



HOUSE OF COMMONS
LONDON SW1A 0AA

Anna Turley MP
10 Milbank Terrace
Redcar
TS10 1ED

Telephone: 01642 485138

Chief Constable
Cleveland Police
Ladgate Lane
Middlesbrough
TS8 9EH

9th April 2018

Dear Chief Constable,

I write on behalf of one of my constituents, Michael Hopkins, a former employee of Cleveland Police, who has approached me with their concerns about the treatment of witnesses during the Operation Sacristy investigation. Whilst I appreciate that this predates your employment with Cleveland Police, I am sure you will be aware of the nature of the investigation and its outcome.

My constituent feels that their concerns have not been satisfied by the public findings of Operation Sacristy and would like some proper answers to the following questions:

1. What steps were taken by Cleveland Police to protect witnesses during the Operation Sacristy investigation into corruption allegations at Cleveland Police Authority.
2. What steps were taken by Cleveland Police to ensure that no evidence was destroyed or any witnesses were intimidated by members of Cleveland Police during Operation Sacristy.
3. Whether any individuals under investigation during Operation Sacristy were charged with perverting the course of justice.
4. Whether Cleveland Police conducted surveillance allowed under the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000 at any time during Operation Sacristy in a way which may have compromised the investigation.
5. What assessment has the force made of the effectiveness of Operation Sacristy in identifying instances of corruption in Cleveland Police and preventing similar instances occurring in future.
6. What assessment has been made of the effectiveness of the anti-corruption strategies that Cleveland Police had in place in accordance with the ACPO police integrity model prior to Operation Sacristy.
7. What discussions have taken place between HM Inspectorate of Constabulary and the Chief Constable of Cleveland Police about the terms of reference for Operation Sacristy.



HOUSE OF COMMONS

LONDON SW1A 0AA

8. What measures were in place to ensure that members of the Cleveland Police Authority did not benefit financially from any procurement or outsourcing partnership arrangements instigated by Cleveland Police prior to Operation Sacristy.
9. What measures were in place to ensure that members of Cleveland Police Authority were required to declare any relevant business interests arising from procurement or outsourcing partnership arrangements instigated by Cleveland Police prior to Operation Sacristy.
10. Whether any individuals under investigation during Operation Sacristy were charged with perverting the course of justice or witness intimidation.

To ensure that the lessons are truly learned from this appalling affair and that the mistakes are not repeated, it is vital that all relevant issues and concerns have been fully explored. Only then can the force be in a position to move on. To that end, I would appreciate if you could provide answers to the above questions.

Furthermore, my constituent, Mr Hopkins, is concerned about the withholding of evidence by Cleveland Police and way in which enquiries have been handled to date. He would like to know why a full disclosure was not made for his case at the time, and would now like the matter to be reinvestigated in order to allow for the full consideration of all evidence. Mr Hopkins feels the unconsidered evidence could have an influence on the conclusion reached and the exclusion of this material has only served to exacerbate scepticism about the Sacristy investigation.

I would be most grateful if this matter and the questions in this letter can be addressed at the earliest opportunity.

Best wishes,

Anna Turley
Member of Parliament for Redcar

CC: Barry Coppinger