

**DI ROLF SCHAMBERGER (MPS)**

**MG14 RESPONSE TO CAUTION**

I wish to make a written response to the Regulation 16 Notice dated served on me by the IPCC on the 8<sup>th</sup> September 2016. I understand that I do not have to say anything, but that it may harm my case if I do not mention when interviewed, or providing this written response, something which I later rely on in any misconduct proceedings under the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2012. I understand this statement may be used in any proceedings under the Regulations.

Signed.. **Signature** ..... Dated.. *03/09/2017* .....

DI Rolf Schamberger

1. I joined the Metropolitan Police Service in June 2003. After initially serving on Havering Borough as a Police Constable and Detective Constable, I moved to Barking & Dagenham Borough on promotion to the rank of Police Sergeant in April 2010. In May 2016, again on promotion, I moved to the Met Intelligence Command.
2. On the 15<sup>th</sup> September 2014, I was asked to "act up" as Detective Inspector. I had become a Substantive Detective Constable in 2007 before my promotion to Sergeant, and had worked as a Uniform Sergeant and a Detective Sergeant on Barking and Dagenham Borough. I have never worked as a Uniform Inspector. From March 2013 I was working as a Detective Sergeant; but due to problems with staffing levels with a Detective Inspector being absent for some time, I was asked to temporarily "act up" in the role of Detective Inspector on the Borough.

- The Borough at that time had no Substantive Detective Inspectors, or Substantive Detective Chief Inspectors; all were acting or temporary, in each role.
5. Most notably, I was based at Roycraft House, a local authority building, and not in the CID General Office at the police station. This physical separation was quite difficult and made the role of Acting Detective Inspector all the more difficult. No other officers from the CID general team were there, and I was not a regular visitor to Fresh Wharf Patrol Base where they were situated. In a sense I was remotely managing most of the time. I replaced DI Petty as I was considered the only option to take on the Role of Acting Detective Inspector, having at least passed my Part 1 Inspector's exams at that time. I did not know the CID team and, to a large extent, was reliant on others who were either "acting up" like I was, or were Substantive Detective Sergeants, to fulfill Substantive Detective roles in the main office.
- Being physically remote as I was meant I had very little interaction with officers from the general CID office. This was both at a professional as well as a personal level. I did not know any of them particularly well professionally, and certainly none of them personally. We did not mix socially, and my opportunities for getting away from Roycraft House over to Fresh Wharf Patrol Base were somewhat limited, due to the demands that were made on me, in relation to the work I was doing at Roycraft House and elsewhere, in relation to the other responsibilities I had within the remit outlined above.
6. I cannot remember ever being told anything about the circumstances surround the discovery of the body of Anthony Walgate in June 2014, and as far as I am aware I never knew about it from anything that was ever said to me, or brought to my attention in the days and months after the 20<sup>th</sup>

September 2014. I was not working on Saturday, 20<sup>th</sup> and Sunday, 21<sup>st</sup> September 2014, I was off on rest days.

7. My first collection of being involved in any matter relating to Stephen Port was on Monday 22<sup>nd</sup> September 2014 when I was the Duty Acting Detective Inspector on the Borough and was told that the body of Daniel Whitworth had been found two days previously. I was told that the Homicide Advisory Team had attended and advice had been sought.
  - I was aware that a note found on Daniel Whitworth's body linked him to another death, that of a Gabriel Kovari, whose body had been found in the same location by the same dog walker, on the 28<sup>th</sup> August 2014.
  - I was aware that FLOs (Family Liaison Officers) had been appointed to both families; DC Baxter for the Kovari family and DC Slaymaker for the Whitworth family. I have had the opportunity to consider the CRIS in relation to Daniel Whitworth (5115490/14).
  - On the 22<sup>nd</sup> September I was on duty performing the role of Duty Detective Inspector until 19:00 hours. I know that I had a meeting with Assistant Commissioner King at 12:00 midday at Fresh Wharf, and there was a Gold Group meeting at 16:00 hours, which I believe was in relation to the Kovari/Whitworth deaths.
8. I do not recall when I first viewed the CRIS. My recollection is that T/DCI Kirk spoke to me on the morning of the 22<sup>nd</sup> September, asking me to deal with the Whitworth body in that the following day there was going to be a Special Post-Mortem. I cannot remember if this was face-to-face meeting, or a telephone call.

- On the 21<sup>st</sup> October 2014, I was duty Detective Inspector again. I attended a Gold Group in relation to rape allegations on the Borough, and a MASH meeting.

18. My recollection is that after this I became primarily involved in trying to assist the Coroner in relation to what was going to be a Joint Inquest in relation to Kovari and Whitworth. Throughout the end of October, I was still performing as the Duty Detective Inspector on the 22<sup>nd</sup>, 27<sup>th</sup> and 31<sup>st</sup> October, and involved in substantial meetings around other issues, concerning operational policing matters within my remit.

- On the 22<sup>nd</sup> January 2015, the Closing Report in relation to Gabriel Kovari had been updated and there, obviously, is an e-mail train which sets out the degree of liaison and contact I had with the Coroner's Officer around arrangements in relation to the Inquests. I gave evidence at the Inquest, as it was me that completed and submitted the Coroner's Report in relation to both Gabriel Kovari and Daniel Whitworth.

19. I have now also considered the Review entry from the CRIS. It is quite often my practice to prepare a Word document which I then cut and paste into the CRIS so that I can write out my own thoughts and the matters which I think are outstanding. I know, for example, that I did this on the 25<sup>th</sup> September 2014, in relation to a Review which was quite extensive, and which I am certain then made its way into the CRIS, with updates, as a full Review.

20. The fact that there was a Special Post-Mortem in relation to Daniel Whitworth was not something which cause me to have any heightened sense of concern around whether it was a suspicious death, or not. It was clear that an initial view had been taken by DS Sweetman in relation to when the body of Gabriel Kovari was found, and a similar view by DS Turrell, in relation to Daniel

Whitworth. I was not aware of any compelling evidence, or indeed any evidence at all in the early stages that caused me concern around what appeared to be the obvious scenario in relation to Mr. Whitworth having confess to killing Gabriel Kovari and then, sadly, taking his own life. The fact that there was a Special Post-Mortem in the case of Daniel Whitworth, I am told, is more to do with the speed of having the Post-Mortem carried out, than the fact that there is any greater degree of suspicion surrounding the circumstances of his death.

21. I prepared both Closing Reports to the Coroner in good faith, based on the information I knew about at that stage, or that was available to me. Specifically after considering the evidence which I gave at the Inquest, primarily by reference to the audio record that is available, I would wish to make the following observations:-

- My recollection is that, given the time constraints, I prepared for giving evidence at the Inquest the night before, namely 18<sup>th</sup> June 2015, by simply reading through the case file for both matters. Some of this was familiar to me, some of it was not. Looking back, I can see that I did not read everything and perhaps not in as much detail as I should, or could, have done. As a result of matters that emerged from the Inquest, I think I have to concede that I was not as well prepared as I needed to be, given that I was undertaking the role of giving evidence to assist the Coroner at both Inquests the following day. I cannot now remember exactly what I read and, having viewed a substantial amount of material, equally cannot now say specifically if I did not read something that has now been brought to my attention or made available.
- I do recall and have seen email traffic on the 18<sup>th</sup> June from the Coroner's Officer, Jane Day, and particularly the fact that I had to