

3.14 Deputy T.M. Pitman of the Minister for Home Affairs regarding the States of Jersey Police's action in relation to 3 plots to kill Islanders since 2010:

Further to statements from the States Police that they have had 3 plots to kill Islanders since 2010, will the Minister clarify whether this number is correct, what action was taken against those making the alleged threats, and under what laws these actions were enforced?

Senator B.I. Le Marquand (The Minister for Home Affairs):

Following a Freedom of Information request, the States of Jersey Police revealed to the *Jersey Evening Post* that there had been 3 occasions since 2010 where there had been an assessment, based upon intelligence received, of a very high risk of danger to a person's life.

[11:00]

The *Jersey Evening Post* sub-editor then created a colourful headline which was worded in the way set out in the question. The assessments of risk here were based upon intelligence which, although sufficient to identify the person who needed to be protected, were insufficient to bring a successful prosecution. Sometimes in such cases the information is insufficient to even identify the precise source of the threat.

3.14.1 Deputy T.M. Pitman:

Obviously one only has to look back a couple of years to see a documented conviction for a gentleman making a threat of death to members of the public. Initially, I know for a fact, that was only going to be progressed through a Parish Hall Inquiry. Could the Minister tell us is that the normal procedure for such serious threats to members of the public?

Senator B.I. Le Marquand:

I am so sorry, I did not completely hear the question. It was not the Deputy's fault; there were 2 bouts of coughing which went right across some of his words. I did not pick up what was the particular incident that he was referring to.

Deputy T.M. Pitman:

I was referring to the fact that in 2011 a gentleman, if I can call him that, was convicted in the court for making a death threat to a family where a former politician was staying. Initially, that procedure was only going to be done through a Parish Hall Inquiry; what I am asking the Minister is: is that the standard reaction to a death threat?

Senator B.I. Le Marquand:

I can only speak on behalf of the States of Jersey Police and it is their role to identify incidents and to investigate them and to produce files for prosecutors. I think, if there is criticism here, it would be criticism of the first thoughts of a prosecutor in relation to how to deal with this, but I take the view that death threats should always be treated seriously. As I say, I am not responsible for the behaviour of prosecutors.

The Bailiff:

Does any other Member wish to ask a question? Do you wish to ask a final question, then, Deputy?

3.14.2 Deputy T.M. Pitman:

Indeed, Sir. That case is documented, we all know it is a [*Name omitted from the transcript in accordance with Standing Order 109(7)*], it is in the public domain; we cannot name Curtis Warren and not someone who makes death threats to people. The police were subject to another complaint just at Christmas, a death threat to another member of the public from the same person, no action taken. Indeed, the member of the public was not even got back to by the police.

The Bailiff:

Deputy, Members are not meant to mention names unless it is unavoidable and central for the question to be understood.

Deputy T.M. Pitman:

I think it is, Sir.

The Bailiff:

No, it is not, you can simply ask the question as a matter of principle.

Deputy T.M. Pitman:

I always take your advice, Sir but, given the fact that the person in question is receiving taxpayers' money, it is a very serious question as to why these serious threats are not being taken seriously. It is worrying to many people.

The Bailiff:

That is a proper question, but you do not need to mention the name in order to do it.

Senator B.I. Le Marquand:

As I said before, the role of the police is to investigate matters and produce a file for the prosecutor to consider as to whether there is a sufficient basis for prosecution. I know nothing of the detail of this case because, as Members of this Assembly know, it would be improper for me to get involved in individual investigations.

The Bailiff:

Deputy Pitman, it appears to me that mention of that name was clearly in breach of the standing order, so I am going to direct it be withdrawn from the Hansard.

Deputy T.M. Pitman:

Could I just ask your explanation then, because regularly Members name Curtis Warren, *et cetera*; I just do not understand how the things differ sometimes. I am just asking so I do not make the same mistake again.

The Bailiff:

I cannot remember the context in which the reference to Mr. Warren was made, but it is a question of whether the subject can be discussed sensibly without mentioning the name, that is the test laid down in standing orders. Your question could be posed without reference to the name, whereas if it is a discussion of the outcome of Mr. Warren's trial then, clearly, that cannot be discussed without referring to the Warren trial. Very well, we come to the next question then which Deputy Southern will ask of the Minister for Transport and Technical Services.