

Witness Name: ALAN MURPHY

Statement No: WITN0083004

Dated: 15 July 2026

THE NOTTINGHAM INQUIRY

SECOND WITNESS STATEMENT OF ALAN MURPHY

I, ALAN MURPHY, will say as follows: -

INTRODUCTION

1. I am a Specialist Prosecutor with the Crown Prosecution Service [CPS].
2. This witness statement is made to assist the Nottingham Inquiry (the **"Inquiry"**) with the matters set out in the rule 9 request dated 23 June 2026 (the **"Request"**).

SEARCH OF 165 BURFORD ROAD

3. I have been provided with the Search Record of 165 Burford Road [NGPF0008920]. I have been asked what discussions, if any, I or the CPS had with the police about the search of this property. I do not recall any discussions with the police about the search of this property. I do not recall any case I have

been involved in where the police sought my advice about which properties to search. I would not expect such an enquiry unless there was a particular sensitivity, such as a search which might result in legally privileged material being obtained.

4. I have been asked what I understood the purpose of the search to be. As stated, I do not recall any discussions about the search of this property. The search of any property in a criminal investigation will be for the purposes of obtaining evidence or other material which might point towards or away from the guilt of any particular suspect.
5. I was not involved in obtaining the search warrant and so I do not know why this search warrant was not obtained until 16 June 2023.
6. I have been asked when I first saw the Search Record and what steps or action I took to consider the evidential value of items recovered from the address. All seven items recovered in this search are listed in the statement of PC Daniel Vasper [NGPF0002455]. That statement was supplied to me by the police in a submission on 2 August 2023. In the material accompanying the police submission, two of the seven items were endorsed as exhibits (i.e. material intended to be used as evidence by the prosecution). Those were items DAV1002 (the whetstone sharpener) and DAV1006 (disc of images). The remaining five items were endorsed as unused material. I considered this statement as part of my review of the case at "stage 1" service and agreed with the police's assessment of the evidential value of this material. I included the statement [NGPF0002455] and the images exhibit DAV1006 [CPSE0000114 - CPSE0000123 and CPSE0000126 - CPSE0000133] in the material I served

as evidence on 18 August 2023. The search record itself was not supplied to me. It was listed in the MG6C schedule of unused material dated 16 August 2023 at item X263 **[CPSE0000044]**.

7. I am asked if I know why PS Toombes instructed PC Vasper to stop the search of the holdall, as per PC Vasper's statement. I do not know why PS Toombes gave this instruction nor ordinarily would I be consulted on or have any involvement in such matters.
8. I am referred to a statement and a report of Jeff Julious, a police staff investigator **[NGPF0002916, NGPF0003748]** regarding items DAV1001 and DAV1004. I am asked if I know why it took the police nearly three months to search this holdall. I do not know why this was. This is a matter for the police to address.
9. I am asked if I was informed that the holdall contained two notebooks, an A4 pad and a sketch pad belonging to VC. I was not informed by the police that the holdall contained two notebooks, an A4 pad and a sketch pad belonging to VC. The only further description of items within the holdall supplied to me is on p.61 of the MG6C schedule of unused material dated 17 November 2023 **[CPSE0000045]** at item S166C. I did not review the items within the holdall DAV1001 as they were not supplied to me by the police as potential evidence and there was nothing in the description provided to me which caused me to believe that there was any evidential value in the material or that the items would satisfy the test for disclosure. Having now reviewed the items, I set out below my observations on the same.

10. I am asked what evidential review was undertaken by the CPS in respect of the “documentation” and “ripped paper” (unused exhibits DAV1004 and DAV1005) found in a green bin in the rear yard at the address. Both items were considered unused material by the police. Both items were included in the photographs DAV1006 which I reviewed when I served the photographs as evidence on 18 August 2023 [see for example **CPSE0000130**, **CPSE0000131**]. There was nothing in the images to suggest that the items carried any evidential relevance and so I agreed with the police assessment of these items that there was no evidential value in them and that they were correctly classified as unused material.

11. I have now been provided with a number of items which I understand derive from the holdall DAV1001. I am asked to give my opinion on whether the items contain information relevant to Operation Hendrix and give my reasoning. I deal with these items in turn.

12. **[NGPF0011501]** This is a 106 page sketch pad. This contains 46 pages of drawings including quasi-technical sketches. The remaining pages are blank. I see no relevance to Operation Hendrix in this item.

13. **[NGPF0011502]** This is a 69 page Pukka pad. There are notes about manoeuvres, about VC having died, about VC needing to die, about God, about VC being the tree that guards the link between heaven and hell. There are also notes about learning the violin and Italian, notes about a story and notes about modelling methodology for a vehicle. Thereafter, most pages are blank. I see no relevance to Operation Hendrix in this item save that it might be capable of assisting the defence as regards VC’s mental health issues. Given the volume

of such material disclosed in the case this note pad does not seem to me to add anything of value.

14. **[NGPF0011503]**. This is a 91 page notepad. The first 45 pages are blank. Pages 46-49 contain drawings. Pages 50-82 are blank. Pages 83-91 contain further blank pages, more drawings, references to Highbury Hospital, "Watchmen Timeline", obtaining power and the Bible. I see no obvious relevance to Operation Hendrix in this item.

15. **[NGPF0011499]**. This is a four page Pukka pad. Page 2 contains notes including reference to either being super paranoid or being somewhat observant / intuitive. Page 3 contains the following:

"mea culpa

- illegal actions in 2013/2014
- defied lockdown"

Immediately below this are further notes relating to the moral high ground which makes little sense. Page 4 contains mathematical equations. I see no obvious relevance to Operation Hendrix in this item. In particular, I do not see how the "mea culpa" passage cited above assists in determining (a) whether VC carried out the attacks and (b) whether at the time of doing so he had available to him the partial defence of diminished responsibility in respect of the murder counts.

16. **[NGPF0011504]**. This is a Pukka notepad across 87 double pages. The majority of the notepad contains primarily what look like complex mathematical equations. These may be related to VC's engineering degree. Within the rest of the notepad is a repeat of the "mea culpa" page from **[NGPF0011499]**, a

repeat of the page immediately before that page in [NGPF0011499], some more drawings and some passages in English and Portuguese. There is also a reference to “11 April 2020 mobile”. I see no obvious relevance to Operation Hendrix in this item.

17. [NGPF0011505]. This is a 70 page Oxford black and red notebook. This contains reference to a dream about observing himself in a jail cell with a third person’s view. It contains passages in English and Portuguese across pages 7-10 in which VC makes reference to targeting by AI, someone’s father being given a brain haemorrhage, reading someone’s mind via a fingerprint and other forms of mind control and telepathy. There is reference to the first time he heard the voices and the fact that the voices created six distinct personalities. There is also reference to MI6, NCA and the FBI and AI agents being used to harass the individual. There is reference to British agencies having technology to access the mind. Pages 13-14 seem to relate to some sort of business plan and page 15 refers to “brain fingerprinting”. Page 16 seems to be a description of the two incidents in May 2020. Within the passage VC refers to mind-reading software and the power to resurrect people. Pages 18-20 contain a reference to “24/05/20” and a “To Do List when interviewing Gail”. There follows a list of questions over pages 19-20 which appear to relate to VC questioning the basis for his detention on 24 May 2020. A number of these questions seem to be linked to police obligations under the Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984. Page 21 refers to the Hydrogen project in Stornoway. Page 23 contains a number of bullet points relating to “BCI – Brain Computer Interface”. Pages 24-70 are blank. In my view there is nothing in this item which would have been capable of being relied on by the Crown to challenge the evidence relating to

the partial defence of diminished responsibility. On the contrary, the multiple references to mind-control etc provide support for the other evidence of this nature that has been obtained and disclosed in this case. In addition to the material already disclosed on these topics, had I had this item at the outset of the case I would have considered it material capable of assisting the defence and therefore disclosable unused material and I would have disclosed it to the defence.

18. I am asked to comment specifically on pages 18-20 and, in particular, the section entitled "To Do list when interviewing Gail". The evidence in the case is that VC did not accept that he was mentally unwell, despite the repeated admissions to hospital and the psychiatric treatment provided to him. This list of questions appears to me to be consistent with that position. He also challenges various aspects of the police's actions in what seems to be the May 2020 detentions. I do not see how this list of questions provides any relevant admissible evidence against VC in the 2023 proceedings.

19. **[NGPF0011506]**. This is a 72 page Oxford notebook. Pages 2-4 contain a story about a wandering black man and some thoughts about sexual dynamics. The remainder of the item is blank. I see no relevance to Operation Hendrix in this item.

20. I am told that PSI Julious has itemised the notebooks and sketchpad as "[N]umerous notes of a mathematical nature". I am referred to **[NGPF0003748]** as the source material for this reference. I am asked to comment on the adequacy of this description. The question is predicated on an inaccurate basis. **[NGPF0003748]** contains PSI Julious's description of item DAV1004,

not the contents of holdall DAV1001. Item DAV1004 are items recovered from the green bin in the yard of the premises (as exhibited in **[NGPF0002455]**). They are not the notebooks and sketchpad etc recovered from the holdall DAV1001. PSI Julious's description of the items in the holdall DAV1001 is contained in his witness statement **[NGPF0002916]**. Within that statement he lists the items found in the holdall. It is an extensive list. It seems accurate to me, albeit the references to a sketchpad and notebooks give no indication of the contents of the sketchpad and notebooks. That seems to me to be inadequate as some of the material in my view meets the disclosure test and that is not apparent from the description.

21. The contents of the notebooks and sketchpads were not brought to my attention. They should have been because in my view two of them (**[NGPF0011505]** and **[NGPF0011502]**) were capable of meeting the test for disclosure to the defence.

22. I am asked to consider the Investigation Management Document **[CPSE0000113]** and explain why there is no reference to VC's notebooks, sketchpad or letters found within the holdall or the bin at 165 Burford Road. The Investigation Management Document is completed by the police and is not a document into which the CPS has any input. Its relevance to me as the reviewing lawyer is to assist me in setting out in the Disclosure Management Document the lines of enquiry being conducted in the case and the disclosure strategy being adopted by the Crown. In the case of searches carried out, I would not normally expect to see the individual items recovered in a search listed in an Investigation Management Document unless the police thought there was particular significance in any such item. All such items recovered will

be included in the served evidence or listed in the MG6C schedule of unused material. As such, in respect of searches of premises and items recovered, there are generally no “strategy” implications that inform the content of the Disclosure Management Document.

23. I am asked to explain why VC’s notebooks were not identified on any of the unused schedules as handwritten notes made by VC. I am asked to refer to all Police Schedules of relevant Non-Sensitive Unused Material and in particular page 4 of **[CPSE0000045]** which is a schedule dated 17 November 2023. I am referred to an entry on this page which is said to read as follows:

“Officers report by PSI 1644 Julious regarding reviewing the contents of Police Exhibit DAV1004 [the holdall]. Contains Lloyds Bank material in the name of Mr VA Mendes Calocane, dated receipts and numerous notes of a mathematical nature”.

It should be noted at the outset that the disclosure officer (in this case SI 9430 Anthony Mason) is responsible for compiling the schedules of unused material and submitting them to the CPS for review. The CPS do not describe the items that appear on the schedules. I therefore cannot assist the Inquiry with why the disclosure officer settled upon any particular description.

24. However, it became apparent on reading the italicised section above that the question is based on an inaccurate premise. I have looked at page 4 of **[CPSE0000045]** and there is no such entry. I have therefore searched through the schedules of unused material using keywords “Julious” and “DAV” to identify any relevant entries and in particular the entry referred to in the italics.

25. There is an entry on page 47 of **[CPSE0000045]** regarding report R48C. This appears to be the entry referred to in the italicised passage above. The italicised passage is based on a false premise, that DAV1004 is the holdall. As explained earlier, DAV1004 are items recovered from the bin at the address. The holdall is DAV1001. There is no reference to the word "holdall" in the entry regarding R48C at page 47 and nor should there be, because this is a report about DAV1004, not DAV1001.
26. DAV1001 is specifically referred to in two entries on the non-sensitive unused material schedule. On the schedule dated 16 August 2023 **[CPSE0000044]** it is referred to at page 69 with the reference X264. On the schedule dated 17 November 2023 **[CPSE0000045]** it is referred to at page 61 reference S166C.
27. I am asked to disclose a copy of the digital images taken during the search of 165 Burford Road and the video footage of the search referred to in the search record. The Inquiry already has the digital images. These are exhibit DAV1006 and were served in evidence on 18 August 2023 **[CPSE0000114 - CPSE0000123 and CPSE0000126 - CPSE0000133]**. The video footage of the search was classified as unused material and CPS has never been provided with a copy of it by the police. As such, I cannot disclose this to the Inquiry.
28. I am asked to provide disclosure of "all documents, certificates and cards found at 165 Burford Road (whether in the property or outside in the yard) including for example letters, identification cards, employment cards and other cards". The police do not provide the CPS with physical exhibits; they are held in the police exhibits store. As such, the CPS does not have these items.

29. I am asked if Dr Blackwood was provided with the handwritten notes and sketch book found at 165 Burford Road. He was not provided with this material because the CPS was not provided with it. He was provided with the statement of PC Vasper [NGPF0002455] and he was provided with the images of the search (exhibit DAV1006).

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.

Signed:

GRO-B

Dated: 15 July 2026

INDEX TO SECOND WITNESS STATEMENT OF ALAN MURPHY

	URN	Document description
1	NGPF0008920	Search Record dated 16/07/2023, [NGPF]
2	NGPF0002455	Witness statement of Daniel Vasper, Nottinghamshire Police
3	CPSE0000114 - CPSE0000123 and CPSE0000126 - CPSE0000133	Various photos of the search of 165 Burford Road exhibited to the statement Daniel Vasper.
4	CPSE0000044	Report dated 17/08/2023 compiled by Crown Prosecution Service RE: POLICE SCHEDULE OF RELEVANT NON-SENSITIVE UNUSED MATERIAL R v Calocane
5	NGPF0002916	Witness Statement of Jeff Julious dated 14/09/2023
6	NGPF0003748	OFFICERS REPORT - OPERATION HENDRIX, [unknown date], East Midlands Special Operations Unit
7	CPSE0000045	Police Schedule of Relevant Non-Sensitive Unused Material in R v Valdo Calocane dated 20/11/2023, CPS
8	NGPF0011501	Notes, re: Sketchpad drawings
9	NGPF0011502	Notes by VC, Re: general journal including thoughts on love, war, dying
10	NGPF0011503	Notes by VC, Re: Gospel of St Matthew
11	NGPF0011499	Notes by VC, re: General journal, including mentions to paranoia
12	NGPF0011504	Notes by VC, Re: Electricity and magnetism equations, passwords and contact details
13	NGPF0011505	Notes by VC, Re: English class and DVND notes
14	NGPF0011506	Notes by VC, Re: Personal thoughts including thoughts about sexual dynamics

		from the male perspective
15	CPSE0000113	Report dated 01/08/2023, compiled by NPCC, Re: Investigation Management Document - Valdo Calocane