

Operation Linden South

Investigation into the evidence of Mr Shaun
Wright at the Home Affairs Select Committee
(HASC) 9 September 2014

Independent investigation report

> Investigation information

Investigation name:	Operation Linden South
IOPC ¹ reference:	2015/058025
Investigation type:	Complaint
IOPC office:	Croydon
Lead investigator:	Lauren White
Case supervisor:	Helen Reid
Director General delegate (Decision maker):	Sarah Green
Status of report:	Final
Date finalised:	17/08/2018

¹ On 8 January 2018, the Independent Police Complaints Commission (IPCC) became the Independent Office for Police Conduct (IOPC). We have referred to ourselves as the IOPC within this report.

> Contents

> Introduction	4
> The investigation	5
> Criminal offences under investigation	5
> Summary of the evidence	6
> Next steps	20
> Summary for publication	20
> Appendix 1: The role of the IOPC	22
> Appendix 2: Terms of reference	24
> Appendix 3: People referred to in this report.....	26

> Introduction

The purpose of this report

1. I was appointed by the IOPC to carry out an independent investigation into a complaint against former Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) Mr Shaun Wright. Professor Jay's Report into Child Sexual Exploitation (CSE) in Rotherham was published in 2014. Following this, a Home Affairs Select Committee (HASC) was held. Mr Wright gave evidence, on oath, as a witness at the HASC. Two complainants, Complainant A and Complainant B, alleged that Mr Wright lied while giving evidence. This came to the attention of the IOPC on 2 December 2015 as a complaint referral.
2. Following an IOPC investigation, the powers and obligations of the Director General (DG) are delegated to a senior member of IOPC staff, who I will refer to as the decision maker for the remainder of this report. The decision maker for this investigation is Regional Director Sarah Green.
3. In this report, I will provide an accurate summary of the evidence and attach or refer to any relevant documents. I will also provide sufficient information to enable the decision maker to:
 - set out their opinion on whether any person under investigation may have committed a criminal offence
 - decide whether they should refer any matter to the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS)
4. Where article 2 or 3 of the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) is engaged, this investigation is also intended to assist in fulfilling the state's investigative obligation by ensuring as far as possible that the investigation is independent, effective, open and prompt, and that the full facts are brought to light and any lessons are learned.

Other investigations

5. This investigation is connected to Operation Linden within the Directorate of Major Investigations (DMI) North. Operation Linden is an investigation into the police response to allegations of CSE in Rotherham.

Background information about Shaun Wright

6. Mr Wright was the Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council (RMBC) member for Children's Services from 2005 to 2010. In 2012 he was elected as the South Yorkshire PCC, the role he held when giving evidence at the HASC in 2014. Mr Wright was giving

evidence in relation to his time as the Cabinet Member of Children's Services. He resigned from his role as South Yorkshire PCC in September 2014.

> The investigation

Terms of reference

7. Sarah Green approved the terms of reference for this investigation on 15 June 2017. The terms of reference can be seen in full in appendix 2, however, in brief they are:
8. To investigate:
 - a) The allegations made in respect of the appearance by Mr Shaun Wright in front of the HASC on 9 September 2014. In particular whether evidence given, on oath, to the committee by Mr Wright during his appearance on 9 September 2014 was in any way misleading.
 - b) To identify whether any subject of the investigation may have committed a criminal offence and, if appropriate, make early contact with the Director of Public Prosecutions (DPP). On receipt of the final report, the Commission delegate shall determine whether the report should be sent to the DPP.

> Criminal offences under investigation

9. The criminal offences considered in this investigation were as follows:

Perjury

10. The Perjury Act 1911, Section 2, defines perjury outside of judicial proceedings as:
*"False statements on oath made otherwise than in a judicial proceeding.
If any person—
(1) being required or authorised by law to make any statement on oath for any purpose, and being lawfully sworn (otherwise than in a judicial proceeding) wilfully makes a statement which is material for that purpose and which he knows to be false or does not believe to be true."*
11. Perjury is a dishonesty related offence, in this case before government officials.
12. Perjury is regarded as *"one of the most serious offences on the criminal calendar because it wholly undermines the whole basis of the administration of justice"* (Chapman J in R v Warne (1980) 2 Cr.App.R (s) 42)).

Allegations about locally elected policing bodies

13. Since 16 January 2012 certain complaints or allegations to Police and Crime Panels (PCPs) fall within the remit of the IOPC.
14. PCPs are required to refer to the IOPC serious complaints and conduct matters concerning PCCs, the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC) and their respective deputies which constitute or involve, or appear to constitute or involve, the commission of a criminal offence.

> Summary of the evidence

15. In order for the decision maker to reach their opinion, I have presented a summary and analysis of the evidence. During this investigation, a volume of evidence was gathered. After thorough analysis of all the evidence, I have summarised that which I think is relevant and answers the terms of reference for my investigation. As such, not all of the evidence gathered in the investigation is referred to in this report. However, the methodology of the investigation, including key decisions made, strategies that were set, and details of people referred to in this report, are included in the attached appendices.
16. This report will refer to an organisation called 'Risky Business'. Risky Business was a part of the Council's Youth Services, set up to provide help for people between 11 and 25 years of age. Professor Jay describes Risky Business in her report as "*the first Council service to develop a special concern for child sexual exploitation (CSE)*". Professor Jay also stated that it was funded through various sources.
17. I have summarised the seven key pieces of evidence referred to in this report below.
 - 1) **Professor Alexis Jay's report on her Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Exploitation in Rotherham 1997–2013.** The report explored the prevalence of CSE in Rotherham during the relevant years, and the role that various organisations played in tackling or failing to effectively tackle it. In the executive summary, Professor Jay stated "*collective failures of political and officer leadership were blatant*". Specifically in relation to Mr Wright, Professor Jay lists the reports he received, which I have detailed in the 'Timeline of reports' below. The report led to the HASC meeting at which Mr Wright gave evidence under oath.
 - 2) **The evidence Mr Wright gave at the HASC meeting on 9 September 2014.** He stated that he could not recall speaking with survivors or victims of CSE about their experiences during his time as Cabinet Member for Children's Services. He also stated that he received only four reports in relation to CSE while a Cabinet Member, none of which highlighted the extent of CSE in Rotherham at the time.
 - 3) **The MG15 transcript of Mr Wright's interview under criminal caution on 16 April 2018.** This included a prepared statement which he read at the beginning of the interview. In his prepared statement Mr Wright explained that he received four reports during his time as Cabinet Member. He stated that he believed the reports Complainant A said he had seen were not any of the four that he received. Mr Wright also explained

that he did not, and still does not recall, speaking with a victim of CSE about their abuse. He also denied lying under oath. He stated that he still held a copy of one of the four reports he had been sent, and agreed to provide it for this investigation. He then exercised his right not to answer any further questions during his interview.

- 4) **The evidence Joyce Thacker² gave at the HASC meeting on 9 September 2014.** In such evidence, Ms Thacker stated that Mr Wright received annual reports which detailed the extent of the work that Risky Business was doing.
 - 5) **A complaint by Complainant A that they believed Mr Wright lied when giving evidence at the HASC.** Complainant A provided a witness statement in which they said they witnessed Mr Wright speaking with survivors of CSE at a barbeque for Risky Business. They also stated that they prepared two reports. One, requested by Mr Wright, detailed the work that Risky Business had done, including detailed information about victims and survivors and the intelligence it had gathered. The second was in relation to the 'Xs'. Complainant A did not provide any further details about this report, but stated that Mr Wright "got a copy" of it.
 - 6) **A complaint by Complainant B that they believed Mr Wright lied when giving evidence at the HASC.** Complainant B is a survivor of CSE, who stated they spoke to Mr Wright about their experiences of abuse in Rotherham. Mr Wright stated at the HASC that he did not recall such an event. Complainant B declined to give a statement in relation to this investigation.
 - 7) **An 'Annual Report on the Protection of Young People in Rotherham from Sexual Exploitation'.** The report was presented at the Cabinet Member for children and young people's services meeting on 9 July 2008. Mr Wright provided a copy of the report for this investigation and stated it was one of the four reports he received. He stated, during interview under caution, that it was the only report he was still in possession of.
18. Some further potential witnesses were identified from the statement of Complainant A. However, their evidence was not sought as the efforts required were not proportionate to the evidential value they could add to the investigation.

² Joyce Thacker was Rotherham Council's Director of Children Services at the time.
Operation Linden South – Shaun Wright: final redacted report

> Timeline of reports

	Date	Title	Content	Referenced by	Seen by IOPC?
1.	2005	State of the nation report from the 'Strategic director' deputies, requested by Mr Wright to bring him "up to speed with issues in relation to the Children and Young People's Service department."	Unknown. However, Professor Jay stated in her inquiry report that it did not mention CSE.	Mr Wright at the HASC and Professor Jay in her inquiry report.	No. I did not source this document as it is not contested, nor would it add evidential value to the investigation.
2.	2006	'Violence and Gun Crime: Exploitation, Prostitution and Drug Markets in South Yorkshire'	According to Professor Jay (in her inquiry report) some of the main findings of the report were: <i>"The situation in 2006 in Rotherham was described as continuing 'as it has done for a number of years, with an established sexual exploitation scene which was very organised and involved systematic physical and sexual violence against young women... The author emphasised the importance of the attitude taken to these crimes"</i>	Professor Jay in her inquiry report. Professor Jay did not state that Mr Wright received this report. She stated it was "circulated to all agencies in the Rotherham Drugs Partnership".	Yes. The report author did not state that Mr Wright received this, nor did Complainant A. Mr Wright was questioned about whether he had seen the report at the HASC, which he denied. No other allegation has been made with regards to this report, so there is little evidential value. In addition, its content has not been contested.

			<i>and to the victims, particularly by the Police and children's social care."</i>		
3.	June 2007	Protection of Young People from Sexual Assault in Rotherham.	Unknown. At the HASC Nicola Blackwood MP, who questioned Mr Wright, stated that some of the report was acted on in Operation Central.	Professor Jay (in her inquiry report).	No. I attempted to obtain this report by open source searching and speaking to the wider Linden investigation team. The wider investigation team has no knowledge of this report or any title like it. The reference to Operation Central appears to be an anomaly as Operation Central had no basis in a report or recommendations.
4.	July 2008	Annual Report on the Protection of Young People in Rotherham from Sexual Exploitation.	Made four recommendations in relation to <i>"the revived Sexual Exploitation Action Plan and implementation"</i> , <i>"changes to the Risky Business Project"</i> , the <i>"Integration Agenda"</i> and a <i>"texting service for young males"</i> . Among its explanations for each recommendation it mentioned <i>"Risks and Uncertainties"</i> and explained that every Local Authority had to address the issues	Professor Jay (in her inquiry report). She stated that Mr Wright called for a further report on the budget of Risky Business and the likely future pressures on the project. Mr Wright (provided a copy for this investigation).	Yes

			of CSE and that Rotherham had “developed some good services and resources”. It stated that the Children and Young People Access Team had received 118 contacts in the previous year, and that Risky Business had 59 referrals.		
5.	November 2008	Further report on the protection of young people from sexual exploitation.	This covers the work of Risky Business and the ongoing work in Rotherham. There is no specific mention of the scale of the problem in Rotherham and the report is positive in its portrayal of Rotherham’s efforts to tackle any case of CSE. The information contained echoes that of report 4.	Professor Jay (in her inquiry report) stated that this was the report that Mr Wright had requested following report 4.	Yes. I attempted to obtain this report by open source searching and speaking to the wider Linden investigation team. A copy was provided to me by the wider investigation team.
6.	January 2009	Progress of arrangements to protect young people from sexual exploitation.	Unknown.	Professor Jay (in her inquiry report).	No. I attempted to obtain this report by open source searching and speaking to the wider Linden investigation team. This report is not known to the wider investigation and may be a report for RMBC’s CSE sub-committee.
7.	Unknown	Unknown. Report	Complainant A stated in their	Complainant A, who stated	No. I attempted to obtain a copy of

		<p>Complainant A stated (in their witness statement) that they had worked on. Complainant A stated that the report had been requested by Mr Wright.</p>	<p>witness statement that it contained names, nicknames, date of birth of victims of CSE in Rotherham, how much intelligence Risky Business was collating. Complainant A stated: <i>“it included information about guns and all sorts of stuff, not just ‘Risky Business is working with 100 girls and they have 12 staff’.”</i></p>	<p>(in their witness statement) that they sent this report to their manager, and is the same report Complainant A brought to the HASC.</p>	<p>this report but Complainant A no longer has access to any Risky Business records. I was unsuccessful because there are no known copies of this report available. A possible excerpt from this report was located on a storage device by an IOPC lead investigator when attending Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council but this has not been verified. Professor Jay has been approached by the wider investigation and will not provide copies of RMBC reports or records, these can only be requested through RMBC. Even the possible copy at RMBC has no evidential value as it has no provenance (having been found on a memory card with no paperwork supporting where it came from) and as such we have no evidence to prove when (if ever) Mr Wright obtained a copy of this.</p>
--	--	---	---	--	--

8.	Unknown – this is an undated document.	Risky Business Intelligence .	Report about sexual activity with numerous young girls in the Rotherham area. It is undated and has no distribution information other than alluding to being sent to Matthew Jukes of Sheffield PPU. This refers to then Chief Superintendent, Matt Jukes.	Complainant A stated (in their witness statement) that they put together this report. Complainant A stated that Mr Wright got a copy from their supervisor at Rotherham Council.	Yes. I attempted to obtain a copy of this report but Complainant A does not have a copy of this report as they have no access to Risky business records. I received a copy of this report from the wider Linden investigation. There is no distribution list for this document and it is undated. It alludes to being presented to Matthew Jukes, there is no mention of Mr Wright or his department. There is no way to ascertain if or when Mr Wright ever saw this report.
----	--	-------------------------------	--	--	---

19. For clarity, I will refer to the reports by the number in which they appear on the table above, throughout the remainder of this report.
20. The terms of reference guide me to look at whether Mr Wright misled anyone at the HASC. I believe there are four elements to this:
- 1) Whether Mr Wright lied when he stated he did not receive reports detailing the extent of CSE in Rotherham. When lied or lying is referred to, I mean wilfully making a statement that he knew to be false or did not believe to be true;
 - 2) Whether Mr Wright lied when he stated he did not recall attending a barbeque for Risky Business nor speaking to any victims or survivors there;
 - 3) Whether Mr Wright lied when he stated he did not take legal advice for the answers he gave at the HASC;
 - 4) Whether Mr Wright lied when he stated he was not aware of the extent of CSE in Rotherham during the time he was Cabinet Member.

Reports

21. As explained in the table above, I have had access to four of the above reports for the purposes of this investigation.
22. Report 4 made four recommendations. Those recommendations were:
 1. *“The Cabinet Member and Advisers endorses the revived Sexual Exploitation Action Plan and implementation.*
 2. *The Cabinet Member and Advisers endorses the changes to the Risky Business Project.*
 3. *The Cabinet Member and Advisers endorses the proposed review of the Sexual Exploitation Procedures within the context of the Integration Agenda.*
 4. *The Cabinet Member and Advisers endorses the attached proposal for the texting service for young males.”*
31. In relation to CSE, the report stated *“sexual exploitation is a national issue and its management requires both a national and local strategic response”*. Report 5 echoes these findings.
32. It stated the successes of the Rotherham Metropolitan Borough in tackling CSE, including the conviction of a man after ten young male victims gave evidence at the trial, and 40 young males attended as witnesses. It stated that 118 contacts had been made with the Children and Young People’s Access Team within the previous year. This evidence was also presented in report 5.
33. It stated that Risky Business had 59 referrals during the previous year. It also detailed the training that Risky business offered to various organisations and sectors. This evidence is also recorded in report 5.
34. The report briefly mentioned services for *“Young Men”*, working with taxi drivers and finance. It then mentioned *“Risks and Uncertainties”*, explaining that every local authority had to address the issues of CSE and that Rotherham had *“developed some good services and resources”*.
35. It did not refer to specific details with names and ages of victims of CSE. Nor did it highlight the extent of CSE in Rotherham, in relation to other areas.
36. Professor Jay’s report stated that Mr Wright received report 1 in 2005, although it did not mention CSE. It also stated that Mr Wright received reports 3, 4, 5 and 6 in relation to CSE during his time as Cabinet Member for Children’s Services. Professor Jay’s report did not confirm where this information came from, although it does state that she interviewed Mr Wright for the purposes of the inquiry.
37. At the HASC Mr Wright stated:

“I received four reports during the five years that I was in that position... In terms of the external reports, I do not recall one single external report from Ofsted or any other organisation that flagged CSE as being a significant issue.”

38. The chair stated that the committee did not accept this evidence from Mr Wright. He stated that it did not accept that Mr Wright *“did not know”* what was happening in Rotherham at the time he was Cabinet Member, because others had testified under oath that he received *“every report”*. This is in contrast with Professor Jay’s report which states that Mr Wright received four reports (reports 3, 4, 5 and 6).
39. Mr Wright later explained at the HASC the reports he received. He said he received report 1, and that it did not mention CSE. He then explained four subsequent reports, all of which related to CSE. He stated that he received the first report about CSE in 2007 and the next in July 2008. He explained how he was *“not satisfied that sufficient resources were being put into Risky Business”* and asked for *“a report to come back”*. He said he received the report he requested in November 2008 and subsequently increased the resources to Risky Business by 80 per cent. He stated that, following this, he requested a further report, which he received in January 2009. He stated he did not receive any further reports in relation to CSE before he left office in May 2010. He explained that he attended a Local Safeguarding Children’s Board (LSCB) meeting in September 2009 where a report was presented to the board, however he was only there in an *“observer capacity”*.
40. The chair stated at the HASC that he did not accept this either.
41. In his prepared statement, Mr Wright again stated he received four reports in relation to CSE which had been compiled for the benefit of council meetings. He said they did not contain *“sensitive”* material and were summarised.
42. The report Mr Wright stated he was sent in July 2008 is report 4, confirmed by the fact that he provided a copy of such report. In his prepared statement, Mr Wright said he received additional reports in 2007, November 2008 and January 2009, all of which had been prepared for the benefit of council meetings. The dates and purpose of such reports is consistent with reports 3, 5 and 6.
43. Complainant A stated, in their witness statement, that Mr Wright *“got”* reports 7 and 8. Complainant A stated that Mr Wright said, in his evidence at the HASC, that he had received report 7.
44. Mr Wright stated at the HASC that, following the annual report from July 2008, he requested a further report that he received in November of the same year. He stated that, following this, he requested another report, which he received in January 2009. Complainant A stated that Mr Wright had requested report 7.
45. Complainant A’s statement that Mr Wright requested report 7 is consistent with Mr Wright’s statement at the HASC that he requested two reports (reports 5 and 6).
46. Complainant A stated, in their witness statement, about report 7, *“I worked for hours on it, to prove how much work we were doing, how much intelligence we were collating to justify our funding”*. Mr Wright stated in his evidence at the HASC that he increased funding to Risky Business by 80 per cent following receipt of report 5. Therefore, there are inconsistencies in relation to funding issues between the statements regarding reports 5 and 7. However, there is not enough evidence to draw a conclusion that report 5 and report 7 are the same.

47. In addition to this, Mr Wright stated in his prepared statement that he had *“never commissioned”* a report that would *“contain sensitive material including names and particulars of the CSE”*. This is the exact content Complainant A stated is in report 7. Mr Wright also said in his prepared statement, *“If a report was prepared by someone believing it was bound for the Council then I know nothing of that”*. Although report 7 is not available to the investigation, report 5 is and does not contain any of the sensitive material Complainant A alludes to. It seems likely the two reports are not the same.
48. Complainant A stated in their witness statement that they sent report 7 to their manager. Complainant A did not state how it was given to Mr Wright, but said that he told the HASC he had read it.
49. In their witness statement, Complainant A stated that Mr Wright got a copy of report 8 from Ms D. Ms D declined to provide a statement to the IOPC when approached as part of the wider Linden investigation.
50. Mr Wright did not state either at the HASC or in his prepared statement how he received any of the reports he did. Nor is it clear from the evidence I have seen.
51. When giving evidence under oath at the HASC, Joyce Thacker (Rotherham council’s director of children’s services), stated that Risky Business sent reports annually that detailed who they were working with. She stated that she worked *“through”* her Cabinet Member and that her *“Cabinet Member received reports”*. She specifically stated that Mr Wright received an annual report from Risky Business in July 2008. Report 4 was an annual report from July 2008, so it could be that Ms Thacker was referring to report 4.
52. Ms Thacker also stated at the HASC that she would *“take decisions where those reports would go”*.
53. Ms Thacker stated at the HASC, *“we had reports from Risky Business annually that set out who they were working with”*. She also stated, *“we knew about child sexual exploitation, child abuse, admittedly, but we did not know about the scale of it”*. This suggests that she read reports 3 and 4, but they did not make her aware of the true scale of CSE in Rotherham at the time.
54. At the HASC Mr Wright was asked if he had seen report 2. He stated that he was not aware of such report until Professor Jay’s report came out.
55. In his prepared statement, Mr Wright confirmed the four reports he had seen, none of which were report 2.
56. When giving evidence at the HASC, Ms Thacker stated that she recalled that report 2 was *“in police hands”* but could not recall what happened to it from there.
57. A report writer also gave evidence at the HASC. In such evidence she stated that her reports *“went to the police predominantly but also to the Drug Action Team, to the Community Safety Unit and some of them also went to the Government office in Leeds, the Crime Reduction Team at that time... They did not go particularly high in the council from my circulation list”*.

58. The allegation is that Mr Wright lied when he stated that he had not received any reports which highlighted the extent of CSE in Rotherham during the time he was Cabinet Member for children's services.
59. Mr Wright agreed at the HASC that he received four reports during his time as Cabinet Member. He stated that two of those reports were ones he requested. Mr Wright confirmed this in his prepared statement. I have not seen anything to confirm that Mr Wright received more than the four reports he stated and therefore to support that he lied on oath with regard to this.
60. Complainant A stated that they compiled two reports (7 and 8) for Mr Wright. Mr Wright stated that he received two reports that he had requested (5 and 6). As stated above, due to the inconsistencies between the statements, Mr Wright and Complainant A could be referring to the same reports. However, I find it unlikely they are the same, given the difference in the content described by Complainant A. Report 5 in particular does not contain the sensitive content report 7 does, as described by Complainant A. Report 8 does contain particularly sensitive material but is markedly different in content to the described report of report 6. Report 8 has no distribution list and is undated. It contains no mention of Mr Wright or his department, instead it is stated as being prepared for Chief Superintendent Matthew Jukes in Sheffield PPU.
61. It is possible that report 3 contained the information stated by Complainant A. I have not seen the report and therefore cannot confirm its content. Based on what Mr Thacker stated at the HASC, she read annual reports from Risky Business. Report 3 is an annual report in relation to the protection of young people from sexual exploitation. Although I have not seen the content of this report, it is likely that it contained information from Risky Business. This is because Risky Business gave significant contributions to report 4, which was the annual report for the following year. Ms Thacker stated in her evidence at the HASC that, despite reading annual reports, she was not aware of the extent of CSE in Rotherham at the time. Should they be referring to the same reports, both Mr Wright and Ms Thacker's statements are consistent in this regard.
62. IOPC investigations as part of the wider Linden investigation could not find any evidence to suggest that report 8 was passed to Mr Wright.
63. Mr Wright confirmed that one of the four reports he received was report 4, which does not highlight the extent of CSE in Rotherham at the time. While this shows that one of the reports Mr Wright definitely received does not contain the alleged content, it does not confirm that the remaining three reports did not. Report 5 echoes this information.
64. At the HASC Ms Thacker stated that she made decisions about who the reports would go to and the writer of report 2 stated that the reports they wrote did not go very high in the council from their "*circulation list*". Ms Thacker did not mention if Mr Wright received report 2 while giving evidence at the HASC.
65. Mr Wright stated at the HASC that he did not receive a copy of report 2. There is no confirmation, nor an allegation that he did, other than the fact that he was questioned about it at the HASC.

66. As stated, I have not seen reports 6, or 7. I cannot confirm their content. Report 4 does not highlight the extent of CSE in Rotherham at the time. Both Mr Wright and Ms Thacker agree that reports 5 and 6 did not either.
67. It is likely that reports 5, 6, 7 and 8 are all different reports, and that Mr Wright only saw 5 and 6. Mr Wright's and Complainant A's statements in relation to the content of the reports suggest they were not the same. If so, their statements contradict each other, as Complainant A stated that Mr Wright did receive reports 7 and 8, and Mr Wright stated that he did not. The evidence I have seen in addition to their statements does not support that Mr Wright did receive them, nor that he lied about this under oath.
68. However, if they are the same reports, both Mr Wright's and Complainant A's statements conflict in terms of the content, but agree in terms of Mr Wright receiving them. I have not seen any further evidence confirming that report 6 contained information which would make Mr Wright aware of the extent of CSE in Rotherham during his time as Cabinet Member, and therefore that he lied on oath at the HASC in relation to this allegation.

Meeting survivors

69. At the HASC Michael Ellis MP, asked Mr Wright if he recalled a meeting taking place with an "*abused girl*" in a room at the Risky Business premises. He was referring to a news story by Andrew Norfolk of The Times. Mr Wright stated "*I do not recall that meeting taking place*". I understand from Complainant B's complaint and from Complainant B's statement that this meeting took place at the Risky Business premises, during a barbeque that Mr Wright had attended. I think it is likely that Michael Ellis was referring to this meeting. He stated that the story had been reported in the press
70. Complainant B, who declined to give a statement for the purposes of this investigation, stated in their complaint that they had spoken to Mr Wright about the abuse they suffered in Rotherham. Complainant B stated that they were the victim who had spoken to Mr Wright and had told their story to Andrew Norfolk, which was the story that was spoken about at the HASC by Michael Ellis.
71. In their witness statement, Complainant A stated they remembered Mr Wright speaking with Complainant B at a barbeque at the Risky business premises, sometime between 2004 and 2006. Complainant A said they overheard some of the conversation where Complainant B spoke about the abuse they had suffered. Complainant A expressed their opinion that the conversation should have been significant to Mr Wright, as it was not his job to speak with survivors and presumably did not do so often.
72. In his prepared statement, Mr Wright stated he did not recall attending a barbeque held or hosted by Risky Business. He also stated he did not, and still does not, recall any survivors of CSE telling him their experiences of CSE during his time at Cabinet Member. He also stated such an event would have affected him emotionally, so he would have recalled it.
73. Mr Wright referred to Complainant A's witness statement, where they stated his invitation to a barbeque may have been as a result of his attendance at an event during the time a young girl was missing. He stated that, according to news reports, she had been missing during 2010. Complainant A stated the barbeque happened between 2004 and 2006. He

stated he stepped down as Cabinet Member for Children's Services in May 2010. Complainant A's statement that the barbeque happened between 2004 and 2006 is inconsistent with their statement that it could have been during the time the young girl was missing. However, this does not necessarily mean that the conversation did not happen. The event, if it happened, was at least eight years ago. In their statement Complainant A was recalling events from as early as 2004. It is reasonable to suggest that Complainant A may have misremembered dates of events or the circumstances surrounding why Mr Wright may have been at the barbeque.

74. At the HASC, Mr Wright did not deny meeting with survivors at all during his time as Cabinet Member. He stated he did not recall an event where one survivor gave him a detailed account of their abuse. He stated in his prepared statement that he still did not recall such an event.
75. I have seen no further evidence to support or undermine the allegation Mr Wright lied by stating that he could not recall this meeting, while giving evidence at the HASC. Mr Wright said he would remember a conversation such as the one that had been alleged. However, as stated, the event was at least eight years ago and it is possible that, if it did happen, Mr Wright had forgotten. In addition, I have not seen any evidence that corroborates Complainant A's account. Complainant A stated in their witness statement that the date that Mr Wright attended the barbeque would be in the Risky Business 'signing in' book. Complainant A stated that they retained everything, however Complainant A also stated "*a lot of stuff has gone missing or been misplaced or lost*". I was unable to get a copy of the signing in book because records have been destroyed or removed.
76. Complainant A named further survivors or witnesses who were present at the barbeque who could corroborate their statement. Some of the survivors contacted as part of the wider Linden enquiry by the IOPC are unwilling to provide a statement to the IOPC at this time. I did not further pursue these witnesses as the evidential value of their statements are not proportionate to the level of investigation it would require to do so.

Legal advice

77. At the HASC, Mr Wright was asked if he had taken legal advice to state he "*did not recall*" events asked about when giving evidence. Mr Wright replied that he had not.
78. When I asked Mr Wright this at interview, he declined to comment.
79. There are no further lines of enquiry that could ascertain evidence to prove the allegation that Mr Wright lied when he gave this answer under oath. Legal discussion between a legal advisor and their client is protected by 'Legal Professional Privilege' (LPP). LPP is part of common law, and protects a client from their legal advisor disclosing the advice that they have given. Therefore, any evidence that would prove this allegation against Mr Wright would be subject to LPP and, therefore, not disclosable without consent.

Mr Wright's understanding of the extent of CSE in Rotherham

80. In their witness statement, Complainant A said Mr Wright was aware of CSE in Rotherham at the time he was Cabinet Member. Mr Wright agreed, in both his evidence at the HASC and in his interview that he was aware that CSE existed in Rotherham. He stated he was not, however, aware of the extent of such CSE.
81. To highlight the extent of CSE in Rotherham at the time, Professor Jay's report stated:
"No one knows the true scale of child sexual exploitation (CSE) in Rotherham over the years. Our conservative estimate is that approximately 1400 children were sexually exploited over the full Inquiry period, from 1997 to 2013."
82. Complainant A stated in their witness statement that Mr Wright sent Risky Business a letter commending its contribution to 'Operation Central'. Complainant A stated that Operation Central was an investigation into four victims of CSE.
83. Nicola Blackwood MP questioned Mr Wright about report 3 at the HASC. She stated that Operation Central was a product of report 3, and asked Mr Wright how he was not aware of the true extent of CSE in Rotherham despite reading that report. Mr Wright stated that Professor Jay agreed with him and said she had read all of the reports he had received and said that none highlighted the extent of CSE in Rotherham at the time. This is not confirmed in Professor Jay's report. Mr Wright told the HASC that Operation Central went to trial in October of 2010, by which time he had already left office.
84. Professor Jay report stated:
"Operation Central was set up to investigate men believed to be involved in sexual exploitation... Four young people were witnesses at the subsequent trial... Five men were subsequently convicted..."
85. Operation Central was in relation to four victims of CSE. Professor Jay stated in her report that the evidence in the case suggested CSE in Rotherham was *"extremely serious"*, which might have been an indication to Mr Wright that the prevalence of CSE was high. But it is not known if, or when, Mr Wright would have got this information. In addition, the trial was held in October 2010, which was after Mr Wright left office. Professor Jay stated that the *"offences under Operation Central represented a small proportion of current CSE offences in the Borough"*, which suggested the operation did not highlight the true extent of CSE in Rotherham.
86. I did not further explore this line of enquiry. Mr Wright knowing of Operation Central while Cabinet Member would not indicate that he was aware of the extent of CSE in Rotherham at the time.
87. As explained, I have not had access to report 3, so I cannot confirm the content of the report nor its involvement with Operation Central.
88. Complainant A alleged Mr Wright lied on oath at the HASC when he stated he was not aware of the true extent of CSE in Rotherham during his time as Cabinet Member. Complainant A stated that he received reports highlighting the extent. As stated, there is limited evidence to support that Mr Wright received reports highlighting such. In addition, Complainant A alleged that Mr Wright was aware of the extent due to his conversation with Complainant B. Again, there is limited evidence to support this.

> Next steps

89. The decision maker is now required to decide if there is an indication that a criminal offence may have been committed by the relevant office holder under investigation. They will record these conclusions on a separate document.
90. If they decide that there is such an indication, they must decide whether it is appropriate to refer the matter to the CPS.
91. The decision maker should consider the criminal offences that were considered during the investigation, which have been listed in paragraph 9, but is not restricted to these offences.

> Summary for publication

92. The following summaries are of the incident and our investigation. If the decision is made to publish the case on the IOPC website, this text will be used for that purpose. This text is included in the investigation report so the AA can provide their representations regarding redactions.

Section of summary	Text
Summary of incident	Two complainants alleged that a former PCC lied when giving evidence to the Home Affairs Select Committee (HASC) (2014) in relation to child sexual exploitation in Rotherham.
Summary of investigation	During the investigation, investigators spoke with one complainant, who provided a witness statement. They then interviewed the PCC under a criminal caution. Investigators also examined the minutes from the HASC (2014) and a report in relation to the protection of young people in Rotherham. Further witnesses who had been identified as part of the wider enquiry declined to give a statement in relation to this investigation, or were not approached.

Operation Linden South

Investigation into the evidence of Mr
Shaun Wright at the Home Affairs
Select Committee (HASC) 9
September 2014

Independent investigation report
Appendices

> Appendix 1: The role of the IOPC

The IOPC carries out its own independent investigations into complaints and incidents involving the police, HM Revenue and Customs (HMRC), the National Crime Agency (NCA) and Home Office immigration and enforcement staff.

We are completely independent of the police and the government. All cases are overseen by the Director General (DG), who has the power to delegate their decisions to other members of staff in the organisation. These individuals are referred to as DG delegates, or decision makers, and they provide strategic direction and scrutinise the investigation.

The investigation

At the outset of an investigation, a lead investigator will be appointed, who will be responsible for the day-to-day running of the investigation on behalf of the DG. This may involve taking witness statements, interviewing subjects to the investigation, analysing CCTV footage, reviewing documents, obtaining forensic and other expert evidence, as well as liaison with the coroner, the CPS and other agencies.

They are supported by a team, including other investigators, lawyers, press officers and other specialist staff.

Throughout the investigation, meaningful updates are provided to interested persons and may be provided to other stakeholders at regular intervals. Each investigation also passes through a series of reviews and quality checks.

The IOPC investigator often makes early contact with the CPS and is sometimes provided with investigative advice during the course of the investigation. However, any such advice will usually be considered to be confidential.

Investigation reports

Once the investigator has gathered the evidence, they must prepare a report. The report must summarise and analyse the evidence, and refer to or attach any relevant documents.

The report must then be given to the decision maker, who will decide if a criminal offence may have been committed by any of the subjects of the investigation, and whether it is appropriate to refer the case to the CPS for a charging decision.

Criminal proceedings

If there is an indication that a criminal offence may have been committed by any person to whose conduct the investigation related, the IOPC may refer that person to the CPS, if the decision maker considers it appropriate. The CPS will then decide whether to bring a prosecution against any person. If they decide to prosecute, and there is a not guilty plea, there may be a trial. Relevant witnesses identified during our investigation may be asked to attend the court. The criminal proceedings will determine whether the defendant is guilty beyond reasonable doubt.

Publishing the report

After all criminal proceedings relating to the investigation have concluded, and at a time when the IOPC is satisfied that any other misconduct or inquest proceedings will not be prejudiced by publication, the IOPC may publish its investigation report, or a summary of this.

Redactions might be made to the report at this stage to ensure, for example, that individuals' personal data is sufficiently protected.

> Appendix 2: Terms of reference

Terms of Reference

Investigation into the evidence of Mr Shaun Wright at the Home Affairs Select Committee (HASC) on 9 September 2014

Investigation Name:	Op Linden – PCC Shaun Wright HASC evidence
Investigation Type:	Independent
Appropriate Authority:	South Yorkshire Police
IPCC Reference:	2015/058025 and 2015/055334
Commissioner:	Sarah Green
Lead Investigator:	Lauren White
Target Range	3-6 months

Summary of events

Following the publication of the Jay report in 2014, the Home Affairs Select Committee (HASC) interviewed a number of witnesses as a part of their enquiries into the handling of Child Sexual Exploitation (CSE) in Rotherham. One of those witnesses was the former Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council (RMBC) member, Mr Shaun Wright. At the time of his appearance as a witness in front of the HASC Mr Wright was the elected Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) for South Yorkshire Police (SYP).

The complaints relate to the evidence he gave at the HASC on 9th September 2014. Former PCC Wright gave evidence, under oath, regarding his knowledge of CSE in Rotherham. It is specifically alleged that he denied having knowledge of CSE in Rotherham relating to his time as Cabinet Member for Children’s Services between 2005 and 2010. Complainant B in this matter (a victim of CSE in Rotherham and Risky Business client) recalled a meeting in 2005/2006 that they had with Mr Wright in which they related to him a detailed account of the exploitation they had suffered. Complainant A was also present at this meeting in a supporting capacity. When giving evidence to the HASC, former PCC Wright could not recall meeting with victims of exploitation, stating it would have been inappropriate for him to do so.

Terms of Reference

1. To investigate the allegations made in respect of the appearance by Mr Shaun Wright in front of the HASC on 9 September 2014. In particular whether evidence given, on oath, to the committee by Mr Wright during his appearance on 9 September 2014, was in any way misleading

2. To identify whether any subject of the investigation may have committed a criminal offence and, if appropriate, make early contact with the Director of Public Prosecutions (DPP). On receipt of the final report, the Commission delegate shall determine whether the report should be sent to the DPP.

The commissioner currently responsible for oversight of this investigation is Sarah Green. The commissioner has approved these terms of reference. At the end of the investigation they will decide whether or not the report should be submitted to the Director of Public Prosecutions, and whether they agree with the appropriate authority's proposals in response to the report. During the investigation they may choose to delegate their role to another member of staff if appropriate.

These terms of reference were approved on 15 June 2017

> Appendix 3: People referred to in this report

The IOPC categorises people in three different ways:

- **Subjects** of the investigation (people upon whom notices were served informing them that their conduct was subject to the investigation).
- **Witnesses** (people who gave evidence for the investigation). This includes **significant witnesses** (people who saw or heard, or otherwise witnessed, a significant part of the incident).
- **Experts** (people with expertise in a particular area who were instructed by the IOPC to provide their expert opinion).

Not everyone spoken to during the course of the investigation is referred to in this report. This report makes reference to the following people:

> Subjects

Ref	Name	Role	Date notified	Interviewed
	Shaun Wright	Former PCC	30 June 2017	16 April 2018

> Witnesses

Ref	Name	Role	Interviewed
	Complainant A	Former Senior Worker, Risky Business project	1 November 2017
