

J7 Response to the Provisional Index of Factual Issues – Provisional Index of Factual Issues – Issue 2

The explosions and the immediate aftermath

2. The travel of MSK, Tanweer, Hussain and Lindsay to and within London on the morning of 7 July 2005.

Currently existing information in the public domain regarding the travel of the four accused is at best patchy, and at worst woefully inadequate. Of the CCTV footage that has been released, it has clearly been heavily edited and there are inexplicable gaps in what has been presented to the public in support of the official Home Office narrative. Much of the footage is of such poor quality as to be useless without additional methods of confirming its contents.

THE HIRE AND USE OF A NISSAN MICRA



Photograph showing the tiny boot space of a Nissan Micra

It has yet to be established definitively when the Micra was hired, or when it was due to be returned. Worthy of examination is why they might choose one of the smallest available hire cars into which to cram three fully grown men, five large rucksacks purporting to contain highly volatile explosives, associated cooling equipment and “bombs of a smaller and different kind”. If the reports that Tanweer specifically hired a Nissan Micra for the journey to London are correct, then these do not make sense on more than one level. Firstly, it appears that he had hired the car some days before the 7th, because it was so overdue¹ that a representative from the car hire company had coincidentally turned up at his

¹ The cricket-loving terrorist whose father runs the local chip shop - Telegraph - <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/1493880/The-cricket-loving-terrorist-whose-father-runs-the-local-chip-shop.html>

house to retrieve the car the same day that the police raided it. However, he hired the car in his own name and used his own credit card to pay for it; illustrated by the company representative going straight to his house when the car became overdue for return. This demonstrates Tanweer felt there was no reason to be covert about hiring the car.

Were the keys to the Nissan Micra recovered and where?

EYE-WITNESS ACCOUNT FROM ALEXANDRA GROVE

On June 15th, 2006, the top story on the ITN evening news was a brief tour of the 'bomb factory', which involved the hallway and bathroom, and an interview with a neighbour who claimed that she saw the men on the morning of July 7th.

INTERVIEW W/SYLVIA WAUGH, NEIGHBOUR: "you'd never believe you have bombers on your doorstep, I saw them on July 7 getting into cars to bomb London. I thought they were dealing in drugs but they were going to bomb London, they were putting stuff in car boots and I thought they were dealing drugs. If only I could smell I could have done something. I should I have rung the police to say they were dealing. I saw an old Asian lady clearing out number 18 and filling garden sacks."

The reporter, Emma Murphy, stated that the Metropolitan police had released a statement "*in the last hour*" of that day, confirming that they had spoken to Sylvia Waugh, that they were treating her as a very credible witness and saying that the information she has provided to them and to ITN news offered them an active line of enquiry. This gives the impression that Sylvia Waugh had only just offered her statement, whereas such testimony should surely have offered and pursued as an "*active line of inquiry*" almost a year earlier.

Why does Sylvia Waugh refer to a number of cars rather than just one car, the Nissan Micra? Where did this 'active line of inquiry' lead and why the delay in soliciting eye-witness accounts of the events at Alexandra Grove on the morning of July 7th? Was the "old Asian lady" ever identified, located and interviewed?

MISSING CCTV FOOTAGE FROM LEEDS

Regarding the footage of the Nissan Micra when parked in Westfield Road, there is footage missing between 03:59:47 and 04:00:21.

What is the explanation for this missing footage of the Micra in Leeds, what does it show and what other footage of the Micra in Leeds can and should be made available for inspection?

MISSING CCTV FOOTAGE FROM WOODALL SERVICES

What is contained in the missing footage taken at Woodall Services from 04:53:21 and 04:53:51 when the passenger door to the Nissan Micra is opened and it appears that the passenger is about to exit the vehicle? Why is this not shown, given that the narrative holds that this would be one of the accused, and why is the footage of the Micra at Woodall Services partial and incomplete?

The footage from Woodall Services also appears to show Tanweer beginning to open the bonnet of the Micra, and this too appears to have been cut from the released CCTV footage.

TANWEER'S ALLEGED CHANGE OF CLOTHES

Quoting the Home Office narrative²:

04.54: The Micra stops at Woodall Services on the M1 to fill up with petrol. Tanweer goes in to pay. He is wearing a white T-shirt, dark jacket, white tracksuit bottoms and a baseball cap. He buys snacks, quibbles with the cashier over his change, looks directly at the CCTV camera and leaves.

....

07.21: ... Tanweer's posture and the way he pulls the rucksack on to his shoulder as he walks, suggests he finds it heavy. It is estimated that in each rucksack was 2-5 kg of high explosive. Tanweer is now wearing dark tracksuit bottoms. There is no explanation for this change at present.

There has never been an explanation of how Tanweer, the apparent driver of the Micra, managed a change of clothing *en route* and still managed to complete the journey to Luton some 30 minutes quicker than suggested by route-planners.

When did Tanweer's change of clothing happen and what evidence is there to support this?

We have determined, via Freedom of Information requests to the Metropolitan Police that the tracksuit bottoms are believed to have been located.

When, where and how were the tracksuit bottoms found?

² Report of the official account of the bombings in London on 7th July 2005 - <http://www.official-documents.gov.uk/document/hc0506/hc10/1087/1087.asp>

The footage which claims to show “Tanweer quibbling over his change and looking “directly at the CCTV camera” has never been released either, although why anyone who was intending to head off to their death would quibble over change remains a mystery.³

LINDSAY & THE FIAT BRAVA AT LUTON

The Official Account of the London Bombings of 7 July 2005 states:

05.07: A red Fiat Brava arrives at Luton station car park. Jermaine Lindsay is alone in this car. During the 90 minutes or so before the others arrive, Lindsay gets out and walks around, enters the station, looks up at the departure board, comes out, moves the car a couple of times. There are a handful of other cars in the car park. A few more arrive during this period.

The limited amount of black and white, poor-quality CCTV makes it impossible to positively identify either the red Fiat Brava or Lindsay, or indeed any of the accused in the car park at Luton station.

What measures were taken to verify that the footage showed what is described? There is a considerable gap of over 90 minutes in the released footage, between 05:07:44 and 06:39:42. Why? What does this footage show? Is there any footage in which the cars and four accused are actually identifiable?

The released footage appears to show the Brava being moved once, rather than “a couple of times” as stated in the narrative.

LUTON PARKING TICKETS

The Home Office narrative claims, “The Micra had a day parking ticket in the window, perhaps to avoid attention, the Brava did not.”

Was there a day parking ticket on the Micra and when and where was it purchased. Why and when was the Fiat Brava removed from the car park and where is the CCTV footage of this?

It is, in fact, *not* the policy of Luton station car park to tow away unticketed cars. On the Luton station car park regulations notice, under section 12, headed, "INVALID TICKET OR FAILURE TO DISPLAY A VALID TICKET", the notice states:

³ Freedom of Information Request Reference No: 2009050000778,
<http://z13.invisionfree.com/julyseventh/index.php?showtopic=140&view=findpost&p=14976741>

12.1. If you fail to display ticket correctly (which means visible at all times and available for inspection) at any time the following provisions of this condition 12 shall apply. The right of the Company given in this condition 12 are in addition to any other legal remedies available to the company.

...

12.2. A Penalty Charge Notice ("PCN") will be affixed to your vehicle or handed to you.

THE INFAMOUS LUTON TO KING'S CROSS JOURNEY

"The official account that we provided to the House states that the train on which the bombers travelled left Luton station at 7.40 am. The police have now told us that that is incorrect—the train in fact left Luton station at 7.25 am. It did, however, arrive at Kings Cross at 8.23 am, as recorded in the official account. Although that does not appear to affect anything else in the official account, it is nevertheless an error, which is why I report it to the House. I can understand why this may be of concern to some. I have asked the police, as Members would expect, for a full report on how that discrepancy came about. I will ensure that the official account is amended and will write to the survivors and to the families of the victims on this matter."⁴

This error in the train time was uncovered by independent researchers and brought to the attention of the authorities by the July 7th Truth Campaign well in advance of the publication of the Home Office narrative, yet the error still made it into the narrative.

According to John Reid, the error regarding the 7.40am Luton to King's Cross Thameslink train was based on erroneous eye-witness statements. The official Home Office story was then amended to state that the accused caught the 7.25am train. It was later revealed that, "Scotland Yard pointed out that the official account had been produced by the Home Office and police had never given it the time for the train."⁵

Where did the erroneous Luton to King's Cross train time come from, given that, technically, it is the police who interview witnesses in the aftermath of a crime?

Who were these witnesses and who, if not the police, interviewed them to supply the Home Office with the incorrect information?

4 House of Commons Hansard Debates for 11 July 2006 (pt 0867) -

<http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200506/cmhansrd/vo060711/debtext/60711-0875.htm>

5 Another reason why we need a public enquiry - Luton Today - <http://www.lutontoday.co.uk/lut-news/Another-reason-why-we-need.1629373.jp>

Further, why was the original and erroneous train time based on hearsay as opposed actual, verifiable evidence, the likes of which could be obtained by ordinary members of the public and would stand up to the scrutiny of a law court? Do any eye-witness statements exist which claim to have seen the accused on the 7.25, rather than the 07.:40, Luton to King's Cross train?

TICKETS TO RIDE

The official Home Office narrative⁶, published some ten months after the events to which they refer, states:

07.15: Lindsay, Hussain, Tanweer and Khan enter Luton station and go through the ticket barriers together. It is not known where they bought their tickets or what sort of tickets they possessed, but they must have had some to get on to the platform.

This statement conflicts with the CCTV image released purporting to show this occurring, the image bearing the timestamp 07:21:54.

What was done to ensure which timestamps were correct and how were multiple potentially erroneous timestamps correlated?

On 10th July 2005 an Independent on Sunday article highlighted a number of issues that once again – as with many articles that were being published up until the release of Khan's so-called 'martyrdom video' in September 2005 – called into question the notion of suicide bombers:

Suicide bombers do not buy return tickets. Theirs is a one-way trip. When four young men met at Luton railway station a week ago last Thursday, however, they gave every impression of going to London and coming back. They paid and displayed, leaving valid tickets on the windows of a Nissan Micra and a Fiat Bravo in the station car park. They boarded the 7.48am to London carrying return tickets.

Why would they do that, if they knew they would be dying very soon? The car park can be explained: perhaps they did not want to attract attention or get stopped. But the question of the train tickets has no obvious answer, unless the bombers were not aware that they would be among the casualties at Aldgate, Edgware Road, King's Cross and on the No 30 bus. They may have thought that they could leave their

6 Report of the official account of the bombings in London on 7th July 2005 - <http://www.official-documents.gov.uk/document/hc0506/hc10/1087/1087.asp>

deadly bags on the train or the bus and walk away, merging safely into the crowd by the time a detonator set off the plastic explosive they called Mother of Satan to kill and maim in those enclosed spaces. Or were they told the bombs would go off later than they did?⁷

Also on July 10th 2005, The Independent on Sunday reported that “Police and intelligence agents are investigating the theory that a gang of white 'mercenary terrorists' was hired by al-Qa'ida to carry out last week's devastating attacks on London,” and the possibility that, “criminal gangs were paid to mount the worst atrocities in British history.”⁸

What happened to this line of investigation, particularly given the repeatedly expressed determination of the police and politicians to catch and bring to justice the perpetrators of the 7 July attacks?

Meanwhile, “Sir Ian Blair reaffirmed the Met's absolute determination to catch the terrorists who killed at least 52 people and injured 700 in bombing attacks on Thursday 7 July,” proclaimed an 11th July 2005 Metropolitan Police press release detailing Commissioner Ian Blair's visit to the crime scenes at Russell Square and King's Cross.⁹

On 16th July 2005, the Daily Mirror ran with the front-page headline, “EXCLUSIVE: WAS IT SUICIDE?” which reiterated the intentions of the police to bring the perpetrators to justice and highlighted that the attacks bore none of the hallmarks of a typical suicide bombing. The article asked a number of pertinent questions, “Why did they buy return train tickets to Luton? Why did they buy pay & display tickets for cars? Why were there no usual shouts of 'Allah Akhbar'? Why were bombs in bags and not on their bodies?”¹⁰

Questions about whether or not suicide bombers were responsible for the attacks continued for many weeks and were still running at the end of July 2005. In an article published in the New York Times on 27th July 2005, Elaine Sciolino and Don Van Natta noted again how none of the characteristics of a suicide bombing were evident in what happened on 7/7:

But in recent days, some police officials are increasingly considering the possibility that the men did not plan to commit

7 The reconstruction: 7/7 - What really happened? - Crime, UK - The Independent, Sunday 17th July 2005 - <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/crime/the-reconstruction-77--what-really-happened-499129.html>

8 “Police hunt 'mercenary' terror gang recruited by al-Qa'ida”, *The Independent*, 10th July 2005, <http://news.independent.co.uk/uk/crime/article298105.ece>

9 Police investigation continues into the 7/7 bombings, *Metropolitan Police*, 16th July 2005, http://cms.met.police.uk/news/major_operational_announcements/terrorist_attacks/police_investigation_continues_into_the_7_7_bombings

10 “EXCLUSIVE: WAS IT SUICIDE?”, *Daily Mirror*, 16th July 2005, http://www.mirror.co.uk/news/tm_objectid=15742951&method=full&siteid=94762&headline=was-it-suicide---name_page.html

suicide and were duped into dying.

Investigators raising doubts about the suicide assumption have cited evidence to support this theory. Each of the four men who died in the July 7 attacks purchased round-trip railway tickets from Luton to London. Germaine Lindsay's rented car left in Luton had a seven-day parking sticker on the dashboard.

A large quantity of explosives were stored in the trunk of that car, perhaps for another attack. Another bomber had just spent a large sum to repair his car. The men carried driver's licenses and other ID cards with them to their deaths, unusual for suicide bombers.

In addition, none left behind a note, videotape or Internet trail as suicide bombers have done in the past. And the bombers' families were baffled by what seemed to be their decisions to kill themselves.¹¹

A day later, on Thursday 28th July 2005, the International Herald Tribune led with, "London bombers may have been duped" and noted, "The British police have been reluctant to publicly declare the July 7 bombings a suicide mission. Britain's top police officers - Ian Blair, the Metropolitan Police commissioner, and Peter Clarke, the head of Scotland Yard's anti-terrorist branch - have steadfastly refused to call the men "suicide bombers" in public." This was some three weeks after the attack and two weeks after the four accused had been named.¹²

It would be another month before the issue of how none of the accused had left behind a "note, videotape or Internet trail" would be addressed, thereby ending all lines of rational and legitimate questioning of the suicide bomber theory by the media. On 1st September 2005 the al Jazeera network obtained and broadcast a video which they claim to have obtained from Al Qaeda that was reported to be the suicide video of Mohammad Sidique Khan. "One of the four suicide bombers behind the 7 July London Tube attacks which killed 52 people has appeared on a video obtained by an Arab TV station," proclaimed the BBC whose announcement of the video, "London bomber video aired on TV,"¹³ noted, "It is not clear when or where the tape was filmed. Prime Minister Tony Blair and the Foreign Office have not responded to the tape."

11 "Police Debate if London Plotters Were Suicide Bombers, or Dupes", *The New York Times*,

<http://www.nytimes.com/2005/07/27/international/europe/27suicide.html?ei=5088&en=fd59ca60c9db55a&ex=1280116800&partner=rssnyt&emc=rss&pagewanted=print>

12 "London bombers may have been duped", *International Herald Tribune*, 28th July 2005,

http://www.ihf.com/bin/print_ipub.php?file=/articles/2005/07/27/news/bombers.php

13 "London bomber video aired on TV", *BBC News*, 2nd September 2005, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk/4206708.stm>

The police said they were “aware” of the video but refused to comment on its authenticity. The Independent reported an unnamed spokesman saying, “We are aware of the tape and it will be assessed as part of the investigation,” and noted also that the video was, “obviously heavily edited.”¹⁴

Did this assessment of the so-called 'suicide video' happen? What were the results? Will the results of this assessment be considered as part of the inquest process?

In the video the character alleged to be Mohammed Sidique Khan does not state that he intends to attack London. In fact, not only is there no mention of an attack on London, nor is there any mention of the Underground or bus network, nor mention of suicide bombing, or indeed of any sort of bombing at all. There is no mention at all of anything vaguely related to what is alleged to have happened on 7th July 2005 and the video would not stand as evidence in a court of law.

Has it been determined when and where the tickets were purchased? If so, were they return tickets as reported? What evidence exists to demonstrate when and where the tickets were purchased? If tickets were not purchased at Luton, they would certainly have been required to gain access to the underground network so, if this is the case, when and where were these purchased?

WHEN WAS THE LUTON STATION CONNECTION MADE

The Home Office narrative states:

12 July Report received that 4 people by two vehicles were seen putting on rucksacks at Luton Station car park. One of the vehicles was now missing but one remained in the car park.

By lunchtime, police working on the theory that there is a King's Cross link to the 3 train bombs, all being broadly equidistant from there at the time of the explosions, identify a CCTV image of 4 men with rucksacks at King's Cross. They recognise Tanweer first from a DVLA photograph.

The police identify CCTV images of the same 4 at Luton Station.

Yet inquiries to First Capital Connect show that the MPS requested CCTV footage from Luton and King's Cross (and no other stations) on the 11th July.

¹⁴ “Videotapes reveal al-Qa'ida's link to July 7 London bombings”, *The Independent*, 2nd September 2005, <http://news.independent.co.uk/uk/crime/article309683.ece>

How was Luton identified by the 11th, and why was CCTV from no other Thameslink station requested?

MISSING CCTV FOOTAGE FROM THE LONDON UNDERGROUND

According to Andy Trotter, Deputy Chief Constable British Transport Police "If they weren't suicide bombers, then they must have got on and off these trains. That means their pictures can be grabbed from CCTV cameras. The Underground network is a CCTV-rich environment, and so this is going to be an intense investigation to look at the images."¹⁵

It is therefore extraordinary that no CCTV footage of any of the four accused has been released showing them in any part of the London Underground.

Will any footage from the London Underground, platforms and trains be released to the Inquest?

MISSING CCTV FOOTAGE FROM THE BUSES

There is no CCTV footage of Hasib Hussain boarding or leaving any London bus, despite it being claimed that he boarded both the affected number 30 bus and a number 91 bus prior to that.

According to reports, the CCTV unit on the number 30 bus was not operational.

Why was the 30 CCTV not operational? Why is there no released CCTV footage of Hasib Hussain from Euston Road, Euston Station or the number 91 bus it is claimed he also boarded? Who was the driver of the number 91 bus, and why did the driver of the 91 bus 'usher passengers onto the number 30 at Euston Station', a bus which did not follow the same route¹⁶?

ABSENCE OF CORROBORATING WITNESSES

Only two witnesses (Anita Dybek and Lisa French) positively identified any of the four alleged perpetrators (Hussain) under oath at the trial of those cleared of conspiring with the alleged perpetrators. However, Lisa French was interviewed for a TV documentary some years prior to the trial and did not positively identify Hussain. She only said that a person with a rucksack got on the bus as she boarded.

¹⁵ WorldTribune.com: Advanced bombs were so powerful that none of 49 dead have been identified - http://www.worldtribune.com/worldtribune/WTARC/2005/eu_terror_07_11.html

¹⁶ April 10, 2008 7/7 helpers trial at Kingston Crown Court

How can it be that three years later Lisa French is able to testify under oath that it was Hussain rather than the nondescript person with a bag, as reported in the Telegraph¹⁷?

Why are there no other witnesses to corroborate the travel of the four alleged perpetrators on 7 July 2005?

The Home Office narrative states in a list of 7 key items of evidence that these men were responsible for the attacks:

Witness accounts suggest 2 of the men were fiddling in their rucksacks shortly before the explosions.

Were the eye-witnesses referenced by the Home Office narrative Richard Jones and Danny Biddle? If not, who were they?

In the many and varied newspaper and media interviews with Richard Jones, who was travelling on the Number 30 bus, he never once describes a man bearing any resemblance to Hasib Hussain. On the contrary, he describes a man who was fiddling with a small bag at his feet, and who was wearing hipster-style fawn checked trousers, with exposed designer underwear and a matching jersey-style top. Mr. Jones even described the underwear, saying "The pants looked very expensive, they were white with a red band on top." In other reports Jones describes the man as clean-shaven. Given that CCTV stills and footage have been released which show an unshaven Hussain wearing jeans and a polo shirt, the "smartly dressed", "clean shaven" man described by Jones may well have been the bomber, but it certainly wasn't Hasib Hussain.

Have the police ever identified the man that Richard Jones claims he saw? Did this ever become an avenue of investigation for police, particularly as reports exist of a "6ft 3in tall", with "a Mediterranean look" and "dark, curly hair" in the vicinity of 18 Alexandra Grove, one of the suspected 'bomb factories'.¹⁸

Danny Biddle, who received appalling injuries at Edgware Road, identified Khan after seeing his face on the TV and has given so many varied accounts of his sighting of Khan, that he cannot be considered a reliable witness.

Neither Richard Jones nor Danny Biddle were called upon to give their testimony

¹⁷ CCTV footage of 7/7 explosion shown in court, The Telegraph, 1 May 2008,

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/1918523/CCTV-footage-of-77-explosion-shown-in-court.html>

¹⁸ From Cricket... to Carnage, Stephen White, The Mirror, <http://www.mirror.co.uk/news/top-stories/2005/07/15/cricket-to-carnage-115875-15738492/>

under oath at the trial of those cleared of conspiring with the alleged perpetrators on July 7th. Why was this? How did the testimony of someone who could not positively identify the accused in the wake of the attacks later become admissible as evidence in an allegedly related trial after she had decided she now could positively identify one of the accused?

INCONCLUSIVE IDENTIFICATION EVIDENCE

Documents identifying the alleged bombers were reportedly found at the sites of the explosions. It is surprising that they survived the explosions relatively intact in conditions where such damage and devastation occurred and a woman's tights melted into her legs¹⁹. To explain this phenomenon, evidence was given in court that the alleged bombers had deliberately scattered their ID away from the bombs²⁰:

Neil Flewitt, QC, prosecuting, said that expert Clifford Todd had examined the wreckage of the bomb sites. He said:

"It is, in the opinion of Mr Todd, noteworthy that at each scene, some personal materials and documents, such as ID cards, were found relating to the bombers.

"Although they were damaged to some extent, they did not show the damage that would be expected if they were on the body of the bomber or in the rucksack, suggesting that in each case they had been deliberately separated by some distance from the actual explosion."

This evidence contradicts the eye witness testimony that the Piccadilly line underground train was packed to crush capacity, which would have prevented such separating of the identifying material.

It is also noteworthy that the ID at the Piccadilly site was in the name of "Tyrone Smith", which was not the name of the alleged King's Cross bomber. The ID of Mohammed Sidique Khan was apparently found at three of the explosion sites. If the official story is the case, Khan could not possibly have been at at least two of those sites, and so no firm conclusion can be drawn from the presence of his ID.

No credible explanation has yet been given for the preservation of the ID of the alleged bombers at the sites of the explosions.

¹⁹ Londoners a month on: 'I get pumped up full of adrenalin and wonder if something will happen today' - This Britain, UK - The Independent - <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/this-britain/londoners-a-month-on-i-get-pumped-up-full-of-adrenalin-and-wonder-if-something-will-happen-today-501657.html>

²⁰ July 7 bombers 'left clues to martyrdom' - Telegraph - <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/1895690/July-7-bombers-left-clues-to-martyrdom.html>

The last image of them together (as stated in court at the trial of those cleared of conspiring with the alleged perpetrators) was at 08:26 at the entrance to the tunnel from the Kings Cross Thameslink station to the Kings Cross Underground and Mainline station. From that image it should be possible to track each of the four in further images as they continued their journey along that tunnel, up the escalator to the ticket hall then on to the Underground platforms on to the trains.

How is it possible that the accused made their alleged journeys, but were not captured in further CCTV images?

THE 'ICONIC IMAGE' THAT HAS NEVER BEEN SEEN

The narrative claims “euphoric hugging” after which the four separated, but no further detail is provided regarding their movements thereafter. There is no CCTV evidence for this, not even a still image.

At what location is the “euphoric hugging” alleged to have occurred and on what evidence are these conclusions based. What are the details of the alleged movements of the accused thereafter, and what evidence is used to corroborate the allegations? Where is the 'iconic image' and why has it never been published?

THE FIFTH MAN

The Home Office narrative states, “There was at the time of the attacks, reports of a “5th bomber”. It was thought, because of witness statements and CCTV, that there was a “5th man” with the group travelling down from Luton.” before later concluding, “But there is no evidence of a fifth bomber.” Given the levels of training and expertise required to manufacture the never-before-seen devices, complete with highly volatile explosive material, and the aforementioned two possible sightings of a tall man of Mediterranean appearance, both on the day of the attacks and in the vicinity of the alleged 'bomb factory' at Alexandra Grove, it seems highly unlikely that the four accused could have accomplished the attacks unaided by someone with expertise in the field of explosives and explosives manufacture.

There is also the presence of a reported fifth rucksack left in the boot of the Micra²¹, one more rucksack than four people would require. Who was the person that the Home Office claimed “The press reported later that a known extremist figure and possible mastermind left the UK shortly before the bombings. There is no evidence that this individual was involved.”.

21 'Primed bombs' could point to more suicide cells, Daily Mail, 18 July 2005, <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-356180/Primed-bombs-point-suicide-cells.html>

