

attend Court to make the application. I arrived at Court and provided the warrant to the tribunal, this was considered and granted by the Court. I therefore achieved what I had been tasked and returned to the police station.

I have seen the regulation 16 Notice and can see that it wrongly assumes that I drafted the warrant which I did not. Despite this I strongly reject any assertion that the section 8 warrant failed to consider the seriousness of the offence, ultimately the warrant was granted by the Court and we [the police] were able to search Mr Port's flat. I am therefore extremely confused about any criticism of the section 8 warrant.

On returning from Court I gave the warrant to Eugene and dealt with my prisoner in custody. After this I believe I attended Mr Port's home address where I understood the arrest was taking place. My involvement in relation to this was limited and attended as support for my colleagues if needed.

Later that day Eugene was looking for someone to conduct the interview of Mr Port and I volunteered. I cannot recall specifically what information I was given prior to this interview but can only assume that I had I was given the pre-interview briefing document that I have seen within the disclosure. In relation to the interview of Port I thought that this had the potential to be the first of many interviews as I was under the impression that Eugene and Dave would be seeking further HAT advice following this.

I was interviewing Mr Port in relation to an allegation, primarily, of perverting the course of justice and theft. I did believe that once he had accepted his wrongdoing in interview that I had at least achieved a confession in relation to a criminal offence which always assists any investigation.

Once I had been able to achieve that I believed my role then was to obtain a detailed account to see if the team could prove or disprove what he was saying. My interview style is non-confrontational and not argumentative, I believe the interview is the opportunity for the suspect to provide their account and they can only be challenged when the evidence exists to demonstrate what they are saying is a lie. It was not my role to say if a suspects account is credible or not that will always ultimately be a matter for the jury. I believe that by ensuring that Mr Port answered all of my questions, this provided a significant amount of information to assist the investigation and did raise lines of enquiry for the OIC to consider.