

**BABAR AHMAD: ASSAULT BY TSG**

**CHRONOLOGY**

**02.12.03 – 02.06.11**

Date	Event
<b>02.12.03</b>	<b>Assault at Fountain Road upon Babar Ahmad</b>
12.05.04	Completion of the investigation into Babar Ahmad's complaint against police conducted by the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) under the supervision of the Independent Police Complaints Commission (IPCC)
05.08.04	Babar Ahmad arrested pursuant to an American extradition request. He has remained detained, without trial, pursuant to that warrant for 7 years.
<b>05.09.04</b>	<b>Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) decision that there is insufficient evidence to prosecute any officer arising from the claimant's complaint</b>
25.10.04	IPCC direct misconduct tribunal in respect of PC James-Bowen's initial contact with Babar Ahmad only (the only aspect of the force used that was accepted by Babar Ahmad to be lawful)
13.04.05	Misconduct tribunal concludes that there is "no case to answer" and that PC James-Bowen "acted professionally and with bravery – we support his actions".
16.06.05	Mr Ahmad's previous solicitors, Arani & Co notify the defendant's Anti-terrorist Branch of intended claim for damages
22.11.05	Defendant provides a letter of response denying liability but without providing pre action disclosure
13.12.05	Arani & Co seek papers from the IPCC with a view to instigating civil proceedings against the police
20.12.05	IPCC decline to provide papers
04.04.06	Bhatt Murphy solicitors (BM) instructed
24.07.06	Public funding certificate issued
08.03.07	Letter of claim
12.04.07	Letter of response again denying liability
24.05.07	MPS provide pre action disclosure
<b>01.06.07</b>	<b>Assault at Edgeware Road upon Basil Khan, Omar Mohidin and Ahmed Hegazy</b>
10.01.08	MPS offer Babar Ahmad £20,000 compensation without an admission of liability
<b>24.06.08</b>	<b>BM seek similar fact evidence from the MPS - allegations of assault and/or dishonesty</b>
<b>20.08.08</b>	<b>MPS state that there is no similar fact evidence falling to be disclosed.</b>
25.10.08	CPS decision to charge PC Jones and others in relation to the Edgeware Road matter.
25.11.08	PC Jones summonsed in relation to the Edgeware Road matter
08.12.08	PC Jones make his first appearance before Kingston Magistrates Court charged with (among other things) racially aggravated assault in respect of the events of 1 June 2007. Reporting restrictions lifted.
09.12.08	Mutual exchange of witness statements. PC Jones is not relied upon as a witness of truth in light of his suspension from duty. In addition evidence is not relied upon from the following other TSG officers who were present at material times: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- PS Davis</li><li>- PC O'Riordan</li><li>- PC Denham</li><li>- PC Gray</li><li>- PC Scottow</li></ul> Each state that they are scared. MPS subsequently clarify that there is no objective basis for their fear.

05.12.08	Basil Khan and Omar Mohidin contact BM
13.02.09	Order permitting Babar Ahmad to amend his Particulars of Claim to rely upon the Edgeware Road events by way of similar fact evidence and Order for disclosure of all previous allegations of assault against this group of officers
05.03.09	MPS indicate that due to the "sheer volume of complaints" against the relevant officers it is not possible to comply with the Court Order. 83 separate complaints (relating to approximately 75 separate incidents) have been identified in respect of the 6 relevant officers.
11.03.09	MPS disclose 27 of the 75 complaint dockets
13.03.09	MPS offers Babar Ahmad £60,000 compensation without any admission of liability. Babar Ahmad rejects the offer. MPS disclose papers relating to 2 other complaint matters
16.03.09	First day of the civil trial
17.03.09	MPS offer full admission of liability by reference to the detail of Mr Ahmad's allegations and £60,000.
18.03.09	Babar Ahmad accepted the MPS offer and the civil proceedings were therefore concluded without any police officer being called upon to give evidence.
25.03.09	BM submit the evidence marshalled and analysis of the strength of that evidence to the DPP seeking a fresh decision.
26.03.09	MPA full authority meeting expresses to the Commissioner the members "astonishment" that police officers chose not to give evidence and disbelief in relation to the suggestion that the officers were scared.  Further MPA seek an explanation for the prior briefings they had received that Babar Ahmad's allegations were without substance.  Sir Paul Stephenson announces a review of the case including the pattern of similar complaints.  MPA insist that this should have independent oversight.
13.07.09	Re-investigation of Babar Ahmad's complaint had been subsumed within the MPS internal review now overseen by Sir Geoffrey Grigson.
06.08.09	CPS indicate that they are waiting for the view of the MPS and will reach a decision based upon the MPS view only.
30.09.09	MPS inform CPS saying that the MPS review will recommend reconsideration by the CPS in light of similar fact evidence uncovered by BM.
26.10.09	BM letter before claim to the CPS informing them of intention to challenge the DPP's decision by way of judicial review.
03.11.09	PC Jones acquitted of charges arising from the Edgeware Road matter.
24.11.09	DPP appoints Mr Jonathan Laidlaw QC (JL) to review the evidence in the Ahmad matter and offer an opinion on the prospects of a successful prosecution
05.03.10	JL completes his review and the CPS request certain additional investigations from the MPS
15.03.10	CPS ask MPS to interview PS Davis as a suspect
22.03.10	IPCC decision not to lay misconduct charges against PC Jones and others in relation to the Edgeware Road matter.
21.04.10	MPS review completed but not formally disclosed pending CPS decision
06.08.10	MPS decline to assist the CPS by way of interviewing PS Davis
12.08.10	Decision to prosecute PC Jones etc communicated
13.01.11	Mr Justice Rivlin QC rejects the defence argument that a prosecution in the above circumstances is an abuse of process and orders that the trial will proceed.  He states:  "I am satisfied that if, from the month of September 2004 [the original CPS decision not to prosecute] onwards anyone was entitled to say that there had been an affront to justice, it was Mr Ahmad, and not the defendant [officers]".  He also stated:

	<p>“I believe that Mr Laidlaw (prosecuting counsel) is right to submit that the initial decision not to prosecute was seriously flawed.</p> <p>“Mr Laidlaw does not mince his words: he notes that this [original September 2004] Advice, and its endorsement by Mr Davies’ superiors (for it went up the line to Dru Sharpling), led to the decision not to prosecute; and he goes so far as to describe it as “wrong” and “irrational” ... I have been persuaded that Mr Laidlaw’s view of that original decision that it was plainly wrong is the correct one.”</p>
27.05.11	Trial commences