



Inland Fisheries
Level 2, Crown Buildings
140 Jervis Street
Portadown
Armagh
BT62 3BZ
First Class

30 July 2026

Your ref:
Our ref: M020420003 MM/MM

mm@mkblaw.co.uk

Dear Sirs,

Re: **Mr Raymond Mairs – Visit by Inland Fisheries Officers on 30 June 2026**

We act for Mr Raymond Mairs in relation to a visit to his property made by officers from your Inland Fisheries Division on 30 June 2026. We are writing to request full details of the purpose and conduct of that visit and to raise serious concerns about the manner in which it was carried out.

Background

Our client was visited at Glen Oak Fisheries, 1 Nutts Corner Road, Crumlin [the 'Premises'] by two officers from Inland Fisheries on 30 June 2026. This being the most recent of four visits to the Premises by the same two officers.

(i) First Visit

Two officers attended the Premises on Sunday 19 April 2026. We refer to our correspondence dated 3 June 2026 requesting further information on this visit and any inspection report pertaining to this visit. In your response dated 19 June 2026, you declined to provide this.

(ii) Second Visit

There was a subsequent Sunday visit on 31 May 2026 to the Premises, during which the officers were advised to arrange an appointment, setting out the matters to be addressed and an agreed date and time for the visit.



(iii) Third Visit

Notwithstanding the request made on the second visit, the same two officers returned to the Premises on Thursday 4 June 2026 in the absence of our client. It is our client's understanding that the two officers spent several hours inspecting the Premises, including the use of underwater cameras and other photographic equipment. The officers left the Premises without explaining the rationale for their attendance to our client's site manager, who had attended them and facilitated the inspection.

(iv) Fourth Visit

The two officers returned to the Premises on 30 June 2026 without an appointment. Prior to entering the Premises, they were observed confirming to one another that their body-worn camera equipment was turned on. Upon entering our client's office, they were asked to complete a visitor's questionnaire, which is standard procedure for our client's Premises. In the questionnaire, the officers answered that they had no recording equipment. When challenged on this, their answer was changed. The readiness of the officers to carry out an initial misrepresentation is a matter of grave concern.

When asked to state the purpose of their visit the officers refused to provide an answer. This question was repeated several times without any response. Indeed, in the questionnaire, the officers refused to complete the section titled "Reason for Visit".

Our client also asked why an appointment had not been made in accordance with his request made on the second visit. The response from the officers was to the effect that they did not make appointments in case a "reception committee" was waiting for them. This comment suggests, either intentionally or recklessly, that our client may take steps to prevent any inspection from taking place. Our client is a chartered architect, director of multiple companies, and has operated the Premises for in or around 50 years. Indeed, his conduct on previous visits was to assist in the facilitation of an inspection. The comment made by your officer is an unwarranted attack on our client's reputation and requires both an explanation as to why it was made and an apology.

In addition, during the visit, the officers proceeded to caution our client. However, they failed to inform our client of the specific allegation and/or reason for the caution. Furthermore, when our client requested the opportunity to seek legal representation, which was repeated several times, the officers continued to administer the caution.

Our client asked the officers to leave the Premises as he held an honest belief that their conduct was harassing in nature.



Request for Information

We require the following information without delay:

- (i) **Purpose of Visit:** A full explanation of the purpose of the visit, including the statutory basis and powers relied upon by your officers, and details of any suspected offence or regulatory breach under the Fisheries Act (Northern Ireland) 1966 or any other relevant legislation;
- (ii) **Use of Body-Worn Cameras:** Confirmation as to whether body-worn cameras were in use during the visit, and if so, why this was not properly disclosed on the visitor questionnaire at the first instance. Please provide a copy of your policy and legal basis for the deployment of body-worn video recording equipment by Inland Fisheries officers;
- (iii) **Recording and Footage:** Confirmation of whether any audio or video recording was made during the visit;
- (iv) **Administration of the Caution:** An explanation as to why our client was cautioned, the specific allegation or offence for which he was cautioned, and why the officers proceeded to caution and question him after he had expressly requested legal representation; and
- (v) **Compliance with PACE (NI) 1989:** Confirmation that your officers complied with the requirements of PACE (NI) 1989, in particular the obligation to cease questioning and to re-caution a suspect in appropriate terms once a request for legal advice has been made.

Next Steps

It is our client's position that the conduct of the officers during the visit was procedurally irregular and potentially unlawful.

We request a full written response to the matters raised in this letter within 14 days. Should we not receive a satisfactory explanation, or should it become apparent that your officers acted unlawfully or in breach of statutory safeguards, we reserve the right to take further action on our client's behalf, including (but not limited to) an application to exclude any evidence obtained during the visit and a formal complaint to the relevant oversight body.

If it is your intention to interview our client, we request pre-interview disclosure before one can take place at the appropriate time.

We look forward to your urgent response.



Yours faithfully

Michael Murphy for MKB