

Witness Name: Officer B  
Statement No: 2  
Exhibits: OB2/01 – OB2/07  
Dated: 26 September 2025

**THE SOUTHPORT INQUIRY**

---

**SECOND WITNESS STATEMENT OF  
OFFICER B**

---

I, OFFICER B, will say as follows:

### **Introductory matters**

1. I am Officer B. I am a Detective Constable ('**DC**') in the Lancashire Fixed Intelligence Management Unit ('**FIMU**') of Counter Terrorism Policing North West ('**CTPNW**').
2. This is the second statement I have made for the Southport Inquiry ('**the Inquiry**'). My previous statement ('**first witness statement**'), dated 20 August 2025, addresses questions set out in the Inquiry's Rule 9 request dated 29 July 2025. I make this statement in response to a second Rule 9 request dated 19 September 2025, which has asked me to respond to some additional questions relating to my involvement in AR's first Prevent referral.

### **Recollection and my involvement in the first referral**

3. As stated at the outset of my first witness statement, I hope the Inquiry will appreciate that it is difficult for me now to recall with clarity the specific detail of the individual matters I worked on, particularly where they occurred nearly 6 years ago. To prepare my first witness statement, I reviewed the contemporaneous documents to refresh my memory.
4. In my first witness statement, I said that my earliest involvement in AR's case was on 10 December 2019 when I contacted Acorns School to request AR's internet browsing history. It has since been brought to my attention that I reviewed this case a few days prior on the 6 December 2019, whilst waiting for the school to resubmit their concerns on a Prevent concern form.
5. This was an inadvertent oversight: I have no independent recollection of the detail of my involvement with AR's first Prevent referral, and as such, I did not recall my involvement on 6 December 2019 until it was recently brought to my attention. I have now taken the time to review the relevant materials, and I have answered the questions put to me as best I can.

## Correspondence with Acorns School

6. I have reviewed the correspondence between Acorns School and Lancashire FIMU **[OB2/01 - LANC000175]** and can see that Acorns School first made contact with the 'Concern' central inbox, monitored by FIMU, on 5 December 2019.
7. The Inquiry has provided me with copies of the witness statements prepared by Joanne Hodson and Janet Lewis of Acorns School, dated 2 September 2025 **[OB2/02 - LCC001773]** and 5 September 2025 **[OB2/03 - LCC001774]** respectively. I have reviewed the relevant paragraphs of these witness statements. Their recollection is that Ms Lewis included a record of AR's school internet browsing history as an attachment to her email of 5 December 2019 **[OB2/02 - LCC001773, paragraph 133]** **[OB2/03 - LCC001774, paragraph 29]**. I understand that the browsing history has been disclosed to the Inquiry by Lancashire County Council and the Inquiry has taken steps to analyse its contents **[OB2/04 - LCC001401]**.
8. Enquiries have been made on my behalf, and I understand that due to the passage of time, it is not possible to access the attachments to the emails from 2019 on the Lancashire Constabulary IT systems. I am told that all attachments are deleted after three years in line with the Lancashire Constabulary email retention policy. However, I understand that the Inquiry has sought disclosure of the zip file from Lancashire County Council. The Inquiry has established that the email on 5 December 2019 contained two attachments:
  - a. Acorns School's safeguarding database (CPOMS)<sup>1</sup>
  - b. Zip file called 'Re\_Child\_AR\_Urgent\_safeguarding.zip.txt'
9. I am told the zip file contained the following documents:
  - a. Alder Hey CAMHS referral made by Range High School
  - b. Report from PC Alexander McNamee
  - c. Range High School safeguarding report form
  - d. Range High School EPEN 1, advising of AR's permanent exclusion

---

<sup>1</sup> This document was provided by the Inquiry and includes information that postdates 5 December 2019 and therefore appears to be the full CPOMS database. Any documents sent on 5 December 2019, would presumably have only included information up to the date the referral was submitted.

10. From reviewing the documents, there is no indication that either of these attachments contained AR's school internet browsing history.
11. As set out below in further detail, Ms Lewis was asked to resubmit her concerns using the appropriate Prevent form, which was sent to her by Officer A. She sent through the completed form on 6 December 2019. The records do not indicate that the internet browsing history was annexed or attached separately to the Prevent concern form or to Ms Lewis' email.

### **Summary of my involvement**

12. I have set out below a timeline of the relevant events concerning information provided to FIMU regarding AR's first Prevent referral. Further enquiries have been made on my behalf with the Lancashire Constabulary to clarify the dates and timings of these emails, as these are not entirely clear. For example, several emails have the sent time as 6.32pm. This appears to be a consequence of the emails being lifted from an old system, with some manual input of dates and times. I have however tried to provide as clear a narrative as possible focusing on my involvement in this referral.

*5 December 2019*

13. On 5 December 2019, Ms Lewis, the Designated Safeguarding Lead ('DSL') at Acorns School in Lancashire, sent what was intended to be a Prevent referral to the relevant 'concern' email address at Lancashire police [OB2/01 - LANC000175, p.21].
14. That same day, the records indicate my colleague, Officer A, read that email and responded asking her to resubmit her concerns using the prescribed Prevent form, which he attached. Officer A specifically asked that Ms Lewis "*make it clear exactly what concerns you have around the subject having an extremist ideology or being vulnerable to radicalisation*" [OB2/01 - LANC000175, p.21].
15. Officer A then made a note to FIMU colleagues on Ms Lewis' email, setting out his initial thoughts as follows:

*"Quite a confusing referral with no Concern form attached. Appears to be a large 'dump' of data from the school but not clear if there is any concern about his ideology or*

*radicalisation. It appears that he has made threats to stab other people at the school including teachers and that Police have already been involved. I am not sure if this is simply a misguided referral but I have stressed in my email [copied below] to make the relevance of this referral clear. Hopefully this will be returned in a clearer state!" [OB2/01 - LANC000175, p. 17-18].*

16. Officer A's comment reflects his consideration that before the case could be allocated to an officer for assessment, more input was required by the referrer.
17. When a referral is received into the 'concern' email inbox, FIMU does not have a document management platform to store the details and attachments of 'live' or completed Prevent referrals. Within the 'concern' email inbox, various subfolders have been created where emails can be stored only once the referral has been dealt with by FIMU from a CT/DE relevance perspective. All emails relating to 'live' referrals should remain within the inbox so that officers can see what other related emails have already been received. In this case, I do not know if the previous emails from 5 and 6 December remained within the inbox prior to my actions taken on 10 December.

*6 December 2019*

18. On 6 December 2019, I made a note on the earlier email from 5 December 2019, as follows, and have noted the following information:

*"As per [OFFICER As] comments the concern form has been filled out with very little detail asking us to refer to the large amount of data provided, a telephone call has been made to the school for the teacher to resubmit the concern form in relation to the concerns and any extreme ideology or vulnerabilities to radicalisation [as most] of the paperwork relates to disruption in class [and] unruly behaviour." [OB2/01 - LANC000175, p. 41-42]*

19. I have no recollection of this and can only rely on what has been recorded in the documents as well as our usual practice at the time when dealing with referrals. When reviewing a referral for the first time, my normal practice was, and still is, to look at any accompanying documents to better understand the nature of the referrers concerns. I note my comment that most of the paperwork included in the two attachments related to disruptive behaviour.

However, I cannot recall whether, at this stage, I reviewed the documents myself, or whether I relied on Officer A's assessment of the referral from the previous day.

20. I also note that my comment above refers to a telephone call with Ms Lewis. I have no recollection of this, and the record provided to me of the call is from Acorns School's database (CPOMS) rather than a note made on the FIMU system by a FIMU officer. It therefore is not a FIMU record of the call. However, these documents indicate the discussion took place on 6 December 2019, the same date that I added the entry to the FIMU notes. As such, it is reasonable to assume I was the officer who spoke to Ms Lewis, as it seems unlikely that a different officer (i.e. an individual not dealing with the case) would have made that call, but I cannot provide any further detail than that. **[OB2/05 - LCC001346, p. 67].**

21. The CPOMS record of that call refers to a request to resubmit the concern "*due to too many attachments being forwarded for the police to go through...*" **[OB2/05 - LCC001346, p. 67].** I did not write this note and so could not be sure what was meant by this comment. It may have been a reference to Officer A's point - that the referral initially included a large amount of material but without an explanation from the referrer as to the specific concerns. While FIMU officers would of course review any documents attached to a Prevent referral, where Prevent and Pursue relevance is not clear from the information provided, it was usual practice to go back to the referrer to ask them to identify specific concerns, or to complete the relevant forms.

22. On 6 December 2019, Ms Lewis resubmitted the referral on the relevant Prevent concern form, in accordance with Officer A's request. The completed form summarised various examples of AR's concerning behaviour as recorded in the school's CPOMS database, including reports from November 2019 that AR was found in class researching school shootings in America.

#### *AR's internet browsing history*

23. On 10 December 2019, I returned to this case and undertook a number of actions. These have been set out in detail from paragraph 32 onwards of my first witness statement. I made a note on 10 December 2019 that I had contacted Ms Lewis to ask for AR's school internet search history. My records state that Ms Lewis was to contact the school IT provider to obtain this information if still available **[OB2/01 - LANC000175, p. 66-67].** This

would indicate that the record of AR's browsing history was not in my possession at that time.

24. On 16 December 2019, I emailed the Prevent Officer and PC Russ Davies to inform Prevent of the JAT assessment outcome. I cannot see from the records whether my email contained any attachments.
25. For the avoidance of doubt, I can see no record of receiving the browsing history. As such, it did not appear in the material I sent to the Prevent team. I accept that I could have followed up on that action point to make further attempts to access that information prior to the Prevent referral being made, or to flag it to Prevent as outstanding. I don't consider this would have affected my decision to refer within FIMU.
26. However, I understand from the documents that the Prevent Officer working on this referral was aware of the internet history and was taking her own steps to follow up on this. On 7 January 2020, the Prevent Officer, Carmen Thompson updated the Action Result Document following the second multi agency strategy meeting on 6 January 2020 [OB2/06 - CTPNW000132]. The minutes of this meeting confirmed that Merseyside Police were reviewing AR's school internet history and would update accordingly with any concerns found [OB2/07 - CTPNW000009].
27. The Inquiry has asked, in theory, if the browsing history had been sent through to FIMU, what steps could have been taken to analyse the document. Any analysis by FIMU would have been undertaken by officers via a manual search, i.e. by copying the relevant URL into a browser and checking the links. Given the size of the document, it is likely I, or another FIMU officer, would have sought to narrow down the search by dip sampling or speaking to the school and asking for guidance such as dates when they knew AR had undertaken searches of concern. The analysis is always done on a case-by-case basis, with an eye to proportionality and bearing in mind the other work which would have been necessary, but FIMU would be expected to consider the information provided by the referrer. It is difficult to say what results could have been returned since this is a hypothetical consideration of the browsing history, therefore I do not wish to speculate any further.
28. I have considered whether the receipt of the internet browsing history in December 2019 would have changed my assessment of the first referral. As set out above, I would have

reviewed the record of the internet browsing history and uploaded it to the National Common Intelligence Application ('NCIA'), alongside any analysis performed, to make it available to the JAT for further consideration. I cannot comment on whether the JAT would have made a different assessment based on this information, however, my own view is that the search results provided by the Inquiry Legal Team do not contain anything that would change my assessment of CT/DE risk. The case would still have been referred onto Prevent, with the internet browsing history record made available to them on the NCIA.

## Reflections

29. My reflections are set out in detail within Section 5 of my first witness statement. At Section 6, I list the improvements I am aware of which have been made in the FIMU and Prevent teams since my involvement in AR's case and the incident in Southport last year.

30. I am asked whether myself or my organisation could have done more or done things differently in respect of the matters I have addressed in this statement. I have set out above my own reflections on my earlier involvement in AR's first Prevent referral.

## Statement of Truth

I believe that the facts stated in this witness statement are true. I understand that proceedings may be brought against anyone who makes, or causes to be made, a false statement in a document verified by a statement of truth without an honest belief of its truth.

Signed: Officer B  
Officer B

**Dated:** 26 September 2025