

Witness Name: Graham Foster

Statement No: WITN0004001

Dated: 09/10/2025

THE NOTTINGHAM INQUIRY

FIRST WITNESS STATEMENT OF PC GRAHAM FOSTER

I, Graham Foster, will say as follows: -

Introduction

1. I have been a police constable within the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) since February 2011, when I was initially based in a response team in Westminster for around 4 years. I then moved to the Business Engagement Team which looked after the Leicester Square and Soho areas, remaining there until I moved to Parliament and Diplomatic Protection (PaDP) in 2019. At the time of this incident, my role was an authorised firearms officer within PaDP, which was a role I undertook until early 2023, after which time I moved to my current role in Digital Data and Technology where I work as a Power App Developer (as a police constable.)
2. This statement is made to assist the Nottingham Inquiry (the "Inquiry") with matters set out in the Rule 9 request dated 1 July 2025 (the "Request").

Background

3. I have been asked to set out the details of an incident on the 31st May 2021 when I had an interaction with Valdo Calocane outside of MI5 Headquarters, Thames House, 12 Millbank, London, SW1P 4QP.

4. The information in this statement is (a) drawn from my own knowledge and experience; and (b) taken from material I have viewed on MPS systems and which relate to my contact with Mr Calocane but which were created by my colleagues. Due to the fact this brief incident took place over four years ago, I did not have a clear recollection of the events, so I have viewed the body worn video (BWV) footage of this incident prior to the writing of this statement in order to refresh my memory. I exhibit my BVW as WITN0004002.

5. Prior to 31 May 2021, to the best of my recollection, I had no personal knowledge or previous interactions with Valdo Calocane. I understand that the Inquiry Review Support Command (IRSC) have made checks, upon requests for evidence having been received from the Inquiry, for any interactions or knowledge of Valdo Calocane throughout the MPS prior to 31 May 2021 and that there are no other records that pre-dated this incident.

Events of 31 May 2021

6. On 31st May 2021, I was on duty with my colleagues in the Westminster area in carrier RX500, patrolling around embassies and points of interest in a police van. Whilst I do not recall exactly now due to the passage of time, I can see from the

Incident Report 5109 31MAY21(CAD) exhibited as METF000
0001 that a call came through from the control room operator over the main working radio channel asking for available units to respond to a report outside Thames House. I can tell from the CAD that the call was accepted by our carrier at 17.18.

7. We were told by the CAD Operator that a security officer on duty at Thames House, Millbank SW1 had called police to report a male, later established to be Mr Calocane, was ringing the bell at Thames House, the Head Quarters of MI5, saying he wanted to speak to someone and that despite being told he could not, had not left the area.
8. I only remembered that I was on duty with PC Billy Nash as he was on the BWV and we had both received requests from the IOPC regarding this matter over a year ago. I assume that I was sitting in the rear of the van as the BWV shows me going through the side door.
9. The CAD shows that we arrived at Thames House, 12 Millbank, London SW1P 4QP at around 17:21hrs. However, the time on the body worn video (BWV) shows 16:21hrs. I assume that the CAD is correct.
10. I cannot recall now who saw Mr Calocane first and cannot confirm this via the BWV as the first few seconds of BWV records visually but not the audio due to a buffer time. However, from the BWV, it seems that Mr Calocane was no longer outside the front of Thames House and had gone around the corner away from the entrance stairs. PC Nash and I got out of the police van and walked over to him to make enquiries.

11. Mr Calocane was stationary, seemed relaxed and observed my colleague (PC Nash) approach him. I asked Mr Calocane how he was, to which he looked at me and said that he was ok and asked me how I was.
12. I explained to Mr Calocane why we were needed to talk to him and that we had received a call reporting that he had been ringing the bell at the property. Mr Calocane confirmed that he had been, and I asked why. Mr Calocane replied straight away that he wanted to speak with a staff member and confirmed that he had been told it was a Bank Holiday and that no staff were about to talk to him and to come back another day. Mr Calocane did not want to explain why he wanted to speak to a member of staff at Thames House and stated that he did not want to speak to police.
13. PC Nash then asked Mr Calocane if he had any ID on him, to which Mr Calocane replied that he hadn't got ID but he had something with his name on. He passed PC Nash something with his name on (I cannot recall what) and PC Nash started to do checks whilst I continued to try and build a rapport with Mr Calocane. I cannot say for certain what checks were done but usually we would conduct a name check by speaking to the radio operator and passing on the name and date of birth which we would obtain from the member of public. Those details would be cross referenced against the Police National Computer. These would see if the person stopped would be wanted in relation to any offences or reported missing. Also, there could be information markers which might identify whether the individual was a danger to police/others or known to conceal weapons etc.

14. Mr Calocane did not want to explain why he wanted to speak to a member of staff at Thames House and stated that he did not want to speak to police. I asked Mr Calocane a couple of times not to put his hands in his pockets and he complied with the instructions without hesitation. I asked him this because I did not know if Mr Calocane had anything on his person which may cause harm. I did not expect that to be the case, but this has become my practice when dealing with members of public until I gather more information for my decision making. It is also useful to see how people react to instructions.
15. I asked Mr Calocane some more questions like what his plans were for the rest of the day to which he said he was going home and that he had already ordered an Uber and was awaiting collection. Mr Calocane said that he was not with anyone else and it was his first time to Thames House or buildings which were similar and he intended to go back home and enjoy the rest of his day.
16. Whilst waiting for checks to be conducted, Mr Calocane checked his phone to see how long his Uber would be and he remained calm and polite throughout. He presented as compliant and cooperative, leaning casually against a post while he was being spoken to. There were no indications that he was agitated and he appeared fully coherent in response to the questions being asked. He engaged in discussion and no concerns were raised regarding his presentation.
17. PC Nash asked Mr Calocane if he had been in trouble with the police before, to which he replied he hadn't really but then admitted he did get arrested the previous year but that was the only time. PC Nash asked Mr Calocane some more questions regarding his address but I cannot remember what his response was and it is a little unclear on the footage.

18. Whilst waiting for the Uber, I explained again why we were speaking with Mr Calocane ie that he rang the doorbell a few times and was still seen in the area and that staff didn't know that he was waiting for an Uber to arrive. It was then confirmed by PC Nash that Mr Calocane was known to police but not wanted or reported missing and that there were no warning signals or special checks against his name.
19. After several minutes, the Uber for Mr Calocane arrived and as we had completed our checks and it did not appear he had committed an offence, he was allowed to leave the area. The interaction lasted about 6 ½ minutes.
20. I did not make any entry in my pocket notebook nor did I create any record of the contact with Mr Calocane as it was all clearly recorded on my Body Worn Video. Due to experience, I don't like to be writing and speaking to a member of the public at the same time if there is no need, as I like to be aware of my surroundings. There is no requirement in law or police policy that a written note is made of every interaction between police and members of the public.
21. While I cannot recall what happened exactly, it would be normal practice to return to our home station at the end of a shift, book weapons in and dock the cameras from our BWV. We would then normally go to the writing room which is located the next room along and create any necessary reports in this area. I would then go on to Evidence.com and save the footage from the BWV from this site.
22. Having been a frontline officer for 10 years (approx), working in a variety of departments, including firearms, I have a good working knowledge of police powers and policy relevant to dealing with members of the public. In addition to police

powers of arrest, detention and questioning under the Police and Criminal Evidence Act (PACE), this includes Met policy and guidance on officer safety practice and use of the National Decision Model. I am therefore able to effectively manage difficult situations, but did not feel that Mr Calocane presented with any concerning behaviours which warranted further intervention. During my contact with Mr Calocane, there was no need to detain him due to him already being stationary and compliant. I spoke to Mr Calocane and there were no signs giving rise to concern or for the safety of himself or others at that time. Mr Calocane gave an account of why he was there. He stated that he didn't frequent these types of properties. He understood that the building was closed due to it being a Bank Holiday and took the advice of the Thames House staff, to come back another day. He had booked an Uber home prior to police attending and was calmly awaiting its arrival. Mr Calocane held a conversation, followed instructions and was calm and polite at all times answering questions.

23. The Crimint (intelligence report) METF000
0002 was created after the interaction and was passed to the Fixated Threat Assessment Centre (FTAC). I could not independently recall whether I completed this report or whether it was completed by PC Nash, however I have looked at the Crimint and can see that it was PC Nash who created it. I therefore did not have any involvement in the referral to FTAC, nor did I have any involvement in sharing details of my contact with Mr Calocane with any other organisation, agency or individual. My understanding of the FTAC referral process is that once the Crimint is generated and referred to FTAC, it would have been looked at, assessed and passed on to relevant organisations by FTAC.

24. In dealing with Mr Calocane, I do not consider there were any failings in my or PC Nash's actions.

25. I do not feel that we missed any opportunities that would have affected the later outcome. This was a brief encounter, where Mr Calocane was compliant and coherent. Name checks were conducted whilst at the scene. Body worn footage was used and viewed by other departments. The Crimint was recorded at the earliest opportunity. There were no signs of mental health or crisis so there were no reasons nor power for utilising S 163 Mental Health Act. Also, Mr Calocane was not wanted by police for any previous offences or reported missing. Mr Calocane had also not committed any offences on the day so there were no powers for arrest. In light of the minimal interaction I had with Mr Calocane on 31 May 2021, his actions and demeanour and the lack of any concern that he posed a risk to others at that time, I have no basis upon which to suggest any recommendations, nor do I have any basis to suggest there are any structural issues regarding police policy, procedure, methodology or training relevant to my interaction with Mr Calocane.

Statement of Truth

I believe the content of this statement to be true. I understand that proceedings may be brought against anyone who makes, or causes to be made, a false statement in a document verified by a statement of truth without an honest belief of its truth.

GRO-B

Signed:

Dated: 09/10/2025

Index to Exhibits in First Witness Statement of Graham Foster

<u>No.</u>	<u>URN</u>	<u>Document</u> <u>Description</u>
1	WITN0004002	PC Graham Foster Body Worn Video recording of CAD 5103/31MAY21CAD
2	METF0000001	CAD report of call to police from Thames House staff
3	METF0000002	Crimint Intelligence Report, dated 31 May 2021