

HansonYoung

Solicitors

www.hansonyoung.co.uk

Independent Police Complaints Commission

Via Email: enquiries@ipcc.gsi.gov.uk

Our Ref: AT/AD/E.Draper/130515
Your Ref:

15th May 2015

Dear Sirs,

Re: COMPLAINT TO IPCC

1. We represent Ms Ella Draper in family court proceedings in respect of a matter that arose out serious allegations made on 5th September 2014 by Ms Draper and her two children, Alisa Gareeva Dearman ("Q") and Gabriel Gareev Dearman ("P") to the Metropolitan police about satanic ritual abuse. This investigation is documented in Cris report 2419891/14 (exhibit CR1) and was investigated by a special unit at Colindale police station. The matter was remarkably concluded on 22nd September 2014 and the care proceedings were issued by the local authority in respect of P and Q. This public law family matter is being dealt with by the High Court.

The allegations are summarised at paragraph 11-15 of the public Judgement given by Justice Pauffley of the High Court Family division on 19th March 2015;

- *"In September 2014, lurid allegations of the most serious kind were drawn to the attention of the Metropolitan Police. In a variety of ways, it was suggested that P and Q were part of a large group of children from north London who had been sexually abused,*

Harrow Office

Miller House
Rosslyn Crescent
Harrow
HA1 2RZ
T: 020 8861 8374
F: 020 8861 8358
E: info@hansonyoung.co.uk

Purley Office

14 Russell Hill Road
Purley
CR8 2LA
T: 020 8668 9091
F: 020 8711 3007
E: reception@hansonyoung.co.uk

Bradford Office

Rutland House
114-116 Manningham Lane
Bradford
BD8 7JF
T: 01274 507050

This firm does not accept service by fax or email

Hanson Young Solicitors is the trading style of Hanson Young and Co Ltd.

This firm is authorised and regulated by the Solicitors Regulation Authority - SRA No. 523774

Registered office Miller House, Rosslyn Crescent, Harrow, HA1 2RZ. Company registration No. 07105980. VAT No. 156542894.

List of members available for inspection at registered office.

made to abuse one another and that they had belonged to a satanic cult in which there was significant paedophile activity.

- *Specifically, it was said that babies were supplied from all over the world. They were bought, injected with drugs and then sent by TNT or DHL to London. The assertions were that babies had been abused, tortured and then sacrificed. Their throats were slit, blood was drunk and cult members would then dance wearing babies' skulls (sometimes with blood and hair still attached) on their bodies. All the cult members wore shoes made of baby skin produced by the owner of a specified shoe repair shop.*
- *Children, it was alleged, would be anally abused by adult members of the cult using plastic penises or "willies."*
- *Christchurch Primary School in Hampstead was said to be where the "main action" occurred but at least seven other local schools were named. East Finchley swimming pool was identified as one of the other meeting venues for the paedophile ring. Rituals were performed, so it was claimed, in an upstairs room at the McDonald's restaurant where the "boss" allowed child sacrifice because he was a member of the cult. Human babies were prepared, cooked in the ovens within a secret kitchen and then eaten by cult members.*
- *It was alleged that the children's father, Ricky Dearman, was the leader of the cult and that others included the children's head teacher, Ms Forsdyke, another teacher, Mr Hollings, the priest at the adjacent church, a large number of named parents of other children, social workers, CAFCASS officers and police officers. It was said that, in all, more than a hundred people were involved in 'doing sex' to the children."*

(The full Judgement can be viewed at <http://www.bailii.org/cgi-bin/markup.cgi?doc=/ew/cases/EWFC/HCJ/2015/26.html&query=ZC14C00315&method=boolean>)

2. Our client, Ms Draper, alleges that the police investigation into these allegations was flawed, not in line with normal procedure, no prompt and effective investigation was carried out, it involved several breaches of the PACE Code and the children's rights secured under Article 3 of the ECHR.

3. Before we detail some of the irregularities within the police investigation, it should be noted that this matter has attracted publicity initially through the internet and then via the mainstream media. We understand millions of people world-wide have viewed material relating to this case which was one way or another uploaded onto the internet. Subsequently, there is a large public outcry for the police investigation to be re-opened as a matter of public interest and the integrity of the justice system as a whole. More importantly, the outcry is for a proper, prompt and effective investigation into the allegations so that P and Q are given (and seen to be given) justice so that their rights under Article 3 of the ECHR are protected, which in our client's submission, has not happened and their rights have been seriously breached.
4. It could be argued that some of the material exhibited in this compliant are protected documents, or they arise from protected documents. However, we strongly submit that this matter is in the public interest, the protected documents have been in the public domain for some time and there is a suggestion that this matter is becoming a matter of national security. Accordingly, the issue of protected documents should be overridden for the above reasons so that this compliant could be properly investigated.
5. We request that you consider this compliant in conjunction with the statutory inquiry into historic child abuse set up by The Home Secretary Theresa May lead by Justices Goddard. This inquiry, as we are aware, is *'considering whether, and the extent to which, public bodies and other important institutions have taken seriously their duty of care to protect children from sexual abuse. It will seek to address public concern over failings exposed by appalling cases of organised and persistent child sexual abuse'*.
6. We draw your attention to the comments of Theresa May in the Telegraph published on 14th March 2015 (exhibited TMT1);

"We already know the trail (historic child abuse) will lead into our schools and hospitals, our churches, our youth clubs and many other institutions that should have been places of safety but instead became the setting for the most appalling abuse. However, what the country doesn't yet appreciate is the true scale of that abuse..... how abuse is woven, covertly, into the fabric of our society."

“During one of my first meetings with survivors, one lady said to me: “Get this inquiry right and it will be like a stick of Blackpool rock. You will see abuse going through every level of society.” I fear she is right. I have said before and I shall say again, that what we have seen so far is only the tip of iceberg.”

“..where there has been a failure to protect children from abuse, we will expose it....So if there has been a cover-up, we will uncover it. And if perpetrators of child sexual abuse are found, they will be brought to justice”.

7. Our client believes that this child abuse is not historic, but woven deeply into our society today and it happens on a much larger and horrific scale. Indeed there is widespread evidence/suggestion of satanic ritual practise which has been documented;
 - in a programme by Dispatches titled “listen to the children” aired on Channel 4 in 1990,
 - The Cook report (which supposedly had 10 million viewers) Edition titled ‘The Devil’s Work’ which was aired on 17th July 1989 referring to widespread Satanism in the UK and USA . This programme was by Roger Cook who is considered Britain’s most popular journalist ever.

8. Therefore, it is submitted on behalf of the client that an investigation should not be discouraged due to the “fantastical” nature of the allegations. In any event, there is other evidence / suggestion that Satanic ritual practice exists and one would not need to look far to find it. Infact there are published books and known survivors of satanic ritual abuse who speak openly about their ordeal. For example, P and Q mention in their evidence that the alleged abusers used ‘special tools’ to peel the skin from the babies. It should be noted that there is a niche expensive market for human leather (humanleather.co.uk).

Police Investigation

9. It is summited that a proper, prompt and effective investigation was never carried out, vital evidence was not secured and possibly allowed, deliberately or negligently, to have been concealed or destroyed. This, our client strongly states, is in breach of the children’s rights under Article 3 of the European Convention on Human Rights and has allowed for a serious miscarriage of justice where the children, P and Q, and many other children still remain at serious risk.

10. The serious procedural irregularity within the police investigation is supported by the witness statements of former Detective Constable Kylie Wilson dated 28th December 2015 (exhibited as KW1). Ms Wilson specialised in sexual offences and analysed the Crime report 2419891/14 (exhibited as CR1), She criticises the police investigation and states:

- Para 31 *“The Crime Report would appear to infer that policy was not followed in this case”*,
- Para 38: *“Evidence pointing to and away from an offence must be considered. Investigators should not make assumptions that due to the unlikely or seemingly ridiculous nature of the allegation that it is untrue. If an account appears to be untrue corroboration should be sought for this also”*. This corroboration was never effectively sort to support / negate the allegations or the “retractions” of P and Q.

Particular attention should be given to the final conclusions of the witness statement.

11. Attention is also drawn to exhibit KW2, a further witness statement of former Detective Constable Kylie Wilson dated 28th December 2015 in relation to the ABE interviews of P and Q. This report concludes that it was not suitable *“to close this investigation at this point without further enquiries and corroboration being sought”*.

12. It should be noted that there was no investigative action taken against the implicated schools, the teachers, parents and members of the Social Services and the police. Other named suspects and professionals were not formally interviewed, policy was not adhered to correctly in regard to achieving best evidence in the police interviews of P and Q, and the crime report 2419891/14 (Exhibited as CR1) does not appear to have appropriate set of considerations, actions or reviews.

Child Abuse Investigation Teams.

13. It is submitted on behalf of our client that in line with normal procedure, the allegations made by the children should have been referred to the **Child Abuse Investigation Teams**, and the five specialist sections as the allegations were wide ranging and required co-ordinated investigation;

- **Major Investigation Teams** which investigate child homicide and complex abuse enquiries within a family environment.
- The **Paedophile Unit** which investigates the activities of organised paedophiles and those who manufacture and distribute paedophile material/child pornography.

- The **Hi-Tech Crime Unit** provides technical support and investigates Internet-based child abuse.
- The Safeguarding Children and Development Unit. And
- The **Ports Safeguarding Team** which are a small team of detectives based at Heathrow Airport working closely with the UK Border Agency dealing with child protection issues, which include child trafficking, child abduction and the monitoring of high-risk sex offenders entering and leaving the UK.

Our client understands that such a referral to all the specialist sections was not made and no reason is detailed in the crime report. This omission is consistent with the assertion that no effective investigation was carried out and normal police procedures were not followed or adhered to.

Arrests and lines of enquiries

14. PACE CODE G states that *“the power of arrest must be used fairly, responsibly, with respect for people suspected of committing offences and without unlawful discrimination”*. It is argued that the powers of arrest in this instance were not employed fairly or responsibly and with unlawful discrimination in that Mr Dearman, a suspect, was subject to positive discrimination as he was never arrested and never interviewed about the allegations made by the children. Infact, the powers of arrest were never exercised during the police investigation in respect of any of the alleged abusers. The only one “interviewed”, although it was an inadequate interview in our submission, was Mr Dearman. This is detailed below.

15. Under section 24 PACE 1984 and PACE 2.1 CODE G,

“ A lawful arrest requires two elements: A person’s involvement or suspected involvement or attempted involvement in the commission of a criminal offence; AND Reasonable grounds for believing that the person’s arrest is necessary.

- both elements must be satisfied, and
- it can never be necessary to arrest a person unless there are reasonable grounds to suspect them of committing an offence”

16. It is argued on behalf of our client that the arrest criteria for Mr Dearman was satisfied but yet he was never arrested by the police thereby the police breached section 24 PACE 1984 / PACE CODE G. Instead, curiously, he was invited for a caution plus 3 interview at Colindale Police station on the 15th

September 2015 where he is not arrested, free to leave at any stage, No finger prints or DNA taken, his persons nor his home address is searched and neither is his mobile phone or laptop / computer ever seized for forensic examination. Such line of enquiry would have been expected to follow after an arrest. Such line of enquiry would have been expected to follow in any event given the serious nature of the allegations. Indeed, such lines of enquiries are conducted regularly by the police for less serious allegations.

17. Additionally, Guidance note 2B of Codes of Practice – Code G Statutory power of arrest by police officers states;

“If a constable who is dealing with an allegation of crime and considering the need to arrest becomes an investigator for the purposes of the Code of Practice under the Criminal Procedure and Investigations Act 1996, the officer should, in accordance with paragraph 3.5 of that Code, “pursue all reasonable lines of inquiry, whether these point towards or away from the suspect. What is reasonable in each case will depend on the particular circumstances.”

18. It is submitted that all reasonable lines of inquiries were not pursued and the ones that remotely were was biased towards pointing away from the suspect (as detailed below).

19. Importantly, the caution plus 3 interview at the police station on 15th September 2014 was prior to any ‘retraction’ by P and Q (retraction interviews were on the 17th September 2015). We submit that the fact that he and other alleged abusers were not, and have never been, arrested when the arrest criteria had been satisfied raises concerns and strong suspicions over the manner of the investigation conducted by the police. There had been attempts, evident throughout the crime report, to minimise the need to arrest Mr Dearman. On page 12 (and onwards) of the Crime report 2419891/14, entry by DI Cannon on 6th September 2015 at 00:44 hours;

“We do not have any confirmation of a current residence for Ricky”

“I have considered *immediate arrest once the address has been identified.*”

“I recommend that **immediate arrest is not required**...the disclosure amounts to historic sexual abuse on **both children, and each will need medical examination.**”.

20. We note here that:

- When the police had confirmation of a possible current residence for Mr Dearman, officers attended and viewed the flat from the outside and determined that there was no way a secret room could be located there (the children alleged that Mr Dearman had a secret room in his house where some of the abuse took place). Pages 24 and 25 of the Cris report (CR1) refer to this;

three addresses had been identified as possible locations for the suspect of this matter, firstly 16 St Pauls place N1 - this address was visited it appears uninhabited and you look through to the basement and it can be seen as a self-contained flat in which you can see right through to the rear garden. upstairs on the ground floor is

empty and there is a fitted shelving unit in the corner but the area below can be seen and is part of the flat so it is hard to imagine where a stairway could fit. even so it would be pointless as it would be into an open flat visible through the window.

It is submitted on behalf of our client that the justification given in the Cris report is inadequate and the 'viewing' of the premises from the outside was only done in order to show that something was being done when in actual fact nothing substantive was being conducted. It is a strange fact that no search warrant was obtained for the premises and no forensic search was carried out. We submit on behalf of our client that this would have been expected in line with normal procedure.

- Even when the medical examination confirmed the allegations (see below paragraphs 30-32), no arrest was ever completed. Furthermore, the abuse was not historic in the sense that the children clearly indicated in their ABE interviews that the abuse of other children was still on-going, especially at Christ Church Primary School. A further entry in the Cris report (CR1) reads;

"DC Martin has attempted to use Google Maps with the (P) to verify the home address of Ricky. This was unsuccessful. Both victims are claim they can identify the address of the father by means of a drive around...drive around to be completed Monday 8th September 2015".

We note here that by this time, the children had provided details of other abusers and their names including Mr Hollings and Kate Forsdyke, teachers at Christ Church Primary School. They specifically stated that they had been abused at the home address of Mr Hollings and he had a cupboard / wardrobe which lead to a secret room. It is submitted that the address of Mr Hollings and Ms Forsdyke could have easily been identified by the police but they failed to do so, let alone carry out a forensic search of the home addresses which would have been expected in line with normal

procedure. Furthermore, it is submitted on behalf of our client that the “drive around” to identify Mr Dearman’s house was done to indicate that there was action and genuine attempt to substantiate the children’s account when in fact it was anything but; and to confuse rather than enlighten the children so that it could be used to undermine their accounts.

21. Page 15 (onwards) of 77, entry by DI Cannon on 8th September 2015 at 11:44 hours;

“Saturday 6th September 2015.

I briefed DCI Foulkes regarding this investigation based on the information we had we had grounds for arrest, however no fixed address for the suspect”.

22. The above demonstrates that there was already by the 6th September 2015, grounds for arrest as the arrest criteria had been satisfied. Further confirmation that the arrest criteria was fulfilled is given at Page 35 of 77 entry by DS Fernandez 10th September at 15:09

“...Ricky Dearman is the biological father of the children and has not yet been arrested due to the complexity of the allegation”

However, as stated above, he was invited for a caution plus 3 interview at the police station on 15th September 2014 where he is not arrested and free to leave at anytime. This was prior to any retraction by P and Q. This is in breach of section 24 PACE ACT 1984 and the children’s rights secured under Article 3 of the ECHR.

23. Strangely, there is no detail within the Cris report as to why and how the decision was made to invite Mr Dearman for a caution plus 3 interview when the immediate previous investigative steps suggested an arrest strategy would be discussed regarding Mr Dearman (as no doubt he was to be arrested), other named abusers and applying for Section 8 warrants for the venues of interest. There is no detail as to how or who contacted Mr Dearman. However, see paragraph 48 below.

Caution plus 3 Interview of Mr Dearman on 15th September 2015.

24. We refer to an entry in the Crime report 2419891/14 page 42 of 77, by DS Fernandez on 15th September 2014 at 16:59

*“Mr Dearman has been invited in Caution plus 3 for interview regarding one specific allegation of sexual abuse which occurred between Nov’2013 and July 2014 at Finchley swimming pool.
DC Savage Interviewing officer”*

25. It is certain from the above entry at paragraph 24 that Mr Dearman would only be questioned about one specific allegation of sexual abuse at Finchley swimming pool but there is no reasoning given for this strange ‘pick and choose allegation’ approach. Our client suggests that this is because the idea of having so many people in one go in the disabled toilets at the swimming pool abusing the children was perhaps unlikely given the size of the toilet (this is not to say something did not allegedly happen). Therefore it is submitted that Mr Dearman was questioned about this only in order to make it look like some genuine action into the allegations was being taken when in actual fact noting effective was being done.

26. Importantly and curiously, the Crime report does not provide any reasoning for why Mr Dearman was only questioned in relation to incidents of sexual abuse at the swimming pool in the disabled toilets. He is never questioned about satanic child abuse rituals or being a leader of a satanic cult or his connections with other alleged abusers. This is something that would have been expected to have been done to allow for a prompt and effective investigation (see paragraph 49 below).

27. An extract from page 42 has an entry providing a summary to the interview.

17/09/2014 15:29

DC 219414 S MARTIN

Interview caution plus 3

Start 16.20
Finish 17.08

Start 17.10
Finish 17.26

MR Ricky Demean was interview on the 15/09/2014,

He said that 1st of all the dates that have been disclosed are in correct the first time he was allowed to see his children was after he had been to court to get a order to allow him to see his children. On the 5th of July 2014 he did take the children swimming; he thinks that it was the complex in Finchley, near the a406. They went in and choose a cubicle which was a big on he choose this as he had 2 children with him. He said in side the changing room was a bench and a fold down baby changer. They all wanted to use the pool with the wave machine but this was not working. So they played with a ball around the pool. After about 1hr they have got changed all together in the large changing room.

On the 2nd time they met up they all went to London on day out they got some food from Barents health shop, they then went on a river cruse. While on the cruse his daughter has said that when she was ill the mother BF has come in to her room and given her a hot lemon drink. While doing this he has pulled her hair.

On the same trip Gabriel disclosed.
His son told him that he has walked in on his mum and her BF having sex,

17/09/2014 15:29

DC 219414 S MARTIN

Gabriel has asked what is going on. Both said nothing Gabriel told him to leave his mother alone The BF has then grabbed hold of the mother's breasts in clear view of Gabriel and told him that he can do what he likes with her.

MR Demean thinks that this has been said because

1. His wife has been telling the children what to say he said that he has witness this via Skype.
2. the mother would like to leave the UK and move to Russia, which he has refused to allow.

He said that he feels that the police should look at the reports that the Cafcass have on the mother lying and failing to care for the children.

28. The above further demonstrates that Mr Dearman was not questioned about the allegations as a whole, his connections with the other named alleged abusers and that he was part of satanic cult. Such omission raises further concerns of procedural irregularity / police cover up especially given that no reasoning for the strategy or content for the interview is detailed in the Crime Report and no doubt

there would have been a strategy and reasoning for this bizarre decision and approach. In fact, strictly speaking, our client doubts that what the children actually alleged about the incidents at the swimming pool in Finchley was put to Mr Dearman during the bizarre interview. As far as she recalls, the children alleged that aside from Mr Dearman, there were many people (alleged friends of Mr Dearman) in the swimming pool who did 'sex' to them in the disabled toilets using "plastic willies", stretching P's bottom in order to insert the plastic willies, making it bleed, the children were made to suck their "real willies" and lick the privates of the female abusers. This is detailed in the ABE interview of the children on 5th and 11th September 2014.

If Mr Dearman was to be questioned only about the incidents in the swimming pool, all of the above allegations should have been put to him as they were relevant to the swimming pool including details of the other alleged abusers and the abuse. There is no explanation as to why Mr Dearman is only questioned about a specific incident, which strictly speaking, never actually occurred as it was never alleged in that manner?

29. There appears to be a clear reluctance from the police investigators to address the allegations as alleged by the children. It is apparent not only from the Crime report and the various interviews, but also from the curious handling of the recordings and short video clips provided by Officer Jean Clement Yaohirou (see paragraph 35+ below) and the overall failure to follow up investigative leads.

Dr Hodes evidence available during the Caution Plus 3 Interview (which should have been an interview under arrest)

30. Dr Deborah Hodes was **instructed by the police** to conduct medical examinations of the children. Her reports and evidence was within the care proceeding papers. According to the University College Hospital website:

"Deborah Hodes is a Consultant Community Paediatrician in the community trust for the London Borough of Camden and at University College London Hospitals. Deborah studied medicine at the Royal London Hospital and trained in paediatrics Deborah is a fellow of the Royal College of Paediatrics and Child Health and has an active role there as a co-opted member of the Child Protection Standing Committee and writes for their publications. She represented the College on the Inquiry into Child Sexual Exploitation that reported in 2013 and now is the representative on the Children's Commissioners Inquiry into child sexual abuse.

“Her key interest is in safeguarding children. She is Designated Doctor in Child Protection in Camden. She teaches both locally and nationally and at UCLH she leads the student teaching of community paediatrics. At UCLH her clinic includes the assessment of children with complex safeguarding presentations including historic sexual abuse.”

Therefore Dr Hodes is a well experienced and a profound medical expert in her field

31. We understand that Dr Hodes completed a medical examination of P and Q and provided a report to the police on the 15th September 2015 (exhibit DH1) stating:

“(Q) has physical signs that support his allegations of both physical and sexual abuse”

“There was evidence of findings consistent with the allegations given by (P). These were of inflicted physical injury – physical abuse and insertation of a blunt penetrating instruments into her anus”

In addition, there is an entry on the Crime report on page 40 of 77 at 16:49 on 15th September 2014 by DS MJ Fernandez that Dr Hodes had confirmed the;

“injuries to the children and that the child had implicated...his father for causing injuries to the anus area”.

32. It is important to note that Mr Dearman was interviewed without arrest by the police on 15th September 2014 between 16:20 and 17:26 hours, clearly within the period that Dr Hodes provides her confirmation of the injuries and the abuse *(at 16:49 on 15th September 2014)*. It is a fact that at this stage of the investigation, there had been no ‘retractions’ by the children (which were made on 17th September 2014) and Dr Hodes medical examination had not been criticised by Mrs Justice Pauffley. The Police had no reason to ignore the findings of Dr Hodes whom they themselves had instructed. Indeed she was instructed on her ability. This supporting evidence would have triggered further grounds for **immediate** arrest under PACE CODE G and, Mr Dearman in our submission, should have been arrested and his phone / computer/other relevant property identified and seized for evidential purposes and his premises and other places of interest searched to secure evidence and to allow for a prompt and effective investigation at the very least. In line with normal procedure, his laptop / computer should have been seized and forensically examined for relevant material, his mobile phone forensically examined to determine any connection with abusers and the mobile phone should

have been cell sited to identify his whereabouts during the weekdays, especially during the school hours. This procedure was not adhered to and no explanation is given for the positive discrimination in the crime report or any papers that our client has seen. This is further evidence of serious PACE breaches and the rights of the children under Article 3 of the ECHR.

Distinguishing Marks, audio recordings made by Officer Jean Clement Yaohirou and various short films clips of the children

33. As a logical technique of identifying individuals or suspects, it is a common practice amongst police to note distinguishing features or marks particular to the individual concerned. The children documented such distinguishing marks on the alleged abusers and there are drawings made to assist in identifying the marks. Please find attached Exhibit PP1; various drawings of abusers showing in detail the distinguishing marks and dairy notes detailing some specifics of the allegations. We believe these documents were provided to the police during the investigation stage.

34. There is no explanation in the Cris report (CR1) as to why the alleged perpetrators with distinguishing marks were not at the very least invited for a medical examination to verify or rebut the allegations, after all, it was within the police knowledge as demonstrated at Page 31 of 77 entry by DI Cannon on 9th September 2014 at 16:43:

*“Email from Sara Kundu (Speciality Doctor in child and Adolescent Psychiatry)
Re the Dearman Family, as reported to me by Jean-Clement Yaohirou....
...Jean-Clement told me he was struck by the amount of detail given to him by the children themselves eg. Detailed description of unusual features of the alleged perpetrators genital regions which made him feel that the allegations had a likelihood of being true”.*

Yet no explanation is given to the lack of investigation in this regard. Since these allegations were made, the onus was on the police to investigate and rebut them, which as we are aware, never happened. This highlights another failing in the police investigation and raises serious suspicions of a cover up.

35. These distinguishing marks and other details of the allegations were further documented in great DETAIL in the audio recordings made by Officer Jean Clement Yaohirou (the children first spoke to him about the allegations and he recorder them) and in the various films clips of the children that

found their way onto the internet. Please notes that this various film clips were made by the client and her boyfriend, Mr Christie whilst in Morocco in order to secure the allegations made by the children. They contained great detail about the abuse, the abusers, and the satanic rituals including the murder and cannibalism of babies.

36. However, we understand that the audio recordings made by Officer Jean Clement Yaohirou and the various films clips of the children was concealed or at the very least, not made available to the officers involved in the investigation. The investigative police officers failed to review the recordings prior to making a 'hasty' decision to conclude its investigation without, in our submission, a prompt and effective investigation. The investigation was concluded in just over two weeks.
37. The fact that such evidence was not made available to the investigative officers raises the possibility that other vital evidence may have also been misplaced, concealed or not even secured. Valid or even essential lines of enquiry for an effective investigation may not have been properly explored or disclosed. These pieces of evidence which if considered could have led the investigation to having *taken an entirely different course*. This highlights another serious irregularity in the police investigation that needs further attention.

Secret Rooms and locations of alleged Satanic Ritual Abuse activity

38. The secret rooms within Christ Church, houses of the alleged abusers, and Macdonald's which the children have described in great detail in the short video clips should have been thoroughly investigated. We exhibit the drawings of the location of some of these secret rooms in Christ Church and Mr Dearmans house as SR1. We understand that the police were in possession of these documents.
39. Secret rooms for child abusers is not uncommon, as documented in the now infamous case of "Fritzl" where he kept his victims captive in a concealed corridor part of the basement are of the large family house. It is not accepted that two police officers attending the church without notice and having a "good look around was sufficient to identify the secret room and investigate fully this line of inquiry. This, our client suggests, was to give the impression that some investigation was being done when in actual fact nothing effective and in line with procedure was being done. The police should have attended in numbers with a search warrant and a forensic team so that the area could be secured and a proper and thorough examination of the church could take place for blood amongst other things. The

same should have happened with the alleged abusers homes, the 7 local schools including Christchurch Primary School in Hampstead which is said to be where the *main abuse* occurred. Also, there was no forensic search conducted at East Finchley swimming pool which was identified as one of the other meeting venues for the paedophile ring. The police failed to follow this obvious line of inquiry and there is no explanation given in the crime report as to its failings / decisions.

40. Page 9 of the Crime report 2419891/14 states that on 5th September 2014, "*Forensic opportunities unknown at this time*" and "*no scene to preserve*". This is unusual given the heavy details of the allegations and the fact that P in her interview invited the police to attend Hampstead Christchurch Primary School in the morning where they could catch the abusers in action. Therefore it is clear that the crime scenes for forensic analysis were obvious and apparent but search warrants were never obtained or execute where they should have been. This further highlights the serious irregularities in the police investigation which supports the assertion that a police 'cover up' has taken place.

CCTV

41. It is submitted that the police failed to consider viewing or securing any CCTV from the alleged crime scenes such as Christ church Primary School and Christ Church. There is no consideration within the Cris report (CR1) concerning the line of enquiry into the presence of CCTV footage at the relevant crime scenes let alone efforts to secure any CCTV footage evidence. This highlights further procedural irregularities within the police investigation which suggest that a prompt and effective investigation never took place.

Crime report 2332233/11

42. Furthermore, your attention is drawn to Crime report 2332233/11 (Relevant pages Exhibit as CR2) which was part of the evidence considered in the care proceedings.

The incident refers to sexually explicit text messages from Mr Dearman to our client in October 2011 that distressed her. The messages were sent out of the blue and it is understood there had not been any contact between the two for two years. The content was that he "had been having vivid dreams about our client with 'Big boy' (apparently a reference to sex toys) and that his dreams were about our client being with 3 men (1 black and 2 white) and her being under the sheets with them" having "intercourse... whilst he stood in the room watching". Mr Dearman admitted to sending the texts but that they were taken out of context.

Our client submits that these text messages suggest that Mr Dearman has obscene and unnatural sexual fantasies. This would have been, or should have been, within the knowledge of the police officers investigating the allegations made by the children. There is no reference in the Cris report 2419891/14 (CR2) to this and whether this matter was even considered to be relevant. Our client submits that it highlights another failing on the part of the police investigation.

Retraction interviews

43. The “retraction” interviews took place on the 17th September 2015 whilst P and Q were in the custody of the possible alleged abusers (members of the Police Service, Social Services and CAFFCASS). The retractions themselves were inconsistent and do not give the same sources of material as to where they got their ideas from for touching, whether they touched or not, where the idea of plastic willies came from etc. Q’s retraction appears to be confused and he appears to be lead through it by the Police interviewer, DC Martin. This raises further concerns of cover up and therefore the possibility that the retractions may have been coerced should have been considered especially given the confirmation of sexual abuse by the medical evidence, and the suggestion by Kylie Wilson in her witness statement dated 29th December 2015 that the nature of the “abuse and by whom is unfortunately tainted by the questioning and handling of this matter”. The interviewing officer fails to ask about details of the actual abuse and of the abusers in order to identify them but instead seems to largely concentrate on the surrounding items of the crime scenes (i.e. the types of tables in a abusers home the carpet, the clothes in a wardrobe etc.).

Our client notes that during the interviews of P and Q, DC Martin even goes as far as asking Q to describe one of the “best times” at the swimming pool that he can remember to which Q replies “I did not like it”. Our client states that imagine reporting to the police that you have been abused and tortured on several occasions and the police ask you to describe one of the “best times!” Our client seriously questions the intentions of DC Martin during the police interviews and the nature of questions he asked and / or that he failed to ask.

Part Analysis of Retraction interview of Q

44. Below is a part analysis of the retraction of the allegations of “killing of babies”. Our client submits that this retraction was subtly coerced and only after heavy prompting;

Interviewing Officer IO): "So when we was (sic) in the car there was something you desperately wanted to tell me but I asked you to wait until the interview, what is it you really wanted to tell me?"

This clearly indicates that the matter has been discussed beforehand and the suggestion is that it was in breach of PACE Codes and another irregularity in the investigation procedure.

Initially witness Q states that the mother's partner told him to say that Dad hurt him really bad but he didn't.

IO: "We talked in two other interviews didn't we?"

Q: "Yeah"

IO: "Was what you told me the truth?"

Q "Yeah" Affirmation 1.

IO "So all that stuff about the babies...."

Q "Yeah." Affirmation 2.

IO "and the Church and all that?"

Q "No the babies, well the babies, there is some of the babies killed yeah." Affirmation 3.

IO "OK, are you sure?"

Q, starting to give in: "Yes, but not much, not every single day, not every single day killed no. Not like that." Affirmation 4.

At this point it is submitted that Q is trying to tell the truth and please the adult, he can tell that the Interviewing Officer is not happy at what he is hearing, so he tries to do both. He sticks to his honest story but he tries to minimise it over and over stating things such as, "not every day" and "not all the time" and "not that much." before the penny drops and he realises that a retraction is required.

Q has repeated his earlier allegations of murder from the previous interviews and affirmed them now four times in this interview. At this point the interviewing officer provides for further leading questions.

IO: "Cos I heard you watched a film Zorro, is that right?"

Q: "Yeah."

IO: "and there was someone kill.... killed there someone was killed there.weren't there? Because it sounded to me like, what it sounded to me was similar to the story you told

about the babies. And that's why I was a bit (sic) wondering wondering. are babies actually killed?"

Q: "Yeah". Fifth affirmation. Ignored.

IO: "or is that something you've been made to say?"

Q: "Yeah it is something I was made to say."

IO: "Are babies being killed?"

Q: "No, not much but there is yeah." Sixth affirmation.

IO "By who?"

Q "By my dad. Not much" Seventh affirmation.

It is submitted that the interviewing officer inexplicably completely refuses to pursue the obvious line of questioning here. He has been told that the father specifically killed babies, neither pertain to the movie Zorro, so any reasonable interviewer would solicit further details, When did it happen? Where did it happen? Who else was there? What time of the day did it happen? What day of the week? How many times? etc and if the story was not true it would obviously collapse under scrutiny once all those details were provided. How many times does a witness have to say that something has happened before it is acted upon? The interview continues;

IO "Are you sure? It's ok If it hasn't happened it's ok as long as we talk about it now."

This, it is submitted on behalf of our client, is an indirect intimidation for Q to retract his allegation otherwise it won't be ok. The Court should bare in mind that P and Q made it very clear in their previous interviews and the short video clips that they feared for their life if they continued with their allegations.

Our client submits that in the face of barely veiled threats, having reaffirmed seven times even upon prolonged badgering, Q finally understands what he is 'supposed' to say and now debunks the "dead babies" claim obeying the obvious instructions of the Interviewing Officer and retracts this allegation. It is submitted that this methodology adopted to extract the retraction is in breach of the children's Rights under Article 3 of the ECHR and raises further suspicions of a cover up and the retraction interviews should have been inadmissible as evidence.

Were all allegations Retracted?

45. Significantly, it submitted that the abuse at the swimming pool in the disabled toilets is confirmed by Q and not retracted on the 17th September 2014 or on any other date.

IO: Oh ok. And what about...you told me about obviously the swimming pool, you told me lots of people in this disabled toilets and they done stuff with your willy

Q: Yeah yeah that that's true. That is true, yep.

P: It's true, even though you said you were only 4 and you hadn't been to that school.

Q: No, they had they had like..they were friends like teachers like I know I only was 4 years old but my sister was in the school when I was 4 years old.

The Interviewing officer does not challenge this story. Instead he seeks reconfirmation of the other retractions.

IO: OK. S S So... what we'll do, we'll try and sort out what's true and what's not true. So the babies, it's not true

Q: ...no..

IO: no babies being killed, no baby skulls...secret rooms, are there any secret rooms?

Q: No.

IO: What about with the wardrobes....

Q: No, no, look, no that's not true

IO: cupboards

Q: No. Yeah. I ??????. Abraham made me say that, He said, Where's the secret room. He said where the secret ????????" My Dad is the main person doing the sex...so um he is the main person...Abraham accused me of saying he got the most secret rooms..

IO: So..has your..have you been to a house of your Dad's with secret rooms?

Q: No..

IO: So there's no secret rooms...

Q: No..

The Interviewing officer seeks reconfirmation of the same elements - no babies killed, no skulls, no secret rooms – at other points in the interview (as well as of the Mr Hollings topic introduced after the first summary confirmation). The Interviewing officer again ignores the topic of the swimming pool/disabled toilets.

IO: OK, so we know there's no baby skulls {Q shakes head} no babies being killed {Q looks up} your Dad hasn't got any secret rooms {Q shakes head} you haven't been to Mr Hollins' house {Q shakes head}. OK..

Thus this topic of “doing stuff with your willy” in the disabled toilets at the swimming pool has not been retracted and the suggestion is that not all the allegations were retracted thereby rendering the Judgement wholly or partly unlawful.

Follow up investigation after the 'Retraction' interviews?

46. In addition, the “retractions” had implicated a child at Christ Church primary called “Sophie”. There is no evidence or information to confirm what, if any, actions were taken against identifying Sophie

and confirming the content of the retractions made by P and Q which would have added support to the retractions. Infact, there is no supportive investigative evidence to support the retractions. Our client finds it difficult to accept how two interviews of each children, phone recording by officer Jean-Clement Yaohirou, the short video clips and the medical evidence was dismissed in favour of a single retraction interview of each child where there are vast inconsistencies. It is suggested on behalf of our client that the interviews of 17th September were designed for the sole purpose to illicit retractions from P and Q. The interviewing officer seems to take great care in getting 'hurried' retractions without probing the retractions for any detail. This is, our client suggest, because any further probing would prove the 'retractions' to be untrue. The above raises further concerns about the intention of the police investigative team and the breach of the children's rights under Article 3 of the ECHR

47. On separate but related note in relation to the retraction interviews, We draw the Courts attention to notes which we believe are from the foster carer of the children written after they were removed from the our clients care on 11th September 2014. This document is exhibit as FC1 and it was part of the care proceeding Court bundle of papers. Following are disturbing extracts taken from this exhibit, and we take no comfort in repeating this;

"(P) said that when she goes to the church Daddy & Mr Hollings are there. Mr Hollings told her to come here to pull your knickers down and bend over & puts cream on her bottom & gives her a long chewy sweet called refresher...Mr Hollings says..if it hurts bite hard on the chewy sweet then its not painfull.

I find both children very odd in somethings (Q) seems sad at times, he finds it difficult to know how to play with toys.

She (P) said daddy gets a plastic willy & sticks it or puts it in their bottoms it really hurts (both children confirm this). He's allowed because he is daddy and it is their secret, if they tell anyone their daddy said both children will go to jail. When they go to his friend's house the friends are also allowed to do it to them.

Daddy said women have babies and they can't afford to feed or clothes them so they are killed and he drinks the blood & eats them. Both kids said they had drunk blood & ate flesh which was from a baby...

Q always talks about violence, blood, cutting of limbs..”

Curiously, there is mention of P and Q whispering after seeing some Vaseline saying it was what was used on “our bottoms”.

The document continues on to significantly state that on “Tuesday 30th Sept” P retracts the allegations saying that everything was made up about “the sexual things” and her and other children (likely from the school) had shown each other their private parts after Sophie showed her pictures of “willies” and Sophie has pictures on her “Ipad”. It is curious that the suggestion by the author is that the allegations were repeated by the children after the 17th September 2014 (date of ‘retraction’ interviews) and not retracted until the 30th September 2014. This our client suggests is further evidence that the children were coerced to make the retractions statements during the interviews of 17th September 2014 as they were still repeating the allegations to the author of this document.

More Importantly, there is no mention of Q retracting the allegations of sexual abuse after having repeated them to be true to the author of that document.

FRESH EVIDENCE

48. The following evidence has come to light since Mr Dearman gave an interview to Victoria Derbyshire of the BBC, which was broadcasted on Monday 20th April 2015. Victoria Derbyshire introduces the interview in the following way;

“He (Mr Dearman) explained when he first heard about the claims being made against him”

Mr Dearman states;

“it was 2014, um, September. And um I can’t remember how, But I I I found out that the police were looking for me. It might have been social services got in touch with me and and and said that you need to go to the police station and I am and the children have been taken away from your mum and I am saying Why why why have they been taken away from their mum whats going on and they weren’t telling me anything and I was kinda freaking out a little bit”

The above identifies how Mr Dearman was contacted. It is very curious that it was the Social Services that contacted him, with relative ease it seems, whilst the police were failing to locate his

whereabouts. Our client seeks to know how and why the Social Services contacted Mr Dearman and not the police who were investigating the matter. The fact that social services contacted him would have given him, in theory, sufficient time to conceal, hide or destroy relevant evidence to the investigation.

It should be noted that the children alleged that members of the social services and police were involved in the abuse. The police have purported they were unable to contact Mr Dearman even after investigation into several of his known addresses and a drive around with P and Q to identify his residence. However, it appears that social services, who were liaising with the police, were able to contact him by telephone without much difficulty. This raises concerns about the manner the investigation was carried out and echos the comments of Kylie Wilson in her statement (exhibited as KW1) that "*Social Services input may have had an influence on investigators*".

It is submitted that this is further evidence in support as to why the police should reopen the investigation and investigate in a prompt and effective manner which they failed to do so.

49. We draw your attention to further strange and curious comments made by Mr Dearman during the aforementioned BBC programme that seriously undermine his credibility;

Victoria Derbyshire: "And what did the police say to you, that you've been accused of?"

Mr Dearman: "They said, I am ok with what they said it was um, it was more that its come from my children. They said that I, I'm the leader of a satanic, satanic sex cult, paedophile ring and there's 100 and plus involvement in this including cafcass, the police, social services, schools and I am the I am the leader of this and..I am sat acrosss, and they are recording this, I'm sat there across from the table from the police officer asking the questions, and I don't know how to answer that"

Victoria Derbyshire: "What was your reaction?"

Mr Dearman: "Quiet difficult to have a reaction, I was kinda ok because it was ludricious, it was the fact that my children had said this"

The comments made above by Mr Dearman are in grave contradiction with what the police interviewed him about. Mr Dearman makes it clear that he was in a recorded interview with the police officers when he was questioned about this and there is no reason to doubt that he is not talking about the same interview on the 15th September 2014 as this was the only time we understand that he was interviewed.

These comments made by Mr Dearman on National TV seriously undermine his credibility in respect of anything he has claimed or said during the actual 'flawed' interview, and in the care proceedings especially in relation to our client and the allegations made by the children. Given that the safety of the children is of most importance, these comments by Mr Dearman should be considered by the IPCC and all others involved with an abundance of caution, concern and alarm.

Online Researchers

50. The lack of investigation by the police and the disclosure of some of the care proceeding documents online has had a massive impact on the general public. We understand that more than 30 million people worldwide have viewed the various related material online and the numbers are growing. This has consequently led to a unique situation where concerned members of the public have been conducting their own investigations in order to, in their views, protect P and Q and ascertain whether the children allegations are truthful or not. Our client submits on their behalf that they are not *evil* nor *foolish* but just a concerned public who request that a full, prompt and effective investigation is carried out by the police.

51. One such research organisation is hampsteadresearch.wordpress.com. Though we do not encourage such research (as it is the job of the police), our client cannot verify their findings but invites the IPCC to browse their website and view the work they have done. A summary of their findings is exhibited as HR1 for informational purposes only. Please also view the following links;

<https://hampsteadresearch.wordpress.com/vid-19-when-tricky-met-vicky/>

<https://hampsteadresearch.wordpress.com/vid-21/> (Who is involved).

52. The online researchers allege, with some sort of evidence, that an IP address linked to Mr Dearman has links to child pornography and prostitution. One of these links has advertisements for the sexual service of a 9 year old girl named with the same name as P (see comments on exhibit HR1 and video number 17 titled "Dearman Child Pornographer?" on the Hampstead research website). An anonymous IT expert analysis of how the IP address is linked to Mr Dearman is exhibited as HR2. Although, our client cannot verify the truth of these findings, it is submitted that this provides further reason for an official, transparent investigation to be launched as a matter of urgency and public interest. The public outcry demonstrated by the fact that they feel they need to do their own investigations highlights the serious concerns of the general public about the integrity of the officers involved in the police investigation and of the safety of the children.

53. It is argued that the fact that the public feel they have to take investigation into their own hands in itself highlights the failings of the police investigation and the integrity of the police and the Justice system.

Conclusion

54. The police have a duty to conduct investigations into particularly severe violent acts perpetrated by private parties in a timely and efficient manner. It is submitted that there had been systemic failings by the police in investigating these allegation perpetrated by Mr Dearman and other abusers which amounted to a serious breaches of PACE and of the children's rights secured under Article 3 of the European Convention on Human Rights.

55. Accordingly, it is submitted that the investigation should be reopened and an investigation to the failings of the police investigation should also be launched. This is in the interest of Justice, public interest and the integrity of the justice system as a whole.

Should you have any queries please do not hesitate to contact us.

Yours faithfully



Hanson Young & Co