

## Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA)

### Decision notice

**Date:** 13 February 2012

**Public Authority:** The Chief Constable of Northumbria Police

**Address:** North Road  
Ponteland  
Newcastle upon Tyne  
NE20 0BL

#### Decision (including any steps ordered)

---

1. The complainant requested information relating to the attempted murder of Martin McGartland in 1999 and Northumbria Police's investigation of that incident.
2. The Commissioner's decision is that Northumbria Police was correct to deem the request vexatious within the meaning of section 14(1) of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (the Act).
3. The Commissioner however finds that Northumbria Police breached section 10 of the Act by failing to respond to the complainant's request within the 20 day time for compliance.
4. The Commissioner does not require the public authority to take any steps in this matter.

#### Request and response

---

5. On 15 January 2011, the complainant made a request to the public authority via the 'What do they know?' website and requested information in the following terms:

*"Under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 I am seeking the following pieces of information in relation to the attempted murder of Martin McGartland in June 1999.*

*(1) How many suspects are currently being sought in relation to above case?*

*(2) Please could you tell me how long has the longest outstanding suspect been sought in relation to this case?*

*(3) Has the force used familial DNA testing in relation to above unsolved [sic] case. If so, when was it first used in relation to above case. How many times has it been used since the June 1999 attack?*

*(4) How many potential "matches" {as regards to question 3) did the DNA database provide you with in relation to above case.*

*(5) Please could you supply me with the total cost of the investigation for the first year starting from 16-06-1999 to 16-06-2000.*

*(6) Please could you supply me with the total current cost of the investigation for the past 2 years. I would like this information annually, for the past two years up until the time my request is answered.*

*(7) Please could you supply me with the up-to-date total current cost of this investigation since 17-06-1999 and until this request is answered.*

*(8) Please supply full details of all amounts paid by your force in relation to above case on external legal advice and also external legal representation between 17-06-99 and until this request is answered. Please provide a yearly breakdown of the figures and also specify which payments were counsels' fees.*

*(9) Please provide the names of all law firms and individuals, including counsels, who have supplied such services and/or advice {as regards to question 8) to Northumbria Police concerning Martin McGartland and/or the McGartland the attempted murder case between 17-06-1999 and the date this request is answered."*

6. The public authority responded on 21 February 2011 following a reminder from the requestor. It stated that it was unable to provide a response within 20 days and stated that it was considering the exemption under section 14. The requestor then asked the following supplementary questions:

*"a, How are you researching the information held, with whom and for what reasons. Please supply all information and also a list of names of all persons involved.*

*b, A list of names of person, or person's[sic], within Northumbria Police who are dealing with or who have been involved with this request.*

*c, Supply all information of any contact between your office/officers and*

*Chief Superintendent Chris Thomson concerning this request.*

*d, All information concerning any request for legal advice or assistance concerning this request."*

7. The public authority responded on 9 March 2011. It explained that the request was vexatious within the meaning of section 14(1) of the Act.
8. Following an internal review the public authority wrote to the complainant on 18 May 2011 upholding its view that the request was vexatious. However, at this point some information was provided to the requestor that had previously been disclosed in response to a similar request by another individual in September 2009.

### **Scope of the case**

---

9. The complainant contacted the Commissioner to complain about the way the request for information of 15 January 2011 had been handled.
10. The Commissioner considered whether or not the request was vexatious within the meaning of section 14(1) of the Act.

### **Reasons for decision**

---

11. Section 14 of the Act states that

"Section 1(1) does not oblige a public authority to comply with a request for information if the request is vexatious."

12. The Commissioner's approach to what makes a request vexatious is outlined in his guidance '*Vexatious or repeated requests*<sup>1</sup>'. The key question is whether the request is likely to cause unjustified distress, disruption or irritation. The guidance sets out a number of factors to consider in determining whether a request is vexatious, namely that:

- it would create a significant burden in terms of expense and distraction;
- it is designed to cause disruption or annoyance;
- it has the effect of harassing the public authority;

---

1

[http://www.ico.gov.uk/for\\_organisations/guidance\\_index/freedom\\_of\\_information\\_and\\_environmental\\_information.aspx#vexatious](http://www.ico.gov.uk/for_organisations/guidance_index/freedom_of_information_and_environmental_information.aspx#vexatious)

- it can otherwise fairly be characterised as obsessive or manifestly unreasonable; and
  - it clearly does not have any serious purpose or value.
13. To determine whether the complainant's request is vexatious, the Commissioner will consider the circumstances, history and context of the request. In certain cases, a request may not be vexatious in isolation but when considered in context it may form a wider pattern of behaviour that makes it vexatious. The Information Tribunal upheld this approach in *Rigby v Information Commissioner and Blackpool, Fylde and Wyre Hospitals NHS Trust* (EA/2009/0103), commenting that:
- "it is entirely appropriate and indeed necessary when considering whether a request is vexatious, to view that request in context"* (para 40).
14. The Commissioner recognises, however, that it is the request and not the requestor that must be vexatious for section 14 to be engaged.
15. The public authority explained that it refused the complainant's request in reliance of section 14 because it had received a number of other requests relating to the same subject matter. These requests were made by a number of other requestors. The public authority determined that the complainant's request should be considered in the overall context of these requests. The public authority had previously responded to requests from other requestors on the same subject matter, beginning in 2009. In September 2009 the public authority refused a request for very similar information to that requested in points 5, 6 and 7 of this request on the basis that it would exceed the appropriate cost limit<sup>2</sup> to provide the information requested.
16. On 13 November 2009, a refusal notice was issued to a requestor stating that all future requests from that particular requestor on the subject would be deemed vexatious. Since that time the public authority has received a number of other requests from members of campaign groups interested in the McGartland case. Many of the requests came from the same website and the public authority is of the opinion that the requestors are acting in concert due to the similarity, frequency and nature of the requests submitted.
17. When investigating a public authority's application of section 14(1), the Commissioner is also mindful of the Tribunal's decision in *Hossack v the*

---

<sup>2</sup> Section 12(1) of the Act exempts a public authority from complying with a request for information if the authority estimates that the cost of complying with the request would exceed the appropriate cost limit.

*Information Commissioner (EA/2007/0024)*. In that case, the Tribunal commented on the consequences of finding a request vexatious. It accepted that these are not as serious as those of determining vexatious conduct in other contexts and, consequently, the threshold for vexatious requests need not be set too high.

18. In determining whether section 14(1) was applied correctly, the Commissioner considered the evidence provided by the public authority and the complainant against each of the criteria in paragraph 12, and in the context and history of correspondence and contact up until the date of the internal review.

***Would complying with the request create a significant burden in terms of expense and distraction?***

19. When considering whether this factor applies, the Commissioner would expect a public authority to be able to show that complying with the request would cause a significant burden in terms of both costs and diverting staff away from their core functions.
20. The public authority directed the complainant to the Commissioner's guidance concerning vexatious requests in order to explain its position. It advised her:

*"Clearly your request when taken in context with the many other requests received on this subject is part of an ongoing campaign that can be fairly called vexatious in nature. Please note that it is the subject of the request that can be declared vexatious rather than the requestor and it is therefore relevant to take into account all other requests received and subsequent responses issued on this matter.*

*As it is believed that you are acting as part of a campaign group it is entirely appropriate to take into account the requests made by other members of that group on the same subject."*

21. The Commissioner is satisfied that the previous requests contain sufficiently similar questions to make the public authority's opinion that the requestors are acting in concert a reasonable one. The request under consideration in this notice was received just one day after the public authority issued its response to similar requests. Requests refused on 14 January 2011 are reproduced in Annex A. The public authority states that members of the campaign group have persistently submitted overlapping requests regarding the minutiae of the public authority's involvement in the case. The requests are repetitive and due to the volume and nature of requests, including the large number of questions contained in some of them, dealing with the campaign group places a significant burden on the public authority.

22. The public authority explained that the requestor and other members of the campaign group were well aware that "it is in the public domain that the investigation into the shooting remains live. This request (along with others received) was seen as designed to disrupt the normal business process of that investigation".
23. In many of the previous requests, and in this one, the original request has been followed up with supplementary questions.
24. The Commissioner has recently upheld a complaint concerning a request to the same public authority relating to the same subject matter. This request was also refused by the public authority on the basis that it was vexatious. In that case the Commissioner disagreed with the public authority. However, the Commissioner accepts that there comes a point where the cumulative effect of requests about the same issue, including follow-up requests and requests for internal reviews becomes a burden in terms of expense and distraction.
25. The request under consideration in this notice appears to be the first request from this individual. However, when requesting an internal review the requestor proactively informed the public authority, via the 'What do they know?' website, of her close relationship with the victim at the centre of the police investigation. The Commissioner is therefore satisfied that she is linked to the campaign group.
26. In the Commissioner's view the cumulative effect of the complainant's request, the repetitive nature of her request and the number of requests received prior to hers which the public authority recently refused, has created a significant burden on the public authority in terms of both expense and distraction.
27. The history of the requests also suggests that responding to this request would lead to more requests from the group.

***Are the requests designed to cause disruption or annoyance?***

28. The public authority, in its submission to the Commissioner, stated:

*"Prior to [the complainant]'s submission Mr McGartland had made 10 FOI requests all concerning the subject matter of his shooting and related matters. Each request made was followed up by a request for internal review irrespective of whether information was provided or not. Such actions are clearly taken to cause disruption and annoyance to this department and other departments that may become involved in such requests. The volume and frequency of these requests were taken into account when considering [the complainant]'s submission."*

29. The complainant maintains that all she wants is for the requested information to be provided. She notes that the public authority has not previously provided any of the information she requested, either in response to this request or in response to any others by other requestors. The Commissioner notes that this observation also supports the view that there is a group of people acting in concert.
30. The campaign group's focus is a desire for further investigation of the attempted murder of Martin McGartland. The public authority has told the complainant and other members of the campaign on a number of occasions that the investigation is ongoing. They have also been informed that there are processes in place for appropriate sharing of information between the police and victims of crime while the investigation is still live.
31. It is not the stated aim of the campaign group to disrupt or annoy the public authority, although the group is clearly dissatisfied with the public authority's investigation to date.
32. The public authority has stated that the effect of the multiple requests is disruptive and annoying, whether or not that was the intention. The Commissioner agrees that the number of requests on the same subject matter within a short period of time was disruptive and annoying, even though there is no evidence to suggest that that was the intention.

***Did the requests have the effect of harassing the public authority?***

33. The Commissioner's guidance on considering this issue states that the focus should be on the likely effect of the request (seen in context) rather than the requestor's intention. It is an objective test – a reasonable person must be likely to regard the request as harassing or distressing. Relevant factors to consider could include the volume and frequency of correspondence, the use of hostile, abusive or offensive language, an unreasonable fixation on a particular member of staff, or mingling requests with accusations and complaints.
34. There is no suggestion that the language or tone used by this complainant could fairly be characterised as abusive or distressing.
35. It is however the repetitive nature of the combined requests that is likely to have a harassing effect on the public authority rather than this individual request. It is in the public domain that there is an internet campaign group<sup>3</sup>. The Commissioner accepts that the number of requests made by persons identified as being linked to the campaign

---

<sup>3</sup> [www.causes.com/causes/548596-we-the-friends-of-martin-mcgartland-support-his-right-to-justice](http://www.causes.com/causes/548596-we-the-friends-of-martin-mcgartland-support-his-right-to-justice)

group, and the repetitive nature of those requests, has a harassing effect on the public authority and its staff, regardless of the language or tone used.

***Could the requests fairly be categorised as obsessive?***

36. Arguments as to obsession are likely to be persuasive where a request follows previous requests for similar information or is on the same theme.
37. The public authority has noted that the request was made one day after it refused other requests on the same subject on the basis that they were vexatious. This request contains questions which are substantially similar to those in the requests refused the previous day. The public authority's view is that this request was a tactic employed to circumvent the refusal of previous requests.
38. The public authority states that a number of requestors, acting in concert as part of a campaign group or groups, have persistently submitted overlapping and repetitive requests for information about the public authority's involvement in the case. The nature and volume of the requests on similar subject matter can fairly be characterised as indicative of an obsession with the subject.
39. This request was not looked at in isolation. In the public authority's view it was entirely appropriate, given the known connection with previous requestors and the remarkable similarity of some of the questions to those included in previous requests, to take into account the requests made by other parties on the same subject.
40. The test is whether a reasonable person would describe the request as having crossed the line from persistent to obsessive. In the context of the number of requests on the subject from members of the campaign group and the similarity of those requests, the Commissioner accepts that in all the circumstances the request is indicative of an obsession with the subject matter. There is every indication that responding to this request would have led to further requests from the group.

***Do the requests lack any serious purpose or value?***

41. The complainant and other requestors are of the view that the investigation has not been properly conducted and that the public authority has repeatedly refused to provide information or answer (in the requestor's view) reasonable questions about the progress of the investigation. From the requestor's point of view the requests do have a serious purpose and value. However, the public authority has repeatedly said that the investigation is still ongoing and that there are processes in place, such as victim support, that offer appropriate limited sharing of



information. The public authority has stated that 'this sharing is fully compliant with relevant legislation'.

42. The Commissioner does not consider that the Act is the appropriate forum to air a grievance or progress a campaign against a public authority. This view is supported in the case of *Rigby v the Information Commissioner and Blackpool, Fylde & Wyre Hospital NHS Trust* [EA/2009/0103] where the Tribunal pointed out that "FOIA is not a panacea for problems that have not been resolved through other channels".
43. The Commissioner therefore accepts that although there is a serious element in trying to establish if the attempted murder was being properly investigated, this has been overshadowed by the nature and frequency of the enquiries into what is a 'live' and ongoing investigation.

## Conclusion

---

44. The Commissioner's view is that it is appropriate to consider this request in the context of other requests and correspondence relating to the aforementioned investigation. It is clear that there is a campaign to elicit information and further the investigation, as the campaign group is unsatisfied with the progress of the investigation to date. The complainant in this case voluntarily, prior to the internal review, made the public authority aware of her close relationship with the victim of the crime which is the subject of the requests. If the request were to be considered in isolation it would appear to be reasonable but in the context of the number of requests by members of the campaign group the Commissioner agrees that there is sufficient evidence for him to determine that the request, when considered in context, is obsessive, causes a significant burden in terms of expense and distraction and has the effect of harassing the public authority. In all the circumstances, the request can be characterised as vexatious within the meaning of section 14(1). The public authority was therefore correct to refuse to comply with the request.

## Right of appeal

---

45. Either party has the right to appeal against this decision notice to the First-tier Tribunal (Information Rights). Information about the appeals process may be obtained from:

First-tier Tribunal (Information Rights)  
GRC & GRP Tribunals,  
PO Box 9300,  
LEICESTER,  
LE1 8DJ

Tel: 0300 1234504

Fax: 0116 249 4253

Email: [informationtribunal@hmcts.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:informationtribunal@hmcts.gsi.gov.uk)

Website: [www.justice.gov.uk/guidance/courts-and-tribunals/tribunals/information-rights/index.htm](http://www.justice.gov.uk/guidance/courts-and-tribunals/tribunals/information-rights/index.htm)

46. If you wish to appeal against a decision notice, you can obtain information on how to appeal along with the relevant forms from the Information Tribunal website.
47. Any Notice of Appeal should be served on the Tribunal within 28 (calendar) days of the date on which this decision notice is sent.

**Signed .....**

**Alexander Ganotis**  
**Group Manager – Complaints Resolution**  
**Information Commissioner’s Office**  
**Wycliffe House**  
**Water Lane**  
**Wilmslow**  
**Cheshire**  
**SK9 5AF**

## **Annex A**

### **Request dated 13 December 2010 refused 14 January 2011**

"Dear Northumbria Police,

1. Which Category was given by Northumbria Police to my 1999 attempted murder case. Please also explain the reason(s) for this.
2. Have Northumbria Police, (Northumbria Police Authority), requested and or been paid any additional and or special funding by the Home office in relation to my 1999 attempted murder case.
3. Please identify all/any funding, payments made to Northumbria Police, Northumbria Police Authority by the Home Office in relation to this case.
4. Have Northumbria Police, (Northumbria Police Authority), requested and or been paid any additional funding by any other Government departments, third party organisations in relation to this case. If so, please identify all/any payments.
5. Please supply full details of criteria used by Northumbria Police, (Northumbria Police Authority) when applying to Home Office, other Government departments for special and or additional funding for high profile criminal and or terrorist operations and investigations.
6. After investigating this case for more than 11 years, have Northumbria Police established a motive for my attempted murder, if so, please give full details.
7. Have Northumbria Police uncovered any evidence of IRA involvement in my case, if so, please give full details.
8. Please supply details including documents of total costs of investigation during past 12 months.
9. Did Northumbria Police at any time, request the assistance of the Anti Terror Branch in relation to this case, if so, for what reason and please explain when they became involved, at what period during the 11 year investigation and when they ceased being involved in the case.

10. Please supply copy of all documents concerning Northumbria Police's procedures, policy on major crime review(s).

11. Please detail all/any reviews which have been carried out by Northumbria Police in relation to my case since 1999.

12. A van (Bedford Rascal) was recovered from scene of shooting, please explain what happens to such vehicles, evidence, are they retained, is this van still being retained by Northumbria Police, if not, please explain why not. If it has been disposed of, please give full details of when this took place, reasons why and supply evidence to confirm same.

13. Have Northumbria Police ever identified or recovered the getaway car used in my attack, if so, give full details.

14. Have Northumbria Police ever been able to identify anyone who is suspected of being involved in my attack from CCTV footage, if so, please give full details.

15. Have Northumbria Police ever been able to identify either the getaway car or the Bedford Van involved in my attack from CCTV footage, if so, please give full details.

16. Have Northumbria Police ever been able to identify suspect(s) or potential suspect(s) from forensic evidence recovered in this case, fingerprints, DNA, including familial DNA searching and or intelligence led, screening and or testing in this case. If so, please give full details.

17. Have Northumbria Police used Familial DNA searching in this case, if so, has there been any partial and or close matches, if so, please give full details, including when it was used in this case, if not, please explain why not.

I would be interested in any information held by Northumbria Police (Northumbria Police Authority) regarding above requests. I understand that I do not have to specify particular files or documents and that it is Northumbria Police's (Northumbria Police Authority) responsibility to provide the information I require.

I wish to receive the information in electronic format. Please also ensure all information is sent via what-do-they-know, this site.

If my request is denied in whole or in part, I would ask you to

Reference: FS50401605

justify all deletions by reference to specific exemptions of the act. I will also expect you to release all non-exempt material. I reserve the right to appeal your decision to withhold any information."

**Request dated 14 December 2010 refused 14 January 2011**

"Dear Northumbria Police,

1. How many police officers have been directly involved in the investigation in this case.
2. What is the total cost of the investigation to date.
3. How many firearms officers were directly involved in protecting me.
4. What was the total cost of providing firearms officers in this case.
5. How many times have Northumbria Police officers, other person(s) acting on their behalf) travelled to Northern Ireland in relation to this case.
6. Please identify all costs in relation to all visits to Northern Ireland including total costs to date.
7. Please identify all/any costs paid in legal fees in relation to the case. Please also supply breakdown of such costs.
8. Please identify all costs paid in relation to all/any other professional fees in this case. Please supply breakdown.
9. Have any Northumbria Police officer travelled outside of the United Kingdom in relation to this case, if so please give full details including date(s), number of officer(s), rank(s) of officers.
10. If so, what was the total cost(s), including full breakdown relating to number 9 above.
11. Please give full details of all/any payment(s) made by Northumbria Police, it's insurers or any other third party organisations, acting on their behalf, to any person(s) by way of compensation, damages, payment(s) for damage and or any other associated costs connected to the case.
12. Please supply full details of names and rank of all senior officers, above Chief Superintendent rank, who have been involved

Reference: FS50401605

in this case during past 10 years. Please detail their involvement in this case."

**Request dated 19 December 2010 refused 14 January 2011**

"Dear Northumbria Police,

On the 4th of July 2010 the News of the World (Scotland) published a story with the headline; "IRA's secret Glasgow hitman" – "MYSTERY SCOT IS PRIME SUSPECT BEHIND ASSASSINATION ATTEMPT", written by Charles Lavery.

I sent a copy to both the SIO and also the force Solicitor at the time of publication.

The News of the World claimed that;

(a) 'The prime suspect behind an attempt to assassinate an MI5 supergrass is a mystery Scot who masterminded the IRA hit from his Glasgow base.'

(b) "The 52-year-old, who we can only call 'S' for legal reasons, sent a three-man team of Scottish hitmen to Newcastle to kill IRA informer Martin McGartland in 1999."

(c) 'And last night a source at the force told how 'S' is a prime suspect.'

(d) The terror boss has organised IRA active service units on the British mainland for more than two decades and runs operations from his base in the Calton district of Glasgow.

(e) Our source said: "This individual has come up time and time again during our investigations.

"It seems he sent the team down to Newcastle with the express instruction to carry out their hit. "That is the line of inquiry being focused on at the moment."

(f) We can reveal the team tasked with assassinating McGartland ended up boozing with one of his pals and made a drunken pact just to wound, not kill, him.

(g) Our source said: "S sent the team down to Newcastle. Their orders were to kill, and they did fire six bullets into McGartland - but most of them were in his lower body.

"They struck a deal with a close friend of Marty's and agreed not to kill him."

Please confirm the following;



1. Have Northumbria Police contacted the News of the World concerning this story, if so, when. If not, why not.
2. Have Northumbria Police spoken to Charles Lavery, if so, when. if not, why not.
3. Is any of the information within the report accurate, if so, please supply full details.
4. Is; "The 52-year-old, who we can only call 'S' ...' known to Northumbria Police, if so, is he suspected of being involved in my 1999 attempted murder.
5. The report claimed, as c above, that; 'And last night a source at the force told how 'S' is a prime suspect.' It also stated, g above; Our source said: "S sent the team down to Newcastle. Their orders were to kill, and they did fire six bullets into McGartland - but most of them were in his lower body. "They struck a deal with a close friend of Marty's and agreed not to kill him."
  - (a) Is 'S' a 'prime suspect' in my attempted murder, if so, please supply full details.
  - (b) Do NP have any evidence that 'S' sent a team down with ' ... orders to kill' me, if so, please supply full details.
  - (c) Do NP have any evidence that; "They struck a deal with a close friend of Marty's and agreed not to kill him." And/or, as f above; We can reveal the team tasked with assassinating McGartland ended up boozing with one of his pals and made a drunken pact just to wound, not kill, him. Do NP have any evidence concerning this, any of the claims, or have any of these claims ever formed part of NP's investigations, if so, please supply full details.
6. As detailed in d above; The report claimed 'The terror boss has organised IRA active service units on the British mainland for more than two decades and runs operations from his base in the Calton district of Glasgow.'
  - (a) If this is correct, if 'S' is a 'prime suspect' in my undetected 1999 attempted murder case why has 'S' never been arrested by NP.
  - (b) Will NP now be arresting 'S' and/or other(s) connected to him, my shooting, if not, why not.

(c) Can NP confirm that 'S' is not being protected from arrest because he is/was an IRA terrorist.

(d) Have NP ever been prevented or ordered not to arrest 'S' and/or any other suspects connected to my 1999 case by security services, Home Office or any other servants of the Crown, yes or no please.

7. The report also claims; " 'S' is well known to counter-terror officers in the UK and runs his operations from some Celtic-affiliated pubs in the Calton area, where he is a respected member of the Catholic community." And that Sources claim he has been involved in EVERY IRA operation on the UK mainland for three decades."

(a) Have NP been in contact with counter terror officers, terrorist branch concerning these claims, and or the person referred to as 'S' or any other person(s) linked to him. If so, when. If not, why not.

You will of course appreciate that these are very serious issues and it follows that they ought to be fully investigated in an open and transparent manner, given according to NP, my attempted murder case remains unsolved almost 12 years on. The claims within News of The World are very relevant and also important to my 1999 attempted murder case, NP's investigation and all/any lines of enquiry must be fully investigated.

(b) As 7 (a) above, have NP been in contact with MI5 concerning these News of The World claims, 'S', if not, why not.

8. Have there been any internal investigations by NP, concerning the claims within News of The World article of leaks by NP unidentified officers, as detailed in both paragraphs c and e above, if not, please explain why not, given that these are extremely serious and very damaging issues. Moreover, NP will be aware that at least one member of staff has been dismissed for leaking confidential information about me in the past and that there were further libelous and extremely damaging leaks by NP, which were given to the press by them, on the day of my shooting, and given to press 'off the record' and which were sanctioned by unidentified chief officers, no doubt on the orders of the Home Office, it's servants and also MI5. All of the information was of course deliberate lies and smear as has been proved publicly to be the case and underlines how NP, the Crown will lie, deceive, cover-up and break the law when it suits, while dealing with my

1999 case.

I maintain that there is evidence that NP, other Crown servants have and continue to act corruptly when dealing with me, my cases.

9. Given number 8 above, will NP now establish a totally independent investigation to investigate such leaks and to identify those involved, if not, please explain why not.

I also maintain that NP, others, have been involved in a cover-up concerning my attempted murder case. I also maintain that NP officers have been involved in collusion when dealing with my 1999 attempted murder case.

I note that Sir John Stevens used the following criteria as a definition of collusion while conducting his investigation/s in Northern Ireland:

- The failure to keep records or the existence of contradictory accounts which could limit the opportunity to rebut serious allegations.
- The absence of accountability which could allow acts or omissions by individuals to go undetected.
- The withholding of information which could impede the prevention of crime and the arrest of suspects.
- The unlawful involvement of agents in murder which could imply that the security forces sanction killings.

Taken from; <http://cryptome.org/stevens-3.htm>

I would like your reply to be sent to me via this site, the what-do-they-know website."