



HOUSE OF COMMONS

LONDON SW1A 0AA

Mr Mark Roberts
Chief Constable, Cheshire Police
Cheshire Constabulary Headquarters
Clemonds Hey
Oakmere Road
Winsford
CW7 2UA

13 April 2026

Dear Mr Roberts,

I have reviewed the contents of your letter of 8 April.

As stated at the time of my speech, the words I used were, to a large extent, the product of rigorous investigation by two separate senior police officers, both extremely experienced in precisely this sort of case.

My debate was carefully constructed using large amounts of publicly available documentation – including some from Cheshire Constabulary.

The speech was underpinned by over 100 references. This amounts to one reference for every 15 seconds of the speech. These were all provided to interested journalists. At least one online source has gone through the speech paragraph by paragraph, elucidating the documents of origin for every statement.

Let me deal with the principal assertions of your letter item by item.

Lines of Inquiry

You state *“Operation Hummingbird commenced in May 2017, and it was not until more than a year later, in June 2018, that Letby was designated a suspect.”*

Operation Hummingbird was reported in the press within days of a meeting that took place on 15 May 2017, between hospital consultants, DCS Wenham and then-DI Hughes. The Thirlwall Inquiry, document INQ0102309 makes plain that at this meeting, the allegations focused on a particular nurse, named explicitly as *“Lucy Letby”*.



On 23 September 2024, in his evidence to the Thirlwall Inquiry, the father of Baby K described how, in May 2017, within days of Operation Hummingbird commencing, he and his wife were visited by two officers who told them that “*it was an investigation into a nurse at Chester hospital*”. It is clear that this could only have derived from a briefing given by the leadership of Operation Hummingbird.

On 30 June 2017, a briefing summary was prepared and shared with the NCA, with a request that it be shared with Dr Evans before his first meeting with the Operation Hummingbird team.

This Summary for the National Injuries Database, titled ‘Operation Hummingbird Summary – Countess of Chester Hospital Enquiry’, highlights that there was “*one member of the nursing staff who had been present at more of the cases than any other member of staff*”.

It is therefore clear that the focus of the investigation was on a single nurse, Lucy Letby, from a year before the assertion you made in your letter.

Use of Experts

You state “*The notion that the investigation was reliant on one medical expert is demonstrably untrue.*”

Dr Evans was on record on 18 July 2017 stating, “*I do not think it is necessary to consider additional expert opinion at this time.*”

This occurred despite clear advice from the NCA on 26 May 2017, again on 28 June 2017, and again on 4 July 2017 that a panel of relevant experts from different disciplines should be brought together.

The Court of Appeal judgment on 2 July 2024 states “*His [Evans] conclusions were peer reviewed by Dr Bohin*”. It also makes clear that Evans recommended six further “experts”, including for example Peter Hindmarsh who was taken on by the police and during Letby’s trial, faced a General Medical Council investigation for failures of expertise. Best practice required an independent review of the medical records from first principles rather than a peer review of his own work.



Statistics

You state *“The Constabulary did not retain an expert statistician as part of Operation Hummingbird, nor did it seek or receive a report from Prof Jane Hutton or indeed any other statistician.”*

On 22 March 2018, DS Adam Bolger approached Professor Hutton as Cheshire Police required *“assistance of a statistician... to help us understand and assess the chances of sheer coincidence”*.

On 3 April 2018, the same officer asked Professor Hutton whether she could put a figure on the likelihood of there being one member of staff on duty *“during all the deaths/collapses”* in the neonatal unit - *“ie 1 in a million etc”*.

Professor Hutton signed a consultancy agreement with Cheshire Police dated 25 June 2018.

There is an invoice dated 23 July 2018 from Professor Hutton to Cheshire Police for statistical advice and analysis requirements for an investigation.

On 15 July 2021, DS Bolger wrote to Professor Hutton stating that the CPS then instructed the police not to pursue this line of inquiry, saying: *“The prosecutor does not agree with our line of inquiry and has instructed us not to pursue this avenue, any further, at present”*.

Accordingly, your extraordinary assertion that I misled the House is patently untrue.

The real problem we are facing here revolves around the lack of understanding that all public servants are accountable to Parliament.

On 5 September 2024 you failed to answer a series of questions from me directly related to the matters subsequently covered in my speech. On 13 September 2024, you refused to answer **any** further questions, stating: *“I will not be providing any further detail or engaging in ongoing correspondence”*. This of itself was an astonishing response to a Member of Parliament on a matter of significant public interest.

On 27 March 2026, Cheshire Constabulary issued a press release responding to my adjournment debate suggesting that I and others have been responsible for *“spreading misinformation”*.

The concerns I have raised have been expressed by leading national and international authorities on neonatology, forensics, statistics, law and other relevant specialisms, all of



whom have expressed severe concerns about the entire basis of the evidential case that your Constabulary purported to bring. This is not misinformation.

This all indicates an extraordinary attitude to the proper accountability of public servants to the House of Commons. One that I must say is difficult to reconcile with your assertion that "*Scrutiny of policing is legitimate and welcome*".

If you are, as you suggest, open to scrutiny, I strongly urge you act upon my recommendation that you refer Cheshire Constabulary to another independent force via His Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary and Fire & Rescue Services (HMICFRS) for an independent review of the Operation Hummingbird investigation.

It seems that I must remind you that miscarriages of justice, including the Birmingham Six and the Post Office Horizon scandal, only came to light because of extensive scrutiny from Members of Parliament. When there are concerns about miscarriages of justice, transparency is essential.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "David Davis". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, sweeping initial 'D'.

Rt. Hon. Sir David Davis KCB MP