

I am writing to request information regarding the case of Randox Testing Services and Trimega Laboratories, and the consequences of the discovery that tests performed by these companies may have been flawed.

I understand that Randox provided each force with a list of cases that could have been affected.

I would please like to know:

1. How many cases were on this list?

The spreadsheet contained 165 cases in total, of which 142 were drug drive - and of the remaining 23, 6 were duplicate entries.

2. After the cases were reviewed by the force, how many were deemed to have been affected by issues around the forensic data?

This left 17 cases for review.

Cases reviewed: Suicide (1) Child Neglect (1) Sexual Assault (8) Administer Noxious Substance (1) Violence (4) Suspicious Death (1) Violence/Fatal RTC (1)

3. If possible, please provide details of the crimes charged for the cases deemed to have been affected, e.g. how many: a. Murder, b. Manslaughter, c. rape, etc.

None. See below where all 17 cases are referenced and summarised;

Each individual case has been reviewed. There are a number of cases where 'No Further Action' or 'No Conviction' stands and these are therefore irrelevant to this review.

The review concludes that in all cases, where a conviction stands, 'Guilty' pleas were entered by the defendants. Evidence in these investigations has been from other prim facia means, and not forensic evidence.

In conclusion, there is no evidence of improper or unsafe convictions in any of the identified cases.

Please note in respect of any information provided, specifically for question 3, this may be inaccurate as the heading of the investigation against which it was tested may not be correct. For example, an alleged offender for a rape may have been arrested whilst driving under the influence of drugs. The suspects blood sample would have been submitted as part of the overall investigation. The rape allegation may have been discontinued but the suspect charged and convicted of drug driving and sentenced accordingly. In this instance the data which was supplied initially by RANDOX and then reviewed by forces, may show that the suspect was disqualified from driving for a rape, which couldn't happen. The data needs to have been updated to show the offence for which toxicology was actually relevant to, not the offence that was originally investigated, but this may not have happened before a re-test was completed.