

Tuesday May 11 (cont.)

Detective Inspector Bruce was called. He went to the scene after the find of the petrol bombs. After questioning, he agreed that he had "fiddled with material, bottle, wicks etc," before the forensic experts had had access.

The next prosecution witness was Detective Inspector Sidebottom who went to the scene of the find on 17 July, took part in a police search of the area on 20 July and arrested Tarlochan on the morning of July 30. He made a long statement about the events and was then cross-examined by defence. He and Huntingdon were responsible for questioning and taking statements from TG.

Sidebottom's account: (abbreviated). "He and Huntingdon visited TG's house at 7 a.m. TG opened door. S had never seen or met him before. He told him who he was, cautioned him and said some petrol bombs had been found etc. TG said he knew nothing and S arrested him. Took him to the police station. Police searched the house and bin liner before they left. In bin liner they found NUS headed paper with addresses on it and the names Harrogate, Brixton and Norwich underlined. TG was interviewed at 9.40 a.m. Police recorded questions and answers at the same time as the interview was held. TG denied petrol bombs. Asked questions about UBYL and split with AYM. Asked about founders of UBYL. Asked about meeting place and aims of organisation. TG said the aim of the organisation was to defend our community from fascists like NF, BM and Column 88. TG talked about racist attacks on the community in Bradford and elsewhere. TG said would only act in self defence to protect our people. Denied petrol bombs. Police kept saying that they had definite evidence that he was implicated. He had a large number of left wing magazines and books. Mentioned New Statesman, Race Today, H-Block literature, KAR and CARF among others. This showed that he was a man of extreme views. He had maps of Leeds, Liverpool and Brixton in the house. Kept asking about petrol bombs whether he had seen them used etc. TG said we would defend ourselves."

"asked about arrest on 11 July. Why were they there? TG said it was an unlawful arrest. They had been there because of the threat from fascists. Police officers said there had been no such threat. TG said they were told that skinheads were coming into town."

"TG finally admitted making of petrol bombs and said that remembering Southall we saw the necessity to prepare ourselves. He accepted responsibility. Gave nicknames. This was in first statement which TG insisted on writing himself. A second statement was made later on that day after being told that two of the others had been arrested. Fri 31 July he made a third statement in which he admitted responsibility with TA."

The last two statements were written by police and not by TG. Although the defence does not challenge all the statement, there are key parts which are challenged - like references to Brixton and Toxteth as opposed to simply Southall.

Defence tried to bring out collusion between police officers. They all denied knowing TG or anything about him before these events. MM brought out the fact that different departments of the police force work in the same building, some of them on the same floor and must know each other. Sidebottom claimed not to know TG but he knew who he was when he opened the door. Admitted he had been issued with a photo of TG. It came from the collators office where records were kept. S would not answer questions about the nature of these records.

Another point brought out by MM was that the police had not checked out what TG had said about seeing the need for the defence of the community, or information about skinheads coming to Bradford. They had ignored these points because they said they did not believe them. For example, TG said he had had a phone call warning him about skinheads coming from Fourth Idea Bookshop. Police had not bothered to check this out.

Wednesday May 12

Cross examination of Sidebottom continued. Defence tried to bring out the ignorance of the police of racist attacks and the fact that they did not take seriously these points made in TG's statement.

S did not know of the two specific attacks mentioned and had not checked up on TG's statements on attacks. He didn't know about a whole list of attacks on 4th Idea Bookshop. He said he didn't know that TG had played a part in various campaigns e.g. Anwar Ditta's.

MM suggested that things were included in the statement that had not been said and things were left out that were said. (He was warned that this was a serious allegation to be making against a senior police officer - and he continued.) There was questioning about the way the notes were made at the time of the questioning. Questions about why a solicitor had not been allowed. S said it was because TG had not asked for a solicitor. (Huntingdon says a general decision had been made not to allow solicitors.) Subtle pressure was used: e.g. I will be all right, if you answer all my questions. TG had not seen notes made or signed them.

The main point challenged in the third statement was where TG is alleged to have said that TA was one of the prime movers. MM put it to S that the statement "was fabricated by making additions to it at key points."

EA raised the question of special forms which are used by the police for taking notes 'contemporaneous' with interviews. These had not been used in Bradford and were not normally used.

It became clear that different people were being questioned at the same time in the police station and liaison was taking place between the different police officers involved. Information was being pooled and coordinated.

Kadri: Made the point that the important thing was the motive for making the petrol bombs. If they were for self defence, then they were lawful. Judge and P both said that they would be addressing the jury on that point at a later stage. K held up form which is the official Home Office form for collecting information on racist attacks. S said he had not seen it - did not know what it was. He did not know that W. Yorks had been one of the areas under study for the Home Office report. He said he did not consider he needed special training for multi-racial work. K then said "This is precisely the insensitivity I'm talking about". He was cut off by the judge and now allowed to continue his questioning.

MR continued on this line of questioning. S did not know of local fascist paper called New Order. Didn't know about specific racial attacks mentioned. She said: he had singularly failed in his duty. S said that racist attacks were one of a number of priorities in police work. He was asked about murders last year in Coventry. He said he had read about them. He was asked if he had considered making preliminary inquiries in the Leeds Bradford area on racist attacks - he said no.

At this point the judge closed the court and told all the barristers etc to come to a meeting with him. Some of the black barristers took a stand on 'no secret meetings' and refused to go to talk to him. Judge said, in this meeting, that following this line of question - i.e. on racist attacks and the police attitude to them - would exacerbate race relations in Bradford. i.e. police ignorance and negligence must not be exposed in court.

Kadri continued questioning: Did he know of burning of Asian and black people by white people? meaning Deptford. S said he didn't know details. S said he thought Southall Brixton and Toxteth were all the same - the violence was directed against the authorities and against the police.

Shown leaflets by English KKK. Did he find them nasty? yes, objectionable. Did he know of NF meetings in Bradford? No.

Asian councillors in Bradford? No.

Internal bulletin 4 p.4.

Did he know about the delegation of community leaders who went to the police before July 11 in Bradford? No.

Ed Rees brought it out about the pooling of information by different police officers during questioning. Police had argued that only TG and TA brought up question of self defence. ER pointed out that GS had raised question of self defence but police had brushed it aside. Police had made up their minds and dismissed real possibility of self defence.

TA: If you knew that right wing organisations were boasting that they had infiltrated police to get hold of files etc, would you say that would be nasty and dangerous? S said he didn't see possibility of such a thing.

Is the increase in organised fascist violence of interest to you?

He got the judge to allow him to read out article from 'Bradford Star' headed 'Nazi Patrols in Streets'. Talked about vigilante patrols in Manningham to cut down crime rate. Infiltration of police force because of the need to get access to files.

Had he heard of the shotgun attack on International Club? No

Did he know about the incident when a pig's head was put in a mosque in Dewsbury? No.

Asked what he understood 'Paki-bashing' to mean.

He thought that Southall was a case of . violence against the authorities. Was it to do with skinheads? No.

He thought that Southall, Brixton and Toxteth were all the same.

Do you think skinheads have racist ideas? No

Asked about attacks on Asians - said question was too general.

Do you keep a record of racist attacks? No

Do you keep a record of cases where victim is black? No

(Important because Ellis had said that he had information from S's records that there was no increase in racist attacks.)

He said there was no evidence of skinheads in Bradford on July 11. No increase in fascist activity in general in Bradford? When asked about NF candidates standing in local elections, he said 'that's different.'

When asked about NF and BM slogans and posters, he said no more than in other places.