

S. R. (Bondonderry 113)  
file)  
SM 65

BT4 3SU

12th June, 1969.

Dear McClelland,

Following receipt of your letter of 10th June, I asked District Inspector Faulkner, the officer entrusted with the investigation into the Devenny case, to call with me and put me in an up-to-date picture.

This he did yesterday, and I find that it will be some little time before he is in a position to furnish his report.

Although Faulkner was appointed for the task on 30th April, it was not until the 28th May that the solicitor acting for the Devenny family (and I think generally for others concerned) made available to him three of the main witnesses, i.e. Mr. Devenny, the injured man, and Messrs. Budd and Harkin, two others who were in the house of Devenny at the time of the alleged assaults. Meantime he had, of course, interviewed a number of others concerned.

Furthermore, Faulkner has at the moment a questionnaire circulating amongst some 300 policemen, and on the replies received will depend how many he must interview. His guess is that this may well amount to 200 or over.

Another obstacle to an early report is that the hospital reports on the various injured persons have not yet been made available; again the solicitor has not yet consented to their being furnished, despite several requests from the District Inspector.

I am not importing anything sinister into the delays by the solicitor, but merely mentioning them as factors which have militated against an early report. Apart from them, however, the extent of the domestic police enquiry is such as to resemble (on not such a minor scale!) the prelude to the Baillie Report on Bogside, which has now been completed.

I am glad to note that, whilst the matter is sub judice, the British Government has not in any way accepted the allegations made.

Yours sincerely,

L. G. HILL

R. McClelland, Esq.,  
Home Office,  
Whitehall,  
LONDON, S.W.1.

Mr Hill  
Seen Harkin  
J.G.H.  
16/6