

**Reference Code:** 2021/47/85

**Creator(s):** Department of Foreign Affairs

Accession Conditions: Open

**Copyright:** National Archives, Ireland.

May only be reproduced with the written permission of the

Director of the National

Archives.

REGINA

-V-

BRIAN NELSON

before

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE LORD JUSTICE KELLY

On

MONDAY, 3RD FEBRUARY 1992

At

BELFAST CROWN COURT

SENTENCE

## •

## SENTENCE

LORD JUSTICE KELLY: The accused Brian Nelson is charged and has

pleaded guilty to five counts of conspiracy to murder and

other related offences. Conspiracy to murder is a serious

crime and Parliament has prescribed life imprisonment as the

maximum penalty.

All these crimes were committed between August 1987 and January 1990 when Neison was a member of the Uister Defence Association and indeed a senior intelligence officer. But throughout this period he played a double game. He was at the same time an agent for Army intelligence. The defence, however, would not put it quite that way, that is that he played a dual role. Rather they would say that he played the singular and undivided role of an undercover agent for the Army within the UDA, that his loyalty was only to the Army and that for the UDA he merely postured as of necessity as its member and intelligence officer.

The infiltration into criminal gangs by undercover agents working for law and order has long been recognised in most countries as a legitimate means of detecting criminal activity and bringing criminals to justice. In particular this is especially acknowledged where gangs and groups carry on constant serious crime against society — yet its leaders and members remain unknown, or if known remain in the absence of evidence free from prosecution. Terrorist groups and drug trafficking groups fail easily into this category.

But at the same time the law has made it clear that if the undercover agent during the period of his infiltration

commits a crime, he cannot expect to be immune from criminal prosecution and punishment. In our system of criminal justice there is no refuge or half-way house in criminal culpability in these circumstances. Our system does not create for the agent an in between category that ites somewhere between guilt and innocence. The agent is prosecuted and punished for his crimes as an ordinary criminal and that is why in this case Brian Nelson appears before this Court guilty of crime and subject to punishment as a criminal.

However, the law realistically recognises there may be special extenuating circumstances peculiar to the undercover agent. The agent may find, even if he is a disciplined and knowledgeable police officer, as he often is, but which Nelson was not. difficulty in maintaining the line between lawful cooperation with his criminal associates and entering into the commission of criminal offences with Nelson was tasked by Army intelligence, as Colonei 'J' has said, to learn the workings of the UDA, to limit their murderous activities, to pass on information, but not to get involved with their murder gangs. On the other hand, as their senior intelligence officer, the UDA having given him a mass of documentary intelligence relating to suspected Republican terrorists and other personalities, instructed him, in his own words : "I was to build an efficent intelligence network to enable the Association to properly target known Republicans for possible execution". In these opposing directions the dividing line between criminal participation and rawful interligence gathering was drawn. Neison chose to cross the wrong side of the line on five

3

4 5

6

8

9

11

12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19

21

22

23

2425

26

27

28

occasions, as his pleas of guilty indicate. He did not, as Colonei 'J' said, maintain a balance but went beyond what was required of him and involved himself with the murder gangs.

In the McDaid conspiracy, when asked for a target by a UDA gunman, he selected from his index cards that of Declan McDaid and confirmed that the house he had watched and which he believed was Declan McDaid's was indeed his. In the Maskey conspiracy he took steps to inform UDA gunmen of his whereabouts in a restaurant and on two occasions went to see gummen to alert them of this fact. In the Morgan conspiracy when asked for a target by a gunman he selected James Morgan and passed over his card and photograph, again checking with the electoral role and map Morgan's identity and acdress. He did the same thing in the case of Patrick Monaghan. In the case of Brian Gillen he watched the bar Gillen was alleged to frequent and suggested a plan to assassinate him to a UDA reader, and even suggested who might be the gunman. In each case he took steps of his own accord to confirm the addresses and habits of these victims, and in addition in the case of Gillen he assisted in the transporting of a sub-machine gun to be used in his murder.

Nelson's activities in all these five matters amounted in law to nothing less than conspiracies to murder, and in these he conformed to the UDA directive and disobeyed his instructions from Army intelligence.

It is of course right to say that in four of these conspiracies, including that of Decian McDaid, he had peviously alerted his military handlers of the intended victim on more than one occasion, and that none of them

3

6

7

8

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

resulted in the murder of or injury to any of the targets. But it was a close run thing. In three cases the gunmen went into action at the addresses given by Neison, and on one of these, tragically, the brother of Nelson's selected victim was murdered. In the fourth the gunmen were ready but the guns were not available. And in a fifth the gunmen did not shoot because their victim was in the company of a woman.

In passing sentence I remind the accused again that the maximum penalty for conspiracy to murder is imprisonment for life. However, the sentences I am about to impose will show that much of the mitigating material given forcefully before me by Colonei 'J', and submitted most eloquently by Wr Boal, has been taken into account.

In particular I take into account that Nelson gave up a comfortable life in Germany at the behest of the Army and with good motivation, not for gain, and with the greatest courage submitted himself to constant danger and intense strain for three years. I also take into account that in order to preserve his identity and indeed his life, and to give the appearance of cooperation with his criminal associates, it was never easy for him to maintain the line between what was lawful and what was not. And I give of course considerable weight to the fact that he passed on what was possibly life saving information in respect of 217 threatened individuals.

Further Nelson has pleaded guilty and the law rules that such a course should reduce the sentence. And finally I am mindful of the fact that a prison sentence in his case will mean, for obvious reasons, extra hardship.

Brian Nelson, would you stand up? On the 11 counts of possession of documents likely to be useful to terrorists I sentence you on each count to three years imprisonment.

On the three counts of collecting information I sentence you to four years imprisonment on each count.

On the count of possession of firearms with intent I sentence you to six years imprisonment.

On each of the five counts of conspiracy to murder I sentence you to ten years imprisonment. All these sentences will be concurrent.