

Internal Bulletin - 5

Wednesday May 12 (cont.)

Afternoon: Huntingdon, the PC who accompanied S during the arrest and questioning came in. He was using the same notebook as S. Even the judge remarked on this.

Cross-examination by MM: said he did not know TG, had not seen him before. There had been a briefing before they went to TG's house. When asked about racist attacks in Bradford he said he had been on holiday from 10 - 26 July. He did not know of any before the 10th. Did he know of NF and BM? He had heard of them.. Did he know of attacks on 4th Idea Bookshop? No. What did he read? Yorkshire Evening Post. It was very rare that he read books and he agreed this meant that he was not a good judge of books. When asked how he chose which books to take away from TG's house, he said by titles. Said there were hundreds of books in the house. It was a random selection which to take away. The New Statesman had been taken because there was a picture of PC on front. What did he know about Bradford Black? He had read about it in police review. What did he consider left wing to be? Anyone who is against the police and critical of the running of the country. What did he consider to be extreme? It depended on the individual. Did he consider Enoch Powell to be extreme? No.

The point that defence drew out of those questions was that the police had been very selective about the books and maps that they took out of the house.

E. Alexander put it to him that once he had had briefing from Holland (superior officer) and heard of arrests on July 11, he had jumped to conclusions. It came out that both H and S were passing information back to Holland during questioning. Holland was in charge of collecting information and he carried out briefings.

It was agreed that a catalogue of information on racist attacks, raised by defence, should be drawn up and be passed to the jury. This should include 3 sections: on Bradford, on Leeds and nationally and should cover before and after July 11.

Thursday May 13

Huntingdon still in witness box (Detective Superintendent)

Kadri questioned him on racist attacks. Did he fill up any of the HO forms in July last year? No. Did he keep any statistics - No. He had not heard any expression of concern from black community on such matters.

M Russell questioned him. He agreed that as a detective police officer, his job was to detect crimes already committed and be aware of potential crimes. But he had never seen a Leeds paper, New Order, from NF.

He agreed that his understanding of 'left-wing' was 'anyone against the police and the general running of the country.' When asked about 'right-wing' he said: "Anyone who conducts himself within the general running of the country." He was asked if left wing was extreme, what about right wing? He said he had not looked at it this way. When asked if the NF is a right wing party? He said: 'I had never realised that. I have never been biased in any way.'

He was questioned about NF activity in various city centres - Leeds, murder in Coventry, etc. He knew about the Coventry attack and admitted that there had been incidents with skinheads in Bradford city centre but said they were not alarming and they did not involve Asians.

E. Rees asked about the incident in Bradford city centre involving skinheads. He said there had been arrests for theft, assault etc. He agreed that he took Police Review and Police Magazine but said he had not seen the Feb 81 issue of Police Review which had an article on White Power and the Nazis.

(Prosecution are presenting evidence in relation to each of the twelve defendants in the order on the indictments. This is the end of their evidence on TG. They now move on to BK.)

internal bulletin 5 p.2.

thursday May 13 (cont)

Det. Serg. Crossley in witness box - he arrested BK. Usually based in Halifax not Bradford. Described BK's arrest: "Had been at briefing at 6 a.m. Went to BK's house at 1.50 p.m. Notes made at police station after interview. Took him in car to point out MM's house. In first interview, denied anything about petrol bombs. Later after arrest of MM and others, in second interview at 3.50 admitted being involved and said he wanted to tell them what happened.

There was questioning about details in the statement.

E. Alexander asked him about the briefing. He said there were about 30 people there. He gave names of some other officers there. Agreed there was contact with Special Branch on this case. When asked about briefing he said: "It was chaired by Holland. Officers were told about the background to the arrests and part of this information was about the incidents on July 11. When asked if he took notes at the briefing, he said he just took down some names.

(Important because before this the police said all their information came from questioning.)

There was more questioning on briefing. It wasn't clear that TG or TA had been mentioned. More questioning on notes made of interview and their accuracy. For example, JB asked: "You asked him about the UBYL and meetings held. You say that he said: "We talked about the situation in our country and about the riots." I put it to you that BK said nothing of the sort." A lot of the questions were on details, wording etc to cast doubt on the general accuracy.

At the end of the questioning by JB she said: "I put it to you that your notes are influenced by your understanding of the whole situation from the briefing." This was denied.

Det. Const. Harold Irvine came to witness box. (Different Irvine from before.) He accompanied Crossley in arrest and interviewing of BK.

He was asked about the briefing, the notes made and details of the arrest etc. It came out that the notes were only made after the visit, the arrest and the first and second interview. Some of the details of the visit to the house contradicted what Crossley said. e.g. he said they did see some members of the family. EA put it to him that: "When you asked him about the UBYL and the meetings, he is supposed to have said that they talked about the situation in this country and the riots. Did he not elaborate upon the 'situation' in terms of racist attacks, deportations and the like?"

Irvine said: "I don't think so. It did not concern me to ask him what he meant. I was more concerned with the riots."

EA finished: "I put it to you that your notes interpret what was really said at the interview in terms of your understanding of the situation."

Sidebottom came back to the witness box. He saw BK 10.20 on Friday morning following his interview with other police on Thursday.

He was questioned about the notes, phrases in them and the way that B's statement was made. e.g. EA said: "The statement that you obtained ... it was not a matter of dictation, but was obtained from replies to questions that you put." This was denied. There was a contradiction between what S said and Huntingdon on whether BK read it out himself or had it read to him.

Prosecution now moved on to the arrest of Maseed Malik.

S went to MM's house at 2.30 and took him to the station. Told him about petrol bombs and he admitted involvement. Interviewed at police station straight away: by S & H. H took notes. Made two statements, later cautioned and charged.

POC put it to him that: "If an arrested man makes an oral or written submission, it is a straightforward matter for the police to resolve?" He agreed. and "The objective of the police from the outset was to obtain such statements." He denied this and said it was to find those responsible. POC put it to him that: "You and H set about from the outset to intimidate MM to obtain admissions?" He said: No, he was forthcoming, willing and frank with us from the outset. He denied being a man given to blunt language, agreed that MM had been put through the form-

alities at the station quickly but denied having said: "Right, son, - you'd better talk, or we'll kick you all around this building."

POC pointed out that the first interview had lasted 9 minutes, and the police claimed there were 7 questions and answers all recorded contemporaneously in that time. He confirmed that Holland was in charge and was responsible for collating all the information.

POC put it to him: "The possibility that these petrol bombs might have been used against the police, had that occurred to you by this time?" S said they only had what TG had said about self defence. POC asked: "You had been aware of the circumstances of TG's arrest and the suggestion that he was inciting violence against the police?" "And you were anxious to confirm this suggestion - a preoccupation which determined your questions?" He denied this.

POC suggested MM had not been asked if he wanted to make his own statement. S denied this. POC said: "The fact is he was putty in your hands - and you knew it." S said: "He was being completely honest and forthcoming." He brought out that MM's statement begins with: "Further to my previous statement, I would like to clarify the points which I did not mention before ..." and asked if these were the words of an 18-year old Yorkshire lad. S said yes. POC pointed out that S' own statement begins with: "Further to my previous statement, I would like to clarify the points which I did not mention before ...." and asked if this statement was drafted by MM. Judge ruled out question.

POC brought out that TG wrote his own statement but all the others were written by police with the exception of TA. He put it to him that: "Is it true to say then that TG's statement did not turn out to be satisfactory to the police? So the others were not given a choice?" S denied this.

S agreed that normally an arrested person has the right of access to a solicitor but in this case there had been an order from Sup. Holland to refuse access to solicitors for 14 hours. The embargo was lifted at 4 a.m. on Sat. POC pointed out that MM was not charged till 36 hours after his arrest even though the police had plenty of evidence against him from his own statement. He also asked: "You wanted as much about TG as possible in statement." S denied this.

He was asked about an incident room set up by WY police to deal with the problem of armed robberies which was seen as a serious threat to law and order. He knew about this. He was asked: "Has any incident room ever been set up in Bradford to deal with the problem of racist attacks?" He said: "No, it is not considered to be a serious problem."

#### Friday 14 May

H still in witness box. Denied that S adopted an openly aggressive approach with M from the outset etc.

Prosecution moved on to the arrest of AM.

First witness was Det. Ins. Windle who had arrested AM on evening of 30 July. Arrested for conspiracy to cause explosions and taken to police station.

He was questioned by Kadri on AM's voluntary statement. Brought out that AM was only just 17 when arrested. Put it to Windle that in the car on the way to the police station he has been told he would get 7 years and be punished. Denied. Also denied that AM asked for a solicitor. Denied that Prosser had hit AM on the face. Denied that any pressure was put on AM. Said that he knew of no racist attacks on the black community. Kadri put it to him: "AM was never offered the opportunity to write his statement - or was never told that the statement was to be written down at all - he was simply told 'Now let's go through everything again and we'll write it down.'" "After the statement was written, A never read it himself - something was read to him and handed to him to be signed. He was told everybody else had signed a statement. 'Why don't you do the same?'" The interview started with oppression and ended with oppression and the last half hour was the time when he was being persuaded to sign the statement." W. denied this: "He was cooperative throughout."

internal bulletin 5 p. 4.

Friday 14 May (cont.)

At the beginning of the afternoon an application was made for an adjournment because news had come through of the death of Masoor Malik's father. The judge turned it down.

Det. Const. Prosser in witness box. Accompanied Windle in arrest etc. of AM. Went through arrest and interviews etc. Also questioned by ER about going to the Black Swan and seeing GS and others.

Prosecution moved on to the arrest of VP. Notes made after the interview. Main point raised in cross examination was whether the statement had been dictated by VP or whether it was written down as a result of questions and answers. Also denied knowledge of racist attacks. "Are you aware of any incidence of such (racist) attacks in Bradford?" "No, there aren't any." "Not a topic the police think relevant?" "No."

DC James in witness box. Accompanied Prosser. Nothing new.