

**IN THE SURREY CORONER’S COURT  
BEFORE HM SENIOR CORONER FOR SURREY, MR RICHARD TRAVERS  
IN THE MATTER OF THE GUILDFORD PUB BOMBINGS 1974  
AND IN THE MATTER OF THE INQUESTS TOUCHING AND CONCERNING  
THE DEATHS OF:**

- (1) MR PAUL CRAIG (DECEASED)  
(2) GUARDSMAN WILLIAM FORSYTH (DECEASED)  
(3) PRIVATE ANN HAMILTON (DECEASED)  
(4) GUARDSMAN JOHN HUNTER (DECEASED)  
(5) PRIVATE CAROLINE SLATER (DECEASED)**

---

**WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS ON BEHALF OF  
COUNSEL TO THE INQUESTS**

**For Hearing at Pre-Inquest Review: 29<sup>th</sup> March 2021 at 10am**

---

**1. Abbreviations**

“CSR”	Current Situation Report from Surrey Police;
“CTI”	Counsel to the Inquests;
“GPB”	the Guildford Pub Bombings 1974;
“HGPH”	the Horse & Groom Public House;
“HMC”	HM Coroner for Surrey, Mr Richard Travers;
“IP”	Interested Person;
“MOD”	Ministry of Defence;
“MPS”	Metropolitan Police Service;
“PIR”	Pre-Inquest Review;
“RARDE”	Royal Armament Research & Development Establishment;
“RSCH”	Royal Surrey County Hospital;
“SECAmb”	South East Coast Ambulance Service;
“SIO”	Senior Investigating Officer;
“SP”	Surrey Police;
“SSPH”	the Seven Stars Public House;

“WRAC” Women’s Royal Army Corps.

## **2. Introduction**

- 2.1. These submissions provide an update on completed and upcoming work on preparations for the final evidential hearings provisionally listed for Spring 2022.
- 2.2. Insofar as these submissions contain information and proposals in relation to next steps, it should be borne in mind that HMC may take a different view and that any IP may submit questions, challenges or alternative proposals.
- 2.3. It is important to state at the outset that the progress made to date has depended upon, and would not have been possible without, the invaluable assistance and contribution of the SP GPB team, Operation IGIL.
- 2.4. Before proceeding, we also think it appropriate to flag that parts 8-9 below contain outline facts about the deaths of the Deceased which members of their families, in particular, may not have heard before and may find distressing.

## **3. Searches for potentially relevant materials – the general approach**

- 3.1. In the Ruling on Resumption of 31<sup>st</sup> January 2019, HMC gave the following indication as to the proper scope of these inquests:

*10. Although the background to this case is unusual, the inquests themselves will have the same purpose as any other inquest in that they will seek publicly to ascertain and record: (a) who the deceased were; (b) how, when and where they came by their deaths; and (c) the particulars (if any) required to be registered under the Births and Deaths Registration Act 1953 (section 5(1) of the Coroners and Justice Act 2009). For these purposes, the “how” question must be taken to mean “by what means did each deceased*

*come by their death” (R v HMC North Humberside & Scunthorpe, ex p. Jamieson [1995] QB 1 (CA)).*

*11. Importantly, coroners courts must operate within their powers and statutory restrictions provide that they must not express any opinion or make any determinations or findings on any matters other than (a)-(c) above or frame their determinations in such a way as to appear to determine any question of criminal liability (on the part of a named person) or civil liability (on the part of any person, named or unnamed) (sections 5(3) and 10 of the Coroners and Justice Act 2009). These restrictions inevitably inform and guide coroners in the exercise of their discretion to set the scope of the issues investigated and evidence heard at any inquest.*

*12. In my view, the above restrictions mean that the resumed inquests cannot investigate the identities of the Provisional IRA terrorists who carried out the attack, any evidence pointing towards or away from any particular perpetrators or any questions relating to the conduct of the original police investigation or prosecution. I give this ruling on this basis, notwithstanding that, in due course, I will be required to undertake a more detailed assessment of the scope of the inquests....*

...

*21. ...it is not in doubt that the deceased were unlawfully killed by a team of Provisional IRA terrorists - probably comprised of eight people in two cars. What the resumed inquests can and will investigate are issues such as the time of the blast, the respective locations of the bomb and its victims, who was with the victims at the time of the blast, whether each of the deceased died immediately and, if not, how long they survived for, whether they said anything to anybody prior to their deaths and the response of first aiders and the emergency services. These are all important questions.*

*22. I take the view that the deceased, their families and the public are entitled to have these matters formally explored in open court and in proceedings which are untainted by allegations of impropriety or misconduct. Doing this will establish and record a credible and reliable account of what happened to the victims in a way that respects and honours their memory and I believe this would represent an important and worthwhile exercise.*

3.2. Disclosure searches have been guided by the above.

#### **4. Searches for potentially relevant materials – Interested Persons and other entities**

4.1. The collation of pre-existing documentary evidence is at an advanced stage, with only a few outstanding lines of enquiry being pursued.

4.2. Surrey Police:

4.2.1. Op IGIL was established approximately two years ago and charged with the collation and review of GPB materials held by SP in order to (1) assist and support the inquests and (2) facilitate the assessment of whether there are any available lines of enquiry open to criminal investigation. Op IGIL has prioritised the processing of material which appears to fall within the scope of these inquests and has provided three tranches of disclosure, with a fourth due within the next month or so.

4.3. The Metropolitan Police Service:

4.3.1. MPS has conducted searches of general, intelligence, forensic files, bomb and counter-terrorism files and databases and files at the National Archives and has liaised closely with SP to avoid the duplication of material. The results of the MPS searches have either been reconciled with Op IGIL's own materials and found to be duplicative, or have been provided to Op IGIL so that there is, as far as possible, a single conduit of material being provided to HMC. It is considered that MPS has now completed its searches for GPB material.

#### 4.4. The Ministry of Defence:

4.4.1. MOD has conducted searches of material held at: the National Archives; the MOD's Portsmouth Sensitive Records Archive; the Defence, Science and Technology Laboratory (successor to RARDE); the MOD's Digital Archive System; the 29 Explosive Ordnance Disposal and Search Group, 38 Brigade; the Scots Guards Regimental HQ; the Royal Military Police; and the Army Training Centre at Pirbright. It has also provided personnel files for WILLIAM FORYTH and JOHN HUNTER and confirmed that the personnel files for ANN HAMILTON and CAROLINE SLATER have not been retained. The MOD has liaised with SP, and Op IGIL has reviewed a large quantity of the results of the above searches, again to avoid duplication, and it is considered that its searches for GPB material are also complete.

#### 4.5. South East Coast Ambulance NHS Foundation Trust:

4.5.1. SECAmb is not an IP and it has not been able to locate any potentially relevant materials, but it has made contact with one former ambulance officer who recalls the GPB and a subsequent staff debrief at Banstead HQ. This individual has referred to an ambulance service "Major Incident Report" to which "AMB 1" forms (a type of form generated by each call received by the Service following the explosions) would have been attached. SECAmb has not retained a copy of this and CTI are making enquiries with the National Archives to see if a copy has been retained in any records relating to any of SECAmb's predecessor bodies. Those enquiries have been delayed due COVID-19 staffing restrictions at the National Archives.

4.6. Royal Surrey NHS Foundation Trust:

4.6.1. RSCH is also not an IP. The bodies of those who died at the scene of the blast were taken to RSCH and WILLIAM FORSYTH died there very shortly afterwards. RSCH has also been unable to locate any potentially relevant materials and CTI are making enquiries with the National Archives in order to check whether any records may have been deposited there by any of its predecessor bodies.

4.7. The Home Office:

4.7.1. The Home Office is not an IP, but has responsibility for the Archive of material relating to Sir John May's Inquiry.<sup>1</sup> CTI have reviewed a schedule of the Archive's contents and were given access to 11 files contained in it and assessed as potentially relevant. These were reviewed and the results were set out in a report from Junior CTI dated 11<sup>th</sup> February 2020 and circulated to IPs. Copies of the materials identified as relevant pursuant to that review have now been provided to CTI by the Home Office and some of these will form part of the disclosure process in due course.

4.8. Insofar as they are able to do so, all the IPs, SECAmb and RSCH have offered to assist with tracing former employees and staff and (in the case of SP) others identified as possible witnesses. Some preliminary enquiries have been made.

4.9. In addition to the above, HMC welcomes assistance from members of the public and has a short list of individuals who have made direct contact with his office.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Inquiry into the Circumstances surrounding the Convictions arising out of the Bomb Attacks in Guildford and Woolwich in 1974.*

## **5. Tranches of materials provided by Op IGIL**

### **5.1. Tranche 1:**

- 5.1.1. We have reviewed 580 contemporaneous witness statements given to SP by 370 individuals, including those who: (1) were in or near HGPH at the time of the blast and/or injured as a result; or (2) mention seeing one or more of the Deceased at some point on the evening of 5<sup>th</sup> October 1974. We have also reviewed summaries of a further 132 such statements given by individuals who were in the town centre on the night (mostly in SSPH) but who did not attend HGPH or see any of the Deceased at any time.

### **5.2. Tranche 2:**

- 5.2.1. We have also reviewed a further 139 witness statements from 114 individuals (civilians, healthcare professionals and emergency service personnel) who responded to or assisted with the aftermath of the blast at HGPH.
- 5.2.2. In addition to this, we are in the process of reviewing the following which were also included in Tranche 2:
- (a) Photographs (either contained in albums compiled by the original SP investigation, or loose photos collated into albums by Op IGIL);
  - (b) Photo negatives;
  - (c) Large-scale plans/charts relating to HGPH and SSPH;
  - (d) Police messages pertaining to the investigation carried out by SP at the time e.g. relating to investigative actions to be carried out, internal

messages relating to the operation of the investigative team, or messages from members of the public;

- (e) A schedule of exhibits (including physical exhibits) from the original SP investigation; and
- (f) Other documents, e.g. maps, sketches and plans of HGPH, documents relating to the continuity of the bodies of the Deceased, and explanatory reports for CTI prepared by Op IGIL.

### 5.3. Tranche 3:

5.3.1. We have also been provided with, but have not yet begun to review, the following more peripheral materials which are less likely to be relevant to the inquests:

- (a) A schedule summarising a further 746 witness statements, primarily from persons who attended HGHP or SSPH during the lunchtime period on 5<sup>th</sup> October 1974, and others who attended or passed either scene but were not able to give significant evidence, e.g. bus drivers;
- (b) Photo negatives; and
- (c) Other documents, e.g. sketch plans, floorplans, photographs and other documentation primarily relating to SSPH, along with further explanatory reports for CTI prepared by Op IGIL

### 5.4. Tranche 4:

5.4.1. These materials are due to be made available to CTI shortly, but they relate to the subsequent criminal investigation and proceedings and are unlikely to be relevant to the inquests.



## 6. First batch of disclosure to IPs of materials identified as potentially relevant

6.1. Pursuant to the above review and discussions with HMC, it is proposed that the first batch of disclosure to the IPs comprise the witness statements and exhibits (from tranches 1-2) and certain core documents (including from tranche 2) as set out below.

### 6.2. Witness statements:

6.2.1. From the 719 statements by 484 individuals within tranches 1 and 2 reviewed in full by CTI, we have identified the following as disclosable:

- (a) From tranche 1: 250 statements by 140 individuals; and
- (b) From tranche 2: 65 statements by 53 individuals.

6.2.2. Pursuant to discussions with HMC, the above comprise statements from each witness who gave a statement meeting at least one of the following criteria:

- (a) Witnesses present in HGPH at the time of the blast.

Rationale: Naturally, those who were present in HGPH at the time of the explosion give an account of the blast itself, and are also able to speak to the events immediately preceding it, thus giving an account of the circumstances in which the Deceased died (or suffered fatal injuries). The amount of detail given by witnesses as to the blast itself varies in detail and quality - some witnesses give only an extremely sparse account and it should be borne in mind that many of them were relatively young and had been drinking. However, given that the

explosion was the most significant mechanism which directly caused the death of the Deceased, it is considered important to disclose the evidence of those who experienced it first-hand. This goes to matters such as the location of the blast, its force, and its appearance to those who saw it. Some witnesses also mention a hissing sound immediately preceding the explosion.

- (b) Witnesses who saw one or more of the Deceased on the evening of 5<sup>th</sup> October 1974.

Rationale: In order to fulfil the purpose of these inquests, the chronology of what each Deceased did on the evening of 5<sup>th</sup> October 1974 is considered to be *prima facie* relevant. Although the evidence of the witnesses who saw them covers various periods (ranging from their going to Guildford shortly before the GPB to travelling around the town much earlier in the day), it is considered that the *evening* chronology from opening time at the HGPH at about 17:30 hrs is a suitable starting point for disclosure purposes.

- (c) Witnesses who were present in the aftermath of the explosion at HGPH *and* provided substantive evidence of seeing bodies and/or mentioned helping with bodies or the seriously injured.

Rationale: A number of witnesses give striking evidence of their unsuccessful attempts to assist persons who died in the blast, whilst others give a bare mention of seeing bodies under blankets. The latter kind of evidence is unlikely to be useful, and has not been identified as disclosable. CTI have also excluded persons who give a bare mention of, for example, “helping the injured” after the blast, where there is no suggestion of any involvement with the Deceased specifically.

(d) Witnesses who provide relevant expert evidence, e.g. on the nature of the blast or explosive device.

6.2.3. Based on the application of the above criteria, the remaining statements reviewed by CTI (330 from tranche 1 and 74 from tranche 2) were identified as *not* relevant and so *not* disclosable.

6.2.4. Of course, it may be that as CTI and the IPs continue to gain familiarity with the material, it becomes apparent that an unnamed person mentioned in a statement is likely to be one of the Deceased, or new matters take on particular significance or relevance. Alternatively, it may be felt that a witness who gives a sparse statement may have more to say that could assist. These matters can be the subject of further submissions by CTI and/or the IPs in due course. Accordingly, the relevance and disclosability of all materials provided by the IPs and reviewed by CTI can and will be kept under ongoing review.

6.3. Exhibited sketches and floorplans:

6.3.1. The exhibits to the disclosable witness statements - sketches and floorplans of the HGPH - will also form part of the first batch of disclosure.

6.4. Core documents:

6.4.1. Although our review of the tranche 2 materials is not complete, we have identified the following as particularly relevant and helpful and submit that they should form part of the first batch of HMC's disclosure to the IPs:

- (a) Unmarked floorplans (i.e. the documents that were used by witnesses to mark their position/movements);
- (b) Photographs of HGPH;
- (c) Maps of Guildford town centre;
- (d) Contemporaneous reports/summaries produced by SP, attending emergency services personnel and experts;
- (e) A selection of documents relating to the opening and adjournment of the original inquests, including post mortem reports;
- (f) Relevant extracts from the personnel files for WILLIAM FORSYTH and JOHN HUNTER; and
- (g) Two files from the May Inquiry Archive.

6.4.2. These core materials have been selected to enable IPs to gain a provisional overview of the events of 5<sup>th</sup> October 1974, and to contextualise the remainder of the first batch of disclosure. In particular, CTI would draw attention to two documents as being of particular assistance:

- (a) D671: A report dated 29<sup>th</sup> October 1974 prepared by DS Harding for the Chief Constable of SP; and
- (b) D1589: An overview report produced by SP and entitled “Factual Summary” (sections 1-3 and Appendices A-B only).

## **7. Sensitive information and personal data**

- 7.1. Op IGIL has reviewed the witness statements in the proposed first batch of disclosure materials and confirmed that SP does not wish to make any public interest immunity claims in relation to their contents. (One police statement by DS Donaldson goes on to deal with possible suspects in passages which fall outside the scope of the inquest and will be redacted accordingly.) Op IGIL will also review the other documents scheduled for inclusion in the first batch of disclosure and, where necessary, the Government Legal Department, as representative of the MOD and Home Office, is also being consulted.
- 7.2. In addition, we have considered whether any further redactions might be needed for privacy or data protection reasons and do not think this is necessary. In this regard, disclosure will be limited to potentially relevant materials whose disclosure can be said to be *necessary* to allow the IPs to consider and make submissions on the scope and conduct of the inquests and for the progress of the proceedings more generally. Accordingly, the disclosure of personal data within these materials falls within and is lawful under Articles 6(1)(c), (e) and/or 9(2)(f)-(g) of the UK GDPR. It will also be borne in mind that disclosure is only being made to the IPs at this stage subject to an implied undertaking prohibiting onward disclosure and collateral use.

## **8. The Horse and Groom Public House and witness evidence**

- 8.1. The following section in these submissions is intended to provide a brief and provisional introduction to the matters with which these inquests are concerned. It must be read with a clear understanding that the information set out below does not constitute and should not be treated as evidence, or in any way definitive. The evidence upon which HMC's conclusions of fact will ultimately be based will of course emerge in the course of the final inquest hearings.

## 8.2. The Horse and Groom Public House:

- 8.2.1. HGPH was situated towards the easterly end of North Street in Guildford town centre. It was a short walk from SSPH, which was situated to the southwest on Swan Lane (a passage off North Street). The pubs in this area were frequented by military personnel. On Saturday 5<sup>th</sup> October 1974, many members of the armed forces came into Guildford from training centres and barracks at Pirbright, Aldershot, Southton and Elizabeth Park in Guildford itself. A small number came from London.
- 8.2.2. HGPH was popular with military personnel at the time, particularly young women from the WRAC. Its sole entrance was on the northern side of North Street. On entering the bar, facing north, there was an amusement machine and room divider immediately to the right, behind which was a seating area and access to the gents toilets and cellar. The bar was positioned straight ahead of the entrance, perpendicular to the front wall and slightly to the right. There was a kitchen behind the bar, at the north-eastern corner of the building. Facing the bar, on the left hand / western side of the pub, there were two alcoves separated by a partition, each with tables and chairs, and bench seats around the outside. The second, northern-most alcove contained a fireplace and a jukebox against a wall and the ladies toilets were located behind this wall. The bomb exploded in the second alcove.
- 8.2.3. The damage to the pub was significant. Shortly after the blast, a hole opened up in the floor to the cellar below, through which some of the Deceased and a number of other injured persons fell. They had to be lifted up and out by rescuers.

8.3. The witness evidence:

- 8.3.1. It is clear that as part of their investigation after the bombing SP attempted to identify and take statements from, amongst others, everyone who attended HGPH from its evening opening time at 17:30 hrs. The statements taken vary in their level of detail and are not all consistent, but it is clear that the blast emanated from the second alcove adjacent to the fireplace. More precise evidence as to the location and nature of the explosive device can be found in the statement of DONALD LIDSTONE, whose examination of the debris led him to suggest the explosive device consisted of around 10lbs of explosive, located under a bench seat along the pub's external wall.<sup>2</sup> The post mortem report of Professor ARTHUR MANT suggests that the device was located directly beneath CAROLINE SLATER.<sup>3</sup>
- 8.3.2. The pub was very busy in the lead-up to the blast, filled mostly with young service personnel. As part of the original investigation, SP plotted the position of 53 individuals who were in HGPH *and* injured in the blast. Of course, there was a greater number of people in the pub at the time who escaped injury.
- 8.4. Batch 1 of the proposed disclosure also contains the statements of personnel from the emergency services (police, fire and ambulance services) who attended the scene after the blast, as well as some evidence from civilians (some with medical expertise) who went to assist. This evidence will be crucial in identifying where the Deceased were found, the precise point at which they died and the movement of their bodies. It is important to note that this evidence also paints a vivid picture of the devastation and horror of the incident.

---

<sup>2</sup> See S283.

<sup>3</sup> See S307.

## 9. Key witness groupings

9.1. From the witness evidence provided by Op IGIL and reviewed by CTI thus far, work is ongoing to identify those witnesses who are most likely to be able to provide the most significant evidence for these inquests.

9.2. It may assist those reviewing the statements to pay particular attention to the witnesses referred to below and to divide them into three broad groupings:

9.2.1. Group 1 – the CRAIG, HAMILTON & SLATER group (“the BURNS party”);

9.2.2. Group 2 – the FORSYTH & HUNTER group; and

9.2.3. Group 3 – the Responders.

9.3. Group 1: the BURNS party:

9.3.1. The individuals in this grouping are as follows:

CAROL BURNS

EILEEN BURNS

ROBERT BURNS

PAUL CRAIG

ANN HAMILTON

CAROLINE SLATER

9.3.2. 5<sup>th</sup> October 1974 was the birthday of CAROL BURNS of the WRAC, which was based at Elizabeth Park, Guildford. She had decided to celebrate her birthday at HGPH with her parents and some friends. Her parents (EILEEN and ROBERT BURNS) came to the base to pick her up. With them was PAUL CRAIG, a family friend whose own birthday



was the following day, 6<sup>th</sup> October (it was to be something of a joint celebration). CAROL BURNS and her friend SHEILA PARROTTE travelled with them by car to HGPH, arrived at around 19:00 hrs and the party based themselves in the second alcove, near the fireplace and jukebox.

9.3.3. Meanwhile, at around 19:15 hrs another group had left the WRAC camp, namely, ANN HAMILTON, JANET OLIVER, ISABELLA PRICE and CAROLINE SLATER. They caught a taxi into Guildford which dropped them outside HGPH at around 20:00 hrs. Upon arrival they went into the alcove where the BURNS party was situated, and joined the birthday celebrations.

9.3.4. The core BURNS party remained in the second alcove in HGPH until the time of the blast at 20:50 hrs. However, there were various movements of note, and the precise composition was fluid. In particular:

(a) Shortly after arriving at HGPH, SHEILA PARROTTE took CAROLINE SLATER to SSPH to show her what it looked like, but they only stayed there for a few minutes before returning to HGPH at around 20:30 hrs. CAROLINE SLATER took a seat in the second alcove once again, next to ROBERT BURNS.

(b) At around 20:30 hrs, ANN HAMILTON left HGPH with JANET OLIVER and ISABELLA PRICE, and they went to SSPH for a dance. However, it was very crowded, and they did not stay for any length of time and instead returned to HGPH. ANN HAMILTON then resumed her original seat in the alcove with the BURNS party.

9.4. Group 2: FORSYTH & HUNTER:

- 9.4.1. WILLIAM FORSYTH and JOHN HUNTER formed part of a larger group of young Scots Guards from the Barracks at Pirbright, who went into Guildford to enjoy their Saturday evening. The individuals in this group were as follows:

JAMES COOPER  
STEHEN COOPER  
ALEXANDER FINDLAY  
WILLIAM FORSYTH  
JOHN HUNTER  
ROBERT NODDLE  
BARRY RUSHTON  
BRIAN SCANLAN

- 9.4.2. The group first went to SSPH at around 19:15 hrs. WILLIAM FORSYTH and JOHN HUNTER then left that pub at around 19:30 hrs, and went to HGPH instead, arriving at around 19:45 hrs. Once there, the movement of the Deceased and their friends was more fluid, as the young men enjoyed socialising and drinking. However, it is clear that FORSYTH and HUNTER were also based in the second alcove near the fireplace and jukebox in the period leading up to the explosion.

9.5. Group 3: The Responders:

- 9.5.1. The evidence of those who responded to the blast and provided rescue assistance will be crucial for establishing when and where each of the Deceased came by their deaths. Although not all connected to each other, the following non-exhaustive list contains the *key* individuals forming part of this group:

JAMES ADAMS	Ambulance
JENNIFER AUSTIN	Civilian – nurse
ARCHIBALD BEATY	Military
ALAN BENTLEY	Police
ALEXANDER BLACK	Military
COLIN CAMPBELL	Police
ANDREA GIBSON	Police
PATRICK JOHNSTON	Police - doctor
MALCOLM KEEFE	Police
GEOFFREY LARKINS	Police
DAVID LAMBERT	Police
RICHARD NOTLEY	Hospital - doctor
MAUREEN OSBORNE	Ambulance
JACQUELINE PARRISH	Police
ERIC SNELL	Hospital - nurse
ANDREW SAUNDERS	Fire brigade
DANIEL STEWART	Civilian - doctor
CHRISTOPHER TERREBLANCHE	Hospital - doctor
STEPHEN WALSH	Military

9.6. The following key points arise from the witness evidence that has been reviewed at this stage:

9.6.1. First on scene were police officers JACQUELINE PARRISH, ANDREA GIBSON, COLIN CAMPBELL, MALCOLM KEEFE, DAVID LAMBERT and ALAN BENTLEY. They were soon joined by members of the public (in particular ALEXANDER BLACK, a recruit, JENNIFER AUSTIN, a nurse, and DANIEL STEWART, a doctor), the ambulance service and the fire brigade.

- 9.6.2. The explosion seriously damaged the floor of the pub. Two individuals who had been situated in the second alcove (JANET OLIVER and CAROL BURNS) were rescued, but the floor then collapsed, causing a number of the Deceased and other individuals (including ROBERT and EILEEN BURNS and STEPHEN COOPER) to fall into the cellar below.
- 9.6.3. In terms of the order in which the Deceased were removed from the cellar, it appears to have been - JOHN HUNTER, ANN HAMILTON, CAROLINE SLATER and PAUL CRAIG. It is not yet clear whether WILLIAM FORSYTH fell into the cellar and, if so, when he was removed.
- 9.6.4. Following the sequence above, the first person removed from the cellar was JOHN HUNTER. He was identifiable by reference to medical strapping around his chest which pre-dated the explosion. It appears that he may have initially survived the blast, as DANIEL STEWART makes reference to his shallow breathing, and PATRICK JOHNSTON refers to a weak pulse. JENNIFER AUSTIN and RICHARD NOTLEY also appear to have been involved in attempts to treat him at the scene. He may have been carried out of the cellar by ANDREW SAUNDERS and GEOFFREY LARKINS, and then dealt with by an ambulance attendant, MAUREEN OSBORNE, who administered first aid with no response. She then refers to unidentified members of an “intensive care unit” arriving at the scene and failing to resuscitate him. That occurred at around 21:20 hrs. It thus seems that he may have died at some point between being placed on a stretcher and being treated at the ambulance around that time. He was then taken to RSCH by MARUEEN OSBORNE and her driving partner PHILLIP WHITE.
- 9.6.5. The second of the Deceased to be removed from the cellar was ANN HAMILTON. She can be identified from the witness evidence by references to the pink underwear she was wearing at the time. She may

also have been alive, barely, when she was first found, based on the evidence of ANDREW SAUNDERS, who believed that nurse JENNIFER AUSTIN may have said she heard a pulse. She was transported on a stretcher to an ambulance by ANDREW SAUNDERS and DENNIS LYONS, by which point she appears to have died. She was transported in an ambulance to RSCH by DENNIS LYONS and MICHAEL LAWRENCE.

9.6.6. There is a mix of evidence concerning CAROLINE SLATER, the third of the Deceased to be removed from the cellar. It is possible that she survived the initial blast and was initially conscious, as one witness (ROBIN YOUNG) describes attempting to help a girl with both feet blown off who was screaming. In contrast, STEPHEN WALSH describes coming across an unconscious girl with a missing foot being treated by a nurse. Others (DANIEL STEWART, JOHN TAYLOR, STEPHEN COOPER and FREDERICK KNIGHT) also describe providing treatment to a girl with damaged legs and her pulse stopping and starting, before finally stopping whilst she was still in the cellar. It seems that after she died, she was carried out of the pub on a stretcher by ARCHIBALD BEATY and STEPHEN WALSH. Her body was transported to RSCH in an ambulance by RICHARD GRIFFITHS and RICHARD STYLES.

9.6.7. The last of the Deceased to be removed from the cellar was PAUL CRAIG. There is no clear suggestion that, at the time he was found, he appeared to be alive. This *may* be indicated by the statement of DANIEL STEWART, but he may also have been referring to WILLIAM FORSYTH. This requires further analysis. Those who may have been involved in carrying him out of the cellar on a stretcher include JEREMY SPINDLOVE and ANDREW SAUNDERS. He appears to have died by the time his body was placed in an ambulance along with CAROLINE SLATER and transported to RSCH by RICHARD GRIFFITHS and RICHARD STYLES.

9.6.8. WILLIAM FORSYTH was still alive when he was removed from HGPH, although there is no reason to think his injuries were survivable. It appears that ALEXANDER BLACK may be able to give relevant evidence in this regard. He (FORSYTH) was then transported to RSCH by RICHARD NICHOLLS and JAMES ADAMS. He was treated there by CHRISTOPHER TERREBLANCHE, RICHARD NOTLEY and ERIC SNELL. Resuscitation attempts were unsuccessful, and he was certified dead at 22:50 hrs.

## **10. The mechanics of disclosure**

- 10.1. We propose that the documents falling within the first batch of disclosure be made available to the IPs via the Caselines system together with an index and a notice reminding all recipients of the implied undertaking requiring confidentiality and prohibiting onward disclosure or collateral use for purposes unconnected with the inquests.
  
- 10.2. The index to the first batch of disclosure will indicate, first, if it is known that a witness has died and, secondly, our preliminary view of the relevance of each statement. In this latter regard, the index will differentiate three categories of witness: (1) key witnesses likely to be able to give important evidence who could be called (if alive and traceable) or whose statements could be read; (2) borderline witnesses who may or may not be able to supplement the evidence those in the first category; and (3) more peripheral witnesses whose statements meet the criteria for disclosure, but who are unlikely to be able to add to the evidence of others. We would suggest that HMC invites submissions from the IPs at the next PIR on our categorisation and whether live or written evidence from any particular witness is proposed or opposed.

- 10.3. Professor Thomas Hennessey, Professor of Modern British and Irish History at Canterbury Christ Church University gave expert evidence at the Birmingham Pub Bombing Inquests on the historical context of the Northern Ireland Troubles and the Provisional IRA bombing campaign on mainland Britain in 1973-1974. HMC has obtained and reviewed a copy of Professor Hennessey's instructions and report (kindly provided by HM Senior Coroner for Birmingham) and is of the view, with which we agree, that similar evidence would assist in these inquests. HMC's officer has therefore contacted Professor Hennessey's office to establish if he would be willing and able to assist and the IPs will be updated on his response. Subject to this, the IPs will be given an opportunity to comment on the appointment of any such expert and, if so, their instructions.
- 10.4. Finally, we think it important to warn the families of the Deceased that the first batch of the disclosure contains some potentially distressing evidence including:
- 10.4.1. Photographs of HGPH following the blast (*not* images of the Deceased or any injured persons/unidentified bodies, but photographs of this kind do exist and consultation about their disclosure and use will take place in due course); and
- 10.4.2. Witness statements which provide (sometimes vivid) descriptions of the immediate aftermath of the explosion and rescue attempts.

## **11. Conclusion and next steps**

- 11.1. A significant amount of progress has now been made in collating, processing and reviewing material for the substantive inquest hearings. The majority of material which is relevant to the scope of the inquests (as set out in the Ruling on Resumption) has now been provided by Op IGIL.

- 11.2. With that in mind, HMC has provisionally listed this matter for a final hearing between 7<sup>th</sup> March and 14<sup>th</sup> April 2022 (provisional hearing window, time estimate to be confirmed, but full six weeks unlikely to be needed and school holidays will be avoided if possible). Preparatory PIRs will take place on a roughly quarterly basis on 2<sup>nd</sup> July and 8<sup>th</sup> October 2021 and 14<sup>th</sup> January 2022.
- 11.3. By the time of the next PIR, IPs will have had an opportunity to consider, at least, the first batch of disclosure materials and it is submitted that they could then be invited to make submissions on: scope and whether any matters going beyond the Ruling on Resumption should fall within scope; CTI's three-fold categorisation of key, borderline and peripheral witnesses and whether any particular individuals should or should not be called or read; and empanelment of a jury.

**OLIVER SANDERS QC**

**MATTHEW FLINN**

*1 Crown Office Row, London*

24 March 2021