

A whistle-blower has stepped forward, revealing that Starmer was informed about the situation and provided with the file for examination. Subsequently, he made a significant call to Tony Blair for guidance and later received a communication from a senior royal, after which the file was closed with no further action taken.



There is no question that in 2009, Starmer held the position of Director of Public Prosecutions and was the head of the Crown Prosecution Service when it was determined that credible allegations against Jimmy Savile would not be prosecuted, a decision that came alarmingly late. Although the Director does not personally oversee each case, they are certainly involved in the decision-making process for significant cases.

Thus, it is hard to believe that Starmer was not consulted regarding the decision to drop the Savile case. What was he expected to do in his leadership role if not participate in such crucial discussions?

Alison Saunders, who succeeded Starmer as Director of Public Prosecutions, acknowledged that Jenner should have faced charges in 1991. She also noted that there were two additional missed chances in 2002 and 2007 when the "evidential test was met," **indicating a viable possibility of securing a conviction.**



As a young reporter, I was given letters that might have helped make a case against the MP for child abuse



Greville Jenner, whose dementia has prevented him from facing charges, outside the high court in 2005. Photograph: Nick Razzell/REX Shutterstock

Alison Levitt's husband, (**Carlile**) who was appointed by Starmer as the lawyer to investigate the decision not to prosecute Jenner, was significantly involved with the Establishment in 1991, working to prevent the prosecution of Jenner. On December 3, 1991, **Carlile** delivered a speech in the House of Commons that

www.jaoc.org.uk

vehemently criticized Janner's public accuser in shocking language.

[House of Commons Hansard Debates for 3 Dec 1991 \(parliament.uk\)](#)

It has become evident that the police possessed substantial corroborative evidence supporting Beck's allegations regarding Janner's abuse of children in care homes. Carlile has indicated that Janner is his friend. **Both were Members of Parliament, Queen's Counsel, and involved with Friends of Israel, as well as patrons of UK Lawyers for Israel and the Friends of Israel Educational Foundation. They frequently participated in the same parliamentary committees focused on legal matters. Additionally, they were set to exit the Commons around the same time and transition to the Lords shortly thereafter.**

It is entirely possible that Alex Carlile was unaware of Janner's paedophilia. He shared a small parliamentary office with Cyril Smith for many years and seemingly did not recognize Smith as a notorious paedophile. It may be that Alex Carlile is simply an exceptionally unobservant individual.

It is regrettable that Starmer decided to appoint the **spouse of a steadfast parliamentary supporter of Britain's second most notorious paedophile as his legal representative in the matter concerning Jimmy Savile**. One might assume that Starmer was oblivious to this connection, just as he seemed unaware of his office's decision not to pursue charges against Savile.

The following shows that everyone knew about Savile and therefore it is clear that he was aware of the case being high profile and he would have signed off on it. BBC, Hospital staff, Journalists and Police all knew.

[Jimmy Savile report: The five senior BBC employees who knew about sexual predators but did not act | The Independent | The Independent](#)

[Hospital staff knew Jimmy Savile was abusing patients \(yorkshirepost.co.uk\)](#)

[UK police knew of Savile abuse from early 1960s, inquiry finds | The National \(thenationalnews.com\)](#)

[Paul Gambaccini 'aware of accusations' linking Jimmy Savile to necrophilia | The Independent | The Independent](#)

[Savile told hospital staff he performed sex acts on corpses in Leeds mortuary | Jimmy Savile | The Guardian](#)

It is remarkable how individuals can attain such wealth and influence while remaining so oblivious. This is particularly striking given that Levitt, Starmer, Carlile, and Jenner are all distinguished QCs.

In 2012, as public outrage intensified, Starmer resorted to a familiar tactic employed by those in power. He engaged a lawyer, whom he was acquainted with, to produce an "independent" report that would clear him of any wrongdoing. The report contained typical phrases such as acknowledging past errors and committing to learning from them. The law

firm Mishcon de Reya, known for its connections to oligarchs, was tasked with this whitewashing effort. After stepping down as Director of Public Prosecutions, Starmer transitioned to a new role at...GUESS WHO?

[Mishcon de Reya fined £232,500 over numerous AML failings | News | Law Gazette](#)



Just as Savile was shielded from genuine sexual offenses, Starmer was aware that Assange was targeted for alleged sexual misconduct that lacked substance. Starmer's handling of the Assange situation was fundamentally corrupt.

It is crucial to recognize that Assange was never formally charged with any sexual offense in Sweden. He was sought for questioning after Stockholm's chief prosecutor concluded there was no viable case, yet a prosecutor from a different jurisdiction pursued the matter. Assange consistently believed that this was a ploy to extradite him from Sweden to the United States. His legal representatives had proposed that Swedish prosecutors conduct an interview with him at the Swedish Embassy in 2011, which could have led to the resolution of the case.

Under Starmer's leadership, the Crown Prosecution Service instructed Swedish prosecutors not to travel to London. The emails detailing this directive were subsequently destroyed and were only retrieved through a Freedom of Information request from the Swedish side. It is important to note that after a lengthy seven-year wait, when Swedish prosecutors finally managed to interview Assange at the Ecuadorean Embassy, the investigation was ultimately abandoned.

UK prosecutors admit destroying key emails in Julian Assange case

Correspondence between CPS and its Swedish counterparts about WikiLeaks founder deleted after lawyer retired in 2014



Furthermore, in October 2013, while Starmer was still serving as Director of Public Prosecutions, his team communicated with Swedish prosecutors after hearing they were considering dropping the case, admonishing them with the phrase, “Don’t you dare get cold feet.” The Swedish authorities clarified their intention to discontinue the case, yet the Crown Prosecution Service once again urged them to reconsider.

Sweden tried to drop Assange extradition in 2013, CPS emails show

UK prosecutors tried to dissuade Swedish counterparts from doing so, exchange shows



The question arises as to why Starmer felt compelled to advocate for a foreign state to persist with an investigation that it itself sought to terminate, particularly when no British citizens were involved.

It is evident that Starmer's intentions were not genuinely aligned with the Swedish inquiry; rather, they likely pertain to the unlawful CIA operations against Assange and the ongoing extradition attempts by the United States. This situation exposes Starmer as a figure lacking integrity and honesty.

Why did you meet with MI5 chief for social drinks the year after you decided not to prosecute MI5 for its role in torture?

Serving as Britain’s Director of Public Prosecutions (DPP) from November 2008 to October 2013, you held the final authority on which criminal cases would proceed to prosecution. The Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) is designed to operate independently from both the police and the government, including the security services.

In 2010 and again in 2012, you faced significant scrutiny for your decision not to prosecute an MI5 officer involved in torture. The subsequent year, your hospitality register while leading the CPS included a note from April 16, 2013, indicating a meeting for “drinks” with Sir Jonathan Evans, who was the director-general of MI5 at that time.

The value of the hospitality you received is listed as “unknown” and MI5 is not mentioned, indicating this was a social meeting. Formal meetings for the DDP are registered by the CPS [Permanent Secretaries' meetings with external organisations | The Crown Prosecution Service \(cps.gov.uk\)](#) under “meetings with external organizations,” which would include MI5.

Such social drinks appear to be unusual for the DPP. I analysed the three years of hospitality [Gifts and Hospitality Register | The Crown Prosecution Service \(cps.gov.uk\)](#) for the period after you stood down from the CPS. They clearly show your successor as DPP received such no hospitality from a sitting intelligence chief — or any formal meetings with them.

In that year's register, your meeting with Evans was the only hospitality you received which you [board register gifts hospitality 13 14.pdf \(cps.gov.uk\)](#) in the section that asks whether it was accepted or not. It is not known if your hospitality drinks were covered by MI5 or Evans personally. Evans has not responded to questions I posed about this meeting.

In November 2010, you concluded ['Insufficient evidence' against MI5 officer over torture claims | The Independent | The Independent](#) as the DPP that there was “insufficient evidence” to prosecute an MI5 officer, known as Witness B, for his role in the torture of British resident Binyam Mohamed.



Jonathan Evans then released a [statement MI5 officer escapes charges over Binyam Mohamed torture case | Guantánamo Bay | The Guardian](#) declaring: “I am delighted that after a thorough police investigation the CPS has concluded that Witness B has no case to answer in respect of his interviewing of Mr. Binyam Mohammed.” He

added: “I regret that he has had to endure this long and difficult process.”

Mohamed had been arrested in Karachi, Pakistan in April 2002 and interrogated for a week allegedly with various torture techniques. Mohamed said that as well as being interrogated by his American captors, Witness B had also [taken part](#). It was later [revealed Police to investigate MI6 over rendition and torture of Libyans | Foreign policy | The Guardian](#) that MI5 knew he was being mistreated before an officer was sent to Karachi to question him.

Mohamed was then transported to Morocco by the CIA and again interrogated by Witness B, despite MI5 claiming it [did not know Police to investigate Binyam Mohamed claims of MI5 torture complicity | Binyam Mohamed | The Guardian](#) his whereabouts in the north African country.

Former Guantánamo Bay detainee welcomes inquiry and promises his co-operation



Guantánamo Bay detainee Binyam Mohamed alleged MI5 was complicit in his interrogation and torture.

Mohamed eventually spent seven years at Guantánamo Bay, the detention facility run by the US on Cuba, before being released without charge and receiving a secret payout from the US.

Your decision not to prosecute was surprising: it was reported, for example, that MI5 [telegrams](#) to the CIA demonstrated that British intelligence officers fed the US information on Mohamed when he was allegedly being tortured in Morocco.

Evans' relief was understandable. The CPS' role also involved attempting to [trace responsibility](#) for Witness B's actions further up MI5's chain of command. It is likely that Evans, who joined MI5 in [1980](#), played a role in the Mohamed case as it unfolded. In

September 2001 Evans had become [director](#) of international counter terrorism at MI5 and was in this position when Mohamed was snatched, tortured and rendered by the CIA, with MI5 involvement.

[Jonathan Evans | MI5 - The Security Service](#)

It is not known if Evans would have been criminally liable if the prosecution had gone ahead, but he later had to defend MI5 from accusations of a [cover-up](#) in the Mohamed case after Lord Neuberger, then President of the Court of Appeal, said there was a “culture of suppression” in the agency.

Allegations made by Mohamed concerning the role of MI6, Britain’s external intelligence service, meant a “wider investigation” continued after your 2010 decision. This included new allegations by another [detainee](#) about British involvement in torture at Bagram air base in Afghanistan.

In January 2012, however — after 30 months of investigation — you [decided](#) against prosecuting anyone from MI5 or MI6 for their role in torture. You [said](#) at the time that there was evidence showing that MI5 “provided information to the US authorities about Mohamed and supplied questions for the US authorities to put to Mr Mohamed while he was being detained.” But you also concluded that there was “insufficient evidence to prove to the standard required in a criminal court” that any spies provided information when they “knew or ought to have known that there was a real or serious risk that Mr Mohamed would be exposed to ill-treatment amounting to torture.”

Evans left MI5 a [week](#) following his drinks with you. The day after Evans left the service, you [announced](#) you would also leave the CPS. You went on to become a Labour MP at the 2015 general election, while Evans is now Baron Evans of Weardale after prime minister David Cameron made him a life peer in 2014.

What did you discuss with US Attorney General Eric Holder when you met him on November 9, 2011 in Washington DC?

Analysis of your available business expenses at the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) in the 22 months from January 2012 to when you left in October 2013, shows you undertook five international work trips, two of which were to the US.

In November 2012, you spent [£6,807.59](#) on a first-class plane ticket to Washington DC for an “official meeting” but the register does not indicate how long you spent in Washington or who this meeting was with.

In September 2013, the month before you left the CPS, you spent [£4,085.15](#) on another first class flight to Washington DC for a “conference.” For three nights in the US capital you expensed £1,050.73 for accommodation and food. I could find no evidence of what this conference was or who you met with on this trip.

I have also obtained US [government files](#) revealing that you were also in Washington DC on November 9 2011 when you met with US Attorney General Eric Holder and five other officials from the US Department of Justice. Also present was Gary Balch, UK Liaison Prosecutor to the United States.

[Attorney General Holder’s Calendar \(justice.gov\)](#)

At this time the CPS which you headed was handling the complex legal case surrounding WikiLeaks publisher Julian Assange.

The year previous to your meeting, Holder had [stated](#) that he had given the go-ahead for a number of unspecified actions as part of a criminal investigation into WikiLeaks. “I personally authorized a number of things last week and that’s an indication of the seriousness with which we take this matter and the highest level of involvement at the Department of Justice,” he said.

[Wikileaks cables: US looks to prosecute Julian Assange | The US embassy cables | The Guardian](#)

Three weeks after your meeting with Holder, the attorney general met with the then British home secretary, Theresa May, alongside three other DOJ personnel, two of whom had been in the meeting with you.

Why did you develop such a close relationship with the *Times* newspaper while you were the Director of Public Prosecutions and does this close relationship still exist?

During your time at the CPS, you developed a particularly close relationship with the *Times*, a paper owned by Rupert Murdoch. In the space of [two months](#) in 2011, you accepted hospitality from three of its journalists, meeting for lunch or interviews with [Francis Gibb](#), [Sean O’Neill](#), and [David Leppard](#). In December of the same year, you [attended](#) Christmas drinks at the *Times*.

There is no record that you accepted hospitality from any other newspaper during your time at the CPS. In April 2012, you also [met](#) with *Times* editor James Harding to discuss CPS media prosecution guidelines, and the following month with John Witherow, editor of the *Sunday Times*.

You met Leppard — the journalist who broke the notorious [fraudulent](#) story on former Labour leader Michael Foot being a Soviet agent of influence — for lunch at Le Pain Quotidien on 2 June 2011. Six weeks before, on 14 April 2011, you had lunch with Sean O’Neill.

While you were in Jeremy Corbyn’s shadow cabinet, the *Times* played a key role in sabotaging his attempt to become prime minister, functioning as a key publication for leaks from serving [intelligence](#) and [military](#) officials presenting the Labour leader as a threat to national security. The former head of MI6, John Scarlett, [joined](#) the board of the *Times* in 2010, the year after he left the Secret Intelligence Service.

One *Times* scoop on which your lunch partner Sean O’Neill was lead reporter was published on 27 February 2016 and [titled](#), “How leadership is taking its toll on ‘paranoid’ Corbyn”.

O’Neill and his co-author deployed anonymous briefings from shadow cabinet members to paint a picture of an overwhelmed Corbyn unable to handle the job of leader. “Shadow cabinet members complain that their meetings lack structure, discipline and direction,” they wrote. One shadow cabinet member told them of Corbyn: “He just lets people talk, but it often meanders pointlessly. If there’s a row it ends up in the media but more often the discussion just wanders off”.

Four months after this article appeared in the *Times*, you resigned from Corbyn’s shadow cabinet, [citing](#) the “need for a much louder voice on the critical issues” and airing your “reservations” about Corbyn’s leadership and the need for a change of leader.

To the surprise of many, you wrote your first national media [article](#) after being elected Labour leader in the *Sunday Times*, which was behind a paywall.

