

4.10 Deputy M. Tadier of the Attorney General regarding an estimate of the prosecution costs in respect of the conviction of Curtis Warren and associates:

Will the Attorney General provide an estimate of the prosecution costs in respect of the conviction of Curtis Warren and Associates, including the appeal case, and advise what steps, if any, have been taken to recover the court and case costs?

Mr. T.J. Le Cocq Q.C., H.M. Attorney General:

Since the case against Curtis Warren and others started in July of 2007, the prosecution, up until 31st December 2012, has incurred expenditure of £1,963,619. This sum covers all hearings up to and including the Privy Council and expenditure incurred preparing for confiscation proceedings which it is anticipated will take place later this year. The confiscation proceedings are still before the court and there are other matters upon which the Royal Court has been asked to adjudicate. I am not therefore in a position to provide more details about these matters as they are before the court and *sub judice*. As is the normal practice, issues relating to the costs of the proceedings and whether those who were convicted should pay all or part of the costs of the prosecution have been adjourned until the conclusion of the confiscation proceedings.

4.10.1 Deputy M. Tadier:

If I might be permitted a supplementary, can the Attorney General advise whether there were any cost implications for the Law Officers' Department in the related disciplinary case of the 3 police officers which we found the result for on Thursday?

The Attorney General:

No, there were not. All decisions relating to the police disciplinary proceedings and expenditure were incurred by the police.

4.10.2 Deputy M.R. Higgins:

I am just wondering if the Attorney General can elaborate on what other matters, other than the confiscation order, are before the court and which will be incurring costs?

The Attorney General:

No, I am afraid it would not be appropriate for me to do so in this public forum.

4.10.3 Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:

Notwithstanding the fact that the disciplinary procedure was handled by the police, could the Attorney General state categorically to the House whether he was involved at any point in giving advice, directly or indirectly, to the police as to the advisability of disciplinary proceedings and thereby increasing the cost?

The Attorney General:

Contrary to the report that appeared in the newspaper of yesterday, I did not make any complaint of misconduct or anything else against any of the officers. It was not my decision. I was neither a party to, nor did I participate in, the disciplinary proceedings in any way.

4.10.4 Deputy M. Tadier:

The Attorney General will be aware of the Privy Council ruling of 28th March 2011 which said that a senior member of the Law Officers' Department in Jersey advised the police that despite the French and Dutch refusals, he did not think that a Jersey court would be likely to exclude any evidence and therefore a link was made whereby police officers acted inappropriately, ostensibly on the advice of a senior Jersey law officer. On that basis, does the Attorney General think that there was likely to be any cost arising from a potential investigation into the Law Officers' Department and if so, what would that cost likely be?

The Attorney General:

No, I do not.