

Witness Statement

of

**DAVID ELLIS HARRISON**

Occupation:           Writer & Consultant

Date of birth:         Over 21

My name is David Ellis Harrison. I was employed as a Criminal Investigator/Intelligence Officer with the Serious Organised Crime Agency (SOCA) between April 2006 and July 2008. Previously I had carried out the same role for H.M Customs between 1990 and 2006.

In December 2006 I was part of a SOCA surveillance team working on the Ipswich murder inquiry.

On or about the evening of 18th December 2006 I attended the first operational briefing. I seem to recall that we were taking over from a Suffolk Constabulary surveillance team. The briefing was delivered by the SOCA Branch Commander, Simon Jennings.

During this briefing we were told that the News of the World had employed their own 'surveillance team', made up of ex-special forces soldiers, whose objectives were to identify any suspects we were working on, and to identify 'us' and our operating base.

Our operational objectives were to put under surveillance (as directed by the Senior Investigating Officer) anyone suspected of that crime. Our specific objectives were to gather evidence against the suspect and to prevent him from carrying out any further offences.

I recall discussing the matter with my colleagues and coming to the conclusion that someone in the Police had found out that SOCA were being deployed and had passed this information to the media.

During our surveillance activities over the next couple of days, we confirmed that we were indeed, being targeted. On at least two occasions we noted vehicles that were attempting to follow us. I cannot recall if the details of these vehicles were included in any observation logs.

During another briefing, on possibly the 19th or 20th of December, we advised that a Sunday Mirror surveillance team had been employed to pick up and interview the first suspect in the inquiry.

The surveillance team I was part of was not on duty at the time that the first suspect was interviewed by the Sunday Mirror. Colleagues on the surveillance team that was on duty advised us that they had watched him being picked up and driven round by a team that carried out anti-surveillance maneuvers before dropping him off at an hotel to be interviewed.

I believe that by its actions NOTW jeopardised the murder inquiry. I believe that they did this in two ways.

Firstly, many murderers revisit the scene of the crime. If that act is evidenced by a covert surveillance team, it's value to the prosecution is extremely important. In this case, if the suspect had decided to re-visit the scene, to dispose of additional evidence, or to move a body that had not yet been found and he realised he was being followed, he may have cancelled or postponed his trip. He would not care whether he was being followed by a 'legitimate' surveillance team or one employed by a newspaper. The evidence would be lost and the prosecution case weakened.

Secondly, our other objective was to ensure that by carrying out 24 hour a day surveillance on the suspect, he would not be able to commit further murders. Our surveillance of the suspect could have been seriously hindered, if at the same time we were trying to keep him under tight control, whilst also having to deal with a 'private' surveillance team getting in the way. If we had lost the suspect because of their actions there could have been tragic consequences.

I confirm that the contents of the above statement are true.

Signed:



Name: **DAVID ELLIS HARRISON**

Date: 19/2/12