!

!

!

!

#

#

f) CTI also confirmed that many of the witness statements were repetitive

in terms of what they described. In light of that, it would not be

necessary to hear from all living witnesses at the inquest hearings; there

will need to be a filtering process. CTI noted that there were 53

individuals who were in the Horse of Groom at the time of the blast and

injured (of a larger group of peop le in the pub at the time). Of those 53

individuals, HMC’s legal team had provisionally identified 33 potential

“core witnesses”, although more work was needed to go through that

evidence.

g) Going forwards, CTI explained that the next step will be for HMC’s

legal team to identify to Surrey Police the witness statem ents which it

is considered should be disclosed to the IPs, along with the associated

exhibits and other documents, so that they (Surrey Police) could

consider the need for any proposed redactions. It will then be for Surrey

Police to p rovide an indication as to how long they will need to carry

out that task. There was an issue as to whether or not to disclose

statements first and other materials later. In terms of identifying

material proposed for disclosure, CTI will start with statements and then

come on to exhibits and other documents. However, when it comes to

disclosure it may be better to provide everything all in one go.

h) CTI noted that Surrey P olice had proposed that the recipients of the

disclosure should p rovide a confidentiality undertaking, and had

provided a proposed draft. However, an alternative would be to provide

a notice with the disclosure to the IPs, reminding them of the implied

undertaking to the court not to disclose material further. HMC indicated

he would hear counsel for Surrey Police on that issue in due course.

3.2.2.

! #
!
#
#
!

!

!

a) CTI confirmed that there was no update from the MPS because it had

!
#
!

!

!

!

!! ! !!! !! ! !

he would go through Schedule again and provide a cop y to CTI highlighting any material which might be relevant, but which wasn’ t

!

!

!

!

3.10. CTI responded by noting that there was an implied undertaking for any recipient of

disclosure that they should not use material for any collateral purpose, and that it

should suffice to serve a notice confirming the terms and effect of the implied

undertaking with any disclosure. There were potential difficulties in requiring a

signature, and it could cause concern to unrepresented IPs, who in any event were

under no obligation to sign such an undertaking. There was no reason to suspect that a

notice explaining the implied undertaking given upon receipt of disclosure would be

disregarded.

3.11. HMC noted that such undertakings were becoming more commonplace, although

pointed out that he was under a statutory obligation to provide disclosure to IPs. If

someone refused to sign an undertak ing but still wanted disclosure, it left the court in

a very difficult position, although ultimately the disclosure would still need to be

provided.

3.12. Ms Barton noted that, in her experience, she had never encountered a party who had

refused to sign an undertaking, and that the benefit of requiring a signature was that it

!

!

!

!

!

! ! ! !!! ! !

material should be signing an undertaking, as was standard practice e.g. for legal

teams.

3 .14 . HMC indicated he would not give a decision on the issue immediately, as the point of

disclosure had not been reached, however he would consider the matter and the

submissions made.

3 .15 . Ms Barton then invited HMC to give an indication as to the platform to be used to

facilitate disclosure. HMC confirmed that the court utilised the document-management

system “Caselines”, which allowed customised access (e.g. particular individuals

could be granted access to particular documents or p articular parts of the database) . It

was a tried and tested system which had proven to be successful in the Surrey Fam ily

Courts and the Surrey Coroner’s court, and it was anticipated that it would be suitable

for these inquests.

3 .16. HMC then turned to the matter of timelines. He noted that PIRs had occurred every

three months, and he was keen to continue with that approach in order to ensure that

regular updates were provided in public. He queried whether full disclosure could be

provided before the next PIR, noting that IP s needed to have it for a period of time in

order to be able to have a substantive discussion about it.

3 .17 . CTI submitted that a further PIR in March 2021 would be useful, although it was

unlikely that full disclosure would be provided by that time. The statements would

probably be processed, but it was unlikely that all the associated exhibits and other

documentation would be ready to go before the hearing. Nevertheless, a PIR in March

would p rovide an opportunity to tak e stock, and in particular to involve the families at