 18:23	happens 2:11,11	10:24 20:4 23:14	<b>invite</b> 21:12 34:12
17:14 21:14 23:13	37:10	<b>happy</b> 29:22	28:25 29:1,3	inviting 14:7
31:17 32:13 33:11	<b>give</b> 2:15 3:1,18	hares 2:23	individual 6:21 7:4	involve 35:9
firstly 14:23	7:24 8:13 16:18	<b>harm</b> 33:13	8:16,17 10:16	involved 35:13
<b>five</b> 6:16	19:24 25:25 26:2	head 27:20	individual's 8:8	issue 2:13 8:2 11:5
<b>fixture</b> 16:10,11	29:17 35:18	hear 5:7,12 14:10	individuals 2:15	13:12
<b>flat</b> 6:23 7:8 19:6	given 5:6 9:5 11:10	15:23 16:24 18:3	<b>influence</b> 9:22 10:7	
following 7:16	12:12 16:12,19	heard 2:18 13:23	27:13	<u>J</u>
<b>force</b> 16:22 26:25	29:14 30:14 33:10	14:5,24 18:3,4,13	informally 16:10	Jafari 19:8
forever 12:13	36:15	20:25 21:3 22:12	information 24:6	jeopardise 9:3
formal 30:5	gives 11:19 14:23	27:4,13 31:19	informed 13:21	jeopardised 9:12
<b>forth</b> 15:2	16:18 27:24	hearing 16:13	inherent 8:23	jeopardising 8:13
forward 4:24	giving 2:22,25 10:2	22:24 29:7 30:3	innocent 27:18	<b>job</b> 32:11
<b>four</b> 6:15 17:7	10:16 13:16 16:14	32:22	Inquiries 11:18	joint 5:20 6:4
<b>fraud</b> 6:20,21 7:14	21:9,10 27:19,21	hearings 14:24	14:15	<b>judge</b> 18:16 20:16
7:18,20 18:11	36:16	heaven's 29:1	inquiry 2:14,19	<b>June</b> 7:16
19:9	<b>go</b> 7:2 8:9 18:12	held 36:2	6:12 8:25 9:22	<b>junior</b> 36:6
fraudulently 6:22	23:12 32:20	help 2:3 37:8	10:17 11:8,14	jurisdiction 20:22
7:7	goes 16:18 19:18	helped 17:22	28:3 35:24 36:10	<b>jurors</b> 10:10
free 19:12	31:18	<b>helpful</b> 33:3 36:1,3	36:20	<b>jury</b> 9:8,22 10:7,15
<b>freedom</b> 11:23 12:7	<b>going</b> 1:4 2:21	37:4	insist 32:3	28:2
12:9	12:19,20,25 14:10	hit 27:20	insofar 5:11	<b>justice</b> 4:9,19 11:24
<b>Friday</b> 9:8 14:5,7	15:18,21,23 21:6	hold 25:4	instance 31:17	12:7 22:1
16:14 19:17,18	22:13,13,14 25:25	<b>holds</b> 18:16	32:13	K
21:7 22:24 24:1	26:2,18 27:14	hoof 14:3 21:24	instructed 3:4,5	
24:15 26:3,6 30:4	30:3 32:15 33:2	hope 15:11 29:9	5:21,23,25 30:12	kind 3:25 7:11 18:1
32:21 34:24 37:15	34:22,23 35:5,6,7	32:25 36:4 37:2	instructions 6:5	19:1 23:3 24:16
Friedman 18:5,8	36:7,15	hopefully 24:14	29:5,24	knew 17:14
19:23 20:5,9,11	Gomes 2:7,9,20	horses 23:1	intend 1:25	knock-on 21:8
24:11,17 26:12	12:23 17:20 19:5	<b>Human</b> 20:8	intended 7:21	know 15:7 18:7,10
Friedman's 32:14	21:6		intention 2:24	18:19 19:19 22:16
friends 25:5	Gomes's 2:11,18	I	13:14,16	28:4 30:10 33:5
frustrated 8:20	<b>good</b> 34:3,19 35:4	identifiable 30:13	<b>interest</b> 4:9 5:15	known 17:8
frustrating 13:12	37:7,19	identified 30:10	14:2 31:4	knows 31:11
frustration 8:14	grateful 4:22	immediately 33:11	interests 27:10	
<b>fully</b> 6:6	Grenfell 6:23	important 21:25	interfere 26:17	lady 28:4
fundamental 9:4	<b>group</b> 20:5 30:12	35:10 36:19	interfering 19:21	late 1:13,14 9:7
14:22	30:17 32:9	imposed 8:7 30:20	interim 19:14	16:24 19:7
<b>further</b> 1:6 5:5,8	guiding 11:17	in-depth 33:16	24:11,14,16 25:13	law 11:14 20:22
21:18 22:10 28:20	<b>guilty</b> 13:4,5	inaudible 19:16	25:19 27:10 28:13	Lawyers 30:12,16
28:24 29:16		included 19:15	28:21	learned 25:5
	<u>H</u>	inconvenienced	interpretations	legal 1:20,21 13:19
$\frac{G}{}$	happen 19:11	16:6	15:8	14:2 22:21 29:18
gathering 33:21	happened 1:14	indicate 17:4		17.4 44.41 47.10
	•	•	•	•

24.40		l		
36:10	18:7 19:20 20:1,9	minutes 37:12	nearest 31:1	24:25 25:3 26:13
legislation 11:17	20:19 21:16,22	misrepresentation	necessarily 17:2	opportunities
length 9:13 13:24	22:9,13,18 23:8	6:21	necessary 7:5	17:23
lengthy 31:23	23:12,18,20,24	misunderstood	24:19	opportunity 11:6
Let's 23:12	24:1,9,16 25:16	15:13	need 8:10 9:12	13:23
liaison 18:10	25:23 26:2,5,8,12	moment 4:24 12:18	17:13 23:14,16	opposed 31:9
liberty 8:18	26:20 27:3,7,23	13:3 20:14 21:4	24:6 30:4,7 32:12	oral 1:9
<b>lightly</b> 1:23 34:7	28:10,17 29:1,6,9	26:21 30:11 33:4	33:16 34:22 37:12	<b>order</b> 1:7 4:14 5:3
<b>limited</b> 9:6 12:13	29:14,25 30:6,15	<b>Monday</b> 2:17 6:14	<b>needed</b> 35:19	6:11 14:14 15:3
29:4 30:10 37:3	30:23,25 31:4,7	9:7,9 16:11,15,18	needs 19:11	18:18 24:14,16,24
<b>limits</b> 8:7 17:6,23	32:23 33:2 34:1	16:19 21:10 29:9	neutral 14:20	25:4,12 26:13
17:24 20:11,17,24	34:22 35:1,4,15	MOORE-BICK	31:15	27:10 28:13,21
<b>listen</b> 26:22	36:2,4,7,21,24	1:3,14 2:2,6 3:3,7	never 18:23 25:1	29:16 30:14 33:22
<b>listing</b> 8:6 9:3,11	37:13	3:11,14,22 4:5,16	norm 25:6,7	37:17
little 9:18 16:12	material 23:22	4:21 5:17,21,24	<b>note</b> 15:17 36:5	orders 31:16,17
32:17 34:7 36:14	30:16	6:2,7,24 7:2,6,10	<b>notice</b> 1:13,22 18:8	36:5
live 10:16 28:3	matter 3:7,9 4:6,6	7:13 9:17 10:1,4,8	notoriously 11:1	ordinary 9:19
logistical 5:1	5:9 8:15 17:16	10:19,23 11:1,10	notwithstanding	ought 3:23 4:23
long 7:6 26:24	25:18 28:20 29:3	11:19,22 12:1,15	15:22	13:20,23 15:25
look 33:9	matters 4:12 9:10	12:23 13:7,9,18	novel 28:10	18:3 21:23 22:19
looking 15:6	10:17 12:10 13:6	15:5,16 16:5,21	November 9:7	22:20
<b>loser</b> 19:3	13:10 24:7 31:25	17:13,22 18:7	<b>nub</b> 2:13,16 6:7,10	outcome 8:3
losers 20:6	mean 5:21 10:1,23	19:20 20:1,9,19	<b>number</b> 3:16 7:14	outline 18:20
<b>lost</b> 20:7	12:18 23:3 25:23	21:16,22 22:9,13	17:25	<b>outlined</b> 5:16 18:25
	meant 5:5	22:18 23:8,12,18	nutshell 27:24	<b>outside</b> 9:10 35:11
<u>M</u>	mechanics 36:18	23:20,24 24:1,9		overestimated 20:2
maintain 24:18	media 30:2,9,12,16	24:16 25:16,23	0	P
26:9	30:22	26:2,5,8,12,20	o'clock 5:8 23:2	
making 4:3 14:12	members 18:6	27:3,7,23 28:10	24:2 33:24 34:21	pace 33:21
22:10 31:14 34:9	24:20	28:17 29:1,6,9,14	34:23,25 36:9	part 1:6 10:21
34:14 36:5	merely 27:22	29:25 30:6,15,23	37:15	26:14 27:4 31:24
<b>Mansfield</b> 16:2,3,7	message 37:10	30:25 31:4,7	<b>object</b> 14:7 16:23	31:25,25
17:1,21 25:6	Metropolitan 3:5	32:23 33:2 34:1	26:18 32:1	participants 13:20
26:19,20 27:7,8	4:2 5:6,14 6:5	34:22 35:1,4,15	objectionable 33:6	22:22 32:2,9,21 36:11
28:9,12	8:22 16:1 17:9	36:2,4,7,21,24	obliged 16:3	particular 5:9 6:19
mark 14:6	middle 36:17	37:13	<b>obtaining</b> 7:10 <b>obvious</b> 20:2 34:16	1
MARTIN 1:3,14	Millett 29:24 30:2	morning 19:8		7:3 8:10 10:12
2:2,6 3:3,7,11,14	30:7,18,24 31:3,6	MPS 5:25	<b>obviously</b> 16:13	27:9 29:13 33:24
3:22 4:5,16,21	31:8 32:24 35:5,6	multiple 19:3	19:23 28:14 30:4	particularly 10:17
5:17,21,24 6:2,7	36:1,3,6,18,23	N	30:19	18:5 19:3
6:24 7:2,6,10,13	mind 3:16 14:14	Nadia 19:8	occasion 28:5 officers 18:10	partner 3:12 parts 32:3
9:17 10:1,4,8,19 10:23 11:1,10,19	34:5	nail 27:20	Oh 28:4	Pause 30:1
11:22 12:1,15,23	minded 13:22 14:4	nature 3:17,19 28:8	once 21:19 26:23	pejorative 35:13
13:7,9,18 15:5,16	19:10 35:22	34:16	31:11	pending 8:18 24:14
16:5,21 17:13,22	mindful 5:8	near 18:23	open 18:16 22:1	pending 8.18 24.14 people 14:7 18:19
10.3,21 17.13,22		11 <b>Cal</b> 10.43	open 10.10 22.1	people 14./ 10.19

22:4 24:13 26:15 <b>possibly</b> 10:14 11:3 33:14,19 35:9,13 21:25 <b>quickly</b> 19:11	<b>rely</b> 11:16
	<b>1 Cly</b> 11.10
1 / / 14 N/ / 1 N/ / 1 / 1   1   1   1   1   1   1   1	remainder 23:1
37:3   21:7 34:10   process 8:20 27:5   quite 7:15 15:16	repeat 1:25
perfectly 15:10   process 8.20 27.3   quite 7.13 13.16   process 8.20 27.3   quite 7.13 13.16   21:25 22:16	repeat 1.23
27:17   potentially 4.12 3.3   31.20   21.23 22.10   profound 4:8	9:22 12:11 24:25
1 1- N	26:14 29:15
period 25:21   power 11:19   progress 13:2   R   raise 4:14 14:9	
personally 23:19 prefer 35:15 prolixed 16:15 21:24 32:10	<b>reporting</b> 1:6 9:13 10:6 11:20 18:17
personally 25.17 profess 15.15	19:14 24:24 25:12
projective 0.25 projectly 15.21	
persuade 17.13	25:19,20 26:9,25
prosecution (	30:19 31:5,10
Prosedumger:	representation 34:9
phraseu 15.14 prejudiceu 6.1	- '-
Programme   Progra	representations
ratio 12/11 2 the promise yield	5:11 22:11 23:10
property of	30:3
prospects 17.25	representative 34:6
press 7:13 13:23,23 provide 30:20 37:3	representatives
play 17.15 provided 7.20 23.0	13:20,25 18:4
prox 17.17 27.0	22:21 29:18 36:11
predation probabilities public 2.11,15 o.11	representing 7:7
preduced 13.1 presume 25.0 10.10 11.2 1,23	34:8
Product 25,220 co.22   Product 1020   1011 2200 2 1020	request 4:3
pm 1:1 37:20   prevent 11:7 13:16   24:23 25:9 29:4   reconfigured 32:18   proint 15:10 13 17:1   preventing 11:6   31:2 33:13 35:22   record 29:4	requested 25:21
point 13.110,13 17.11   preventing 11.0	requires 12:16
22:8 29:11,13,20 <b>primary</b> 11:17 37:9 <b>recorded</b> 1:8	reset 37:12,13
31:13 35:7 36:18   principally 13:19   publication 6:12   reference 14:17	resident 6:23 7:8
points 18:1 34:9   principle 11:18   7:24 10:6 28:22   15:15   reflect 28:12 22:20	resolution 24:14
police 3:5,24 4:2,6	resolve 16:16
4:8 5:6,14 6:5   principles 11:13   publicised 12:10   34:19	respect 6:11 18:14
8:22 16:1 17:10   12:24   publish 11:8   regarding 24:7	35:17
18:10,25 31:10   private 1:2 36:2   purpose 17:3   regroup 33:12	respectful 20:14
33:7 34:8 purposes 31:2 reiterate 1:4	24:23
position 1:19,20   pro 30:8   pursue 36:8   relates 7:19	respectfully 18:12
5:10,13 9:13   probably 25:5   pursued 15:22,24   relating 6:20	21:12 34:12
17:20 22:3 24:11 32:24 36:16 15:25 17:19 23:4 relation 2:4 12:2,25	responsibly 13:11
24:12 25:10,11   <b>problem</b> 9:2,4 10:2   <b>put</b> 4:5 8:15 9:23   20:21 21:13,25	restrict 11:20
29:12 31:1,9 34:7 11:22 21:5 27:18 10:3 20:7 22:16 24:6 26:16 37:1	restricted 32:3
34:12 <b>proceedings</b> 1:6,8 27:23 28:7 31:21 <b>relationship</b> 35:24	restricting 32:4
positive 10:12 11:3 3:1,19,20 4:11,13 puts 1:19,21 released 1:10 8:11	restriction 6:10,12
possibility 13:3 6:17,19 7:5,25 putting 4:23 21:7 8:16	6:16 9:5 12:13
17:2 22:10 23:5 8:14 9:2,8 13:13 relevance 2:6 3:18	14:14 15:3 19:14
possible 3:1 16:16	25:20,20 26:9
19:25 21:23 23:4 26:9,14,17 27:13 <b>question</b> 9:21 14:6 12:4 29:17 36:20	30:8,20 31:11
23:6,24 28:16 29:15 31:5 20:24 21:9 26:8 <b>reliance</b> 15:19	restrictions 9:14
questions 3:16 reluctant 7:3	
	•

	·	•	i	1
26:25	15:7,10,15,20	7:2,6,9,10,12,13	sought 9:5	12:19
resume 37:14,17	sections 15:6	8:21 9:15,17 10:1	sound 27:25	succeeding 20:3
resumes 26:5	see 3:14 4:24 15:19	10:3,4,8,19,22,23	specifically 35:20	suffered 35:18
return 21:17 23:11	16:21 21:13,14	11:1,10,15,19,22	speech 11:23 12:8	sufficiently 30:13
24:1,21	23:12 26:6 28:18	12:1,6,6,15,22,23	12:10	suggesting 8:22
reveal 7:3 27:11	29:21 31:21 37:4	13:7,8,9,18 14:9	<b>spoil</b> 31:23 32:11	11:12 26:13
reviewed 25:13	seek 6:12	14:22,25 15:5,16	35:5,6	suggestion 27:24
rid 21:21	seeking 5:4 12:6	16:5,21 17:13,22	<b>stage</b> 24:3 37:9	summarise 25:10
<b>right</b> 1:3,11 2:2 3:3	seen 6:24 10:15	18:7 19:10,20	<b>stance</b> 20:18	summary 23:17
5:17 6:7 7:8,9,13	15:17 18:10 27:22	20:1,9,19 21:12	stand 14:7,20 20:5	<b>supply</b> 28:23
10:19 12:9 15:11	32:2	21:16,20,22 22:9	31:8 34:2	<b>support</b> 6:6 21:1
15:16,25 16:4	semantics 25:22	22:13,18 23:5,8,9	standard 18:20	supported 19:1
18:12 20:1,9	sense 10:2 12:18	23:12,18,19,20,24	<b>start</b> 1:12 2:17	suppose 32:10
22:18,20 23:20	25:23 35:4	24:1,9,10,11,16	starting 22:8	supposed 16:14
24:9 25:16 29:16	sensible 21:18	25:16,18,23 26:2	status 4:15	sure 4:11 7:4 25:22
29:22 30:15,17	22:25	26:5,8,12,20,22	statutory 8:7	29:3
31:7 32:23 35:16	<b>series</b> 34:18	27:2,3,5,7,23	stay 10:24 18:23	surprising 14:13
36:4 37:6,13,18	serious 8:19	28:10,17,20,23	20:22	14:16
rightly 7:15	seriousness 19:5	29:1,6,9,14,25	<b>stayed</b> 26:25	surrounds 27:19
Rights 20:8	serve 23:22	30:6,15,23,25	steer 31:14	suspect 15:12
ring 18:16 25:4	served 22:20 30:16	31:4,7 32:23 33:2	Stein 20:20,21	
ring-fence 11:7	36:10,19	34:1,13,22 35:1,4	21:17 22:6,7,10	T
rise 7:24 8:13 37:14	<b>Service</b> 3:6,8,13	35:15 36:2,4,7,21	22:17 23:5,9,17	take 9:10 12:11,20
risk 5:3 8:4 11:23	4:2,4 5:6,15 8:22	36:24 37:13	23:25 33:2,4 34:5	22:12 29:24 32:16
27:16	16:1 17:17	sit 18:21	34:25 35:3	32:21 33:14
<b>RLRs</b> 31:9 32:18	session 24:17	<b>sitting</b> 16:4 37:16	step 21:14 23:13	taken 1:9,23 15:11
36:20,25 37:5	set 2:23 6:18 14:23	situation 1:24	stock 22:12	34:1
room 1:5 13:18	27:2	17:11 18:15 24:18	stop 18:21	takes 18:11,14 26:6
31:19 32:5 35:8	sets 16:8	25:1	Straight 23:24	talk 19:6
35:11	<b>short</b> 1:22 5:3 7:6	<b>slightly</b> 9:25 13:5	streaming 15:2	team 1:20
round 16:13 31:22	shortly 10:3	27:8	28:3	teams 1:21
<b>Roy</b> 19:7	shouldering 3:23	<b>slowly</b> 32:17	strict 3:9	tell 24:12,20 26:15
run 6:15 8:10	shrouded 28:13	<b>Smith</b> 19:7	stringent 15:4	32:14 33:2 35:22
running 2:23 9:8	side 18:22	social 30:22	<b>subject</b> 15:2 30:7	tem 30:8
runs 2:16	sight 21:19 22:7	somebody 17:5	submission 11:5	tempted 34:25
	33:5	27:17	20:15 24:23	ten 37:12
S	similar 30:17	somewhat 14:16	submissions 1:4	terms 6:4 20:24
safeguard 4:10	<b>simply</b> 6:16 11:8	soon 19:25 23:6,24	11:4 13:11 21:18	24:11 26:25 27:2
sake 29:2	12:11 32:13 35:22	sooner 1:18	32:19	30:17
saying 18:17,21	sir 1:3,14,19 2:1,2	<b>sorry</b> 13:8 16:5	<b>submit</b> 27:16	terrible 7:16
33:13	2:6,9 3:3,6,7,9,11	22:6,24 26:22	substance 27:1,3	terrorist 19:4
says 10:1	3:12,14,22 4:1,5,8	27:8 37:10	31:12	tests 12:1
Secondly 33:12	4:16,20,21 5:1,7	<b>sort</b> 9:20 10:20	substantial 7:11	thank 2:2 5:17 20:1
section 11:11,16,18	5:11,17,18,21,23	22:15	substantive 25:23	20:19 23:25 24:10
12:2,3 14:15,17	5:24 6:2,4,7,9,24	<b>sorts</b> 14:1	succeed 11:2,5	37:8,19
14:19,23 15:3,4,6				thing 14:9 22:25
	<u> </u>	·	ı	1

	1	•	1	1
30:19 31:8 33:11	treat 22:14	<b>vague</b> 32:16	<b>wholly</b> 13:7,9	36:9
things 17:23,25	trial 2:10,12,15,16	<b>vain</b> 31:17	widely 29:19 32:20	<b>10</b> 23:2 24:2 34:25
32:11,11	2:18,22 3:2 6:14	versus 9:1 12:7	37:6	37:15
think 4:22 6:24	6:15,20,20 7:18	video 1:8	wider 32:2	<b>12</b> 9:7
9:23 12:16,24	7:22 8:1,3,6,8,13	view 15:24 21:24	widespread 7:15	<b>18</b> 14:23 15:6
13:18,22 15:21	8:18 10:15 12:12	viewing 10:13	10:6	<b>182</b> 6:23 7:8 19:6
17:16 18:2 20:2	13:2,3 17:25	voice 14:6	willing 5:12,19	<b>19</b> 11:18 14:15,17
21:22 22:19,24	18:24 19:9 20:16		19:24	14:19 15:3,4,6,7
23:12,14,15 25:5	20:16 24:6 29:9	W	window 8:13	15:10,15,20
25:18 26:12 27:23	trials 19:4	<b>Wahabi</b> 7:20,20	wish 13:24 17:2	
28:7 29:16 32:24	trouble 19:20	10:13 12:11 13:15	18:25	2
34:3 35:4,8,10,16	true 17:21	15:23 16:4,25	wishes 36:8	<b>2</b> 5:8
35:20 36:16 37:3	<b>try</b> 4:10 35:3	19:5 25:24 35:10	witness 5:7 7:22	<b>2.28</b> 1:1
37:4	trying 26:22 31:14	35:12,16 36:15	9:20 16:8 17:12	
thinking 13:19	Tuesday 21:11	<b>Wahabi's</b> 2:4 6:11	27:25 28:12 35:12	3
18:13	turns 28:16	8:24 10:6,11	witnesses 2:25 3:18	<b>3.15</b> 37:20
<b>Thirdly</b> 33:18	<b>two</b> 3:17 16:8 17:6	12:21 27:9	19:24 22:21	4
<b>Thomas</b> 14:9 15:5	26:22	waiting 14:6	woken 17:5	-
15:13	two-speed 32:9	want 2:20,23 13:14	wonder 16:3,12	<b>4.2</b> 11:11,16 12:2,3
thought 16:22 23:8		17:22 18:4 24:18	worded 15:7 36:12	5
32:12	U	25:7,16 28:19	words 23:7 27:18	
<b>three</b> 17:6	ultimately 18:17	31:16,17,22 35:1	work 19:18 27:14	6
three-speed 32:9	underlying 11:13	35:17	worried 10:20	
tight 19:21	undermine 4:18	wanted 19:25	worry 20:10	7
time 8:7,9 9:6,13	understand 2:21	watching 28:3	worse 6:2	
12:18 16:12 17:6	4:21 9:18 19:5	<b>way</b> 9:19 10:8 11:7	would've 1:18	8
17:23,24 18:25	35:8	14:25 16:13 19:12	27:12	
20:11,17,24 25:21	understanding	21:3 31:22,23	<b>wouldn't</b> 10:24	9
36:14	2:24	32:25 33:1 35:10	11:5 20:14 28:19	
times 27:22	undertake 12:5,18	ways 15:7	35:1	
timescale 33:24	unfortunate 17:8	we'll 14:4 24:1 26:6	writing 30:5 36:9	
timetable 19:22	<b>unhelpful</b> 32:16,25	29:20 37:14	written 15:17	
23:2 26:3	unkindly 28:7	we're 4:2 15:22	21:15 23:14 32:19	
tipping 9:9	unpredictable	34:23 36:15		
today 17:4,5 20:25	13:10	<b>we've</b> 18:9 20:7,25	X	
21:12,13,20 22:11	unreasonable 35:2	22:12 24:17 27:22	<b>T</b> 7	
23:11 24:12 27:13	unreservedly 2:1	31:2	<u> </u>	
34:8,9,15 35:20	unsatisfactory 16:6	week 11:8 12:24	year 7:17	
<b>told</b> 2:21 16:9,10	17:14	19:8,9 20:17	yesterday 17:15	
30:18 35:19	urgency 17:4	33:15 36:17	$\overline{\mathbf{z}}$	
tomorrow 33:25	urgent 1:24	weeks 17:6,7,7		
34:21,23 36:9	use 30:21	welfare 16:7	0	
<b>Tower</b> 6:23	<b>USHER</b> 37:12	went 18:9		
transcript 1:9	usual 1:9	whatsoever 5:18	1	
33:19 37:1	$\overline{\mathbf{v}}$	35:17	<b>1</b> 33:24 34:21,23	
		wholesale 12:13	, ,	
	•	•	•	•