

FILE NOTERE: GLENCROSS, HAWKES & PERKINSELEMENTS OF OFFENCE RE:

LH

On LH's unsigned statement the following potential offences arise:-

1. Prurient Interest *§ 58, 9j*
2. Unlawful Sexual Intercourse - fellatio *+ anal*
3. ~~Indecent Assault.~~

With respect to the USI and the indecent assault outlined in the declaration there is a problem of R v S. However, when speaking to LH he outlined one occasion only of anal intercourse, Therefore, we may be able to prove unlawful sexual intercourse with respect to that count. We would need to obtain proof of age.

As to prurient interest I was advised by Len Mosheev that he and Carr found photographs of LH at Perkins' home. These were seized. The films (they were not actual photographs as such) were processed. When they went to interview Perkins he had left. They continued their investigations, but later when they went to resume the investigations after a break they found the photographs missing. Further photographs were found when a raid took place at Perkins' place. There were also further photographs found in England in the home of Ashby. Mosheev said that some of these were the ones that he could remember originally seizing from Perkins' place. He said that the blue bathers that were seized at Perkins' place are identical to the ones in the photographs.

Perkins, therefore, can be shown to have possession of these photographs. When proofing LH he outlined 2 occasions that the photographs were taken, one by Perkins and one by Hawkes. With the photographs and LH own evidence we should be able to establish the varying elements of the offence. However, as against Hawkes, if LH proves to be a bad witness which I fear he will, we do not have evidence linking Hawkes with the photographs.

Recommendation:

In the charge of Prurient Interest should be laid against Perkins and one count of USI. Unless we can overcome the problem of R v S, i.e. being unable to isolate an incident, no further charges should be laid. Unless we could come up with evidence linking Hawkes and Perkins together I doubt whether LH's evidence of Rob being present is sufficient.

*For oral examination of committed*

*Query with police whether*

LH

*can ID Acc. ? R. Hawkes ?*