

Witness Name : Bridget Shaw  
Statement No : First  
Exhibits: BS1-BS14  
Dated :

**THE INDEPENDENT JERSEY CARE INQUIRY**

---

Exhibit BS5

---

CENTENIER GEOFFREY PIROUET  
PARISH HALL, ST CLEMENT

5 January 2000

Re [REDACTED]

I interviewed [REDACTED] at the Parish Hall on [REDACTED] December in the presence of Mr Barry Jordan of the Probation Service following the end of the three month deferred decision period.

Prior to this, I had spoken with Ms Bridget Shaw of the Legal Advisers Dept.

During the three month deferred period, [REDACTED] had breached the conditions only once. A letter from Mr Jordan dated 21 December (copy attached) indicated that [REDACTED] had successfully completed the Voluntary Supervision .

I made the decision not to proceed with any charge and to discontinue the deferred decision period on the understanding that [REDACTED] would voluntarily attend the Faithful Foundation Assessment (the 'Assessment') scheduled for 11 January 2000. In my presence, Mr Jordan explained clearly to [REDACTED] that should he not attend this matter would be reported back to me for a review of my decision not to prosecute.

I made it clear to [REDACTED] in Mr Jordan's presence, that regardless of what I decided at the Parish Hall Enquiry, I could be told to prosecute by the Attorney General. This was also made plain in my letter to Mr Jordan dated 22 December (copy attached).

My decision was based on the following:

1. If I continued to defer my decision the probation Service will not arrange for the Assessment to take place.
2. If I had decided to charge, the Probation Service will await the instructions of the Court which might or might not include an Assessment. The view of Ms Shaw was that the judge would be unlikely to pass any severe sentence on the basis of [REDACTED] admissions. Indeed it may be (and this is my view and not necessarily that of Ms Shaw) that [REDACTED] lawyer might advise him to plead Not Guilty so that, if successful, [REDACTED] would avoid becoming a Schedule 1 offender which would stay with him for life and affect future job prospects.
3. If I decide not to proceed, it is Mr Jordan's view that [REDACTED] will attend the Assessment, voluntarily. Ms Shaw has told me that results of an Assessment are likely to be very much more accurate where a 'patient' attends as a volunteer.
4. Whilst I fully understand that a prosecution could proceed without the support of [REDACTED] family, I am mindful that, at the outset of the enquiry, Det. Sgt. Mike Shearer had stated that nothing would be done in relation to [REDACTED] without the approval of [REDACTED]. In Sgt Shearer's last conversation with the [REDACTED] they remained firmly against prosecution where [REDACTED] would be required to give evidence.
5. If the result of the Assessment is that [REDACTED] is dangerous then a Risk Assessment conference would be arranged at which those risks identified by the Faithful Foundation would be made available to, amongst others [REDACTED]. It may be then that they could be persuaded to assist in any prosecution.
6. If the Assessment shows that [REDACTED] is 'harmless', then it is unlikely that he would be prosecuted in Court in any event.
7. Finally, it seems to me that the Assessment is the priority. In not taking the matter any further at Parish Hall level at this time, I have given an opportunity for [REDACTED] to be assessed voluntarily (which is likely to give a more accurate result). Had I done anything else there is a high risk that no Assessment would be made of [REDACTED] until he next commits a similar crime. Common sense tells me that this was not a risk worth taking.