



*AC Yates  
Room 556(V)  
Victoria Block  
New Scotland Yard  
Broadway  
Victoria  
London SW1 0BG*

Dear John

I hope this letter finds you and all colleagues in 'Specialist Operations' well. I thought I should take the opportunity to write to you as I am advised you are leading on the issue of the publication of the 'Johnston' Review.

I recently received a letter dated 8<sup>th</sup> September 2009 from Jenny Leonard indicating that you had considered the representations made by all interested parties in relation to the proposed publication of the Review and had now agreed a redacted version for publication. The letter also states you have decided to allow my representatives and I to read the final redacted version prior to publication.

I replied to Jenny Leonard's letter by telephone and e-mail indicating I was out of the UK but would look forward to receiving after my return on 21<sup>st</sup> September 2009. I spoke to Ms Leonard on 21<sup>st</sup> of September and tried to arrange to receive a copy of the redacted Review when I visited London on 22<sup>nd</sup> of September. Ms Leonard advised me that I could not be given a copy of the Review but may be permitted to read it under supervision.

As I am sure you are aware I have reserved my position on the Review in the hope that the MPS would determine it's publication as a standalone document would not be in the public interest. I share the Commissioner's and your desire to serve the public interest and I believe this will be best achieved by making available all the relevant information pertaining to the Home Office leak's investigation (Operation Miser) that is not precluded from publication by genuine legal restrictions or other legitimate and defensible reasons.

You will be aware that following the arrest of Damian Green there was a deluge of ill informed press and media reporting that was damaging to the MPS and to me personally. These reports suggested that the then acting commissioner was not involved in, or supportive of, decisions to investigate the Cabinet Office complaints and to arrest Green, that he and I were in conflict over these decisions, that searches of Greens' parliamentary office and other premises were unlawful and improper and that Greens' arrest was not justifiable as he was lawfully going about his business holding the Government to account. These stories were not corrected by the MPS at the time or subsequently despite clear evidence to the contrary.

This situation is likely to be repeated if the 'Johnston Review' is published in isolation as proposed and the public interest will be further seriously undermined. I understand that significant redactions have already been made to the Review based on representations about its accuracy and fairness. You will be aware from the events of last December that I and several other colleagues in the MPS expressed serious concerns about the omission of very pertinent facts from the Review. I appreciate these facts may lead to a degree of discomfort for some but they appear overwhelmingly to be relevant to the public understanding of the actions and conduct of senior and well paid officials and elected representatives. You are therefore in the potentially difficult position of publishing a review that is significantly redacted due to inaccuracies on the one hand and which excludes a series of pertinent facts on the other. I fail to see how this could serve the public interest.

Whilst it could be argued the Review is just a 'snapshot' in time, I believe the MPS is well aware of its perfunctory nature and it's potential to mislead the public if published in isolation when other more complete and competent documents exist and could be published alongside the Review or as an alternative.

I can, of course, give you an account of a series of factual omissions in the Review, and when and by whom they were drawn to the reviewing officers attention. Therefore redactions of inaccuracies alone will not suffice. I am not able to explain why these facts were omitted from the review but I do believe that when they are set out they lend themselves to very unhelpful interpretations about the quality of the review, and when they are set out alongside the 'public narrative' being proffered by some at the time of events, the omissions could lead to the reviews motives being called into question.

I am aware that a number of senior former colleagues who were close to these events hold similar views and have expressed these to me personally.

I have no desire to become embroiled in a further public controversy and feel I have personally drawn a line under these events and have moved on. However if the Review were to be published I believe the controversy is likely to be reignited and therefore I would strongly advise publishing the material that will address the inaccuracies and omissions that characterise the review. This could take the form of a redacted version of the report forwarded to the CPS by the investigation team and a clear account of the decision making involving Sir Paul Stephenson and I which led to the investigation being initiated and to the arrest of Galley and then Green.

I am confident that I am not alone in making representations about the publication of the Review and would ask that you at least consider my representations. I believe the representations you have received have vindicated my remarks and have seriously challenged the Reviews' fitness for public consumption. I regret having to write to you in these terms but the issue of the Reviews' publication is a matter of conscience for me in respect of its potential to mislead.

I am aware the intention is to publish the Review as an appendix to a further review being conducted by Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Constabulary. However this logic is flawed, as HMI's review is a forward-looking review and is not intending to adjudicate on the investigation. Therefore it is not a mechanism able to address the inadequacies of the 'Johnston Review'.

I do hope you find my comments helpful in your effort to determine where the public interest lies in this matter. I have attempted here to set out genuine concerns that I believe are shared by others who may feel more inhibited about making their arguments.

R F Quick