



For the attention of news editors & forward planning

For further information, contact Stafford Scott on 020 7430 2869 or 07830 133076

PRESS RELEASE ON BEHALF OF THE MARK DUGGAN FAMILY

Independent Police Complaints Commission (IPCC) Report into the killing of Mark Duggan

The Duggan family are no longer surprised by the endeavours of the IPCC in the case of Mark Duggan's killing by police. This report merely confirms their belief that the IPCC are 'unfit for purpose'.

From the beginning their conduct has been a chronicle of inefficiency and incompetence:

1. The public and the family were seriously misled about what happened at the scene implying a shoot out between Mark Duggan and police
2. There was an unjustified delay in the family being informed.
3. The investigation by the IPCC on the night was dilatory, inadequate and mismanaged as evidenced at the Inquest
4. Thereafter their investigation was slow and failed to pursue obvious lines of enquiry particularly in relation to the supplier Kevin Hutchinson Foster and the gun transfer.
5. Their obligation to the court and the family to honour various necessary stages of disclosure was constantly reneged upon to the extent that the learned Coroner had to threaten proceedings for contempt of court.
6. This report is no better. It is plainly wrong to suggest that the 'evidence' indicates that the most plausible explanation for the gun being found 14 feet away in a park over a fence was that Mark Duggan was shot whilst in the process of throwing the weapon. There was absolutely no evidence from any of the many witnesses to suggest this scenario. To the contrary when asked the witnesses who had a clear view denied seeing any such occurrence. In any event according to the shooter the gun was still in Mark Duggan's hand when he was shot for a second time just before he collapsed to the ground. Four experts in the fields of pathology and firearms gave their opinion at the inquest that there was no evidence that the gun was thrown over a fence after this or at the point of the second shot. Furthermore the jury findings do not support this contention but disposal at an earlier stage before Mark

Duggan was shot and was therefore unarmed.

- 7. The report is silent about the officer who falsified his training records (W42) - a partner officer to the one who shot Mark Duggan**

- 8. The report is far from robust about a number of matters relating to intelligence given the jury's criticisms. This aspect is of considerable importance since the family's position was that no shooting need have occurred if the police had taken obvious and clear steps to arrest the gun supplier in the preceding days. The jury findings were especially critical about this aspect and there are matters revealed this week that need to be addressed:**
 - a. Was there a previous trial of the gun supplier to Kevin Hutchinson Foster in which gun charges were dropped?**
 - b. Was there an intelligence file checked 2 days before which particularised gun possession by Kevin Hutchinson Forster?**
 - c. Where is the file now?**
 - d. Did a member of the Trident unit mislead the court about why the exact whereabouts of Kevin Hutchinson Foster had not been ascertained from the probation service. This has critical importance and is touched on in paragraph 1505 of the IPCC report.**

In the light of recent revelations these concerns need to be addressed by the IPCC as soon as possible and we call on them to produce a supplementary report. ENDS

London Civil Rights and Art Centre
Upper Floors, 37 Museum Street
London WC1A 1LQ
T 0207 430 2869
E office@tmg-uk.org
W www.tmg-uk.org