

2. Attendance

2.1 HMC began the PIR by welcoming the attendees. The legal representatives in attendance (in person) were:

2.1.1 Oliver Sanders QC, leading counsel to the inquests;

2.1.2 Matthew Flinn, in s011(f)800(e)1271Q inquest; 1b9T0 u.tf41 veQ. n.so)4 (tt)-tha /TTO

2.1.3 Alice Kuzmenko, second junior counsel to the inquests;

2.1.4 Fiona Barton QC, leading counsel for Surrey Police;

2.1.5 James Berry, counsel for MPS; and

2.1.6 Edward Pleeth, counsel for MOD.

3. Summary note of hearing

3.1 After welcoming and introducing atteC Q/P cb2o the inquests;

- 3.5 In terms of witnesses speaking to that issue, the topic was better addressed by more senior military personnel, however it was reported that CTI had had less engagement with that cohort of potential witnesses. That was because those in the HGPH on the night in question were mostly younger recruits and very few of the senior officers from the local barracks made statements to Surrey Police at the time.
- 3.6 One relatively senior officer who did make a statement was 2nd Lt Gillian Taylor. She was involved in the identification of the bodies of Ann Hamilton and Caroline Slater (as they were recruits from her barracks). Junior CTI had been in contact with her (now Gillian Boag-Munroe) to explore the scope of the evidence she might be able to give about security measures/advice/training generally at the time. CTI reported that it appeared she would be able to provide some useful evidence on that topic, and had also provided some further names that the counsel team could follow up.
- 3.7 Such enquiries, and a number of other avenues being explored by CTI, meant that IPs could anticipate a few further witness statements being added to Batch 4 on Caselines in the coming weeks.
- 3.8 Further enquiries on this topic were being pursued by the MOD. Mr Pleeth confirmed to HMC that the Defence Inquest Unit from MOD had been working hard to locate any relevant documents setting out security policies and procedures that were in place at the time. This had not been a straightforward exercise, and a number of avenues had been explored which had not yielded any results. However, there remained a few outstanding lines of enquiry, and the MOD did anticipate that it would be able to provide some additional material to the court. The MOD also proposed to provide an additional witness statement speaking to this issue to assist the court as far as possible.
- 3.9
- provision of any relevant materials located, a statement or report explaining what steps the MOD had taken to carry out searches and what the outcome of those searches had been.

3.10 CTI then provided an update on the report of Ms Lorna Hills from the Defence Science and Technology Laboratory. This had been provided to CTI on 21st March 2022 and had been circulated to IPs. It did not contain expert evidence from Ms Hills herself, strictly speaking, but rather interpreted the expert evidence and materials in relation to the explosive device and blast that were generated in the aftermath of the GPB.

3.11 CTI raised the query of whether it was sufficient to hear oral evidence from Ms Hills on the basis of her report, or whether the underlying materials on which it was based should be also read directly into evidence under Rule 23 of the Coroners (Inquests) Rules 2013.

3.12 On that topic Ms Barton QC for Surrey Policy expressed the view that it was not necessary to read in the underlying materials, given that:

3.12.1 Ms Hills will be best able to understand and speak to those materials; and

3.12.2 IPs will have a list of the underlying documentation and can ask questions about it.

3.13 That submission was supported by Mr Pleeth for the MOD, and Mr Berry for MPS.

3.14

was likely to be a lot of read evidence during the inquest hearings, and that might be considered a point in favour of not reading documents where it was not necessary to do so.

3.15 In light of the submissions made, HMC confirmed that he was content to rely on the report and oral evidence of Ms Hills without reading into evidence the underlying materials.

3.16 CTI noted that a further piece of 20 12 Tf136.82 338.33 Td338.337ts ~~into~~ (w136()20 (20iv)-4ly

kept in reserve. This entailed pushing the start of the hearings from 6th to 20th June 2020. It was noted that this would also work with other commitments of certain counsel for the IPs.

3.20 CTI then addressed some logistical points in respect of the final hearings.

3.21 It was confirmed that the court would be obtaining transcripts, which would be put on the Surrey County Council GPB webpage as and when they were prepared. These would be prepared from court recordings and would not be immediately available. The

24 hours) were more expensive than e.g. 48 or 72 hours.

3.22 HMC noted that he would normally opt for a 48 or 72 hour turnaround time, bearing in mind that if any points needed to be urgently checked or confirmed, the recordings could be reviewed. However, the problem with that time period was that in the event that a request was made to obtain a transcript for a particular day more urgently (e.g. 24 hours), the capacity of the transcription service to meet that request depended

that meeting would be communicated to media representatives and any submissions on the approach adopted could be made at the next PIR hearing.

Correspondence from the family of Ann Hamilton

- 3.26 CTI noted some correspondence which was received from Cassandra Hamilton (the sister of Ann Hamilton) on 6th his behalf. The correspondence had been circulated to IPs. As set out in the written submissions, CTI confirmed that