



Detective Chief Superintendent Craggs
Central Specialist Crime
OCU Commander
Metropolitan Police Service

20 January 2026

Dear Detective Chief Superintendent Craggs

Safeguarding and Witness Protection Risks Arising from Civil Disclosure in Live Criminal Investigations

No One Above is a collective of Fayed survivors.

We are writing to raise serious safeguarding concerns arising from the way civil redress for survivors of abuse linked to Harrods and the Fayed estate is reportedly being structured, and to ask what steps the Metropolitan Police Service is taking to mitigate foreseeable risks to victims and to ongoing criminal investigations.

As you will be aware, there are active criminal investigations in both the UK and in France into allegations of serious sexual abuse, exploitation, and trafficking connected to Mohamed Al Fayed. These investigations depend, fundamentally, on survivor safety, confidentiality, and continued cooperation.

Against that background, it has been reported that two members of the Fayed family, Heidi and Camilla Fayed, remain executors of the Fayed estate and that Harrods' position is that it will not settle survivor claims unless it is able to pursue counterclaims against the estate. If this is correct, any meaningful counterclaim would require disclosure of evidential material about survivors to the estate, and therefore to the executors - who are close family members of the alleged abuser.

Survivors are aware that in October/November last year Harrods amended its redress scheme documentation so that disclosure of survivor information and evidence to third parties is mandatory where required for the purpose of counterclaiming. Disclosure is built into the scheme itself as a condition of participation.

This raises acute and foreseeable risks.

As you will know, evidence in sexual exploitation and trafficking cases necessarily contains highly sensitive material: survivor identities, locations, timelines, and patterns of abuse. Disclosure of such information to family members with a direct interest in defending the estate creates obvious dangers, including witness intimidation (direct or indirect), interference with evidence, deterrence of further complainants, and significant psychological harm.

What makes this particularly concerning is that survivors report that, during police interviews, officers have shown close interest in what information survivors may have shared among themselves, reflecting a proper awareness that uncontrolled information-sharing can affect evidence and justice. In that context, it is difficult to understand how mandatory disclosure of survivor information to

powerful, legally resourced family members of the abusers, via civil counterclaims, could be treated as a matter outside safeguarding concern.

There is an additional and serious dimension that we ask the Metropolitan Police Service to consider carefully. Ali Fayed remains alive. There has previously been litigation in the United States seeking to compel him to provide evidence in connection with allegations linked to the Fayed enterprise. Survivors whose experiences intersect with Ali Fayed - whether through knowledge, proximity, or alleged involvement - cannot safely risk having their identities or evidence disclosed to him, directly or indirectly.

In an international context, disclosure of survivor information to family executors risks alerting individuals who may themselves be witnesses or subjects of inquiry to the identities, locations, and accounts of complainants. Once such information is disclosed, the harm cannot be undone.

We fully appreciate that the Metropolitan Police Service does not control private civil litigation. However, where police know, or ought to know, that parallel processes create a real and foreseeable risk to victims or to the integrity of criminal investigations, legal duties arise. In cases involving trafficking and severe exploitation, those duties are heightened by the UK's positive obligations under Article 4 of the European Convention on Human Rights, including duties to protect victims from retaliation and to ensure investigations are effective in practice.

Silence in the face of foreseeable harm is not neutral.

We are therefore writing to ask:

- Whether the Metropolitan Police Service has assessed the safeguarding risks arising from civil disclosure of detailed survivor information to executors who are close family members of the abusers, particularly in light of the amended redress scheme documentation;
- Whether those risks have been assessed in light of the fact that Ali Fayed remains alive and has previously been the subject of evidential proceedings in the United States;
- What steps, if any, have been taken to raise concerns with relevant authorities, prosecutors, or courts about the potential impact of such disclosure on victim safety and ongoing investigations;
- Whether the Met has considered supporting or recommending measures such as disclosure restrictions, anonymisation, or ring-fencing of survivor evidence to prevent foreseeable harm; and
- How the Met is ensuring that survivors are not deterred from cooperation by fear that participation in redress or investigations will expose them to risk.

This letter does not seek to attribute blame, nor to interfere with lawful civil processes. It seeks clarity on safeguarding. Once risks are foreseeable, inaction itself becomes a matter of concern - not only for survivors, but for the integrity of justice.

Given the seriousness of the issues and the irreversible nature of disclosure once it occurs, we would be grateful for a response within 7 working days of this letter, setting out the Met's position and any steps being taken.

Yours sincerely,

No One Above

www.nooneabove.org

contact@nooneabove.org