

IN THE MATTER OF THE INQUIRIES ACT 2005
AND IN THE MATTER OF THE INQUIRY RULES 2006

THE ANTHONY GRAINGER INQUIRY

GIST OF PARTS OF THE CLOSED HEARING 28.3.17 [5]
MARK GRANBY

2.3.12

1. Mr Granby gave evidence to the Inquiry that, in the course of the telephone conversation that he had with DI Cousen at 7.00pm on 2.3.12, he received intelligence from Mr Cousen that Messrs Totten, Grainger and Rimmer were planning to commit a robbery on Saturday or Monday. He assessed this as being persuasive and very reliable.
2. Mr Granby gave evidence to the Inquiry that:
 - a. It was not particularly clear to him from what DI Cousen said as to what the likely target of the robbery was to be. His understanding was that there were a full range of available targets.
 - b. He did not make a detailed note of the information provided to him by Mr Cousen.
 - c. A discussion also took place at this time in respect of the vehicles having DSU technical control - by reference to VTDs [see the less redacted page 205 of Bundle K attached].
3. Mr Granby said that he could not recall what, if any, of the intelligence he received from Mr Cousen at 7.00pm on 2.3.12 he passed on to Mr Sweeney.
4. Mr Granby agreed that Mr Cousen had passed no intelligence to him on 2.3.12 that Messrs Totton, Grainger or Rimmer had access to firearms or would be carrying firearms.

Power Point for 3.3.12 Briefing

5. Mr Granby was asked why the words “should the subjects get inside any premises” had been removed from the threat assessment within the PowerPoint presentation for 3.3.12 [see F/453] when it *had* been in the Power Point for 2.3.12 [see F/1271]. Mr Granby could not recall directing those words to be removed but could think of no one else who would ask for those words to be removed.
6. Mr Granby was asked why he had specifically added to the additional threat

assessment in the PowerPoint presentation at F/1271, and again in his working strategy at F/1272, the words “Cash in transit custodians” and replied that at that stage there was not absolute clarity about the intended target and that he had drawn the assumption that if the offence was to take place on Saturday that cash in transit custodians would be a potential target. He did not recall Mr Cousen suggesting that the robbery was likely to be a Cash in Transit robbery but formed the view that it might.

3.3.12

7. Mr Granby was asked about the following exchange [Open Transcript 24.3.17, pages 55-56 set out below] and confirmed that in fact it was not closed session material to which he was referring:

“Q. Did you and ACC Sweeney conclude, as a result of your review at 12.45, that the subjects were running out of potential targets?

A. Yes, I think what that -- the inference to me was that the target premises were more likely to be the late night or the evening opening business establishments.

Q. Why was that the case, that you drew from the fact that cash in transits had finished, that the things that were described as likely targets earlier on were now closed –

A. Yes.

Q. -- that the conclusion to be drawn from that was that, "Well, they cannot be the targets so these commercial premises must be the targets", as opposed to, "The likely targets have now closed or been and come and gone safely, there is to be no robbery2?

A. No, that is not the conclusion I drew.

Q. Yes, but I am asking why.

A. I think that would be a conversation I would have with you in the closed session, sir.

Q. Right. You are saying it was specifically because of closed session material that you concluded at 12.45 that the targets, although the likely targets had now closed or come and gone safely, the intention of the subjects was nonetheless to conduct a robbery of late-opening commercial premises?

A. That was my assessment and the conclusion I drew from the information, yes.”

8. Mr Granby explained why, after certain targets had closed or passed safely, that he continued to assess and conclude (i.e. by 12.45pm and after) that the intention of the subjects was to commit a robbery. Some of his assessment was informed by the intelligence that the subjects were planning to commit the robbery on Saturday or Monday. Some of his assessment related to further sensitive intelligence received on 3.3.12 and some related to the “tracker” evidence that the vehicle had been to Culcheth the previous evening. None of the intelligence established specifically that there would be a robbery or what the intended target of any robbery would be but taken together Mr Granby worked on the assumption that if a robbery occurred later on Saturday the target would be a late night opening commercial premises because

by then that would be the only available option.

9. During the course of 3.3.12 Mr Granby received no further intelligence [further to that received on 2.3.12] that the subjects intended to commit a robbery that night but said that he had a working assumption that, if Messrs Totton and Grainger met, it was with the intention of committing a robbery.
10. Mr Granby agreed that Mr Cousen had passed no intelligence to him on 3.3.12 that Messrs Totton, Grainger or Rimmer had access to firearms or would be carrying firearms.
11. This gist is not a summary of all of the closed evidence given by Mr Granby.
12. This gist has been seen by the NCA and GMP – each agrees that:
 - a. It is accurate and fair; and
 - b. The information contained within it can be disclosed to the Core Participants in the Inquiry and to the public.

Jason Beer QC
Sophie Cartwright
Counsel to the Inquiry
4.5.17

