

Solicitors

7 Crawford Road,
Edinburgh EH16 5PQ

T/Deputy Chief Constable
Stuart Houston
Crime and Operational Support
Police Scotland Headquarters
Tulliallan Castle
KINCARDINE
FK10 4BE

Date: 15 July 2026
Our ref: CAM006-0009/DH
Your ref:

Dear Deputy Chief Constable,

**REVEREND STUART CAMPBELL
OPERATION BRANCHFORM
SCOTTISH NATIONAL PARTY AND OTHERS**

We are instructed by the Reverend Stuart Campbell. In your letter to our client dated 13 July, you suggested that his legal representative might make contact with you. On our client's instruction, I am taking up that invitation.

Our client has obtained an Opinion, from the Dean of Faculty, on the questions of (a) embezzlement, and (b) fraudulent breach of trust. I attach a copy of this Opinion.

I will preface things, if I might, by reminding you that the Dean of the Faculty of Advocates is the elected head of the Scottish bar. An opinion from the Dean of Faculty carries particular weight. The Dean's opinion is conventionally regarded as the most authoritative that can be obtained from counsel in Scotland. The opinion of the Dean of the Faculty of Advocates is not something that ought to be breezily dismissed or airily brushed aside. Our client would not expect you to do either. He expects that you will properly consider it and properly, and fully, engage with its terms. I think that that is a reasonable expectation.

Against that background, the Dean's analysis is unequivocal: there is clear evidence of the crime of embezzlement, with the only question being who was responsible therefor. The facts do not appear to be disputed: (a) funds were solicited on the basis of an assurance that they would be ringfenced for a particular purpose; (b) funds provided in light of that assurance were held on trust; and (c) as has openly been admitted, those funds were spent on other matters in breach of that trust. The legal analysis is very simple, and (so far as we can see) unarguably correct. I instantly recognise (as does the Dean) that we do not know who was responsible for this crime, but it is very clear on the indisputable facts that a crime has been committed.

Precisely who was responsible would be for the police to investigate. But where there is clear evidence of a crime as serious as embezzlement and where the public interest is as firmly engaged as it is here, we struggle to understand a coherent basis for declining to investigate the sole



Law Awards Scotland - Litigation Team of the Year: Winners 2015, Commended Finalists 2018
Legal 500 - Leading Firm Commercial Litigation 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018 and 2019
Signet Accredited Commercial Litigation Specialists

T: +44 (0) 131 668 3000 | F: +44 (0) 131 510 7113 | W: www.hallidaycampbell.com | David Halliday, Partner

outstanding question, namely who was responsible.

If you have a legal analysis which differs from the Dean's, then please let me know and we will consider that with him. If not, please confirm that you agree that the matter merits reconsideration. You will be aware that this matter has already received significant public attention. Given that the demonstrated crime involves the governing party in Scotland, declining to investigate without any proper, reasoned basis for such declinature would raise serious questions as to the independence and efficacy of Police Scotland. We are sure that this will not be so.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'D. Halliday', with a stylized, wavy line extending from the end.

David Halliday
HALLIDAY CAMPBELL