

**SECURITY APPRAISAL
FOR
MR LALIT MODI****Background**

1. The Chairman of the Page Group (PG) Stuart Page, accompanied by counter terrorist specialist Keith Pearce carried out a preliminary appraisal of the potential threat to the safety of Mr Lalit Modi (LM) and his immediate family during a short visit to India in April. Subsequently, enquiries were conducted outside India.
2. A short description of the professional backgrounds of Stuart Page and Keith Pearce is shown at Annex A.
3. LM is married and has three children. His varied business activities include the Indian Cricket Premier league (IPL) of which until recently, he was Chairman and Commissioner.

Security Threat

4. LM identified a number of threats to the security of himself and his immediate family. They include:
 - a. Ibrahim Dawood / Chota Shakeel who might utilise a 4 man team to carry out a shooting from one or more motorcycles. We are informed by LM that the Mumbai Police has received information/intelligence which strongly points to such a plot.
 - b. Bombing by members of the Indian Mujahideen. LM has received a threatening email to this effect.
 - c. threats from elements prejudicially affected by LM's involvement in anti corruption.
5. Threats a / c appear to have a common theme. Threat b. cannot be substantiated.

Security Treat – Basic Analysis

6. In basic terms the threat comprises the following elements:
 - a. **Who?**

Any individual or group identified in paragraph 3.

b. Why?

The IPL has been phenomenally successful and in India, "Cricket = Money = Politics"

Reasons for an attack on LM or his family are common to all prominent and successful figures, particularly those whose business interests generate large sums of money and in the case of LM, a sporting enterprise that is susceptible to large scale corruption. We are informed by LM that his concerted efforts at stamping out match fixing from IPL has not endeared him to syndicates engaged in this activity, most of whom have strong underworld links.

c. What?

Kill or attempt to kill LM and prevent his future participation in the IPL.

d. When?

At any time.

e. Where?

Not so likely outside India. Could occur anywhere in India if LM's personal security arrangements are inadequate.

f. How?

Gun most likely, but a bomb cannot be discounted.

Security Threat - Corroboration

7. Discussions were held in Mumbai with Police and intelligence sources and other informed individuals. The consensus view was that the basic analysis was correct, but little by way of accurate intelligence was available that could be used in the short term, to target resources to reduce the threat. For obvious reasons details of these discussions cannot be mentioned but we can state that we do regard what was disclosed to us in the course of our discussions as a cause for serious concern and requiring strong security counter measures.

Security Measures

8. The security measures observed were considered totally inadequate to provide the level of protection which LM and his immediate family should have. Shortcomings identified included:
- No strategic aim or objectives
 - No command and control system in evidence
 - Poor level of training
 - Lack of a dedicated provider of relevant intelligence and additional resources. This is extremely critical in situations such as that faced by LM. The importance of an established local law and order intelligence network cannot be emphasized enough. This is far more important than the physical and/or electronic aspects of security. It is most important that potential threats need to be detected, monitored and neutralized, as they develop. A highly evolved intelligence network of the local law and enforcement agencies is therefore extremely critical.
 - Lack of a dedicated security operations & planning coordinator.

Recommendation

9. We would strongly recommend that LM remain in the UK as far as possible. Should he desire to travel outside UK, this should only be if it is absolutely necessary and after his security advisors evaluate the risk and take adequate measures. It is our strong recommendation that LM and his immediate family DO NOT return to India at the present time.
10. If there are compelling reasons for returning to India, LM and his immediate family should not do so until arrangements for their safety are substantially enhanced.
11. A review of the situation and re-appraisal should be undertaken in India in three months time.

Signed:



Stuart Page
Chairman
3 May 2010