

**PRE-INQUEST REVIEW HEARING**

arising from the deaths in the

**WESTMINSTER TERROR ATTACK OF 22 MARCH 2017**

held at

The Central Criminal Court  
The Old Bailey  
London  
EC4M 7EH

before

**HIS HONOUR JUDGE MARK LUCRAFT QC**  
(Her Majesty's Chief Coroner of England and Wales)

on

Monday, 15<sup>th</sup> January 2018

---

**PROCEEDINGS**

## APPEARANCES

MR J. HOUGH QC and MR A. MOSS (instructed by Bircham Dyson Bell LLP) appeared as Counsel to the Inquests.

MR G. PATTERSON QC (instructed by Hogan Lovells LLP) appeared on behalf of the families of Aysha Frade, PC Keith Palmer, Leslie Rhodes and Andreea Cristea.

MR D. ADAMSON (instructed by Slater & Gordon LLP) appeared on behalf of the family of Kurt Cochran.

MISS S. LEEK QC (instructed by the Government Legal Department) appeared on behalf of the Secretary of State for the Home Department.

MR H. KEITH QC and MR M. BUTT appeared on behalf of the Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis.

MR P. HATHERALL (instructed by Capsticks LLP) appeared on behalf of the London Ambulance Service.

MR G. LADENBURG (of Counsel) appeared on behalf of the London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority.

MR S. NAUGHTON (of Counsel) appeared on behalf of Barts Health NHS Trust.

MR D. SIMPSON (Solicitor) appeared on behalf of the Independent Office for Police Conduct.

---

## I N D E X

	<u>Page No.</u>
Opening address by the Chief Coroner	1
 <u>OPENING SUBMISSIONS:</u>	
Mr HOUGH	2
 <u>SUBMISSIONS</u> re Topic 1 – Interested Persons:	
Mr LADENBURG	12
Mr NAUGHTON	12
 <u>SUBMISSIONS</u> re Topic 2 – Update on Investigations:	
Mr KEITH	14
Mr SIMPSON	14
 <u>SUBMISSIONS</u> re Topic 4 – Scope of the Inquests:	
Mr PATTERSON	15
Mr ADAMSON	17
Miss LEEK	18
Mr HOUGH	18
 <u>SUBMISSIONS</u> re Topic 6 – Article 2 ECHR:	
Mr PATTERSON	20
 <u>SUBMISSIONS</u> re Topic 7 – Disclosure:	
Mr PATTERSON	21
Mr HOUGH	21
 <u>SUBMISSIONS</u> re Topic 11 – Anonymity:	
Mr KEITH	22
Mr HOUGH	23

1  
2 (10.30 a.m.)  
3

4 THE CHIEF CORONER: Mr Hough, we are here to deal with the pre-inquest review hearing into  
5 the tragic events that took place last March in Central London. The lives of many were torn  
6 apart by less than two minutes of high and terrible drama. Can I start by expressing my  
7 sincere condolences to the families of those who lost loved ones?  
8

9 The purpose of the inquests that will be held in relation to those deaths will be to examine  
10 the key issues for a Coroner; who died, when they died, where they died and how they died.  
11 In the course of the inquests, I hope the process will provide answers to the obvious and  
12 understandable questions that the family of those who died will have. I hope that the key  
13 issues around how they died will be explored and answers provided that will give some  
14 comfort in such difficult circumstances.  
15

16 On 22<sup>nd</sup> March 2017, Khalid Masood drove a car across Westminster Bridge. His vehicle  
17 mounted the pavement and struck a number of pedestrians. Four people sustained fatal  
18 injuries – Kurt Cochran, Leslie Rhodes, Aysha Frade and Andreea Cristea. The vehicle  
19 went on to crash into railings at the perimeter of the Palace of Westminster. Masood left the  
20 vehicle. He ran through the Carriage Gates vehicle entrance of the Palace of Westminster.  
21 He attacked PC Palmer, causing fatal injuries. Masood was then confronted by plain-  
22 clothes armed officers and was shot. These events spanned 82 seconds. Not only were four  
23 pedestrians and a police officer killed but many others were injured.  
24

25 Dr Fiona Wilcox, the Senior Coroner for Inner London West, opened inquests into the  
26 deaths of those who died. An early pre-inquest review took place in May 2017.

27 Responsibility for these inquests has now passed to me and, with your assistance and with  
28 those present in court, we will turn to deal with the management of the inquests.  
29

30 Before you begin, I should make one important point for the media, one which I expect is  
31 well understood by experienced reporters. The inquests are likely to take place later this  
32 year and it seems that a jury will be required for at least the inquest concerning Masood.

33 The jury must decide the case solely on the evidence they hear in court. It is important that

1 reporting should be accurate and balanced. Nothing should be published, including by way  
2 of online commentary or social media, which could run the risk of prejudicing the outcome  
3 of the inquests. I have the power to refer anything to the Attorney General if, in my view, it  
4 may amount to a contempt of court.

5 MR HOUGH: Sir, may I begin by introducing the advocates? I appear, with Aaron Moss, as  
6 counsel for the inquests and Bircham Dyson Bell are solicitors to the inquests, a team lead  
7 by Siân Jones. To my left, and in order, Gareth Patterson QC, instructed by Hogan Lovells,  
8 appears for the families of Andreea Cristea, Aysha Frade, PC Keith Palmer and Leslie  
9 Rhodes. Dominic Adamson appears for Mrs Cochran, the widow of Kurt Cochran. Hugo  
10 Keith QC and Matthew Butt are for the Metropolitan Police Service. Samantha Leek QC is  
11 for the Secretary of State for the Home Department and is representing the security  
12 agencies. Philip Hatherall of Capsticks is for the London Ambulance Service. Guy  
13 Ladenburg is for the London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority, the responsible for  
14 the London Fire Brigade. Danny Simpson is present for the Director General of the  
15 Independent Office for Police Conduct (formerly the IPCC), and Sebastian Naughton is for  
16 the Barts Health NHS Trust.

17  
18 Sir, on 5<sup>th</sup> January solicitors to the inquests circulated an agenda for today's hearing and a  
19 set of written submissions on our part. Those were available to the press on the large table.  
20 If they may be handed round? By last Wednesday, as directed, the various interested  
21 persons helpfully provided their submissions in writing. The exchange of submissions tells  
22 us that there is general agreement on the right approach for these inquests and the case  
23 management directions have been given. I should also mention that the spouse of Khalid  
24 Masood is represented by Mr Imran Khan, of Imran Khan and partners. He is not in  
25 attendance today because of a prior court commitment. He has informed the court that his  
26 client has no submission or observation on the proposals we've made in writing.

27  
28 Although there is common ground on the directions to be given, I propose to summarise the  
29 main points of our submissions for the benefit of everyone in court, including the media,  
30 following the order of the agenda. Before I do, let me make one important observation,  
31 chiming with yours, sir. The events of 22<sup>nd</sup> March 2017 in Westminster were devastating  
32 for the families of those who died and for those others who were seriously injured.  
33 Furthermore, any inquiry into this, that happened in Central London and the seat of our

1 Parliament, is a matter of high public interest. These events demand a full, thorough and a  
2 fair inquiry within the bounds of the law, and that guiding principle runs through our  
3 submissions.

4  
5 The first topic we addressed is interested persons, p.2 of our submissions. Those recognised  
6 as interested persons, as you know, sir, in an inquest are accorded certain rights, including  
7 the right to receive relevant documents and the right to examine witnesses, typically through  
8 lawyers. At an earlier pre-inquest hearing, in May of last year, the Westminster Coroner, Dr  
9 Wilcox, designated the families of those who died and various organisations as interested  
10 persons in the relevant inquests.

11  
12 As to others, you have an application before you from the London Fire and Emergency  
13 Planning Authority for interested person status, which you will grant if you consider that it  
14 has sufficient interest, within the meaning of that phrase in s.47(2)(a) of the Coroners and  
15 Justice Act 2009. We submit, briefly, that the application is strong given that Fire Brigade  
16 officers were involved in the emergency response to a significant extent. Mr Ladenburg  
17 may develop that further.

18  
19 You may also receive an application from Barts Health NHS Trust, and, sir, I'll let Mr  
20 Naughton say any more about that.

21  
22 The next topic is to update the court on the investigations, and there's an update at pp.3-4 of  
23 our submissions. The events with which we are concerned have been the subject of a major  
24 investigation by Counter-Terrorism Command of the Metropolitan Police (SO15). That's  
25 involved taking statements from witnesses at the scene and from witnesses about the  
26 attacker and his preparations. It's involved extensive trawls of CCTV evidence, and  
27 especially footage which shows the attack and its immediate aftermath from many angles.  
28 It has included forensic investigations and substantial reports on the speed and movement of  
29 the Hyundai car used in the attack. Instructions have been given for a range of expert  
30 reports.

1 In addition to the police inquiries, there was an IPCC investigation into the use of lethal  
2 force by the officers who confronted the attacker. That's standard practice. The IPCC  
3 found no basis for any suggestion of misconduct or any offence by those officers.

4  
5 A number of internal reviews have been carried out by MI5 and counter-terrorist policing  
6 bodies, and, helpfully, an independent assessment of those reviews by David Anderson QC  
7 has been made public, which gives some key information about the attacker and his  
8 background, including how he came to the notice of the police and MI5 some years before  
9 the attack. That report is available online. Finally, there have reviews of security at the  
10 Palace of Westminster.

11  
12 The product of these various investigations and reviews will no doubt be of great value to  
13 the inquests, and I should say that SO15, in particular, has already provided substantial  
14 assistance.

15  
16 Moving on then to the organisation of the inquests, which we address at p.4 of our  
17 submissions. An inquest must be held concerning each of those who died. However, it's  
18 not necessary or appropriate to hold a separate hearing for each person because of the  
19 common factual circumstances. The question, therefore, arises as to how these inquests are  
20 to be organised and what we propose is as follows: first of all, there should be a hearing of  
21 the inquests concerning those who were struck on the bridge and PC Palmer, that's to say  
22 the victims of the attack. Immediately afterwards there should be a separate, probably  
23 shorter, hearing of the inquest into the death of Khalid Masood, the attacker.

24  
25 The reasons for that approach are as follows: First of all, understandably, the families of the  
26 victims would not wish their inquests to be heard together with the inquest concerning the  
27 attacker. If possible, the court should respect that wish just as Lady Justice Hallett  
28 respected the same preference of the victims' families in the 7/7 London bombings inquests.  
29 Secondly, the inquest concerning the deaths of the victims raises a set of issues distinct from  
30 those raised by the inquest concerning the shooting of Khalid Masood. The former, for  
31 example, raise questions about whether the attack could have been prevented or the victims  
32 better protected. The latter will involve a consideration of the confrontation with the armed  
33 officers. Next, this approach which we've proposed shouldn't involve too much duplication

1 of evidence. We anticipate that the investigating officer could give evidence at the start of  
2 Khalid Masood's inquest, summarising the basic facts about his preparations and the attack,  
3 on which evidence would have been heard in the prior hearing, in order to provide context.  
4 Finally, for legal reasons the inquest concerning Khalid Masood has to be with a jury. The  
5 approach we suggest is taken in the other inquests is that they can be in a hearing without a  
6 jury, which is the preference of all interested persons who have expressed a view, including  
7 the families. I will turn to that topic later. I understand that proposal of ours as to the  
8 organisation of the inquests to be supported by others, but you may hear if that's wrong in  
9 any respect.

10  
11 Fourthly, the scope of the inquests, which we address at pp.5-7 of our submissions. In these  
12 inquests, as in most others, a view has to be taken at an early stage about the proper scope of  
13 the inquiry. The Coroner is obliged to call evidence to answer the four factual questions  
14 prescribed by the 2009 Act, to which you, sir, referred in opening; the identity of each  
15 person who died and when, where and how that person came to die. However, the inquiry  
16 will often be more extensive than is strictly necessary to answer those questions and we  
17 submit it ought to be in this case supplied by the reports.

18  
19 At para.16 of our submissions we've set out a series of points for inquiry, which I can  
20 summarise as follows. First, for all the inquests we intend considering evidence of the  
21 background to the attacks, including Khalid Masood's personal history, what the authorities  
22 knew of him over the years, his planning and preparations and his dealings with others and  
23 movements in the period for the attacks.

24  
25 Secondly, the inquests concerning those who were struck by the vehicle. We shall consider  
26 the sequence of events on the bridge and how each came to be injured, the care and  
27 treatment given to each of them and the medical cause of each death. All of those matters  
28 obviously will require sensitive handling.

29  
30 For the inquest concerning PC Palmer, we will consider the attacker's entry into the Palace  
31 grounds, his attack on PC Palmer, the care and attention given to the officer, the injuries he  
32 suffered, the security arrangements at the Palace and the protection given by the officer's  
33 body armour.



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

For the inquest concerning Khalid Masood, we shall consider the events leading up to his entering the Palace grounds, his attack on PC Palmer, his confrontation with the armed officers, the medical attention he received after being shot and his cause of death.

My learned friend Mr Patterson, at para.20 of his submissions, and Mr Adamson at para.10 of his, have identified some questions into their clients (inaudible), notably about Masood’s background and security at the Palace. As we see it, in general terms, those questions fall within the topics we’ve proposed so far as there is admissible evidence to answer them and assuming, in each case, that a proportionate inquiry will be pursued.

Some interested persons, notably the families and the Home Secretary, have raised questions in their submissions about the date range suggested in para.16(a)(ii) of our document relating to MI5’s knowledge of Masood. The date range was suggested to reflect the information in the Anderson report about when Masood was under active consideration. However, we accept that the timeframe shouldn’t be limited in the way that our submissions initially proposed at this stage. So we consider it best to remove the date range and rephrase that part of the sub-paragraph to refer to “some consideration of his police record and what was known to the authorities about his association with extremists”. And obviously implicit in “some consideration” is the notion of a proportionate inquiry.

Sir, the fifth topic concerns summoning of a jury, and this is addressed on p.7 of our submissions. As you know, sir, s.7 of the Coroners and Justice Act makes it mandatory to have a jury for certain types of inquest but in other cases the Coroner has a discretion whether to summon a jury or to hear the case him or herself without a jury. It is explained in our submissions, and as everyone agrees, the inquests concerning the victims of the attack do not have to be heard with a jury. There is also, as we understand it, general agreement that it would be preferable for you, sir, to hear those inquests without a jury. The key benefit of that course is that you would be able to produce a reasoning for your conclusions, something a jury can’t do and something which we would expect to be particularly beneficial in this case.

1 The inquest into the death of Khalid Masood, which we propose be the subject of a separate  
2 hearing, must be with a jury and that's simply because the statute says that a jury is required  
3 for any death resulting from the act of a police officer, even if there is no suggestion that the  
4 officer did anything wrong.

5  
6 The sixth topic that we address is Art.2 of the European Convention on Human Rights, p.9  
7 of the submissions. I will deal with this topic quite shortly. It's addressed fully in our  
8 document. Sir, in a small proportion of inquests the state's investigative obligation under  
9 Art.2 of the European Convention is engaged. This is an issue of law, a somewhat  
10 recognised one, and its resolution may affect the form in which the inquest conclusions may  
11 be given. Based on the evidence presently available, we consider that it can't be said that  
12 Art.2 is engaged in the relevant legal sense in the inquests concerning the victims.

13 However, the matter will be kept under review as evidence is disclosed. The point we  
14 would stress is that as the Court of Appeal and the Supreme Court have repeatedly said, this  
15 question of law of Art.2 engagement has no real effect on the range or rigour of a Coroner's  
16 inquiry. These inquests will be comprehensive irrespective of how the Art.2 question is  
17 answered.

18  
19 The seventh topic is disclosure, p.10 of our submissions. Sir, in any inquest interested  
20 persons have a general statutory right to be supplied with the relevant evidence, such as the  
21 witness statements, before the inquest hearing. As in other substantial inquests, we are  
22 proposing to set up a document management system and to disclose statements, reports and  
23 other documents via that system to the interested persons. Sir, Mr Moss, in our team, has  
24 reviewed the Tier 1 statements – and we explain Tier 1 statements in our documents. It's a  
25 form of police categorisation – he's reviewed the Tier 1 statements provided to us by the  
26 police, bar a few, which comprise most of the relevant evidence about the attack itself. He's  
27 applied redactions for irrelevant personal information, like telephone numbers and addresses  
28 and so on, and for a few pieces of irrelevant security sensitive information. Once a  
29 document management platform has been set up, that material will be uploaded. We'll then  
30 continue to upload further tranches of material as it is produced and we expect that all  
31 relevant investigation material can be uploaded well before the hearing. Your team is  
32 presently in the process of negotiating the potential providers for the document management  
33 system. In the meantime we'll arrange for conventional confidentiality undertakings to be

1 signed by the various teams, other than the Metropolitan Police itself, so that we can give  
2 them access to the systems up and running. All IPs who signed should be given access to  
3 the system with at least the Tier 1 statements uploaded within one month from now, and  
4 sooner if possible.

5  
6 Moving on to witnesses for the inquests, which we address from p.11 of our submissions. It  
7 will ultimately be your decision, sir, which witnesses are called, but, as you will appreciate,  
8 it is good and standard practice to consult the interested persons on the issue. In a case of  
9 this kind, where many people saw the key events unfolding in a city centre, the choice of  
10 witnesses inevitably involves some selection to obtain the best evidence. What we propose  
11 to do is to circulate draft witness lists after the disclosure process has started, and to invite  
12 comments on those lists, and we hope by that process to settle on an appropriate selection of  
13 witnesses who are generally agreed by correspondence.

14  
15 The ninth topic we address in our submissions is video evidence and visual aids, on p.12.  
16 Sir, the police investigation team has produced a compilation of footage which shows the  
17 attack, using various pieces of CCTV footage, and that can be used to illustrate the sequence  
18 of events. It's gone through a number of versions. The final version will be provided in  
19 due course to all interested persons and will obviously be sensitive to the concerns of the  
20 families about any footage being too graphic to show in court, although I understand the  
21 police have already taken that into account to an extent.

22  
23 The inquests are likely to receive other video evidence too. For example, there exists  
24 footage of the store in which Masood purchased knives. There is footage of the car rental  
25 company who provided the car. We understand there's footage showing what seems to be  
26 some of his reconnaissance.

27  
28 The Police Computer Aided Modelling Bureau have also been working on a computer  
29 model of the scene based on a digital photographic survey, and it's likely that that too will  
30 be useful in presenting the evidence.

31  
32 Next, sir, expert evidence, topic 10 at p.12. The inquests are likely to receive evidence from  
33 experts in a number of disciplines. First, we have, as is usual in any inquest, the forensic

1 pathologists who carried out the post-mortem examinations and give their views as to the  
2 clinical cause of death. Secondly, in this case we have a neuro-pathologist to give  
3 supplemental views specifically on brain injuries. Thirdly, we have crash investigation  
4 experts from the police, describing the movements and speed of the vehicle amongst other  
5 things. Fourthly, an expert on police body armour, of the type worn by PC Palmer, and  
6 addressing specifically what happened in the attack concerning that armour. Fifthly, a  
7 psychologist has been instructed to prepare a profile of the attacker, based on the available  
8 material. And, sixthly, a pharmaceutical toxicologist has been instructed to give evidence  
9 about scientific findings of Khalid Masood having taken anabolic steroids in the hours or  
10 days before his death. The reports of those experts will, of course, be disclosed.

11  
12 The next topic, 11, concerns anonymity and special measures. This is dealt with from p.13  
13 of the submissions. Sir, the court has before it applications by the two officers who were  
14 involved in the confrontation with Khalid Masood in which he was shot. They seek orders  
15 as follows: First, that the two officers' names and identifying details aren't revealed.  
16 Secondly, that pseudonyms are used for them. Thirdly, that they're not asked questions that  
17 reveal their identity. Fourthly, that they are screened from the public gallery when giving  
18 evidence. And, fifthly, that they be permitted to enter the court by a non-public route. We  
19 anticipate that they would also seek an associated order under s.11 of the Contempt of Court  
20 Act 1981 prohibiting reporting of any details liable to identify them.

21  
22 The reasons for these applications are set out in detail with supporting evidence, which has  
23 been supplied to all interested persons, including the representatives of Khalid Masood's  
24 spouse. None of the interested persons resist these applications and I'll summarise the  
25 position very briefly before I suggest a process for dealing with them. First, of course, the  
26 court unquestionably has the powers to make the orders sought. It has the common law  
27 power to make anonymity orders and statutory power to order the screening of witnesses.  
28 Secondly, if a refusal of anonymity would give rise to a real and immediate risk of the  
29 applicant being killed or seriously harmed, then the default position is that anonymity would  
30 ordinarily be granted to safeguard the applicant's rights under Art.2 or 3 of the European  
31 Convention on Human Rights; rights for life and protection from inhuman treatment.  
32 Otherwise, the court carries out a fact-sensitive balancing exercise which takes account of

1 all the circumstances, including the Art.8 rights of the applicants and the Art.10 freedom of  
2 speech rights of those reporting on the proceedings.

3  
4 In this instance the evidence shows that there are very strong factors in favour of the  
5 application. First, identifying these officers could make them and their families targets for  
6 reprisals by terrorists. Secondly, it would constantly cause them fear and distress. Thirdly,  
7 it would inhibit two skilled and experienced firearms officers from progressing in their  
8 careers. Fourthly, it would inhibit their ability to give the best possible evidence to these  
9 inquests. And, fifthly, it would deter others from going into similar specialist firearms and  
10 close protection roles in the future. And the evidence addresses all those matters.

11  
12 By contrast, granting the orders for these officers wouldn't reduce the quality of this inquiry  
13 in any way. Even giving the general principle of open justice full weight, it can't, in our  
14 submission, outweigh the points in favour of the application. Accordingly, even if one sets  
15 aside the question of whether the refusal of these orders would infringe Art.2 or 3 rights, we  
16 submit that the application ought to be granted. However, we're aware that media  
17 organisations may sometimes comment on these applications, applications of this type.  
18 Therefore, what we propose is that the court give the media organisations the opportunity to  
19 request a copy of the applications and respond within fourteen days. If there is no  
20 objection, or if you consider any objection and conclude that the application should be  
21 allowed on paper, we will propose that you issue a written ruling allowing it and making the  
22 requisite orders. Otherwise, that's to say if in doubt, the court should schedule a further  
23 hearing on the applications specifically. That, we suggest, is a sensible way of dealing with  
24 the applications while giving proper respect to the position and rights of the media.

25  
26 Topic 12 concerns security sensitive evidence, p.15 of our submissions. We're aware that  
27 this inquiry covers some points which would raise security sensitivities. For instance, it will  
28 be obvious to anyone that the full details of MI5 investigations, in which Khalid Masood  
29 was considered, may well be sensitive. It will also be obvious to anyone that security  
30 arrangements at the Palace of Westminster will include sensitive information. It's partly  
31 because preparation for these inquests may require consideration of security sensitive  
32 material that (inaudible) by a judge and key members of the legal team are develop vetted.  
33 We are committed to ensuring that the relevant material, which is not sensitive, is disclosed

1 and put in evidence. For example, we know that some key information about MI5's  
2 knowledge of Masood can be made public because it's been included in a public report  
3 already. Often experience tells us that careful disclosure, with appropriate redactions, can  
4 ensure the inquests receive all the important evidence without any need for public interest  
5 immunity applications. However, if such applications are needed they will have to be made  
6 before the inquests. In the coming weeks, we'll be meeting with the Secretary of State's  
7 team to discuss all these issues. As I've said, we are more concerned to ensure an open  
8 inquiry but one which does not compromise national security interests.

9  
10 Topic 13, venue and timing, on p.15 of the submissions. Sir, we understand that a large  
11 court here at the Old Bailey can be made available for the inquests and we're grateful to the  
12 Recorder of London for his help. We presently anticipate that the hearings are likely to start,  
13 be scheduled to start on 10<sup>th</sup> September this year, and to last around three to four weeks,  
14 although precise estimates will have to await discussion. As we understand, no interested  
15 person objects to that start date, which we consider gives sufficient time for proper  
16 preparation. Between now and then, your team will be in regular contact with interested  
17 persons on matters such as disclosure, witness searching, timetabling of the evidence and  
18 logistics for the hearing. Experience tells us that all these matters are best handled by email  
19 correspondence. However, in case a further pre-inquest hearing is needed, we propose that  
20 shortly after today solicitors to the inquests set a provisional date and we would suggest late  
21 June or early July, so as to allow time for the disclosure process to be well advanced and  
22 everyone properly informed before any such hearing was needed. The date that's set may  
23 not be used if it proves unnecessary but we would see the sense in Mr Adamson's point that  
24 a date could usefully be set for everyone's diaries now.

25  
26 Sir, the final topic is logistics. I won't deal with this in great detail. We've set out in our  
27 submissions various proposals for the logistics of the hearing. For the benefit of the media  
28 and public here, I should say that there will be a website for the inquests and that when the  
29 hearing is taking place it will be transcribed and transcripts will be posted daily on the  
30 website. I should also add that arrangements may be made for some families of those who  
31 died to view the proceedings from locations overseas, and we're in discussions with their  
32 teams concerning that topic.

33

1 Sir, unless I can assist further at this stage, that's what I propose to say in opening. As  
2 interested persons address each item on the agenda, I may respond briefly to assist the court.

3 THE CHIEF CORONER: Thank you. So, Mr Hough, would it be sensible to go through the  
4 items on the agenda in turn then to see whether, for example, in relation to the first topic, in  
5 relation to interested persons, whether there are any further submissions first of all?

6 MR HOUGH: Yes, sir.

7 THE CHIEF CORONER: I'm looking----

8 MR LADENBURG: Sir, I represent the London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority.

9 THE CHIEF CORONER: Yes.

10 MR LADENBURG: Given that Mr Hough has conceded there's a strong application for that  
11 organisation to be regarded as an interested party, I don't know how much further assistance  
12 you, sir, would want.

13 THE CHIEF CORONER: No.

14 MR LADENBURG: The application was put to Dr Wilcox on 2<sup>nd</sup> June on the basis that the Fire  
15 Brigade were one of the first – one of the emergency services responding to the incident and  
16 particularly involved in Andreea Cristea, following her fall from Westminster Bridge, and  
17 on that basis we submit these facts do warrant an interested person status for the London  
18 Fire Brigade under statutory authority.

19 THE CHIEF CORONER: Yes. Mr Hough, it seems to me there is good reason for me to  
20 designate them as an interested person and I propose to do so.

21 MR HOUGH: Thank you, sir. I don't think there's been any suggestion otherwise by anyone in  
22 their submissions or----

23 THE CHIEF CORONER: No.

24 MR HOUGH: -- (inaudible).

25 MR NAUGHTON: Sir----

26 THE CHIEF CORONER: Yes.

27 MR NAUGHTON: -- Mr Naughton, on behalf of Barts Health NHS Trust, not currently an  
28 interested person.

29 THE CHIEF CORONER: Yes.

30 MR NAUGHTON: An application was made before Dr Wilcox at the May hearing of last year---  
31 -

32 THE CHIEF CORONER: Yes.

1 MR NAUGHTON: -- for us to become an interested person. Barts' role is that Ms Cristea was  
2 treated at their hospital, the Royal London Hospital, and subsequently at Barts Adult  
3 Critical Care Unit, and statements have been provided from four doctors associated with her  
4 care. In addition, Barts is responsible for two – the two doctors who attended the  
5 Westminster Bridge with the Helicopter Medical Emergency Service. Also, as I understand  
6 it, the London Ambulance employed a paramedic as part of the same team, and those  
7 consultants provided care to PC Keith Palmer as well as to Khalid Masood and were present  
8 on the bridge thereafter.

9  
10 At the stage of the PIR last year it wasn't clear – no statements had been obtained yet from  
11 the HEMS doctors and I understand that two statements have been provided to you. And so  
12 Barts was involved in the care, assistance and treatment of those deceased to the extent I've  
13 indicated. Barts wishes, therefore, to renew its application to become an interested person so  
14 that it can have the opportunity to have a representative present at the inquest when its  
15 witnesses attend and to ask questions of those witnesses, if appropriate. It therefore has a  
16 similar role to the London Ambulance Service as well as to the Fire Brigade and anticipates  
17 a very limited role in the inquest. I'm not sure whether there's anything you would wish me  
18 to address you on further, but I renew the application on that basis.

19 THE CHIEF CORONER: Thank you, Mr Naughton.

20 MR HOUGH: We should perhaps explain that the reason that this application wasn't considered  
21 in detail in May, as I recall it, is that the application was put on alternative grounds, either to  
22 designate Barts as an interested person or to participate to an extent without IP status. Barts  
23 was at the time of that hearing in some logistical difficulties in substantiating the application  
24 because it had recently been the subject of an IT intrusion.

25 THE CHIEF CORONER: Yes.

26 MR HOUGH: Sir, based on the submissions that have been made, we can see a compelling case  
27 for Barts to be designated as an interested person. We don't see any great disadvantage  
28 given the limited role they anticipate playing.

29 THE CHIEF CORONER: Thank you. Certainly, Mr Naughton, your application is granted. The  
30 second item on the agenda concerned, Mr Hough, the update on the investigations. I don't  
31 know whether – I've obviously seen all of the written submissions which have been put in  
32 by the various interested persons. I don't know if anyone wishes to make any further oral



1 submissions in respect of the matters that you set out in your introduction in respect of topic  
2 2? Mr Keith.

3 MR KEITH: May I raise one matter in relation to the Metropolitan Police----

4 THE CHIEF CORONER: Yes.

5 MR KEITH: -- because a little time has passed since the pre-inquest hearing before Dr Wilcox  
6 and a great deal of work has been done since then.

7 THE CHIEF CORONER: Yes.

8 MR KEITH: It may be of some use to know that the current position is that over 2000 statements  
9 have been taken and around 3,700 exhibits seized. In total, I think, there are about 10,000  
10 documents and over 1500 investigative actions have been identified and dealt with, leaving  
11 only 78 on the (inaudible) computer by the counter-terrorism crime investigators to  
12 complete.

13

14 The Metropolitan Police team met with your team on 15<sup>th</sup> December and a number of draft  
15 reports were handed over, and the SO15 investigators will be providing a full disclosure  
16 schedule in a matter of weeks and the results of a full audit of all the material which has  
17 been generated by this extensive and thorough investigation. At that time there will be a  
18 further discussion between the officers and your team about how best to present the  
19 electronic and graphic material----

20 THE CHIEF CORONER: Yes.

21 MR KEITH: -- and your counsel has already outlined the nature of the likely evidence in that  
22 regard concerning videos, photographs, a 3-dimensional portrayal of the bridge and the  
23 Palace, and also the various expert reports. There are a number of draft reports already in  
24 existence concerning health and safety, crash investigation and forensic toxicology, and all  
25 those matters will be discussed in due course. So the Metropolitan Police continues to give  
26 very extensive assistance to your team by way of provision of fruits of its investigation.

27 THE CHIEF CORONER: Yes. Mr Keith, I know that there's been very good liaison and I'm  
28 sure that will continue, but thank you very much for that update, and obviously the sooner  
29 the material is available then the sooner it can be considered and put on the common  
30 platform for the interested persons to look at. Thank you. Yes?

31 MR SIMPSON: Yes, sir, on behalf of the IPCC I don't -- or now the IOPC -- I don't need to add  
32 anything to what's in the submissions I made. Your solicitor has been provided with a copy  
33 of the IPCC's final report----

1 THE CHIEF CORONER: Yes.

2 MR SIMPSON: -- and a list of all the evidence it holds, and the investigating staff will continue  
3 to work with your solicitors to ensure that any evidence is (inaudible).

4 THE CHIEF CORONER: Thank you very much indeed. Mr Hough, I don't think there's any  
5 further we need to say in relation to topic 2.

6 MR HOUGH: Yes, sir.

7 THE CHIEF CORONER: And moving on to topic 3, the organisation of the inquest, again I've  
8 read the written submissions which have been made by all interested persons. I think  
9 everyone is content with the suggestion set out by Mr Hough for the two inquests.

10 MR HOUGH: I don't discern any----

11 THE CHIEF CORONER: No.

12 MR HOUGH: -- desire to make any submissions on those. As you've heard, sir, the proposal  
13 we've made is subject to general agreement for the reasons we've given.

14 THE CHIEF CORONER: Yes. Well, we will work on that basis, Mr Hough, that we will hold in  
15 due course – there will be held in due course two inquests as set out in the written  
16 submissions.

17

18 Can I, whilst dealing with that, obviously scope then follows, and I'm looking particularly  
19 at Mr Patterson who sits next to you. I think, Mr Patterson, there have been discussions  
20 between you and Mr Hough about the scope and the particular concerns you've raised in  
21 your written submissions, which I've seen.

22 MR PATTERSON: Yes.

23 THE CHIEF CORONER: And I think, from his outline at the beginning, it's clear that they are  
24 contained within the questions which are set out at para.16----

25 MR PATTERSON: Yes.

26 THE CHIEF CORONER: -- and it may well be that when it comes to the actual questions which  
27 are posed, there's no difficulty at all between you and he as to what are proper questions to  
28 be asked.

29 MR PATTERSON: Yes. We welcome the indication that----

30 THE CHIEF CORONER: Yes.

31 MR PATTERSON: -- it is recognised and accepted that there is a high public interest in a  
32 comprehensive investigation, whether it's to be described as a *Jamieson* investigation or an  
33 enhanced *Jamieson* investigation----

1 THE CHIEF CORONER: Yes.

2 MR PATTERSON: -- is perhaps neither here nor there. But given the unprecedented nature of  
3 this attack----

4 THE CHIEF CORONER: Yes.

5 MR PATTERSON: -- there are obvious topics that we would wish to be explored and it seems  
6 that your Lordship recognises and proposes to explore these topics.

7 THE CHIEF CORONER: Yes, absolutely. As I said in my very short introductory remarks, I  
8 hope that the process will provide the answers to the obvious and understandable questions  
9 that the families that you represent have, and I hope that they will be explored in such  
10 circumstances that provide some comfort in what I appreciate are very difficult  
11 circumstances for them. But certainly I will do all I can to ensure that it's as wide as it can  
12 be in dealing with those issues that you flag up.

13 MR PATTERSON: Yes. I mean, obviously, looking for protection of the public, the reality is we  
14 know there will be further terrorist attacks----

15 THE CHIEF CORONER: Yes.

16 MR PATTERSON: -- of this sort in this city.

17 THE CHIEF CORONER: Yes.

18 MR PATTERSON: And the ongoing problems do not seem to be addressed, such as the internet,  
19 end-to-end encryption of messages, radicalisation within our prisons, and a failure, it would  
20 seem, to get to grips with these problems occurs again and again within this building, as my  
21 Lord knows. Terrorist trial after terrorist trial shows that the same problems feature in the  
22 evidence.

23 THE CHIEF CORONER: Yes.

24 MR PATTERSON: And if you can assist the public in this investigation by perhaps assisting  
25 with these problems, and one is focusing in particular on a report that might point everyone  
26 in the right direction to doing more to address these problems. Why it is that radicalising  
27 material continues to be freely available on the internet we just don't know. We just do not  
28 understand why notice to take down material cannot cause radicalising material that's  
29 available this very day to come down off the internet. Material will be seen in the evidence  
30 again and again in terrorist cases. And we know from David Anderson's analysis that this  
31 particular attack involved an attacker who was using WhatsApp to send jihadi documents  
32 without any difficult and unless we seize the handsets we know that material and the  
33 evidence simply cannot be obtained, and we just do not understand why it's necessary for

1 WhatsApp and Telegram, and these sorts of social media applications, to have end-to-end  
2 encryption.

3  
4 We set out what we wanted to set out, my Lord, in our written submissions and focusing  
5 perhaps on the issues that arise for the family of PC Keith Palmer----

6 THE CHIEF CORONER: Yes.

7 MR PATTERSON: -- we welcome the indication that you will be investigating thoroughly what  
8 happened at the Houses of Parliament and how on earth it was that this attacker was able to  
9 get through those gates and how it was that PC Palmer, apparently stationed alone and  
10 unarmed, with it seems possibly inadequate bodily protection, how it is that that fatal attack  
11 was allowed to take place. And, again, how can you help the police in the future and the  
12 protection of the police doing their best, as they are, to keep the public and Parliamentarians  
13 safe? So we would positively encourage thorough investigation into those areas and look  
14 forward to receiving and analysing the disclosed material.

15 THE CHIEF CORONER: Thank you. Yes.

16 MR ADAMSON: Sir, my name is Dominic Adamson and, with your permission, I appear on  
17 behalf of Mrs Cochran, the spouse of Mr Cochran.

18 THE CHIEF CORONER: Yes.

19 MR ADAMSON: And just to add the point, a very brief, that we welcome the indication by Mr  
20 Hough that in connection with the issue articulated at para.16(a)(ii) of his submissions, that  
21 is to say whether and how Mr Masood came to the attention of the authorities before the  
22 attacks and, in particular, whether his activities gave any warnings, will not have some  
23 arbitrary line in the sand drawn as far as the date range of the consideration of that material.  
24 The only material as you, sir, are aware, that the families have seen is that contained in Mr  
25 Anderson's report.

26 THE CHIEF CORONER: Yes.

27 MR ADAMSON: And there are certainly aspects of that report which do catch the eye in terms  
28 of what was and what wasn't known about him in the years prior to these attacks, and  
29 they're summarised in our note for your consideration. Sir, I appreciate that you've seen  
30 that and so I just wish to give the court our acknowledgement that----

31 THE CHIEF CORONER: Thank you.

32 MR ADAMSON: -- there's no (inaudible). Thank you.

33 THE CHIEF CORONER: Miss Leek?

1 MISS LEEK: Sir, may I just say this on behalf of the Secretary of State for the Home Department  
2 with regard to the issue of scope and particularly the answers that have just been raised by  
3 Mr Patterson.

4 THE CHIEF CORONER: Yes.

5 MISS LEEK: Given that Masood was a subject of interest in any event until 2012, we question  
6 the relevance of whether he was radicalised in prison or elsewhere. The issue is what was  
7 known to the authorities and what was done about that. Sir, obviously this is a matter for  
8 you and you have a wide discretion as to what comes with this case, but we would caution  
9 that you analyse carefully what is relevant to scope and, so far as disclosure is concerned,  
10 we seek to ensure that that is proportionate having regard to the fact that we know that he  
11 was on the radar at least till 2012 in any event.

12

13 So far as the issues of what was on the internet and what is available on the internet and  
14 whether or not that should be taken down, and how there should be Government policies  
15 with regard to that, sir, those are very wide issues----

16 THE CHIEF CORONER: Yes, they are.

17 MISS LEEK: -- of legislation and policy and we question whether this inquest is the place for  
18 those issues to be dealt with. Sir, I'm not sure I need to go any further----

19 THE CHIEF CORONER: Thank you.

20 MISS LEEK: -- in relation to those issues.

21 MR HOUGH: Sir, if I can----

22 THE CHIEF CORONER: Mr Hough.

23 MR HOUGH: -- just deal with both of those concerns. First of all, as regards radicalisation in  
24 prison, the reason why we respectfully submit that that may be a topic to be looked at is that  
25 one of the questions that the families will naturally want the court to consider is whether the  
26 authorities, who were looking at Masood between 2009 and 2012, could or should have had  
27 access to material identifying his radical tendencies which may have been recorded, for  
28 example, in prison records. For that reason, we consider that that is a topic that is  
29 appropriate to look at.

30

31 Quite how far one pursues any of these lines of inquiry is inevitably a matter of judgment.

32 The judgment can only be formed when one starts to look at the material----

33 THE CHIEF CORONER: Yes.

1 MR HOUGH: -- but it's not a topic which we would propose closing out at this stage.

2

3 As regards more broader questions of public policy, such as the nature of the encryption of  
4 mobile devices and (inaudible) on them, we do see force in the submission that it is not  
5 normally the purpose of an inquest to investigate and produce conclusions on matters of  
6 absolutely general public policy. That said, there will obviously be consideration of the  
7 means used by Masood to communicate, although I should say that, based on the  
8 information that we have, the communication was after he had set forth on the attack rather  
9 than communication with accomplices.

10 THE CHIEF CORONER: Yes.

11 MR HOUGH: That's based on the information that we have. So it has been said, for example, in  
12 a case called *Scholes* and in the *Smith* case in the Supreme Court, that an inquest is not the  
13 forum to debate all issues of broad policy.

14 THE CHIEF CORONER: Yes.

15 MR HOUGH: But that's not to say that you ought to be looking at the methods of  
16 communication adopted by (inaudible).

17 THE CHIEF CORONER: Thank you, Mr Hough.

18 MISS LEEK: May I just say, if I may----

19 THE CHIEF CORONER: Yes.

20 MISS LEEK: -- just for a moment, that the methods of communication used----

21 THE CHIEF CORONER: Yes.

22 MISS LEEK: -- should not be looked at. Of course, that will cover (inaudible).

23 THE CHIEF CORONER: Yes. Mr Hough, as you've rather indicated in your opening, we will  
24 have to keep matters of scope under review but obviously to ensure that they remain as  
25 limited as they can be but, at the same time, also dealing with the questions that properly  
26 arise on the material that is disclosed.

27 MR HOUGH: Yes.

28 THE CHIEF CORONER: The next topic on the agenda related to whether or not the hearings  
29 were to be held with a jury. Again I think there's common -- there is consensus amongst all  
30 present that, in fact, the only inquest which will require the summoning of a jury is that for  
31 Masood.

32 MR HOUGH: Yes, and, indeed, further common ground that you should not exercise your  
33 discretion to summon a jury in the other cases.

1 THE CHIEF CORONER: Yes, and that is certainly the approach that I intend to take. So far as  
2 Art.2 is concerned, again there seems to be a fairly common approach amongst all  
3 concerned with what you set out in relation to Art.2. I don't know if anyone wishes to  
4 elaborate on the written submissions but, as I say, it seems to me that there is a common  
5 approach in relation to that.

6 MR HOUGH: Yes.

7 MR PATTERSON: Simply to highlight the point, we may be right and obviously at this stage we  
8 haven't seen any material----

9 THE CHIEF CORONER: Absolutely, yes.

10 MR PATTERSON: -- and it will need to be kept under review.

11 THE CHIEF CORONER: Very much so, Mr Patterson. Yes.

12 MR ADAMSON: And we support that position.

13 THE CHIEF CORONER: Yes. So far – turning on to the arrangements for disclosure, again at  
14 the moment I think there is again general agreement with the suggestion that's being made  
15 as to how disclosure is going to happen. Obviously it's very difficult for people to make a  
16 comment about it until such time as they have material disclosed to them, but I'm sure  
17 everyone will appreciate that having the material on a common platform, in a way which  
18 makes it easier to look at, digest and can be added to as more material is disclosed.

19 MR HOUGH: We've explained in our document the history of how material came into our hands  
20 and how we proposed to deal with it from here. I want everybody to understand that public  
21 authorities need to jump through certain hoops and procuring a document management  
22 platform, and we're certainly concerned to get a good platform and to upload material onto  
23 (inaudible).

24 THE CHIEF CORONER: Yes. I was going to take, Mr Hough, if I may, topics 8, 9 and 10 from  
25 the agenda, which are the selection of witnesses to be called, the video evidence at the  
26 inquest and other visual aids, and the expert evidence, very much as one particular topic.  
27 Again I, having read the written documents, everyone understands the position and again I  
28 think it's going to be very much a case of seeing the material before there may be other  
29 comments that can be made about it, and I'm going to work on the basis that no one has  
30 anything further to say about those topics today.

31

32 So far as anonymity is concerned----

33 MR HOUGH: Sir, just before you move on----

1 THE CHIEF CORONER: Yes.

2 MR HOUGH: -- Mr Patterson may have a word or two to say about disclosure.

3 THE CHIEF CORONER: Yes.

4 MR PATTERSON: Yes, simply this. I've discussed with Mr Hough, very helpfully, that, as your  
5 Lordship will appreciate, the families know very little.

6 THE CHIEF CORONER: Yes.

7 MR PATTERSON: They know very little, in particular, about how their loved one met their end  
8 and what injuries were suffered and----

9 THE CHIEF CORONER: Yes.

10 MR PATTERSON: -- haven't even seen the post-mortem reports.

11 THE CHIEF CORONER: Yes.

12 MR PATTERSON: So although we recognise the logistics of the document management system  
13 having to be set up, we recognise the problem with redactions, at the very least if the  
14 relevant families can see the particular post-mortem reports as soon as possible, I don't  
15 know whether there's going to be any difficulty with that. Unfortunately, and I think this  
16 was before my Lord took responsibility, they were told that last summer they would begin  
17 to have disclosure----

18 THE CHIEF CORONER: Yes.

19 MR PATTERSON: -- and until they begin to see the material, the process cannot begin. And if it  
20 is possible, first, for those reports to be provided at an early stage and, secondly, there's one  
21 particular topic in relation to the family of PC Palmer, whether the body armour report  
22 might be provided, because again, on a highly pressing topic, PC Palmer's widow is very  
23 anxious to know what she can----

24 THE CHIEF CORONER: Yes.

25 MR PATTERSON: -- about the body armour that -- that the husband was wearing.

26 THE CHIEF CORONER: Mr Hough, I don't know whether it may be possible to accede to the  
27 request very sensible request that Mr Patterson makes to address those as a priority, even if  
28 it's a paper copy at this stage, to be followed by a copy being put onto the management  
29 system in due course?

30 MR HOUGH: Sir, yes, we will look to prioritise those. We'd explained to Mr Patterson, and to  
31 other interested persons, the reasons why the disclosure couldn't happen quite as quickly as  
32 Dr Wilcox had hoped. We've also explained why the post-mortem reports have taken some



1 time to produce and that's really been, in a nutshell, because of concerns to deliver them to  
2 all the families at the same time----

3 THE CHIEF CORONER: Yes.

4 MR HOUGH: -- and to do so in a sensitive way, avoiding, for example, the Christmas period.

5 THE CHIEF CORONER: Yes.

6 MR HOUGH: But we all understand the importance of getting those post-mortem reports to the  
7 relevant families quickly and we see the sense in providing them in paper form. It may be  
8 that they will be provided in the first instance via police family liaison officers----

9 THE CHIEF CORONER: Yes.

10 MR HOUGH: -- rather than just in a (inaudible) from us.

11 THE CHIEF CORONER: No, well, again I think that would be a very appropriate way of dealing  
12 with it but, as I say, it's really just to make clear to Mr Patterson that we will do what we  
13 can, so far as his comments are made, which I'm sure are echoed by Mr Adamson sitting  
14 next to him, that we will do what we can to have those reports made available as quickly as  
15 we possibly can.

16 MR HOUGH: And, in fact, it may be possible, depending on discussions with the police, to give  
17 Mr Patterson some information about the conclusions of the body armour report to answer  
18 one or two very obvious questions that the Palmer family may have today.

19 THE CHIEF CORONER: Thank you. Turning to the anonymity and special measures  
20 application, Mr Hough, again you've very helpfully set out what the position is and, Mr  
21 Keith, I've read all of the material, but it seems to be sensible to adopt the stance that Mr  
22 Hough suggested, namely of giving a limited period for the media representatives to make  
23 any representations they wish to do and then, depending on the representations which are  
24 made, for me then to give a written ruling.

25 MR KEITH: I certainly agree it's a very sensible proposal.

26 THE CHIEF CORONER: Yes.

27 MR KEITH: The press must be given the opportunity of advancing submissions or  
28 representations in relation to the two applications for anonymity.

29 THE CHIEF CORONER: Yes.

30 MR KEITH: Like your counsel, we are keen that the applications be determined speedily. The  
31 applications were, in fact, lodged in June of last year----

32 THE CHIEF CORONER: Yes.

33 MR KEITH: -- and obviously a fair amount of time has passed since then.

1 THE CHIEF CORONER: Yes.

2 MR KEITH: So we would welcome an early resolution of those two applications of the two  
3 firearms officers.

4 THE CHIEF CORONER: Yes. Mr Hough, I think the suggestion you made was fourteen days  
5 from today for the press to make requests to see the material and to indicate whether, in fact,  
6 there are any representations to be made.

7 MR HOUGH: Yes.

8 THE CHIEF CORONER: That----

9 MR HOUGH: It's not a huge volume of material----

10 THE CHIEF CORONER: No.

11 MR HOUGH: -- that they would need to consider. It's only something in the order of 25 or 30  
12 pages, and the messages conveyed by that material are fairly simple ones which I have  
13 already opened.

14 THE CHIEF CORONER: Yes.

15 MR HOUGH: But obviously the media must have the opportunity to see it, consider it and make  
16 representations by letter to your solicitors.

17 THE CHIEF CORONER: Fourteen days from today takes us to 29<sup>th</sup> January, and obviously  
18 depending on anything which comes back as a consequence of that, I can then determine, as  
19 you've indicated, whether there was the need for a further hearing or whether I can then  
20 resolve the matter by means of a written ruling.

21 MR HOUGH: The only reason we made the proposal of doing it in that way is so that we can  
22 reach a much speedier outcome than having to wait for a further hearing in which----

23 THE CHIEF CORONER: Yes.

24 MR HOUGH: -- (inaudible).

25 THE CHIEF CORONER: Thank you for that. I will make those directions. So far as topic 12,  
26 again you've indicated in the course of your submissions, Mr Hough, what the position is in  
27 respect of public interest immunity or security sensitive evidence, and I've seen and read  
28 obviously the submissions made by Miss Leek, in particular, and Mr Keith in relation to  
29 those topics. I don't think there are any other written submissions touching on it at this  
30 stage.

31 MR HOUGH: No, I don't see any obvious signs (inaudible).

32 THE CHIEF CORONER: No. And that then leaves – I was going to take the logistical  
33 arrangements first of all before coming on to venue and timing. You have indicated that

1           there will be a website, there will be transcription. We are looking, or you are looking, at the  
2           possibility of remote courts for family members overseas and the way in which the hearings  
3           will take place. And I know, looking at the written submissions, that, in particular, the  
4           remote courts is something which is welcomed by the families.

5   MR HOUGH: Two or three, I understand, locations in two or three different countries.

6   THE CHIEF CORONER: And I'm sure that those arrangements will be welcomed by people not  
7           having to travel an enormous distance but also having some degree of privacy when they are  
8           watching and listening to an inquest from a remote court.

9  
10           That brings us to the venue and timing of the inquests. So they will be conducted at this  
11           court and part of the reason for dealing with matters that way round is that, although this  
12           court has large courtrooms available, it is principally a criminal court, but it has many of the  
13           facilities that we will require for the holding of an inquest. It does, of course, bring with it a  
14           slightly bigger headline perhaps in terms of the venue, which is why the remote courts, it  
15           seemed to me, are something to be explored as much as we possibly can and make those  
16           arrangements.

17  
18           So far as the date for commencement of 10<sup>th</sup> September, again looking at the written  
19           submissions, I think everyone is content with that start date providing sufficient time for  
20           material to be disclosed, to be analysed and for us to have a smooth transition through the  
21           inquests, starting from that date. I don't purpose today, Mr Hough, to set a fixed date for  
22           any further hearing. I will simply leave that to Miss Jones to contact all parties to find a  
23           date. But I will be here in any event throughout all of June and July, so finding a time slot  
24           will not pose a problem so far as I am concerned.

25   MR HOUGH: Sir, as I say, it may not be necessary to use that date but it (inaudible).

26   THE CHIEF CORONER: Yes. Are there any other further matters we need to canvass this  
27           morning? (After a pause):

28   MR HOUGH: I don't see anybody jump up.

29   THE CHIEF CORONER: Thank you. Very good. Well, thank you very much, Mr Hough.

30           Thank you to everyone else and we will meet again, if not before, on 10<sup>th</sup> September, and I  
31           know that there'll be quite a lot of email correspondence passing between the various  
32           parties.

33   MR HOUGH: I'm grateful.

1 THE CHIEF CORONER: Thank you. I'll rise.

2

3 (11.34 a.m.)

4

---

**CERTIFICATE**

Opus 2 International Ltd. hereby certifies that the above is an accurate and complete record of the proceedings or part thereof.

*Transcribed by **Opus 2 International Ltd.**  
(Incorporating **Beverley F. Nunnery & Co.**)  
Official Court Reporters and Audio Transcribers  
5 New Street Square, London EC4A 3BF  
Tel: 020 7831 5627 Fax: 020 7831 7737  
civil@opus2.digital*