



# INDEPENDENT INQUIRY CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE

## SUMMARY OF FINAL NOTICE OF DETERMINATION OF WM-A5'S CORE PARTICIPANT APPLICATION

**[this is a summary of the Chair's decision prepared for publication in order to protect  
the applicant's identity]**

1. This Notice contains a summary of my final determination of WM-A5's application for core participant status in the Westminster investigation. It has been prepared for publication in order to give additional protection to WM-A5's identity and should be read and considered in conjunction with my Restriction Order dated 3 October 2018 prohibiting the identity of WM-A5 as an application for core participant designation being published.
2. WM-A5 made her application on 5 February 2018. On 25 April 2018, I issued a determination indicating that I was minded to refuse the application, but inviting WM-A5 to make further submissions if she wished to do so. The Inquiry did receive further submissions on behalf of WM-A5, which were dated 9 May 2018. I have considered those further submissions with care, and they are addressed below.
3. Applications for core participant status are considered under Rule 5 of The Inquiry Rules 2006 which provides:

*(1) The chairman may designate a person as a core participant at any time during the course of the inquiry, provided that person consents to being so designated.*

*(2) In deciding whether to designate a person as a core participant, the chairman must in particular consider whether –*

- a. The person played, or may have played, a direct and significant role in relation to the matters to which the inquiry relates;*
- b. The person has a significant interest in an important aspect of the matters to which the inquiry relates; or*
- c. The person may be subject to explicit or significant criticism during*



# INDEPENDENT INQUIRY CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE

*the inquiry proceedings or in the report, or in any interim report.*

*(3) A person ceases to be a core participant on –*

*a. the date specified by the chairman in writing; or*

*b. the end of the inquiry.*

4. In determining the application, the matters listed in Rule 5(2) must be considered, but the list is not exhaustive and other relevant matters can also be taken into account.
5. WM-A5's application was lodged four months after the deadline for core participant applications in this investigation. Notwithstanding the delay, I have a discretion pursuant to Rule 5(1) to designate a core participant "at any time" during the course of the Inquiry. WM-A5 stated in her application that the delay was the result of difficulties that she has been experiencing at home. In light of the fact that the investigation is still at a relatively early stage, and also as a matter of general fairness in light of the explanation that has been given, I consider that the delay should not stand in the way of my considering this application.
6. It is apparent from the content of WM-A5's initial application that the interest that she asserts in this investigation is that of someone who was, as a child, a victim of sexual abuse at the hands of people of prominence associated with Westminster. WM-A5's application is put on the basis that she was in the care of Buckinghamshire Council during the late 1960s where at a very early age she was subjected to sexual, physical, racial and satanic abuse. WM-A5 states that she was abused at home when she was in foster care and she was subsequently abused by a number of "powerful people". WM-A5's application is also put on the basis that she witnessed sexual abuse of other children by others of prominent status and she was interviewed as a witness by Operation Conifer. It is stated that this abuse happened at many different places, including Chequers, and other locations frequented by people in positions of power in England and Wales.



# INDEPENDENT INQUIRY CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE

7. In addition to WM-A5's application, I have also had regard to a report that I have received from Thames Valley Police. The report, which was prepared at the request of the Inquiry, summarises complaints made by WM-A5 and investigations that have been conducted as a result. I understand that WM-A5 was born in 1968 and that the incidents of child sexual abuse to which she refers took place no later than about 1988 - some 30 years ago. The report records, amongst other things, that WM-A5 first contacted the Thames Valley Police in relation to her allegations of child sexual abuse in 2015. I will return to this report below. I should emphasise that the report is the only police document that I have looked at for the purposes of determining this application. I have not had access, for example, to any wider police records or documentation.
8. As I have already indicated, in my determination dated 25 April 2018 I reached the view that I was minded to reject WM-A5's application for core participant status. My reasons for reaching that provisional conclusion were (a) that I was not able to place any weight on WM-A5's claims to have been the victim of child sexual abuse at the hands of people of prominence associated with Westminster; and (b) that there was no other basis upon which it would be appropriate to grant WM-A5 core participant status.
9. The core reasoning that underpinned my earlier provisional decision was contained in the following three paragraphs of the determination dated 25 April 2018:

*"13. The main reason why I am, at least at the moment, unable to place any weight on WM-A5's allegations of having been sexually abused by persons of prominence associated with Westminster arises from the number and identity of her alleged abusers. Leaving aside [redacted], WM-A5 claims to have been abused by 10 individuals, and to have witnessed other children being abused by 3 further individuals... One of the individuals whom WM-A5 names as having abused her is Jimmy Savile. One of those whom WM-A5 claims to have witnessed abusing other children is Ted Heath. None of the*



# INDEPENDENT INQUIRY CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE

*named individuals has any obvious or explained connection to WM-A5, and the strongest theme that links them to each other is the fact that many of them have been publicly accused in recent years of involvement in historic cases of child sexual abuse. The only further detail that WM-A5 provides is a list of locations where the abuse is said to have taken place, but she gives no explanation as to how she came to be in such disparate places as Chequers, an American military base at Naphill and the Stoke Mandeville Hospital.*

14. *There is a further matter, which arises from the report by Thames Valley Police to which I have already referred. The report records that WM-A5 told the police that she had included her allegations of abuse against persons of prominence in the original manuscript of a book that she wrote some years ago, but that the publisher had refused to publish the allegations for legal reasons. Investigation by the police demonstrated that this was not the case - neither the publishing company nor WM-A5's ghostwriter had any memory of these allegations. It appears that WM-A5 deliberately sought to mislead the police in suggesting that she had made these allegations earlier than in fact she had.*

15. *Taking these matters together, I do not consider that I can place any weight on WM-A5's claims to have been sexually abused by persons of prominence. And it is these allegations that provide the basis for WM-A5's application for core participant status in this investigation... While WM-A5 makes factual allegations of sexual abuse by persons of public prominence, she does not allege any further institutional failing relevant to the focus of this investigation."*

10. As I have indicated, as a result of that provisional determination, further material has been submitted in support of WM-A5's application. That material, which includes a Chronology, provides some further detail about WM-A5's allegations of having suffered and having witnessed child sexual abuse committed by prominent



# INDEPENDENT INQUIRY CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE

individuals. The Chronology also contains a response to the suggestion that WM-A5 sought to mislead the police.

11. The question for me is whether this new material satisfies me that, contrary to my earlier view, I can place weight on WM-A5's allegations of having suffered and witnessed child sexual committed by prominent individuals connected with Westminster. I emphasise that my task is not to determine the truth or otherwise of these allegations. Far from it. This is an application for core participant status, and my function is to decide whether WM-A5 has a sufficient interest in this investigation to justify granting the application. The particular issue that arises is whether WM-A5's relevant allegations are sufficiently plausible to generate an interest in the investigation.
12. I have carefully reviewed the further material submitted on behalf of WM-A5, in particular the Chronology. There are three points that I would make about that document.
13. First, the Chronology contains a factual account of the way in which WM-A5 drafted her book, and of her dealings with her publisher and ghostwriter and, subsequently, the police. There are factual conflicts between WM-A5's account and the police report, which I am not in a position to resolve. I have therefore disregarded the police report for the purposes of reconsidering my provisional decision on WM-A5's application for core participant status.
14. Second, there are obvious factual difficulties with the Chronology. In a document that generally provides little detailed support for a large number of extremely serious allegations, these difficulties are striking.
  - a. WM-A5 says that she was abused by and/or witnessed abuse by three prominent individuals closely connected with the Conservative Party. According to details given in the Chronology, this abuse took place at



# INDEPENDENT INQUIRY CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE

Chequers in 1977/78, when WM-A5 was between the ages of 9 and 10. It is hard to see how these facts can be accurate, since the Labour Party was in power during the years in question, and it seems extremely unlikely therefore that figures connected to the Conservative Party would have had repeated access to Chequers.

- b. A similar point arises in relation to allegations that WM-A5 makes in relation to Ted Heath. The Chronology details various events that are alleged to have taken place in 1978-80, when WM-A5 was aged between 10 and 12. It is said that the events took place at Ted Heath's house, which WM-A5 "*recognised much later from media exposure*". I take it from this that WM-A5 is referring to Arundells, Mr Heath's house in Salisbury that featured prominently in media reporting of Operation Conifer. However, publicly available information shows that Mr Heath did not purchase Arundells until 1985, by which time WM-A5 would have been 17.

15. Third, and most important, the Chronology provides at best sketchy further detail in relation to a large number of extremely serious allegations. No further detail at all has been provided in respect of one of the prominent individuals connected with Westminster who is alleged to have abused WM-A5.

16. Taking these matters together, I remain of the view that I am not able to place any weight on WM-A5's relevant allegations of child sexual abuse. I come back to the reasoning at paragraph 13 of my earlier determination, which I adopt. Considering WM-A5's allegations in the round, including the number of allegations, the identity of the alleged abusers, the alleged circumstances of the abuse, as well as the further factual information, with its difficulties, that she has now provided in the Chronology, I simply do not regard WM-A5's allegations as being plausible. Even if that is putting the matter too high, and there is some degree of plausibility about these allegations, I certainly do not regard them to be sufficiently plausible to generate an interest in this



# INDEPENDENT INQUIRY CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE

investigation that would lead me, in the exercise of my discretion, to grant core participant status.

17. In reaching this decision, I repeat two important points that I made in my earlier determination.

a. This decision should not be read as a rejection of WM-A5's entire account of having been the victim of child sexual abuse. Her account of being abused whilst in the care of Buckinghamshire Council is supported by other records, but is not of itself relevant to the Westminster investigation. What I am at the moment unable to place any weight upon are WM-A5's separate allegations of having been abused by persons of prominence associated with Westminster. It is those allegations, however, which are critical to this application.

b. My reasons for concluding that I cannot rely upon WM-A5's allegations of having suffered child sexual abuse at the hands of persons of prominence associated with Westminster do not include the fact that she only made these allegations many years after the events were said to have taken place. It is well known that reports of sexual abuse are often only made after a delay, sometimes a considerable delay. I regard the issue of delayed reporting in this case as an entirely neutral factor.

18. It follows from the conclusions that I have expressed above my conclusion that I am not satisfied that WM-A5 fulfills the criteria in Rule 5(2) as a person who played, or may have played, a direct and significant role in relation to the matters to which the Westminster investigation relates, or that she has a significant interest in an important aspect of such matters or may be subject to explicit or significant criticism during the inquiry proceedings or in the report, or in any interim report. There is no other basis upon which WM-A5 seeks or would be entitled to core participant status.



# INDEPENDENT INQUIRY CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE

19. This application is accordingly refused.

**Professor Alexis Jay OBE**  
**Chair, Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Abuse**

**3 October 2018**