

Investigation Number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
84	Referred for inquiry	On the basis of the investigative reports and witness statements that the Service Police have provided, the Secretary of State has concluded that an inquisitorial inquiry under Article 2 ECHR should be established.	30 May 2017
85	Referred for inquiry	Notwithstanding the IHAT's decision that there is no realistic prospect of further prosecution in this case, the Secretary of State has concluded that an inquisitorial inquiry under Article 2 ECHR should be established.	14 October 2015
88	No inquiry	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In light of the investigation undertaken by the IHAT, the Secretary of State considers that the investigative obligation under Article 2 ECHR has been met fully in terms of scope and procedure.</li> <li>2. The prospect that an inquiry would be able to answer satisfactorily further questions surrounding the death is so remote and insufficient to justify the substantial cost (both financial and human) that a further inquiry would involve.</li> <li>3. This is not a case which raises wider issues of such ongoing importance to the operations of the UK Armed Forces that it justifies such substantial costs.</li> </ol>	30 May 2017
93	No inquiry	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In light of the investigation undertaken by the IHAT, the Secretary of State considers that the investigative obligation under Article 2 ECHR has been met fully in terms of scope and procedure.</li> <li>2. The prospect of being able to trace additional witnesses is low and, even if it were possible, it is unlikely that their evidence would add significantly to what is already known.</li> <li>3. The prospect that an inquiry would be able to answer satisfactorily further questions surrounding the death is so remote and insufficient to justify the substantial cost (both financial and human) that a further inquiry would involve.</li> </ol>	2 August 2016

Investigation Number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
95	No inquiry	<p>1. There is no dispute that the deceased was shot and killed by UK Forces. However, on the available evidence, UK Forces acted reasonably in self-defence and in accordance with the Rules of Engagement.</p> <p>2. The Secretary of State considers there is no credible breach of the deceased's rights under Article 2 ECHR.</p>	15 October 2015
102	No inquiry	<p>1., The evidence demonstrates that UK Forces shot and killed the deceased in self-defence. The force used in this case was reasonable and no more than absolutely necessary.</p> <p>2. Accordingly the Secretary of State does not consider that there are any further investigative steps which ought reasonably to be taken in order to fulfil any Article 2 duty which might arise in this case.</p>	5 July 2016
116	No inquiry	<p>1. The Secretary of State considers that these incidents do not fall within the UK's jurisdiction under Article 1 ECHR as none of the exceptional bases for establishing extra-territorial jurisdiction are satisfied in this case.</p> <p>2. Even if a court were to conclude that these incidents do fall within the UK's jurisdiction, the Secretary of State considers that an inquisitorial inquiry is not required on the basis that the evidence does not disclose an arguable or credible breach of Article 2 ECHR.</p> <p>3. Taking the above matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided not to establish an inquisitorial inquiry in this case.</p> <p>Please note that this case (IHAT 116) includes 9 victims. This decision applies in respect of each of the victims.</p>	12 June 2018
120	Referred for inquiry	<p>On the basis of the IHAT's investigative report and witness statements that the IHAT have provided, the Secretary of State has concluded that an inquisitorial inquiry under Article 2 ECHR should be established.</p>	28 May 2015

121	No inquiry	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. It is not possible to ascertain whether the deceased was killed by UK Forces.</li><li>2. There are no other reasonable and proportionate lines of inquiry that could shed further light on this incident.</li><li>3. On the available evidence, UK Forces acted reasonably, in self-defence, and in accordance with the Rules of Engagement.</li><li>4. The Secretary of State does not consider that there are any wider systemic issues relevant to this case which require further investigation.</li></ol>	30 May 2017
122	No inquiry	Notwithstanding the extensive enquiries undertaken by the IHAT, there is no evidence to support the allegation that there was a breach of the deceased's rights under Article 2 ECHR.	30 May 2017

Investigation Number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
123	No inquiry	<p>1. This death does not fall within the UK's jurisdiction under Article 1 ECHR. There is no evidence to attribute the deceased's death to actions by UK Forces.</p> <p>2. Even if the Court were to conclude that the incident came within Article 1 jurisdiction, there is no credible breach of the deceased's rights under Article 2 ECHR.</p>	30 May 2017
124	No inquiry	No credible basis for concluding that the deceased's rights under Article 2 ECHR were engaged.	16 June 2015
125	No inquiry	Notwithstanding the extensive enquiries undertaken by the IHAT, there is no evidence to support the allegation that there was a breach of the deceased's rights under Article 2 ECHR .	30 May 2017
126	No inquiry	1. Notwithstanding the extensive enquiries undertaken by the IHAT, there is no evidence to support the allegation that there was a breach of the deceased's rights under Article 2 ECHR.	30 May 2017
127	No inquiry	Notwithstanding the extensive enquiries undertaken by the IHAT, there is no evidence to support the allegation that there was a breach of the deceased's rights under Article 2 ECHR.	30 May 2017
128	No inquiry	<p>1. There is no dispute that the deceased was shot and killed by UK Forces. However, on the available evidence, UK Forces acted reasonably, in self-defence and in accordance with the Rules of Engagement.</p> <p>2. Accordingly the Secretary of State does not consider that there are any further investigative steps which ought reasonably to be taken in order to fulfil any Article 2 duty which might arise in this case.</p>	30 May 2017

Investigation Number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
129	No inquiry	No credible breach of the deceased's rights under Article 2 ECHR. The evidence clearly indicates that the deceased was not killed by UK Forces.	15 June 2015
130 / W12	No inquiry	<p>1. In light of the thorough investigation undertaken by the IHAT and completed by SPLI, the Secretary of State considers that it is not necessary for any further investigation to take place in this case in order to fulfil any investigative duty under Article 2 ECHR which may arise.</p> <p>2. The results of the IHAT/SPLI investigation clearly demonstrate that there was/is insufficient evidence to establish whether UK Armed Forces were responsible for the death of this individual. There are no further reasonable or proportionate lines of inquiry that might shed any further light on this issue. The core purpose of the Article 2 investigative obligation has therefore been complied with.</p> <p>3. The Secretary of State considers that further investigations into the wider circumstances surrounding the death of this individual are not necessary on the basis that the financial and other costs of inquiries need to be balanced against what will usefully be gained from them and the circumstances are such that it is not considered that the costs are outweighed by the potential benefits.</p> <p>4. Taking the above matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and an inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12 June 2018
132	No inquiry	<p>1. It is not possible to ascertain whether the deceased was killed by UK Forces.</p> <p>2. There are no other reasonable or proportionate lines of inquiry that could shed further light on the incident.</p>	30 May 2017
133	No inquiry	Notwithstanding the extensive enquiries undertaken by the IHAT, there is no evidence to support the allegation that there was a breach of the deceased's rights under Article 2 ECHR.	30 May 2017

134	No inquiry	<p>1. There is no evidence that UK Forces were involved in this incident or that they were in the area at the relevant time.</p> <p>2. This death does not fall within the UK's jurisdiction under Article 1 ECHR. 2. Even if the Court were to conclude that the incident came within Article 1 jurisdiction, there is no evidence of a credible breach of the deceased's rights under Article 2 ECHR.</p>	15 October 2015
136	No inquiry	<p>1. There is no dispute that the deceased was shot and killed by UK Forces. However, on the available evidence, UK Forces acted reasonably in self-defence and in accordance with the Rules of Engagement.</p> <p>2. There is no credible breach of the deceased's rights under Article 2 ECHR .</p>	15 October 2015
137 / W7	No inquiry	<p>1. In light of the thorough investigation undertaken by the IHAT/SPLI into the circumstances surrounding the death of this individual, the Secretary of State considers that it is not necessary for any further investigation to take place in this case in order to fulfil any Article 2 investigative duty which may arise.</p> <p>2. The possibility that an inquiry could answer key questions pertaining to the death of this individual is so low that it does not justify the substantial financial and human costs which a further inquiry would involve.</p> <p>3. In addition to the above principal reasoning, some, albeit limited, reliance is placed upon the concerns that have emerged from the disciplinary action that has been taken against Mr Phil Shiner of Public Interest Lawyers.</p> <p>4. Taking the above matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided not to establish an inquisitorial inquiry in this case.</p>	12 June 2018

139	No inquiry	<p>1. In light of the investigation undertaken by the IHAT, the Secretary of State considers that the investigative obligation under Article 2 ECHR has been met fully in terms of scope and procedure.</p> <p>2. The results of the IHAT investigation show that there is no prospect of establishing that the force used was unlawful, nor are there any viable or proportionate lines of enquiry that might shed any further light on this incident.</p> <p>3. Further inquisitorial inquiry in this case is unlikely substantively to add to lessons that have already been learned. The prospect that an inquiry would be able to answer satisfactorily further questions surrounding the death is so remote and insufficient to justify the substantial cost (both financial and human) that a further inquiry would involve.</p>	22 December 2017
140	No inquiry	<p>1. It is not possible to ascertain whether the deceased was killed by UK Forces.</p> <p>2. There are no other reasonable and proportionate lines of inquiry that could shed further light on this incident.</p> <p>3. On the available evidence, UK Forces acted reasonably, in self-defence, and in accordance with the Rules of Engagement.</p> <p>4. The Secretary of State does not consider that there are any wider systemic issues relevant to this case which require further investigation.</p>	30 May 2017
141	Referred for inquiry	Inquiry ordered by Court	7 April 2016

Investigation Number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of decision
144	Referred for inquiry	MOD's initial decision not to refer this case for an inquiry was successfully judicially reviewed by the claimant.	7 April 2016
146	No inquiry	<p>1. In light of the thorough investigation undertaken by the IHAT, the Secretary of State considers that it is not necessary for any further investigation to take place in this case in order to fulfil any Article 2 investigative duty which may arise.</p> <p>2. Given the passage of time and in light of contemporaneous statements taken from witnesses, it is unlikely that any new evidence will become available that could shed further light on this incident. The possibility that an inquiry could bring to light further evidence pertaining to the death of this individual is low and would not justify the substantial financial and human costs that a further inquiry would involve.</p> <p>3. Taking the above matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigative obligations have been fully met and an inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12 June 2018
176	No inquiry	<p>1. There is no evidence of a credible breach of the deceased's rights under Article 2 ECHR.</p> <p>2. Even if there were evidence of a credible breach of Article 2 ECHR, the Al-Sweady Public Inquiry has discharged the investigative duties in this case.</p>	15 October 2015

275	No inquiry	<p>1. In light of the investigation undertaken by the IHAT, the Secretary of State considers that the investigative obligation under Article 2 ECHR has been met fully in terms of scope and procedure.</p> <p>2. It is not possible to ascertain whether the deceased was killed by UK Forces. There is a lack of evidence to support the assertion that UK Armed Forces were involved.</p> <p>3. The prospect that an inquiry would be able to answer satisfactorily further questions surrounding the deaths is so remote and insufficient to justify the substantial cost (both financial and human) that a further inquiry would involve.</p>	11 September 2017
276	No inquiry	<p>1. In light of the investigation undertaken by the IHAT, the Secretary of State considers that the investigative obligation under Article 2 ECHR has been met fully in terms of scope and procedure.</p> <p>2. It is not possible to ascertain whether the individuals who died were killed by UK Forces.</p> <p>3. On the available evidence, the use of force by UK Forces was proportionate and lawful.</p> <p>4. The prospect that an inquiry would be able to answer satisfactorily further questions surrounding the deaths is so remote and insufficient to justify the substantial cost (both financial and human) that a further inquiry would involve.</p>	11 September 2017

Investigation Number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
280	No inquiry	<p>1. The Secretary of State considers that this death does not fall within the UK's jurisdiction under Article 1 ECHR.</p> <p>2. Even if a court were to conclude that this death does fall within the UK's jurisdiction, the Secretary of State considers that it is not necessary for any further investigations to take place in order to fulfil any Article 2 duty which may arise. The costs (in both financial and human terms) of establishing an inquisitorial inquiry would be insufficient to outweigh any benefits to be derived from carrying out further investigations.</p>	22 December 2017
282	No inquiry	<p>In light of the thorough investigation undertaken by IHAT into the circumstances surrounding the death of this individual, the Secretary of State considers that there is no evidence to support an allegation that there was a breach of the individual's Article 2 ECHR rights nor an allegation of unlawful killing. The Secretary of State has therefore decided not to establish an inquisitorial inquiry in this case.</p>	12 June 2018
288	No inquiry	<p>1. The results of the IHAT investigation show that there were no UK Forces present in the area at the time of the incident.</p> <p>2. There are no reasonable and proportionate lines of inquiry that could shed further light on the incident.</p>	30 May 2017
302	No inquiry	<p>1. The Secretary of State does not consider that there are any further investigative steps which ought reasonably to be taken in order to fulfil any Article 2 duty which might arise in this case.</p> <p>2. On the available evidence, UK Forces acted reasonably, in self-defence and in accordance with the Rules of Engagement.</p> <p>3. There are no reasonable and proportionate lines of inquiry that could shed further light on this incident.</p>	22 December 2017

303	No inquiry	<p>1. In light of the extensive enquiries made by IHAT, the Secretary of State considers that there is no evidence to support the allegation that there was a breach of the deceased's Article 2 ECHR rights.</p> <p>2. In addition to the above principal reasoning, some, albeit limited, reliance is placed upon the concerns that have emerged from the disciplinary action that has been taken against Mr Phil Shiner of Public Interest Lawyers.</p> <p>3. Taking all of the above matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and there is no requirement to establish an inquisitorial inquiry in this case.</p>	12 June 2018
312	No inquiry	<p>1. The Secretary of State considers that this death do not fall within the UK's jurisdiction under Article 1 ECHR as none of the exceptional bases for establishing jurisdiction are satisfied in this case.</p> <p>2. Even if a court were to conclude that this death do fall within the UK's jurisdiction, the Secretary of State considers that it is not necessary for any further investigations to take place in order to fulfil any Article 2 duty which may arise. The results of the IHAT investigation demonstrate that there is no realistic prospect of further investigations into the case leading to a criminal prosecution.</p>	23 April 2018
320	No inquiry	<p>1. The results of the IHAT investigation show that it is not possible to ascertain whether UK Forces were responsible for the death of the deceased.</p> <p>2. There are no reasonable and proportionate lines of inquiry that could shed further light on the incident.</p>	30 May 2017
326	No inquiry	<p>1. The Secretary of State considers that this death does not fall within the UK's jurisdiction under Article 1 ECHR as none of the exceptional bases for establishing jurisdiction are satisfied in this case.</p> <p>2. Even if a court were to conclude that this death does fall within the UK's jurisdiction, the Secretary of State considers that it is not necessary for any further investigations to take place in order to fulfil any Article 2 duty which may arise. The results of the IHAT investigation demonstrate that it is not possible to identify whether UK Forces were responsible for the death of the deceased. There are no other reasonable or proportionate lines of enquiry that could shed further light on the incident.</p>	23 April 2018

328	No inquiry	<p>1. In light of the investigation undertaken by IHAT, the Secretary of State considers that it is not necessary for any further investigation to take place in this case in order to fulfil any Article 2 investigative duty which may arise.</p> <p>2. The results of the IHAT investigation show that it is not possible to identify who was responsible for the death of the deceased. There are no reasonable and proportionate lines of inquiry that could shed further light on the incident.</p> <p>3. Taking these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met.</p>	23 April 2018
343	No inquiry	<p>1. The Secretary of State considers that this death does not fall within the UK's jurisdiction under Article 1 ECHR as none of the exceptional bases for establishing jurisdiction are satisfied in this case.</p> <p>2. The results of the IHAT investigation demonstrate that no offence was committed; the deceased died as a result of a road traffic collision and was not unlawfully killed by UK Armed Forces.</p> <p>3. Taking these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met.</p>	23 April 2018
347	No inquiry	<p>1. It is not possible to ascertain whether the deceased was killed by UK Forces. There is a lack of evidence to support the assertion that UK Armed Forces were involved.</p> <p>2. There are no reasonable and proportionate lines of inquiry that could shed further light on the incident.</p>	30 May 2017
358	No inquiry	<p>1. It is not possible to ascertain whether the deceased was killed by UK Forces. There is a lack of evidence to support the assertion that UK Armed Forces were involved.</p> <p>2. There are no reasonable and proportionate lines of inquiry that could shed further light on the incident.</p>	30 May 2017
359	No inquiry	<p>1. It is not possible to ascertain whether the deceased was killed by UK Forces.</p> <p>2. There are no reasonable and proportionate lines of inquiry that could shed further light on the incident.</p>	30 May 2017

360	No inquiry	<p>1. It is not possible to ascertain whether the deceased was killed by UK Forces. There is a lack of evidence to support the assertion that UK Armed Forces were involved.</p> <p>2. There are no reasonable and proportionate lines of inquiry that could shed further light on the incident.</p>	30 May 2017
361	No inquiry	<p>1. It is not possible to ascertain whether the deceased was killed by UK Forces. There is a lack of evidence to support the assertion that UK Armed Forces were involved.</p> <p>2. There are no reasonable and proportionate lines of inquiry that could shed further light on the incident.</p>	30 May 2017
362	No inquiry	<p>1. It is not possible to ascertain whether the deceased was killed by UK Forces. There is a lack of evidence to support the assertion that UK Armed Forces were involved.</p> <p>2. There are no reasonable and proportionate lines of inquiry that could shed further light on the incident.</p>	30 May 2017

Investigation Number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
363	No inquiry	<p>1. It is not possible to ascertain whether the deceased was killed by UK Forces. There is a lack of evidence to support the assertion that UK Armed Forces were involved.</p> <p>2. There are no reasonable and proportionate lines of inquiry that could shed further light on the incident.</p>	30 May 2017
367	No inquiry	<p>1. The Secretary of State considers that this death do not fall within the UK's jurisdiction under Article 1 ECHR as none of the exceptional bases for establishing jurisdiction are satisfied in this case.</p> <p>2. Even if a court were to conclude that this death do fall within the UK's jurisdiction, the Secretary of State considers that it is not necessary for any further investigations to take place in order to fulfil any Article 2 duty which may arise. The results of the IHAT investigation demonstrate that there is no realistic prospect of further investigations into the case leading to a criminal prosecution.</p>	23 April 2018
369	No inquiry	<p>1. In light of the thorough investigation undertaken by IHAT into the circumstances surrounding this death, the Secretary of State considers that it is not necessary for any further investigation to take place in this case in order to fulfil any Article 2 investigative duty which may arise.</p> <p>2. The results of the IHAT investigation demonstrate that UK Armed Forces acted in self-defence and there is no realistic prospect of further investigations into this case leading to a criminal prosecution.</p> <p>3. Taking these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met.</p>	23 April 2018
377	No inquiry	UK Forces were not involved in this incident therefore there has been no breach of the deceased's rights under Article 2 ECHR for which the UK may be held accountable.	5 July 2016

383	No inquiry	<p>1. In light of the extensive enquiries made by IHAT, the Secretary of State considers that there is no evidence to support the allegation that there was a breach of the deceased's Article 2 ECHR rights.</p> <p>2. In addition to the above principal reasoning, some, albeit limited, reliance is placed upon the concerns that have emerged from the disciplinary action that has been taken against Mr Phil Shiner of Public Interest Lawyers.</p> <p>3. Taking all of the above matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and there is no requirement to establish an inquisitorial inquiry in this case.</p>	12 June 2018
586	No inquiry	<p>1. There is no evidence of a credible breach of the deceased's rights under Article 2 ECHR.</p> <p>2. Even if there were evidence of a credible breach of Article 2 ECHR, the Al-Sweady Public Inquiry has discharged the investigative duties in this case.</p>	15 October 2015
587	No inquiry	<p>1. There is no evidence of a credible breach of the deceased's rights under Article 2 ECHR.</p> <p>2. Even if there were evidence of a credible breach of Article 2 ECHR, the Al-Sweady Public Inquiry has discharged the investigative duties in this case.</p>	15 October 2015
588	No inquiry	<p>1. There is no evidence of a credible breach of the deceased's rights under Article 2 ECHR.</p> <p>2. Even if there were evidence of a credible breach of Article 2 ECHR, the Al-Sweady Public Inquiry has discharged the investigative duties in this case.</p>	15 October 2015

Investigation Number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
589	No inquiry	<p>1. There is no evidence of a credible breach of the deceased's rights under Article 2 ECHR.</p> <p>2. Even if there were evidence of a credible breach of Article 2 ECHR, the Al-Sweady Public Inquiry has discharged the investigative duties in this case.</p>	15 October 2015
590	No inquiry	<p>1. There is no evidence of a credible breach of the deceased's rights under Article 2 ECHR.</p> <p>2. Even if there were evidence of a credible breach of Article 2 ECHR, the Al-Sweady Public Inquiry has discharged the investigative duties in this case.</p>	15 October 2015
591	No inquiry	<p>1. There is no evidence of a credible breach of the deceased's rights under Article 2 ECHR.</p> <p>2. Even if there were evidence of a credible breach of Article 2 ECHR, the Al-Sweady Public Inquiry has discharged the investigative duties in this case.</p>	15 October 2015
592	No inquiry	<p>1. There is no evidence of a credible breach of the deceased's rights under Article 2 ECHR.</p> <p>2. Even if there were evidence of a credible breach of Article 2 ECHR, the Al-Sweady Public Inquiry has discharged the investigative duties in this case.</p>	15 October 2015
593	No inquiry	<p>1. There is no evidence of a credible breach of the deceased's rights under Article 2 ECHR.</p> <p>2. Even if there were evidence of a credible breach of Article 2 ECHR, the Al-Sweady Public Inquiry has discharged the investigative duties in this case.</p>	15 October 2015
594	No inquiry	<p>1. There is no evidence of a credible breach of the deceased's rights under Article 2 ECHR.</p> <p>2. Even if there were evidence of a credible breach of Article 2 ECHR, the Al-</p>	15 October 2015

Investigation Number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
		Sweady Public Inquiry has discharged the investigative duties in this case.	
595	No inquiry	Notwithstanding the extensive enquiries undertaken by the IHAT, the evidence shows that UK Forces were not present in the area on the date of the incident and were not involved in the engagement which led to the death of the deceased.	30 May 2017
618	No inquiry	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The results of the IHAT investigation show that it is not possible to ascertain whether UK Forces were responsible for the death of the deceased.</li> <li>2. There are no reasonable and proportionate lines of inquiry that could shed further light on these incidents.</li> </ol>	30 May 2017
619	No inquiry	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In light of the investigation undertaken by the IHAT, the Secretary of State considers that the investigative obligation under Article 2 ECHR has been met fully in terms of scope and procedure.</li> <li>2. It is not possible to ascertain whether the individuals who died were killed by UK Forces.</li> <li>3. On the available evidence, the use of force by UK Forces was proportionate and lawful.</li> <li>4. The prospect that an inquiry would be able to answer satisfactorily further questions surrounding the deaths is so remote and insufficient to justify the substantial cost (both financial and human) that a further inquiry would involve.</li> </ol>	11 September 2017
622	No inquiry	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The results of the IHAT investigation show that it is not possible to ascertain whether UK Forces were responsible for the death of the deceased.</li> <li>2. There are no reasonable and proportionate lines of inquiry that could shed further light on these incidents.</li> </ol>	30 May 2017

Investigation Number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
627	No inquiry	<p>1. There is no evidence of a credible breach of the deceased's rights under Article 2 ECHR.</p> <p>2. Even if there were evidence of a credible breach of Article 2 ECHR, the Al Sweady Public Inquiry has discharged the investigative duty in this case.</p>	30 May 2017
628	No inquiry	<p>1. There is no evidence of a credible breach of the deceased's rights under Article 2 ECHR.</p> <p>2. Even if there were evidence of a credible breach of Article 2 ECHR, the Al Sweady Public Inquiry has discharged the investigative duty in this case.</p>	30 May 2017
629	No inquiry	<p>1. There is no evidence of a credible breach of the deceased's rights under Article 2 ECHR.</p> <p>2. Even if there were evidence of a credible breach of Article 2 ECHR, the Al Sweady Public Inquiry has discharged the investigative duty in this case.</p>	30 May 2017
630	No inquiry	<p>1. There is no evidence of a credible breach of the deceased's rights under Article 2 ECHR.</p> <p>2. Even if there were evidence of a credible breach of Article 2 ECHR, the Al Sweady Public Inquiry has discharged the investigative duty in this case.</p>	30 May 2017
631	No inquiry	<p>1. There is no evidence of a credible breach of the deceased's rights under Article 2 ECHR.</p> <p>2. Even if there were evidence of a credible breach of Article 2 ECHR, the Al Sweady Public Inquiry has discharged the investigative duty in this case.</p>	30 May 2017

Investigation Number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
632	No inquiry	<p>1. There is no evidence of a credible breach of the deceased's rights under Article 2 ECHR.</p> <p>2. Even if there were evidence of a credible breach of Article 2 ECHR, the Al Sweady Public Inquiry has discharged the investigative duty in this case.</p>	30 May 2017
633	No inquiry	<p>1. There is no evidence of a credible breach of the deceased's rights under Article 2 ECHR.</p> <p>2. Even if there were evidence of a credible breach of Article 2 ECHR, the Al Sweady Public Inquiry has discharged the investigative duty in this case.</p>	30 May 2017
634	No inquiry	<p>1. There is no evidence of a credible breach of the deceased's rights under Article 2 ECHR.</p> <p>2. Even if there were evidence of a credible breach of Article 2 ECHR, the Al Sweady Public Inquiry has discharged the investigative duty in this case.</p>	30 May 2017
635	No inquiry	<p>1. There is no evidence of a credible breach of the deceased's rights under Article 2 ECHR.</p> <p>2. Even if there were evidence of a credible breach of Article 2 ECHR, the Al Sweady Public Inquiry has discharged the investigative duty in this case.</p>	30 May 2017
636	No inquiry	<p>1. There is no evidence of a credible breach of the deceased's rights under Article 2 ECHR.</p> <p>2. Even if there were evidence of a credible breach of Article 2 ECHR, the Al Sweady Public Inquiry has discharged the investigative duty in this case.</p>	30 May 2017

Investigation Number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
637	No inquiry	<p>1. There is no evidence of a credible breach of the deceased's rights under Article 2 ECHR.</p> <p>2. Even if there were evidence of a credible breach of Article 2 ECHR, the AI Sweady Public Inquiry has discharged the investigative duty in this case.</p>	30 May 2017
638	No inquiry	<p>1. There is no evidence of a credible breach of the deceased's rights under Article 2 ECHR.</p> <p>2. Even if there were evidence of a credible breach of Article 2 ECHR, the AI Sweady Public Inquiry has discharged the investigative duty in this case.</p>	30 May 2017
639	No inquiry	<p>1. There is no evidence of a credible breach of the deceased's rights under Article 2 ECHR.</p> <p>2. Even if there were evidence of a credible breach of Article 2 ECHR, the AI Sweady Public Inquiry has discharged the investigative duty in this case.</p>	30 May 2017
640	No inquiry	<p>1. There is no evidence of a credible breach of the deceased's rights under Article 2 ECHR.</p> <p>2. Even if there were evidence of a credible breach of Article 2 ECHR, the AI Sweady Public Inquiry has discharged the investigative duty in this case.</p>	30 May 2017
641	No inquiry	<p>1. There is no evidence of a credible breach of the deceased's rights under Article 2 ECHR.</p> <p>2. Even if there were evidence of a credible breach of Article 2 ECHR, the AI Sweady Public Inquiry has discharged the investigative duty in this case.</p>	30 May 2017
642	No inquiry	<p>1. There is no evidence of a credible breach of the deceased's rights under Article 2 ECHR.</p> <p>2. Even if there were evidence of a credible breach of Article 2 ECHR, the AI Sweady</p>	30 May 2017

Investigation Number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
		Public Inquiry has discharged the investigative duty in this case.	
643	No inquiry	<p>1. There is no evidence of a credible breach of the deceased's rights under Article 2 ECHR.</p> <p>2. Even if there were evidence of a credible breach of Article 2 ECHR, the Al Sweady Public Inquiry has discharged the investigative duty in this case.</p>	30 May 2017
644	No inquiry	<p>1. There is no evidence of a credible breach of the deceased's rights under Article 2 ECHR.</p> <p>2. Even if there were evidence of a credible breach of Article 2 ECHR, the Al Sweady Public Inquiry has discharged the investigative duty in this case.</p>	30 May 2017
645	No inquiry	<p>1. There is no evidence of a credible breach of the deceased's rights under Article 2 ECHR.</p> <p>2. Even if there were evidence of a credible breach of Article 2 ECHR, the Al Sweady Public Inquiry has discharged the investigative duty in this case.</p>	30 May 2017
1070	No inquiry	<p>1. The results of the IHAT investigation show that it is not possible to ascertain whether UK Forces were responsible for the death of the deceased.</p> <p>2. There are no reasonable and proportionate lines of inquiry that could shed further light on these incidents.</p>	30 May 2017
1071	No inquiry	<p>1. The results of the IHAT investigation show that it is not possible to ascertain whether UK Forces were responsible for the death of the deceased.</p> <p>2. There are no reasonable and proportionate lines of inquiry that could shed</p>	30 May 2017

Investigation Number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
		further light on these incidents.	
1072	No inquiry	<p>1. The results of the IHAT investigation show that it is not possible to ascertain whether UK Forces were responsible for the death of the deceased.</p> <p>2. There are no reasonable and proportionate lines of inquiry that could shed further light on these incidents.</p>	30 May 2017
1073	No inquiry	<p>1. The results of the IHAT investigation show that it is not possible to ascertain whether UK Forces were responsible for the death of the deceased.</p> <p>2. There are no reasonable and proportionate lines of inquiry that could shed further light on these incidents.</p>	30 May 2017
1074	No inquiry	<p>1. The results of the IHAT investigation show that it is not possible to ascertain whether UK Forces were responsible for the death of the deceased.</p> <p>2. There are no reasonable and proportionate lines of inquiry that could shed further light on these incidents.</p>	30 May 2017
1075	No inquiry	<p>1. The results of the IHAT investigation show that it is not possible to ascertain whether UK Forces were responsible for the death of the deceased.</p> <p>2. There are no reasonable and proportionate lines of inquiry that could shed further light on these incidents.</p>	30 May 2017
1076	No inquiry	<p>1. The results of the IHAT investigation show that it is not possible to ascertain whether UK Forces were responsible for the death of the deceased.</p> <p>2. There are no reasonable and proportionate lines of inquiry that could shed further light on these incidents.</p>	30 May 2017

Investigation Number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1077	No inquiry	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The results of the IHAT investigation show that it is not possible to ascertain whether UK Forces were responsible for the death of the deceased.</li> <li>2. There are no reasonable and proportionate lines of inquiry that could shed further light on these incidents.</li> </ol>	30 May 2017
1388	No inquiry	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In light of the investigation undertaken by the IHAT, the Secretary of State considers that the investigative obligation under Article 2 ECHR has been met fully in terms of scope and procedure.</li> <li>2. It is not possible to ascertain whether the individuals who died were killed by UK Forces.</li> <li>3. On the available evidence, the use of force by UK Forces was proportionate and lawful.</li> <li>4. The prospect that an inquiry would be able to answer satisfactorily further questions surrounding the deaths is so remote and insufficient to justify the substantial cost (both financial and human) that a further inquiry would involve.</li> </ol>	11 September 2017
1421	No inquiry	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In light of the investigation undertaken by the IHAT, the Secretary of State considers that the investigative obligation under Article 2 ECHR has been met fully in terms of scope and procedure.</li> <li>2. It is not possible to ascertain whether the individuals who died were killed by UK Forces.</li> <li>3. On the available evidence, the use of force by UK Forces was proportionate and lawful.</li> <li>4. The prospect that an inquiry would be able to answer satisfactorily further questions surrounding the deaths is so remote and insufficient to justify the substantial cost (both financial and human) that a further inquiry would involve.</li> </ol>	11 September 2017