

# STATES OF JERSEY



## CHIEF OFFICER OF STATES OF JERSEY POLICE: APPOINTMENT PROCESS (P.33/2010) – AMENDMENT

---

Lodged au Greffe on 13th April 2010  
by the Minister for Home Affairs

---

STATES GREFFE



CHIEF OFFICER OF STATES OF JERSEY POLICE: APPOINTMENT PROCESS  
(P.33/2010) – AMENDMENT

---

**PAGE 2 –**

After the words “should be established,” insert the words “which shall include in its terms of reference the role played by the Acting Chief Officer of the States of Jersey Police in relation to the original suspension of the Chief Officer of the States of Jersey Police,”.

MINISTER FOR HOME AFFAIRS

## REPORT

I accept that the debate on P.30/2010 (“Chief Officer of the States of Jersey Police Force: appointment”) should not take place before the outcome of the review being conducted by the Commissioner appointed by the Chief Minister. Indeed, it is my intention that the debate on P.30/2010 should not take place prior to my being able to provide to the Members of the States Assembly the following –

- (1) the parts of the Metropolitan Police Interim Report and Final Report which relate to the areas of concern expressed by the Acting Chief Officer of Police in his letter dated 10th November 2008; and
- (2) as much as possible of the relevant reports of the Wiltshire Police Force in relation to disciplinary matters concerning the Chief Officer of Police.

I have full confidence in the Acting Chief Officer of Police and I am satisfied that he acted most properly in bringing to the attention of the Chief Executive to the Council of Ministers and the Minister for Home Affairs his concerns in relation to the handling of the Historical Abuse Enquiry with regard to Haut de la Garenne. Indeed, I am satisfied that he was under a duty to bring those concerns to the attention of the appropriate authorities.

However, it has been suggested publicly by the Deputy of St. Martin and others that the Acting Chief Officer of Police acted improperly in so doing. I wish to ensure that the Members of the States Assembly have the maximum amount of information available to them in relation to this issue prior to the debate on P.30/2010.

Three possible outcomes may result from the review being conducted by the Commissioner appointed by the Chief Minister and these are as follows –

- (a) he may simply complete his review and make this public;
- (b) he may decide that a Committee of Inquiry is desirable in relation to all the issues which would be covered by his review; or
- (c) he may decide that a Committee of Inquiry is desirable in relation to certain aspects of the matters being covered from his review.

The purpose of this Amendment relates to option (c) above. In particular, it occurs to me that the Commissioner could hypothetically come to a position in which he was fully satisfied that the Acting Chief Officer of Police had acted properly in this matter but felt that there were other issues (which did not relate to the role played by the Acting Chief Officer of Police in relation to the original suspension of the Chief Officer of Police). In that eventuality, there would in my view be no reason why the debate on P.30/2010 should not go ahead as soon as possible after I was able to provide the additional information set out in (1) and (2) above.

In putting forward this Amendment, I am aware that unnecessary delay in relation to the appointment of a new Chief Officer of Police with effect from the day after the retirement of the current Chief Officer of Police is highly undesirable for the following reasons –

- (1) The States of Jersey Police have been in a situation of uncertainty since November 2008 in relation to its future leadership. The sooner that this situation can be ended, by the appointment of a new Chief Officer of Police, the better.

- (2) The Acting Chief Officer of Police was originally selected, subject to subsequent satisfactory performance and States approval, to be the Chief Officer of Police Designate. He also has been left in a position of uncertainty for some time and it is only fair to him as an individual that his future role in Jersey be clarified as soon as possible.

**Financial and manpower implications**

There are no financial or manpower implications for the States arising from this Amendment to P.33/2010.