

METROPOLITAN POLICE

Reference: C.O. OG1/79/2234 C.I.B.(2) Branch/Station
C.O. Divn

Numbers Divnl.

Registry Folio Number :

Statutory Complaint

Register Number:

12th July, 1979

COMPLAINT AGAINST POLICE

1. COMPLAINT

1. Investigations commenced on instructions from the Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis.
2. Private persons from whom statements have now been obtained by Police, and I enjoin the name of Celia STUBBS the common Law wife of Clement Blair PEACH. (I.C. 1)

2. BRIEF PARTICULARS OF COMPLANT

It is alleged that Clement Blair PEACH, age 31 years, was assaulted by police with a truncheon, whilst he was with other persons who had been taking part in a political demonstration, at about 8 p.m. on 23rd April, 1979, at Orchard Avenue, Southall, and that he collapsed on the pavement.

He then crossed the road and was taken into a nearby house and at 8.12 pm conveyed by ambulance to New Ealing Hospital where it was found he had suffered a fractured skull on the left side of his skull.

He was operated on and resuscitated but died at 12.10 am on 24th April, 1979. Post mortem examination established cause of death as a fractured skull. (X.S. Section)

General police brutality is also alleged within the content of the statements made.

4. **OFFICERS SUBJECT OF COMPLAINT**

Unnamed officers of the Special Patrol Group of the Metropolitan Police who were on duty at the demonstration at Southall on 23rd April, 1979.

5. **INVESTIGATING OFFICERS**

Commander CASS, Detective Chief Superintendent TELFER and other officers of the Complaints Investigation Bureau.

6. **INQUEST DATE**

Extensive enquiries and interviews have been carried out and although further investigative action is in hand to round off the enquiry, this report is submitted prior to the adjourned inquest date of 17th July, 1979, so that the complexity of the inquest hearing on a later date may be assessed. The decision of the Director of Public Prosecutions will also have to be awaited but on the evidence to date I would expect that opinion would be that there is insufficient evidence to prefer a charge against any person of homicide with any prospect of conviction. At the inquest it appears appropriate that the Metropolitan Police is legally represented by Solicitors Department. Other persons including the family of the deceased are likely to be legally represented.

NOW
VERIFIED

EFFECTIVE DATE FOR THE START OF THE INQUEST
HEARING IS LIKELY TO BE 11TH OCTOBER, 1979

7. The death of Clement Blair PEACH and other incidents at Southall on 23rd April, 1979, have been raised in Parliament but a request for a Public Enquiry was not agreed to. There is a demand from certain quarters of pressure groups for the Special Patrol Group to be disbanded. (The Deputy Commissioner is carrying out an internal review of the Special Patrol Group within the Metropolitan Police).

PUBLICITY

8. A Public Enquiry would not have subjected police officers to the prolonged and rigorous questioning they have been subjected to during this investigation. Continuing reports appear in the Press and on television and it is a case which will receive wide publicity and be the subject of comment for a long time. The funeral of the deceased was akin to a potential demonstration with Left-wing political elements most prominent. Associates of the deceased see it as a 'cause celebre' and will endeavour to obtain maximum benefit for their purposes and whatever happened would never be satisfied. This inquest and evidence will be widely reported not only in this country but abroad, especially in New Zealand from where the deceased came several years ago.

Appendix 'B'**P. 8**

P. 270

9. Clement Blair PEACH, age 31 years, born 25th March, 1946, was a teacher, and lived with **Person 59** at *****. He was an active member of the 'Anti Nazi League' and had been arrested on previous occasions when protesting on political issues. On 23rd April, 1979, he travelled with companions to Southall to protest against the 'National Front'.

ELECTION MEETING

10. The Parliamentary election was to be on 10th May, 1979, and in the build up to it during the preceding weeks there was the usual political activity. The 'National Front' political party hired the Town Hall, Southall, on Monday 23rd April, 1979, with resultant protestations from

their opponents which culminated in a major demonstration in the afternoon and evening at and near the Broadway, Southall, where the Town Hall is situated. Part of the crowd was violent with missiles being thrown at police officers who were deployed to maintain order. To appreciate the atmosphere the crowd was in excess of 3,000. 345 arrests were made, 97 police officers injured, 39 prisoners injured, 42 cases of damage to property and 25 (1 fatal) members of the public injured. The number of police engaged in the area was 2,750. Officer A was in charge of police operations with Officer B, as his Deputy. Full operational planning and procedures had been invoked.

TERMS OF INVESTIGATION

11. My brief is to investigate the circumstances surrounding the death so I do not propose to enlarge much further on the events of that day except to emphasise that it was an extremely violent, volatile and a ugly situation where there was serious disturbance by what can be classed as a 'rebellious crowd'. The legal definition 'unlawful assembly' is justified and the events should be viewed with that kind of atmosphere prevailing. Without condoning the death I refer to Archibold, 38th Edition, paragraph 2528 "In case of riot or rebellious assembly the officers endeavouring to disperse the riot are justified in killing them at common law if the riot cannot otherwise be suppressed".

Within that dictum in relation to this case there are however some imponderables. It need not therefore be pursued.

EVENING OF 23RD APRIL, 1979 AT SOUTHALL

AND LOCATIONS

12. The members of the National Front entered the Town Hall for their meeting at 7.30 p.m. and about that time part of the crowd in the Broadway, Southall had a cordon of police in front and a cordon behind. The cordon behind was brought forward and this allowed the crowd to disperse westwards along the Broadway in the direction of the cross-junction Northcote Avenue with Beechcroft Avenue. From the map it will be seen that from the Broadway, down Beechcroft Avenue after about 90 yards there comes a 'T' junction with Orchard Avenue. Turning right into Orchard Avenue there is a cul-de-sac but access can be obtained by people on foot around the end of the houses and a narrow alley gives access back into Beechcroft. Turning left into Orchard Avenue the road has pathways through to other streets, to a Social Club and where the road turns it becomes Herbert Road, which leads back onto the Broadway. Important junctions insofar as this report is concerned are the Broadway, a main road shopping thoroughfare, with Beechcroft Avenue immediately off it which has one shop and homes on either side for a part of the distance. On the left side, at the junction with Orchard Avenue is house No. 62, the end of a row of terraced houses the front garden of which is surrounded by a wall, with the usual width of pavement before the actual roadway. On the edge of the pavement outside No. 62 is a traffic sign. Beechcroft Avenue is

Appendix B

wide enough for a two-way thoroughfare but it is only one-way with 'no entry' signs at the Broadway end.

The residents of Orchard Avenue are mainly of Asian origin with a small number of English people.

Appendix 'B'

P.1

Doc. Page 51

13. A visual appreciation of the location can be obtained by perusal of the map and serial photographs.
14. Returning to the activity of the crowd who had partially dispersed west along the Broadway towards the junction with Beechcroft Avenue. Asian youths comprised the majority of the crowd but with some white people among them who were members of the 'Anti Nazi League' and included the deceased and his friends. There is no actual evidence that the members of the 'Anti Nazi League' were encouraging or inciting the throwing of missiles, but they were there to protest and to stimulate others to do so. Bricks, stones, bottles and curry powder was being thrown about and an incendiary device was hurled at a police coach in the Broadway. Police had previously taken away crates of bottles as a preventative measure. A subsequent search by police found a butcher's cleaver which had been concealed in a garden of Beechcroft Avenue.

3 UNIT SPECIAL PATROL GROUP AT

NORTHCOTE AVENUE

15. The Special Patrol Group officers in personnel carriers were being utilised as a mobile reserve and because of the violent activity they went to the junction with Broadway and Beechcroft Avenue. The personnel carriers

Appendix 'B'

Page 2

turned left into Northcote Avenue and stopped. When getting out the officers were subjected to a heavy bombardment from missiles and one officer - Officer C - was hit on the face with a brick and felled to the ground. He was rescued by his colleagues who noted his distorted face which was due to his jaw being severely fractured.

3 UNIT SPECIAL PATROL GROUP IN SHIELD FORMATION

16. The Special Patrol Group involved at this stage was No. 3 Unit under the command of *****, all based at Leytonstone. ***** lined up his men in the Broadway, with protective shields and truncheons drawn in conditions reminiscent of war, to face the missile throwing crowd in the mouth of Beechcroft Avenue. These officers were operating therefore in some isolation from the main body, exposed and vulnerable.

P. 741

Appendix B

P. 2

17. Up to this point events are relatively clear but I must preface any further description of what happened with a proviso that conflicting accounts have been given by private persons and also by police. The diverse opinions as to what occurred can be attributed to several aspects, the most obvious being confusion as it is not uncommon in violent situations for people to think primarily of themselves, to avoid being hurt or with other personal or singular objectives in mind. People can be mistaken as to what occurred and when two witnesses describe the same detail collusion is not improbable.

Deliberate

lies or collusions is another aspect with the making of false allegations against the police which some people are prone to do particularly those who are anti-authority. Police officers may seek to avoid responsibility, criminal liability, embarrassment or public blame. The police officers continued on duty some hours after that at the demonstration, which could distort their memory and the consequences of the activity at Orchard Avenue was not known until the next day.

Appendix 'B'

P.7

18. For more detail of police action in the area in question I invite the reader to look at a sketch plan which gives a general impression of the accounts that have been given, but I must emphasise that all the police and private witnesses do not agree in their description of the events but it is a basis from which to start.
19. With those observations made I return to the events of that evening.

1 UNIT SPECIAL PATROL GROUP SENT TO ASSIST 3 UNIT

P. 741

20. Assistance was sent to ***** and his men facing the crowd in Beechcroft Avenue, in the form of ***** No. 1 Unit Special Patrol Group (Barnes) in three personnel carriers. They went eastwards along the Broadway to the junction with Beechcroft where two carriers turned right into the road being waved in by officers on foot.

The third carrier was turned back in the mistaken belief that it could get into Beechcroft from a side road and thereby entrap the violent demonstrators. 3 Unit officers advanced on the crowd on foot with 1 Unit officers in the two carriers, “one-one” (11) and “one-two” (12). A point of dispute is whether the carriers stopped momentarily at the mouth of the junction, but if so it is doubtful if any officer could have alighted. The impression one gets is it started off as a ‘tank and infantry’ type of advance and in such circumstance the adrenalin starts to pump; particularly with the high probability of injury.

21. The officers of 3 Unit Special Patrol Group ran after the demonstrators preceded by the personnel carriers, with the exception of Officer D who claims he was to the forefront because of his ability as a sprinter and he caught a man named **Person 58** and struggled with him some yards short of the junction with Orchard Avenue. The first vehicle at that junction was “one-one” (11) driven by **Officer F** and in charge was *****. The vehicle stopped at an angle at the junction turned towards the nearside, thereby causing a bottle-neck. Simultaneously, or thereabouts, ***** jumped from the carrier and were immediately involved with the demonstrators. The demonstrators at that junction were then endeavouring to avoid capture but the atmosphere of violence remained.

P. 741

P. 449

P. 1572

P. 1218

Dispersal of the demonstrators was a

continuing operation by the police with the theory of 'hot-pursuit' being applicable. Differentiating stone-throwers in the crowd from others would be extremely difficult. I am of the opinion that if a person remains part of a crowd who are throwing missiles, that is collective support and guilt by presence and perhaps it ought to be a distinct offence. One is practically just as bad as the other and police on a dispersing action cannot be expected to differentiate.

WITNESSES OF ASSAULT UPON CLEMENT BLAIR PEACH

22. At or about the time the police jumped from the carriers 14 witnesses say they saw a police officer hit the deceased on the head, 13 of the persons are Asians and Person B, who was a friend of the deceased.

The persons are:-

- | | |
|----------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <u>P. 406</u> | 23. Person C |
| <u>P. 410</u> | Person D |
| <u>P. 417</u> | Person E |
| <u>P. 432</u> | Person F |
| <u>P. 445</u> | Person 103 |
| <u>P. 462</u> | Person H |
| <u>P. 472</u> | Person I |
| <u>P. 479</u> | Person J (later retracted) |
| <u>P. 483</u> | Person K (later retracted) |
| <u>P. 487</u> | Person L |
| <u>P. 503</u> | Person M |
| <u>P. 511</u> | Person N |
| <u>P. 515</u> | Person O |
| | And |
| <u>P. 296</u> | Person B (a friend of the deceased) |

Unfortunately the majority say they cannot identify the officer and if they did there are discrepancies which detract from their credibility. Officer F and Officer G were put on an identification parade on 11th July, 1979 but there was no identification by the witnesses **Person I** or **Person L**.

P. 472

However further identification parades are to be held but I am not hopeful of any development in that respect.

24. To some the deceased was prominent because they noted he was the only white man among Asians at the junction. He would also be wearing his yellow 'Anti Nazi League' badge in his lapel. If he was true to form he may have been in dispute, conflict, obstructing or interfering with the police and Person 58 was being overpowered just about that time. After being hurt it is reported PEACH was pushed around the corner and fell to the ground, getting up after the police had gone and making his way unsteadily across the road to No. 71 from where he was later taken to hospital.
25. Confusion and conflicting accounts by private witnesses obviate a clear picture of what occurred. Some say he was hit by a truncheon, some say several times but that is not in accordance with the medical evidence. Others say he was hit by an officer wielding a riot shield. Some say the officer came from the carrier and others say he did not but had arrived on foot from Beechcroft Avenue. No officer has admitted striking Clement Blair PEACH either deliberately, accidentally, or given an account which would

indicate that he may have done so without realising it.

Consideration has been given as to whether the injury could have been caused by a fellow demonstrator or by a missile, but in the absence of evidence such speculation cannot be pursued and the remaining allegation is that police caused the injury.

- 26. As I have pointed out some officers of 3 Unit were on foot but undoubtedly the officers on carrier “one-one” were to the forefront. The officers in that carrier after disembarking, who could have assaulted Clement Blair PEACH were Officer E, Officer H, Officer G, Officer I, Officer J and Officer F, and I give them in that order of possibility. Here I must point out that earlier that day those officers of the Special Patrol Group had been involved in other incidents and if the soreness of the previous incidents had worn off it no doubt remained in the mind.

P. 1218

Officer E *****
is a young ***** with a forceful personality.

PROMINENT DISCREPANCY

P. 1218

- 27. Officer E and Officer H require mention in that when seen the next day and after the news media had given the death some prominence, their recollection was they got out of the carrier “one-one” at the junction

of Broadway and Beechcroft and not at the junction of Beechcroft and Orchard. One could speculate that if they thought they had been seen alighting from the carrier and they had then gone straight into the assault on PEACH, saying they had got out earlier would have obviated suspicion on them. However, at a later interview Officer E acknowledged that he had got out at the junction where the assault on PEACH took place.

Officer H still maintains he got out at the junction of the Broadway and Beechcroft and he will not move from that account. There is the possibility that both officers confronted PEACH, one or the other struck him and then bundled him around the corner. There would then be complicity in the assault and it raises the question of conspiring or attempting to pervert justice if they decided to tell lies, but there is no such proof.

P. 1642
(Questionnaire
)

However, both maintain they did not assault PEACH, but Officer F subsequently said under intense questioning that Officer E and Officer H got out of the carrier on the corner and went straight into the crowd. This has a ring of truth and it may be that Officer F saw more but will not enlarge. He is under suspension from duty at the present time. All the officers have been subjected to lengthy interviews but they maintain their innocence of crime and complicity to conceal what occurred.

CRIMINAL LIABILITY

28. After the incident at the junction which in effect took as long as one passed by, the officers either got back into the personnel carriers or pursued demonstrators either way along Orchard Avenue. The criminal liability of an officer striking PEACH in such circumstances would be more of a point for deliberation if there was an officer conceding that it had or could have occurred, but that is not the case. Notwithstanding that an officer has not come forward it does not rule out certain considerations because there are two separate issues; 1) the officer's criminality in assaulting PEACH and 2) his admission of doing so. The action was to disperse the crowd and the use of truncheons may well be thought to be justified. The death of PEACH is tragic but had he not died I doubt if any lesser charge could have been preferred with good prospect of conviction. With regard to an officer admitting responsibility, the death was widely reported in the news the next day with allegations in various quarters that the "S.P.G. had murdered Blair PEACH". Placards to that effect were displayed by persons believed to be from the 'Socialist Workers Party' outside Southall Police Station. With such a serious allegation made the reason for an officer failing to come forward may be that he could not measure up to do so, concede blame, or may feel that he was not obliged to offer himself for legal

and public scrutiny as to his actions. There is the right of silence as a legal privilege but an untruth could be an attempt to pervert justice. There is little doubt that many defending lawyers in such circumstances would advise their clients not to make any such admission and to leave the matter to other proof. Police officers are expected to be forthright and if knowingly responsible failure to do so would be discreditable or shows up most unfavourably. An officer failing to report his colleague would at the very least incur severe censure. The measure of moral fibre needed by both may be a matter for speculation. Assuming an officer had come forward or his identity (and any accomplice) become known, the preferring of any charge would have had to be weighed against any explanation tendered. An officer may also have been in trepidation of a charge being preferred straightaway and having failed to make a disclosure in the early stages then felt it was too late.

29. The purpose of the officers was to disperse the demonstrators, so the use of truncheons could be made out and in all the circumstances I would not envisage a jury convicting an officer of murder. Accepting that an officer is entitled to use force an issue would be “excessive” force which thereby makes any speculative offence being murder as distinct from manslaughter.

It transpires that the deceased had an abnormally thin skull and on another person such a blow may not have had the same disastrous consequences. The inquest verdict of “misadventure” will therefore justify some consideration alongside “open verdict”.

SOLICITORS OF FAMILY AND ? ANTI NAZI LEAGUE

- P. 291** 30. Person P, Solicitor ******, representing the family of the deceased, had an independent post mortem, by **Person Q** and on 6 / 7th June, 1979, disclosed the opinion that the instrument used to cause the injury was not likely to be a police truncheon, but a leaded cosh or similar object. They released the content of Person Q’s report to the Press and it received wide and extensive publicity.
- P. 2359** 31. A search of the rooms of the Special Patrol Group at Barnes on 5th June, 1979, had revealed a lead cosh and other truncheon type weapons in the locker of Officer F. This officer was the driver of the first Special Patrol Group carrier “one-one” down the street.
- P. 813** 32. On 4th June, 1979, Officer K had made a statement that no one was on the vehicle “one-one” at one stage. Officer F was detained for three days and subjected to lengthy questioning. He maintained he was not responsible, and at that stage said that ***** and the rest of the crew went into the crowd on the corner and, as I pointed out earlier, particularly mentioned Officer E and Officer H. Officer F says he did not have the cosh in his possession at Southall. He has given two explanations as to how he obtained it:- 1) that he got it in America when on a visit there ten years ago, and 2) he found it at a road block. It is not uncommon for prisoners to attempt to dispose of incriminating items before arrival at
- P. 1642**

police stations. It is improper and contrary to regulations for an officer to retain such an item and indeed as such an item would then become the Commissioner's property there is the question of theft. I submit however that a charge of theft would not be sustained. As the driver of the vehicle Officer F would have to clear out the carrier and laxity in the correct procedure is apparent.

FURTHER POST-MORTEM RAISED BY POLICE

33. A further official post-mortem was requested and when carried out by **Person R**, with Person S it was disclosed that the deceased had an abnormally thin skull at the point of impact. In fact the bone is particularly translucent which accounts to some degree for the shattering effect that resulted. As yet the thinness of the skull is not public knowledge. Of a number of items including truncheons, riot shields and Motorola radios, Person R favours the latter by weight and size as the more likely object to have caused the injury. He rules out the cosh as it is not consistent with the fracture site. Evidence has not emerged to show any officer as wielding his Motorola personal radio as a weapon. Officer L of Unit 1 had one with him out of the carrier at the junction, but he denies any contact with the deceased. In relation to that examination which was on 21st June, 1979, Person S concurs but refers to 'considerable inertial force'.

P. 285

P. 293A

P. 1739

P. 293A

OTHER INCIDENTS OF ASSAULT, ETC. NEAR THE SCENE

34. Other incidents relative to the police action in Beechcroft Avenue and Orchard Avenue require mention in relation to allegations of police brutality and as indicative of the overall state of affairs.

35. **ASIAN MAN ASSAULTED**

At the time that officers from 3 Unit Special Patrol Group were advancing down Beechcroft Avenue it is alleged that **Person 103**, age 51, of *****, was assaulted by an officer with a truncheon and he sustained a scalp wound requiring hospital treatment and the insertion of stitches. The identity of any officer who assaulted him is not known. An Asian child witness says he fell down and was kicked but a number of other witnesses say the assault was by a police officer. An aspect of that incident is that following it a chair was brought from a house and he was sat on it prior to him walking home from where he was later conveyed to hospital.

P. 445

INJURY TO FRIEND OF THE DECEASED

36. Person B *****, alleges she was assaulted on the head by a police officer with a truncheon and also sustained an injury to her hand believed from a riot shield. Person B is a member of the 'Anti Nazi League' and was a friend of and accompanying the deceased. She says she saw Clement Blair PEACH struck on the head by an officer with a truncheon. She cannot identify any officer and

P. 296

Person B will be subject of further comment later in this report.

**PROCEEDINGS PENDING AGAINST MAN FOR
UNLAWFUL WOUNDING**

Appendix 'A'

37. Person T, *****, was chased by officers on foot to the right of Orchard Avenue into the cul-de-sac, went behind No. 82 and by an alleyway back into Beechcroft Avenue where he was arrested and later charged with unlawful wounding of Officer C who sustained a fractured jaw.

CUL-DE-SAC ORCHARD AVENUE

P. 660

38. A number of other persons had endeavoured to avoid police by running around the side of No. 82, including **Person U**, age 18, a clerk, of *****, who sustained a laceration to her head allegedly caused by a police officer with a truncheon, necessitating the insertion of one suture. She came forward on 17th May, 1979, after I had had a discussion with Person P, Solicitor, representing the family and members of the 'Anti Nazi League'. She says the officer had a beard but his identity is not known and she may be mistaken as to his description. Person U was taken into No. 82 by the Asian family living there and afforded comfort and assistance. In her statement Person U names several friends but does not have their addresses.

P. 660

39. We have been dependent upon Person P (Solicitor) in arranging interviews with these people and after inordinate delay appointments are now made. I do not doubt that Person P knows what they can say but he has not given them any prominence and communication has been maintained with him. It would appear that their knowledge, if any, is to do with the incident - albeit serious - affecting Person U but is other than the assault upon Clement Blair PEACH.
40. Police officers pursued demonstrators to the left down Orchard Avenue and several Asian witnesses say that a police officer caught a "youth" in a side alley leading to the Social Club and hit him with his truncheon. This person could be Person V, age 16 of *****, and we have just been able to contact her and a statement should be obtained next week. Officer G admits to confronting a "youth" but denies the assault as do the other officers.
41. Further investigations respecting these other incidents are being made and identification parades considered. A further report on these aspects will be submitted.

T.V. CREW AT HERBERT ROAD

42. After the main incident at the junction of Beechcroft Avenue, the Special Patrol Group officers went on foot or in the two carriers, along Orchard Avenue to the junction with Herbert Road, where District officers were on duty. Here Officer E and a

P. 1218

P. 712

P. 719

television camera crew had what it termed a “heated exchange”. There is no doubt that Officer E was not as cool as he should have been and the strain was showing. There is however no photographic evidence of the incidents in or near Orchard Avenue.

43. COMMISSION FOR RACIAL EQUALITY

In the past few days newspapers have disclosed a “report” on the Southall demonstration prepared by the ‘Commission for Racial Equality’. As it appears they have witnesses I have endeavoured to contact Person W, the Chairman, but he is on leave this week and I will not be able to see him until 16th July, 1979.

BUILD UP TO INCIDENT AT BEEHCROFT AVENUE

44. I will now make brief comment against the names of persons from whom statements have been taken, as far as possible in the chronological order of events or the prominence of one incident against other things they saw, but there is some overlap.

P.1

P.4

Doc. No. 16

45. Person X was the driver of Person Y, a photographer who took photographs of a serious incident earlier in the day. The photographs highlight the tempo of the day’s events. The copyright of the photographs remain with his employers, the *****. Referring to the police in general Person Y said as a whole they showed a lot

P.4

- of restraint. The tone of the statement of
- P. 8 46. **Person Z**, sounds as if he is a ‘National Front’ supporter.
- P. 10 **Person 1**, describes part of the build up to violence.
- P. 12 **Person 2** was the driver of the coach hired by the police on
which there was an incendiary attack in the Broadway.
- P. 16 47. **Person 3** is the Community Relations Officer at Southall who
has appeared on television in respect of the incidents and his
statement is included should he emerge during ensuing
proceedings.
- P. 18 **Person 4** was visiting Southall from Nottingham and his
description of events and neutrality is worthy of note.
- P. 21 **Person 5** has a shop in the Broadway and he saw part of the
build up to violence.
- P. 24 **Person 6** saw an incendiary object thrown at the police coach
and gives a good outline of the general state of affairs.
- P. 31 48. **Person 7** took some photographs early in the evening.
- P. 33 **Person 8** saw a firecracker thrown at the police coach. He did
not see any undue violence by police. He is the father of
Person 4 already mentioned.
- P. 35 **Person 9** saw some violence and praises the police.

- P. 77 53 **Person 26** Earlier than the main incident he saw chilli powder thrown at police and other missiles.
- P. 80 **Person 27** no doubt one of the demonstrators and saw “one or two bricks thrown”. Described a white woman hit who could be Person B and says police were indiscriminately hitting people. It appears he evaded police by running through one of the escape alleyways off Orchard Avenue.
- P. 82 **Person 28** saw police carriers at the junction with Beechcroft Avenue but was not nearby.
- P.85 54. **Person 29** saw the police carriers obviously 3 Unit of the Special Patrol Group, arrive at the junction with Northcote Avenue when he was part of the crowd. He ran indoors and watched a police officer chase youths into an alleyway which appears to be the entrance to the Social Club, and hit one of the “youths” on the head with his truncheon.
- P. 88 55. **Person 30** saw police with shields and truncheons run down Beechcroft Avenue at about 8 pm and about two or three police transit vans drove down after them. Not specific enough and lacks detail.
- P. 90 **Person 31** age 13, **Person 32**, age 16 both give brief accounts
P. 255 but of little value.
- P. 94 56. **Person 33**, an ambulance driver who went to convey Officer C to hospital and saw a police carrier apparently “one-two” of the Special Patrol Group driven by a Woman Police Constable.

- P. 97 57. **Person 34** was standing near some of ‘Anti Nazi League’ members in the crowd who said directions by police were a trap which gives some indication of the influence they were having on the crowd. Saw rocks thrown at the police van. Was part of the crowd who ran down Beechcroft Avenue chased by the police and he ran into No. 62 Orchard Avenue. Saw two policemen talking to a man on the other side of the wall on the pavement and this was probably the deceased.
- P. 105 **Person 35** was part of the demonstrating crowd and chased down Beechcroft Avenue.
- P. 108 **Person 36** is critical of police but has nothing of evidential value.

58. **CO-OPERATION BY ASIAN COMMUNITY IN ORCHARD AVENUE AREA, ETC.**

I must place on record that the Asian people visited in their homes in the course of this enquiry, stopped in the street and asked if they have any information, or seen at the Mobile Police Station that was sited in the street to facilitate enquiries, have been most co-operative and readily made statements negative or otherwise. If any suggestion of non-co-operation by the residents in Orchard Avenue with the police is made it can be refuted.

FURTHER WITNESSES

- P. 110 59. **Person 37** saw the arrival of the police into Northcote Avenue and gives a preamble of general events.

- P. 113 60. **Person 38** was in the crowd but is of little value.
- P. 115 **Person 39** was injured in an incident earlier and is of little value.
- P. 116 **Person 40** saw Asian youths picking up bricks during the afternoon.
- P. 118 **Person 41** saw that Indian youths had gathered empty milk bottles.
- P. 119 **Person 42** saw Indian youths taking empty milk bottles.
- P. 120 61. **Person 43** was arrested at an earlier incident and hit on the head by police causing a wound.
- P. 122 **Persons 44 and 45** saw Indian boys throwing bottles and bricks at the police and
- P. 129 **Person 46** saw missiles thrown at police.
Person 47 saw burning object thrown at a police coach.
- P. 132 **Person 48** saw police hitting people. Was part of the crowd.
- P. 135 62. **Person 49** saw two police vans drive into Beechcroft Avenue, earlier the crowd was in an angry mood, and saw milk crates full of bottles and stones.
- P. 137 **Person 50** was part of the crowd and sustained injury.

- P. 140 63. **Person 51** saw a bottle thrown at the police coach and the crowd was throwing bricks and bottles at the police. Saw the two Special Patrol Group carriers drive into Beechcroft Avenue, one of the vehicles cut the corner and went over the pavement.
64. **BUILD UP** (missile throwing) - Police Statements
- P. 142 **Officer M** on duty with officers in the Broadway. Eliminates other officers from the Special Patrol Group incident at Northcote Avenue, etc.
- P. 146 **Officer N** on duty in the Broadway and did not see officers other than Special Patrol Group at the Northcote Avenue junction.
- P. 150 **Officer O** says about the police cordon.
- P. 153 **Officer P** had a brief meeting with Person 3 the Community Liaison Officer.
- P. 154 **Officer Q** on duty in the Broadway.
- P. 159 **Officer R** was with Officer N in the Broadway.
- P. 162 **Officer S** on duty at the demonstration.
- P. 165 **Officer T** was with previously mentioned senior officers.
- P. 169 **Officer U** on duty at the demonstration.
- P. 172 **Officer V** on duty in the Broadway area.
- P. 175 **Officer W** on duty but of little value.
- P. 178 **Officer X** gives quite a bit of evidence of what was going on and appears to be a good witness of the events in the Broadway, but he was not in Beechcroft / Orchard Avenue.

- P. 184 66. **Officer Y** was observation officer on top of 'Safeways' roof in the Broadway so had a good vantage point. Saw the start of the operation at the junction of Northcote Avenue.
- P. 188 **Officer Z** on duty but nothing specific about prime incidents.
- P. 191 **Officer 1** was on duty in the Broadway and briefly saw the Special Patrol Group carriers.
- P. 195 **Officer 2** gives account of previous incidents.
- P. 198 **Officer 3** was in the Broadway during missile throwing.
- P. 204 **Officer 4** saw bricks, bottles and red powder (chilli) thrown at police. Was struck on the head by a brick.
- P. 208 67. **Officer 5** on duty and eliminates his officers from being involved in the incident at Beechcroft / Northcote Avenue. Special Patrol Group officers sought to establish that Divisional / District officers had also been there but there is no proof of this.
- P. 215 68. **Officer 6** was the Police Helicopter Observer and circled over Beechcroft Avenue at the important time. Gives good outlines but the moving position of the helicopter prevented a continuing sight of a situation in the streets below. There is a tape recording of the police messages on the main control channel and the calls to the police control room feature on it. Whilst there is a record of those transmissions the conversations on the Motorola personal radio sets of the Special Patrol Group are not recorded.
- Doc. Pages 52 -
83

- P. 218 69. **Officer 7** was the officer in charge of the ‘Serial’ of officers who formed part of the cordon which was withdrawn allowing the crowd to disperse westwards along the Broadway.
- P. 222 **Officer 8** refers to operational deployment.
- P. 226 **Officer 9** reports violence by the crowd but it is in the Broadway as distinct from Beechcroft Avenue.
- P. 231 **Officer 10** reports violent behaviour but again in the Broadway.
- P. 235 **Officer 11** also reports violence and was on the coach when it was hit.
- P. 238 70. **Officer 12** reports violence and the police cordon moved forward and from a distance saw the approach of the Special Patrol Group carriers along the Broadway and officers alight.

BEEHCROFT AVENUE

- P. 251 71. **Person 52** lives in Beechcroft Avenue and from an upstairs room saw the police vans go past his address. He saw the Asian man Person 103 bleeding and a chair was obtained for him to sit on. I think this witness has events in the wrong order.
- P. 254 **Person 53** saw police pursuing people in Beechcroft Avenue but his time is wrong and his statement too brief.
- P. 255 **Person 32** saw police run after demonstrators down Beechcroft Avenue.

- P. 258 72. **Person 54** saw coming and going by police but of little value.
- P. 260 **Person 55** saw Indian youths with sticks in their hands and pick up milk bottles. This was when police were down Orchard Avenue and appears to be about or just after the time of the PEACH incident. Also saw a little Indian man, Person 103, bleeding, being helped to his home. (Police and the milk crate in Orchard Avenue was some time later).
- P. 264 **Person 56** saw people running from Beechcroft Avenue into Orchard Avenue and also saw police remove the milk crate.
- P. 267 **Person 57** says she saw a man obviously the deceased, sitting against the wall by the 'no entry' sign outside No. 62 Orchard Avenue and three policemen were standing near him. This would be after the injury was caused. One of the officers could be Officer G of the Special Patrol Group. She says the man on the ground appeared to be trying to say something to him but they ignored him. This was apparently just a brief glimpse by this witness.
- P. 269 **Person A** was a person arrested and he says little else. The interviewing officer was of course seeking information, specifically respecting the PEACH incident and not his arrest. This person is not to be confused with Person 58 of the same address who was arrested by Officer D after the chase down Beechcroft Avenue.

MORE SPECIFICALLY - THE PEACH INCIDENT

P. 270

73. **Person 59**

Appendix B

Page 8

At 9 am on 23rd April, 1979 when she left for work he was still in bed and she had an idea he would be going to the demonstration at Southall. At 1.45 am on 24th April, 1979, she identified his body at New Ealing Hospital.

P. 271

Officer 13 provides continuity of the identification of the body from Person 59 to Person R, the pathologist.

P. 273

74. **Person 60** of the London Ambulance Control Service received

Doc. No. 5

the call at 8.14 pm on 23rd April, 1979 for an ambulance to go to 71 Orchard Avenue, Southall and in response sent Person 61 and Person 62, being driver and attendant respectively.

P. 275

P. 277

Within minutes they arrived at the address and there they found Clement Blair PEACH who said "My head hurts". A woman said that he had been hit on the head with a truncheon by a policeman. The deceased appeared to need medical treatment and was immediately conveyed to New Ealing Hospital. There he was seen and examined by Person 63 ***** (Ed) the Duty Surgical Registrar, who

P. 279

found him to be suffering from

a severe injury on the left side of the head. There was no bleeding or laceration but there was swelling, approximately 4 inches by 2 to 3 inches. The patient was in an apparently critical condition, transferred to the Intensive Care Unit and surgery was performed. Resuscitative procedures were carried out but the patient died at 12.10 am on 24th April, 1979.

P. 283

Person 64 ***** the Consultant Surgeon was called to the operating theatre and he was involved in the attempt to arrest the haemorrhage around the brain. Person R

P. 285

M.A., M.B., B.Ch, F.R.C.P. (Ed), M.R.C.P., F.R.C. Path. D. Path D.M.J., carried out the post mortem examination on 24th April, 1979, at 2.30 pm. Cause of death was due to extradural haemorrhage due to fracture of the skull, the findings being consistent with a blow shattering the left side of the skull and causing extensive uncontrollable extradural haemorrhage.

75. Oral opinion as to the type of weapon was a hand object such as a lead pipe covered by a sock but a police truncheon could not be ruled out. A police truncheon was likely to have split the skin but the amount of hair could affect the result of a blow. An extensive variety of instruments could have caused the wound and a rubber truncheon was a possibility. This was borne in mind as regards forensic and scientific examination of the truncheon and the uniforms of Special Patrol Group officers, but no such evidence was found.

- P. 285
P. 293A
76. At a subsequent post mortem examination on 21st June, 79 which was requested, Person R and Person S who opined that the skull vault was distinctly thinner than expected and in the area of the fracture less than 1/16 inch. It was also found to be unusually translucent. This would lead to any blow causing a more extensive fracture than on a normal skull. A number of truncheons and other items including a cosh, which had been found in the locker of Officer F, Special Patrol Group, at Barnes Police Station on 5th June, 79, together with a standard type Motorola personal radio on issue to Special Patrol Group officers, was shown to Person R, whose opinion is that the personal radio was the most likely instrument as it was more closely related to the size of the injury. The finding of the cosh was obviously disclosed to the Press and received wide publicity. It did not merit special mention as a likely instrument as it is substantially smaller in size than the fracture site. A statement from Person S has not yet been received. (Report received 13.7.79).
- P. 291
77. Person Q had carried out a post mortem examination on 30th April, 1979, as requested by Person P, the Solicitor, acting for relatives and friends of the deceased. The findings of Person Q were released by those having them to the Press and his opinion that the weapon could have been a cosh was linked with the finding of such a weapon in Officer F's

possession. The last opinion as given by Person R has not been released as yet to the public.

- P. 294
295
Doc. No. 17
Doc. No. 18
78. **Person 65** and **Person 66** are police photographers and took the necessary photographs at the mortuary and at Southall respectively.
- P. 296
79. Person B was a friend and associate of the deceased and was at the demonstration with him. She says she saw a police officer **hit him with a truncheon** but she cannot identify the officer. She also received injuries herself and received brief treatment at the hospital. She was also at the address at 71 Orchard Avenue from where Clement Blair PEACH was taken to hospital and present when Person C, the Occupier, was requested not to make a statement to police until a solicitor was there. In the early hours of the morning Person B was at *********, the address of another member of the 'Anti Nazi League', but she could not be seen and it was not until 11 am 24th April, 1979, that she could be interviewed at the offices of Person P (Solicitor). In that interview she failed to disclose that Person 67 was with her at Southall and at the time it had sinister connotations. Person B is an intelligent woman and for the sake of the objectives of their cause, I would not put it past her adding the assault on PEACH to her

account of the matter, which otherwise appears to be reasonably accurate. When seen at the New Ealing Hospital she did not tell an officer who spoke to her that she had seen the deceased assaulted. She is a person who will have to be called to give evidence and I do not expect her to concede much. Prior to any evidence she gives she will be the recipient of advice from Person P.

- P. 337 80. **Officer 14** was the officer who saw Person B at the hospital and he recalls her saying “Look they were hitting everyone, I got hit, so he must have too, have you seen his injuries”.
- P. 340 81. **Person 68** a teacher of ***** Ealing was a friend of the deceased and a member of the ‘Anti Nazi League’. He was at the demonstration but did not see the deceased assaulted. He had ran further down Orchard Avenue on the approach of police on the dispersal operation. He was also involved in the concealment of Person 67 as being present at the time of the PEACH incident. It was at his address during the early hours that he and other persons obviated being interviewed by police. He appears to be extremely biased against authority.

- P. 372 82. **Person 67** was seen a few days later. She describes how she was part of the crowd chased by police but she did not see the assault on the deceased. She says the reason she did not come forward is because she is French and it could affect her chances of getting a job. Amongst her friends it was a positive decision not to disclose that she was with them and it only came out when a Person 69 was being questioned as to who went to 71 Orchard Avenue later that evening and the people occupying the motor cars in which they travelled.
- P. 381 83. **Person 69** was with the deceased and others of the ‘Anti Nazi League’. It was close questioning of her that disclosed the agreement to conceal Person 67. Person 69 was part of the crowd being chased along Beechcroft Avenue but was ahead of Clement Blair PEACH and having ran down Orchard Avenue she did not see what happened to him. On retracing her steps and making enquiries she found him in 71 Orchard Avenue **slouched** in a **corner** of the sofa. From there he was taken to hospital with Person B and she followed. She concludes by saying that she did not see any policemen hitting anyone in Beechcroft Avenue. Officer 15 spoke to Person 69 at New Ealing Hospital and about the same time Officer 14 was talking to Person B.
- P. 395
- P. 337

- P. 397 84. **Person 70** is a member of the 'Anti Nazi League' and was at the demonstration. He was part of the crowd chased by police down Beechcroft Avenue and Orchard Avenue but did not see the assault on the deceased.
- P. 402 85. **Person 71**, a member of the 'Anti Nazi League' was with friends at the demonstration and saw Clement Blair PEACH and his colleagues. He went down Beechcroft Avenue but it was possibly later than the PEACH incident.
- P. 406 86. **Person C** of 71 Orchard Avenue, Southall, gives her description of what occurred when police chased demonstrators down Beechcroft Avenue. Her statement is most important in that she describes the police carriers and officers on foot coming down the street and describes in detail how Clement Blair PEACH was assaulted. She says the deceased was attacked by police who came out of the van, the policeman hit him with his truncheon and the man collapsed 1½ yards around the corner in Orchard Avenue. She says the police officer attacked him more than once. She cannot identify the officer. Clement Blair PEACH then managed to cross the road into the gateway and collapsed on the ground. He was taken indoors from where the ambulance was called and later took him to hospital. Person 68 and others later returned to the address and in accordance with their advice she did not make a statement in writing until an associate solicitor of Person P was present,

and then through the services of an interpreter. By coincidence the husband of Person C had met Person 68 at a protest meeting some years earlier and they appear to be of the same political persuasion. Person C concludes her statement to the effect that police attacked people for no reason as no one was creating trouble.

- P. 410 87. Person D is the son of Person C and he also describes the advance of the police vans and that the officers from them started hitting people with their truncheons. He saw the deceased assaulted by an officer with a “very hard hit”. Clement Blair PEACH then staggered across the road to his house and an ambulance was sent for. Person D has been interviewed on television in respect of the incident.
- P. 417 88. **Person E** ***** also of 71 Orchard Avenue, says that the police vans came down Beechcroft Avenue facing Orchard Avenue and then she went to the kitchen to do some washing up. On returning she saw a police officer strike a man on the left side of the head. It may be that this witness is giving a distorted account of what she has heard from conversation in
- P. 420 her home. Her sister, **Person 72** was not at home when the incidents happened.

- P. 421 89. **Person 73** ***** saw police vans arriving in the street and police hitting people but no specific incident.
- P. 423 **Person 74** of 71 Orchard Avenue is the husband of Person C already mentioned. He did not see the assault on PEACH but saw him on the settee in his house. Person 68 who he knew from a meeting connected some time earlier with the death of an Asian boy, told him they would sue the police and statements should be made in the presence of a solicitor.
- P. 426 90. **Officer 16** says that he saw Person D giving an account of events at Southall on television and recognised him as being provocative during the demonstration. **Officer 17** was with Officer 16 but did not recognise Person D in a newspaper photograph.
- Doc. No. 6
P. 430
- P. 432 91. **Person F** saw police transit vans speed down Beechcroft Avenue to Orchard Avenue chasing the demonstrators and saw a man (PEACH) hit on the head by a police officer with his baton. The man stumbled to the ground and was later helped into 71 Orchard Avenue. He joined the people there and telephoned for the police. He could not say if the officer who struck the blow came out of the transit vans. Police were hitting people indiscriminately and shouting at them to go away.

- P. 437 92. **Person 75**, age 14, the son of the above, was at the demonstration and ran into the house of a friend.
- P. 440 **Person 76** was in the crowd of demonstrators and ran when pursued by police down Beechcroft Avenue and escaped through an alley.
- P. 442 **Person 77**, age 15 was part of the crowd and ran into the home of his friend at ***** from where he saw two police vans stop at the junction of Orchard and Beechcroft Avenues and police officers get out. He saw police assault a man who then fell to the ground.
- P. 445 93. **Person 103** saw four policemen get out of the police van and two grabbed an Indian youth (Person 58) and the other two officers grabbed a white man and hit him. One of the officers caught him and the other hit him on the head with his truncheon. He was also hit by a truncheon several times. He fell to the ground and was left there. He was helped home and then taken to hospital for treatment to a cut on the head which was caused by the police.

- P. 449 94. **Person 58** was the person arrested in Beechcroft Avenue and says three or four policemen beat him with batons. This appears to be the arrest by Officer D. At the time of his arrest he saw a man - PEACH - fall to the ground about two feet from the corner.
- P. 454 95. **Person 78** saw police vans drive down Beechcroft Avenue and stop near the junction with Orchard Avenue where officers got out and the crowd split up. He saw police officers hitting a man with their truncheons. The man had dark skin and appears to be Person 58 above. A short time later he saw a man (PEACH) sitting on the pavement outside No. 62 holding his head. In the second statement he corrects the first statement he made.
- P. 462 96. **Person H** saw about ten policemen running down Beechcroft Avenue towards Orchard Avenue chasing people. He says people were arrested and that two policemen caught a man (PEACH) and one of them hit him on the head. The policeman only hit him once and it didn't seem to be a heavy, hard blow. It all happened very quickly. The officer who carried out the assault then walked back up Beechcroft Avenue. He adds that he didn't have a very clear view.

- P. 470 97. **Person 79** saw a man sitting in Orchard Avenue holding his head but did not see what had occurred just previously.
- P. 472 98. **Person I** has given his account on television. He saw two police vans on the corner of Beechcroft and Orchard Avenue. The policemen rushed out with truncheons and shields and hit people, one being the deceased. He says “I think it was about three policemen who hit this man”. The officers did not have shields. After he had been hit the man leaned against the wall of No. 62 holding his head with both hands. The man then walked off unsteadily into the garden of No. 71 Orchard Avenue and was later taken away by ambulance.
- P. 479 **Person J**, age 11 made a statement that he saw three or four policemen jump on a man at the junction of Beechcroft and Orchard Avenue and were hitting the man with their truncheons, but in a later statement he retracted the part about the assault saying he had assumed that was what had occurred.
- P. 483 **Person K** age 11 made a statement but it is worthless and was retracted in part.

- P. 487 99. **Person L** describes the two police vans coming down Beechcroft and pulling up at the corner of Orchard Avenue. This witness was in his house and lives practically opposite *****. He says the first officer out of the front van hit a man at the corner with his truncheon on the head, the man then fell to the ground. The police officer then ran off up Beechcroft Avenue. He describes the officer as about 5'8", 30 - 35 years and goldish or blond hair. The age is wrong but the fair hair may indicate that it is Officer G. He is sure the officer had a shield in his left hand when he came out of the van.
- P. 493 100. **Person 80**, said about ten policemen were at the top of Beechcroft Avenue and they had shields to fend off the bricks and bottles that were being thrown at them. The officers had started to advance down Beechcroft Avenue towards the crowd of 20 - 30 youths, mainly Indians, when two police vans drove into the street, one after the other. They were being driven furiously with lights flashing and sirens sounding. The vans went through the foot police and overtook some of the demonstrators and one van stopped behind the other in the middle of the junction with Orchard Avenue.
- The policemen jumped out of the vans and started hitting people with their truncheons. They were mostly carrying truncheons but not shields and the policemen with riot shields ran down the road to join their colleagues. When police ran towards him he then ran indoors.

- P. 511 104. **Person N** was part of the crowd although he points out not one of the demonstrators. He was in the lead running from the police and ran to his address at ***** . The police got hold of a man at the corner of Beechcroft and Orchard and they hit him with a “little stick”. The officer was holding a shield. The man was hit two or three times. Two of the officers went back onto the police van and a third officer hit the man with his shield on the head.
- P. 515 105. **Person O** says she saw police hit a man right on top of his head with a glass shield. (The shape and weight of such shields makes this improbable). She describes the man assaulted and it fits the description of PEACH. She also describes an officer chasing a white “boy” up an alley passed No. 46 Orchard Avenue to a social club and assaulting him and it was definitely the same officer who assaulted the man on the corner. It appears that the officer who chased the “boy” (and it is now believed to be a young woman) is Officer G. In a subsequent statement she retracts having seen the ‘boy’ assaulted. Several of the witnesses were adamant in the first instance as to what they had seen and later revealed it to be as what they had heard - but nevertheless believed to be true. Getting to this point across to some of them in the witness box may not be easy.

- P. 528 106. **Person 83** saw a man (PEACH) sitting on the ground outside No. 62 Orchard Avenue.
- P. 529 **Person 84** saw the demonstrators endeavouring to escape from the police who were chasing them and saw police hit out at some people with their truncheons.
- P. 532 107. **Person 85** saw two police vans at the junction of Beechcroft Avenue and Orchard Avenue and 5 or 6 officers with shields get out and chase people to the cul-de-sac at 82, Orchard Avenue.
- P. 535 **Person 86** saw two police vans stop at the junction and police get out with shields and truncheons. One person was arrested and put on a van. She saw no one hit by police but saw a white man with a beard and a yellow badge on his collar (Anti Nazi League badge) on the ground opposite the “no entry” sign and this was obviously PEACH.

- P. 537 108. **Person 87** age 14 saw two police vans at the junction and a lot of policemen get out. She saw a “boy” chased up the driveway that leads to the social club and came out a few minutes later holding his wrist. He also saw a man on the corner of the two avenues sitting on the ground as if helpless.
- P. 541 **Person 88** saw police chasing people and saw two officers near a man at the junction and it was as if they were telling him to get up.
- P. 542 109. **Person 89** gives an account of what he saw but appears to be more confused than other witnesses.
- P. 546 **Person 90** saw the police transit vans drive down Beechcroft Avenue passed him at a fast speed and officers get out at the junction. The officers were then hitting people. He ran away but was chased and struck by an officer with a truncheon who said “get lost you bastard”.
- P. 550 **Person 91** saw the previous witness assaulted by a police officer.

- P. 552 110. **Person 92** heard the noise and the chase and police with riot shields and truncheons. Two people were arrested and he saw two policemen appearing to tell a person to get out of the way.
- P. 554 111. **Person 93** refers to incidents in the Broadway. Also saw police and people at the cul-de-sac of Orchard Avenue near his home. A man he now knows as **Blair PEACH** was sitting on the ground near to the 'No Entry' signs.
- P. 559 **Person 94** saw youths picking up milk bottles. People, mostly Asians, were being chased by police at the junction but did not see anybody hit by police officers.
- P. 561 112. **Person 95** saw two police vans stop at the junction and officers get out. When the vans arrived she saw a man falling down and police held him and took him on the other side of the road. This witness is confused.
- Person 96** saw police van turn into Beechcroft Avenue, cutting the corner and stuck under the front wing was a red and white traffic cone and it remained until the vehicle reached the bottom of Beechcroft. I

refer to this traffic cone because it is mentioned elsewhere and helps to establish it was Officer F's vehicle.

- P. 568 113. **Person 97** was in the crowd with officers chasing them. He also describes MR PEACH as arguing with police officers in Beechcroft Avenue about 10 yards from the Broadway.
- P. 573 **Officer 18** visited 71 Orchard Avenue after the deceased had been taken from there by ambulance.
- P. 577 **Officer 19** puts SPG carriers at the junction of Broadway and Beechcroft but none of the officers under his control went down to Orchard Avenue.
- P. 581 114. **Person 98** took photographs of 2 damaged S.P.G. carriers and produces 2 albums of photographs SPD/1 & 2.
- Doc. No. 19 /
20
- P. 582 **Officer 20** refers to subsequent discussions at the Feltham Training Course at Feltham and the point is that SPG officers were the only officers at the junction

with Orchard Avenue which they contest.

P. 585 **Officer 21** and **Officer 22** also briefly cover the point.
584

PEACH AND PREVIOUS INCIDENTS

- P. 586 115. **Person 99** gave character evidence for the deceased at a Court
Hearing to do with a case involving protestations against a
publican for racial discrimination. Person 99 and **Person 100**
refer to a police officer threatening to 'get' Blair PEACH after
P. 588 the Court Hearing.
- P. 591 116. **Person 101** was a police officer in 1974 and was involved in
the arrest at the public house in question for threatening
behaviour. He says he did not speak to Blair PEACH when he
left the Court.
- P. 594 117. **Person 102** was involved in the arrest of Clement Blair
PEACH for obstruction in 1978 outside a school where the
National Front were holding a meeting.

- P. 445 118. **Person 103** assaulted in Beechcroft Avenue.
- P. 596 119. **Person 104** saw the advance in Beechcroft Avenue and at the request of a woman (Person B) got a chair for the injured Asian man.
- P. 598 **Person 105** corroborates his brother above.
- P. 600 120. **Person 106** saw the injured Asian sitting on a chair outside No. 7 Beechcroft Avenue.
- P. 602 **Person 107** also saw the injured man.
- P. 604 **Person 108** saw the police hit the Asian man with a baton in Beechcroft Avenue. Police seemed to be hitting anyone who got in the way.
- P. 608 121. **Person 109**, a schoolgirl, makes a brief statement but it is of little use.

- P. 610 122. **Person 110**, a schoolgirl, saw police jab an Asian in the stomach with his truncheon. She also saw an old man fall over and was kicked by accident by a policeman running behind him. The old man later sat on the wall and was bleeding.
- P. 614 **Person 111**, age 15 saw an Asian with a cut head as did her
P.617 brother, **Person 112** and also **Person 113**.
- P. 620
- P. 623 123. **Person 114** saw a man bleeding from the head in Beechcroft
P. 624 Avenue and **Person 115** also saw him and the charge by the police at the Asian young men.
- P. 629 **Person 116** says that after the police chased a crowd of Indians he saw an old Indian staggering in Beechcroft Avenue.
- P. 631 124. **Person 117** saw the line of police go down Beechcroft Avenue but could not pick out individual incidents. She saw the Asian man bleeding.

- P. 647 128. **Person 122** saw police being stoned and the arrest of an Asian man. This appears to be Person T who had run around 82 Orchard Avenue and was arrested back in Beechcroft Avenue. He was hit in the stomach by the police who arrested him.
- P. 649 **Person 123** also appears to have witnessed the arrest of Person T and assault upon him.
- P. 651 129. **Person 124** was visiting 82 Orchard Avenue and saw police pursue demonstrators around the side of that house. He saw police hit the girl Person U.
- P. 654 130. **Person 125** saw police pursuing people in the direction of the cul-de-sac.
- P. 656 **Person 126** also saw police chasing people run towards the dead-end of Orchard Avenue. A man was arrested by the police but the identity of this man is not known. There is the possibility that he

was released if there was no other officer who wished to prefer a charge.

- P. 658 131. **Person 127** saw police get out of vans at the junction at rush off individually chasing people who were running away. Some people ran towards the dead-end of Orchard Avenue.
- P. 660 132. Person U is the woman who was hit in the cul-de-sac and had gone to the demonstration to protest against the National Front. She describes indiscriminate hitting by the police. She ran to 82 Orchard Avenue the end house of the cul-de-sac and there a policeman hit her with his truncheon and she screamed as he did so. Her head was bleeding and she was taken into that house, where her head was cleaned and she was given a cup of tea. She later received medical treatment. She describes the officer as having a full beard but nevertheless, establishing the identity of the officer is proving difficult. Her identity came to notice as a result of me having a discussion with Person P.

- P. 668 133. **Person 128** saw a man arrested by police near 82 Orchard Avenue.
- P. 670 **Person 129** was chased by police and having gone indoors, saw police van with a white man who they had arrested near the dead-end of Orchard Avenue.
- P. 674 134. **Person 130** saw police pursue 3 men at the cul-de-sac and one of the men arrested.
- P. 676 **Person 131** took Person U into her home at ***** and she was bleeding from a head wound.
- P. 680 **Person 132** saw police chase a man with a long sheath knife at the cul-de-sac.
- P. 684 135. **Person 133** saw police running after a man beside the last house (No. 82) in Orchard Avenue.
- P. 686 **Person 134** saw Asians run past her house towards the dead-end pursued by police officers.

ASSAULT - ENTRANCE TO SOCIAL CLUB

- P. 585 C 136. Between 44 - 46 Orchard Avenue there is an entrance to a Social Club and witnesses have said a “boy” / “youth” was assaulted thereat, immediately after the PEACH incident. After much enquiry and pressure upon Person P to give addresses we have traced other persons including a **Person 135** and it now appears that the person allegedly assaulted was Person V age 16 *****. She has yet to be seen but arrangements are in hand. My information is that Person 135 and her friends may not make impressive witnesses.
- P. 687 137. **Person 136** saw a policeman with a truncheon hitting a ‘boy’ who was against the fence in that alleyway. Whether he can be identified is not known but I believe the officer is Officer G, then of the Special Patrol Group.
- P. 690 **Person 137** saw a young ‘boy’ in the alleyway pleading with the police officers not to hit him. The boy had a graze to his wrist.
- Person 138** age 15 saw a police officer with a ‘boy’ against the fence, but when she went outside with his father the policeman had gone.

- P. 699 138. **Person 138** saw a white boy come out of an alleyway holding his head.
- P. 701 **Person 139** saw a policeman chase a boy up the alley at the side of No. 34 Orchard Avenue.
- P. 703 **Person 140** says he saw a young Asian boy 14 - 15 years being hit by a policeman with a truncheon who had got out of a police transit van.
- P. 705 **Person 141**, age 16, says he saw a policeman catch an Indian boy by the alley that leads past the Social Club.
- P. 706 **Person 142** says he saw police hit a boy in the road opposite to where he lives at *****.
- P. 708 139. **Person 143** saw police run past his house at *****, but did not see them strike anyone.
- P. 2604 **Person 144** saw a “white boy” “aged 28 to 29” and after leaving the alley in Orchard Avenue he was picking up pieces of glass on the street as if he had broken the lenses of his glasses.

FILM CREW

140. Following the incident at the junction of Beechcroft Avenue and Orchard Avenue involving PEACH the officers of the Special Patrol Group went down Orchard Avenue to Herbert Road.
- P. 710 141. **Officer 23** of No. 2 Unit Special Patrol Group (Whetstone) was in a carrier and attended Herbert Road junction with Orchard Avenue and there saw Officer E from No. 1 Unit. Officer E ***** went up to the T.V. crew and asked them to move along Herbert Road. His carrier then followed a carrier of No. 1 Unit Special Patrol Group (one-two) out along Orchard Avenue into the Broadway. In effect he adds little.
- P. 712 142. **Person 145** of I.T.N. News speaks of his confrontation with Officer E and what he considers to be unreasonable behaviour. My belief is that Officer E told the camera crew to go away using old English expletives but no one has actually backed it up by using the actual words. I am convinced the camera crew of I.T.N. are protective of police there at the time. Person 146 the sound recordist, supports they do not wish to complain and are no doubt applying judgements aligned to the prevailing conditions.

- P. 722 143. **Officer 24** was on duty at Herbert Road and says an Officer E was involved in an incident when voices were raised. The suggestions about this aspect have fallen a bit flat but reading between the lines Officer E was out of order in what he actually said to the T.V. crew and may well not have maintained control of his temper.
- P. 728 144. **Officer 25** was in the vicinity at the time.
- P. 730 **Person 147** an ambulance man refers in his statement to a constable being conveyed to New Ealing Hospital.
- P. 733 **Person 148** refers to the conversation he had with an unknown customer and it does not take the matter any further.

CLEARING OF DEBRIS

- P. 736 145. **Person 149** can give evidence of clearing debris from the Broadway and adjoining streets.

- P. 737
Doc. No. 21
P. 738
P. 739
146. **Officer 26** tells of the finding of bricks etc., in Beechcroft Avenue and Orchard Avenue; also **Officer 27** and **Officer 28** refer to finding a butcher's cleaver concealed in a garden in Beechcroft Avenue, with other items nearby.
- P. 740
P. 741
147. **Officer 29** recovered a crate of milk bottles and bricks from a service station indicated to him by Officer D, Special Patrol group.

THE SPECIAL PATROL GROUP

148. Having a formation of police officers, mobile and with the ability and organisation to combine a multitude of tasks at short notice is absolutely essential for present day policing and that is in effect the role of the Special Patrol Group, as a reserve or pool to draw on. Their duties are mainly saturation policing for districts throughout London, usually posted to an area a month at a time to combat crime. With the prevalence of demonstrations their involvement is essential when additional officers are needed at short notice and they are already organised as distinct from calling small numbers from different Districts.

149. Pressure groups seek to criticise the Special Patrol Group en bloc obviously because they get involved in confrontation situations and positive policing and the designation is a title too easily latched on to. As I have pointed out earlier the Deputy Commissioner is reviewing the Special Patrol Group at the present time but my opinion is that it is necessary to have such a unit of police available and the need will continue.

It is some years since the original setting up of the Special Patrol Group so some modifications can be expected. Officers volunteer for the Special Patrol Group and then there is a selection procedure.

SPECIAL PATROL GROUP AT
BEEHCROFT AVENUE, SOUTHALL

150. Many police officer including Special Patrol Group officers, were interviewed in the early stages of the enquiry and since. It is now apparent that the police at the junction of Beechcroft Avenue and Orchard Avenue at the time of the PEACH incident were solely Special Patrol Group officers. It has been suggested that officers other than Special Patrol Group were there, and there was therefore, the possibility that some 'stray' officers had been involved. Mention has been made of District officers in the Broadway near the junction with Beechcroft and also Traffic Patrol Officers. At the time of the assault on PEACH one witness says the trousers of one officer were close

at the knee which could indicate a motor cyclist. However from enquiries it is now obvious that the officers concerned were Special Patrol Group and there is no credible evidence that any other officers were actually at the scene in question but a number of officers from District were not much more than a hundred yards away.

151. It will be appreciated it was a matter of great importance as to whether other officers could have been involved. In such a case as this, if one accepts a police officer caused the injury, it could be a matter of only one or two officers knowing about it and that would include the officer who struck the blow. The fullest co-operation would be needed from other officers who were in the area at the time to establish the prime factor of who struck the blow or was in a position to do so, particularly as there is wide speculation as to the type of weapon used.

POLICE TRUNCHEON

152. Whilst other instruments have been given consideration, particularly a cosh, the police truncheon cannot be ruled out and if it was a police officer that is the most obvious and probable item. I favour the truncheon as the likelihood of an officer displaying an unauthorised weapon in a crowd of people is extremely

remote, particularly with the risk of it being seen by many members of the public and police. Officers would also be aware of photographers and TV. crews on such occasions.

153. I gave consideration to a rubber truncheon and at the very early stages of the enquiry I had a meeting with Person 150 of the Forensic Science Laboratory and asked for examination of officers' clothing, particularly truncheon pockets, for traces of rubber. No such evidence has emerged and the result of forensic examinations is so far negative. Whilst we have three pathologists not preferring to accept the instrument was a police truncheon, it must be borne in mind that exceptions do arise and an added factor in this report could be that the resistance to the blow was affected by the thinness of the skull. It is general knowledge of course that truncheons usually (but not always) cause a wound if used on the head. Pathologists have experience of wooden objects causing injury but (fortunately) I doubt if they could claim any or much experience of police truncheon wounds. A police truncheon must retain some prominence as the likely instrument with which PEACH was struck.

**ANALYSIS OF ACCOUNTS FROM
OFFICERS' STATEMENTS**

154. The officers of 3 Unit Special Patrol Group in facing the missile throwing crowd and following the serious injury upon Officer C lined up in what it termed shield formation to protect themselves and prepare to take positive policing action. It needs to be stressed that being subjected to the risk of injury in such circumstances is disturbing and in fact in training in the use of shields officers are nervous, let alone facing it for real.

Appendix 'B'
Page 2

155. I refer the reader again to the Sketch Plan drawn up with qualification that it was a moving situation. Facing the mouth of Beechcroft Avenue and lined up in the Broadway from left to right in three shield formations were:-
Officer 30, Officer 31, Officer 32, Officer 33, Officer 34 and Officer D.
Officer 35, Officer 36, Officer 37, Officer 38, Officer 39,
Officer 40, Officer 41, Officer K.

The 1 Unit carriers ***** arrived and drove into Beechcroft simultaneously as the officers of 3 Unit went forward, but I will confine myself to the officers on foot at present.

- P. 940
1140
P. 781

P. 892
P. 1163
P. 813, 1036,
759
P. 989, 841
P. 660
156. Officer 33 and Officer 42 only went a short way down Beechcroft and then went back to the Broadway. Officer 35 says he went down to the junction with Orchard Avenue and just turned right for a few yards then returned to the Broadway. Officer 39 and Officer 40 went along Orchard Avenue towards the cul-de-sac end pursuing demonstrators. Also Officer K, Officer 34, Officer 36, Officer 41 and Officer 38. It will therefore be appreciated that one of these officers could have struck Person U at the side of No. 82, and that in the pursuit down Beechcroft Avenue it is possible that officers from 3 Unit caused the head injury to Person 103.
- P. 445

P. 914
- Officer 37 also ran around No. 82 Orchard pursuing Person T and having come back to Beechcroft through an alleyway, caught up with him near the Broadway. Private witnesses mention an Asian youth being assaulted by police on arrest and this is obviously him.

- P. 741
157. Officer D ran down the left side of Beechcroft Avenue and arrested Person 58 and with the assistance of Officer 32 put him on the 1 Unit carrier. As I have pointed out earlier Officer D says he was in the front going down Beechcroft Avenue but it appears that the 1 Unit carrier “one-one” was neck-and-neck with him. Officer D in particular refers in his statements to the positions of ***** and his officers.
158. I would indicate that for the inquest, ***** would acquit himself well and be a prime witness. If ***** had assaulted PEACH I get the impression he would have been forthright and said so. He ordered his men to draw truncheons and in doing so more or less gave tacit consent to the use of them. I doubt however if anyone would have the temerity to challenge the drawing of truncheons in the violent conditions that were prevailing at the mouth of Beechcroft Avenue.
159. ***** and his officer arrived in Beechcroft Avenue in 2 carriers, “one-one” and “one-two”.

160. In the first carrier, which came to a full stop at the junction of Beechcroft and Orchard slightly slewed on causing a bottle neck, were:-

- P. 1218 Officer E
- P. 1572 Officer F (driver)
- P. 1459 Officer I
- P. 1396 Officer J
- P. 1304 Officer H
- P. 1513 Officer G (officer not sure himself, which carrier he was on).

Officer H says he got out of the carrier at the mouth of Beechcroft (junction with the Broadway) but this is disputed.

161. The clearest analysis is that Officer F the driver, was with this vehicle and if he got out it was for a very short time. All the other officers admit they were out of the carrier and as assaulting PEACH would have been a momentary matter in time they all appear to have had opportunity to do so. However Officer I says he got out of the van and ran down the cul-de-sac end of Orchard Avenue and Officer 43 corroborates that he was there. He thereby puts himself in close proximity when Person U was assaulted.

P. 2098

162. Officer J and Officer G say they first of all went a short distance back up Beechcroft Avenue then into and down Orchard Avenue. Officer E and Officer H appear to have got out of the side door of the carrier and from the position of the vehicle they would then be right at the junction where the deceased was assaulted.
- P. 1794
P. 1885
163. The second carrier of No. 1 Unit “one-two” followed “one-one” into Beechcroft and stopped initially part way down when Officer 44 took over as driver from Officer 45, who appears to have been anxious to join the fray. Thereabouts the other officers got out of the vehicle which at some stage was stopped near the junction and some witnesses say to the right in Orchard Avenue facing partially towards the cul-de-sac.
- P. 2098
P. 1739
164. Officer 43 puts himself as pursuing demonstrators to the cul-de-sac end of No. 82 Orchard Avenue. Officer L says he went into Orchard Avenue to the right but was more or less in the centre of the road and then went the other way down Orchard Avenue. It will be recalled Officer L had a Motorola personal radio with him, and overall the junction is quite confined.
- P. 2037
1885
- Officer 45 and Officer 64 put themselves at the junction but with regard to officers of carrier “one-two” their arrival at the junction was after the officers of carrier “one-one”.

SPECIFIC COMMENT ABOUT OFFICERS

165. I do not intend to go into great detail upon the content of every officer's statement, suffice it to say they have been interviewed to the extreme. I have not been oblivious to the possibility of collusion and in fact after interviews it would be unnatural for officers working together not to discuss it. In fact, it was hoped such discussions would result in an officer coming forward but that has not been the case.

Confusion at the time is also a major factor with regard to conflicting accounts of what occurred especially as the officers were further engaged in the demonstrations that evening and I have no evidence to suggest that the officers were aware of the seriousness of PEACH's injury.

166. The strongest suspicion is against officers of No. 1 Unit "one-one" ***** and their accounts are in some measure contradictory.

- P. 741 *****
167. He appears to be a man of sound judgement and demonstrated his qualities of leadership at the junction of Northcote Avenue. All the arrests about that time were effected by his officers under him. By what I have seen of him he is a good sound officer who faced the situation with courage and responsibility. I do not doubt that the provocation, pressures and fear of injury was extremely excessive and the advance forward that he ordered is fully justified.
168. He puts ***** at the junction of Beechcroft and Orchard at the time PEACH was injured whilst he was effecting the arrest of *****.
- P. 759 169. **Officer 36** ran down Beechcroft Avenue and was at the cul-de-sac near No. 82. Mention is made of an officer of his description in that vicinity by private witnesses but no allegation of assault is made.
- P. 773 170. **Officer 46** stayed with the carrier of 3 Unit at the junction of Northcote Avenue, where Officer C was awaiting transport by ambulance to hospital.

- P. 781 171. **Officer 35** says he took part in the advance down Beechcroft Avenue and went a short distance along the right of Orchard Avenue but some doubt exists as to whether he moved from the Broadway.
- P. 791 172. **Officer 47** was the driver of 3 Unit Special Patrol Group and remained at the junction of Northcote Avenue.
- P. 813 173. **Officer K** says he took part in the chase down Beechcroft Avenue and he went to the Orchard Avenue cul-de-sac. He says he saw a white man (PEACH) sitting against the wall of the corner house (No. 62).
- P. 841 174. **Officer 38** says he chased demonstrators and went as far as the side of No. 82 Orchard Avenue and says he saw a girl there crying and Officer 36 spoke to her.
- P. 869 175. **Officer 31** says he remained at the junction of Northcote because he had two arrests there.
- P. 892 176. **Officer 39** ran down Beechcroft and turned right into Orchard Avenue. By the time he got to No. 82 Officer 41 was coming out of the side entrance and Officer 36 was nearby.

- P. 914 177. **Officer 37** had a long chase down Beechcroft to the cul-de-sac of Orchard Avenue and by an alleyway back into Beechcroft where Person T was arrested for causing the injury to Officer C by throwing a brick. Officers of No. 2 Unit Special Patrol Group were by this time at the mouth of Beechcroft Avenue (but never went down) and were involved in the stopping of Person T.
- P. 938 178. **Officer 48** remained at the junction with Northcote Avenue because of an arrest he had made, just prior to the advance down Beechcroft Avenue by his colleagues.
- P. 940 179. **Officer 33** and Officer 30 only went part of the way down Beechcroft Avenue then gave up the chase and returned to the Broadway.
- P. 986 180. **Officer 49** was not involved as he was engaged at Wembley Police Station with an arrest he had made elsewhere.
- P. 989 181. **Officer 41** was involved in the chase and arrived at the cul-de-sac and side of No. 82. He concedes to striking two Asians with his truncheon. He is a favourite as regards the injury to Person U but he does not have a beard.
- P. 660

- P. 1015 182. **Officer 50** was the driver of a 3 Unit carrier and remained with it at the junction of Northcote Avenue.
- P. 1036 183. **Officer 34** took part in the charge and got as far as the cul-de-sac at No. 82 Orchard Avenue but gave up pursuit and walked back up Beechcroft Avenue. He recalls an Asian falling over in the centre of Beechcroft when they were running down that street and a police officer with a shield falling over him. He also says he saw a man (? PEACH), sitting on the road at the junction with Beechcroft and Orchard Avenue and then to stagger across to the west pavement.
- P. 1060 184. **Officer 51** remained at the junction of Northcote Avenue on the instructions of ***** no doubt to protect the vehicles. He also assisted the injured Officer C into the ambulance.
- P. 1079 185. **Officer 32** took part in the chase down Beechcroft Avenue and assisted Officer D in the arrest and detention of Person 58 who was then put into one of the carriers of Unit 1 at that junction.
- P. 1140 186. **Officer 30** only went part of the way down Beechcroft Avenue in the chase and gave up after he fell over.

- P. 1163 187. **Officer 40** ran down and to the cul-de-sac where he saw other officers with an Asian detained. He also says he saw a white man being carried by four Asians into a house but it is not known if this was the deceased.
- P. 1183 188. **Officer 52** remained at the junction of Northcote and it was him who turned back the third carrier having waved the other two into Beechcroft Avenue.
- P. 1192 **Officer 53** was on his way to Wembley at the time of the incident.
- P. 1194 **Officer 54** was otherwise engaged with an arrested person at the Broadway.
- P. 2412 189. **Officer 55** Special Patrol Group 2 Unit accounts for his officers being other than in Beechcroft Avenue junction with Orchard Avenue.
- P. 1213 190. **Officer 56** is in charge of the Special Patrol Group and his office is at Barnes, where 1 Unit are based as distinct from the other units who have offices at various police stations throughout the Metropolitan Police District. He was on duty that day and was near ***** officers of No. 1 Unit at Herbert Road, Southall, when they answered the radio call for assistance.

No. 1 UNIT SPECIAL PATROL GROUP (BARNES)

P. 1218

Officer E

191. This Officer has been subjected to lengthy questioning because if a police officer caused the injury to Clement Blair PEACH the circumstances of Officer E getting out of the vehicle at the 'scene' indicate that it could well have been him.

192. From a prepared statement he made on 24th April, 1979, the impression he gives is that ***** got out of their carrier at the mouth of Beechcroft and ran down after Officer D ***** . In a subsequent interview he puts, "I would like to correct one point in that (previous) statement which is that I did not get out at Beechcroft Avenue with its junction with the Broadway but at Beechcroft Avenue at its junction with Orchard Avenue" "I cannot explain these discrepancies".

193. One explanation is that his first account was a concoction or otherwise he was substantially confused.

194. At the time he made the statement where he corrected himself he also put forward that 'C' District officers were in the immediate vicinity of the assault upon PEACH. With no small amount of investigation this is discounted.

195. After a lengthy interview with Officer E he claimed illness owing to lack of food and a doctor had to be called to him. At a subsequent interview in the presence of Person 151 (Solicitor) it was put to him that he attempted to mislead the investigators and at that stage his Solicitor advised him to refuse to answer further questions. There is very little further that can be put to him at this stage so there has been no subsequent interview, but should anything arise he will be seen.
196. Touching upon interviews with officers I gave instructions that no one was to be cautioned under the Judges Rules without reference to me. (Officer F is one officer who has been cautioned as it raises aspects of theft).
197. Returning to Officer E, he has not given a credible account of his movements and it is disturbing. There was no doubt that he was suffering from stress which together with his driving personality attaches to him grave suspicion, if not as the officer responsible but for concealing it. I suspect that prior to interviews he voiced his opinion and was more anxious ***** to meet officers who had been to make statements. He will be put up for identification but at present is on leave and he has also been on sick leave. He has since transferred from the Special Patrol Group. He is a ***** and I have reason to believe he was well thought of with potential for high rank.

- P. 1279 198. **Officer 57** was elsewhere with an arrest.
- P. 1283 **Officer 58** was also elsewhere with an arrest.
- P. 1304 199. Officer H says he got out of the carrier “one-one” at the junction of the Broadway and despite questioning and logical reasoning, he still persists in his first account. His explanation is consistent with that put up by Officer E in the first instance, but Officer H remains adamant and perhaps it can best be described as stubbornness. He also says he assisted in the arrest of Person 58 but this is disputed by Officer D and Officer 32. Officer H will also be put up for identification.
- P. 1393 200. **Officer 59** was injured earlier and taken to hospital.
- P. 1396 201. Officer J says he alighted from the carrier “one-one” three-quarter way down Beechcroft Avenue and chased a youth back towards the Broadway then went along the pavement to Orchard Avenue and down that street. He makes no mention of seeing PEACH on the corner. He puts himself as running in the opposite direction to the general chase and I regard it as dubious. At present he is on leave but it is intended to put him up for identification.

- P. 1459 202. Officer I arrived in carrier “one-one” and says he chased demonstrators towards the cul-de-sac of Orchard Avenue, and this is supported by Officer 43. Between alighting from the carrier and running to the cul-de-sac he could have gone a matter of yards to where PEACH was standing. He is now off the Special Patrol Group and has grown a beard which has raised difficulty respecting an identification parade.
- P. 1513 203. Officer G, he purports to have alighted from “one-one” and gone back up Beechcroft Avenue and stayed there 3 to 5 minutes, and then went to Orchard Avenue. This explanation is viewed with some suspicion. He says he saw a man (PEACH) sitting on the pavement and shouted to him to go away. His recollection is extremely vague as to what he was doing.
204. Further along Orchard Avenue there was an alleged assault upon a “youth” now believed to be a Person V and Officer G is thought to be the officer involved in that.
- P. 1561 205. **Officer 60** was elsewhere with an arrest.

- P. 1572
206. Officer F was the driver of carrier “one-one” and even remaining in the driver’s seat he had an exceptionally good view of the incident on the corner of Orchard Avenue but his initial accounts fell short of his later recollections when he came under certain pressure. One police officer - Officer K - also said in a later statement that at one stage on that corner the carrier “one-one” was completely unoccupied.
207. A search was made of the Special Patrol Group offices at Barnes on 5th June, 1979, and in the locker of Officer F in addition to truncheons, a rhino whip and other items, was found a “cosh” or “black jack”. On top of the locker was a stolen driving licence.
208. Officer F was interviewed at length in the presence of Person 152 of *****, and detained for three days at Rochester Row Police Station.
209. In a question and answer session he was asked who the officers were who were pushing the demonstrators around the corner and he replied “Officer E, Officer I, Officer J and Officer H and wasn’t sure whether Officer G was there”.

210. In his first questionnaire on 24th April, 1979, he said that he “drove the carrier “one-one” to Beechcroft Avenue. Some if not all of the officers got out and he drove down Beechcroft behind those officers. This has a disturbing ring of consistency with the first account given by Officer E. Officer F is suspended from duty.
- P. 1715 211. **Officer 61** was engaged in an arrest elsewhere. On 24th April, 1979 when parading for duty he says that Officer E “told us that his own recollection was difficult to be precise about and that all he would advise anyone to do was to answer questions as accurately and as truthfully as possible”.
212. Special Patrol Group Officers had been sent for by this time to go to Southall Police Station and this was really the time for someone to come forward if that was to happen. Conversely, it was then that an officer who felt culpable would take evasive action.
- P. 1739 213. From the account of Officer L he was in the middle of the junction doing nothing and seeing nothing at the relevant time. There are discrepancies in his statement. He is a personal friend of Officer E and I am sure that any interview at C.I.B.(2) would be discussed in depth.

- P. 1794 214. **Officer 44** took over as driver of carrier “one-two” on arrival in Beechcroft from Officer 45. She can be eliminated from assaulting PEACH. She is confused.
- P. 1885 215. **Officer 45** deferred to Officer 44 as the driver of carrier “one-two” in Beechcroft Avenue, and says he ran in front of carrier “one-one” and along Orchard Avenue. He appeared anxious to get involved but from his statement gives no credible reasons for him to rush about.
- P. 1981 216. **Officer 62** was engaged elsewhere with an arrest.
- P. 2003 217. **Officer 63’s** account does not vary materially to other officers on that carrier. He does not give detail and in fact his account is vague. He says he did not see PEACH but it is possible he is one of the officers with shields seen near to the deceased when he was sitting on the ground.

- P. 2037 218. **Officer 64** says much the same as the above but surprisingly does not see the injured man on the ground. Again it could be him, Officer 63 and possibly Officer L who were near to PEACH when he was on the ground as described by private witnesses, but they do not say so.
- P. 2098 219. **Officer 43** corroborates the initial account that Officer E got out of the vehicle at the mouth of Beechcroft which Officer E has since retracted but this officer does not do so. Perhaps he feels entrenched on that aspect. Officer 43 then went to the cul-de-sac at 82 Orchard Avenue, where he detained a white man and subsequently released him because no other officer could not identify him as a stone-thrower. He did not get the person's name who he detained.
- P. 2199 220. **Officer 65** was engaged elsewhere but he gives explanations from a practical aspect of Officer F having the unauthorised instruments as found in his locker.
- P. 2224 221. **Officer 66** was the driver of the third Special Patrol Group 1 Unit carrier and turned back by Officer 52 in the Broadway.

- P. 2245 222. **Officer 67** had an arrest elsewhere.
- P. 2249 **Officer 68** also had an arrest and was elsewhere.
- P. 2267 **Officer 69** similarly.
- P. 2269 **Officer 70** was injured and in hospital.
- P. 2274 **Officer 71**
- P. 2295, 2312 **Officer 72, Officer 73 and Officer 74** were on the carrier that
2318 was turned back in the Broadway.
- P. 2335 223. **Officer 75** was interviewed in relation to a wooden handle
found in his clothing locker at Barnes on 5th June, 1979 when
the whole of the Special Patrol Group officers' lockers were
searched.
- P. 2337 224. **Person 153**, is the loser of the driving licence which was
found on top of Officer F's locker. She says it was stolen with
her handbag and contents by a West Indian in Regent Street
W.1. Most probably a prisoner had discarded the licence in
the carrier after arrest and then it was subsequently found but
regulations were not complied with.
225. There are statements attached from interpreters.

- P. 2353 226. **Officer 76** took the fingerprints of the deceased but this is of no relevance.
- P. 2354 227. **Officer 77, Officer 78, Officer 79, Officer 80** and **Officer 81**, all of the Complaints Investigation Bureau, give accounts of searches and interviews.
2356, 2357
2359, 2368
- P. 2370 228. **Person 154** is a Senior Photographer and produces an album of photographs of Parkview, Southall.
- P. 2371 **Person 155** also produces an album of photographs.
Doc. No. 21
- P. 2372 229. **Person 150** Of the Metropolitan Police Forensic Science Laboratory gives a negative report on his examinations.
- P. 2373 230. **Officer 82** ***** spoke to all the Special Patrol Group officers on the lines shown in his statement on dates commencing 30th April, 1979, giving officers an opportunity to come forward but no one did so.
- P. 2382, 2385 231. Statements are attached by **Officer 83** and **Officer 84** of interviews, but they do not incorporate all interviews and for the sake

of reducing paper I have not attached statements from the large number of officers who took the statements. They can however be supplied.

232. Statements attached total 2,390 pages in bundles 1 - 11.

Bundles No. 12 contains non-relevant statements 2391 - 2736.

Bundle No. 13 are documents and

Bundle No. 14 plans and sketch maps.

233. As I have indicated earlier in this report investigations are continuing and will be subject of a further report.

234. This report has been prepared with some haste because of the public interest in the matter. Consideration of the issues, evidence and enlargement on certain aspects may be considered essential at conferences.

235. Copy report, statements, etc., taken by hand to the Director of Public Prosecutions (Mr. FLAVELL) on 16th July, 1979.

236. I ask that one copy of this report, statements, etc., be forwarded to:-

1) Director of Public Prosecutions

2) The Solicitor, Metropolitan Police

I intend making a copy of the report, statements, etc., available to Dr. BURTON, H.M. Coroner, West London as and when he requires them.

Commander CASS