



INDEPENDENT INQUIRY CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE

NOTICE OF DETERMINATION CORE PARTICIPANT APPLICATION

1. On 30 August 2017, the Inquiry invited anyone who wished to be designated as a core participant in the Westminster investigation to make an application to the Solicitor to the Inquiry by 27 October 2017. The Inquiry subsequently held a Preliminary Hearing in this investigation, at which Counsel to the Inquiry identified which organisations and individuals had been designated as core participants.
2. On 19 June 2018, an application was made by WM-A6 for core participant status in the Westminster investigation. He sent a further email supplementing his application on 24 July 2018. WM-A6 provided information to the Inquiry in support of his application, which I have considered carefully. This notice sets out my determination of the application.
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 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*



INDEPENDENT INQUIRY CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE

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-A6's application was lodged several 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-A6 explained in his application that he only decided to apply for core participant status in the Westminster investigation after attending a Truth Project session [REDACTED]. In all the circumstances of his case, I consider that WM-A6's delay should not stand in the way of my considering this application.
6. Both the initial application document that WM-A6 submitted and his later email are composed in somewhat broken English. They are not easy to follow. A considerable number of allegations are made, some of which are more fully developed than others.
7. Many of the allegations of abuse that WM-A6 makes are of no relevance to the Westminster investigation. For example, WM-A6 alleges that he was sexually abused by staff at an educational establishment. He alleges that he was abused by [REDACTED] at [REDACTED]. And he alleges that he was abused by [REDACTED]. WM-A6 also makes allegations of misconduct against a number of local police officers. None of these allegations are within the scope of the Westminster investigation.
8. The allegation that WM-A6 makes that is, arguably, within the scope of the Westminster investigation is an allegation that he was abused as a child by Cyril Smith [REDACTED]. No precise date is given for this alleged incident, but from the context of the rest of WM-A6's account, the date would appear to be in or about [REDACTED] when WM-A6 was



INDEPENDENT INQUIRY CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE

about [REDACTED] years old. WM-A6 says that [REDACTED] he was "made to strip naked and physically abused" by Cyril Smith. He alleges that he was told to keep silent about it by staff. There is no suggestion from WM-A6 that this incident was reported to the authorities.

9. In addition to WM-A6's application and his supplementary email, I have also had regard to a report that I have received from [REDACTED] Police relating to WM-A6. I have taken into account the entire contents of the report, but I would refer in particular to the following points.

a. The Police have made detailed searches of records [REDACTED] but have not found any evidence that WM-A6 was ever a student there.

b. In [REDACTED] WM-A6 made a report to the police that he had been abused (apparently in or about [REDACTED] by a fellow pupil at [REDACTED]. No record could be found of WM-A6's alleged abuser (who was known to WM-A6 as an adult) ever being at [REDACTED]. Moreover, the individual in question would have been about 7 years old at the time of the alleged abuse, and there is no record of children that young ever being at [REDACTED].

c. WM-A6 made claims to the police during interview that were demonstrably untrue. For example, he claimed to have given evidence in [REDACTED] at a trial of members of staff from [REDACTED] a trial that did not take place.

10. I have considered all the material that is before me with care, including WM-A6's assertion that records of his attendance at [REDACTED] were deleted by the police. Having done so, I have drawn the three following core conclusions. First, very few of WM-A6's allegations are of relevance to the Westminster investigation. Second, for the reason set out at paragraph 9 above, I am unable to place any weight on WM-A6's account of having been abused by Cyril Smith, or, indeed, his claim that he was ever a pupil at [REDACTED].



INDEPENDENT INQUIRY CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE

Third, there is no other basis upon which it would be appropriate to grant WM-A6 core participant status.

11. I am accordingly not satisfied that WM-A6 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. Further, nor am I satisfied that he has a significant interest in an important aspect of such matters to which this investigation relates or may be subject to explicit or significant criticism during the inquiry proceedings or in the report, or in any interim report. I have therefore decided that I will not exercise my discretion to designate WM-A6 him as a core participant in this investigation.

12. Before concluding, it is important that I make the following two points clear.

13. First, it is not my role or the role of the Inquiry to make factual determinations of the truth or otherwise of individual allegations of sexual abuse. The question to which I am directed by Rule 5(2) in this case is whether WM-A6's application establishes either that he played or may have played a direct and significant role in relation to the matters to which the inquiry relates, or that he has a significant interest in an important aspect of those matters. It is in that context that I have considered WM-A6's account.

14. Second, this decision should not be read as a rejection of WM-A6's entire account of having been the victim of child sexual abuse. All that it has been necessary for me to consider in determining this application is the relatively limited part of his account that relates to Westminster.

15. I will keep the scope of the investigation and the designation of core participants under review as the Inquiry progresses and further invitations to apply for core participant status may be made as the investigation proceeds. My decision not to designate WM-A6 as a core participant in this particular investigation does not



INDEPENDENT INQUIRY CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE

preclude him from making a future application in respect of other investigations. I will consider any future application which WM-A6 wishes to make on its merits.

Professor Alexis Jay OBE

9 November 2018

Chair, Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Abuse