

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the criminal investigation undertaken by IHAT and SPLI and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. No evidence was identified or provided to support the allegations. The possibility of obtaining further evidence which is relevant to the circumstances of the alleged ill-treatment in this case is low. The Secretary of State therefore considers that the costs of further inquiries outweigh the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p> <p>Please note that this case (IHAT 1) includes 6 victims. This decision applies in respect of each of the victims.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
2	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the criminal investigation undertaken by IHAT and SPLI and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. No evidence was identified or provided to support the allegations. The possibility of obtaining further evidence which is relevant to the circumstances of the alleged ill-treatment in this case is low. The Secretary of State therefore considers that the costs of further inquiries outweigh the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
2	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p> <p>Please note that this case (IHAT 2) includes 6 victims. This decision applies in respect of each of the victims.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
5	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the criminal investigation undertaken by IHAT and SPLI and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. No evidence was identified or provided to support the allegations. The possibility of obtaining further evidence which is relevant to the circumstances of the alleged ill-treatment in this case is low. The Secretary of State therefore considers that the costs of further inquiries outweigh the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
8	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
10	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p> <p>Please note that this case (IHAT 10) includes 3 victims. This decision applies in respect of each of the 3 victims.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
11	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
11	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p> <p>Please note that this case (IHAT 11) includes 3 victims. This decision applies in respect of each of the 3 victims.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
12	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
17	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
22	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
23	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
24	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
27	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
28	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p> <p>Please note that this case (IHAT 28) includes 3 victims. This decision applies in respect of each of the 3 victims.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
30	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p> <p>Please note that this case (IHAT 30) includes 2 victims. This decision applies in respect of each of the 2 victims.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
32	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the criminal investigation undertaken by IHAT and SPLI and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. No evidence was identified or provided to support the allegations. The possibility of obtaining further evidence which is relevant to the circumstances of the alleged ill-treatment in this case is low. The Secretary of State therefore considers that the costs of further inquiries outweigh the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
32	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
36	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
37	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p> <p>Please note that this case (IHAT 37) includes 4 victims. This decision applies in respect of each of the 4 victims.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
37	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p> <p>Please note that this case (IHAT 37) includes 2 victims. This decision applies in respect of each of the 2 victims.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
38	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p> <p>Please note that this case (IHAT 38) includes 4 victims. This decision applies in respect of each of the 4 victims.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
41	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
43	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
47	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
48	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the criminal investigation undertaken by IHAT and SPLI and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. No evidence was identified or provided to support the allegations. The possibility of obtaining further evidence which is relevant to the circumstances of the alleged ill-treatment in this case is low. The Secretary of State therefore considers that the costs of further inquiries outweigh the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
49	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p> <p>Please note that this case (IHAT 49) includes 2 victims. This decision applies in respect of each of the 2 victims.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
51	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
53	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
54	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p> <p>Please note that this case (IHAT 54) includes 2 victims. This decision applies in respect of each of the 2 victims.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
55	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
56	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
57	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
60	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p> <p>Please note that this case (IHAT 60) includes 2 victims. This decision applies in respect of each of the 2 victims.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
61	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
62	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
63	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18
65	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
66	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
68	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p> <p>Please note that this case (IHAT 68) includes 2 victims. This decision applies in respect of each of the 2 victims.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
69	No inquiry	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The combination of the criminal investigation, plus the availability of a civil damages claim in respect of the alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise. 2. The evidence submitted to the Solicitors Disciplinary Tribunal (SDT) and the SDT judgement in disciplinary proceedings brought against Mr Phil Shiner of Public Interest Lawyers (PIL) casts significant doubt upon the veracity and credibility of the allegations made by PIL. 3. Taking these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met. 	30-May-17

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
70	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
72	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
76	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
80	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
89	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
108	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
109	No inquiry	There is no credible allegation of a breach of Article 2 or Article 3 ECHR while the victim was under the care of UK Forces.	19-Jun-15
110	No inquiry	1. There is no credible allegation of a breach of Article 3 ECHR. The investigation into the death of the deceased has been designated IHAT 595.	19-Jun-15

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
115	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p> <p>Please note that this case (IHAT 115) includes 2 victims. This decision applies in respect of each of the 2 victims.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
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 3 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 3 allegations of ill-treatment. This decision applies in respect of each of the 3 victims.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
117	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p> <p>Please note that this case (IHAT 117) includes 2 victims. This decision applies in respect of each of the 2 victims.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
118	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p> <p>Please note that this case (IHAT 118) includes 2 victims. This decision applies in respect of each of the 2 victims.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
145	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
162	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
163	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
164	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
167	No inquiry	<p>1. This is not a case which raises serious systemic issues akin to an officially tolerated systemic practice which could not satisfactorily be investigated in criminal proceedings or a civil trial.</p> <p>2. The combination of the thorough IHAT/SPLI investigation and the oversight provided by the High Court are sufficient to discharge any investigative obligation under Article 3 ECHR which may arise.</p> <p>Please note that this case (IHAT 167) includes 3 victims. This decision applies in respect of each of the victims.</p> <p>167</p>	23-Apr-18
175	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the criminal investigation undertaken by IHAT and SPLI and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. No evidence was identified or provided to support the allegations. The possibility of obtaining further evidence which is relevant to the circumstances of the alleged ill-treatment in this case is low. The Secretary of State therefore considers that the costs of further inquiries outweigh the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
179	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
180	No inquiry	<p>1. The evidence does not disclose an arguable or credible violation of Article 3 ECHR as there is no evidence to attribute the alleged ill-treatment to actions by UK Armed Forces.</p> <p>2. Even if the allegations do give rise to an investigative duty under Article 3, it has been fully discharged by the combination of the IHAT's thorough investigation and the availability of a civil damages claim.</p> <p>3. Taking these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met.</p> <p>Please note that this case (IHAT 180) includes 2 victims. This decision applies in respect of each of the victims.</p>	23-Apr-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
181	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
183	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
184	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the criminal investigation, plus the availability of a civil damages claim in respect of the alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The evidence submitted to the Solicitors Disciplinary Tribunal (SDT) and the SDT judgement in disciplinary proceedings brought against Mr Phil Shiner of Public Interest Lawyers (PIL) casts significant doubt upon the veracity and credibility of the allegations made by PIL.</p> <p>3. Taking these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met.</p> <p>Please note that this case (IHAT 184) includes 5 victims. This decision applies in respect of each of the 5 victims.</p>	30-May-17

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
185	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
186	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the criminal investigation, plus the availability of a civil damages claim in respect of the alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The evidence submitted to the Solicitors Disciplinary Tribunal (SDT) and the SDT judgement in disciplinary proceedings brought against Mr Phil Shiner of Public Interest Lawyers (PIL) casts significant doubt upon the veracity and credibility of the allegations made by PIL. Taking these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met.</p>	30-May-17

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
187	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
188	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
192	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p> <p>Please note that this case (IHAT 192) includes 2 victims. This decision applies in respect of each of the 2 victims.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
193	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p> <p>Please note that this case (IHAT 193) includes 2 victims. This decision applies in respect of each of the 2 victims.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
194	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
195	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p> <p>Please note that this case (IHAT 195) includes 2 victims. This decision applies in respect of each of the 2 victims.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
196	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p> <p>Please note that this case (IHAT 196) includes 2 victims. This decision applies in respect of each of the 2 victims.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
197	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p> <p>Please note that this case (IHAT 197) includes 2 victims. This decision applies in respect of each of the 2 victims.</p>	30-May-17

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
198	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18
199	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	30-May-17

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
200	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p> <p>Please note that this case (IHAT 200) includes 2 victims. This decision applies in respect of each of the 2 victims</p>	12-Jun-18
201	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
202	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
203	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p> <p>Please note that this case (IHAT 203) includes 2 victims. This decision applies in respect of each of the 2 victims.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
204	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p> <p>Please note that this case (IHAT 204) includes 2 victims. This decision applies in respect of each of the 2 victims</p>	13-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
205	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p> <p>Please note that this case (IHAT 205) includes 4 victims. This decision applies in respect of each of the 4 victims</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
206	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
207	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p> <p>Please note that this case (IHAT 207) includes 2 victims. This decision applies in respect of each of the 2 victims.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
208	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p> <p>Please note that this case (IHAT 208) includes 2 victims. This decision applies in respect of each of the 2 victim</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
209	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p> <p>Please note that this case (IHAT 209) includes 2 victims. This decision applies in respect of each of the 2 victim</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
210	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
212	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p> <p>Please note that this case (IHAT 212) includes 2 victims. This decision applies in respect of each of the 2 victim</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
214	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p> <p>Please note that this case (IHAT 214) includes 2 victims. This decision applies in respect of each of the 2 victim</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
215	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the criminal investigation, plus the availability of a civil damages claim in respect of the alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The evidence submitted to the Solicitors Disciplinary Tribunal (SDT) and the SDT judgement in disciplinary proceedings brought against Mr Phil Shiner of Public Interest Lawyers (PIL) casts significant doubt upon the veracity and credibility of the allegations made by PIL.</p> <p>3. Taking these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met.</p> <p>Please note that this case (IHAT 215) includes 6 victims. This decision applies in respect of each of the victims.</p>	30-May-17

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
215	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
216	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the criminal investigation, plus the availability of a civil damages claim in respect of the alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The evidence submitted to the Solicitors Disciplinary Tribunal (SDT) and the SDT judgement in disciplinary proceedings brought against Mr Phil Shiner of Public Interest Lawyers (PIL) casts significant doubt upon the veracity and credibility of the allegations made by PIL.</p> <p>3. Taking these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met.</p> <p>Please note that this case (IHAT 216) includes 5 victims. This decision applies in respect of each of the victims.</p>	30-May-17

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
217	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the criminal investigation, plus the availability of a civil damages claim in respect of the alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The evidence submitted to the Solicitors Disciplinary Tribunal (SDT) and the SDT judgement in disciplinary proceedings brought against Mr Phil Shiner of Public Interest Lawyers (PIL) casts significant doubt upon the veracity and credibility of the allegations made by PIL.</p> <p>3. Taking these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met.</p> <p>3. Please note that this case (IHAT 217) includes 3 victims. This decision applies in respect of each of the victims.</p>	30-May-17

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
218	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
219	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
220	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
221	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
222	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
223	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
224	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p> <p>Please note that this case (IHAT 224) includes 2 victims. This decision applies in respect of each of the 2 victims.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
225	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
225	No inquiry	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The combination of the criminal investigation, plus the availability of a civil damages claim in respect of the alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise. 2. The evidence submitted to the Solicitors Disciplinary Tribunal (SDT) and the SDT judgement in disciplinary proceedings brought against Mr Phil Shiner of Public Interest Lawyers (PIL) casts significant doubt upon the veracity and credibility of the allegations made by PIL. 3. Taking these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met. 	30-May-17

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
226	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
227	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p> <p>Please note that this case (IHAT 227) includes 2 victims. This decision applies in respect of each of the 2 victims.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
228	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
229	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p> <p>Please note that this case (IHAT 229) includes 3 victims. This decision applies in respect of each of the 3 victims.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
230	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
231	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
232	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
233	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18
235	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p> <p>Please note that this case (IHAT 235) includes 2 victims. This decision applies in respect of each of the 2 victims.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
236	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
237	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
238	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18
239	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
240	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
241	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p> <p>Please note that this case (IHAT 241) includes 3 victims. This decision applies in respect of each of the 3 victims.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
243	No inquiry	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The combination of the criminal investigation, plus the availability of a civil damages claim in respect of the alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.2. The evidence submitted to the Solicitors Disciplinary Tribunal (SDT) and the SDT judgement in disciplinary proceedings brought against Mr Phil Shiner of Public Interest Lawyers (PIL) casts significant doubt upon the veracity and credibility of the allegations made by PIL.3. Taking these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met.	30-May-17

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
243	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p> <p>Please note that this case (IHAT 243) includes 2 victims. This decision applies in respect of each of the victims.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
244	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p> <p>Please note that this case (IHAT 244) includes 3 victims. This decision applies in respect of each of the 3 victims.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
245	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p> <p>Please note that this case (IHAT 245) includes 2 victims. This decision applies in respect of each of the 2 victims.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
247	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p> <p>Please note that this case (IHAT 247) includes 5 victims. This decision applies in respect of each of the 5 victims.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
248	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
249	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
250	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
251	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
256	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
257	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
258	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
259	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
260	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
261	No inquiry	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The combination of the criminal investigation, plus the availability of a civil damages claim in respect of the alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.2. The evidence submitted to the Solicitors Disciplinary Tribunal (SDT) and the SDT judgement in disciplinary proceedings brought against Mr Phil Shiner of Public Interest Lawyers (PIL) casts significant doubt upon the veracity and credibility of the allegations made by PIL.3. Taking these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met.	30-May-17

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
262	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
265	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
304	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
305	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
306	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
384	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
388	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
390	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
392	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
393	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
396	No inquiry	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The combination of the criminal investigation, plus the availability of a civil damages claim in respect of the alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.2. The evidence submitted to the Solicitors Disciplinary Tribunal (SDT) and the SDT judgement in disciplinary proceedings brought against Mr Phil Shiner of Public Interest Lawyers (PIL) casts significant doubt upon the veracity and credibility of the allegations made by PIL.3. Taking these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met.	30-May-17

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
397	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
398	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
399	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
401	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
403	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
404	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
405	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
406	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
407	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
408	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
409	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
410	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
415	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
416	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
417	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
418	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
420	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
423	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
424	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
425	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
426	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
427	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
429	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
431	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
432	No inquiry	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The combination of the criminal investigation, plus the availability of a civil damages claim in respect of the alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.2. The evidence submitted to the Solicitors Disciplinary Tribunal (SDT) and the SDT judgement in disciplinary proceedings brought against Mr Phil Shiner of Public Interest Lawyers (PIL) casts significant doubt upon the veracity and credibility of the allegations made by PIL.3. Taking these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met.	30-May-17

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
433	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the criminal investigation undertaken by IHAT and SPLI and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. No evidence was identified or provided to support the allegations. The possibility of obtaining further evidence which is relevant to the circumstances of the alleged ill-treatment in this case is low. The Secretary of State therefore considers that the costs of further inquiries outweigh the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18
434	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the criminal investigation, plus the availability of a civil damages claim in respect of the alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The evidence submitted to the Solicitors Disciplinary Tribunal (SDT)and the SDT judgement in disciplinary proceedings brought against Mr Phil Shiner of Public Interest Lawyers (PIL) casts significant doubt upon the veracity and credibility of the allegations made by PIL.</p> <p>3. Taking these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met.</p>	30-May-17

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
435	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
436	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
437	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the criminal investigation undertaken by IHAT and SPLI and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. No evidence was identified or provided to support the allegations. The possibility of obtaining further evidence which is relevant to the circumstances of the alleged ill-treatment in this case is low. The Secretary of State therefore considers that the costs of further inquiries outweigh the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
438	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
440	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
441	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
443	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
444	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
447	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
448	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
451	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
452	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
454	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
459	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
462	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
463	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
464	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
466	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
467	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
468	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
469	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
470	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
471	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
474	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
475	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
476	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
477	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
478	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
479	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
482	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
483	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
484	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
486	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
487	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
488	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
489	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
490	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
491	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
492	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
494	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
495	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
496	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
497	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
498	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
499	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
500	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
501	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
503	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18
504	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the criminal investigation, plus the availability of a civil damages claim in respect of the alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The evidence submitted to the Solicitors Disciplinary Tribunal (SDT)and the SDT judgement in disciplinary proceedings brought against Mr Phil Shiner of Public Interest Lawyers (PIL) casts significant doubt upon the veracity and credibility of the allegations made by PIL.</p> <p>3. Taking these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met.</p>	30-May-17

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
505	No inquiry	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The combination of the criminal investigation, plus the availability of a civil damages claim in respect of the alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise. 2. The evidence submitted to the Solicitors Disciplinary Tribunal (SDT) and the SDT judgement in disciplinary proceedings brought against Mr Phil Shiner of Public Interest Lawyers (PIL) casts significant doubt upon the veracity and credibility of the allegations made by PIL. 3. Taking these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met. 	30-May-17
506	No inquiry	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise. 2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it. 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. 4. Taking these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case. 	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
507	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
508	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
509	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
511	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
512	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
513	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
515	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
516	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
517	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
518	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
519	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
521	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the criminal investigation undertaken by IHAT and SPLI and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. No evidence was identified or provided to support the allegations. The possibility of obtaining further evidence which is relevant to the circumstances of the alleged ill-treatment in this case is low. The Secretary of State therefore considers that the costs of further inquiries outweigh the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p> <p>Please note that this case (IHAT 521) includes 2 victims. This decision applies in respect of each of the 2 victims.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
521	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
523	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
524	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
525	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
527	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
528	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
531	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
534	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
535	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
536	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
537	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
538	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
539	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
540	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
541	No inquiry	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The combination of the criminal investigation, plus the availability of a civil damages claim in respect of the alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise. 2. The evidence submitted to the Solicitors Disciplinary Tribunal (SDT) and the SDT judgement in disciplinary proceedings brought against Mr Phil Shiner of Public Interest Lawyers (PIL) casts significant doubt upon the veracity and credibility of the allegations made by PIL. 3. Taking these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met. 	30-May-17

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
542	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
543	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
545	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
546	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
549	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
550	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18
552	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the criminal investigation, plus the availability of a civil damages claim in respect of the alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The evidence submitted to the Solicitors Disciplinary Tribunal (SDT)and the SDT judgement in disciplinary proceedings brought against Mr Phil Shiner of Public Interest Lawyers (PIL) casts significant doubt upon the veracity and credibility of the allegations made by PIL.</p> <p>3. Taking these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met.</p>	30-May-17

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
553	No inquiry	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The combination of the criminal investigation undertaken by IHAT and SPLI and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise. 2. No evidence was identified or provided to support the allegations. The possibility of obtaining further evidence which is relevant to the circumstances of the alleged ill-treatment in this case is low. The Secretary of State therefore considers that the costs of further inquiries outweigh the potential benefits. 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. 4. Taking these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case. 	12-Jun-18
554	No inquiry	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The combination of the criminal investigation, plus the availability of a civil damages claim in respect of the alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise. 2. The evidence submitted to the Solicitors Disciplinary Tribunal (SDT) and the SDT judgement in disciplinary proceedings brought against Mr Phil Shiner of Public Interest Lawyers (PIL) casts significant doubt upon the veracity and credibility of the allegations made by PIL. 3. Taking these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met. 	30-May-17

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
556	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
557	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
558	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
559	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
561	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
562	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
563	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
564	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
565	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
566	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
567	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
570	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
571	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
572	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
574	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
575	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
577	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
579	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
580	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
583	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
584	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
597	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
646	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
650	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
651	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
652	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
653	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the criminal investigation undertaken by IHAT and SPLI and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. No evidence was identified or provided to support the allegations. The possibility of obtaining further evidence which is relevant to the circumstances of the alleged ill-treatment in this case is low. The Secretary of State therefore considers that the costs of further inquiries outweigh the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
653	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
655	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
656	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
657	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
659	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
660	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
661	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
662	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
664	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
665	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
666	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
668	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
669	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
670	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
671	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
672	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
673	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
675	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
676	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
678	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
679	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
681	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
682	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
684	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
685	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
688	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
689	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
690	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
692	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
693	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
697	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
698	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
699	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
704	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
706	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
707	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
708	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
709	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
712	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
715	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
717	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
718	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
719	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
720	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
722	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
723	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
725	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
726	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
727	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
728	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
730	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
731	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
733	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
735	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
736	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
738	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
739	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
740	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
742	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
743	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
744	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
745	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
746	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
750	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
751	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
755	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
756	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
757	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
763	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
764	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
765	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
766	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
768	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
770	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
771	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
772	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
773	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
774	No inquiry	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The combination of the criminal investigation, plus the availability of a civil damages claim in respect of the alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.2. The evidence submitted to the Solicitors Disciplinary Tribunal (SDT) and the SDT judgement in disciplinary proceedings brought against Mr Phil Shiner of Public Interest Lawyers (PIL) casts significant doubt upon the veracity and credibility of the allegations made by PIL.3. Taking these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met.	30-May-17

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
777	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
779	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
780	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
782	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
783	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
784	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
785	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
786	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
788	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
789	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
790	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
791	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
792	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
793	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
794	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
795	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
796	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
799	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
801	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
804	No inquiry	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The combination of the criminal investigation, plus the availability of a civil damages claim in respect of the alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise. 2. The evidence submitted to the Solicitors Disciplinary Tribunal (SDT) and the SDT judgement in disciplinary proceedings brought against Mr Phil Shiner of Public Interest Lawyers (PIL) casts significant doubt upon the veracity and credibility of the allegations made by PIL. 3. Taking these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met. 	30-May-17

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
805	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
806	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
807	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
808	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
809	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
810	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
811	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the criminal investigation undertaken by IHAT and SPLI and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. No evidence was identified or provided to support the allegations. The possibility of obtaining further evidence which is relevant to the circumstances of the alleged ill-treatment in this case is low. The Secretary of State therefore considers that the costs of further inquiries outweigh the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
812	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
813	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
814	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
816	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
819	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
820	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
822	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the criminal investigation undertaken by IHAT and SPLI and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. No evidence was identified or provided to support the allegations. The possibility of obtaining further evidence which is relevant to the circumstances of the alleged ill-treatment in this case is low. The Secretary of State therefore considers that the costs of further inquiries outweigh the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
825	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
831	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
833	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
834	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
836	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
837	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
839	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
840	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
842	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
843	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
844	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
845	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
849	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
850	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
851	No inquiry	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The combination of the criminal investigation, plus the availability of a civil damages claim in respect of the alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise. 2. The evidence submitted to the Solicitors Disciplinary Tribunal (SDT) and the SDT judgement in disciplinary proceedings brought against Mr Phil Shiner of Public Interest Lawyers (PIL) casts significant doubt upon the veracity and credibility of the allegations made by PIL. 3. Taking these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met. 	30-May-17
852	No inquiry	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The combination of the criminal investigation, plus the availability of a civil damages claim in respect of the alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise. 2. The evidence submitted to the Solicitors Disciplinary Tribunal (SDT) and the SDT judgement in disciplinary proceedings brought against Mr Phil Shiner of Public Interest Lawyers (PIL) casts significant doubt upon the veracity and credibility of the allegations made by PIL. 3. Taking these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met. 	30-May-17

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
853	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
854	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
855	No inquiry	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The combination of the criminal investigation, plus the availability of a civil damages claim in respect of the alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise. 2. The evidence submitted to the Solicitors Disciplinary Tribunal (SDT) and the SDT judgement in disciplinary proceedings brought against Mr Phil Shiner of Public Interest Lawyers (PIL) casts significant doubt upon the veracity and credibility of the allegations made by PIL. 3. Taking these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met. 	30-May-17

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
856	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
858	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
859	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
863	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
864	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
865	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
866	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
868	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
869	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
870	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
872	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
874	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
875	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
877	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
878	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
880	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
883	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
884	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
886	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
888	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
889	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
890	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
892	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
893	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
894	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
895	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
897	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
898	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
900	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
902	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
905	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
906	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
907	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
908	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
909	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
912	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
913	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
914	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
916	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the criminal investigation undertaken by IHAT and SPLI and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. No evidence was identified or provided to support the allegations. The possibility of obtaining further evidence which is relevant to the circumstances of the alleged ill-treatment in this case is low. The Secretary of State therefore considers that the costs of further inquiries outweigh the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
917	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
918	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
920	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
921	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
922	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
923	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
924	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
926	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
927	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
928	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
930	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
931	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
932	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
933	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
939	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
940	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
943	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
944	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
945	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
947	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
948	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
949	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
950	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
951	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
953	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the criminal investigation undertaken by IHAT and SPLI and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. No evidence was identified or provided to support the allegations. The possibility of obtaining further evidence which is relevant to the circumstances of the alleged ill-treatment in this case is low. The Secretary of State therefore considers that the costs of further inquiries outweigh the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
954	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
955	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
956	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
957	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
958	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
959	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18
961	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the criminal investigation, plus the availability of a civil damages claim in respect of the alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The evidence submitted to the Solicitors Disciplinary Tribunal (SDT)and the SDT judgement in disciplinary proceedings brought against Mr Phil Shiner of Public Interest Lawyers (PIL) casts significant doubt upon the veracity and credibility of the allegations made by PIL.</p> <p>3. Taking these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met.</p>	30-May-17

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
965	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
966	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
967	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
968	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
970	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
971	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
973	No inquiry	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The combination of the criminal investigation, plus the availability of a civil damages claim in respect of the alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise. 2. The evidence submitted to the Solicitors Disciplinary Tribunal (SDT) and the SDT judgement in disciplinary proceedings brought against Mr Phil Shiner of Public Interest Lawyers (PIL) casts significant doubt upon the veracity and credibility of the allegations made by PIL. 3. Taking these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met. 	30-May-17
974	No inquiry	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The combination of the criminal investigation undertaken by IHAT and SPLI and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise. 2. No evidence was identified or provided to support the allegations. The possibility of obtaining further evidence which is relevant to the circumstances of the alleged ill-treatment in this case is low. The Secretary of State therefore considers that the costs of further inquiries outweigh the potential benefits. 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. 4. Taking these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case. 	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
976	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
977	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18
978	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the criminal investigation, plus the availability of a civil damages claim in respect of the alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The evidence submitted to the Solicitors Disciplinary Tribunal (SDT)and the SDT judgement in disciplinary proceedings brought against Mr Phil Shiner of Public Interest Lawyers (PIL) casts significant doubt upon the veracity and credibility of the allegations made by PIL.</p> <p>3. Taking these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met.</p>	30-May-17

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
980	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
982	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
983	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
984	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
985	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
987	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
989	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
991	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
994	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18
995	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the criminal investigation, plus the availability of a civil damages claim in respect of the alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The evidence submitted to the Solicitors Disciplinary Tribunal (SDT)and the SDT judgement in disciplinary proceedings brought against Mr Phil Shiner of Public Interest Lawyers (PIL) casts significant doubt upon the veracity and credibility of the allegations made by PIL.</p> <p>3. Taking these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met.</p>	30-May-17

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
997	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18
999	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the criminal investigation, plus the availability of a civil damages claim in respect of the alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The evidence submitted to the Solicitors Disciplinary Tribunal (SDT)and the SDT judgement in disciplinary proceedings brought against Mr Phil Shiner of Public Interest Lawyers (PIL) casts significant doubt upon the veracity and credibility of the allegations made by PIL.</p> <p>3. Taking these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met.</p>	30-May-17

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1001	No inquiry	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The combination of the criminal investigation, plus the availability of a civil damages claim in respect of the alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise. 2. The evidence submitted to the Solicitors Disciplinary Tribunal (SDT) and the SDT judgement in disciplinary proceedings brought against Mr Phil Shiner of Public Interest Lawyers (PIL) casts significant doubt upon the veracity and credibility of the allegations made by PIL. 3. Taking these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met. 	30-May-17
1002	No inquiry	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise. 2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it. 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. 4. Taking these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case. 	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1003	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1005	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1006	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1007	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1010	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1011	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1013	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1014	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1016	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1017	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1019	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18
1025	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the criminal investigation, plus the availability of a civil damages claim in respect of the alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The evidence submitted to the Solicitors Disciplinary Tribunal (SDT)and the SDT judgement in disciplinary proceedings brought against Mr Phil Shiner of Public Interest Lawyers (PIL) casts significant doubt upon the veracity and credibility of the allegations made by PIL.</p> <p>3. Taking these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met.</p>	30-May-17

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1026	No inquiry	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The combination of the criminal investigation, plus the availability of a civil damages claim in respect of the alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise. 2. The evidence submitted to the Solicitors Disciplinary Tribunal (SDT) and the SDT judgement in disciplinary proceedings brought against Mr Phil Shiner of Public Interest Lawyers (PIL) casts significant doubt upon the veracity and credibility of the allegations made by PIL. 3. Taking these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met. 	30-May-17
1027	No inquiry	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The combination of the criminal investigation, plus the availability of a civil damages claim in respect of the alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise. 2. The evidence submitted to the Solicitors Disciplinary Tribunal (SDT) and the SDT judgement in disciplinary proceedings brought against Mr Phil Shiner of Public Interest Lawyers (PIL) casts significant doubt upon the veracity and credibility of the allegations made by PIL. 3. Taking these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met. 	30-May-17

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1028	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1029	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the criminal investigation, plus the availability of a civil damages claim in respect of the alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The evidence submitted to the Solicitors Disciplinary Tribunal (SDT) and the SDT judgement in disciplinary proceedings brought against Mr Phil Shiner of Public Interest Lawyers (PIL) casts significant doubt upon the veracity and credibility of the allegations made by PIL.</p> <p>3. Taking these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met.</p>	30-May-17
1089	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1092	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1096	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1099	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1100	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1103	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1105	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1107	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1109	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1110	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1112	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1113	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1114	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1117	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1118	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1119	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1120	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1123	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1124	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1125	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1126	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1127	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1128	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1129	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1131	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1132	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1133	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1134	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1135	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1136	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1137	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1138	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1140	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1142	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1143	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1144	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1148	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1149	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1151	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1152	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the criminal investigation undertaken by IHAT and SPLI and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. No evidence was identified or provided to support the allegations. The possibility of obtaining further evidence which is relevant to the circumstances of the alleged ill-treatment in this case is low. The Secretary of State therefore considers that the costs of further inquiries outweigh the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1155	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1156	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1157	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1158	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1159	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1160	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1161	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1163	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1164	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1165	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1167	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1170	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1171	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1173	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1174	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1175	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1176	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1177	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1178	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1180	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1183	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1184	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1186	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1187	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1189	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1191	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1192	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1194	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1196	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1197	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1198	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1199	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1200	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1202	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1203	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1205	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1207	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1212	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1213	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1217	No inquiry	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The combination of the criminal investigation, plus the availability of a civil damages claim in respect of the alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise. 2. The evidence submitted to the Solicitors Disciplinary Tribunal (SDT) and the SDT judgement in disciplinary proceedings brought against Mr Phil Shiner of Public Interest Lawyers (PIL) casts significant doubt upon the veracity and credibility of the allegations made by PIL. 3. Taking these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met. 	30-May-17

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1218	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1219	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1222	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1223	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1226	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1228	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1229	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1232	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1234	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1236	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1240	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1241	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1242	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1244	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1246	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1250	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1251	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1252	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1255	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1256	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1259	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1261	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1262	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1263	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1266	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1267	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1268	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1269	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1270	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1271	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1272	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1273	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1274	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1275	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1277	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1280	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1281	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1282	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1283	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1284	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1285	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1286	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1290	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1291	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1294	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1295	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the criminal investigation undertaken by IHAT and SPLI and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. No evidence was identified or provided to support the allegations. The possibility of obtaining further evidence which is relevant to the circumstances of the alleged ill-treatment in this case is low. The Secretary of State therefore considers that the costs of further inquiries outweigh the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1296	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1297	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18
1298	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the criminal investigation, plus the availability of a civil damages claim in respect of the alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The evidence submitted to the Solicitors Disciplinary Tribunal (SDT)and the SDT judgement in disciplinary proceedings brought against Mr Phil Shiner of Public Interest Lawyers (PIL) casts significant doubt upon the veracity and credibility of the allegations made by PIL.</p> <p>3. Taking these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met.</p>	30-May-17

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1299	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1300	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1302	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1303	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1304	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1306	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1308	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1309	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1311	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1312	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the criminal investigation undertaken by IHAT and SPLI and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. No evidence was identified or provided to support the allegations. The possibility of obtaining further evidence which is relevant to the circumstances of the alleged ill-treatment in this case is low. The Secretary of State therefore considers that the costs of further inquiries outweigh the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1313	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1314	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1315	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1316	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1317	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1319	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1321	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1324	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1325	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1326	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1327	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1328	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1329	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1330	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1331	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the criminal investigation undertaken by IHAT and SPLI and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. No evidence was identified or provided to support the allegations. The possibility of obtaining further evidence which is relevant to the circumstances of the alleged ill-treatment in this case is low. The Secretary of State therefore considers that the costs of further inquiries outweigh the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1333	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1336	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1338	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1339	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1340	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1341	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1342	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1343	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1344	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1351	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1358	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1359	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1361	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1362	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1364	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1365	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1367	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1368	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1369	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1370	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1371	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1374	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the criminal investigation, plus the availability of a civil damages claim in respect of the alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The evidence submitted to the Solicitors Disciplinary Tribunal (SDT) and the SDT judgement in disciplinary proceedings brought against Mr Phil Shiner of Public Interest Lawyers (PIL) casts significant doubt upon the veracity and credibility of the allegations made by PIL.</p> <p>3. Taking these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met.</p>	30-May-17
1375	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the criminal investigation, plus the availability of a civil damages claim in respect of the alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The evidence submitted to the Solicitors Disciplinary Tribunal (SDT) and the SDT judgement in disciplinary proceedings brought against Mr Phil Shiner of Public Interest Lawyers (PIL) casts significant doubt upon the veracity and credibility of the allegations made by PIL.</p> <p>3. Taking these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met.</p>	30-May-17

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1376	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the criminal investigation, plus the availability of a civil damages claim in respect of the alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The evidence submitted to the Solicitors Disciplinary Tribunal (SDT) and the SDT judgement in disciplinary proceedings brought against Mr Phil Shiner of Public Interest Lawyers (PIL) casts significant doubt upon the veracity and credibility of the allegations made by PIL.</p> <p>3. Taking these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met.</p>	30-May-17
1378	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the criminal investigation, plus the availability of a civil damages claim in respect of the alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The evidence submitted to the Solicitors Disciplinary Tribunal (SDT) and the SDT judgement in disciplinary proceedings brought against Mr Phil Shiner of Public Interest Lawyers (PIL) casts significant doubt upon the veracity and credibility of the allegations made by PIL.</p> <p>3. Taking these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met.</p>	30-May-17

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1379	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1380	No inquiry	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The combination of the criminal investigation, plus the availability of a civil damages claim in respect of the alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise. 2. The evidence submitted to the Solicitors Disciplinary Tribunal (SDT) and the SDT judgement in disciplinary proceedings brought against Mr Phil Shiner of Public Interest Lawyers (PIL) casts significant doubt upon the veracity and credibility of the allegations made by PIL. 3. Taking these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met. 	30-May-17
1381	No inquiry	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The combination of the criminal investigation, plus the availability of a civil damages claim in respect of the alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise. 2. The evidence submitted to the Solicitors Disciplinary Tribunal (SDT) and the SDT judgement in disciplinary proceedings brought against Mr Phil Shiner of Public Interest Lawyers (PIL) casts significant doubt upon the veracity and credibility of the allegations made by PIL. 3. Taking these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met. 	30-May-17

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1382	No inquiry	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The combination of the criminal investigation, plus the availability of a civil damages claim in respect of the alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise. 2. The evidence submitted to the Solicitors Disciplinary Tribunal (SDT) and the SDT judgement in disciplinary proceedings brought against Mr Phil Shiner of Public Interest Lawyers (PIL) casts significant doubt upon the veracity and credibility of the allegations made by PIL. 3. Taking these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met. 	30-May-17

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1383	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1384	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1422	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the criminal investigation undertaken by IHAT and SPLI and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. No evidence was identified or provided to support the allegations. The possibility of obtaining further evidence which is relevant to the circumstances of the alleged ill-treatment in this case is low. The Secretary of State therefore considers that the costs of further inquiries outweigh the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1432	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the criminal investigation undertaken by IHAT and SPLI and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. No evidence was identified or provided to support the allegations. The possibility of obtaining further evidence which is relevant to the circumstances of the alleged ill-treatment in this case is low. The Secretary of State therefore considers that the costs of further inquiries outweigh the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1434	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the criminal investigation undertaken by IHAT and SPLI and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. No evidence was identified or provided to support the allegations. The possibility of obtaining further evidence which is relevant to the circumstances of the alleged ill-treatment in this case is low. The Secretary of State therefore considers that the costs of further inquiries outweigh the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1435	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1436	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1437	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1438	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1439	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1441	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1442	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1443	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1444	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1445	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1446	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1447	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1448	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1450	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1452	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18
1453	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the criminal investigation, plus the availability of a civil damages claim in respect of the alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The evidence submitted to the Solicitors Disciplinary Tribunal (SDT)and the SDT judgement in disciplinary proceedings brought against Mr Phil Shiner of Public Interest Lawyers (PIL) casts significant doubt upon the veracity and credibility of the allegations made by PIL.</p> <p>3. Taking these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met.</p>	30-May-17

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1455	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1456	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1457	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1458	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1459	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1460	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1461	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18
1462	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the criminal investigation, plus the availability of a civil damages claim in respect of the alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The evidence submitted to the Solicitors Disciplinary Tribunal (SDT)and the SDT judgement in disciplinary proceedings brought against Mr Phil Shiner of Public Interest Lawyers (PIL) casts significant doubt upon the veracity and credibility of the allegations made by PIL.</p> <p>3. Taking these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met.</p>	30-May-17

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1463	No inquiry	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The combination of the criminal investigation, plus the availability of a civil damages claim in respect of the alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise. 2. The evidence submitted to the Solicitors Disciplinary Tribunal (SDT) and the SDT judgement in disciplinary proceedings brought against Mr Phil Shiner of Public Interest Lawyers (PIL) casts significant doubt upon the veracity and credibility of the allegations made by PIL. 3. Taking these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met. 	30-May-17

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1464	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1465	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1467	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1468	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1470	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1471	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1472	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1473	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1475	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1476	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1477	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1478	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1479	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1480	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1481	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1482	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1483	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1484	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1485	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1486	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1487	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1488	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1489	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1491	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1493	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
1494	No inquiry	<p>1. The combination of the SPLI criminal investigation, and the oversight provided by the High Court in this case – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment – satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. The case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</p> <p>3. The circumstances of this case are such that the Secretary of State does not consider that the costs of further inquiry are outweighed by the potential benefits.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in any of this case.</p>	12-Jun-18

Investigation number	Decision	Summary of Reasons for Decision	Date of Decision
3758	No inquiry	<p>1.The combination of the IHAT criminal investigation in this case and the oversight provided by the High Court – including the availability of judicial review and civil proceedings in respect of any alleged ill-treatment, satisfies any Article 3 ECHR obligation which might arise.</p> <p>2. This case does not highlight issues that are of such seriousness or ongoing importance that it is necessary to conduct further inquiry in order to learn lessons from it.</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 these matters into account, the Secretary of State has decided that any investigatory obligations have been fully met and inquisitorial inquiry will not be established in this case.</p>	12-Jun-18