

Serious Fraud Office

Elm House 10-16 Elm Street London WC1X OBJ

Anthony Scrivener Esq. QC 2-3 Gray's Inn Square London WC1R 5JH

Our ref:POLO1

17 November 1992

Dear Tonz

Your letter of 6 November to the Attorney General has been passed to me for reply in respect of the specific matters relating to this office.

I must emphasise at the outset that I do not have charge of the investigations currently being undertaken in relation to which your client was arrested on 5 November last.

The matters to which your complaints relate are in respect of the very issues to be decided in the course of the criminal trial currently before Mr Justice Tucker. I do not think it is appropriate for me to respond in detail to such criticisms at this stage. Subject to that, however, I would reply as follows.

You raise a number of points about what you perceive as this office's failure to visit northern Cyprus. It has been pointed out both to you and to those instructing you many times that the SFO's position stems from the obstructive attitude of the "government" there, and not from any lack of desire or effort on behalf of this office to undertake enquiries there.

Your client was not arrested in a "blaze of publicity". The publicity which followed his arrest was not sought by this office. The bail terms subsequently set were, in fact, set at a level suggested to the Court by the defence. No application has ever been made to vary the financial terms of that bail, and in respect of applications to vary other terms, I am satisfied that amounts mentioned by the prosecution as being involved in the case have been consistently referred to throughout.

Transfer occurred some fourteen months after your client was charged. During that time, evidence to justify a transfer on counts involving thefts of sums in excess of £150 million was brought together. It is a matter of law that transfer is, and can only be, a matter for a designated authority as defined in section .4(2) of the Criminal Justice Act 1987. The Chief Metropolitan Stipendiary Magistrate is not such a designated authority.

page 2 November 17 1992



I have no knowledge of the events surrounding the enquiry into the behaviour of the senior police officer you mention.

The matter as originally reported to this office concerned allegations of improper share dealing. The facts surrounding these allegations are contained in the prosecution case (see for example, pages 18 and 19 of the Case Statement).

The investigation by this office was not initiated as a result of a complaint made by Mr Allcock of the Inland Revenue. If you have evidence which implicates or tends to implicate Mr Allcock, then you should forward it to the Police department which is investigating the matter.

I am entirely satisfied with the manner of the investigation carried out by the Serious fraud Office into the matters with which your client has been charged. I am satisfied in addition with the judgement which has been exercised by those officers of the SFO whom you seek to criticise.

Yours sincerely

George Staple