

Internal Bulletin No.6.

N.B. These bulletins are not meant to be public but can be given out to members of support groups etc. If you want more copies sent, please let us know.

Monday 17 May - Court

Individual barristers asked for leave for the defendants to attend the funeral of Masood Malik's father who had died on the previous Friday. All the defendants got leave apart from Saeed Hussain whose case was being dealt with that day.

The prosecution continued with the evidence on SH.

Det. Cons. Wight in the witness box. He went to arrest SH on the evening of 30 July at his house. Asked him if he understood English. Took him to the police station, interviewed him etc. He had not given any information on the first interview. His replies had been: 'I don't know.' 'I don't remember'. etc.

E. Alexander asked him about the briefing on 17 July. It came out that Lafish, Holland's boss had been present there. Kadri asked W. about racist attacks, HO report etc. Replies were same as others. Kadri pointed out that an Asian school boy had been attacked with a petrol bomb in Keighley, where Wight works. Also that a local councillor, Pickles, had stated publicly that Asians had been systematically persecuted in Keighley.

There was a series of interviews with SH who at first gave no replies. Different policemen were brought in to 'help' with the interviews, which continued till after midnight. Finally the police fetched in BK who identified SH. SH then admitted having been at the house where the meeting took place, but said that he had not taken part in the meeting. It was said that "if he just sat there and said nothing, it was probably not a criminal offence."

He was interviewed again the next morning by two other policemen, Porter and Melaney. He was made to admit being at the meeting and knowing the people there etc. He was asked: "What were the petrol bombs to be used for?" "Defensive measures against skinheads!" "That isn't true, is it?" "Yes, it is." "When were they to be used?" "In case of trouble." Police insist that 'trouble' meant using the petrol bombs against shops and police, not just in case of trouble with skinheads.

Defence suggested that the police had been deliberately aggressive with SH because he was not giving them the information they wanted. That they had brought the "heavy boys" in. Porter denied have said: "Since your lot are always complaining about police harrasment, I'll let you know what it's really about."

There were questions about the interview and when the notes were taken. Police claimed to have written down notes after the interview. HK pointed out that there were 196 questions and answers altogether. Porter said there were two of them so they didn't miss anything out. However when asked, he couldn't remember the first question that defence had asked him in court that day!

HK suggested that the notes were not in fact taken until after the fourth interview and after they had obtained a written statement from SH. This was denied.

She also suggested that it wasn't a statement but replies to questions by police. That the whole tenor of the interview was unpleasant and phrases had been used like 'You lot from the jungle'. That he had been struck on the head three times. All this was denied by Porter.

Det. Serg. Palmer was questioned. He was present at the 3rd interview. It was suggested that he was 'brought in to be aggressive'. This was denied. It was suggested that things would be difficult (for SH), if he didn't answer questions and he was threatened with deportation. This was also denied.

internal bulletin 6 p.2.

Monday May 17 (cont).

PC Melaney: present at 2nd and 4th interview - cross examined.
MR brought out that in this interview SH is supposed to have said that TG & PP masterminded the whole thing. She implied that PP was included at this point by police because he had not been implicated before. This was denied. (PP was in fact only arrested later that day.)

HK cross examined M: He admitted that they had had an 'agreement' to make the notes after the interview. He denied "not telling the truth" and that "he and Porter put their heads together and invented the whole interview." She suggested that SH was never invited to write down his own statement etc.

The prosecution went on to present evidence on Ishaq Kazi. No statement from IK had been presented to the jury so far because the defence objects and challenges his 'statement' in its entirety. A 'trial within a trial' took place while the jury went out, the prosecution presented its evidence, the defence carried out some cross-examination. At the end of this the judge overruled the objection so the jury were called back in to hear the evidence and cross-examinations.

The police originally picked up IK as a witness. They interviewed him and later arrested and charged him - treating him as a suspect. At first he only admitted lending his car to TG and denied any involvement in the making or planning of petrol bombs.

Tuesday 18 May

(Some of these points were originally made in short cross examination on Monday without the jury. They have been put together to avoid repetition.)
Prosecution presented evidence and defence cross examined in front of jury.

Det. Serg. Morley was cross examined by Crabtree. He interviewed IK a number of times, on thursday, friday and saturday. IK was charged on friday.

During the cross examination, C brought out the way the police had threatened and tried to persuade IK to get a statement out of him. This was denied.

For example, IK had said that he wanted to go home. His father was ill and it was during Ramadan. He was told "You can go nowhere now." C put it to the police that this was a "ploy to intimidate and extract answers from him." He was told that he wouldn't get out unless he gave right answer. When he wouldn't give them an answer, he was asked: "Don't I deserve an answer?" At another point he was asked: "Do we take it that when you're silent, you're lying?" The police kept on playing on the fact that IK had a job in the bank. 'He was a sensible chap with a reasonable job.' He was alternately accused of being a ringleader and threatened with 'punishment' of 7 years and told by police: "I'll give you credit in court, if you tell us everything." He was threatened with being charged with conspiracy to murder a policeman. All this was denied by police.

C put it to M that he had bullied IK. M denied this and said he wouldn't hurt a fly. M said he was talking quietly in court because had had a sore throat but denied shouting at IK. C brought it out that IK had three interviews on Thursday and Friday but the police got very little information out of him. C put it to M that "By the end of Friday, IK was shaking like a jelly." M said he had been shivering. M denied threatening to have IK punished. C pointed out that when IK had tried to remain silent, the police had intimidated and threatened him and 'reduced him to a wreck'. This was denied.

M agreed that he had said: "I'll give you credit at court for not going along with them (the others), if you tell us everything." He denied that 'credit' meant a lighter sentence. C said that the police had said to IK that he would be properly punished before sending him to the cell for the night to deliberately put that into his head for the night. This was denied.

internal bulletin 6 p.3.

Tuesday May 18 (cont.)

In the morning IK made a statement. The defence again tried to bring out that the statement was not dictated but was replies to questions by police, with certain changes etc. Also after making his statement, IK was still questioned to get information about others. C accused the police of extracting the statement after putting great pressure on IK and by total disregard of the judge's rules i.e. by refusing to recognise the right to keep silent and refusing access to a solicitor. By the time he did make the statement, he was very distressed.

MM cross examined: Asked about meeting with Det. Ins. Holland on Sunday 19th July at 6 p.m. Morley had also arrested AK and questions were asked about the interview with him. He had been asked about the split between UBYL and AYM.

MM questioned him about his attitudes to 'riots' etc. "Did he consider the riots to be spontaneous?" "No." "Did he know what TG had said to the police on self-defence?" (at that time) "No." "Had he read TG's statement?" No.

M said that he was not personally aware of any racist attacks although he knew that they did happen. He had not heard of the Mr Singh who was attacked on Leeds bus service. But he knew of three Sikh men who had beaten up a white guy. He had no personal experience of NF activities in Bradford. (He is now stationed in Manningham but has only moved there recently.) He said he had read reports of NF activity outside Bradford. Agreed that their activities consist of things like stickers, graffitti etc. containing racial abuse. But he made the point that he had also seen several incidents of the reverse (!) He was asked did he know of examples of property being damaged substantially as a result of racial abuse? or of the NF attacking people or property? He said he was not aware of examples himself but he would accept that this sort of thing happened. He was asked if he was aware of the fears of the Asian community of these attacks? He said not in the way 'you put it'.

TA cross examined Morley. Asked him if he had heard of TA? He said he had heard of one (another) TA. Was he aware that there are fascist vigilante patrols in Manningham? No. Was he aware that the three Sikh men he had earlier talked about had been abused by the white man who was in a crowd shouting racial abuse? They were the Virk brothers. He said he wasn't aware of this.

Had he heard of the murder of Mohammed Arif last year in Bradford? Yes. Was he aware that the murderer was a member of the British Movement? and that he had taken part in a Free Rudolf Hess demonstration in Leeds? M said that he was aware that he had had some connection with the BM. Would you agree that this was a racist murder? He denied this because he said that the man involved had earlier had a row with his wife and it was this that was the cause of the murder.

DC Powell who had accompanied Morley came to witness box. He was questioned about the same sort of things as Morley and gave similar version of what had happened in the police station. He denied that IK was shaking because he had been 'reduced to a wreck' by police intimidation. He said he was shivering in a sudden chill in a draught.

The prosecution then went on to present evidence on Pravin Patel. Wight went into the witness box. He is the policeman who went to Scarborough to fetch PP and interviewed him in the police station.

The main points brought out by the defence and denied by the police were that the police had no evidence against PP so they were determined to get an admission out of him and put him under pressure and threatened him until they got a statement. Judges rules ie right to solicitor and right of silence were ignored. PP was not given anything to eat from the time he arrived in Bradford till the next morning. There is no suggestion that violence was used against PP but that he was put under great pressure. For example, in the car on the way from Scarborough, defence suggested that "a softening up technique took place in the car, building up in his mind that effectively you knew it all already, so he might as well tell you everything."

internal bulletin 6

Wednesday May 19

There were questions asked about when PP requested solicitor and entries on the detention sheet in relation to this. Defence said that request for solicitor was a serious matter. Put it to PC Windle that PP had made request on 31st July. W denied this and said no request had been made that day. Defence pointed out that on detention sheet the entry had been changed from 31st July to 1st August on request for solicitor. W agreed that the figure had been altered. Defence said this indicated that the request had been made on 31st. W said that he was not present when the request was made.

W was also asked about coordination between different officers going on in the station at the time. For example: Defence asked: What did you do in this half hour? (before an interview). He said: "I can't remember." Told to look at notebook. W read from notebook: "After he (PP) had been lodged, liaised with supervisory officers." Defence put it to him that he had found out that 8 statements had been made. W said he couldn't remember. Defence asked: "Was there a theory put forward by senior officers about why the crime was committed?" W said they certainly had. He went on: "It is blatantly obvious why petrol bombs are made - they're for one purpose and one purpose only."

MR pointed out that in one interview he asked 69 questions and got 69 answers and all this was recorded from memory afterwards. She went on to ask detailed questions about the way the statement had been put together and particular phrases (she suggested) had been added or changed to include the police view on the purpose of the petrol bombs and the role of TG. For example, the statement includes: "Tarlochan said at the meeting we'd use them against shops and buildings." PP denies ever having said this. Police denied having made any changes. Another example was that the statement had: "There's going to be a riot tonight." PP denies saying 'riot' and says he said 'trouble'.

PC Fletcher (arrested and interviewed PP) in witness box.

In cross examination, MR brought out that the two had written notes together and they each seemed to have perfect recollection of interview. No crossings out in notes. MR put it to him that: "When statement came to be made, you added your suggestions But you didn't in fact quote what PP had said himself."

Prosecution moved on to Giovanni Singh.

Windle and Proctor responsible for interview. Proctor went to GS house at 1.30 p.m. Notes made when he went back to office. Arrested GS for conspiracy. GS denied having anything to do with petrol bombs. Police say that: "At first interview said that he went to meeting and was asked to get tubing. Second interview said he wanted to make statement. Statement started with meeting TG, information about AYM etc. Said that TA and SH had been at meeting but had left. Described meeting and later going to Black Swan and back into town."

ER cross examined: He put it to police that they had put pressure on GS to make full statement rather than that he had given on voluntarily. ER tried to bring out the police view. Asked Proctor: "Do you support Wight's view on petrol bombs, that it is blatant what their use is?" P agreed. ER asked if GS had mentioned Southall and later on mentioned skinheads coming to Bradford. P denied this. P denied that pressure had been used on GS, that GS had asked when he would be released or that he had asked for a solicitor. ER put it to him that when he had arrested him (GS) in his house, GS had been told that he was in trouble and that he had asked for a solicitor then. This was denied. ER pointed out that every single defendant is supposed to have made a voluntary statement, and that every single one was denied access to solicitors. He pointed out that according to the police and their record, GS is supposed to have made a long voluntary statement and "When it's all over he asks to see a solicitor after making a comprehensive statement." He pointed out changes in date on detention sheet. He suggested the police had written statements from questions and answers GS had given and changed some things, for example, on petrol bombs.