Monday, 29 April 2024 1 2 LORD BRACADALE: Good morning, Ms Miller. Will you raise 3 your hand and say the words of the oath. 4 LINDSEY MILLER (sworn) 5 Examination-in-chief by MS THOMSON LORD BRACADALE: Ms Thomson. 6 7 MS THOMSON: Good morning. You are Lindsey Miller? 8 Yes. Α. 9 May I ask how old you are? 10 Α. 52. You are employed by the Crown Office and Procurator 11 Q. 12 Fiscal Service? 13 I am. Α. 14 What is your current role? Q. 15 Α. I am deputy crown agent for operational support. Q. Before I ask you any questions, can I ask you to take a 16 look inside the blue folder? Is it just there to your 17 left. You should find within that folder a Rule 8 18 19 request that the Inquiry sent to you. 20 A. Yes. Q. It's undated. It has reference SBPI 00456, but we don't 21 need that on the screen. This is the procedure that we 22 use whereby we can ask witnesses to provide us with a 23 24 written statement and that request sets out a number of 25 questions that you were asked to cover in your response.

1 Can we please pull up on the screen your response, 2 which is SBPI 00428. This is your response to the 3 request. If we scroll to the very bottom, we'll see that it was prepared by you and signed on 4 4 January 2024. Your signature has been redacted, but 5 hopefully will appear on the version in hard copy in 6 7 front of you? 8 Yes. Α. 9 And if we can look at the very last paragraph of the Q. statement which is 93 pages long -- sorry -- 93 10 paragraphs long, it reads: 11 12 "I believe the facts stated in this witness statement are true. I understand that this statement 13 14 may form part of the evidence before the Inquiry and be 15 published on the Inquiry's website." And so you prepared this statement in that 16 17 knowledge? I did. 18 Α. 19 And did you do your best to provide a full and accurate Q. 20 response to the questions that you were asked? 21 Α. I did. 22 Ms Miller, you have hard copies of the request and your Q. response in front of you. Any passages that I would 23 24 like to refer you to I'll bring up on the screen, but 25 those documents are there to assist you and you can look

1 to them at any point and if there's anything that you would like me to bring up on the screen, please just say 2 3 and we can do that. I want to begin by asking you some questions about 4 your legal career, your roles and experience. When did 5 you qualify as a solicitor? 6 7 1996. Α. 8 When did you join the Crown Office? Q. 9 1994. Α. 10 Q. You explain in your statement that as at May 2015 you 11 were the procurator fiscal for organised crime and 12 counterterrorism? 13 Α. Yes. Q. If we could perhaps bring your statement back up and 14 15 have a look at that paragraph. You say: "At the time of Mr Bayoh's death, I was the 16 17 procurator fiscal for organised crime and counterterrorism and the head of the Serious and 18 19 Organised Crime Division, which was a senior civil 20 service post. I had been in that role since 21 November 2013. In that role I had strategic responsibility within COPFS for a number of specialist 22 areas of prosecution work, including the investigation 23 24 and prosecution of organised crime, serious economic 25 crime, terrorism offences, international cooperation,

25

1 proceeds of crime recovery, civil recovery, the Lockerbie bombing investigation, wildlife and 2 3 environmental crime and complaints against the police. 4 I reported to the then director of Serious Casework." 5 Α. Yes. Now, before I ask you any questions really about the 6 Q. 7 content of that statement, can I draw your attention to 8 the first line there and I see that you have spelt 9 Mr Bayoh's name with an "E" rather than an "A", it's 10 BAYOH, and I think as we go through your statement we'll see that that misspelling is repeated. Can I assume 11 12 that was inadvertent? 13 I can only apologise, yes, that's inadvertent. Α. 14 Q. You mention at the bottom of this paragraph that your 15 portfolio of responsibilities within the Crown Office at the time of Mr Bayoh's death included complaints against 16 17 the police. We've heard about CAAPD, the Complaints 18 Against the Police Division or Department. Did that 19 fall within your remit then, CAAPD? 20 Α. Yes. 21 Q. You explain elsewhere in your statement that whilst you 22 were not in the day-to-day management of the investigation into Mr Bayoh's death, you had 23 responsibility and supervision for the team members who 24

were so responsible. Can you explain what does having

1		responsibility and supervision in this context involve
2		if you're not involved in the day-to-day management?
3	Α.	In that role I was often copied in to submissions that
4		were going to the law officers, I was asked to clear
5		material that was being seen by more senior members of
6		staff, I had regular meetings with that team to discuss
7		their workload, any areas of concern and if there are
8		any high profile cases, as with any of these units
9		within my responsibility, I would regularly discuss the
10		progress of investigations or investigative strategy.
11	Q.	Okay. You also explain in your statement that in
12		May 2016 you became the deputy crown agent for Serious
13		Casework, however you retained responsibility for CAAPD;
14		do I understand that correctly?
15	Α.	Yes, that's correct.
16	Q.	You explain at paragraph 36, if we could look at that
17		briefly please at the bottom of that paragraph. Thank
18		you:
19		"When my role within COPFS changed in 2016, I
20		retained oversight of this particular investigation for
21		continuity purposes and because I had met Mr Bayoh's
22		family on a number of occasions and it was thought to be
23		good practice and helpful for the family to have
24		continuity via senior COPFS officials, particularly as
25		in June Lord Mulholland demitted office as

Lord Advocate." 1 2 So here you talk about your role changing but 3 retaining oversight of this investigation for continuity 4 purposes. Was there any difference between your role 5 before and after May 2016 when you changed post? Not particularly. Somebody replaced me in a role of a 6 Α. 7 different title but essentially carrying out the same 8 role I had had pre-2016, but I took the view and in 9 discussion with the Lord Advocate we thought it was 10 important that I retained an involvement in the same way as I had before. 11 12 Q. Who was it that the replaced you? 13 It was Liam Murphy as procurator fiscal for specialist Α. 14 casework, as it then came. 15 Q. How long did this oversight of the investigation last, did it continue up until the prosecutorial decision in 16 17 2018 and beyond? 18 A. Yes. 19 We've heard at the relevant time the head of CAAPD was Q. 20 Les Brown? 21 Α. Yes. 22 That the precognoscers who worked on the narrative were Q. 23 Alisdair McLeod and Erin Campbell? 24 Α. Yes. And the precognoscer who worked on the analysis was 25 Q.

25

1 Fiona Carnan. Were you responsible for all members of 2 the team? Ultimately, yes, they were within the division for which 3 Α. 4 I had responsibility so yes. 5 Did you directly provide supervision and support to all Q. members of the team? 6 7 Α. Yes. 8 Okay. I wonder if we can look at the initial letter of Q. 9 instruction from the crown to the PIRC at COPFS 02539. 10 So you'll see it was sent by Stephen McGowan. It's dated 5 May of 2015 and it's addressed to Irene 11 12 Scullion, head of investigations at the PIRC, and if we 13 can scroll down to look at the text, please. So the 14 letter is issued in terms of section 33A of the 2006 Act 15 and at this particular point in time, two instructions 16 were given: 17 "There are two areas which require investigation. 18 These are the circumstances leading up to the incident, 19 namely Mr Bayoh's movements late on Saturday, 2 May and 20 during the early hours of Sunday, 3 May prior to contact 21 with the police, including his attendance at the 22 Dick/MacLeod home address and events following his attendance there and the incident in which the police 23 became involved with Mr Bayoh shortly after 7.00 am on 24 3 May."

1		If we look at the bottom of the screen, we see:
2		"My colleague Les Brown, head of CAAPD, will be the
3		senior fiscal with oversight of this case and will bring
4		in such assistance from the COPFS as required."
5		Now, both Mr McGowan and Mr Brown have already given
6		evidence before the Inquiry and we understand there was
7		an earlier version of this letter also in Mr McGowan's
8		name and signed by him, but he doesn't think that it was
9		ultimately issued and it said that David Green, who was
10		head of the SFIU, the Scotish Fatalities Investigation
11		Unit, would have the oversight of the investigation. So
12		it appears that at some point on 5 May a decision was
13		taken within Crown Office that the investigation should
14		sit within CAAPD rather than SFIU. I wondered if you
15		could assist us with who took that decision?
16	Α.	I genuinely can't recall. I assume I would have been
17		involved in the discussion, but now I have no
18		recollection of how that came about. I know David Green
19		was involved in the initial call about Mr Bayoh's death,
20		but as for who took that decision and how it came about,
21		I'm afraid I can't recall now.
22	Q.	Okay, Mr McGowan was also asked this question and he
23		couldn't recall either, but I'll tell you what he said
24		in his evidence. He said:
25		"I don't specifically recall any discussion about

1 it. There must have been a discussion about it. I 2 imagine that would have involved myself, John Loque, Lindsey Miller, but I don't recall the specific 3 4 discussion." 5 And he was asked: 6 "Who would have authority to make a decision of that 7 sort?" 8 And he said: "Either of us could have made that decision. CAAPD 9 10 sat within Lindsey Miller's remit so she would have had to have been involved in that. Mr Logue oversaw both of 11 12 us, but any of us would really have had the technical 13 authority, but there must have been a discussion as 14 reflected between the two drafts of the letter, I just 15 don't recall it." 16 Yes, I would agree with that. Α. You would agree with that. And can you assist us as to 17 Q. why the decision was taken that this investigation 18 should sit within CAAPD rather than SFIU? 19 I anticipate it was because the nature of the work that 20 Α. 21 CAAPD did was focusing on police practice and procedure, 22 a range of criminality processes that the police undergo training, all of that is dealt with by CAAPD. They 23 focus primarily on criminal allegations, but they also 24 look at training and the roles that police officers 25

perform day in, day out. There is always the ability to

consult and seek assistance from SFIU, so there's no

suggestion that if it's sat with CAAPD, it's sat within

a silo in COPFS, but in my view CAAPD would have the

specialism and the subject matter expertise to deal with

some of the issues that we knew were likely to come out

in the course of this investigation.

- Q. Would it have made any practical difference if the investigation had remained within SFIU?
- 10 A. I think it would have led to similar calls on CAAPD time
 11 if it had sat with SFIU. Their function is obviously
 12 the investigation of sudden and unexpected fatalities.
 13 I think that the nature of this investigation focused
 14 very much more on the actings of the police officers
 15 involved.
 - Q. Okay. Can we bring your statement back up on the screen, please. And look at paragraph 44. You were asked questions about the ECHR and at paragraph 44 you say:

"During the investigation there were multiple discussions amongst officials about COPFS obligations under Article 2 of ECHR both in terms of the nature of the unprecedented levels of disclosure provided to family via the legal representative, but also in terms of the nature and extent of the crown investigation on

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the basis that this was a death at the hands of the state.

"Article 2 is referenced in a series of briefing documents, emails and correspondence, to which I was copied or offered in the course of the investigation, recognising that in accordance with our guidance the investigation's conclusions must be based on a thorough, objective and impartial analysis of all relevant elements. Failing to follow an obvious line of inquiry undermines to a decisive extent the investigation's ability to establish the circumstances of the case and the identity of those responsible. COPFS must ensure that all lines of inquiry relevant to the death are considered, including responses received from third parties, expert opinion and concerns raised by nearest relatives. The investigation must be prompt and and be open to public scrutiny depending on the facts and circumstances of the death and supportive of the participation of nearest relatives.

"I do not recall any specific discussion referencing Article 14 as it specifically relates to protection from discrimination on race and religious grounds, but all of those involved in the investigation were conscious, certainly in my discussions with them, of the crown's obligations and core values to treat all with

professionalism and respect." 1 2 Now, a number of witnesses before you have been 3 asked about Articles 2 and 14 and that the principles 4 that can perhaps be distilled from the case law have 5 been put to them and witnesses have agreed that for an investigation into the death by the state to be 6 7 Article 2 compliant it requires to be effective; would 8 you agree with that? I would. 9 Α. 10 Q. And to be effective an investigation must be adequate. 11 Can I make you aware, Ms Miller, that the proceedings 12 are being transcribed? 13 Yes. Α. Thank you. Where the death follows the use of force by 14 Q. 15 state agents, an adequate investigation must be capable of leading to a determination of whether force used was 16 or was not justified; do you agree? 17 18 Α. I do. 19 And the standard to be applied is that of no more than Q. 20 absolutely necessary when considering the use of force? 21 Α. I agree. 22 Further, when a death is at the hands of state agents, Q. 23 Article 14, taken in conjunction with Article 2, poses an additional duty on an authority to take all 24 25 reasonable steps to unmask any racist motive and to

1 establish whether or not ethnic hatred or prejudice may 2 have played a role in the events? 3 Α. I agree. 4 And that investigation should be pursued with vigour? Q. 5 Yes, that's correct. Α. So these are positive obligations on both the PIRC and 6 Q. 7 crown in terms of Article 2 and 14? 8 Yes. Α. And they would required to be discharged both through 9 Q. 10 the PIRC's investigation and through the crown's investigation? 11 12 Α. Yes. 13 And central to the crown investigation, of course, is Q. 14 the precognition process? 15 Α. Yes. Okay. I want to begin by asking you some questions 16 Q. 17 about the PIRC investigation and then we'll move on to look at the precognition process. Can we bring up 18 perhaps paragraph 77 of your statement. You say here: 19 20 "It was important to take into account Mr Bayoh's 21 race at all stages of the investigation, in particular 22 to understand whether the police response to the calls from the public and the manner in which they sought to 23 detain him was in any way effected because he was a 24

black man and indicative of racial bias."

25

1 So you anticipated that at all stages of the investigation account would be taken of Mr Bayoh's race. 2 3 That would apply both to the PIRC investigation as well 4 as the crown investigation? 5 Α. Yes. Q. Yes. You say: 6 7 "Whether the manner in which the officers sought to detain him was indicative of racial bias... " 8 9 Was that a question that you expected the PIRC to address? 10 A. Yes, I did. 11 12 What expectation did you have as to how they would take Q. 13 account of race during their investigation? I expected them to analyse the initial instructions to 14 Α. 15 the officers, what they had been told, what their understanding was when they attended the locus, what 16 17 their training was in terms of detention and restraint and to include that in their analysis to be provided to 18 19 the crown. Q. And in particular what was your expectation as to how 20 21 the PIRC would investigate whether the police response and the manner of detention were indicative of racial 22 bias? 23 I would expect them to review and certainly through 24 Α. 25 discussions we had had with the family and their

24

25

1 representative there were concerns about policing 2 response in that local area, particularly around issues 3 of race. That certainly was passed to the PIRC and I 4 would have expected them to investigate that and provide 5 detail on it in their report. Q. Okay. And beyond that particular issue, where else do 6 7 you anticipate they would look for evidence indicative 8 of racial bias? 9 In the overall context of the circumstances. Α. 10 Q. Do you consider that it was clear to the PIRC what was expected of them? 11 12 Α. Yes. 13 How was it communicated to them what your expectations Q. 14 were? 15 Α. In the initial letter of instruction and I believe there was a follow-up letter from Mr Brown which set out in 16 17 significant detail what was expected of them. That first written letter to the PIRC makes no mention 18 Q. 19 of race. We looked at it a moment ago, perhaps we can 20 bring that letter back up on the screen again. We 21 looked at this paragraph already. There are two areas which require investigation and 22 they are and I'll read it short the circumstances 23

leading up to the incident and then the incident itself.

So there's no mention of race within before four corners

1 of the initial letter of instruction. Mr McGowan, who was the author of this letter, was asked whether he 2 considered giving a specific direction to consider race 3 4 and this is what he said in his oral evidence. He said: 5 "I didn't consider doing it, because in my view it was entirely obvious that a black man having died in 6 7 contact with the police, race would be at the forefront of the mind of any competent investigator, as it was in 8 the forefront of our minds, so I don't think I did 9 consider it." 10 And he said too: 11 12 "It would have been stating the obvious." 13 Would you agree with his sentiments? Yes, I would. 14 Α. 15 Q. Mr Brown was also asked a similar question and he said: "I think my position is I don't accept that it 16 required a letter of instruction from the crown to 17 consider race. The letter of instruction was for an 18 effective investigation to be carried out." 19 20 Again, is that something that you would agree with? 21 Α. Yes, I agree. 22 In her evidence Kate Frame, who was the Commissioner Q. back in 2015, was asked whether she considered that this 23 letter of instruction permitted PIRC to actively 24 investigate whether race was a factor and she said and I 25

Τ		quote:
2		"I would have expected a specific direction from
3		Crown Office about that."
4		Would you wish to offer any comment on that?
5	Α.	I would disagree with that. This is a letter of
6		instruction, but I don't consider that she would be
7		restrained by the four corners, as you called it, of the
8		instruction. It's not like terms of reference for
9		nonstatutory or statutory inquiries where they're very
10		specific and inquiries need to stay within those the
11		parameters of those terms. I think it would be obvious,
12		as Mr McGowan has said, that race should be considered
13		and could be considered by the PIRC.
14	Q.	Ms Frame's evidence was put to Mr McGowan and he said:
15		"In this letter of instruction we were not setting
16		terms of reference or parameters for an investigation.
17		It was not like heads of investigation such as an
18		inquiry like this may have. What we were doing is we
19		were asking the PIRC to investigate something. So it
20		wasn't a case of specific terms of reference and they
21		had to work within those terms of reference. They were
22		expected to gather evidence and follow the evidence in
23		my view and that evidence would take them where it took
24		them."
25		So he's expressing a similar sentiment to you

1 talking about the letter of instruction not being restrictive, it doesn't set terms of reference, there 2 was no requirement to stay within the instruction given. 3 4 Now, you mentioned there being a further letter and 5 I think that's a letter dated 2 September? 6 Α. Yes. 7 Which we will look at shortly, but the Inquiry has heard Q. 8 evidence that between the date of the initial 9 instruction and the letter of 2 September they were 10 taking cognisance of race, but race was not a positive line of investigation. So Mr McSporran was taken to his 11 12 policy log where he has recorded an entry which is dated 13 9 May that says: 14 "Although not directed by Crown Office at this 15 stage, taking cognisance of any issues of race if they emerge." 16 17 So it appeared that the PIRC were not taking a 18 positive line of investigation in relation to race and 19 so, for example, when the officers gave their statements 20 on 4 June, the interview strategy didn't cover race, but 21 were you aware of that? 22 I wasn't aware of the interview strategy. We are Α. sometimes sighted on interview strategy but not as a 23 matter of course, so I wasn't aware of that. 24 Would you have expected the interview strategy to cover 25 Q.

1 race? 2 Yes. I think Mr McSporran's assessment there sounds Α. 3 quite passive and not looking positively to investigate 4 that. 5 Again, Mr McGowan was taken to the entry in Q. Mr McSporran's policy log and he said that taking 6 7 cognisance sounds passive, as you have just said: 8 "So as you say it it is sounds as if it arrises, 9 then you look at and see what it takes, but in my mind 10 the best investigative practice would have required that to be an active line of investigation which was pursued 11 12 and so questions would be asked about that of almost any 13 witness and things may emerge that would be followed up." 14 15 Would you agree with --16 Α. Yes. -- what he had to say about that? Were you aware that 17 Q. the PIRC did not appear to have a positive line of 18 inquiry around race at that time? 19 20 No, I wasn't. We wouldn't as a matter of course see an Α. 21 investigating officer's policy log. We would in certain circumstances but in the circumstances of the 22 investigation of Mr Bayoh's death I wouldn't have 23 24 expected to see it and I didn't know what was in it. Does it concern you to hear that the PIRC were not 25 Q.

- 1 advancing a positive line of investigation --
- 2 A. Yes.
- 3 Q. -- into these issues.
- 4 Now, a report which has been variously described as
- 5 a first report or an interim report was received in the
- 6 Crown Office in August 2015. Did you read that first
- 7 report?
- 8 A. I did.
- 9 Q. I understand that the statements of the police officers
- may have been appended to that report. Did you read
- 11 those?
- 12 A. From memory, I did.
- 13 Q. The report itself is just more than 350 pages in length
- and there are references to a black male, a black guy,
- threat level, terrorist risk. There is however no
- mention of race, racism, race discrimination, racist and
- 17 the analysis doesn't cover race or discrimination or
- 18 Article 15, even just to raise and exclude these issues.
- Do you wish to offer any comment on that?
- 20 A. I think the report was deficient.
- Q. Can you expand on that?
- 22 A. I think that it should have covered the issues you've
- 23 raised. I think the question of race was a crucial
- 24 pillar of the investigation and should have been set out
- in the report to the crown.

1	Q.	We heard from Mr Brown that concerns as to the content
2		and quality of the report prompted a more directive
3		approach by the crown and the letter of 2 September was
4		then issued. Did you have any part to play in shaping
5		this more directive approach?
6	Α.	I don't recall. I will have seen it. A lot of the
7		correspondence that was being sent to the PIRC had been
8		passed to me for authorisation and final sign off, so I
9		will have seen a version of that before it went to the
10		PIRC.
11	Q.	Okay. Let's bring it up on the screen. It's
12		COPFS 02557 and if we can get our bearings. So this is
13		a letter that we can see from the reference has been by
14		Mr Brown, his signature is at the bottom, addressed to
15		Kate Frame and dated 2 September. There is a reference
16		of to a meeting with the family, and the Lord Advocate,
17		and:
18		"The Lord Advocate confirmed that the PIRC would be
19		instructed to carry out investigations in respect of a
20		number of matters in order that a properly informed
21		decision may be taken by the crown as to the most
22		appropriate way to proceed.
23		"The following matters require further investigation

25 And there then follow a number of bulletpoints. If

in this regard."

24

1 we can perhaps scroll all the way down to page 4, and if we stop here, please, the bulletpoint that's at the top 2 3 of the screen is the one that relates to race so let's 4 look at that: "I require confirmation from the Commissioner that 5 issues of race and whether there is any evidence of 6 7 racial motivation is a primary focus in the PIRC 8 investigation. The investigation should examine whether 9 there is any evidence that any of the officers involved 10 has expressed any racist views or opinions in the past, in particular someone indicated that officers from 11 12 within the Fife area had been investigated for texting 13 racial slogans and that one of the officers was referred 14 to him. The family have enquired as to whether any of 15 those officers apparently involved in that inquiry were in the group of officers engaged with Mr Bayoh. 16 17 "Associated with this aspect of the Inquiry, I have 18 already been in correspondence with you regarding the investigations that have been instructed in relation to 19 20 allegations of previous criminal conduct by 21 Constable Alan Paton. The family of Mr Bayoh believe that he has a history of racism." 22 Does that jog your memory at all? Do you recall 23 having seen this at least in --24 25 Α. Yes.

1	Q.	draft? So far as race is concerned then, there's a
2		request for confirmation from the Commissioner that
3		issues of race and whether there is any evidence of
4		racial motivation is a primary focus in the PIRC
5		investigation and then there is a direction that the
6		investigation should examine three particular areas,
7		racist views in the past, text messages I think that
8		were shared by other officers and whether any of the
9		officers who attended Hayfield Road were associated with
10		the sharing of those messages and concerns about
11		Mr Paton, Constable Paton.
12		We've heard evidence that these three particular
13		lines of inquiry reflect concerns that had been raised
14		by Mr Bayoh's family; was that your understanding?
15	Α.	Yes, that's right. That's what I was referring to
16		earlier.
17	Q.	Mr Brown gave evidence that he intended this to be a
18		general instruction, the requirement that the
19		Commissioner confirm the issues of race or evidence of
20		racial motivation were primary focus. He intended this
21		to be a general instruction in which he then went on to
22		highlight three specific concerns raised by the family.
23		Now, the Inquiry has heard that the PIRC's
24		consideration of race didn't really go beyond those
25		three specific lines of inquiry. Did you anticipate

1 that their investigation would be broader in its scope? I did and I would take that from the first sentence and 2 Α. 3 that bulletpoint: 4 "The issues of race and whether there is evidence of 5 racial motivation is a primary focus in the PIRC investigation." 6 7 Q. What did you expect from the PIRC in carrying out this 8 investigation into race and whether there's any evidence 9 of racial motivation? 10 Α. I expected that to form certainly a significant portion of the report to the crown, again looking at some of the 11 12 factors I identified earlier in my evidence about police 13 officers, their background, any issues they were aware 14 of, what they were told at the time of their response 15 and, more generally, I suppose across the police force what was the position of Police Scotland. 16 Okay. Now, given that the first report submitted in the 17 Q. 18 August of 2015 was deficient in your view certainly insofar as its consideration of race was concerned, was 19 20 any consideration given within the crown to providing 21 more in the way of guidance and direction to the PIRC at 22 this stage, rather than a general instruction or a request for reassurance followed up with what were in 23

effect three bulletpoints or lines of inquiry?

I don't recall any specific discussion about that, but

24

25

Α.

I'm aware from my own meetings with the PIRC and also

Mr Brown's role that there was regular engagement on

this investigation. So even if you take that

bulletpoint and the three issues as a starting point,

that certainly wouldn't be the end of the discussion and

I would expect there to be ongoing dialogue, as we would

with any agency as the inquiry progressed.

Q. Thank you. When Mr McGowan gave evidence he was asked:

"We've heard that the PIRC's consideration of race didn't really go beyond these three specific aspects and I wonder whether with hindsight this was an opportunity for the crown to have provided more in the way of guidance to the PIRC, perhaps by providing additional examples of lines or perhaps by stating that the expectation was that they applied their own minds to the issue and perhaps reported back to the crown in terms of how they proposed to take this aspect of the inquiry forwards."

And Mr McGowan said:

"In hindsight we could have, but again I go back to the context and the context is a number of discussions in which these were discussed and the context is also that the people that we were dealing with at PIRC were very experienced. Although PIRC was a new organisation, the Commissioner was an experienced prosecutor and the

1 director of investigations and the senior staff were very, very experienced police officers and very 2 3 experienced detectives, who to my own knowledge had 4 dealt with very complex cases. On reflection given what 5 you told me, yes, we could have put more in, but I would be disappointed if today as we sit here now, if a 6 7 similar incident occurred, we would have to specify in 8 the body of the letter of instruction these are the 9 lines of inquiry you should follow." 10 Would you agree with what Mr McGowan had to say? I would. 11 Α. 12 Q. You mentioned there being ongoing dialogue between PIRC 13 and the crown. Was this telephone calls, emails, 14 meetings? 15 I think as far as Mr Brown was concerned that was the Α. nature of the contact. I had from early 2017 onwards 16 17 quarterly meetings with the Commissioner, not just about this case, but about the range of the casework that PIRC 18 was undertaking, so that was mostly face-to-face with 19 20 some email contact. 21 Q. Ms Frame in her evidence said that the PIRC had sought guidance about how to assess whether the officer's 22 23 actions had been influenced by race and that a greater 24 degree of direction and guidance would have been 25 helpful. Do you have any comment to make on her

1 evidence?

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- 2 That's her view. I think I go back to what Mr McGowan Α. 3 said and what I agreed with that she was a very 4 experienced prosecutor who had in fact before been appointed to be the Commissioner, had been the head of 5 CAAPD. The PIRC officials involved were very senior at 6 7 the time of their retirement from respective police 8 forces, very senior, very experienced. I would have 9 expected them to be able to discharge the instructions 10 such as they were that were provided by the crown without needing to be taken step-by-step through an 11 12 investigation of this sort.
- Q. In her evidence Ms Frame said that no guidance was given
 about the evidence from which inferences might be drawn
 and the guidance had been sought. Were you aware of
 the PIRC looking for guidance as to how to approach
 their examination of the question of race?
 - A. No, I don't recall. I may have been -- I don't recall, but again I would have expected those with the experience at the PIRC to be able to look at the evidence that they had been and gathered and to draw those inferences.
 - Q. You mentioned that you had an expectation that the PIRC would look at the backgrounds of the officers, look at the information provided, their knowledge effectively,

1 on arrival at the locus, and look across the police 2 force in general. 3 Mr McGowan in his evidence said that he expected the PIRC to gather and follow the evidence and he said: 4 5 "I would be disappointed if we had to specify these are the sorts of things you need to look for, whether 6 7 it's the language of the officers before, the language 8 of the officers after, how they have dealt with other 9 people, whether there's anything in their past, you 10 know, whether there are any racial tropes or stereotypes applied in any of the material that's been produced. 11 12 I would be disappointed if we had to do that now." 13 So he referenced language, racial tropes and 14 stereotypes and a comparison of the treatment of 15 Mr Bayoh with how the officers had dealt with other people. How did those suggestions fit with your own 16 17 expectations as to how the PIRC might have looked at issue of race? 18 19 I would agree with all of that. Α. And again, Mr McGowan said: 20 Q. 21 "I didn't understand that we were looking for 22 anything complex or novel. It all goes down to those questions of looking at all the circumstances to say 23 24 what can we discern about why the officers acted in the 25 way that they did and you can get that from all of the

1		surrounding circumstances."
2	Α.	Yes.
3	Q.	And you're nodding agreement.
4	Α.	Yes.
5	Q.	Okay. I want to move away from the PIRC investigation
6		and ask you some questions now about the crown
7		investigation, again with the focus on race. And I
8		would like to begin by looking at what you say in your
9		statement about a meeting that you were present at on
10		14 May 2015.
11		So if we could perhaps bring up your statement again
12		and look at paragraph 79 and this was a meeting with the
13		Lord Advocate who at that point in time was
14		Lord Mulholland. I think in the questions that lie
15		behind these answers you had been taken to a note and a
16		notebook. I don't think we need that for present
17		purposes, but the quotation "you know me on this race
18		stuff" is one that you attribute to Lord Advocate. You
19		say it was his response to Mr Anwar asking for question
20		of race to be looked at by the PIRC:
21		"This was said in the presence of Mr Bayoh's family
22		and he was looking to reassure them that the issue of
23		race was one which was very much front and centre of the
24		investigation for which he had overall responsibility.
25		"During this discussion the Lord Advocate confirmed

1 that there would be a detailed investigation by the PIRC, so therefore independent and not involving the 2 3 police. He advised the family that at the very least 4 there would be a fatal accident inquiry as Mr Bayoh had 5 decided in police custody. He also indicated that if there was sufficient evidence linking an assault to 6 7 Mr Bayoh's death then there could be a prosecution for 8 murder or culpable homicide and indicated that he would 9 have no hesitation in raising a prosecution if that evidential threshold was met." 10 So this was 14 May and the Lord Advocate said to the 11 12 family that the issue of race would be front and centre. 13 Now, we see that the Lord Advocate gave a commitment to there being at the very least an FAI. Do you know 14 15 what was meant by "at the very least"? That was in the context that it was mandatory for there 16 Α. to be a fatal accident inquiry as Mr Brown had died in 17 18 lawful custody. What he was setting out -- my recollection was that there was -- all options were 19 20 still to be consider, so this was an investigation that 21 was looking a the actings of the officers and that if 22 criminality was identified, then if the evidential threshold was met there could be criminal proceedings. 23 Thank you. We can scroll up the page just a little bit, 24 Q. please, to look at the paragraph above. So this was in 25

1 the context of Mr Anwar having asked a question about race being examined by PIRC and: 2 3 "The Lord Advocate was looking to provide reassurance that the issue of race was one which was 4 5 very much front and centre of the investigation for which he had overall responsibility." 6 7 Can we take it that the Lord Advocate anticipated or 8 he understood that he was anticipating that race would 9 be front and centre not only of the PIRC investigation, 10 but also the crown investigation? Absolutely, yes. 11 Α. 12 Okay. How did you anticipate that the lawyers within Q. 13 CAAPD would investigate whether race was a factor in the 14 circumstances of this incident? 15 A. I'm really looking at the factors that you've discussed with me this morning that Mr McGowan outlined. So we 16 would be looking at statements from eye witnesses, 17 statements from the officers, the officers' training 18 records, any suggestion of a misconduct, anything within 19 20 the materials provided by Police Scotland about -- about 21 training, about the officers themselves, and in the 22 focus on them with Mr Bayoh at the locus, their actings and was there anything that could be drawn -- any 23 inference that could be drawn from that that suggested 24 25 it was indicative of racial bias.

- 1 Q. Okay. Had guidance been published within Crown Office
- 2 as to how to recognise racial bias in an investigation
- 3 of this sort?
- 4 A. There's certainly considerable guidance in relation to
- 5 the investigation of racially motivated crime and the
- 6 use of the then racial aggravations when preparing cases
- 7 for prosecution.
- 8 Q. We've already looked at what was chapter 44 I think of
- 9 the Precognoscer's Handbook which deals with section 50A
- and section 96, the racial motivation for racial
- 11 aggravations. So that chapter of the handbook certainly
- dealt with the nuts and bolts of how to approach those
- 13 two sections and it explored what the threshold was for
- 14 each, but in terms of where to look for evidence of
- racial bias, how to approach that task, was there any
- published guidance?
- 17 A. I'm not sure that there is. I might be wrong about
- 18 that, but I'm not sure that there is on that specific
- 19 issue.
- Q. Okay. Do you think that's something that might be
- 21 helpful?
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 Q. Okay. Was there training for the staff involved in the
- 24 precognition process on how to recognise racial bias?
- 25 A. In the context of investigation, I don't think so. In

25

1 the context more generally of how prosecutors and staff 2 will go about their daily duties, yes, but I think 3 they're two separate things. 4 Q. Okay. We've heard evidence that racial bias can be 5 overt, shouting a racist slur for example, and there's no evidence of that here. The Inquiry has also heard 6 7 that evidence of racial bias can also be overt --8 sorry -- covert, subtle, harder to defect, would you 9 agree with me that if you only look for evidence of 10 overtly racist behaviour then you may overlook the more subtle behaviours that are indicative of bias? 11 12 A. Yes, there are issues such as what we would call 13 "micro-aggressions" so phrases, words, actions on the 14 face of it which might not be overt commentary you're 15 talking about, but certainly are indicative of a particular bias. 16 And would you agree with me that if you only look for 17 Q. 18 evidence of overtly racist behaviour then your 19 investigation might not unmask a racist motive? Yes, I would agree with that. 20 Α. Mr McGowan was also asked where did he anticipate the 21 Q. team within CAAPD would look for evidence of racial 22 motivation. He said: 23 24 "It would be in all of the evidence so it would be

in the evidence of the statements, so things which were

- said in statements which might cause you to have a view.
- 2 They would be in things like the police radio chatter,
- 3 the airwave chatter I think it was. That was all
- 4 available to us. We would be looking in that. We would
- 5 be looking in all of the documents that were prepared.
- 6 We would be looking at the policies that I think we were
- 7 then gathering. We would be looking across the piece
- 8 for evidence of that."
- 9 Would you agree with that?
- 10 A. Yes, I would.
- 11 Q. And at what stage of the investigation did you expect
- 12 the crown to be on the look out for evidence of racial
- 13 bias or motivation?
- 14 A. At every stage.
- 15 Q. Okay. And who within the team was responsible for
- scrutinising the evidence and assessing it for relevance
- to the question of race?
- 18 A. That would be those involved in what we call the
- 19 precognition, the case preparation process, so the
- 20 procurators fiscal depute who were analysing the
- 21 evidence as it came in and were responsible for
- 22 preparing what became the narrative and analysis for the
- crown.
- Q. So that would be Alisdair McLeod?
- 25 A. Alisdair McLeod and Erin Campbell and --

- 1 Q. Fiona Carnan?
- 2 A. -- Fiona Carnan with oversight obviously directly
- 3 Mr Brown and from me if required.
- 4 Q. We've heard that Mr Brown was a countersignatory to the
- 5 precognition?
- 6 A. Yes, that's right.
- 7 Q. So direct oversight by Mr Brown and then you sat above
- 8 that?
- 9 A. Yes.
- 10 Q. How confident were you that the team within CAAPD who
- 11 were working the precognition had the necessary skill
- 12 set?
- 13 A. Confident, we brought in Mr MacLeod and Ms Campbell from
- 14 the wider Serious and Organised Crime Division to deal
- with this, so they weren't in CAAPD from memory at the
- time that it took over the investigation. Mr MacLeod
- 17 had experience of investigating police corruption cases
- in the past. He also had experience from health and
- safety investigations of fatalities, which I think was
- important in this context, given what we were looking
- 21 at. He had significant experience of large and complex
- cases.
- 23 Similarly, Ms Campbell was an experienced prosecutor
- and had worked on a number of large and complex
- 25 investigations within the division and I felt certainly

- 1 that they were the right fit to assist Mr Brown.
- 2 Q. And what about Ms Carnan? She was the procurator fiscal
- depute who prepared the analysis of the evidence. Were
- 4 you satisfied that she had the necessary skills?
- 5 A. Yes, she had already been, I think from memory, in CAAPD
- and when Ms Campbell left, Ms Carnan I think began to be
- 7 involved at that stage, so again I had no concerns about
- 8 her involvement.
- 9 Q. Okay. Ms Carnan explained in her written evidence to
- 10 the Inquiry that before the date she became involved in
- 11 the case she had no previous involvement in the
- investigation of deaths in police custody and she didn't
- specifically recall any deaths that she had investigated
- 14 where race was a factor and Mr Brown also confirmed
- again in his written evidence that he had no experience
- of investigating a death in custody and no experience of
- 17 racism being a factor to consider when investigating a
- death in custody or the actions of on-duty police
- 19 officers
- 20 Were you aware of those limitations to their
- 21 experience?
- 22 A. Yes, that's not dissimilar to my own experience.
- 23 Q. Looking and bearing in mind that perhaps there wasn't
- 24 specific quidance available to the team at the time as
- 25 to where to look for evidence of racial motivation or

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

- training on that particular topic and given the
 limitations to their experience, do you consider that
 the team were as well equipped as they might have been?
 - A. No, in hindsight there is more that we could have done to support them in investigating that aspect of the case. I think looking from what we did at the beginning, it was about their experience of complex investigations, about in some cases fatality and police actings, but not the specific issues around being able to identify racial bias.
- Q. Okay, and what more do you feel with the benefit of hindsight might have been done to support the team?
- 13 A. Specific training or, you know, bring in those with
 14 expertise to assist.
- Q. And was any consideration given at the time to bringing in those with expertise to assist?
- 17 A. No, not that I'm aware of, certainly not by me.
- Q. And when you say those with expertise, do you have in mind staff within COPFS or external?
- 20 A. External I think. We do have the -- and I think I have
 21 referred to it my statement, we have the equality
 22 network, we have the inclusion network, but I think it
 23 would be helpful to have those from outwith COPFS with
 24 the relevant skill set and the experience to assist.
- Q. Do you have any thoughts today as to who outwith COPFS

1		might have been approached?
2	Α.	No specific recommendations. I know, for example,
3		Deborah Coles was advising the family, Mr Anwar. Had
4		she not been, she would have been somebody that I would
5		have considered. I know she had significant experience
6		and had also advised other inquiries commissioned by the
7		Home Office. That's the kind of expertise I would be
8		thinking we should involve in cases like this.
9	Q.	And you yourself explain in your statement that you do
10		not have experience of racism being a factor to
11		investigate in relation to a death in custody?
12	Α.	Yes.
13	Q.	But you do also explain that you were the secretary to
14		Sir Anthony Campbell's inquiry and I wonder if we can
15		look at what you say about that at paragraph 72 of your
16		statement:
17		"I was aware of the findings of the inquiry into the
18		investigation of the murder of Stephen Lawrence by
19		Sir William Macpherson of Cluny and the issues he
20		identified within the Metropolitan Police Service of
21		institution racism.
22		"Further, having been secretary to Sir Anthony
23		Campbell KC's nonstatutory inquiry into the actings of
24		the crown and the crown's decision-making regarding the
25		murder of Surjit Singh Chhokar, which followed closely

1 after the Macpherson review, I was conscious of the issues considered in that inquiry which focused on the 2 3 crown, particularly Sir Anthony's definitions which he 4 outlined in his report. Racism is in legal terms 5 unlawful racial discrimination and it may be direct or indirect. Direct discrimination includes less 6 7 favourable treatment of a person on the ground of colour 8 or some other forbidden ground. Indirect discrimination 9 arises where members of different ethnic groups are 10 treated equally in a formal sense, but where a practice, procedure or rule puts the members of one ethnic group 11 12 at a substantial disadvantage compared with another 13 without any objective justification. Direct and 14 indirect discrimination may occur without any intention 15 to discriminate or any discriminatory motive. In the context of this inquiry, I take institutional racism to 16 17 mean racial discrimination which is not only an individual discriminatory act, but is systemic in the 18 sense that it results from a practice or procedure that 19 20 operates within the institution. 21 "During my examination on the decision that were made, I have been alert to the danger of what has been 22 described by Lord Nicholls of Birkenhead's as 23 24 'subconscious motivation'. As he said: 25 "'All human beings have preconceptions, beliefs,

1 attitudes and prejudices on many subjects. It is part 2 of our make up. Moreover, we do not always recognise 3 our own prejudices. Many people are unable or unwilling 4 to admit even to themselves that actions of theirs may 5 be racially motivated'." So do you consider that your experience as secretary 6 7 to that inquiry was an advantage to you when you were 8 surprising or overseeing this investigation? Α. Yes.

9

22

23

24

25

- 10 Q. Can you elaborate on that and explain how it brought you benefit? 11
- 12 In the course of Sir Anthony Campbell's inquiry we Α. 13 looked not only at the purpose, nature and extent of the 14 investigation into Mr Chhokar's death, but the training 15 that staff had had and their own understanding of direct and indirect racism and that was obviously analysed in 16 17 the context of whether the decisions made by the crown 18 in relation to the investigation of Mr Chhokar's death were motived by conscious or unconscious bias and I felt 19 20 that some of that learning was of assistance when 21 looking at the investigation into Mr Bayoh's death.
 - You clearly knew about subconscious motivation. We see Q. that the quotation from Lord Nicholls set out in Sir Anthony's report. Did you expect that CAAPD would examine the subconscious motivation of the officers when

25

considering racial bias? 1 2 I did, maybe not using that terminology, but I did Α. 3 perhaps along the lines more of unconscious bias, but 4 certainly I expected that to be considered. 5 And how did you expect them to go about that task? Q. In their analysis of their findings from the 6 Α. 7 consideration of the evidence as a whole. 8 Okay. And how did you expect that to look? Could it be Q. 9 a question of drawing inferences in the absence of overt 10 examples of racial bias? Yes, if there were no overt examples, but there were 11 Α. 12 inferences to be drawn by actings, behaviours, I would 13 expect that to form part of the analysis of the crown. Did you share with the team any of your learning from 14 Q. 15 your time as secretary to Sir Anthony's report? We talked about it, but only in very general terms. 16 Α. 17 were aware -- Mr Brown and I were obviously in the service at the time, as was Mr McGowan. I think it was 18 19 almost taken as read in some ways and in hindsight 20 perhaps should have been more overt from us in our 21 discussions with the team. And looking back, with the benefit of course of 22 Q. 23 hindsight, do you think there might have been a benefit 24 to the team if you had shared with them the particular

experience that you had through working with Sir Anthony

1		and the learning that you've shared with us today in
2		terms of an approach to subconscious motivation
3	A.	Yes.
4	Q.	or unconscious bias and how to identify it?
5	A.	Absolutely, yes.
6	Q.	Can we scroll a little further down the page, please.
7		Stop there and look at the second paragraph. Here you
8		reference an October 2017 Dame Eilish Angiolini KC, now
9		Lady Angiolini, a former Lord Advocate published a
LO		report commissioned by the Home Office into deaths in
L1		police custody:
L2		"This report was scrutinised by the CAAPD team
L3		preparing the report into Mr Bayoh's death to ensure
L 4		that any learning, findings and recommendations could be
L5		taken into account."
L 6		Who did you understand was scrutinising this report?
L7	A.	Mr Brown and I also reviewed it and a submission was
L8		prepared before the Lord Advocate on the learning and
L 9		the outcomes of Lady Eilish's report to inform what we
20		were doing in the investigation into Mr Bayoh's death.
21	Q.	If we can look at the next paragraph, please:
22		"The recommendations of relevance to the Bayoh
23		Inquiry in the Angiolini report included restraint,
24		mental health of suspects, training for police officers,
25		and separation to prevent conferral. There were also

comments about the disproportionate response by police to suspects who are of black and minority ethnic background, where it was documented that restraint tends to last for longer, there is less attempt to deescalate through nonphysical means et cetera."

So in this particular report concerns were raised about the disproportionate response to suspects who were black or of minority ethnic background and that disproportionate response can include less by way of attempts to deescalate through nonphysical means.

I wonder if we can hold that thought and look also at paragraph 40 of your statement where you comment on your own experience of the use of force by officers in other cases. It's that bottom paragraph, thank you.

You say here:

"My experience from countersigning CAAPD cases was that often officers were very quick to deploy methods in accordance with their training which could be viewed as exacerbating the situation, such as drawing batons, deploying CS spray, tasers, et cetera, rather than trying to engage with individuals to try and calm them down and avoid direct confrontation. My email [and clearly in the underlying question you have been referred to an email] simply reflected my concern at that time that such training might not be possible and

1 my concern that the default setting of many police officers confronted with a potentially dangerous 2 3 situation, both to themselves and the wider public, 4 would be to draw some sort of weapon to deal with and 5 try to contain the situation, particularly in what I have described as a collapsing timeframe." 6 7 So Lady Angiolini expressed concerns around less in the way of attempts to deescalate where a suspect is of 8 a black or minority background. You talk here about 9 10 your own experience of officers being quick to use methods that could be seen to exacerbate the situation, 11 12 rather than trying to engage to calm things down and 13 avoid direct confrontation. 14 Now, are you talking here about your experience of 15 officers behaving in this particular way in general or with reference or in the context to -- or black and 16 ethnic minority suspects? 17 18 No, that's in general from my experience of dealing with Α. 19 CAAPD cases. There were a number that I saw where the 20 initial response was to draw a weapon or deploy CS spray 21 or in one case release a police dog, for example, and 22 there was significant injury to the victim, so that wasn't in the context of black and minority ethnic 23 individuals, that was just in general. 24

Q. Given that the concerns that you had were general rather

25

- 1 than specific to black and ethnic minority suspects, did you anticipate that the CAAPD team might consider as 2 3 part of their investigation and analysis of the evidence 4 whether the officers who engaged with Mr Bayoh had used 5 batons and sprays in other comparable situations or relatively comparable situations involving white
- 6 7 suspects?
- 8 Yes, that would be the normal course of an investigation Α. 9 in CAAPD. You would look at an officer's training 10 record. You would also look at any allegations of use of excessive force, for example, so you would have that 11 12 material as a matter of course.
- 13 Okay. We've heard that use of force forms routinely Q. 14 required to be completed, also use of spray forms?
- 15 Α. Yes.
- Would you have anticipated that those sorts of forms 16 Q. 17 might have been gathered such that the person considering them might look to discern a pattern, if 18 19 there were a pattern apparent from the use of batons or 20 sprays on other occasions?
- 21 Α. Yes, those forms are supposed to be completed if a 22 weapon is drawn, if force is used, or if is CS or PAVA spray is deployed. 23
- Again, given concerns expressed here and in 24 Q. 25 Lady Angiolini's report about excessive use of force,

- 1 would you have had an expectation that CAAPD would have
- 2 examined the tactical options that were open to the
- officers and, in particular, those first on the scene?
- 4 A. Yes, that would be not only analysing what they said
- 5 they did, but also what their training was in terms of
- 6 their range of options and which one to -- which one to
- 7 use.
- 8 Q. And insofar as their training might have indicated a
- 9 requirement for a preclusion, that is to say a lesser
- 10 force option should have been tried and failed or
- 11 otherwise discounted as inappropriate, would you have
- 12 expected there to have been an examination of what
- lesser force options were potentially available to the
- officers and then a consideration as to the
- 15 reasonableness or otherwise of the option that they
- selected?
- 17 A. Yes.
- 18 Q. Would you have expected there to have been a
- 19 consideration of the officers' readiness to use force
- and the speed at which events unfolded?
- 21 A. Yes, perhaps with the assistance of an expert in that --
- in that field, officer safety training, and the range of
- 23 option officers could deploy and should deploy depending
- on the circumstances.
- 25 Q. I wonder if we can look at the bottom of paragraph 73,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

please. Now, there are two paragraphs that have been numbered 73 I think in error and then we jump to 75, so the one above that is actually 74, so if we could scroll up a little more. There we are. It's the paragraph that beginnings "Similarly in the course of the investigation". Thank you, if we could look at this, please. You say that:

"In the course of the investigation into Mr Bayoh's death we were keen to learn from CPS colleagues about their experience of investigating deaths in police custody and restraint deaths in particular. We wanted to discuss how they dealt with such cases and what expert evidence they obtained. We had a particular interest in the review of the no proceedings marking in the Sean Rigg case. We were looking to confirm how CPS reach assessment of criminal threshold in relation to deaths during restraint process; ascertain what expert evidence was crucial; understand how they evaluate recorded footage; understand their method of instruction of restraint experts and how they evaluate opinion; confirm how they evaluate the adequacy of training given to officers. We were looking for reassurance that we were not missing anything obvious and that the way we were proceeding was broadly consistent with CPS practice, subject of course to the jurisdictional

1 differences. We were provided with senior CPS contacts with whom the CAAPD team could discuss preparation of 2 3 the final reports in the investigation into Mr Bayoh's 4 death." 5 Now, can you tell me when you had this opportunity to make contact with colleagues of the CPS? 6 7 It was an ongoing series of discussions following Α. 8 Mr Bayoh's death. We had regular meetings or I 9 certainly I did with my CPS counterparts in the Special 10 Crime and Counterterrorism Division, but I think the specific issues were around trying to identify expert 11 12 witnesses and that was around late 2016, early 2017, 13 from memory. Was anyone involved in these discussions other than 14 Q. 15 yourself? No, I don't think so. Perhaps Mr Brown and I certainly 16 17 got the detail of the colleague from the CPS was passed to Mr Brown so he and I think Crown Counsel could speak 18 to that, that CPS contact. So Mr Brown and I discussed 19 20 really what we were looking for from CPS colleagues to 21 assist and then I made contact and asked the questions. Q. And were the answers that you received fed back into the 22 23 CAAPD team? 24 Α. Yes, I passed what I got from the CPS team directly to 25 Mr Brown.

Q. If we can scroll further down this page, please. Again, it's paragraph 73. It is actually 74. There is a discussion about meetings -- if we can stop there, please -- with Deborah Coles, and in the first paragraph there you recall there being three meetings at which she was present, you have notes from two of them and your give an explanation elsewhere as to why you didn't note the first meeting, your notepad having been locked away. You say:

"I recall being introduced to her at Mr Anwar's offices with Mr Brown around July 2015 where her role as an advisor to the family was set out."

And you explain in the next paragraph that the next meeting you noted was 15 October with the Lord Advocate and Mr Anwar:

"Ms Coals advised us at that time of Dame Elish
Angiolini's appointment by the Home Secretary to chair
the review of deaths in custody. She also advised of
the role of Dame Anne Owers as chair of the Independent
Police Commission who had come from a human rights
inspectorate of prisons background [scroll down] and set
out what she saw as failures in police investigations
not capturing evidence in the golden hours, stopping
collaboration of officers, treating them as suspects
until proved otherwise. These points were taken into

account in the crown investigation." 1 2 How were these matters taken into account in the crown investigation? 3 The matters that Ms Coles had raised? 4 Α. 5 If that's what you're referring to. Q. Yes, that's what I was referring to. The discussions 6 Α. 7 that we had with Ms Coles were incredibly informative 8 and assisted our thinking as the investigation 9 progressed. So when I say these points were taken into 10 account, they were certainly noted by me and by Mr Brown and we discussed these issues often as our investigation 11 12 progressed. 13 Q. You said earlier in your evidence, in the context of the 14 discussion we had about with the benefit of hindsight 15 might external expertise been brought in to assist the team, you said if Deborah Coles hadn't been advising the 16 17 family then she was the sort of person you might have had had in mind -- sorry -- I'm paraphrasing because 18 19 I don't have access to the realtime transcript at the 20 moment. 21 Did you consider -- just so I can be clear in my 22 mind, did you consider back in 2015 the possibility of engaging her and discount that because of her role in 23 advising the family or is it just now with the benefit 24 25 of the hindsight that you're recognising that perhaps

- she would have been a good person to have brought on board, albeit there may still have been an obstacle to get around if she was advising the family?
 - A. It's with the benefit of hindsight and knowing the expertise that she has and how helpful she was in discussions about raising issues she thought the crown should take cognisance of.
 - Q. Okay. We've already identified that in the letter of 2 September, the three specific lines of inquiry relating to race were lines of investigation that had been suggested by the family, and we've also heard evidence that the family and their legal team suggested the names of a number of experts to the crown and to PIRC and the reports were in the fullness of time commissioned.

I think you're perhaps suggesting that Ms Coles acting as a representative of the family was a potential obstacle to the crown drawing on her expertise and I'm just wondering if I could invite you to reflect on that and I wonder whether it's an obstacle. I appreciate this is all with the benefit of hindsight and it didn't occur to you at the time to look to engage her or have an ongoing dialogue with Deborah Coles, but I'm wondering whether it might have been possible to work around the fact that she was providing advice and

- representation to the family and if that really would
 have been an obstacle to the Crown Office perhaps having
- 3 the benefit of her expertise and drawing on that
- 4 expertise in their own investigation?
- 5 A. I hadn't thought about it until you raised it. I don't
- 6 think necessarily the fact that she was assisting the
- family would be an obstacle. Obviously in terms of
- 8 Article 2 we have a responsibility to take into account
- 9 the views of the family and any -- any suggestions
- 10 within reason that they might provide in the context of
- an investigation. On one view there's no reason why we
- 12 couldn't have asked Ms Coles to assist further.
- Q. Okay. And Ms Coles made you aware that Lady Eilish had
- been appointed to review the deaths in custody. Was any
- 15 consideration given to perhaps making contact with
- 16 Lady Eilish and looking to drawing on her experience as
- her own investigation progressed?
- 18 A. No, not at that time, albeit she had contacted the crown
- 19 to advise us that her report was due to be published and
- she thought that there were findings within it that
- 21 would be of assistance to us in our investigation.
- Q. Deborah Coles also mentioned Dame Anne Owers as Chair of
- 23 the IPCC, was any consideration given to making contact
- 24 with her?
- 25 A. Not that I'm aware of and certainly not by me.

1	Q.	And again, with the benefit of hindsight, might there
2		have been a benefit to the crown investigation in making
3		contact with Lady Elish or perhaps Dame Anne Owers?
4	Α.	Yes.
5	Q.	I want to turn now to look at the analysis or the
6		approach that was taken by the CAAPD team to the
7		analysis of the evidence. We don't need to look at the
8		analysis chapter in the precognition itself. I won't be
9		bringing it up on the screen. As you are aware, this
10		was prepared by Fiona Carnan and there is no
11		consideration of race set out in the analysis chapter of
12		the precognition at all.
13		She was asked about her approach to race in her
14		written statement and in her evidence and I would like
15		to invite your comment on the approach that she took.
16		So I wonder if we can bring up her Inquiry statement.
17		It is SBPI 00379, paragraph 45, please. So she was
18		asked:
19		"To what extent was race a factor in your analysis
20		of the actions of the police officers? In your view was
21		this sufficient to inform Crown Counsel of the impact,
22		if any, that Mr Bayoh's race had on the actions of the
23		police officers who engaged him?"
24		She said:
25		"I was concerned with considering whether the

25

1 actions of any of the officers, either individually or collectively, amounted to criminality. My focus was on 2 3 the actions of the officers during the period of their engagement with the deceased and the evidence of how 4 they conducted themselves thereafter. I did not 5 identify criminality on the part of any officers 6 7 involved. Had I identified criminality, it would then 8 have been part of my analysis in respect of criminality 9 to consider whether the conduct was racially aggravated under section 50A(1)(b) of the Criminal Law 10 (Consolidation) (Scotland) Act 1995 or whether race was 11 12 a motivating factor that would amount to an aggravation of the conduct of the accused officers in terms of 13 14 section 96(2) of that Act." 15 And if we can read this in conjunction with paragraph 38, please, where she expands on the approach 16 17 that she took. She explains here: "I was not involved in gathering evidence about 18 race. If my analysis of evidence had established that 19 20 there was sufficient evidence to support criminal 21 charges against any of the officers, the question of any racial motivation or intention would have been addressed 22 at that stage. Since the analysis of evidence did not 23 identify criminality by any officer, the question of 24

racial aggravation did not arise since no offence had

1		been identified."
2		In her oral evidence she was taken to both of these
3		paragraphs and asked:
4		"Am I right to understand this was essentially a
5		two-stage process. You would look for evidence of
6		criminality first."
7		And she said:
8		"Yes.
9		"And if you found criminality, evidence of
LO		criminality, if and only if you found evidence of
L1		criminality, then you would go looking for evidence of a
L2		racial aggravation or motivation for that criminality."
L3		And she replied "That's right" and I asked her "Does
L 4		that fairly set out the approach that you took?" and she
L5		said "yes".
L 6		Can I invite your comment on the approach that was
L7		taken by Ms Carnan and how it fits with your
L8		expectations of the approach that she would have taken?
L 9	Α.	That's not how I would have expected the approach to be.
20		I would have expected the approach to be overall
21		consideration of the officers' actings before, during
22		and after the incident and, as I talked about before,
23		their general training and background in the police
24		force. I don't I think it's too prescriptive and too
25		restrictive an approach if we are considering the issue

1 of race as a whole in this investigation. Okay. So you anticipated that she would explore the 2 Q. 3 issue of race as part of the overall exercise of 4 examining criminality? 5 Α. Yes. Q. Can we look at Fiona Carnan's second statement, please, 6 7 SBPI 00462 paragraph 8. It's quite a short paragraph 8 and it might not be immediately available so I'll simply read it out to you. 9 10 She had been asked about the racial tropes and negative stereotypes and it was drawn to her attention 11 12 that there weren't any references to them in her 13 analysis and she said: 14 "I've made no reference in my analysis of evidence 15 to the use of racial tropes or negative stereotypes being used by any of the response officers in their 16 17 statements. However, it's unlikely that I would have done so since the use of racial tropes is not criminal. 18 Evidence about negative attitudes of officers to 19 20 Mr Bayoh's race would not be relevant to the analysis 21 unless criminality was identified." 22 Do you have any concerns about that approach? A. I can understand where she's coming from. She was 23 looking at it in the context of a criminal investigation 24 and, as she says, to have those thoughts or even certain 25

```
1
             circumstances to voice them is not necessarily criminal,
             but I think when you're looking at the engagement with
 2
 3
             and detention of a black man by police officers in
 4
             public, there is a wider set of considerations and that
 5
             would involve looking at issues such as tropes or
             stereotypes. Bearing in mind that while the
 6
 7
             precognition she was preparing was for Crown Counsel to
 8
             take a decision on whether or not criminal proceedings
 9
             were appropriate, at the very least, as we've talked
10
             about before, there was to be a fatal accident inquiry
             and much of the information in gathered in the course of
11
12
             a criminal investigation can be relevant for the
13
             purposes of an inquiry into the circumstances of a death
14
             if there were to be no criminal proceedings so I would
15
             have expected there to be an assessment of those aspects
             in the course of the precognition, even if they weren't
16
17
             directly relevant to the issue of criminality.
18
             Thank you. Can you bear with me just one moment,
         Q.
19
             please.
20
                 Sir, I am about to move on to a new chapter. I
             wonder if that might be a convenient point to break.
21
22
         LORD BRACADALE: We'll take a 20 minute break at this stage.
23
         (11.28 am)
24
                                (A short break)
         (11.56 am)
25
```

1	LORD BRACADALE: Ms Thomson.
2	MS THOMSON: Thank you. Ms Miller, before the break we were
3	discussing the approach that Fiona Carnan took to her
4	analysis of the evidence and the preparation of the
5	analysis chapter in the precognition and I would like to
6	continue with that theme. So we have spoken about
7	racial tropes and stereotypes. I would like to move on
8	to evidence relating to terrorism and threat levels.
9	There was evidence available to Ms Carnan that some of
10	the officers were concerned that they were attending a
11	terrorist incident, some made reference to an increase
12	in the threat level to severe and Ms Carnan explained in
13	her evidence that she had fact checked that and she had
14	confirmed that there had indeed been an increase in the
15	threat level to severe.
16	Now, the first on the scene were Constables Walker
17	and Paton and of course their statements were available
18	to her. Constable Walker said in his statement:
19	"It did cross my mind that he was doing this to get
20	the police there bearing in mind we're on a severe
21	threat level for an attack on the police."
22	And Ms Carnan agreed that the severe threat level
23	referred to by Constable Walker related to the threat of
24	a terrorist attack on the police specifically.
25	Constable Paton said in his statement:

1	"It also ran through my mind that this male could be
2	part of a terrorist plot."
3	And later in his statement, at a point in time where
4	he had been incapacitated by his own spray, he described
5	"thinking about the Lee Rigby boy, the soldier who was
6	killed."
7	So Ms Carnan was reminded of what Constables Walker
8	and Paton had said in their statements and then she was
9	asked:
LO	"As part of the process that you went through in
11	your analysis and in ensuring Article 2 and 14
L2	compliance, did you consider why the possibility of
L3	terrorism crossed their minds."
L 4	And she said:
15	"I asked the question, although I think it had
16	already been answered, why they had considered
L7	terrorism, because they had a briefing, they had two
18	briefings in the early months of 2015."
19	She was asked:
20	"Did you consider whether they would have thought
21	about terrorism if Mr Bayoh had been white?
22	"No.
23	"Did you consider whether they thought about
24	terrorism every time they went to a knife call?
25	"No.

1		"And did you consider why Constable Paton thought
2		about Lee Rigby in particular?
3		"I simply noted his position.
4		"You didn't give thought as to why they thought
5		about Lee Rigby?
6		"No, I didn't interpret it as being influenced by
7		his race.
8		"Did you consider whether Constable Paton would have
9		been thinking about Lee Rigby if Sheku Bayoh had been
10		white?
11		"I can't ask that question.
12		"Did you consider whether there was evidence from
13		which the inference could be brawn that the colour of
14		Mr Bayoh's skin was relevant to their concern that the
15		incident was relating to terrorism?
16		"I did not make that assessment."
17		Can I invite your comment on that chapter of her
18		evidence and how that fitted with your expectations as
19		to the approach that would have been taken within CAAPD?
20	A.	I don't want to be overly critical, but I would have
21		expected a different approach. It was certainly very
22		clear to me on the basis of the evidence that I had seen
23		and just general experience, life experience, that it is
24		unlikely had Mr Bayoh been white that the police
25		officers would have had those thoughts.

1 The initial terrorism threat increase was I think 2 the January of that year and we had been involved in disseminating information to our own staff where there 3 4 were shared premises with police officers because of 5 that threat, but I think it is obvious to many people that if somebody is of black or minority ethnic descent, 6 7 the use of the word "terrorist" in relation to them can 8 be used as a racial slur and, in my view, it should have 9 been taken into account both in terms of the analysis 10 prepared by Ms Carnan and the consideration by Crown Counsel as part of that overall decision-making. 11 12 Q. When he gave evidence Mr McGowan was also asked to 13 comment on the passage that I have heard to you and he 14 said: 15 "So that information about the terrorist incident that was available at a very early point in the case and 16 17 I recall that. My own view is it would have been 18 relevant to ask why it was they thought it was terrorism and to consider whether Mr Bayoh's race had anything to 19 20 do with that and whether or not had Mr Bayoh been white, 21 they would have wondered the same thing. That's a relevant question." 22 And he was asked: 23 24 "Where might an analyst have looked to find the answers to those questions?" 25

1		And he said:
2		"In the evidence as a totality."
3		I see you nodding.
4	Α.	Yes.
5	Q.	Is there anything in that that you would disagree with?
6	A.	No, I think Mr McGowan and I agree. From what you have
7		read of his evidence, we're in agreement on that.
8	Q.	There was also evidence available to Ms Carnan that
9		Constable Good also thought about Lee Rigby. She said
10		in her statement:
11		"I was also thinking at point of the Lee Rigby
12		incident in London, mainly due to the fact of the
13		coloured male and the potential terrorist connotations.
14		So leaving to one side the issue of the phrase
15		"coloured male", she clearly made a link between the
16		colour of Mr Bayoh's skin and potential terrorist
17		connotations and Ms Carnan was asked when she gave
18		evidence here before the Inquiry:
19		"Did her statement not perhaps cause you to wonder
20		whether others who also thought about terrorism and
21		Lee Rigby had done so because of the colour of
22		Mr Bayoh's skin?"
23		And she said:
24		"I have to say, no, it didn't."
25		Does that concern you?

Yes, it is to me indicative of at least unconscious bias 1 on the part of the police officer. 2 3 Q. Yes. She was asked did she consider whether the link that Constable Good made between the colour of 4 5 Mr Bayoh's skin and potential terrorist connotations was reasonable or whether it could be indicative of racial 6 7 stereotyping and she said: "I considered it was not unreasonable given the 8 9 briefings. 10 "Was it indicative of racial stereotyping? "Possibly." 11 12 She was asked: 13 "Are you saying that now with the benefit of time to 14 reflect or did you think that at the time?" 15 And she said: 16 "I don't think I thought it at the time. 17 "Even though she said in terms that she had made a link between the colour of his skin and terrorism? 18 19 "Yes. 20 "At the time you didn't think of that as racial 21 stereotyping? With the benefit of hindsight and reflection, your evidence today is that it could be 22 indicative of racial stereotyping? 23 24 "Yes. 25 "And if it had occurred to you at the time or if you

1		had thought about it that way at the time, is it
2		something that you might have included in the analysis?
3		"It's possible, yes."
4		Can I invite you comment on what she said in her
5		evidence?
6	Α.	I think that it is something that should have been
7		included in the analysis and she's obviously reflected
8		that with the benefit of hindsight. I don't think
9		necessarily that it would have made any difference in
LO		relation to the consideration of criminality, but it is
L1		something that should have been within that document for
12		the consideration of Crown Counsel.
13		I don't know, however, whether Crown Counsel and
L 4		Ms Carnan discussed that separately in terms of what was
L5		or was not within the analysis.
L 6	Q.	So Constable Good made a link between the colour of
L7		Mr Bayoh's skin and potential terrorist connotations and
L8		you said that to your mind that was indicative of
19		unconscious bias at least and then you clarified that
20		you were referring to unconscious bias on the part of
21		Constable Good, not on the part I assume of Ms Carnan.
22		Can we perhaps just explore that. Mrs Carnan didn't
23		think about it at all. She didn't consider
24		the possibility of unconscious bias in what Constable
25		Good said. She didn't consider at the time whether her

1		language was indicative of racial stereotyping. Do you
2		have any view to offer as to whether that could be
3		indicative of unconscious bias on the part of Ms Carnan
4		herself?
5	A.	I think I would have to say potentially, yes.
6	Q.	I also asked Ms Carnan in her evidence about the
7		language that was used more generally in the officer's
8		statements and, again, I would like to read to you a
9		chapter. I'm sorry the transcripts don't come up on the
10		screen, but I'm just reading from the transcript of the
11		evidence that's available to me:
12		"I'm sure you'll be aware of racist stereotypes in
13		society that black men are more violent, unpredictable,
14		aggressive. You will have come across those stereotypes
15		I would imagine.
16		"I have.
17		"And did you examine the officers' statements for
18		language of that sort?
19		"No.
20		"Did you consider patterns of behaviour whether, for
21		example, they had used their sprays or drawn their
22		batons at previous knife incidents?
23		"No, I was simply concerned with this incident.
24		"Did you consider whether they treated all knife
25		calls as potentially terrorist related.

1	"No, that wasn't a question I asked.
2	"Did you consider looking for comparator evidence,
3	for example, looking at Walker, Paton or Tomlinson's
4	history of use of spray or Tomlinson's history of use of
5	force involving a baton with a view to establishing
6	whether those officers had ever used sprays or batons
7	before?
8	"No.
9	"Or whether they had used sprays or batons when
10	detaining a white suspect?
11	"No.
12	"Did you consider whether the speed with which the
13	officers elected to use force against Mr Bayoh was
14	because he was black?
15	"That wasn't my understanding. I think I have
16	explained in one of the answers my understanding of
17	their perception was based on a whole lot more than the
18	colour of his skin.
19	"Okay. Did you consider whether Constable Walker
20	and Constable Paton's decision to opt for a hard stop
21	may have been influenced by Mr Bayoh's race?
22	"Again, we didn't cross the threshold into
23	criminality, so that wasn't a consideration per se.
24	"So you have explained you took a two stage process.
25	You look forward evidence of criminality. You didn't

1		find it so you didn't get past first base essentially?
2		"Yes.
3		"And it would only have been if you found evidence
4		of criminality that you would have scrutinised the
5		evidence for the evidence that might allow you to draw
6		an inference from racial aggravation?
7		"Yes."
8		So she was candid that these questions simply
9		weren't asked. Do you have any comment or concern to
10		express in relation to that passage of her evidence?
11	A.	I think it is too prescriptive an approach. It's clear
12		from what you've read to me that she was focusing solely
13		on the actings of the officers in relation to
14		establishing whether or not there was evidence of
15		criminality, but it was clear from certainly my
16		understanding of what the Lord Advocate wanted and the
17		discussions more generally about this investigation, and
18		particularly what the family had asked for, that we
19		should be examining the issue of race and the approach
20		of the officers to Mr Bayoh because of his race.
21	Q.	Again, this passage was put to Mr McGowan when he gave
22		evidence and he said:
23		"They're all relevant questions so I've referred to
24		looking at the totality of the evidence. Those would be
25		questions that you would asked and the answers to those

25

1 questions would be part of the totality which I would expect her to look at, all relevant questions." 2 3 Again, you're nodding your agreement. 4 Α. I don't disagree with anything there. 5 So with hindsight, do you consider that the crown Q. explored the issue of race appropriately? 6 7 I'm conscious Ms Carnan wasn't involved from the Α. 8 beginning of the investigation and was preparing an 9 analysis based on the work of others and I'm also 10 conscious that I didn't ask her directly and a lot of her thinking is what you've discussed with me this 11 12 morning, but it's clear if that was her thinking then 13 certainly it wasn't in her mind as she was preparing the analysis of the evidence, which I think is a gap in the 14 15 crown's investigation. Having said that, there were others who had been 16 17 involved, were aware of the issues that we were focusing on and what we had asked the PIRC to focus on and 18 overall the report was being prepared for the 19 20 consideration and decision-making of Crown Counsel so 21 there were other opportunities not just within that 22 document for these issues to be explored. Thank you. And again, with the benefit of hindsight, do 23 Q. 24 you consider that all reasonable steps were taken to

unmask any racist motive by the crown?

1	Α.	I think on the basis of Ms Carnan's evidence, no.
2	Q.	I would like to move away from Ms Carnan's analysis of
3		the evidence to look at what has been called an
4		incremental process or a linear process. Ms Carnan made
5		clear in her evidence that it was no part of her remit
6		from Mr Brown to consider whether there were grounds for
7		an FAI. Her role was restricted to an analysis of the
8		evidence in respect of any potential criminality by the
9		police.
10		Now, Mr Brown was asked about this and I wonder if
11		we can bring up his Inquiry statement SBPI 00419, and if
12		we can turn to paragraph 105. So here he references an
13		incremental strategy approved by the Lord Advocate and
14		he says:
15		"A key element of that strategy was to resolve the
16		issue of potential criminality and to get to a point
17		where Crown Counsel could take a decision in this regard
18		with the necessary confidence thus permitting the
19		investigation to move forward to other areas in
20		anticipation in an inquiry whose forum had yet to be
21		determined."
22		And if he look to the next paragraph, please:
23		"The precognition that was requested by

Crown Counsel was created for the limited purpose of

enabling Crown Counsel to take a decision on potential

24

25

69

1		criminality but was not intended to be the end of the
2		investigative process by the Crown, particularly in
3		relation to race and implicit bias and further detailed
4		inquiry would likely have been undertaken had an FAI
5		been instructed. This would in my opinion have been
6		highly likely to have required precognition of the
7		police officers involved, where their approach to the
8		incident would have been probed, scrutinised and
9		evaluated."
10		Was it your understanding at the time that this
11		incremental process was being followed?
12	Α.	Yes, that was that was the process at the time where
13		the criminal investigation took place and thereafter
14		preparation for a fatal action inquiry or similar
15		inquiry followed. That's not the now because we have
16		realised that that adds in significant delay in relation
17		to the preparation for proceedings and we deal with
18		those more in tandem and in parallel now, but at the
19		time it was the criminal investigation first, followed
20		by fatality investigation.
21	Q.	You talk about this in paragraph 32 of your statement
22		and I wonder if we could bring that up. Third paragraph
23		down:
24		"If an individual has died in police custody or
25		following contact with the police, then the first aspect

of the investigation is likely to establish whether there is any criminality linked to the individual's death. Following that, further work we do not require to be carried out by the crown because it is mandatory for there to be an FAI in those circumstances. It is not therefore unusual for there to be a precognition prepared for Crown Counsel setting out the nature of the investigation, the narrative of the facts as known and recommendations based on those findings when there are no reasonable grounds to suspect particular individuals as that precognition would thereafter be of assistance in preparation for of any FAI."

So that's much the same as what you said in evidence

So that's much the same as what you said in evidence today that this is the approach that was taken in 2015.

Mr McGowan referred to it as a "linear approach" when he gave his evidence.

So you understood that was what would happen, although you say and we've heard already from Mr McGowan that procedures have since changed and that the broader aspects of an investigation that might be relevant to an FAI, which are perhaps not directly relevant to criminality, are considered and investigated in parallel or in tandem.

We heard from Mr McGowan that SFIU health and safety and the custody deaths team now take the parallel

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- approach. He thought it was perhaps too early to say
 whether there were any visible benefits or obvious
 benefits from that approach. Aside from dealing with
 the issue of the built-in delay to the two stage
 process, do you see there being any benefit from this
 parallel approach over the linear or incremental
 process?
- 8 A. Other than addressing some of the delays, I think that 9 there would be sharing of information and subject matter expertise across those teams and actually some of the 10 11 teams have members of staff from all three of those 12 units working on cases. So I think it allows the 13 investigation to have the picture of a whole of the 14 circumstances and looking at both criminality and if 15 that is ruled out, then preparation for an inquiry can be a lot -- a lot more expeditious. 16
 - Q. Now John Logue appeared to be unaware this approach was taken in this particular case. Again, I would like to read you just an extract from the transcript of this evidence and then invite your comment. He said that what he would expect to happen is that an investigation would identify a number of issues which needed to be considered and he said:

"It was clear to all of us who were involved in the initial days that the question of criminality was an

immediate or obvious issue which would need to be explored in the investigation and in simple terms was an immediate priority. There may be wider issues which relate to broader learning which could come out of a fatal action inquiry or inquiry of this nature, but the priority would be to reach a decision on the criminal aspect as quickly as possible.

"I would not expect that that would mean that those individual elements would be isolate off from each other and dealt with one at a time. The investigation I would expect would have had an understanding of all of them and be trying to make progress on all of them at the same time as perhaps identifying particular priorities. I'm not aware of an investigation where we would take a compartmentalised approach and say we're only going to looking at this and we're not going to look at anything else until we finished looking at this.

"I think our approach as much as possible is to progress the whole investigation. One of the challenges we found in recent years has been that with creating the specialist units we may find ourselves with an investigation where perhaps more than one team is involved and therefore there needs to be coordination.

We've learned that you may be need to progress parallel investigation in two separate teams at the same time,

rather than allowing one team to reach a conclusion
before the other team then takes over. That simply
builds delay into the process. So for example you
wouldn't want a team looking at a criminal investigation
and no one else dealing with the broader aspects that I
have referred to until the team is finished. You would
try to make sure there was sharing of information and
progress on all aspects at the same time."

So it seems that Mr Logue anticipated the parallel approach being taken was perhaps unaware that an incremental approach had been taken, but certainly what he describes there appears to be the type of approach that we've heard from you and from Mr McGowan is followed nowadays?

A. Yes, that's right. From about 2017 or 2018 onwards, we began to convene case management panels, which I think I have referred to in my statement, and that was looking to identify the range of issues for which we would be seeking Crown Counsel's instructions or direction and that would cover both when there are fatalities the criminal investigation and aspects arising out of the -- aspects which might arise out of a fatal accident inquiry. I think what Mr Logue is describing is the position as it has been over the last few years, but it is not what the position was at the time of the

- 1 investigations into Mr Bayoh's death.
- 2 Q. Okay. So certainly the way things are done now is that
- 3 the criminal investigation and the broader issues
- 4 relevant to an FAI will be investigated and progressed
- 5 in parallel. That avoids delay and it allows both parts
- of the investigation to make progress --
- 7 A. Yes.
- 8 Q. -- at the same time?
- 9 A. That's right.
- 10 Q. Okay. And as you said earlier in your evidence before
- 11 we had the break, you said:
- "When you're looking at the engagement with and
- detention of a black man by police officers in public,
- 14 there's a wider set of considerations and that would
- involve looking at issues such as tropes or stereotypes,
- bearing in mind that while the precognition was for
- 17 Crown Counsel to take a decision whether or not criminal
- proceedings were appropriate, at the very least we have
- 19 talked about there was going to be an FAI and much of
- 20 the information being gathered in the course of a
- 21 criminal investigation can be relevant for the purpose
- 22 of an inquiry into the circumstances of a death if there
- 23 were to be no criminal proceedings. So I would have
- 24 expected there to be an assessment of those aspects in
- 25 the course of the precognition, even if they weren't

directly relevant to criminality."

So you acknowledge that there may be an element of overlap between a criminal investigation and the broader aspects that might be relevant to an FAI and I suppose in case of this type overlapping areas of interest might include what happened and, in particular, the actions of the officers as well as cause of death, use of force and race?

A. Yes, all those.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

25

10 Q. Okay. When Mr Logue gave his evidence he was asked a series of questions by the Chair. Even though an 11 12 incremental approach was taken in this case, Mr Logue 13 agreed with the Chair you could not consider the 14 question of criminality without also considering the 15 question of race. He said would have expected CAAPD to investigate race as part of their exercise of 16 17 investigating criminality. He said you would have to look at race in order to ascertain whether there was any 18 evidence that did have a bearing on criminality relating 19 20 to race, that he would see that as part of a thorough 21 investigation of the kind that would inspire confidence 22 in the family.

Is there anything in that chapter from Mr Logue's dialogue with the Chair that you would disagree with?

A. No, I don't disagree with that.

25

1 Q. With your ongoing responsibility for CAAPD and even after 2016 when your role changed your continuing 2 3 oversight of the crown investigation, did you read the 4 narrative and the analysis that were sent to Crown Counsel? 5 6 I did sometime after it was submitted to Crown Counsel, Α. 7 yes. 8 Okay. So you didn't see it before it was submitted to Q. 9 Crown Counsel? 10 Α. I don't recall, no. Okay. And in the course of your evidence today and the 11 Q. 12 discussion we have had today, you've identified or have 13 agreed with me perhaps that there are a number of 14 deficiences in the way that the analysis was approached, 15 were they apparent to you when you read the narrative 16 and analysis? No, not necessarily. I -- again, I was looking at it 17 Α. through the lens of identification of criminality. 18 I think it was almost unsaid by that stage that the 19 20 crown -- that race was still an issue that we could have 21 and should have been looking at. Whether it should have 22 been contained in the analysis, I think we have discussed today that, yes, it should have been. I don't 23 think necessarily it would have impeded Crown Counsel's 24

decision-making, because of the purpose for which the

- precognition was prepared, but that's not to say it

 shouldn't have been perhaps more prominent or it

 shouldn't have been prominent within the narrative and

 the analysis.
 - Q. And we've heard from a number of witnesses that the purpose of this precognition was to assist Crown Counsel in taking a decision?
- 8 A. Yes, that's right.
 - Q. And I think you've agreed with me too that the question of criminality cannot be entirely divorced from the question of race and that to look at criminality thoroughly you must also consider the question of race?
- 13 A. Yes.

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

- Q. And I'm wondering to what extent the precognition served its purpose, even if its purpose was a limited one, in assisting Crown Counsel given there is no analysis of race whatsoever in the analysis section?
- It would have assisted to an extent. I'm also conscious 18 Α. that in cases like this where you have allocated 19 20 Crown Counsel that they will often be responsible for 21 directing or instructing particular lines of inquiry in 22 the course of that preparation. As I have said, I think 23 it is a gap in the investigative process by the crown, but just as the PIRC report wasn't the end of the line 24 25 for any investigation by a law enforcement agency, the

- submission of the precognition is not the end of the
 line for the crown's investigation and if there were
 particular issues that Crown Counsel wished to be
 addressed before taking a decision, then it was open to
 Crown Counsel to instruct that and certainly I'm
 conscious in relation to certain aspects of the
 investigation that was done.
- 8 Q. Okay.

19

20

21

22

- So from that perspective it is a gap and there were a 9 10 number of other issues which the Crown Counsel wished the case team to a focus on. I'm not sure if that 11 12 necessarily answers your question, but I think to the 13 extent it was a narrow set of circumstances looking at 14 criminality, it was certainly a step in the right 15 detection. It wasn't as I would have expect to see it because it didn't contain, as you say, the analysis of 16 17 the race, but that was something which could have been 18 explored further.
 - Q. So should we understand that it was effectively left to Crown Counsel to advise the team if she wished any further consideration to be given to the question of race?
- A. I think that's almost placing Crown Counsel in that
 difficult position because there were these gaps, as I
 have talked about, but that was one option. If she felt

1 it was required, she could have -- she could have asked for further work to be done. I'm also conscious she had 2 3 from early days had access to a lot of the material in 4 the case, separate obviously from the narrative and the 5 analysis and I was in discussion, regular discussion, with Mr Brown and the team, so I wouldn't want to say it 6 7 was ultimately Crown Counsel's responsibility. The 8 responsibility sat with the case team in the preparation of the precognition to identify these factors. 9 10 Q. Of course, I didn't mean to suggest that --11 No, no. Α. 12 -- the responsibility necessarily sat with Q. 13 Crown Counsel, but I suppose for Crown Counsel to 14 instruct further inquiries in relation to race, that 15 would require Crown Counsel to recognise that these issues had not been addressed --16 17 Α. Yes. 18 -- in the narrative or analysis? Q. 19 Yes. Α. And you yourself as a highly experienced prosecutor, you 20 Q. 21 have been in position now for 30 years, have given a 22 very candid evidence that even when you read the 23 narrative and the analysis, there wasn't a red flag that 24 these were issues that hadn't been addressed at the time 25 that you read it?

25

1 Α. That's correct. 2 Can you bear with me a second, please. Q. 3 Just one final matter, please, Ms Miller. You had 4 the opportunity to read the precognition, including the 5 analysis, and I appreciate that your evidence, your very candid evidence, is that when you read it you didn't 6 7 identify what you now consider to be deficiencies 8 because your focus was very much on criminality and you were reading the precognition through that particular 9 10 lens. If you had identified that the issue of race hadn't 11 12 been thoroughly explored and it hadn't been explored at 13 all on the face of the analysis, would there have been 14 an opportunity for you to have raised that either with 15 the CAAPD team and/or with Crown Counsel to ensure that that investigation was adequately progressed? 16 A. Yes, it's certainly in my role at that time as deputy 17 Crown Agent for serious case work it was not unusual for 18 me to discuss matters with Crown Counsel after the 19 20 submission of precognition where we thought there were 21 additional inquiries that could have and should have been carried out, so it was certainly open to me to 22 raise it directly with Crown Counsel at that time. 23 Thank you. I have no further questions. Thank you. 24 Q. LORD BRACADALE: Thank you. Are there any rule 9

1 applications? 2 Ms Miller, would you mind withdrawing to the witness 3 room while I hear a submission. Submission by MS MITCHELL 4 5 MS MITCHELL: I'm obliged. Firstly I would like to ask this witness -- there are only two issues. The first that I 6 7 would like to ask this witness about is she said that 8 she had three meetings with Deborah Coles and I wanted 9 to ask whether or not during the course of those 10 meetings she recalled speaking to Deborah Coles about the disproportionate use of force by police officers 11 12 against black men, about racial tropes and stereotypes 13 and also did she explain about excited delirium being a 14 racist issue in and of itself. The Chair and the 15 assessors will recall that Les Brown and Stephen McGowan spoke to Deborah Coles at a meeting arranged by 16 17 Mr Anwar, but their recollection of what was discussed at that time was very limited. 18 The second question that I would like to ask about 19 20 relates to something which arose during the course of 21 the Inquiry hearing this morning where the witness 22 indicated that Dame Elish Angiolini contacted the crown and indicated that there might be parts of the report 23 24 that she considered important for the crown and what 25 I would like to explore a little more is when did she

1 contact the crown, who did she contact, what did she identify as important and how was her advice actioned? 2 3 So really just to explore the detail of that contact and 4 how that affected matters. 5 LORD BRACADALE: Yes, very well. I shall allow you to explore these two matters. We'll have the witness back, 6 7 please. 8 Ms Miller, Ms Mitchell KC, who represents the families of Sheku Bayoh, has some questions for you. 9 10 Questions by MS MITCHELL My first question relates to meetings that you had with 11 Q. 12 Deborah Coles and I'm wondering if I can explore to what 13 extent you recall the terms of that conversations that 14 were had during that time. Do you remember the purpose 15 for which the meetings were convened? I remember that certainly in relation to the first 16 Α. 17 meeting in Mr Anwar's office in 2015 that Mr Brown and I were asked to meet with Mr Anwar and he said Ms Coles 18 19 might be present and it might be helpful for the crown 20 to meet with her. In relation to the other meetings 21 which I have a recollection she was present with the family in advising the family so it's part of that wider 22 23 engagement with the family. And you said that you found the engagement with Ms Coles 24 Q. 25 helpful. I'm wanting really to find out in what way

9

- that was able to help you. Can you recall specifically
 what ways that was of assistance to you?
- A. She clearly had significant knowledge of issues

 particularly in England and Wales of deaths in custody

 of some of the issues that had come out of inquests in

 England where there were deaths in custody and had that

 expertise if you like and she was talking in general

 terms but talking to us about things we might want to
- 10 Q. Okay. And can you remember what those things that she might want to look at were?

look at in the course of the crown investigation.

- 12 A. I think I might have referenced some of them in my
 13 statement but I can't remember the specifics now.
- Q. I wonder if I might ask whether or not you recall that

 she spoke to you about the disproportionate police use

 of force against black men, might that have been one of

 the issues?
- A. Yes, yes, that was and that was reflected in her work
 with Lady Elish and the Home Office Inquiry and
 certainly was one of the factors that we considered
 after the publication of that inquiry.
- Q. And did she raise with you the idea of consideration of racial tropes and stereotypes of police officers dealing with black men?
- 25 A. That was mentioned in meetings that we had, whether it

1 was her or Mr Anwar, I can't remember, but, yes, I do remember them being raised in meetings with 2 representatives of the family. 3 4 Q. And do you remember during the course of any of those 5 meetings a discussion or her telling you about excited delirium being a racial issue in and of itself? 6 That was mentioned -- I couldn't tell you now that it 7 Α. 8 was Ms Coles that said it but, yes, that was mentioned and I think it was one of the issues we were looking to 9 10 explore with some of the expert witnesses, the excited delirium issue and particularly related to race. 11 12 MS MITCHELL: I wonder if I might explore that a little 13 further, my Lord, I have only been given authority to 14 ask about the issues that were raised but it seems that 15 if excited delirium was to be explored with any of the experts it might be an idea to simply ask that question. 16 THE ARBITRATOR: Yes, very well. 17 MS MITCHELL: I'm obliged. You probably heard what I just 18 19 said. In fact you will have absolutely heard what I 20 just said. What we -- were in particular that last 21 issue but any of the others explored with those 22 witnesses? 23 A. I wasn't involved obviously directly with the engagement with the witnesses but that concept I think a number of 24 research papers were identified that looked at that 25

- concept and then they were discussed with the experts
 that were instructed by the crown but other than that
- 3 I couldn't give you much more direct information from my
- 4 own knowledge.
- Q. And two things, who was it that did that gathering together of those documents?
- 7 A. Mr Brown and the CAAPD team and thereafter I think
- 8 Crown Counsel and Mr Brown consulted with a number of
- 9 time experts.
- 10 Q. And do you know what the reports were about? Were they
- 11 about excited delirium?
- 12 A. They were about the concept of excited delirium and my
- 13 recollection is that that had, for want of a better
- phrase, been "debunked" by experts. It wasn't
- something, from memory, that held a lot of credibility,
- 16 certainly from the discussions I had with colleagues.
- 17 It was something that had been raised with us but there
- 18 were concerns that it was not something that was
- 19 relevant for investigation.
- Q. Moving on to my second issue, you explained in your
- 21 evidence earlier that Dame Elish contacted the crown --
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 Q. -- and actually highlighted, flagged up parts of the
- 24 report which she considered might be important --
- 25 A. Yes.

- 1 Q. -- from the crown perspective. First of all, who did
- 2 she contact?
- 3 A. The Lord Advocate's private office.
- 4 Q. Okay. And do you know what the content of the contact
- 5 was about, ie, what parts of the report she specified
- she thought might be important for the crown?
- 7 A. No, she didn't specify any particular parts the report
- 8 hadn't been published at that point so she flagged to us
- 9 that publication was imminent subject to the timescales
- of the Home Office and that she thought there were
- findings in the report that would be of relevance, she
- 12 didn't flag anything -- from recollection anything
- 13 specifically.
- Q. So she effectively put you on notice --
- 15 A. Yes.
- Q. -- that that would be something for you to do?
- 17 A. Yes.
- 18 Q. Was it yourself that dealt with that that took the
- 19 report and looked at it and analysed it in respect of
- the investigation of the death of Mr Bayoh?
- 21 A. Mr Brown, I asked him to have the first pass, if you
- 22 like, and to prepare an analysis and where it might be
- of relevance in relation to the death of Mr Bayoh but
- 24 more generally for the work of the crown, given the role
- I had at the time and then he and I discussed the

- 1 content of the report and what we might want to bring
- 2 out it in the investigation into Mr Bayoh's death
- 3 specifically.
- 4 Q. And how was that actioned, what specific actions did you
- 5 take as a result of it?
- 6 A. That was in the context of the findings that we reported
- 7 to the Lord Advocate and that they would be taken into
- 8 account and if any particular expert witness were
- 9 required to assess some of these issues that they would
- 10 be instructed and consulted with.
- 11 Q. But what were they about?
- 12 A. The issues that I have flagged in my statement so the
- disproportionate length of time for restraint for
- 14 particularly males of black minority, ethnic origin,
- mental health issues, the policing response in general
- when looking to detain somebody who is a suspect so
- those were the issues that we were focusing on.
- MS MITCHELL: I'm obliged.
- 19 LORD BRACADALE: Thank you. Thank you very much, Ms Miller,
- for coming to give evidence to the Inquiry. I'm very
- 21 grateful for your input. When the Inquiry adjourns, you
- 22 will be free to go. The Inquiry will now adjourn until
- 23 tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock. Mr Wolffe, former
- 24 Lord Advocate, who was due to start giving his evidence
- on Wednesday is now available to begin his evidence

```
tomorrow and continue into Wednesday if necessary so
 1
 2
             the Inquiry will now adjourn until tomorrow at
 3
             10 o'clock.
         (The hearing was adjourned to 10.00 am on Tuesday, 29 April
 4
 5
                                     2024)
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

Τ	INDEX
2	1 LINDSEY MILLER (sworn)
3	Examination-in-chief by MS1
4	THOMSON
5	Submission by MS82
6	MITCHELL
7	83Questions by MS MITCHELL
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	