

**VOMIT INDUCING SNIPPETS FROM THE REPORT INTO  
OPERATION ORNAMENT which was published on  
11/01/2013**

[https://www.surrey.police.uk/Portals/0/pdf/news/operation\\_ornament\\_report\\_11.01.2013.pdf](https://www.surrey.police.uk/Portals/0/pdf/news/operation_ornament_report_11.01.2013.pdf)

To avoid repetition, see my PDF 'LEVITT'S SHOCKING FINDINGS' and my 'FIONA OF THE FORGED LETTER' PDF. My comments, as always, are in red.

Before going any further I have to just say that I am gobsmacked that Detective Superintendent Jon Savell can keep a straight face and sign his name to these 44 pages of mind blowing bullshit.

"It became known to Surrey Police in **late November / early December 2011** **this confirms that Mark Williams-Thomas had been in no hurry to find out the police angle during his so-called investigation for Newsnight. Why can't Jon Savell give an exact date that Surrey Police were contacted by MWT? Notice he can be specific about other dates!** that BBC Newsnight were working on a story about Savile and sexual abuse and they asked for a response.

This report has subsequently been commissioned with the **genuine desire** to understand fully exactly how Surrey Police conducted the investigation and what lessons can be learned. **Laugh out fucking loud.**

3.14 During these enquiries **liaison took place with Surrey County Council Children's Services to advise them of the allegations and consider any on-going safeguarding actions that were required.** **Lying wankers. These women are not children anymore!!! The masons must've forgot that they were *fabricating an investigation* that dated back only a few years i.e. not 30 years; these were middle aged women!!! I think the masons fucked up in their zeal to pull the wool over our eyes.**

**On 15th July 2008 the first meeting with the Crown Prosecution Service took place with DI3 and DCI4. It is recorded in the notebook of DI3 that at that meeting the Senior Crown Prosecutor indicated that he "...*did not feel there was a case to proceed as the incidents were relatively minor and they were so long ago there would be grounds for an abuse of process argument.*"**

3.20 It is apparent that DI3 sent a letter and then had a conversation with Savile during which he advised him of the nature of the allegation. It is recorded on the Surrey crime report on 23rd June 2009 that DI3 has told Savile he will be interviewed. This is over and above the advice the Senior Crown Prosecutor gave that Savile should be told about the allegation and that there was to be no further action.

Arrangements were then made by DC1 to interview Savile under caution. Anyone buying this Masonic pretence??? They're telling us that the Masonic controlled police were doing their best, but that ultimately their hands were tied by the decision of the Masonic controlled CPS [who are in reality one and the same!]

3.25 Savile concludes by explaining that he often gets these types of letters and his 'policy' is to get his lawyers to take these people to court and sue them. He has been successful on number of occasions and been awarded several hundred thousand pounds as a result. Evidence? I bet he never took any alleged victim to court. If he did, why wasn't it reported?

3.27 Following the interview a verbal update was provided to the Senior Crown Prosecutor followed by an MG3A summary. The Senior Crown Prosecutor responds on 28th October 2009 with an MG3 (charging decision) stating that "...Nevertheless at the end of the day, on applying the evidential test in the absence of statements from victims, there is clearly insufficient evidence to charge the suspect with any criminal offence".

This first meeting was initiated following contact from Duncroft resident Ms C that made Surrey Police aware that there was more than one victim and that the incidents were being discussed on Friends Reunited website.

The mason fuckers name Pollard, MWT and the twat Jon Savell in this comic, but they don't identify the 'investigating' officers that we are told conducted the investigation during 2007/08. They are referred to as DC 1, DI 3, DC 14, D 13 etc etc. Piss taking lying bastards.

... police intelligence systems and other 'open source' systems. My arse.

4.6 It is also evident that the senior staff at Surrey County Council Children's Services were made aware of the investigation and identity

of the suspect once the corroboration from Ms B had been obtained.  
Children's services!!! Lying wankers.

The decision to share information with Children's Services was on the understanding that this was kept 'confidential'. Ha ha ha. Fuck off ya lying twats.

Evidentially this is correct procedure and prevents future criticism on the motives for a witness coming forward. This point was also raised at a meeting held between the SIO, DSIO and Surrey County Council Children's Services. The date of this meeting was recorded as the 10th June 2008 by DI3 and as 12th June 2008 by a senior manager from Children's Services. Actions from that meeting recorded in typed notes contain the below action:

**'Action number 4.**

***DI3 to consult with CPS to gain their advice as to whether they can tell the alleged victims of each other's accounts, and what is the CPS view of the current evidence and therefore any subsequent Police action.'***

What information are we getting from this 'report'??? NONE. NOTHING. ZILCH. All we have is the ramblings of a bunch of psychopathic paedo loving LIARS. AND WE'RE PAYING FOR IT FOLKS!!!

Upon recognition of the profile of the investigation DCI4 commenced senior oversight of the investigation in his role as the North Surrey DCI. Meetings were held with DCI4 on 23rd November 2007, 7th January 2008 and 13th May 2008 as well as his attendance at the Gold Groups. The professional relationship between DCI4 and DI3 was such that DI3 retained everyday responsibility for the investigation including the completion of the policy log. DI3 referred to DCI4 for guidance and direction when he felt appropriate. It is apparent from conducting this review that DI3 undertook the role of SIO in practice and DCI4 acted in the capacity of advisor. This is contrary to one of the decisions of the Gold Group of 2nd June that agreed that DCI4 would be the SIO.

Spoken like a fuckin mason. How much are we paying the disgusting piece of filth Jon Savell and his mates in the lodge to write this tsunami of shite? I pray for the day that this Detective Supt and his ilk get attended to by a mob of angry pitchforkers.

A further North Surrey Senior Gold Group met again on 2nd June 2008 attended by the Head of Public Protection Detective Superintendent 9, DC110 from the Major Crime Investigation Team and Mr2 the Head of the Major Crime Review Team (former SIO for Operation Arundel). This list of attendees indicates that as well as considering the management issues for the Division advice was also being sought from specialists on the future strategy and plans for the investigation. **This shows due consideration being given to best practice and specialist knowledge on investigating such offences.** It was at this meeting that it was decided to engage with CPS. **No wonder Savile and his filthy paedo mates got away with raping little girls for decades.**

6.6 It is not until 8th January 2009 that further contact is made with the Senior Crown Prosecutor to make arrangements to deliver the Advice File. This was subsequently delivered on 22nd January 2009. **DI3 makes reference to this delay in submitting the file in his notebook on 3rd June 2009,** explaining that this was due to staff shortages that were impacting on the workloads **within the Child Protection unit** at that time. **Ferfuck's sake. I defy any non-mason to try and read this 'report' in full. You will either cry or throw up.**

6.8 As part of the DPP's review of CPS decision making at the time, Surrey Police has submitted a file of papers and copies of interview tapes to the DPP's office. It is understood that the DPP's Principle Legal Advisor **Alison Levitt** has undertaken this review. **Following feedback from this review it has been acknowledged that there are some inaccuracies in the MG3 that was submitted to CPS** as part of the Advice File submission in January 2009. This has been reviewed again internally to assess the extent and impact of this. **It appears that the original MG3 written by DC1 was reviewed by DI3 and amended in some areas. This has changed the context of some of the content. The inaccuracies concern the accounts of Ms A and Ms B and an apparent confusion by DC1 about who saw what being done by Savile.** The victim's original accounts were very similar considering the passage of time albeit there were some differences. **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.** Despite the inaccuracies it is not considered to be

material to the decision making by CPS, as stated in their MG3, who ultimately focussed on the “...absence of statements from the victims...” leading to there being “...insufficient to charge the suspect with any criminal offence.” Jesus wept!

Knowing the limited extent of the content of the file it would seem that the period of five months or so was an overly long time period to put together the required papers. It is also unusual to undertake this before interviewing Savile. **It would be usual practice to submit all the relevant evidence to CPS for their review, thus requiring the evidence gained from Savile’s interview to be included.** As it was, this additional information from the interview had to be provided to CPS verbally in the first instance and then an updated MG3(A) form completed afterwards.

6.11 DI3 (since retired) on a comfortable police pension, paid for by thee and me folks!!! has also been spoken to, whose memory of the investigation is **understandably patchy**. He cannot recall any conversations with the Senior Crown Prosecutor on the police formally interviewing Savile. **His notes/reports should still be there even if he isn’t!!!** DCI4 recalls that the decision to interview Savile was entirely a police one, **Who else’s job is it???** **What we got was a bunch of corrupt coco clowns** with discussions taking place with DI3 at the time over the merits of arrest or not. There is email evidence of this discussion from May 2008, prior to meeting with the Senior Crown Prosecutor. **Yeah ok. Show us then.** There is also a record from 18th August 2008 North Surrey **Gold Group meeting** that the decision made at that meeting was to interview Savile under caution. **Neither DCI4 nor DC1 are able to recall receiving advice from the senior prosecutor that Savile should or should not be formally interviewed.** On this point it is also worthy of note that the final MG3(A) from DC1 to CPS makes mention that she had told the Senior Crown Prosecutor that she had been advised to interview Savile, thus implying this was a requirement from her senior officers. **More senior clowns then. Earning more serious money. Our money. Is anyone taking this ‘report’ seriously? Hang your head in shame Jon Savell you corrupt paedo protecting little parasite. What level in the lodge are you? I sincerely hope I live to see the day you and your ilk get your just deserts.**

6.12 Following the interview of Savile on 1st October 2009 **CPS were updated with the outcome. It is unclear exactly how this was done. Er aren’t you supposed to be finding out?**

7.8 The Surrey Police crime report **comic** indicates that a discussion took place between DI3 and a **senior manager at Surrey Children's Services on or around 20th November 2007 to brief them on the circumstances known in the investigation thus far.** **Why? In 2007 these women were middle aged!!!** This is confirmed by emails between DI3 and another manager at Surrey Children's Services. **This email exchange** indicates that there **may have** been telephone contact prior to this date however there is **no record of this.** **Show us the emails you lying low-life scumbag. No wonder you got promoted to Det Supt.**

7.15 On 20th July 2007 an Impact Nominal Index (INI) check was carried out on James Savile as well as a PNC check. INI checks are a means for all 43 forces to establish if any other force holds intelligence or information on a particular individual. **DC1 submitted the request for a search of Savile against Sussex Police and Metropolitan Police Service.** Had this just been kept to these two Forces then there may have been information 'missed'. As it was, Surrey Police Data Bureau has confirmed that for all INI checks they routinely disregarded such requests for specific forces and **instead undertook a national search.** They also disregarded any specific business areas, such a Child Protection, and **again searched against all business areas to ensure that all available information was captured.** On 22nd July 2007 the **INI results indicated that no other force held any information on Savile.** The PNC check was no trace. **Groan.**

7.16 Without any further method of assessing whether a force held information it was reasonable for the investigation team at the time to draw the conclusion that Savile had not been the subject of any previous allegations and the Surrey investigation was limited to the four women who had come forward. **It is now known that Savile had been investigated by the Metropolitan Police Service in the 1980's and again in 2003** as referenced in the recent 'Giving Victims a Voice' publication. **FFS. Is it any wonder society is in the sewers!**

Police advising them of the investigation into Savile. This was sent via **the anti-corruption team in Surrey** to **West Yorkshire anti-corruption.** **Anti-corruption fer fuck's sake. Laugh out fucking loud.** There was no suggestion that Surrey were in receipt of any information or intelligence that there were **any corruption issues** at West Yorkshire, or that Savile had any con

7.18 On 29th April 2008 Surrey Police sent an email to West Yorkshire **tact or relationships with West Yorkshire officers.** The reason for

advising West Yorkshire via Professional Standards Department appears to be Surrey's concern that the investigation remained confidential and the SIO (DCI4) had a **background in anti-corruption** oh for FUCKS SAKE. Please God give me strength and therefore knew that this was a **secure route to pass information** and gather any intelligence that they had that would not have been disclosed from an INI check. Jon Savell, you pompous, arrogant, smug, prat. You are beyond contempt.

Accounts from potential victims and witnesses were first obtained at an initial meeting in the form of notes. This is **good practice and shows officers were acting in accordance with the Ministry of Justice "Achieving Best Evidence in Criminal Proceedings – Guidance on interviewing victims and witnesses and guidance on using special measures"**, which states **"any initial questioning should be intended to elicit a brief account of what is alleged to.** More vomit inducing shite. I can't take any more.

7.29 When Savile was interviewed by Surrey Police on 1st October 2009 he made various comments about knowing senior police officers from Leeds and seeing them socially. He stated that he gets a number of **letters from people trying to blackmail him** lying prick and he gives these to the police as a matter of course. He also commented on how he deals with these with his legal team as it was a hazard of being a well-known celebrity. He gave the impression that he was often harassed by people with an ulterior motive. Savile named an Inspector and stated that **officers come to his home and have tea. Savile also stated that the officers read and destroyed the letters.** If one of the letters concerned him then he could have it forensically examined as a 'favour' **my arse, bullshitting bastards, all of them** if he needed. Savile was questioned if any of these allegations or blackmail letters were investigated by West Yorkshire Police and **he responded that they were kept for a short time by the police in case something happened to him.** As if anyone considered him important enough to want to do away with him!!! The Masonic boot boys only want to kill or silence people who are a real threat – to their filthy disgusting Satanic paedophilic fiefdom.

7.34 On 20<sup>th</sup> May 2008 **it was disclosed to police** that Ms F was assaulted by Savile in the grounds of Stoke Mandeville hospital. The victim Ms F was a member of a girls' choir in Bedfordshire. **DC1 then made contact with Bedfordshire Police and obtained details of their Child Protection Team.** Yeah ok, piss taking bastards. Why did they

need child protection???

There is no record if they were contacted and advised about this investigation. That's cos they weren't, cos there was no real investigation. Name this DC1. I bet this person doesn't exist. I bet there are no real people behind any of these letters! The crime report states that the details were obtained if required. Piss taking wankers. People, we're paying these corrupt evil scumbags to protect paedophiles and to attack anyone who dares challenge them.

9 29 Policy decision 2 is that no other agency would be informed of the identity of the suspect (Savile). This entry does acknowledge that **Children's Services** had already been informed at a **senior level**. It is clear that the rationale for this decision was the concern that the investigation would generate significant media interest and therefore any leaks to the media could cause the victims additional distress and **potentially jeopardise the investigation**. LIARS. Jon Savell and his Masonic co-writers of this disgusting booklet of bullshit aided and abetted the child raping filth Savile and his vile paedo mates. Investigation my arse.

8.11 Savile was invited to attend an **interview out of custody**. It was not good practice to conduct an interview after caution in the grounds of a hospital even though it was in a private office for Savile. Appropriate arrangements should have been made with Thames Valley Police to use a police station if the interview had to take place in Buckinghamshire. It is accepted of course that **he may well then have refused to cooperate and this would have left the investigation team in a difficult position as it was clear that arresting Savile was unlikely to be justifiable under the Police And Criminal Evidence 1984 with the knowledge that there was unlikely to be a prosecution**. Therefore the **opportunity to capture the account under caution would have been lost**. He wasn't under arrest and therefore not obliged to participate in any police interview. There is no evidence that he did. Surrey police tell us that under F.O.I we can listen to this police interview here <http://www.surrey.police.uk/About-Us/Your-right-to-information/Freedom-of-Information/FOI-Disclosure-Logs/InfoItemId/197> however when you try to click on the links you get an 'error' message – in line with Masonic policy you understand. All you get is a page of Masonic speak from Tony Smith, the Non Information Access Manager [copy/pasted below]. Of course the real reason Savile was never charged was because, as the dirty old perv himself boasts, he would have taken half the station with him.

## 9.0 Press contact and coverage

9.1 During the life of the investigation between May 2007 and October 2009 there were no media enquiries made to Surrey Police. 'If asked' lines were prepared from the outset in the event that there were. The investigation team were careful about information security within Surrey Police as well as sharing this information with external agencies. This is evidenced by the decision to share information with West Yorkshire Police via Anti-Corruption Units to minimise opportunities for information to be 'leaked' to the media.

9.2 It was early December 2011 why wasn't it during November? that Surrey Police's media department were contacted by Mark Williams-Thomas why are you happy to name MWT but none of the 2007/08 investigating officers??? stating he was advising on a Newsnight programme that was due to run a programme on Savile and sexual abuse. This was followed by contact from the producer Meirion Jones requesting Surrey Police comment. Press lines were given and contact made with CPS with the charging decision MG3 to assist them with their media response. No it wasn't. The CPS had sent everything back to the Police!!! [Alison Levitt reports, on p 5 of her report: [http://www.cps.gov.uk/news/assets/uploads/files/savile\\_report.pdf](http://www.cps.gov.uk/news/assets/uploads/files/savile_report.pdf) "The CPS appears to have no record at all of this case, because the original file was returned to the police following the decision that no prosecution would take place. There is nothing on CMS [the CPS internal electronic case management system]; the only reference says that the file was "destroyed" on 26<sup>th</sup> October 2010."]

9.10 Surrey Police have made contact with DI3, the now retired Detective Inspector and DSIO for this investigation. He had been contacted in October 2012 by ITN and Panorama who were seeking to involve him in programmes about the investigation and Savile. DI3 has declined that offer and given a limited statement about the investigation. He remains concerned over on-going media interest in him that is unwelcome. Who is this person??? Where is this statement?

10.2 Surrey Police flagged this enquiry to the CPS why, when the CPS had returned the records??? who advised they had no record of any letters sent to any victims or a record of the decision not to prosecute. At that time the papers for the police investigation had been archived and sent for storage. The masons are saying this to explain the delay i.e. why they couldn't inform Meirion when he inquired. Make your

minds up arseholes, what is the *story* - that the CPS returned the files to the police [as you told Levitt] OR that they were archived and stored. If it is the latter, why did you lie to Alison Levitt?

10.7 In September 2012 a producer from ITV contacted the Surrey Police media relations department stating that they were running a documentary on allegations against Savile. DI14 was contacted by Detective Chief Superintendent 15 and asked to again conduct a second review and **provide a short report regarding the standard of the investigation.** I don't recall that report ever coming to light!!! Why isn't this producer named??? They're happy to name MWT!

11.7 The Metropolitan Police Service has **subsequently confirmed** that they undertook an investigation into Savile in the 1980's and again in 2003. **This did not feature on the return from the INI check conducted by Surrey Police in 2007 that covered all forces."**

44 pages of fuck all facts and plenty of fabrication. It is very likely that there were no genuine victims involved in this showpiece.

Notice how these sewer rats bang on about all these other 'separate' bodies that they allegedly consulted with. In reality all those bodies are one and the same anyway – all of them under the control of the same evil lying Masonic henchmen.

The following is a page of Masonic speak from Tony Smith, the Non Information Access Manager.

<http://www.surrey.police.uk/About-Us/Your-right-to-information/Freedom-of-Information/FOI-Disclosure-Logs/InfoltemId/197>

15/10/2013

### **Jimmy Savile Interview - Operation Ornament**

**Jimmy Savile was interviewed by Surrey Police in October 2009. A copy of the transcript of the interview has now been released under the FOIA with a number of redactions.**

**FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST REFERENCE NO: 165-13-198**

**Savile Interview Part 1** [↗](#)

Download our Savile Interview Part 1 [2mb]

## [Savile Interview Part 2](#)

Download our Savile Interview Part 2 [612kb]

May I first of all apologise for the delay in responding to your request and thank you for your patience and understanding in allowing us time to ensure that all of the victims and innocent parties have been able to be protected and updated.

I write in connection with your request for information received on the 15th March 2013 and subsequent request for an internal review of the original decision. Having had the opportunity to review the initial response, I have decided to partially uphold your appeal. By redacting some of the information from the interview record, I believe that the rest of the material is suitable for disclosure. Having upheld your appeal I will deal with the response as if it were a new request.

Your request asked:

Please provide a copy of the record of police interview with Jimmy Savile dated October 1, 2009.

In a recent CPS report by Alison Levitt QC this is referred to as "Document MG15: record of police interview under caution with Jimmy Savile dated 1st October 2009 (7 pages)". My request is for the full seven-page record of the interview.

I understand that the names of any officers of junior rank may be redacted in line with the Data Protection Act and that names of any victims of alleged offences may be redacted so as not to identify them.

It will be useful at this point to clarify your request for '... (7 pages)'. The seven page document referred to by Alison Levitt QC was a record of taped interview (ROTI). This is an interview summary used by the police and CPS. A tape transcript is a full record of the conversation held during the interview and is considerably longer. In this case, in the interest of transparency, it has been decided to release information from the transcript and not the 'summarised' ROTI. The transcript is in two parts and this reflects the use of two interview tapes. Part 1 is the longer and contains 20 pages. Part two contains 6 pages.

Following receipt of your request, searches were carried out and a relevant interview record was located. I am not obliged to release all of the information, as the duty in Section 1(1)(b) of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 does not apply, by virtue of the following exemptions:

Section 30(1)(a)(b) – Investigations

Section 38(1)(a) – Health and Safety

Section 40(2) Personal Information

Section 17 of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 requires Surrey Police, when refusing to provide such information (because the information is exempt) to provide the applicant with a notice which: (a) states that fact, (b) specifies the exemption in question and (c) states (if that would not otherwise be apparent) why the exemption applies. Accordingly this letter serves as such a notice.

Section 30(1)(a)(b) - Investigations - This exemption is qualified and class based therefore a public interest test is required.

Sec 30 Factors Favouring Disclosure

Jimmy Savile was a very high profile and famous celebrity and as a result there has been a huge amount of interest in the allegations made about him since his death. Significant amounts of information about him have already been placed into the public domain through media articles, official press releases from the police and other bodies involved and through some victims themselves coming forward with their accounts.

Serious allegations have been made that the incidents of abuse are incredibly widespread and may even involve other persons who are in the public eye. The public therefore have a genuine interest in being informed as to the nature and circumstances of these incidents, who may have been involved and what, if any was the involvement of national bodies such as the NHS and BBC. To disclose this information would provide the public with increased knowledge of Savile's responses to the allegations made about him to Surrey Police.

Sec 30 Factors Favouring Non-Disclosure

All such matters are subject of an active on-going police investigation in many force areas. It cannot be clear at present what effect disclosures through FOI of investigation material may have upon this investigation. Care must be taken to not compromise any strand of the investigation or cause any undue harm to the victims and families involved. Commander Peter Spindler, from the investigation has said; "The public's response to this issue has been astounding. We are dealing with alleged abuse on an unprecedented scale. The profile of this operation has empowered a staggering number of victims to come forward to report the sexual exploitation which occurred during their childhood. I am pleased that victims feel confident enough to speak out about the abuse they

suffered and would like to reassure the public that we take all these cases very seriously and they will be investigated with the utmost sensitivity.’

### Sec 30 Balance Test

Although the investigation is of a very high profile nature the needs of the victims must be of paramount importance. Although there is an undeniable public benefit in disclosing the information in this case, Surrey Police took the decision to be transparent in the way it dealt with the allegations that it received. The proactive publication of the Operation Ornament senior investigating officers final report demonstrates the Force’s commitment to be open about Surrey Police’s involvement.

In addition, the report by Alison Levitt QC to the Director of Public Prosecutions (DPP) has placed more information regarding Savile into the public domain.

The disclosure of the interview records by Surrey Police shows a continued commitment to openness, however, there are parts of the interviews that contain information that is not suitable for publication at this time. It clearly would not be in the public interest to disclose material that would be likely to damage an on-going or future investigation. Therefore, I have decided that in this case, the public interest is best served by non-disclosure of the material. The material in question has been redacted and clearly marked with the relevant exemption.

Section 38(1)(a) Health and Safety This exemption is qualified and prejudice (Harm) based therefore a public interest test and evidence of harm is required.

### Sec. 38 Harm

The interviewing officers were acting on instruction and their actions were supported by the force. There is concern that any personal scrutiny of individuals will cause them harm and distress and may impact on the way they are viewed by the public and their peers.

### Sec. 38 Factors Favouring Disclosure

Openness and transparency are strong arguments for disclosure of information. It is important that the public have confidence in the way that investigations are conducted. Releasing this information would allow the public to know the names and rank of the officers who conducted the interview.

### Sec. 38 Factors Favouring Non-Disclosure

The impact that disclosure will have on the welfare of the officers is a strong argument against disclosure. Surrey Police has confidence in the abilities of the

officers concerned. The officers were acting under instruction while carrying out the interview. Where officers are carrying out their duty it would not be responsible to expose them to personal criticism when their actions are supported by the force.

### Sec. 38 Balance

When carrying out the balance test, I have to consider the strongest reason for disclosure against the strongest reason for non-disclosure. The 'public interest' in relation to the balance test means that there is a public benefit in disclosing the information. It is not simply something which the public might find interesting.

Surrey Police has a duty of care to all of its employees. Where officers are carrying out their duty it would not be responsible to expose them to personal criticism when their actions are supported by the force. It is important that the public have confidence in the officers that serve them. Where there is wrongdoing suggested on the part of an individual officer or officers, this may sway the balance in favour of disclosure. However in this case as previously stated the officers were acting under instruction and so release of their details would not be of any material benefit to the public or enhance the debate about the allegations made against Savile.

Section 40(2) - Personal Information – You acknowledge in your request that the information requested will contain personal information about individuals or information which may lead to their identification. Section 40(2), in this case, is an absolute exemption, requires neither a Harm nor a Public Interest Test in order to justify its application. Again, those entries have been redacted and marked accordingly.

In addition to the response we have given Surrey Police can neither confirm nor deny that any other information is held in relation to information that may or may not originate from exempt bodies, or in relation to any other material which may or may not form part of the investigation.

The two exemptions relevant to this statement are S23 (5) Information supplied by, or relating to certain exempt bodies and S30(3), by virtue of both S30(1) and (2), investigations and proceedings conducted by public bodies.

S 23 is an absolute exemption, although it would be fair to say that it is a matter of public record that investigations of the type here, primarily focused on child abuse, may attract the involvement of the Child Exploitation Online Protection Agency. They are part of the larger National Crime Agency and are therefore an exempt body under freedom of information legislation. This should not be taken

as an inference that they are, or are not involved in this case, simply that your enquiry, by its very nature relates to the type of activities they may undertake.

With regard S30, this is a qualified exemption and I am obliged therefore to consider the public interest in neither confirming nor denying that information is held.

Factors favouring not maintaining a neither confirm nor deny stance.

To confirm whether or not there is any information relevant to your request would satisfy the public need to know, at this time, where material relating to the Jimmy Savile allegations may, or may not be found. This not only allows them to exercise their rights to access such material but also means that the public are better informed.

Factors favouring maintaining the neither confirm nor deny stance.

By confirming or not that information is held, would in this case disclose what facts may or may not exist in relation to an on-going investigation. If doing so would harm that investigation, denying justice to the victims or jeopardising such an investigation from reaching a satisfactory conclusion then it would not be in the public interest to do so.

Balance Test

Confirming or denying that certain material were, or were not held in this case would harm the on-going investigation, therefore it cannot be in the public interest to do so.

No inference can be taken from these statements that further information does or does not exist.

If you are dissatisfied with the handling of your request, Surrey Police provides you the right to request a re-examination of your case under its review procedure. How to do this is set out in the attached Appeals Notice. Having followed the full procedure, if you are still dissatisfied, then you have the right to direct your comments to the Information Commissioner who will give your case consideration.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for your interest in Surrey Police. Should you have any further enquiries concerning this matter, please write or contact us on 01483 - 630007 quoting the reference number above.

Yours sincerely

Tony Smith  
**Non** Information Access Manager

This log belongs to the **High profile cases** category

**« Back**

**Can't find what you are looking for?**

Remember you can make a **request for an FOI disclosure log**