

9th February 2026

Dear No One Above,

Thank you for your letter of 20 January 2026 raising concerns regarding potential safeguarding and witness-protection implications arising from aspects of the civil redress scheme associated with the Fayed estate. I recognise the gravity of the issues you outline and the impact they may have on survivors engaging with either the criminal justice process or civil claims.

I understand that your letter is drafted on the premise that (a) the civil scheme itself may give rise to safeguarding concerns, and (b) you are seeking assurance as to what steps the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) is taking to mitigate any foreseeable risks to both victims and the integrity of active criminal investigations. I also note that a significant focus of the concerns raised relates to the requirement within the redress scheme for participants to agree to disclosure of information to third parties for the purpose of enabling potential counterclaims against the estate.

Civil disclosure and redress scheme processes

I fully appreciate the understandable anxiety survivors may feel regarding the disclosure of sensitive information within any civil process. It is, however, also the case that in some civil claims, agreements may be reached between claimants and representatives of an estate that limit or avoid the need for detailed evidential disclosure—for example, where liability is not contested, and discussions relate solely to settlement terms. These are matters determined wholly within the remit of the civil litigation process and are not directed or overseen by the MPS.

Your letter sets out a view that disclosure of civil-claim material to Executors of the Estate presents an obvious danger of intimidation, interference, or other forms of harm. While these are serious issues and I do not dismiss the concerns you express, the letter does not specify what evidential basis is relied upon for asserting that such risks currently materialise or have been realised in this context. This absence of detail limits the extent to which the police can meaningfully act upon the concerns presented.

Police interviews and information shared between survivors

You also reference Officers asking survivors about what information they may have shared with others. It is important to distinguish this from the concerns you raise about civil disclosure. In criminal investigations, questions of this nature are asked to assess the integrity of evidence. This is a standard and necessary component of conducting an effective investigation.

It is also possible, though not guaranteed, that the investigation team may seek disclosure of any account's survivors have provided in parallel civil processes, as part of reasonable lines of enquiry. This approach is consistent with the MPS's positive investigatory duties under Articles 3 and 4 of the European Convention on Human Rights and would be a line of enquiry that the CPS would usually specifically expect to have been considered.

Concerns regarding individuals connected to the estate

You express particular concern regarding the possibility that individuals connected to the estate—specifically Ali Fayed—could become aware of survivor identities. I note these concerns. As you will appreciate, I am unable to comment on operational safeguarding assessments, but I can confirm that the MPS has a positive operational duty to take necessary action where there is a real and immediate risk of harm to an identified individual arising from the criminal acts of a third party. For such a duty to be engaged, however, there must be an evidential basis indicating that such a risk exists. The broad and hypothetical risks described in the letter, without supporting detail, make it difficult for the MPS to take specific mitigating action at this stage.

The limits of police involvement in civil proceedings

As your letter itself acknowledges, the MPS does not—and should not—control private civil litigation or the structure of any redress scheme. If there are concerns about how survivor information may be used or shared within that scheme, those concerns are properly directed to those who administer or oversee it. That may include MPL solicitors, Harrods, Dame Sanghera, the Victims' Commissioner, or others with direct responsibility for the governance and operation of the scheme. The broad and thematic nature of the concerns you raise suggests they would be most effectively addressed by the scheme operators or representatives who are able to modify or clarify disclosure processes. While not a matter for the MPS, it may be possible for an agreement to be reached between the parties or even an application to be made for the identity of the victims to be anonymised particularly if, for example, liability is admitted. There are processes and procedures within the civil proceedings that could meaningfully address your concerns.

Possible next steps

If any individual survivor wishes to raise a personal safeguarding concern directly with the MPS, we will of course engage with them and take appropriate steps based on the specific information provided.

In terms of potential actions, one option, for your consideration, would be for the MPS to approach Harrods' legal representatives to seek reassurance or clarification regarding the circumstances under which third-party disclosure occurs. This would, however, require us to disclose the existence of your correspondence, and it is possible that such enquiries would be declined on the basis that they relate to commercially sensitive litigation matters.

Other than this, the thematic concerns you outline appear best placed to be raised with Dame Sanghera or other stakeholders acting in a victim-advocacy role, who may be able to influence the development of the scheme to ensure it does not inadvertently place survivors at risk. You may also wish to take your own legal advice – if those you advocate for have already instructed solicitors, they would be best placed to advise you further.

Conclusion

I acknowledge the seriousness of the matters you have raised. The MPS remains committed to ensuring the safety and wellbeing of survivors and to maintaining the integrity of ongoing investigations. While our ability to intervene in private civil processes is limited, any survivor-specific risk that is brought to our attention will be reviewed and acted upon in line with our legal obligations and commitments to victim survivors.

Thank you for writing, and for your continued advocacy on behalf of survivors. Should you or any affected individual wish to provide further information, or seek safeguarding advice, please contact our dedicated mailbox 'ComplexInvestigationTeam-SurvivorsMailbox@met.police.uk' or call 999 in an emergency.

Yours sincerely,

Detective Chief Superintendent Angela Craggs

Complex Case & Exploitation Command
Metropolitan Police Service