

The following are some of the shocking findings, as reported by QC Alison Levitt
http://www.cps.gov.uk/news/assets/uploads/files/savile_report.pdf My comments, as always are in red.

On p 4: “However each of those to whom I have spoken has said that **had she been given more information by the police at the time of the investigation, and in particular had she been told that she was not the only woman to have complained, she would probably have been prepared to give evidence.**”

P 16: “Looking at the documents created in 2008 **I found it difficult not to conclude that the officers had, even if unintentionally, dissuaded her from pursuing her allegation.**”

Note, it is stated on ‘Op Orn’ on p 20: “However there has been **some confusion when summarising these accounts in the MG3 that incorrectly mixes up what the two have said and therefore does not exactly reflect the information they gave to police.** However, within the Advice File was a summary Short Descriptive Note (SDN) of the account taken from Ms A and an Officer’s Report of the account taken from Ms B that did accurately reflect what they told police. Additionally **there is comment in the MG3 on the account of Ms D that appears to be factually inaccurate.**”

P 47: “There are two documents with this date, each consisting of two pages **but I have only been provided with a single page of each.**”

P 54: “ ... as it suggests that Jimmy Savile had an erection at the time (which would have supported what Ms C had said) when in fact Ms B had said she **did not know whether he had or not.** The summary records What Ms B can be heard to say on the tape was: “*On reflection, I would have looked to see if his penis was hard but I was revolted so I did not look*”. It is also of note that Ms B said at one point on the tape that **DC S had told her that hers was the only complaint, and this surprised her, because she would have thought there would have been many others.** In fact, by this stage DC S knew that there were at least two other complaints, yet she did not correct Ms B.” **It is one thing to withhold info from a witness if there is good reason, but it is not acceptable for the police to outright lie as is the case here.**

P 55: “I have spoken to the (now retired) CPS lawyer. It would seem that at the time, **the lawyer had not seen any papers.** Nor does it seem

that an advice in writing which repeated this view **was ever sent to the Police.**”

P 57: “Either the DSIO has **misunderstood** or he was **inaccurately briefed.**”

P 58: “On 24th October 2008 DC S completed the form MG3, [A form used by the police to request formal advice from the CPS] requesting pre-charge advice. It is significant that she described Ms B’s evidence thus:

*“The reporting witness is a [Ms B] who was aged 13-16 at the time and who witnessed the defendant James Savile (better known as Jimmy Savile) touched [sic] another girl aged about 14 sexually and got her to place his hand on her groin area over his clothing and rub his penis..... That doesn’t make sense – place his hand on her groin and rub his penis! [Ms B] said that [Ms C] had previously told her that **Jimmy would touch her over her clothing and get her to touch him.** She had said that the next time he did it she would say the words “beef biryani” a phrase from a popular TV advert at the time to let her know it was happening. She heard [Ms C] say it and looked over and saw movement under a blanket” (emphasis added).*

I have seen nothing elsewhere in the papers to suggest that either Ms B or Ms C had suggested that Ms B had seen Jimmy Savile touch Ms C sexually (as opposed to getting her to touch him). Further, **DC S** seems to have conflated the accounts of Ms C and Ms B: **Ms C** had never mentioned the “beef biryani” aspect, equally, **Ms B** had said nothing about a blanket.

When I first read these papers I was **very concerned about this discrepancy, because if her account is correct, Ms B was an eye witness to an indecent assault, but if one were to rely on DC S’s description, then Ms B’s evidence at its highest consisted of hearsay and suspicion.** Further if she had given two inconsistent accounts this would have had a **profound impact on her credibility.** In order to resolve this I asked the police where I could find any reference to Ms B having seen movement under a blanket. In a letter of 31st October 2012, DCI P said:

“regarding the reference to [Ms B] having seen a movement under the blanket I can clarify that [Ms B] mentioned that she see’s [sic] a hand on top of another on top of Jimmy Savile’s groin. She does not mention a

blanket. However [Ms C] does say that there was a blanket and the touching was underneath this”.

On the basis of all the material I have seen I am satisfied that Ms B has been consistent in her accounts. One of my reasons for being so satisfied is that in the taped interview which took place on 9th July 2008, Ms B gave a clear account on several occasions of what she had seen and there was **no mention of a blanket**.

Further, in the **MG3**, DC S noted:

“another ex-resident of Barnardo’s stated that while she had been at Duncroft the defendant asked the girls to give him massages and on one occasion he asked her to massage his groin area and give him oral sex” (emphasis added).

Assuming that this is a reference to the account of Ms G, then I am **unaware of any notes which say that she alleged that he asked her to massage his groin area; this certainly was not said during her taped witness interview**, when the only allegation she made was that he asked her to perform oral sex on him.”

P 61: “This is a **rather confusing statement**. Two of the four victims had not been in care. **Ms A was 22 at the time of her encounter and Ms E was the alleged Stoke Mandeville victim**. There is **no record either of Ms G having said that she did not want to give evidence or the reasons she gave for not wanting to** (see further below).”

P 72: “**“Contrary to what the officers told Ms A**, there is no longer any rule of law or practice which requires the prosecution to adduce any additional evidence in support of the allegation, far less formal corroboration. For many years, juries have been directed that the complainant’s evidence alone is sufficient for them to convict.”

P 92: “Be that as it may, in any event these particular assaults were far from trivial. When I spoke to the reviewing lawyer he told me that to the best of his recollection at that stage he was asked to give an **informal view**, and that that is reinforced by the fact that **he had not been provided with any papers**.”

P 108: “Surrey Police have told me that the strategy not to inform victims /witnesses of the existence of others was “adopted in good faith and based on a Policy decision with a clear rationale” **and further that it had been reviewed during a meeting with Children’s Services**.” **What**

was the point talking to Children's Services? These women had long since ceased to be children!!! Piss taking pretenders.

P117: "... the CMS record was automatically deleted. **Why? To bury the truth?** It is not now possible to retrieve it. It follows that I have been dependent on the material provided by the police to show what documents were seen by the reviewing lawyer and the advice which was given. The reviewing lawyer himself is (unsurprisingly) unable to remember which documents were provided to him."