

Witness: Andy Hayman  
Statement No: 1  
Exhibits Referred to: AH/1, AH/2, AH/3  
Date Statement Made: 14 February 2012

---

**The Leveson Inquiry into the Culture Practices and Ethics of the Press**

---

This is the exhibit marked 'AH/3' referred to in the statement of Andy Hayman,  
dated this 14<sup>th</sup> day of February 2012.

**Examination of Witness**

*Witness:* **Mr Andy Hayman**, Former Assistant Commissioner, Metropolitan Police, gave evidence.

Q527 Chair: Mr Hayman, can I start with an apology from me for keeping you waiting so long. As you see, these are very complicated and detailed matters. We are extremely grateful. I wrote to you on 21 June asking you a series of questions about your involvement in this matter. You have not replied to this letter so I will take this evidence as being your reply. We hope to cover some of the points that I put in that letter.

Mr Hayman: Can I just clarify that?

Chair: Yes.

Mr Hayman: Having got that letter, it gives the impression that I have just completely blanked it. That is not the case. I have spoken to your office and asked for some steers on that. I have copies of emails where I needed to contact the Met to get information to answer those questions, and of course we spoke on the phone only two weeks ago to clarify that. The last thing I asked you was whether you are happy that we haven't corresponded and this would be evidence-in-chief, and you were content with that.

Q528 Chair: Yes. That is exactly what I said, in a shorter version.

Mr Hayman: I just wanted to clarify that.

Chair: We have accepted that, so we will cover the points in the letter. But could I start, because I know members of the Committee will ask this and I will just start to clear it out of the way, if I may, with your relationship with News International? It is no surprise that the Committee will want to ask you that question. When did you start your negotiations with News International that you would write a column and become an employee of them?

Mr Hayman: I retired in 2008 and I was approached by several newspapers to write, and that is something I have always wanted to do. It is a sort of boyhood aspiration. It was a choice of being a journalist or being a cop. It has turned out that both of them were probably funny choices. Having then considered approaches by several newspapers, I chose to go with *The Times* and I believe the final agreement was around-I retired on paper in April 2008 and I think I agreed in July 2008, so a couple of months after.

Q529 Chair: So two months after you retired. Did it not occur to you, were there no alarm bells ringing, to remind you that you had been investigating News International, albeit in an oversight role? We have heard the various roles that you had, that you knew exactly what was happening with regard to the investigation, you knew that there were items that had not been properly looked into. Did it not occur to you that this is perhaps not the best decision of your life in that you should go to the very people that you were investigating, especially as we have now heard from both Assistant Commissioner Yates and Peter Clarke that they were most unco-operative in respect of the investigation that was being conducted?

Mr Hayman: Yes, okay, Chairman. *The Times*, okay, it is part of News International. I knew no one at *The Times* at an editorial level. They had slaughtered me on their front page shortly before the Queen's birthday honours list, so there was no love lost there at all. The naivety, looking back at it, you might say, is the point you are alluding to there, that they are part of the same stable, but I just didn't see that. I was seen by the editor and the deputy editor and I didn't know them from Adam. I was put through the paces on asking why I wanted to do that and that is how I took it. The other point really is that I can absolutely say that any hint of being in their back pocket or anything like that is unfounded. I refute that. In terms of the investigation, you have heard from other witnesses; even if I had that motive or motives that other things have been suggested, I had no ability to change the direction of that at all.

Q530 Chair: We will keep the motives for a second, but just in respect of this, are you satisfied that you should continue to write this column for *The Times*, bearing in mind what has now come out, that an investigation over which you had oversight had resulted in so many victims of hacking who had not been contacted, so much criminality, or should you give up this column, even though it is temporary?

Mr Hayman: Do you not think I should perhaps have that as a private conversation with them?

Chair: I am sorry?

Mr Hayman: Do you not think I should have that as a private conversation with the editorial team at *The Times* rather than share any thought I have now in a public arena?

Q531 Chair: You are in a Select Committee considering very important matters, so it is something that I should put to you.

Mr Hayman: I can say it is something that I think all parties need be alive to, and I think a decision needs to be made with both parties privately.

Q532 Chair: So you would be suspended or dismissed, rather than you saying, "I'm sorry, at the moment, because of what has happened, I think I shouldn't continue with my column"?

Mr Hayman: Well, if I get suspended or dismissed then I hope I get grounds for that, because I don't think I have done anything wrong.

Q533 Chair: You talked about two parties. Surely you are a voluntary part of this arrangement and has it crossed your mind that, given what has happened, you shouldn't really be involved with News International?

Mr Hayman: All I am saying, Chairman, is that I think we are contracted together. It is more appropriate when you are contracted together to have that as a private conversation and I just want to have that as a private conversation with them, that is all.

Q534 Chair: I am sure you will have plenty of opportunity. This is the last question from me on this issue and then I will open it up to colleagues. It is right that during your investigation you continued to have private dinners and meetings with News International—that is correct, isn't it?

Mr Hayman: Absolutely. I was the person who actually put it out there in the public domain. I never made any secret of that at all. They weren't the only people. I had a national responsibility for ACPO around media, so it was consistent with that role. I can tell you now that any suggestion or hint that these were cosy candlelit dinners where state secrets were shared is rubbish. They were businesslike; I was never on my own, I was always with the Director of Comms, which I think I put in the public domain.

Chair: The Director of?

Mr Hayman: Communications for the Met. They were businesslike, no more than that.

Q535 Chair: Yes, but at any of those dinners, which you did regularly with them, did you raise the concerns that Mr Clarke has raised with the Committee today that they were being totally unco-operative with the very investigation that you had oversight of? Did you ever say to them, "Hang on, friends."

Mr Hayman: Well, colleagues, not friends.

Chair: Or colleagues. Between the starter and the main course, "Why are you not co-operating with Peter Clarke?"

Mr Hayman: I would have to check the dates of these, but one other thing, of course, is that if we had had regular contact, and we did, and to be honest with you, News International when we had the bombings were very co-operative and helped us, certainly around 21/7 and the images that were plastered across the front pages, and it helped us catch the culprits. It would be more suspicious if

you cancelled contact and kept them at arm's length, having had a relationship-not only them but other people as well-in which you were trying to engender good work relationships and support. So it was quite strange, because I would have been aware that they were being investigated. They had not shown, to my knowledge, any obstruction at all, and it was like either side of the table, "I know something you don't know and I'm not going to tell you."

Q536 Chair: So you do not accept what Mr Clarke has just said.

Mr Hayman: Sorry?

Chair: You do not accept that there was obstruction.

Mr Hayman: What I am saying is the timing. I am aware there was obstruction. My recollection, Chairman, is that it-one of the meals, I am sure, was when it all going on and the bizarre-and it is professional, isn't it? I am sitting one side of the table, "I know something you don't know and I ain't going to tell you" and I did not even know when the door went in on the *News of the World* so therefore I think, as Peter has already said, it was important for the integrity of the investigation he kept everything very tight.

Q537 Chair: Just to clear up the last issue, which is in the *New York Times* today, allegations that there was some kind of deal done because of your personal life, which is a matter of public record, why you resigned and so on, and that they basically would not attack you if you supported them in this investigation. Would you like to, on the record, clear this up?

Mr Hayman: These are all terribly grubby suggestions, and one has to say two things really. Firstly, in that article it suggested that my phone was hacked. That is news to me, and if they did hack it, all they would hear about that is the shopping list and golf tee-off time. There was nothing more suspicious than that. The second point is-

Q538 Chair: So was your phone hacked or not?

Mr Hayman: I don't have a clue.

Q539 Chair: Nobody has told you?

Mr Hayman: No, I don't have a clue.

Q540 Chair: But you are on the list.

Mr Hayman: Am I?

Chair: Apparently.

Mr Hayman: I don't know. I really don't know, and if I am, so be it, because I have nothing to hide at all. As I say, the shopping list will be on there and golf tee-off time. On the second point around the motives and all that kind of deals in the background, we have already heard-even if I had a motive that was unethical, and I didn't-how could I have ever stopped a line of investigation or driven one in any way, shape or form? I didn't, I couldn't, Peter would never let me, and if I had ever done that Peter or the SIO would have been all over me like a rash saying, "What the hell are you doing?"

Q541 Chair: But all of this sounds more like Clouseau rather than Columbo.

Mr Hayman: I have to say-

Chair: You are having dinner with people you are investigating, you don't know they are being investigated and you sign deals two months-

Mr Hayman: I know they are investigated, of course I do.

Q542 Chair: You don't know they are being obstructive, because Peter did not tell you.

Mr Hayman: No, because I made the point, Chairman, going back to it, I don't know the timeline. If those dinners went on after intervention being made, then fine, but my recollection is those dinners happened before the arrest occurred, and that is an important point to make.

Q543 Mark Reckless: Mr Hayman, setting aside the dinners, both you as the officer in charge and the then DPP, who we are told was consulted about the legal advice that apparently limited the scope of the investigation, are now working for News International. Have you any idea as to how that looks to the public?

Mr Hayman: It could look bad if there was some-

Nicola Blackwood: It does look bad.

Mr Hayman: Does it?

Chair: We all think it looks bad.

Mr Hayman: All right, I will take that on the chin. What I am saying is that if there was something behind that that could be evidence that as a result of that relationship things have been done unethically, then I will put my hands up. But you know what, I cannot think of anything, anything, in the background where the line has been crossed or I have done anything wrong as a result of being employed by *The Times*. If I go back in time, if I had jumped to another publication we probably would not all be here now. I jumped the other way and that is where we are.

Q544 Dr Huppert: I have to say some of your comments so far have been quite incredible. We have been trying to understand why, and Mr Clarke gave us very clear evidence that the scope of the initial investigation was simply too narrow, the decision was made, which I think we all think was incorrect, to make it very narrow. You were reporting to him and we are trying to understand why-

Mr Hayman: Reporting to who?

Dr Huppert: Sorry, he was reporting to you. What we are trying to understand is why there was not pressure to look at it broader, why nobody thought to look out, why in a higher role you did not suggest anything? We are trying to understand why this odd decision was made. We then find that you are a cop who wanted to be a journalist, you were having-

Mr Hayman: Absolutely, yes.

Dr Huppert: -regular interactions, you might be interested in the idea of having those connections. You clearly wanted to be a journalist for a long time, whether that was ever floated-do you understand why everybody is so concerned that somewhere along the line somebody failed to think, "This should be looked at a bit broader" and one of the people that could be then seems to have all these other connections?

Mr Hayman: Well, okay, but don't beat me up for being upfront with you and honest. I am saying to you exactly what my aspirations have been and, therefore, when I retired I saw that as an opportunity for a second career. There is nothing more untoward than that. In terms of the decisions that were

made by the investigation, you have heard from Peter as to what decisions he made and, because I was the boss of the Special Operations-although not involved on a day to day basis in understanding the decisions that were made in the decision log-I believe the responsibility and accountability stops at my door. Therefore I have always said, "What do you understand by 'lead the investigation'?" Peter has been very clear about what, on a day to day basis, he was investigating. My command, along with lots of other things that were going on at the same time, were involving whatever investigations-

Chair: We know about the-

Mr Hayman: Right, and so I led that team, that is all.

Q545 Dr Huppert: In terms of the gratuity, as I understand it, the rules are very that any sort of gratuity, any meal, any drink, has to be recorded?

Mr Hayman: Sure, and it was, yes.

Q546 Dr Huppert: Every single interaction you had with any journalist was absolutely recorded?

Mr Hayman: Absolutely, yes.

Q547 Dr Huppert: We will find when that is exposed-it is kept for 10 years-that on no occasion whatsoever were you alone with these journalists?

Mr Hayman: Not to my knowledge, no.

Q548 Michael Ellis: Mr Hayman, you were having dinners with journalists. That in and of itself is not necessarily improper but you were having dinner with journalists, were you not, while they were being investigated by Scotland Yard? That is improper, is it not?

Mr Hayman: Put yourself in my shoes then, and we have to go back and see what the timeline was and what would happen when. I can't remember that.

Q549 Chair: You cannot remember whether you had dinner with-

Mr Hayman: No, I can remember that. I can remember that.

Chair: Then the answer must be yes.

Mr Hayman: No, hang on, hang on, Chairman. I can't remember the timing of when those dinners happened in relation to what was going on in that investigation, but I absolutely agree with what you are saying. I am sure there was an occasion when they were being investigated that may have happened. Now, the judgment is, firstly, there is no way that I am ever, ever going to disclose anything to anyone about what is going on.

Q550 Michael Ellis: Forgive me, Mr Hayman, you say that you would never disclose it-

Mr Hayman: No.

Michael Ellis: -but you have made a judgment call to accept hospitality from people who you are investigating for criminal offences. That is correct, isn't it?

Mr Hayman: Yes.

Q551 Michael Ellis: So you think that is an appropriate course of action to have taken?

Mr Hayman: Well, if you let me finish. The judgment, the alternative judgment, is to say, "No, let's not do that," and make some excuses. I discussed that with a senior colleague who was there at the time.

Chair: Which senior colleague?

Mr Hayman: This was the Director of Communications.

Q552 Chair: Who is this person? What is his name?

Mr Hayman: Hang on, it's gone from me.

Chair: You have forgotten his name?

Mr Hayman: Dick Fedorcio.

Chair: Sorry, who?

Mr Hayman: Dick Fedorcio. Not to have that dinner, I think, would have been potentially more suspicious than to have it, and the most-

Q553 Chair: Suspicious?

Mr Hayman: I don't know why you are laughing.

Chair: Because we are astonished, Mr Hayman, at the way in which you are answering these questions.

Mr Hayman: Well, I am sorry. I am very sorry but I am trying to be-I am trying to share with you the thinking at the time, and all I am sure I can say to you is this, that we never ever had a conversation that would have compromised an investigation.

Q554 Michael Ellis: Mr Hayman, you could also, can you not, during the course of a dinner discuss police tactics in general?

Mr Hayman: No. No.

Q555 Michael Ellis: It is possible for you to do that, though, isn't it?

Mr Hayman: Not at all.

Q556 Michael Ellis: You are aware of police-

Mr Hayman: Absolutely not.

Michael Ellis: Of course it is possible, because you are aware of police tactics.

Mr Hayman: No, absolutely not, it is not possible at all, because you would be-

Michael Ellis: You are not aware of police tactics?

Mr Hayman: That is not what I said. All I am saying is there is absolutely no way that that is the purpose of that meeting. There would be no way we would go into the operational stuff, that is just ridiculous.

Q557 Mr Winnick: The last witness, Mr Clarke, said that when he was looking into phone hacking matters the attitude of News International was hostile. Won't people wonder, when you were in charge of the inquiry in 2006-07-

Mr Hayman: In charge of what inquiry, Mr Winnick?

Mr Winnick: The phone hacking inquiry.

Mr Hayman: What do you mean by "in charge"?

Chair: Well, you had oversight.

Mr Hayman: Oversight.

Q558 Mr Winnick: Oversight. I don't know why you are splitting-

Mr Hayman: I am not splitting hairs, I am just making sure that I can understand-

Mr Winnick: Let's get it quite clear, you were in overall charge of the inquiry into the *News of the World* phone hacking affair 2006-07. You are not disputing that?

Mr Hayman: Yes, it was in my command.

Q559 Mr Winnick: You are not disputing that?

Mr Hayman: No.

Mr Winnick: No, good, that is clear. But won't people say, a general sort of public attitude, that if News International was so hostile originally, what sort of inquiry could you have undertaken overall responsibility for, when they offered you a job a year later, afterwards?

Mr Hayman: It was about two years later, and I must admit, weighing it up, they were a different part of the stable. *The Times*, as far as I was concerned, that wasn't-it was part of News International as a big outfit, of course, but it was not the *News of the World*.

Q560 Mr Winnick: It was one organisation, and I don't think that is in any way disputed. I must put it to you, Mr Hayman, that many people must come to the conclusion that your inquiry, for which you had overall responsibility, was not strong in any way, was not meant to be strong, and in fact you should apologise for what occurred.

Mr Hayman: I think you have heard from Peter that this was not the Sunday football team turning out in the Premiership, this was the best team that I ever had. Peter Clarke, his reputation as an investigator is tenacious, he got on with it, he kept his cards very close to his chest because he didn't want any compromise, and his team below him, they imprisoned many terrible, dangerous men. You would always want him on your team sheet, you would not want him on the subs bench. So I am not quite sure who else I could have gone to. They performed, I believe, to the best of their ability.

Q561 Mr Winnick: You think it was adequate?

Mr Hayman: Well, you can make your own judgments on that. I believe they worked as hard as they could.

Mr Winnick: We have made our own judgment.

Mr Hayman: I know you have.

Q562 Nicola Blackwood: I feel a little bit like I have fallen through the rabbit hole, I have to say. Mr Hayman, you have said, and you are quoted in the *Evening Standard* saying that in the original investigation no stone was left unturned. Something that this Committee is rather unsure about is exactly why there was a decision not to have an exhaustive analysis of the 11,000 documents, which were in the possession of the police from 2006.

Mr Hayman: Yes, sure.

Nicola Blackwood: And why there was no assessment of any additional victims who might have been identified within that, or additional perpetrators.

Mr Hayman: Yes.

Nicola Blackwood: Can you explain to the Committee your role in that decision and your assessment of that role?

Mr Hayman: Well, I sat at the back and I have listened to it and I pick up the mood of the Committee and I can see where you are coming from on that. But I had no involvement in that decision at all; I think Peter has made that clear. I think we have also heard in evidence that there were people that went through it, those pages, but they probably went through it within the parameters that were set for the investigation.

Q563 Chair: Did you ever discuss that decision with Mr Clarke? That is the point.

Mr Hayman: No, it wasn't raised at all.

Q564 Chair: He made the decision himself without discussing it-

Mr Hayman: He has said that, hasn't he, yes.

Q565 Nicola Blackwood: But he came to have meetings with you, at which point he would have discussed his portfolio of investigations, I assume, and would have discussed whether he was going to continue with this investigation or not at some point. You have no recollection of discussing the implications of widespread phone hacking within the media?

Mr Hayman: Yes, you are absolutely right, he would come to me on a regular basis and we would talk in very general terms about it. I think the structure-what was it, 7/7, Litvinenko, or anything like that-is that the SIO would be working very closely with the CPS, who obviously said the direction of the legal advice that was there, and so on the basis of his briefings there, yes, I would take his judgments and his decisions he made, and I have to say, having seen him give evidence here, he stood up and explained exactly what his thinking was, and-

Q566 Chair: What about your thinking? He met you on a daily basis, he said.

Mr Hayman: I guess so, yes.

Q567 Chair: You cannot remember meeting him daily?

Mr Hayman: Well, okay, yes, daily.

Q568 Nicola Blackwood: But you were aware he was conducting this investigation?

Mr Hayman: Of course, yes.

Q569 Nicola Blackwood: And you had no thinking about the priority level that should be assigned to this investigation?

Mr Hayman: Well, he would come to me with what he saw as the priority and the resources that were available, and without going back to what the decision log says, I would endorse it, yes.

Q570 Nicola Blackwood: But you had no thoughts of your own?

Mr Hayman: I can't go back to what the discussions were at the time but the fact that we are where we are now, I would have endorsed what he said.

Chair: We need to hurry, colleagues, we have one final witness.

Q571 Steve McCabe: Two quick points. Firstly, why do you think further investigations into this affair could be a waste of public money?

Mr Hayman: Sorry, can you repeat that?

Steve McCabe: I was just looking at your quote. You said that you don't believe, "that a judicial review will reveal anything more than has already been reviewed by my successor, the CPS and other bodies. It could actually end up being a waste of public money." Is that still your view?

Mr Hayman: When did I say that?

Chair: When did he say it?

Steve McCabe: I am afraid I don't have the date here but it's a pretty-

Mr Hayman: I will be honest with you, if that is the case-

Q572 Steve McCabe: Well, let me ask you now, do you think it is a good idea to have the most detailed investigation of this matter now?

Mr Hayman: I will tell you what, when you look back now, what we know now, this is a horror story. This is absolutely awful. The people that are now going through the pain the second time around as victims, just appalling. The one thing I think publicly has been announced recently that Peter has already said, and I am up for this, is that we must-we must-have a judge-led public inquiry.

Q573 Steve McCabe: Fine, but you don't recall that quote?

Mr Hayman: No.

Q574 Steve McCabe: Answer me one other question, why did you set out to ridicule Lord Prescott when he persisted with his allegations about phone hacking?

Chair: We do have a date for this.

Mr Hayman: Yes, I remember doing it. No, I remember.

Steve McCabe: I think we have got quite a number-

Mr Hayman: No, no, I remember it. I remember it.

Q575 Chair: Do you remember what you said? You said he was ranting. You said, "There is absolutely no evidence from that initial investigation of his phone being hacked." You don't believe a judicial review will reveal anything more. Do you regret saying that?

Mr Hayman: Well, the terms of it were pretty poor.

Q576 Chair: So you owe Lord Prescott an apology?

Mr Hayman: Yes, of course I do.

Q577 Steve McCabe: You said, "If I am proved to be wrong I will eat my words and face the music."

Mr Hayman: Yes, well I think I am doing that now.

Chair: Shall we pass you a piece of paper? Thank you.

Q578 Lorraine Fullbrook: Mr Hayman, do you not understand that the public will just see you as a dodgy geezer who was in charge of a phone hacking inquiry conducted by the *News of the World*, who resigned from the force among allegations of expenses claims and allegations of improper conduct with two females, who has told this Committee today that you had no knowledge of editors or sub-editors of *The Times* while cosyng up to the executive levels of News International, and amazingly received an award for this investigation?

Mr Hayman: Not for this investigation, no.

Chair: No, we would not have expected you to receive an award for this. Apart from that last bit, can you answer Mrs Fullbrook?

Lorraine Fullbrook: But this is a disaster, this inquiry, an absolute disaster under your direction.

Mr Hayman: It is under my watch, it is in my command, absolutely.

Q579 Chair: Absolutely it was a disaster?

Mr Hayman: At the time, and I think Peter has made this point, everything possible that they were able to do given the resources and the parameters they set was done. I stand by that, and Peter has as well.

Q580 Chair: But now?

Mr Hayman: Well, what it looks like now, it looks very lame, and I think what has happened is that we have had more time to do it, more revelations have come out, the *News of World* have given us some material that we didn't have at the time. Peter has gone through the detail of the correspondence he had and he decided-you know, he was frustrated at that correspondence, so that is where we are.

Q581 Lorraine Fullbrook: So it is a disaster?

Mr Hayman: No, it is not a disaster when two people plead guilty and went to prison.

Q582 Lorraine Fullbrook: You do not think this is a disaster, when 11,000 pages of material was cursorily scanned and nothing came from it? That eight hours of investigation was given to this review, you do not think that is a disaster?

Mr Hayman: How do you mean eight hours of investigation?

Chair: The Yates review.

Mr Hayman: I don't know about that.

Q583 Chair: You have never heard of the Yates review?

Mr Hayman: Of course I have, but it is not for me to comment on that.

Chair: No, but Mrs Fullbrook was trying to put it all in a round-

Mr Hayman: I think, given the parameters that were set and the reading that was done of the material, at that time it was proportionate and within those parameters that were set.

Q584 Chair: But now do you think you have reason to apologise?

Mr Hayman: Well, apologise-I want to be sure that when I stand there I am apologising for either something that I have done wrong-

Chair: On your watch.

Mr Hayman: Something that I am personally accountable for, or someone in my team has done. I want to know what it is that people have done wrong for us to apologise.

Q585 Mr Clappison: I am afraid I have one or two questions arising from what you have just said and from what we know about this. You have just said, and Mr Clarke said earlier, that you were under resource constraints, that you had other distractions at the time, and that you set yourself parameters for this. Can I ask you then about your new career as a journalist, because you have chosen to write about this for your new employer, News International, in an article that appeared in July 2009 under the heading-when your recollection was apparently better than it is now-"*News of the World* investigation was no half-hearted affair". You wrote: "In the original inquiry my heart sank when I was told the accusations came from the Palace. This was not the time for a half-hearted investigation. We put our best detectives on the case and left no stone unturned as officials breathed down our necks. The *Guardian* has said" this was subsequently in 2009 "that it understands that the police files show that between 2,000 and 3,000 individuals had their mobile phones hacked into, far more than was ever officially admitted during the investigation and prosecution of Clive Goodman, yet my recollection is different. As I recall the list of those targeted, which was put together from records kept by Glen Mulcaire, ran to several hundred names, of these a small number, perhaps a handful, where there is evidence that the phones had actually been tampered with. Had there been evidence of tampering in the other cases that would have been investigated as would the slightest hint that others were involved."

Mr Hayman: Sure, yes.

Mr Clappison: Would you say that that article could stand some correction in the light of what we

have seen in the last couple of weeks?

Mr Hayman: When it was written it was on the basis-I think it was Commander John McDowell, he came into my office and came to me with a number of foolscap pages-I think A4 or foolscap-and I think it was something in the region of eight or nine, and my recollection was that over his briefing to me there were three groups of names. There was ostensibly a contact list, which, in itself, you wouldn't expect from anyone, it is like an address book of numbers of people. I believe that the second column or list was a shorter number where I think-my recollection was that they might have been PIN numbers that were known. My understanding is on the legal advice-there was a third category of people where I think they had technologically proved that they had used the PIN number and the telephone number to access the voicemail. So my understanding at that time of writing that was that we had gone from a long list of contact numbers down into a list of people, of which some had PIN numbers, and there was a list that had been accessed and hacked.

Q586 Mr Clappison: Could we just come to this a bit shorter, because that was what was written in 2009, and I want to ask you about what you knew at the time or had been told?

Mr Hayman: That is what I knew.

Q587 Mr Clappison: At the time were you told the name of other individuals who had been hacked into, related to the material that had been obtained from Glen Mulcaire and all the files?

Mr Hayman: No.

Q588 Mr Clappison: You were not given the names of any other individuals?

Mr Hayman: No.

Q589 Mr Clappison: To your knowledge there are no other names of individuals in the documents as people who have been effected?

Mr Hayman: The only names-I can only remember a handful of names of people, and the briefing I was getting, was that there were numbers of people who were prosecutable and the CPS said were able to be taken to court.

Q590 Mr Clappison: There were people who subsequently discovered, and I think Mr Taylor was one of them, that their names were amongst the evidence that was in your possession, which apparently had been redacted in certain cases when the evidence was given to those acting privately on behalf of the individuals concerned, who were never approached by you or any other officers at the time, is that right?

Mr Hayman: I don't know.

Q591 Mr Clappison: You don't know. Did it come as a surprise to you when it turned out that Mr Taylor apparently took private legal proceedings to discover these documents and other documents in the possession of News International and to discover that he apparently had been hacked into and was the subject of compensation paid by *News of the World*? That was never investigated?

Mr Hayman: I don't know.

Q592 Mr Clappison: Were any other journalists investigated at the *News of the World* besides the ones who were targeted?

Mr Hayman: I think Peter asked for information on other journalists and I think in his evidence he

said that that was not forthcoming.

Q593 Mr Clappison: Can we just go back to what you said a moment ago then? You said that you were presented foolscaps of names, whose were those names?

Mr Hayman: I can't remember.

Q594 Mr Clappison: Were they names of people who had come to light-I am not asking for particular-

Mr Hayman: No, honestly-

Mr Clappison: Were there names of other people? Who were the names that were presented to you in the foolscap, where did they come from?

Mr Hayman: That was a-I am just trying to explain to you, I recall, not in any real detail, but I just remember John coming in and he said, "These are the names-". I thought that this was-not necessarily from the 11,000 because it wasn't until later that I even remembered that-from names that they had collected from either the searches of the premises or from other sources, and it was-I can't remember the names on it, in fact I probably didn't even pay much attention to it. It was just going through that.

Q595 Dr Huppert: Mr Hayman, I am hoping you can help this Committee. You have told us that you behaved totally honestly throughout, you remember some things and not others, and so forth. Let me give you a counterfactual, that there was somebody who had a very similar role to yours but did have illicit connections, did talk to News International, did make deals about it, whatever it might be, that it was not all entirely innocent. How could this Committee possibly tell the difference from what you have said so far? Is there anything that you could say that could persuade us that your version is correct and we should not be worried about all these other-

Mr Hayman: I think what you have to do is, you can speculate all you want around motive and what have you, but you have to then be able to show that someone can turn a motive into an outcome and has got the ability to do that.

Q596 Dr Huppert: So we have to show that somebody could get a well-paid job with News International? What is the opportunity we are looking for?

Mr Hayman: No, no, what I thought I got from your questions was that for all those motives you described there, what could I have done on a daily basis to either interfere or stop or influence, and I couldn't. I had no ability to do it whatsoever. You have heard that from Peter.

Chair: Thank you, we have some very quick final points. Please make them very quick.

Q597 Nicola Blackwood: Mr Hayman, I am very conscious that this session will be watched by victims of hacking and I am also conscious that much of the evidence that you have given would sound more familiar coming from the mouth of a tabloid journalist than from a senior police officer. I wonder if you would accept the fact that the original police investigation failed those victims, and whether you would have something you would like to say to those victims now?

Mr Hayman: Peter and I would join-you have heard from Peter, and I would say that of course-you know, I have said already in evidence that it is absolutely appalling that victims of crime have then gone through that terrible experience, and then this, where we find ourselves now today, having all this pored over in their private lives. That is absolutely appalling. So that is a matter of absolute regret. Absolutely.

Q598 Nicola Blackwood: Would you like to take this opportunity to apologise to them now?

Mr Hayman: I think I just have. I do apologise, yes.

Q599 Lorraine Fullbrook: Mr Hayman, while a police officer did you receive payment from any news organisation?

Mr Hayman: Good God, absolutely not. I cannot believe you suggested that.

Dr Huppert: Lots of people did.

Mr Hayman: Hang on, I am not letting you get away with that. Absolutely no way. I can say to you-

Chair: Mr Hayman. Order.

Mr Hayman: No, come on, Chairman, that is not fair.

Chair: Order, order.

Mr Hayman: That is not fair.

Chair: Mrs Fullbrook is not getting away with anything.

Mr Hayman: No, no, the additional comment.

Chair: It is the same question she had put to all witnesses.

Mr Hayman: Could Mr Huppert repeat his additional comment?

Dr Huppert: Other people have.

Mr Hayman: Yes, but hang on-

Chair: Mr Hayman. Order, Mr Hayman. Order.

Dr Huppert: There has been evidence in public that a number of police officers did.

Mr Hayman: But that is a real attack on my integrity. I am not having it.

Q600 Chair: Order, order. Members of this Committee are allowed to ask any questions they wish. It is a fair question to put, because it is in the public domain at the moment about other police officers. She has put her question, you have given an answer. The answer is an unequivocal no.

Mr Hayman: Absolutely.

Chair: Thank you.

Q601 Mark Reckless: Mr Hayman, how many officers and staff did you have on this 2006 investigation?

Mr Hayman: I am going to have to rely on what Peter described.

Q602 Mark Reckless: How many was it? If necessary we can refer to Mr Clarke to answer that-

Mr Hayman: Yes, I cannot remember what Peter said.

Mark Reckless: -because I think the Committee needs the answer to that.

Mr Hayman: Yes, whatever Peter said is what we had.

Q603 Chair: Mr Hayman, I normally sum up people's evidence, but on this occasion I think your evidence speaks for itself. Thank you very much for coming.

Mr Hayman: Thank you very much. Pleasure. Thank you.