

26. I was aware that his laptop and mobile phone had been seized at the time of his arrest and the execution of the PACE warrant. As far as I can remember there was no formal advice from the HAT Team following this, or from SC&O1 as to any specific line of enquiry that should be taken up in relation to this. My own thinking in relation to what they may reveal did not incorporate the concept that it would necessarily help in terms of proving any offence against Port other than perverting the course of justice. For this he had been caught out in a lie in relation to what had occurred, conceded the lie and was charged with the one offence which the CPS advised he could be charged with considering the evidence disclosed.
27. Obviously one line of enquiry which we were looking at and repeatedly revisited was whether or not he had actually administered the GHB, in inappropriate quantities, to Mr Walgate. Although we had some very full background, lifestyle, information from China Dunning and others in relation to Anthony Walgate, the actual world that he inhabited and which has now come to light was perhaps a bit of a mystery to all of us at that stage. For my part, for example, I knew nothing about "chemsex" or particular details relating to the type of lifestyle which he appears to have led and I certainly had not had any training in relation to these issues arising in the course of investigations. Although I know that it is suggested that the community in which a victim lives should be the subject of research, this remained an unexplained death and I felt we had sufficient background and lifestyle material relating to Mr Walgate from those sources disclosed on the CRIS to assist us in that regard. It never occurred to me as productive to go further or wider in terms of the type of community from which he came and in which he worked.
28. Equally in relation to issues surrounding exhibits seized from Stephen Port's home address, whatever lingering concern there may have been about the more direct involvement of Port in his death, there were proportionality, time and resource implications that had to be considered in pursuing further lines of

Signed **Signature**

Dated..... 7/8/17

enquiry. Indeed we were advised by the laboratory examining computers etc. that any submissions for this case would not be treated as a priority and could take from several weeks to months to complete. There would then be the question of resourcing the examination. I did not think that speculatively examining the laptop (in the unlikely event that we were authorised to do so) or his phone records further would produce anything in relation to the allegation of perverting the course or justice or, more crucially, anything directly related evidentially to any suggestion that he had administered a noxious substance to Mr Walgate while in his flat. The download of the computer belonging to Stephen Port has now been made available to me and as far as I can tell, although it demonstrates a keen interest in gay and chemsex matters and particularly gay sexual issues, as well as the drug GHB, there is nothing specifically which I think even with the benefit of hindsight would have necessarily caused me to reconsider his position in terms of matters directly relating to the causation of the death of Mr Walgate. It is quite clear that some thought was being given around whether he may have administered the drug to Mr Walgate but, obviously, in due course advice from the HAT Team confirmed that that the appropriate charge was perverting the course of justice on the basis of the available evidence.

29. At most of the material times, just before and post charge, I was dealing with the Inquest to the Coroner, and preparing substantial papers as indicated in relation to that. Whilst I did not close my mind to the possibility that a third party had administered the substance to Mr Walgate i.e. Port, I had no evidence that was the case and did not think that there was material from the search of the premises of Port that would assist us in that regard. I was aware that there was on the PNC relating to Port a mention of a previous arrest in relation to administering a substance to his ex-partner which was not the subject of any criminal proceedings due to the complainant withdrawing from the prosecution.

Signed: **Signature**

Dated..... 7/8/17