

As part of the disclosure for this misconduct allegation I have now had sight of the original HAT return dated the 19/06/15 amongst other documents but I did not have sight of this or any of the advices provided at the time I conducted the interview. These were completed by the an East team at Barking and we were a West team based at Putney.

We arrived at Fresh Wharf police station and I can recall that A/DI McCarthy was sat in the CID room. We were made aware that Mr Port had been arrested on suspicion of theft and perverting the course of justice with the backdrop of an unexplained death. He provided all the support team officers with an overview of the investigation and one of the requests was that a further interview would take place. A/DI McCarthy was conscious that the level of interviewing experience he had at his disposal was limited. We were told that Mr Port had been interviewed the previous evening and during the interview he changed his account. We were tasked to conduct a further interview to ensure that a detailed account was obtained.

The investigation was still in an evidence gathering stage, so other officers from the support team were tasked with conducting a CCTV trawl and assisting in a search of Mr Ports flat to locate the missing mobile phone and gather evidence. No cause of death had been identified or disclosed to us at the time of our involvement.

I was tasked with DC Levoir to conduct the interview. DC Levoir is a tier 5 trained interviewer and I am tier 2 trained. I would imagine we were tasked to conduct the interview as two experienced, trained and well regarded interviewing officers. Prior to the interview we looked at the CRIS, the interview summary prepared by the borough officers following the interview the previous evening and we completed some additional background checks.

I do not believe that we had sight of the pre-interview disclosure document nor had we seen the document at page 73 of the disclosure which appears to be the same pre interview document without the last page.

We did not, nor would have been standard practise to, listen to the tapes of the first interview prior to our interview taking place. We relied on the interview summary as a sufficient document to relay the information that had been provided.

The purpose of us conducting a further interview was to provide Mr Port with a final opportunity to provide a full and truthful account.

It is often useful to have little rather than more information when obtaining a suspects or witness account. With little knowledge of what the person has said previously it can create a better style of interview, so that the questions are open and not slanted with a particular view

**Signature**

details and passwords for his mobile phone, email, Facebook, along with alias names he used on dating sites, and information regarding two previous incidents with police (one of which we had not been aware of prior to interview). We identified that Mr Port used his laptop to access the dating websites and this would have highlighted an important line of enquiry. We ensured he provided a detailed account of his background, lifestyle, his movements, whereabouts and involvement with Mr Walgate, which were all lines of enquiries to be considered by the investigative team. Mr Port provided fine detail of the drugs that were taken and the paraphernalia that was used all of which could assist in the recovery of evidence and identification forensic submissions to the lab. I would have expected all of these lines of enquires to have been considered and investigated as appropriate, to see if anything Mr Port had said could be proven wrong. Then if required a further interview could be conducted and a challenge phase implemented.

The sexuality and circumstances described by Port had no impact on our line of questioning. We did not change the manner in which we asked the questions when he disclosed that he was gay and this had no bearing of our dealing with him or our attitude to the investigation into Mr Walgate's death. When Mr Port suggested that Mr Walgate wanted to take drugs before having sex, that he was being paid for, we had no evidence or reason to suggest this wasn't true and it was not an entirely implausible suggestion.

Following the interview we informed our supervisor that Mr Port had chosen to answer our questions and had provided the detailed account consistent with his latter part of his previous interview. Our supervisor subsequently provided the HAT advice dated 27/06/2016 and a copy of our interview notes to A/DI McCarthy. We then withdrew from the investigation having been involved for approximately 4 hours.

I believed we achieved the purpose that we were tasked. I believed we carried out a thorough, detailed interview that covered all the areas of the investigation. I believe that our interview identified important lines of enquiry for the investigation team to follow. I deny that my failure to challenge Mr Ports led to important lines or enquiry to be missed, especially when the interview process had not reached this phase during our dealings and there was little or no material to challenge his account. I deny any suggestion that our conduct amounted to misconduct or poor performance and that is all I wish to say at this time.

**Signature**

4