- 1 Thursday, 2 May 2024
- 2 (10.10 am)
- 3 LORD BRACADALE: Good morning Lord Mulholland, will you take
- 4 the oath.
- 5 A. Yes.
- 6 FORMER LORD ADVOCATE FRANK MULHOLLAND (sworn)
- 7 LORD BRACADALE: Ms Grahame.
- 8 MS GRAHAME: Thank you, good morning.
- 9 Examination-in-chief by MS GRAHAME
- 10 Q. You are Frank Mulholland?
- 11 A. I am.
- 12 Q. What age are you?
- 13 A. 65 last week.
- 14 Q. You are a senator of the College of Justice?
- 15 A. I am.
- Q. And for the public listing, that means you're a judge
- who sits in the High Court in the Court of Session?
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. And you were Lord Advocate from May 2011 until around
- 20 May 2016?
- 21 A. Yes.
- 22 Q. And in that capacity you were involved in the
- investigation into the death of Mr Bayoh?
- 24 A. Yes.
- Q. At the point in time when you left the role of
- 26 Lord Advocate, I think that was shortly prior to the

- final PIRC report having been received by Crown Office?
- 2 A. Yes, although I wasn't there when it was received.
- 3 There was an interim report I think had been submitted
- 4 whilst I was in office.
- 5 Q. So you had received the interim or the first report from
- 6 PIRC, but you were not in office when the final
- 7 report --
- 8 A. No.
- 9 Q. -- was received? Thank you. And you were not involved
- 10 with the arrangements that were in place after the final
- 11 PIRC report was received?
- 12 A. No.
- 13 Q. Allocating the team or the advocate depute?
- 14 A. No, that was someone -- that was a successor in
- 15 Crown Office.
- 16 Q. That was James Wolffe?
- 17 A. Yes, yes.
- 18 Q. And James Wolffe was your successor?
- 19 A. He was.
- 20 Q. Have you had any chance to watch any evidence in
- 21 the Inquiry at all?
- 22 A. No, I decided not to read any other witnesses'
- 23 statements and I decided not to read -- not to see or
- view any of the evidence.
- 25 Q. Well, in that case, let me tell you about the blue
- folder that's sitting in front of you.

- 1 A. Yes.
- 2 Q. That provides you with hard copies of your Inquiry
- 3 statements and you can use them as you wish and if
- 4 there's anything you would like to refer us to within
- 5 your statement, please let me know and we can have it
- 6 brought up on the screen.
- 7 A. Okay. Thank you.
- 8 Q. When I ask you specific questions about your statement,
- 9 it will come up on the screen so that everyone in the
- 10 room can see, but it will only shown a paragraph or
- 11 perhaps two, but if there's other areas you would like
- me to refer to, please feel free to tell us.
- 13 A. Okay.
- Q. And equally, if there are any documents that you feel
- 15 you should see which I've not let you look at or not
- 16 provided you with, please let us know and we'll try and
- 17 get them at the next break.
- 18 A. I gave the witness support person a number of two
- documents.
- 20 Q. Well, I will have a look at those in the break and we
- 21 can deal with them, unless I am already going to speak
- 22 to you about them.
- 23 A. Yes.
- Q. Could we start first of all with your first Inquiry
- 25 statement which was from March, which is SBPI 000476,
- I believe. And as you'll see, that's come up on the

- 1 screen. You'll recognise that as your statement for
- 2 the Inquiry?
- 3 A. I do.
- Q. And if we looked at the final page -- there's 22 pages.
- 5 If we looked at the final one, you'll see it's dated,
- it's been signed although the copy we see on the screen
- is redacted, but I'm correct in saying it's signed on
- 8 11 March 2024?
- 9 A. Yes.
- 10 Q. And the final paragraph we see on the screen, 126,
- 11 reads:
- "I believe the facts stated in this witness
- statement are true. I understand that this statement
- 14 may form part of the evidence before the Inquiry and be
- public published on the Inquiry's website."
- 16 A. I'm aware of that.
- 17 Q. Thank you. And you were doing your best to give a true
- 18 and accurate recollection of your involvement when you
- 19 gave your statement?
- 20 A. Yes.
- 21 Q. Then we have the second Inquiry statement, SBPI 00536,
- 22 and again this was taken by the inquiry team in April.
- 23 5 April 2024. It's seven pages long and if we can look
- at the final page, we should say that, as I understand
- 25 it, you signed this on 15 April 2024. There we are.
- 26 A. Yes.

- 1 Q. And again, if we look at the final paragraph, it's the
- 2 same wording, paragraph 34, that you believe the facts
- 3 stated in this statement are true and you understand
- 4 this statement may form part of the evidence before
- 5 the Inquiry and be published on the Inquiry's website?
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 Q. Thank you. And again, you were doing your best to give
- 8 a true and accurate recollection of your involvement?
- 9 A. Yes.
- 10 Q. Could I begin by asking you about the topic of
- 11 disclosure?
- 12 A. Mm-hm.
- 13 Q. And there's two aspects to this I'm interested in. So
- 14 this is in relation to your involvement as Lord Advocate
- and the disclosure that you gave to the family.
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 Q. And we've heard that they were represented by their
- 18 solicitor, Mr Aamar Anwar.
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 Q. Perhaps we could look at -- there is a paragraph in your
- 21 own statement, paragraph 94 in the first statement,
- 22 which touches on disclosure, but I have some additional
- 23 questions.
- 24 You talk about not being aware of any undertakings
- and promises made by you beyond the general one, this is
- 26 to the family, that the Inquiry would be thorough, that

the issue of possible racial motivation would be 1 2 investigated and that: 3 "I would continue to meet with the family and the crown would not make any public statement on the 4 investigation." 5 6 Looking behind that aspect of it, we understand from 7 other evidence that we've heard that you authorised 8 disclosure of material available to the crown to the 9 family through their solicitor? To their solicitor, yes. 10 Α. 11 Q. Yes, and as I understand it a number of documents were 12 disclosed --13 Mm-hm. Α. 14 -- on your authority and you also permitted them to Q. watch CCTV --15 16 A. Yes. 17 Q. -- of the events at Hayfield Road. As part of that, did you require Mr Anwar to sign any formal undertaking or 18 19 disclosure or confidentiality agreement in relation to that disclosure that you authorised? 20 21 No, but I mean there's a background to it. I worked or been involved in cases which Mr Anwar has represented 22 23 families over the years. For example, I prosecuted the 24 murder of a Scottish Asian lad called Imran Khan who was 25 murdered in Pollokshaws in Glasgow and that was the

first time I came across Mr Anwar who represented the

26

family of the young lad, and there was issues about the mother, didn't speak very good English and that's whether I got to know Mr Anwar who assisted in liaison with the family in that case.

I also did work on the Chhokar case after the collapse of the first two trials, and Mr Anwar represented the family and I again ensured that as Lord Advocate that this was given top priority through the cold case unit and there required to be liaison with the family. I remember going out to speak to Mr Chhokar's family with Mr Anwar, Aamar Anwar who assisted, and the liaison with the family to ensure that they were told and advised of what the process was leading to a double-jeopardy application and a successful prosecution in that case.

I also worked with Mr Anwar in the murder of

Emma Caldwell, which was sent to the cold case unit when

I was Lord Advocate and I liaised with Margaret Caldwell

with the assistance of Mr Aamar Anwar in that case. So

there has been a lot of very high profile, very

important, very difficult cases for the families to

navigate through and I worked with Mr Anwar in these

three big inquiries -- big cases so I trust Mr Anwar.

He has never breached any confidentiality that -- any

information that I've given him and he of course has his

duties as a solicitor and it seemed to me that there's

an Article 2 right for effective participation by the family. The source of that is paragraph 435 of Human Rights in Scotland edited by Robert -- Lord Reed, the Chair of the Supreme Court, and Jim Murdoch and that explains the Article 2 rights that there requires to be effective participation by the family, which I was well aware of and tried -- did my best to ensure.

So it seemed to me that it's important to -- because the family are going to do -- the solicitors for the family are going to do their own investigations. It was a mandatory fatal accident inquiry at the very least so what I wanted to do was to ensure that he had the material to instruct his experts and part of my obligation in terms of Article 2, effective participation, was to explain the process to the family, listen to their concerns, listen to any points that they want to make, answer them if I could and ensure that they were participants in the process so that was part of that so.

And give you a wider aspect on disclosure, I led the crown through two Supreme Court disclosure cases. I argued them myself. I wrote the disclosure manual for the crown with John -- the late John Dunne and John Watt, who now heads the parole board, as I also have done a number of appeals in the Appeal Court in Edinburgh on disclosure matters. So applying all that

knowledge, experience, judgment, I determined that

I would disclose matters to Mr Anwar so that he can

conduct his own inquiries and that's participation for

the family. So that's a background to it.

4

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

- 5 Q. Thank you very much. Did you have any concerns against
  6 this background that you've explained of risks to future
  7 criminal proceedings in the event that you made this
  8 disclosure?
- 9 Well, I thought about it. I mean I just didn't make it Α. in a vacuum, that decision, I thought about it. 10 11 Firstly, there's a statutory inquiry inevitable, right, 12 so there's preparation required by the family's legal representatives. Secondly, in relation to the potential 13 criminal proceedings, I could not see how that would 14 15 prejudice any potential criminal proceedings. The 16 family -- a lot of the family lived in London, they were 17 not witnesses or wouldn't be witnesses. I couldn't see how they would be witnesses. Collette Bell lived in 18 Fife and there were some family and friends in Fife. 19

Collette Bell would be a witness to background as far as I could see it. She wouldn't be a witness to fact, in other words what went on that resulted in Sheku Bayoh's death. So applying my judgment, I took the view that I couldn't see or the risk to potential criminal proceedings was very, very small.

Q. Thank you. We have heard evidence from James Wolffe who

- 1 was your successor and we've heard about the differences
- 2 in approach that were taken by you in relation to
- disclosure and by Mr Wolffe.
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5 Q. And I would like to ask you about some of his evidence
- 6 so that you can comment on that.
- 7 A. Mm-hm.
- 8 Q. Perhaps if we could have his Inquiry statement on the
- 9 screen, SBPI 00529. There's three or four paragraphs of
- 10 relevance and what I'll do is I'll briefly look at those
- on the screen and then we can discuss his evidence
- 12 together.
- 13 A. Yes.
- Q. Paragraph 60, please. There we are and it's just after
- 15 the --:
- "When the issue arose in the context of further
- 17 detailed disclosure requested by Mr Anwar in February
- 18 and March 2017..."
- 19 So this is after you had left the role of
- 20 Lord Advocate and James Wolffe had taken office?
- 21 A. Yes.
- 22 Q. "I was presented with a dilemma. On the one hand, it
- 23 would have been contrary to my own experience of crown
- 24 practice for disclosure of the sort requested to be made
- 25 in the context of a live criminal investigation. That
- general practice reflected a compelling public interest

1		in avoiding any risk of prejudice to future criminal
2		proceedings. On the other hand, in this case Mr Bayoh's
3		family had already been given certain disclosure and
4		were now seeking further disclosure. Mr McGowan's
5		advice in paragraphs referred to in a minute and an
6		email was consistent with my own experience. I also
7		recall having a brief discussion with the APCC,
8		assistant principal Crown Counsel, about the issue."
9		I'll briefly let you see the minute that he's
10		referring to. SBPI 00529. Sorry. That's a statement.
11		It must be COPFS 00529 I think.
12	Α.	So is this a Steve McGowan minute?
13	Q.	Yes. We'll leave this. I've got the wrong reference
14		there. I don't want to cause difficulty.
15		Having read the minute and having discussed it with
16		Mr Wolffe, we can see that advice was given to him in
17		relation to disclosure by Mr McGowan. Let's move on to
18		61 which is on the screen:
19		"I took the view that my overriding responsibility
20		at that stage was to avoid any risk to the integrity of
21		criminal proceedings should they eventuate. It would
22		neither be in the interest Mr Bayoh's family nor in the
23		public interest if disclosure of information by the
24		crown whilst the investigational was pending were to
25		prejudice a future prosecution. I also had to be
26		mindful that if information were to be disclosed to the

family in this case, issues would likely arise in other death cases to which Article 2 applied about the disclosure of similar information whilst an investigation was ongoing."

And then moving on to 62:

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

26

"I considered whether the investigative obligation under Article 2 of the European Convention on Human Rights required a different approach to be taken and took the view that it did not. It seemed to me that the question of compliance with the UK with its obligation under Article 2 fell to be addressed in light of the whole process of the investigation and inquiry which could be anticipated. I expected the position in relation to disclosure to be different in the context of an FAI or indeed a public inquiry once any issue of criminal proceedings had been resolved. Not only would the family of the deceased see the evidence being led at the Inquiry, but they would likely be represented and would receive disclosure in that context. I accordingly concluded that further material should not be disclosed where that disclosure presented a risk of prejudice to future criminal proceedings. As regards the specifics of what information could safely be disclosed without a risk of prejudice future criminal proceedings, I relied on the judgment of the professional prosecutors directly involved in the case."

- So let's go back to 60 first of all, and, you'll see 1 2 that this was -- he describes it as dilemma and he talks 3 about his general practice, crown practice, for disclosure at that time. This was in the context where 4 5 the final PIRC report had been received and the process 6 of crown precognition was underway and the issue was whether to give the family further disclosure at that 7 8 stage.
- 9 A. What was asked? What was a request or what disclosure?
- 10 Q. We'll have to see if I can get -- I think the difficulty

  11 will be I don't have the access to the minutes on the

  12 screen at the moment.
- 13 A. Yes.
- Q. My understanding of the position is that further
  disclosure of expert reports was specifically requested
  and my reading of the minute, which we can't see at the
  moment, is that that was specifically raised by
  Mr McGowan, the request for expert reports?
- A. Well, without knowing in detail what the actual request
  was and what the reason for it is kind of difficult to
  comment on the specifics. I would just make a general
  observation. It's very easy to say, well, I can't give
  you it because there's a risk of prejudice to future
  criminal proceedings. I think you have got to drill
  down and, well, what is the risk?
- And what I'm saying to you is when I took the

- decision, which I stand by, I think it was the right 1 2 decision with the benefit of hindsight, I drilled down 3 to look at what is the risk of prejudice and what was the purpose that this disclosure -- when I dealt with 4 the matter, what was the purpose of this request? And 5 6 as I understood it, it was in relation to families 7 instructing their own experts and their own inquiry so 8 it seemed to me that it was consistent with my 9 obligations in Article 2. I couldn't see what the risk was and James Wolffe's statement he's not articulated 10 11 what the risk was.
- As I said, I couldn't see that information being

  prejudiced, prejudicial. For the family that lived in

  London, they were not going to be witnesses, and in

  relation to Collette Bell, she was not a witness to what

  happened. So I took the view, and as I say I stand by

  it, that the risk to future criminal proceedings was

  very low.
- 19 Q. Thank you.
- 20 A. And also you have the duties of a solicitor as well.
- 21 Q. All right.
- 22 A. Obligations of a solicitor in ethics.
- Q. The evidence we've heard from Mr Wolffe on 1 May

  yesterday was that he had taken the view that Article 2

  or he had been told that a view had been taken that

  Article 2 required disclosure, but he was not convinced

- 1 that that was correct in the context of a criminal
- 2 investigation. Do you wish to comment on that?
- 3 A. I disagree with him.
- Q. You disagree. And he gave evidence that the crown had a responsibility and needed to be able to investigate, as it, were in a private space and to reach its conclusions
- 7 and then take whatever course was the right course.
- 8 A. Well, I agree with that that the crown needed to do its
- 9 work in a private space. I mean I issued the one and
- 10 only time in my time as a law officer, I was nine years
- 11 a law officer, a media release saying that the crown
- 12 wouldn't make any public statement, that all the stories
- in the press were upsetting for the family and asking
- the media to essentially stop at a report responsibly.
- So obviously you need to conduct your inquiries, the
- 16 crown, in a space that you can do that, but I mean the
- 17 crown has got loads of experience in dealing with high
- 18 profile investigations and prosecution and not being
- 19 affected by outside noise, for want of a better phrase.
- 20 Q. Thank you. I have been provided with the minute I was
- 21 looking for earlier. COPFS 03943A. It's not on the
- 22 play list. If you don't mind I'll read out an
- 23 excerpt --
- 24 A. This is --
- 25 Q. -- just to complete this.
- A. Steve McGowan's minute?

1	Q.	This is the minute dated / February 201/ from
2		Stephen McGowan to the then Lord Advocate and others.
3		And I will read out from paragraph 11:
4		"Throughout the course of the PIRC investigation the
5		family and their solicitor received disclosure of
6		information reflecting their rights under Article 2 in
7		order to facilitate the instruction of their own expert
8		witness or witnesses.
9		"12. It is clear however that following receipt of
10		the report by PIRC that the focus and direction of this
11		investigation, which remains a live criminal
12		investigation, has now passed to the crown. Given that
13		precognitions are confidential, our advice is that we
14		should not share the detail of what we have learned or
15		the precognitions themselves. Our investigation at this
16		stage should remain confidential and there is a real
17		likelihood that a number of family members are potential
18		witnesses in any future proceedings. In light of this,
19		it will be important that the expectations of the family
20		and their solicitor, particularly regarding disclosure
21		at this stage, should be carefully managed."
22		And then 13:
23		"Similarly, whilst we have thus far shared expert
24		reports with the family, we do not recommend sharing the
25		new reports that we are instructing at this stage."
26		And there's a reference to paragraph 5 above which

- details a number of expert reports that were being

  instructed at that stage, including an osteoarticular

  pathology report and a further expert pathology report.

  So I'm sorry I can't show you on the screen.
- A. No, that's fine. I get the gist of that. What I would comment is that Mr McGowan and James Wolffe were dealing with a different situation. The final report is in and the crown is now doing its precognition preparation.

  When I made the decision, it was a different set of circumstances and I took the view and, as I have said, I stand by, I think it was the right decision.

And I just like make a general observation and my time as a law officer is that you are given advice on a regular basis by permanent members of staff in COPFS.

I know Mr McGowan. I know him personally. I have a high regard of his abilities. But the advice you get is not always right and at the end of the day, it is the Lord Advocate or whoever has taken the decision, could be Crown Counsel senior Crown Counsel in those circumstances, that is the decision-maker and regardless of what the advice is, it is a person that's got to make the decision so -- but it's a different set of circumstances it seems to me from the excerpts you've read from Mr McGowan.

Q. Thank you. And then another aspect of the evidence we've heard from James Wolffe yesterday. It was he

1 said:

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2 "One risk in the context of a possible criminal 3 prosecution of the police officers is the question of, you know, the crown has to be independent and 4 demonstrably independent. One would not want to end up 5 6 with a position where it could be said or any issue could be raised about, as it were, the independence of 7 8 the crown investigation, regardless of how that might 9 have been affected."

And did you consider when you were dealing with the matter the issue of crown independence?

- A. Of course. I consider crown independence all the time to ensure -- it was a frequent mantra from me on a whole raft of cases about crown independence. In my time as Lord Advocate, very unpopular decisions were taken in certain cases commensurate with the crown's independence and it might be helpful if at one stage bring up a letter I wrote to Pamela Paton who was the wife of, is it, Alan Paton, Constable Alan Paton?
- Q. Yes, we've heard her evidence.
- A. Well, she was upset at a lot of the media reports about
  what had happened and who was saying what and she
  emailed in -- I don't have access to the email, but I
  responded to her letter with a letter of two pages which
  I set out in great detail the crown's obligations and I
  explained that liaising with the family, meeting with

- 1 the family, is not in any way an indication that the
- 2 crown was representing any one particular party in this
- and I explained what the crown's obligation were in
- 4 relation to Sheku Bayoh's family.
- 5 Q. Thank you.
- 6 A. So what you have -- I mean you cannot shut the crown
- 7 down from speaking to people affected by investigation,
- 8 case and decisions. That is not a breach of your
- 9 independence as a decision-maker. As a prosecutor, you
- 10 have to speak to people and listen to what they have got
- 11 to say. That doesn't affect your independence. As far
- 12 as I can see, no one ever suggested to me that the crown
- weren't independent in its investigations into the death
- of Sheku Bayoh so it was considered.
- 15 Q. Thank you.
- 16 A. Considered all the time in a whole raft of cases.
- 17 Q. I believe the letter has been added now, COPFS 04836A,
- 18 and this may be the letter that you're referring to.
- 19 A. It might be quite helpful if I could have that on screen
- just to go through it, please.
- 21 Q. Yes, I have just asked for that to be. It will just
- 22 take a moment I think. So it's COPFS 04836A. This is a
- 23 letter from you, the Right Honourable Frank Mulholland
- QC, and if we can move down it says PC Paton's wife,
- 25 14 October 2015?
- 26 A. That's the one. There was an email had come into the

private office and I think -- if you just scroll down,

I think she was upset, amongst other things, at

something that Les Brown had said to her in a phone call

so I wanted to set out what the crown's position in this

was.

that the investigation into the death of Sheku Bayoh is at the instance of me who is statutorily responsible for the investigation of all deaths in Scotland.

Investigation conducted by PIRC who acted -- sorry -- who act under my directions and superintendence. I set out what the decisions at the end of the day required to be taken. I set out, state emphatically that:

And you'll see from the second paragraph I state

"The Lord Advocate is impartial and will take decisions following a full and thorough investigation. The crown has a long and proud history of conducting impartial investigations and this one will be no different. Please do not think that because the family of Sheku Bayoh are involved in the process that impartiality is compromised. They will not be involved in the decisions, which is right, but have a legal right to be kept advised of progress in an investigation of this nature. It is important that the family have confidence in the process so that they can have confidence that the decisions taken are taken following a full and thorough investigation and that the family

understand why the decisions were taken. The family are not being treated any differently than other families in similar circumstances."

If we can go on to the next page, please:

"I'm sure you will agree that all parties affected by this decision, including the police officers involved, should have confidence that decisions were taken following a full and thorough investigation with expert opinion from the most eminent experts available. I appreciate the amount of publicity this case has generated and that this has been difficult for the persons affected. I should note that the crown has not been responsible for the publicity and I have said very little about the case, other than to talk about the process. I have not and will not talk publicly about the evidence, as to do so would be tantamount to prejudicing the investigation before it's completed. I hope that at the end of the process you will have the answers you and all parties affected seek."

I then go on to deal with what she was saying in relation to Les Brown and she was also -- I think in her email she was upset about a BBC documentary that was due to be broadcast and I explain that I can't prevent the broadcasting of that, but any matters which are raised in the documentary which will be thoroughly investigated --

- 1 Q. Thank you.
- 2 A. -- is what I said. So that sets out what the crown
- 3 position is in independence and, as I said, liaising and
- 4 speaking to families of deceased persons affected by
- 5 this is not in any way compromising an independence.
- 6 Q. So when you considered the obligations under Article 2,
- 7 but also the importance of retaining crown independence,
- 8 you resolved it in this way and this letter reflects
- 9 your thought processes?
- 10 A. Yes, and I would just add to that that Article 2
- 11 requires an independent investigation.
- 12 Q. Mm-hmm.
- 13 A. So there are procedural requirements and one of them is
- 14 effective participation and I remember checking as -- I
- dealt with a number of cases over the years, deaths,
- 16 call them at the hands of a state, as you know, a death
- in custody is another way of phrasing it, so I -- when I
- 18 became aware of Sheku Bayoh's death, I checked the
- books.
- Q. Thank you.
- 21 A. And Article 2 obligations.
- 22 Q. Thank you. There was only one other aspect that we
- 23 heard in evidence from James Wolffe and that was his
- evidence that let's say one went to a position of very
- open disclosure to any party, and let's take it away
- from this case, you know, taking views about how the

1 crown should proceed with its investigation and so on 2 and so forth, issues about how that would be perceived 3 down the line in the context, but he also talks about a concern, or he gave evidence about a concern, regarding putting himself or the crown under pressure to make 5 6 similar disclosures in other cases also. Did you have 7 any concerns in that regard?

4

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

No, what I did was I looked at the circumstances of this Α. case and and I applied my mind to what is the prejudice. It's very easy, it seems to me, to hide behind, well, it could be prejudicial. I think you have a duty to drill down and try and identify what the potential prejudice is and when I did that and gave consideration to that, as I've said, I think it was a very small risk so I took the view that it was appropriate in those circumstances for the reasons I was being asked to disclose, in other words to instruct the experts, and duties and obligations of the solicitor, my past experience of Aamar Anwar, he never breached a confidentiality when me speaking to him, him speaking to me, it seemed to me that I should instruct the disclosure for that to happen, which I did.

It's a different situation when the crown is doing their investigations and it's being precognosed after the full report has come in from PIRC, so it's a different set of circumstances, but I'm the

Lord Advocate, it's up to me to make the decision. I

thought about it, I thought about it in depth and that's

the decision I took and I stand by it.

- Q. Thank you. We've heard that the different approaches had an impact on the family and I'm interested in your perspective about the benefits of your approach in relation to building trust and confidence in the family?
  - A. Well, I've been a front line prosecutor in the

    High Court as an advocate depute, as a senior advocate
    depute for, what, ten years. In my work as a member of

    COPFS and senior positions I had met families in very
    difficult situations for them. To give you an example,
    the day after the collapse of the World's End trial,
    I was asked to go in and meet the families. As you can
    imagine, that was a very, very difficult conversation.

    So I have experience of those difficult conversations
    and helping families through very traumatic troubled,
    upsetting, distressing times.

Now, my approach is always -- I mean, for example,

I was involved in as Lord Advocate in the Lockerbie

case. I went out to Washington to speak to the families

at Arlington on the anniversary so I have got experience

in that. I dealt with the Chhokar families. I also

dealt with the murder of Elaine Doyle, a young girl that

was murdered in Greenock, and there was I think over

25 years before the perpetrator was brought to justice.

I dealt with very much under the radar confidential not speaking to Mrs Doyle and Mrs Doyle's family and her husband who passed away before. So what I'm saying is I've got lengthy experience, probably more experience at the time I was Lord Advocate than anyone in the crown in dealing with families in these types of situations.

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

26

What are the benefits of it? Well, firstly, the benefit is it helps the families. They don't ask -they didn't ask to be put in this position. They didn't ask to have to or come up to Edinburgh and meet people. They were happy getting on with their lives in London and Fife and then something happened that's propelled them into this alien situation that it seemed to me that on a human level, on a professional level, it was important to speak to the families to explain the process, to listen to them, listen to their concerns, answer any questions that they have. If I could answer them at that time and involve them in the process, effective participation, which is required in the law. That's my approach, and through my lengthy -- now lengthy legal career that's what I've done and, again, I stand by that. I think that is the right approach.

Let me tell you in my experience with the family of Sheku Bayoh they were a nice family put into this position. They were not -- and I had a number of meetings with them, they were not looking for revenge.

They were not looking for someone to pay a price for this regardless of their involvement. What they wanted was they wanted answers. They wanted to know what happened, why it happened, whether anyone is responsible for what happened, whether anything could have prevented the death of a partner, son, brother, and they wanted to be listened to and it seemed to me that that was hugely important in this case.

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

26

And the other thing you have got to remember is the background to this. You -- we need to be deaf not to know of the difficulties that the Stephen Lawrence murder had and caused and the loss of public trust in the judicial process, prosecutorial process, the investigatory process. And in Chhokar it was quite clear from the two inquiries, the Jandoo inquiry which looked at how it was dealt with, the liaison with the family, and the Sir Anthony Campbell inquiry about the process that the crown had failed the Chhokar family. And as Lord Advocate I wasn't -- I was going to do everything I could to prevent that happening under my watch, which is why I liaised, spoke to, listened to the family of Sheku Bayoh and, again, I think that was the right thing to do and I don't regret it and if it happened tomorrow, I would do the same thing.

Q. Thank you. I would like to move on to the issue of race and you have discussed this in both statements. Perhaps

1		if we could look at paragraph 6 of your statement:
2		"The reason I involved myself from the beginning of
3		the investigation "
4		Here we are:
5		"The reason I involved myself from the beginning of
6		the investigation into the death of Sheku Bayoh was in
7		light of my experience of 30 years as a prosecutor. I
8		have been involved in numerous high profile and complex
9		cases. I was not involved in the initial investigation
10		into the death of Surjit Singh Chhokar, but I dealt with
11		the fall-out from the case and the Jandoo report which
12		concluded that the COPFS was institutionally racist. I
13		prioritised this case for re-investigation and
14		superintended the subsequent murder case through the
15		double-jeopardy application and trial. I was not going
16		to let what happened in the Chhokar case happen again
17		with Sheku Bayoh; namely, poor liaison with the family,
18		not addressing issues of colour nor investigating racial
19		motivations"
20		And is that colour of his skin?
21		" if any for what happened. That is why I became
22		involved at an early stage."
23		And was that something you were immediately you
24		say "at an early stage", was that something you were
25		immediately conscious of?
26	Δ	As soon as T heard about it T knew from experience that

this was going to be high profile, that issues of race, racial motivation, were going to be front, left and centre in relation to the investigation and as

Lord Advocate you're the leader of the prosecution service and it would be an abrogation of my responsibility as Lord Advocate to leave that to someone else. It seemed to me that this is what I required to do was to step up to the plate and superintend.

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

26

I can't deal with -- I don't have the time to deal with the day-to-day goings on, but I needed to know about the case, about the circumstances. I also needed to know where the investigations were going, because it is very important in relation to resourcing the investigation of the inquiry that I know where investigation is at and what the issues are, because if additional resources were required, it's my job to get the money for it to fund those additional inquiries. For example, in the Lockerbie case one of the things I did was to get additional funding for investigation and there are other cases where that's happened. So again, that was something which I needed to know, you know, whether they had sufficient resources and I mean it's stating the obvious that with the constraints in the public purse, you know, it's can be a battle to get additional resources if they're required and I need to know what the position is in relation to that.

Q. At that stage, at that early stage, what were your expectations of the crown and your staff and how the investigation would be conducted?

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

A. Well, at the initial stage is that it hadn't been over to the crown yet, because the PIRC final report was not in so we at that stage. I think there was an interim report which was submitted during my time. So the crown was not at the stage of conducting its own investigation. So obviously I would give thought to that.

What my view would be that it would require very experienced and senior Crown Counsel, maybe at principal advocate depute level, that the Crown Counsel appointed to the case would need to be supported with an assistant Crown Counsel, that given the importance of this that the people in COPFS that were dealing with it would require to be experienced and have the ability and track record to be able to deal with cases of this importance and magnitude. There were complexities in this in relation to the pathological evidence, so you required an intellect to be able to navigate through that. There were also issues -- other issues in the case about toxicology, about positional asphyxiation, a whole raft of issues that were not day-to-day issues that you would have to deal with. So my view was it would need to be prosecutors, I'm not talking about Crown Counsel,

permanent prosecutors of COPFS who have the ability and the experience to be able to undertake that.

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

26

Now, Les Brown, I know Les Brown, I know him very well, I hold him in very high regard, I have no doubt about his experience and ability to be able to deal with that so I was reassured that he was directing the investigation. I also knew that Lindsey Miller, who is another person I hold in high regard, had a role, a superintendent's role, an involvement in this so -- and I can't remember at this stage there were others as well. But prior to meeting the family, I would have a briefing meeting so I would have the key personnel down, I would discuss where we are, what the issues are, the questions that were raised by the family have they been answered, what are the answers, what's your fears, what's your concerns, have we properly resourced this. So all that information would be flowing to me from them. And also there's a byproduct of that as well, in the sense that the staff, permanent staff, dealing with this case know that they have got the Lord Advocate's support and that is very, very important, because these are difficult cases to deal with. And there are people of that caliber and dedication to public service who step up to the mark to be able to deal with these challenging and difficult cases and they have to be supported as well, and that's what I was doing as

Lord Advocate, so it's a two-way process. 1 2 Thank you. We've heard from Stephen McGowan in evidence Q. 3 and perhaps we could put his Inquiry statement on the screen, SBPI 00431, and if we could look at paragraph 4 63: 5 6 "In my view everyone was aware that race was matter 7 at the heart of this investigation. From the first 8 telephone call I had from David Green, the question of 9 the deceased's race and whether it was a factor was discussed. No one was in any doubt that it was an 10 11 issue. Whilst no specific instructions were given to 12 consider race as a motive, my recollection was that it was clearly discussed at the time and everyone involved 13 14 was seized of the requirement to investigate the 15 potential for race to have been a motive." Would you agree with that? 16 17 Α. Entirely. Right. And --18 Q. I think I said something similar in my statement as 19 Α. well. 20 Q. 21 I think in paragraph 78 you say: 22 "Race was front and centre from the outset of the 23 investigation. A black man has died in police custody. 24 It was obvious." 25 In relation to -- the comment here that we have on

the screen mentions that no specific instructions were

26

Transcript of the Sheku Bayoh Inquiry 1 given to consider race as a motive. So we've looked in 2 detail at the instructions that were given by the crown 3 to PIRC when it came to the actual investigation into 4 the death of Mr Bayoh and there were no specific references to race at that time. Was that something you 5 6 were aware of? 7 No, it would probably be unnecessary because race was an 8 issue, you know, left, front and centre. There's a 9 letter which was sent by Les Brown. I gave the number to witness support. There's a Les Brown to John 10 11 somebody. Is it John Mitchell of PIRC? And there's a

reference to -- in that letter -- if we could have the

14 Q. All right. I'm advised that it is COPFS 6256 -15 sorry -- 062562.

letter up it may assist you.

- 16 A. Yes, John Mitchell.
- 17 Q. Is this the -- this is dated 13 January. Well, it says 2015?
- 19 A. It's wrong.

12

13

- 20 Q. It must be 2016.
- 21 A. It must be 2016. Yes. So if we could just scroll down.
- 22 We are talking about the paragraph when the final report
- 23 is --
- 24 "... read the comments in respect of the allegation 25 of racism in Fife Division and note that some
- 26 statistical analysis had been carried out, but would

question whether the figure is indicative that institutional racism played no part in the approach of the officers to Sheku Bayoh as stated by John McSporran."

I mean the investigators went to the -- they looked at the complaints against the police for the various forces before it was amalgamated into Police Scotland. They drilled down into whether complaints were being made of racially prejudiced conduct by police officers, and they then compared that with similar complaints across the other police forces so it's a seam of work which was important to be done, indicative of race being, you know, a key issue in the case. And it says:

"The importance of ensuring the issues of race are fully addressed as part of the PIRC investigations has been highlighted in our previous meetings. From a crown perspective, your investigation has to consider whether race had any influence in the way that the incident was dealt with as part of a wider consideration, as well as whether there was any evidence of overt racism, where the latter will be explored as part of your investigations relating to Constable Paton. However, you will no doubt recollect the discussions at our last meeting with the Lord Advocate where your attention was drawn to the behaviour of a [I think it should be 'former' as opposed to 'formal'] Fife officer who

- appears to have been responsible for distributing racist communications and offensive images."
- So what I'm saying is that any information that

  would suggest or that could support racial motivation

  was passed on to PIRC. It was front, left and centre at

  meetings with PIRC and Les Brown is clearly dealing with

  it and clearly knows it's a key issue and refers the

  discussions with -- involving me in which these issues
- So to answer your question if there was -- there's a form -- is it section 33 direction?

were being discussed.

12 Q. 33A.

9

- 13 A. 33A if that was not included in that then it doesn't

  14 mean that race wasn't an issue. It clearly was from the

  15 very beginning.
- Q. We've heard evidence that a number of letters of 16 17 instruction were sent first of all under section 33A by 18 the crown to PIRC to formally instruct them to investigate the death of Mr Bayoh and that during that 19 20 period up to the end August at least, there were no references to race as part of that instruction in 21 correspondence from the crown to PIRC. And that during 22 23 that period PIRC were -- as we've heard evidence 24 described the situation as they were taking cognisance 25 of race if issues emerged, but they did not pursue any 26 active lines of investigation in relation to race. Were

L	vou	aware	of	that	at	the	time?

- I certainly was not aware of it at the time and it would be inconsistent with, you know, the example of the work being undertaken by PIRC to look at statistics in complaints against the police and that type of stuff and investigate -- there was specific instructions given to PIRC to investigate allegations that were being made against certain officers so that seems to me to be inconsistent with what PIRC were doing.
  - Q. I shall perhaps explain that from 2 September 2015 we've heard evidence that there was a letter from the crown to PIRC asking for confirmation that race was a priority in the investigation and that was the first reference --
  - A. Who was that from?

Q. That was a letter from Les Brown to PIRC on 2 September 2015 and that was the first reference in crown correspondence to inviting confirmation that race was a priority in the investigation. From September onwards that letter specifically instructed PIRC to investigate issues that you've identified in this letter, the Fife officers' issues, history of racism, prior misconduct.

So certainly from September 2015 there was reference to race in crown correspondence and specific instructions given, but in the period prior to that, from 3 May up to that specific letter, the PIRC investigation had simply taken cognisance of race, but

- not -- we've heard evidence not actively pursued a line
- of investigation regarding race.
- 3 A. Well, I'm surprised to hear that.
- Q. Right. And were you aware of that at the time?
- 5 A. No. I find it surprising given -- I mean it's the
- 6 interaction with PIRC is not just letters.
- 7 Q. Mm-hmm.
- 8 A. There's conversations, and conversations with people
- 9 involved in the investigation in PIRC and Kate Frame,
- 10 who headed PIRC at the time, and it was quite clear in
- 11 the conversation that certainly I was party to that race
- was front, left and centre.
- Q. So -- and we've heard that you had a number of meetings.
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 Q. You had a meeting with Kate Frame and John Mitchell from
- 16 PIRC on 14 May 2015. As far as you're concerned, in
- 17 your communications with PIRC, did you effectively
- 18 communicate that race was a priority in this
- investigation?
- 20 A. I mean it was weaved into the conversations. I would be
- 21 astonished if -- amazed if PIRC thought that you know
- 22 waited until September to the letter which you've
- 23 referenced to investigate racial motivations.
- 24 Q. Shortly prior to the letter from the Crown the PIRC also
- 25 received a letter from Mr Anwar specifically raising the
- issue of race and after that letter was received they

- did include race into the policy log that they retained

  but we've heard evidence that that was really the first

  point at which the matter became a more active line of

  investigation.
- A. Well, I mean you're telling me something that I wasn't

  involved in, but I just -- race was front, left and

  centre from the very beginning as far as I was concerned

  and that occurred in conversations.

Now, Aamar Anwar is well entitled to formalise it and put it in a letter, he's quite right to do so, but that doesn't mean that this wasn't under consideration from the very beginning. As Lord Advocate, I knew, I dealt with Chhokar, I dealt with a number of what's under the broad umbrella of hate crime. I was involved in -- at the Crown Office in the murder of Mark Scott, who was a young lad that walked through Bridgeton and was murdered just because he was wearing a green scarf. So it's not just race for me. Right across the board it seemed to me that it was something which I was -- that was a priority to me.

Q. Can we look at paragraph 169 of your first Inquiry statement and I think you emphasise here the significance of race as far as you were concerned. 169 says the question of race. It doesn't seem to be the correct reference. Let's leave that to one side. Can I ask you given your -- the significance of race to you

- and the experience you had in that, and you've commented
- 2 about race and racial motivation being important aspects
- 3 of this investigation, what were your expectations of
- 4 PIRC during this period from 3 May 2015 up to
- 5 2 September 2015 at least that initial period?
- A. Well, they would be conducting an inquiry. They were
- 7 the investigators. They would report the results of
- 8 that inquiry to the crown when those investigations were
- 9 complete. I mean what my expectations would be it would
- 10 a thorough investigation. It would be an investigation
- dealing with all of the issues in the case, including
- 12 race. It would deal with the issues about the cause of
- death. It would instruct the -- or obtain expert
- evidence from a raft of experts, experts in their field,
- and that they would report the results of their
- 16 inquiries, together with their analysis, recommendations
- in a final report to the crown.
- 18 Q. In relation to race, did you expect PIRC to not simply
- 19 identify overt examples of racism if they existed, but
- 20 to look at underlying references that may be indicative
- of racism or racial motivation?
- 22 A. Of course.
- Q. To consider --
- 24 A. I mean that's part of the work that they did in the
- 25 statistical analysis. I mean PIRC was -- it was a
- 26 fairly new organisation. It used to be complaints or

Criminal Complaints Against the Police, so it was their own forces that dealt with that so they had their Criminal Complaints Against the Police Department in each of the police forces, then of course you had Police Scotland, and that resulted in having to set up PIRC so that there's an independent investigators independent from the police looking at Article 2 requirements as well. That was required.

It used to be stated that, well, the independence comes from the involvement of the crown so albeit it's investigated by the police officers of the same force, at the end of the day it's going to be the crown that ultimately investigates and takes a decision. So that was the prevailing view at the time, but of course things move on and with the advent of Police Scotland it was decided, and I think it was the right decision, to set up an independent body and that's how PIRC came into being, but Kate Frame used to head the Criminal Complaints Against the Police Department at the Crown Office before she left to be head of PIRC so she had — she had great experience in dealing with these types of cases.

Q. Thank you. Did you -- in terms of your expectation of Crown Office and to some extent PIRC, did you expect them to consider whether Mr Bayoh had been treated differently by the officers because he was black?

- 1 A. Of course. It's all part of it.
- 2 Q. We've talked about Article 2. Were you -- given your
- 3 experience in relation to race, were you also conscious
- 4 of the obligations on PIRC and the crown in relation to
- 5 Article 14 in conjunction with Article 2?
- 6 A. Well, Article 14 you require an Article 2 or some other
- 7 article obligation before Article 14 kicks in, but I was
- 8 well aware of that. I think it's in my statement as
- 9 well, because I set out what the case law Convention
- jurisprudence is in this area and what the obligations
- are on the investigatory agency, PIRC and the crown.
- 12 Q. And we've heard that in terms of Article 14 in
- conjunction with Article 2 that both the crown and PIRC
- 14 would have the duty to take all reasonable steps to
- unmask any racist motive and to establish whether or not
- 16 ethnic hatred or prejudice might have played a role;
- would you agree with that?
- 18 A. Absolutely, I think I refer to it in my first statement.
- 19 Q. I think paragraph 33 may contain that. There we are.
- 20 A. Well, there it is.
- 21 Q. And when you say "take all reasonable steps to unmask
- 22 any racist motive", how did that translate to your
- 23 expectations of PIRC's role? How would you have
- 24 expected them -- what steps would you have expected them
- 25 to take?
- 26 A. Well, the overarching is to carry out that obligation as

- part of the investigation. What steps? Well, I mean
  that's for the investigators to identify what steps to
  discharge that obligation, but what they need to do is
  they need to investigate it up hill and down dale to
  identify or rule out any racist motive and that is overt
  or covert in the sense of unconscious prejudice, racial
  prejudice, that type of --
- 8 So if we have heard evidence that there was language Q. 9 used within the statements of officers referring to Mr Bayoh as "coloured", making connections or possible 10 11 links between the colour of his skin and terrorism, 12 matters of that sort, the use perhaps in the surrounding circumstances of racial tropes or racially stereotypical 13 14 language, of detrimental derogatory comments regarding 15 black people or possibly to be interpreted in that way, are these the types of adminicles of evidence that you 16 17 would have expected PIRC to be identifying and considering? 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

A. Absolutely. You know, use of language is important and that can -- that can identify an issue in relation to the wrong use of language. It can display a mindset, what the mindset is, and language is important and that's one of the things that we looked at when I chaired the diversity group at the Crown Office when I was Lord Advocate to looked at the language used.

I mean I grew up in the 70s and some of the language

- used that was part of everyday vocabulary people, if

  you're looking back 2024, you would be horrified. Some

  of the programs that were broadcast in the 70s under the

  quise of comedy, you look back and you're horrified at
- 5 it. So it's important.
- And I mean people always say, well, it's freedom of speech. Well, it might be freedom of speech, but if

  you're on the receiving end of it, it's not freedom of speech to the person on the receiving end so language is important and the use of language and the wrong use of language can give an insight into person's mindset and motivation.
  - Q. And for those listening, can you explain why is evidence as to -- that would relate to mindset or motivation be of value to the crown in the job that the crown are doing?
- A. Well, it would be -- I mean I make the general point
  that I was aware at the time that -- and I had stepped
  down at the time that the final report and the work that
  the crown did and what the evidence was when the crown
  were preparing a case. So I'm really talking about this
  at a sort of overarching level but, for example, I think
  you referred to terrorist.
- 24 Q. Yes.

13

14

15

16

A. Well, I make a very obvious point, would the mindset be if it was a white person, would that person be referred

- 1 to as a terrorist. So what I'm saying is language, use
- 2 of language a, wrong use of language can be -- can be
- 3 revealing sometimes and deserved of investigation.
- 4 Q. Thank you. And moving away from language at the moment,
- 5 would you also have expectations that PIRC initially
- 6 would consider perhaps patterns of behaviour, underlying
- 7 patterns, whether they had used sprays or batons at
- 8 other knife incidents, for example, or only in relation
- 9 to this particular incident, would you have considered
- it a relevant line of inquiry to look into whether they
- 11 treated all knife calls as potentially terrorist
- 12 related?
- 13 A. Of course. An example I gave but patterns of behaviour
- 14 are important. In my current job I deal with patterns
- of behaviour on a daily basis in trials so of course
- they're important.
- 17 Q. And what kind of pattern of behaviour, if identified, be
- 18 indicative of -- how would that assist the crown in the
- job they have to do?
- 20 A. Well, I mean it depends what the patterns of behaviour
- 21 are, but patterns of behaviour, along with the use of
- 22 inappropriate language, can indicate -- can give an
- indication into someone's mindset.
- 24 Q. Right.
- 25 A. And motivations.
- Q. Thank you. And then I think --

- 1 A. But as I say, I don't know what the evidence was --
- 2 Q. No.
- 3 A. -- at the end of the day because I had stepped down by
- 4 then, but as a general point, as a general point of
- 5 principle, yes, I agree with that.
- 6 Q. And in your experience would you recognise that
- 7 comparator evidence could be of assistance in relation
- 8 to an investigation, for example, comparing actions
- 9 taken with -- in this particular circumstance compared
- 10 to how actions would be normally taken against a white
- 11 man?
- 12 A. Of course. I mean PIRC looked at the patterns of
- behaviour as an example in relation to complaints
- 14 against the police, whether there was a spike in racial
- 15 complaints against police officers for Fife when
- 16 compared with other forces so these things -- these
- 17 things matter and is a legitimate line of inquiry, but,
- 18 again, I didn't see the results of the investigation so
- 19 I'm commenting on a general level.
- 20 Q. Yes. And finally, would you also consider it to be a
- 21 relevant line of investigation to consider the speed at
- 22 which officers elected to use force, for example,
- against Mr Bayoh and consider whether there were any
- 24 underlying indications or from which an inference could
- 25 be drawn?
- 26 A. Well, it's very difficult to answer that question

- 1 without the full panoply of circumstances that the
- police officers were dealing with so I don't think you
- 3 could look at that in isolation. You would need to look
- 4 at that in the round, what are the circumstances
- 5 pertaining to that, you know, speed time in relation to
- 6 whatever actions the police are proved to have taken.
- 7 Q. And in the absence of overt examples, would it be
- 8 necessary for PIRC or for the crown to consider the
- 9 whole circumstances in detail?
- 10 A. Oh, the whole circumstances have to be looked at as part
- of the investigation into all the circumstances.
- 12 Q. And was it any part of your expectation -- given what
- 13 you've told us about your experience and how you viewed
- 14 the significance of race, was it any part of your
- 15 expectation that the issue of race would not be fully
- 16 explored from the very beginning?
- 17 A. No, as I say front, left, centre, as soon as I heard
- 18 about it, I knew and I wasn't alone in that.
- 19 Q. We've heard evidence from Mr McGowan in relation to the
- 20 steps taken by the crown after the final PIRC report was
- 21 received and his evidence is that in light of the
- 22 circumstances that existed at that time and the work
- 23 that was done by the precognoscers and Crown Counsel
- that, as he put it, there were further steps that could
- 25 have been taken. In relation to all reasonable steps to
- 26 unmask any racist motive, he said there were further

1		steps that could have been taken.
2	Α.	I wasn't there at the time so I don't know what the
3		further steps were, what he had in mind, but what the
4		if there were further steps to be taken, these were

- 5 identified as part of the precognition process and those
- 6 further steps required to be taken.
- Right. Perhaps we could look at your second statement 7 Q. 8 now, please. And I think you point out in paragraph 2 9 that you've actually been away from Crown Office now for around eight years. 10
- 11 Α. Yes.
- Could we look at paragraph 4: 12 Q.
- "The Jandoo report following the death of 13 14 Surjit Singh Chhokar looked at inter alia liaison with 15 the family and questions of how the crown dealt with racism and racially motived crime. I was not involved 16 17 in the Jandoo or the Campbell reviews at the time, but 18 I was aware of the findings of the reviews. I was also aware that crown accepted the findings and 19 recommendations of the reviews. I was not involved in 20 the implementation of the recommendations of the 21 reports." 22
- 23 But at paragraph 9 you do go on to say -- sorry --24 paragraph 6 you say:
- 25 "From memory, after the Jandoo report all policies 26 were reviewed to make sure they were equitable and

fair." 1 2 And: "The prosecution policy was reviewed to ensure that 3 racial motivation was identified and embedded in 4 reporting and decision-making." 5 6 Then if we can move to paragraph 9, please, you say: 7 "I know from personal experience that precognition 8 templates were amended to ensure that precognoscers were 9 alive and required to address any issues or potential issues of racial motivation. A section was added to the 10 11 precognition template narrative. I was involved in designing the templates." 12 I'm interested in exploring this issue with you. 13 14 Α. Yes. But I'm conscious it's now half past 11? 15 LORD BRACADALE: We'll take a 20-minute break. 16 17 (11.30 am)18 (A short break) 19 (11.55 am)20 LORD BRACADALE: Ms Grahame. MS GRAHAME: Thank you very much. We were looking at 21 paragraph 9 of your Inquiry statement and if we could 22 23 have that back on the screen and you'll remember this 24 related to something known as precognition templates. 25 Tell us what precognition templates were. 26 A. Well, a bit of a history to get to explain. In the

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

26

nineties what we wanted to do at the Crown Office was to try and improve the quality of precognitions and precognitions are -- originally were a bundle of statements and that then through the 60s then developed into assisting Crown Counsel with a narrative taken from the statements as to what the evidence say happened, together with an analysis of the evidence, sufficiency, problems with witnesses, et cetera, and recommendations.

So that's how it developed 60s and 70s. And of course what you had was you developed a mix of staff. So you had legally qualified procurator fiscal deputes who were doing precognition work and you also had precognition officers or non-legally qualified and when that was looked at we decided that you had to help and focus the mind of precognoscers, in particular precognition officers, as to the issues that required to be identified in a narrative and analysis, recommendations. So a group was set up of which I was involved, precognition working group, I may be wrong in that, but that's my recollection, and part of the work that was done was to develop templates. So in other words you have -- you're dealing with a robbery case so you would set a template for a robbery case as to what should be covered in the precognition. Of course it's not prescriptive. It depends on the case and what the evidence was, but it was designed to help the

- 1 precognoscer as to what the issues are and I remember,
- 2 although you know I have been away a long time from the
- 3 crown, but I remember, because I was involved in
- 4 designing the templates that motivation, racial
- 5 motivation, homophobic motivation, et cetera was entered
- into the templates to help precognoscers with
- 7 identifying what the issues that they required to
- 8 address were.
- 9 Q. So it was designed as a prompt perhaps to remind
- 10 precognoscers, whether legally qualified or not, that
- 11 racial motivation, issues to do with race or other types
- 12 of protected characteristics should be addressed in the
- narrative and analysis?
- 14 A. Not all cases obviously.
- 15 Q. No.
- A. But as you say it's a prompt and it's like a menu from
- 17 the template. If it's not an issue in the case, you
- 18 don't need to address it, but it's, as you say, a prompt
- 19 would be the best way to describe it.
- Q. So something embedded automatically prompts the
- 21 precognoscer to at least consider whether it's relevant
- to the case they have in hand?
- 23 A. Yes.
- Q. And you have recalled here that those templates did have
- 25 some entry which required people to consider racial
- 26 motivation?

- 1 A. That's my recollection. It's a long time --
- 2 Q. All right.
- 3 A. -- since these were produced. I have not kept a copy.
- I am not with the crown. I have been away for a long
- 5 time, but that's my recollection.
- 6 Q. Because in light of this, we have explored the issue --
- 7 the Inquiry team have explored the issue of precognition
- 8 templates. Let me show you one which is in relation to
- 9 the CAAPD department, so COPFS 06461. It relates to a
- 10 standard CAAPD report and this --
- If we can look at the top, it says "Criminal
- 12 Allegations Against the Police Division" and if we move
- down, it invites the following entries to be included:
- 14 officer complained against, complainer, allegations,
- 15 linked criminal proceedings, chapter 24 disclosure,
- 16 category, and move down, circumstances. And that would
- 17 normally be contained within the narrative.
- 18 And then moving down, "Analysis of evidence.
- 19 Recommendation re criminal proceedings and malicious
- 20 complaint," and then "reported by". And as you will
- 21 see, if can move right down to the bottom, there's no
- 22 reference in this template of race, none whatsoever.
- 23 We've gone back to the crown who have continued to
- look for other templates that may have existed. I have
- 25 been advised this morning that they're not able to find
- any that include the issue of race.

- 1 A. Well, it's my recollection. I drafted them. I drafted
- 2 some of them. I didn't draft the CAAPD ones.
- 3 Q. Right.
- A. But it's my recollection.
- 5 Q. So if you -- if at some point you drafted those with --
- 6 to include race, given you experience, it would now
- 7 appear that at least some of these templates do not
- 8 include race. Do you have any comment to make about
- 9 that?
- 10 A. Well, what I'm talking about from recollection is in the
- 11 nineties. It's a long time ago and it's moved on, they
- 12 may have moved on, I'm just speculating, I don't know.
- 13 All I know is my recollection was that in drawing up
- 14 templates there was a reference to racial motivation.
- Q. At one time, perhaps in the nineties when you were
- drafting these templates, you obviously took the view
- 17 that to have race added into them was something to be
- 18 done and of benefit. Can you think of any reason why it
- 19 would not be of benefit now to have race?
- 20 A. Of course, it would be of benefit now.
- 21 Q. Yes, all right. Thank you.
- 22 A. Not only race, but all the protected characteristics
- should be, if it's an issue in the case then of course.
- Q. Would that -- in the same way you thought it would be of
- assistance to precognoscers, legally qualified or not,
- 26 would it continue to be of benefit perhaps to

1 precognoscers?

statement.

2 A. Of course.

6

Q. Yes. Can we turn now, please, to paragraph 24 of your

statement in relation to Simon San -- sorry -- this must

be the first -- sorry -- it will be the second Inquiry

7 You're giving examples and you mention the murder of 8 Simon San, a Chinese delivery driver, and you talk about 9 the accused, John Reid, punched Mr San who fell and struck his head on the roadway and died from a cerebral 10 11 bleed 30 to 40 minutes after the punch. Reid had flown the locus and went to a flat and confessed to another 12 person and used racist language. The question was 13 14 whether the crime was racially motived. The answer on 15 the evidence was that it was not racial aggravated. We made sure that the information was placed before the 16 17 court. We also ensured this was fully explained to the 18 family of Mr San.

So again, you've raised a number of issues here.

This was a case which you yourself prosecuted, was it,

or were involved in?

- A. I was involved in it. I don't think I presented the
  narrative to the court on the plea, but I was involved
  in it, yes.
- Q. Right. And you've talked there about the use of racial language, although you mention that it was after the

		Transcript of the Sheku Bayoh Inquiry
1		actual
2	Α.	I think it was about 30 minutes had lapsed and it was
3		from memory the place he went to after punching Mr San.
4	Q.	Right. You've talked there about placing the
5		information before the court and explain the purpose of
6		that.
7	Α.	Well, I mean there's a number of purposes. Firstly,
8		it's to allow the court to give the court the
9		information so they can take it into account in
10		sentence. Secondly, it places the information in a
11		public domain so that the public, the media, the family
12		are all aware of it, that it's not suppressed, not
13		hidden. And it also gives accountability, public
14		accountability, in the sense that this is your
15		assessment of the evidence and it allows anyone who
16		disagrees with that assessment to challenge it, make it
17		known, challenge it in writing, for example, or
18		whatever.
19	Q.	Thank you. Can we look now at paragraph 31. And we'll
20		have that on the screen. It's a short paragraph. This
21		is where you're asked about training, and you talk here
22		about unconscious bias and racial language and you give

about unconscious bias and racial language and you give
an example in this paragraph and talk about:

"Whether it's a direct quote from a witness or an
accused, this type of racial language was not to be
used."

- Transcript of the Sheku Bayoh Inquiry And you talk about the significance of that and  ${\tt I}$ 1 2 noticed in paragraph 24 when you're talking about San, 3 that you also say racist language was used. 4 Two points about this paragraph in particular. First of all, the example you give you've spelled out 5 6 specifically and I wondered why in one paragraph you've 7 described it as racist language without spelling it out 8 in terms, but in this paragraph you have spelled it out 9 in terms. Was there any reason for that distinction being drawn? 10 11 Α. Not really. I can't think of any reason. I've just 12 wanted to make the point that I was seeking to make about the use of such language and ensuring that that 13 language is not used in a precognition unless it's a 14 15 direct quote, a piece of evidence. 16 Right. Was this a direct quote from --Q. I think it was from --17 Α. -- the case that you're referring to? 18 Q. I think that was an example I gave, but in the 19
- A. I think that was an example I gave, but in the

  Simon San case I recollect that 30 minutes after the

  incident that type of language was used in a

  conversation to someone else in a house about referring

  to someone in such pejorative language.
- Q. Right. You've referred to that and give that as an example of unconscious bias. In this day and age, do you think that is unconscious bias?

- 1 A. It would be both I think.
- Q. Both conscious and unconscious. In any event, it's of
- 3 relevance to any matters of criminality?
- 4 A. Of course.
- 5 Q. Yes, and you would expect in a narrative or analysis for
- 6 that type of language to be addressed?
- 7 A. Of course. But, you know, when you're looking at what
- 8 is the evidence that the actual crime was racially
- 9 motivated, so you need to look at whether that could be
- 10 a link to the actual crime or is it just -- is it racist
- 11 attitudes and views. So I mean there's issues to be
- 12 addressed which prosecutors should be experienced enough
- and able enough to be able to work their way through
- 14 that.
- Q. And I think the key is for those issues to be raised and
- addressed and considered?
- 17 A. Of course.
- 18 Q. Regardless of the ultimate decision taken, that's a
- 19 matter for the crown, but it would be important for
- 20 these types of matters, the use of language such as this
- 21 to be addressed specifically within the body of the
- 22 precognition?
- 23 A. Of course.
- Q. Thank you. Can I move on to another section of your
- 25 statement, paragraph 49, which I think is your first
- 26 statement. And I think in at this section, it's called

1		section 4, and you start to talk about or maybe earlier
2		above that there's a section 4 is mentioned and there
3		you start to talk about the postmortem. There we are.
4		Section 4:
5		"Postmortem examination and release of Sheku Bayoh's
6		body."
7		And you have given the Chair a detailed explanation
8		of the final postmortem report.
9	A.	Yes.
10	Q.	Could we look at paragraph 49, please:
11		"Overall it was not possible for the pathologist to
12		be sure what had been the most significant factor in
13		death and as such the cause of death was best regarded
14		by them as being sudden death in a man intoxicated by
15		MDMA (ecstasy) and alpha-PVP whilst being restrained."
16		And you say:
17		"The results of the postmortem examination would
18		have informed the further investigations instructed by
19		the crown and undertaken by PIRC."
20		We've heard evidence that the final postmortem
21		report was received on 18 June after the toxicology
22		results were in.
23	Α.	Yes.
24	Q.	And various other investigations of that sort, although
25		the postmortem itself had been carried out on 4 May.
26		Regardless of whether the ultimate proceedings were

- 1 a criminal trial or an FAI, the crown would wish to lead
- evidence, regardless of which forum it was, from a
- 3 pathologist to establish what caused or materially
- 4 contributed to the death; do you accept that?
- 5 A. Yes.
- Q. And there were three factors named in the cause of death
- 7 from the final postmortem report and they were MDMA
- 8 (ecstasy), alpha-PVP, and restraint.
- 9 Now, I think in paragraph 49 you say:
- "It wasn't possible for the pathologist to be sure
- 11 what had been the most significant factor in the death."
- But would you agree that all three of those factors,
- the MDMA, the alpha-PVP, and the restraint, were a
- 14 material contribution to death?
- 15 A. According to the pathological evidence.
- 16 Q. Yes.
- 17 A. Just make an obvious -- well, I think it's an obvious
- 18 point that part of the crown investigations dealing with
- 19 the pathology, one of the things, and you've got what
- 20 the pathologist considered contributed to the death of
- 21 Sheku Bayoh, one of the things you've got to deal with
- is to rule out matters. So at an inquiry or a criminal
- 23 prosecution you may be met with, well, is it
- such-and-such, has that been considered, and it's
- 25 really, really a duty of the investigator to look at the
- 26 pathology, identify any possible other explanations and

- 1 rule that out if possible and get expert evidence on
- 2 that and even that would include speculations,
- 3 speculative cause of deaths, that type of thing.
- 4 And the reason is that you may be faced at say a
- 5 criminal prosecution with a defence pathologist who's
- 6 putting forward a theory and if you haven't dealt with
- 7 it, ruled it out or whatever, then your investigation is
- 8 deficient and what you're doing is you're -- there's a
- 9 hole in it which someone else could fill.
- 10 Q. Obviously if the defence pathologist comes up with a new
- 11 theory, you would anticipate the crown would be given an
- opportunity to explore that themselves?
- 13 A. You would.
- 14 Q. So in relation to cause of death you would want to rule
- out things such as natural disease of some description?
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 Q. Such as perhaps an infection or an underlying medical
- 18 condition?
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 Q. You would want to rule out a prior assault --
- 21 A. Yes.
- 22 Q. -- such as a stabbing or a head injury or something
- 23 along those lines?
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 Q. You would want to look at removing the possibility of
- any underlying, as I've said, preexisting condition of

- some description. And the final postmortem report actually addressed all of those issues, did it not?
- 3 A. Mm-hm.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

And Dr Shearer and Dr Bouhaidar took the view that all 4 Q. of those could be excluded as causes of death and the 5 6 cause of death for Mr Bayoh was these three factors, 7 MDMA, alpha-PVP and restraint. So if it's sufficient 8 for the crown's purposes to lead evidence at trial or an 9 FAI as to what caused or materially contributed to Mr Bayoh's death, can I ask you in relation to this 10 11 paragraph, was it not sufficient for the crown to simply 12 proceed on the basis of the cause of death given by Dr Shearer and Dr Bouhaidar? Why was it necessary in 13 your view to consider what was the most significant of 14

those three factors?

- A. Well, I mean the case law is such that that is something which will be an issue at the case, to what extent did all three or taken individually -- for example, if it's put to the pathologist, well, actually it was alpha-PVP which could have caused death without any contribution from MDMA or restraint, then that's something which you would have to address and that's what precognition consultation with the pathological witnesses would do and it may be that you need to get a further opinion when someone with -- a specialist in a particular area.
  - Q. And my understanding of the position, and it will

- obviously be a matter for the Chair, that alpha-PVP, for
- 2 example, could of itself cause death?
- A. Well, that's the issue I'm saying. You would need to
  look at what is the contribution, could each of these
  individually on their own without -- and that would be
  highly relevant I would have thought. Restraint for
  example on its own, highly relevant in relation to the
  investigation.
- 9 Q. We've heard evidence that restraint on its own can cause death.
- 11 A. Well, that's the type of thing that you need to

  12 investigate and get -- identify the definitive position

  13 so that you know where you are in relation to the

  14 decision-making.
- Q. But if it's sufficient for the crown to simply lead

  evidence to prove that restraint, for example, was a

  material cause of death, why did the crown need to

  investigate further what proportion or whether it was

  significant or otherwise? You already have a report

  saying it is a material cause of death, that restraint

  was significant, it could not be excluded as de minimis.
- A. Well, you would want to speak to the pathologist to find out what they meant by that.
- Q. Yes, so in terms of your expectations after that report
  came in, would you have expected either PIRC or your own
  staff to speak to Dr Shearer or Dr Bouhaidar to explore

- 1 these issues and discuss the postmortem?
- 2 A. I would.
- 3 Q. We've heard evidence from the lead investigator at PIRC
- 4 that that wasn't done?
- A. Well, it's a matter for PIRC to answer, but I would
- 6 certainly expect the crown to do that.
- 7 Q. And we've heard evidence from Les Brown that in fact as
- 8 matters progressed with the investigation Crown Counsel
- 9 specifically accepted that cause of death was a given.
- 10 They refer to the case of Johnstone against HMA, which
- I'm sure you're aware of, it's in the Bench Book as I
- 12 understand it, that what was provided in the final
- 13 postmortem report where restraint was specifically named
- 14 as one of the factors which contributed to death, and
- that was sufficient. So was there -- was there a need
- 16 for the crown to explore this proportion issue further?
- 17 A. I can only speak personally. If it was me as
- 18 Crown Counsel that was dealing with the case, I would
- 19 want the pathologist conducting the postmortem to be
- 20 spoken to and consulted with as to what is the
- 21 contribution, primary, major, what minor, and that in my
- 22 experience in dealing with pathology, very important
- I would have thought.
- Q. Would it matter if it was a minor cause of death if it
- 25 has provided a material contribution to death?
- 26 A. Well, legally it wouldn't matter, but in relation to the

- evidence, it does matter. For example -- if for example
- 2 you prosecuted police officers on the back of following
- 3 this and restraint played a minor part, then that would
- 4 if they were convicted affect sentence, for example,
- 5 I would have thought so it is relevant.
- 6 Q. Right. Les Brown also gave evidence on 17 April that:
- 7 "From what I do recollect was that the
- 8 Lord Advocate, and I was in agreement with this, he was
- 9 keen to try to separate out, so far as possible, whether
- it was possible -- sorry, I'll rephrase that. He was
- 11 keen to see whether it was possible to separate out the
- 12 extent to which each of those factors had played a
- 13 part."
- 14 A. Well, for the reason I've explained.
- 15 Q. We've heard that there were a number of reports
- 16 ultimately obtained by the crown from a number of
- forensic pathologists.
- 18 A. Mm-hm.
- 19 Q. We've heard that not only was there this report from
- 20 Dr Shearer and Dr Bouhaidar, who I should say were not
- 21 being criticised by anyone else, that there was also
- 22 forensic pathology reports from Professor Crane, a
- Dr Nat Carey, a Dr Lawler. There were a number of
- 24 pathologists and ultimately all said the same cause of
- 25 death, subject to one element. They also added in the
- 26 struggle against restraint as well as the restraint.

- 1 Can you now envisage why so many pathologists would be
- 2 required?
- 3 A. Well, in a case like this, which is complex
- 4 pathologically, it gives confidence. It can flag up
- 5 issues that haven't been considered by the pathologists
- and, as you said, I think you said that the additional
- 7 pathologists had mentioned struggle so that was flagged
- 8 up. I mean I haven't seen those reports, but in my
- 9 experience of complex cause of death then it seems to me
- 10 that it's sensible to get third opinions on other
- 11 matters on that.
- 12 Q. We've heard evidence that the final forensic pathologist
- who looked at this from the first instruction until the
- 14 final report was received, there were a number of
- 15 communications and reports during that period, but that
- period took 14 months.
- 17 A. Sorry. Give me that again.
- 18 Q. So from the first instruction -- there were a number of
- 19 letters of instruction, but from the first date of the
- 20 first one to the final report that was received was a
- 21 period of 14 months.
- 22 A. For the pathology report?
- 23 Q. For the final report from the final pathologist. And I
- 24 wonder if you were concerned in any way about the
- 25 impact -- often experts can cause -- can take a
- 26 considerable period of time. I'm wondering for your

- thoughts about the impact of delay, the period of time
  that that took and the impact on the overall
  investigation.
- Well, it's difficult to say, and the time taken I think 4 Α. is demonstrative of the fact that it was complex, and 5 6 there's other -- I mean there's issues to consider 7 around this. And for me what I want is I want a 8 thorough report, thorough investigation, there weren't 9 matters that have been raised to be considered, and if the report took 14 months, then if that's what it took, 10 11 you know, for the report to be completed and all these 12 matters to be considered and, as you say, it's not disputed the original postmortem and cause of death 13 14 issued in the report 14 months later, that just 15 demonstrates it was well thought out, I would say, and 16 carefully considered by the pathologist.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

And you have got to remember as well is that the pathologist would be well aware of the profile of this case and the pathologist would know that it was important to be thorough, to be careful, to get it right.

Q. At the time you were Lord Advocate, was it the normal course of events that when a final postmortem became available to the crown and a two doctor postmortem that that would -- the thoroughness and the way that was written, the way that was conducted, would that

- generally be reviewed by a subsequent pathologist to check it was thorough and considered?
- A. Just depends. I mean the importance of this case and the profile that this case had and the issues in
- 5 relation to restraint, postural asphyxia, intoxication,
- all this, it's important I would have thought that the
- 7 crown has confidence in the original pathologist's view
- 8 and to get a third opinion on specific issues. I can't
- 9 see anything wrong with that.
- 10 Q. All right. From your recollection, when this final
- 11 postmortem report came in, was there anyone in your --
- in Crown Office or yourself to have any concerns about
- the pathologists, that's Dr Shearer and Dr Bouhaidar?
- 14 A. No, I don't think -- you mean the ability of and
- 15 experience of the pathologist? Certainly I didn't.
- 16 Q. All right, thank you. I would like to move on to a
- 17 comment that is in a document which is Lindsey Miller's
- 18 Inquiry statement, SBPI 00428, and this relates to a
- 19 period after the first PIRC report has been received so
- 20 it's after the 7 August. It relates to a meeting
- 21 which -- paragraph 59, please, a -- meeting which you
- had with the family on 12 August.
- Now, this is Lindsey Miller's Inquiry statement to
- the Inquiry:
- 25 "The first part of my note from 12 August 2015 is
- not a note of a meeting with Mr Bayoh's family, but the

- 1 note of a premeet before the anticipated meeting with 2 the family."
- 3 So there was a meeting with you I think prior to meeting with the family.
- "I was present at that meeting along with the 5 6 Lord Advocate, John Loque and Stephen McGowan. I have not attributed the comment about the PIRC report being a 7 'piece of rubbish' to anyone, simply noted that it was 8 9 said, and I cannot now recall whether that was said by someone at the meeting directly, or them quoting someone 10 11 else. I say that because of the use of quotation marks,
- Do you remember who said the first PIRC report was a 14 15 piece of rubbish?

which suggests one of the attendees at the meeting was

- 16 A. News to me. I didn't certainly say it and I didn't have 17 a knowledge and I wouldn't describe it is that. So I have no knowledge of that. 18
- Right. Do you remember from that meeting anyone in your 19 Q. 20 hearing saying that?
- No, I don't. 21 Α.

4

12

13

- Right. What was your view of the first PIRC report? 22 Q.
- You mean the interim report? 23 Α.

quoting someone else."

24 Q. Yes, we've heard that -- I think Les Brown when he gave 25 evidence corrected me when I called it an interim report 26 and he said it wasn't actually designed initially as an

- interim report, he thought that would be the PIRC
- 2 report, but subsequently, because further investigations
- 3 were required by the crown, that it then became referred
- 4 to as an interim report by others.
- 5 A. I understood it to be an interim report.
- 6 Q. Did you?
- 7 A. I didn't really have a view on it to be honest, because
- 8 it was an interim -- whatever terminology used -- it was
- 9 an interim report, a final report to come in. You would
- 10 work through the final report once it came in and you
- 11 would conduct your own investigation. I didn't have a
- view on whether it was a good, bad, indifferent report
- 13 at all.
- Q. Right. In your role, did you actually read that first
- 15 PIRC report or did you rely on information from staff?
- A. A bit of both actually, but I remember I did read it
- 17 when it came in.
- 18 Q. What parts of it did you read?
- 19 A. I read -- I don't think I read the appendices and I
- 20 particularly --
- 21 Q. We've heard that was statements and the like.
- 22 A. Yes, I didn't read that. I read the actual body of
- 23 report itself with a particular focus on the
- 24 circumstances which were set out in it and I think I
- looked at the pathology as well.
- 26 Q. Right. In relation to your expectations after that

- first interim PIRC report was obtained, what -- how did
- 2 you envisage matters progressing from that point?
- 3 A. What do you mean from the interim report to call it
- 4 that?
- 5 Q. From the interim report.
- 6 A. Right.
- 7 Q. We've heard that after that -- we've heard evidence from
- 8 Les Brown that he looked through a number of matters, he
- 9 then did a letter on 2 September.
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 Q. Detailed letter giving further more detailed directions
- 12 to PIRC.
- 13 A. Sorry. What year was that?
- 14 Q. That was 2015.
- 15 A. Yes, okay.
- 16 Q. So the first or the interim report is received,
- 17 Les Brown head of CAAPD works on that and does a
- 18 detailed letter of the 2 September --
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 Q. -- instructing a number of lines of investigation for
- 21 PIRC to pursue. They then took a period of around one
- 22 year --
- 23 A. Mm-hm.
- Q. -- between August 2015 and August 2016 for the final
- 25 PIRC report to be received.
- A. Well, exactly that. That's what I would expect.

- 1 Les Brown, experienced, able, been in charge of
- 2 investigation, preparation, from the crown's point of
- 3 view to go through it, identify the issues which need to
- 4 be addressed, let PIRC know about them and these will be
- 5 addressed in the final report.
- Q. And what sort of engagement did you have with Les Brown
- 7 in relation to the work that was being done during that
- 8 period, that year?
- 9 A. Not in detail, a kind of overview. It would tell me
- 10 what the issues are, but it's the official's job to
- interact with PIRC at the end of the day, to move it
- 12 forward and the final report comes in, to conduct the
- crown investigations, to prepare case papers, document,
- 14 precognition, call it what you want, and identify
- 15 Crown Counsel to report it to them.
- 16 Q. Right. I would like to move on to an issue regarding
- instruction of experts.
- 18 A. Mm-hm.
- 19 Q. We've heard that PIRC were asked to identify experts --
- 20 A. Mm-hm.
- 21 Q. -- as part of their investigation. Prior to the final
- 22 report being received by the crown, PIRC were to gather
- in CVs and they were to make recommendations to the
- 24 crown as to who should be instructed and then once the
- 25 crown had approved an expert, the PIRC prepared a draft
- letter of instruction which would be checked by

- 1 Crown Office and then sent off to the expert. And that
- 2 was happening at the period of time shortly prior to the
- 3 final PIRC report being prepared and submitted.
- 4 Can I ask you, did you have any concerns at that
- 5 time about PIRC being asked to do this work in relation
- 6 to experts, particularly medical experts? We've heard
- 7 evidence that maybe their experience of doing that was
- 8 limited.
- 9 A. No, because it would be superintended by the crown and
- 10 it's the crown's decision in what experts are instructed
- and the investigators would have an input in that. They
- 12 made recommend -- I think it was a letter, a detailed
- 13 letter setting out suggested experts, but ultimately
- it's a decision for the crown.
- 15 Q. So were you happy that your staff would ultimately take
- 16 the final view about which experts were to be
- instructed?
- 18 A. Yes, I think is there not -- there's a memorandum of
- 19 agreement between PIRC and the crown.
- Q. Yes, we've heard evidence about that.
- 21 A. Right, I think it may be covered in that.
- 22 Q. But were you comfortable that your staff would deal with
- 23 the issues of who was to be instructed and how they were
- to be instructed?
- 25 A. That was my understanding. I was comfortable with that.
- 26 Q. We've heard that the first couple of experts that were

1		instructed were a Dr Payne-James and a Dr Steven Karch?
2	Α.	Mm-hm.
3	Q.	And they were instructed actually the work had been
4		progressed prior to the final PIRC report, but they were
5		instructed shortly after that was received.
6		Can we look at paragraph 117 of your Inquiry
7		statement. I think this is Lindsey Miller's on the
8		screen. There we are. 117. "Issues regarding
9		Dr Steven Karch", you have addressed this in your
10		statement:
11		"The recommendation of this expert was initially
12		proposed by PIRC. It would have been done through an
13		assessment of his experience and qualifications.
14		Dr Karch is a forensic pathologist who is expert in
15		cardiac pathology. He is a fellow of the Faculty of
16		Forensic and Legal Medicine of the Royal College of
17		Physicians in London. He served as a cardiac
18		pathologist in the office of San Francisco Medical
19		Examiner and is the author of a number of books and has
20		given evidence in a number of trials"
21		Do you remember now was his name first mentioned by
22		PIRC or from someone in Crown Office?
23	Α.	I can't answer that, because I can't remember who the
24		genesis of Dr Karch was.
25	Q.	Right. You have said that:
26		"It would have been done through an assessment of

- 1 his experience and qualifications."
- 2 Who did you expect to carry out that assessment of
- 3 his experience and qualifications?
- A. Well, the people that were involved in the process was
- 5 PIRC and Les Brown.
- 6 Q. Would you have expected PIRC to carry out that
- 7 assessment or Les Brown?
- 8 A. To have an input. To have an input.
- 9 Q. Would you have expected them to work together on that?
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 Q. Right. And was it your expectation that either PIRC or
- 12 Les Brown would assess independence, impartiality of
- Dr Karch and confirm he had no conflicts?
- 14 A. Well, yes, I would expect that, if that information was
- identifiable. I think there was an issue with him.
- I think part of it was that he went to the press.
- 17 Q. Yes, you deal with that in your statement. I'm
- 18 interested in his experience and qualifications, first
- of all.
- 20 A. Yes.
- 21 Q. So who would you have expected to address those issues
- 22 regarding his qualifications and his experience?
- A. Both, Les Brown and PIRC.
- Q. To work together on that?
- 25 A. Work together, yes.
- 26 Q. And in terms of assessing his independence and

- impartiality?
- 2 A. It's part of it.
- 3 Q. And any conflicts that he may have had?
- 4 A. Part of it, yes.
- 5 Q. Part of it.
- Now, we've heard evidence, and there is evidence
- 7 available to the Chair, that Dr Karch was not in fact a
- 8 forensic pathologist, he had never conducted any
- 9 autopsies, and we have other evidence available to
- 10 the Chair that he was being instructed for the purposes
- of expertise in toxicology. Do you have any
- 12 recollection of that?
- 13 A. No.
- Q. No. So what was your understanding of why Dr Karch was
- being instructed?
- 16 A. As it says in paragraph 117, the cardiac pathology.
- 17 Q. Right. And why were you interested in cardiac
- 18 pathology?
- 19 A. I think -- I need to go back to the original postmortem
- 20 report, but from memory it was cardiac arrhythmia was
- 21 referred to so that would be an issue. You would need
- 22 an expert for that just to look at that as an issue.
- 23 Q. That was your recollection of the reasons --
- A. That's my recollection.
- 25 Q. -- the reasons why.
- A. But as I say, I didn't have a detailed involvement in

- 1 that, in the selection of Dr Karch or looking at his
- 2 qualifications, independence, objectivity, that type of
- 3 thing.
- Q. Do you remember any part of the instruction being in
- 5 relation to toxicology or the drugs that were mentioned
- in the final postmortem?
- 7 A. I can't recall that. That doesn't mean that wasn't the
- 8 case but --
- 9 Q. Right.
- 10 A. -- I don't recall that.
- 11 Q. And then if we look at paragraph 120:
- "It's my recollection that there was a
- misunderstanding that Dr Karch was instructed on excited
- 14 delirium. This was not the case. He was instructed on
- 15 his expertise on cardiology."
- 16 A. That's my recollection.
- Q. And so if there's been any suggestion or concern
- 18 expressed by other witnesses that he was instructed on
- 19 the basis of his views on excited delirium, does that
- 20 accord with your recollection?
- 21 A. No, because I was specifically -- I remember asking
- 22 about this, because I think it was raised at one of the
- 23 meetings with the family and I remember specifically
- asking is he being instructed on excited delirium.
- I was reassured that he wasn't. It was in relation to
- that area. That's my recollection.

- 1 Q. So certainly in terms of your understanding and
- 2 awareness at that time --
- 3 A. Mm-hm.
- 4 Q. -- you were not seeking an opinion from Dr Karch --
- 5 A. No.
- 6 Q. -- on excited delirium?
- 7 A. Yes. Earlier in my evidence I talked about ruling out
- 8 things, because it's as important as ruling in things,
- 9 and excited delirium was something that would have to be
- 10 dealt with, ruled out or whatever so I remember that,
- but I wasn't heavily involved in that area, but I do
- 12 remember saying, look, if this is an issue, you need to
- look at this and you need to either rule it out or rule
- 14 it in and if you need expert evidence on it, you would
- need to get expert evidence on it and the expert
- evidence may be that, look, this is bogus or whatever,
- 17 this is not a factor. So that is something that you
- 18 would want to address.
- 19 Q. And if the final postmortem report from Dr Shearer and
- 20 Dr Bouhaidar ruled out excited delirium and said it's
- 21 not a pathological condition and spoke of perhaps being
- 22 more a psychiatric condition at best, but not one for
- 23 pathologists, would you have considered it needed to be
- ruled out further based on that?
- 25 A. I think I would. I would want to have the confidence,
- reassurance, that that was ruled out.

Q. And if it was possibly considered at that stage to be a psychiatric condition, what sort of expert would you consider the crown would have to go to do that ruling

out exercise?

4

21

22

- It's kind of difficult to say in the abstract. I would 5 Α. 6 need to look at what the information is about 7 psychiatric condition. I would, if I was dealing with 8 it, that particular issue, I think I would take 9 soundings, I would speak to people that I respected, I would take soundings on it and try and identify an 10 11 appropriate perhaps psychiatric witness that would speak 12 about it and explain what it is and why that's not a factor in this particular case so that evidence is 13 available to present to the court. But it depends. 14 15 may be it's a combination of both say a third opinion in relation to the two pathologists that said it's not a 16 17 pathological condition, it's a psychiatric condition, I 18 might get a third opinion in that -- on that and I would 19 also consider whether or not to get expert psychiatric 20 evidence.
  - Q. And so would the crown be looking to instruct a consultant psychiatrist or someone along those lines to express a view?
- A. It's a possibility. I don't know. I need to look at,
  you know, what the circumstances are. It may be it's
  a -- you know, it's a step-by-step approach. You know

you've got further information and you look at that and,
you know, your mind is focusing in on the issue and what
particular experts, if any, that may be required to deal
with that, but, as I say, part of the preparation of a

case is to prove what it's not.

- Q. Right. And do you remember why Dr Payne-James was
  instructed? You've talked to us about Dr Karch. Do you
  remember why --
- 9 A. No.

- 10 Q. -- Dr Payne-James was instructed?
- 11 A. I don't.
- 12 Q. Do you remember anything about him?
- 13 A. No.
- Q. Do you remember what specialism --
- 15 A. I remember the name.
- 16 Q. The name.
- 17 Can we look at the letters of instruction that were

  18 sent by PIRC to those experts. Let's look at Dr Karch's

  19 first, PIRC 03434B. See this is a letter from Dr -
  20 from PIRC to Dr Karch in August 2015. This letter

  21 actually was sent out just shortly after the interim

  22 PIRC report was sent. And if we could look at the

  23 actual instructions, you see there letters (a) to (d):
- "Please accept this letter as formal instruction to
  produce an expert witness report and documents are
  attached."

1		There's an expert witness package attached. You'll
2		see that it refers to:
3		"The physiological effect of the drugs detected in
4		the toxicology sample, individually or in combination,
5		on the deceased in the circumstances of his arrest.
6		"(b) The physiological effect of the CS PAVA spray,
7		individually or in combination, on the deceased in the
8		circumstances of his arrest.
9		"(c) The physiological effect of the physical
10		restraint of the deceased in the circumstances of his
11		arrest.
12		(d) And the physiological effect of all three in
13		combination."
14		There's no reference there to cardiology or cardiac
15		pathology or, in fact, any reference to the heart at
16		all?
17	Α.	Well, that's contrary to my understanding.
18	Q.	All right. And then can we look at the other letter of
19		instruction, PIRC 03435A. This is the letter of
20		instruction dated 10 August 2015 to Dr Payne-James, and
21		can we look at his instruction also further down the
22		page, please, looking for (a) to (d) also. There we
23		are:
24		"Please accept this letter as formal instruction."
25		And you'll see that (a) to (d) are in exactly the
26		same terms and we've heard that Dr Payne-James and

the letter of instruction appears to simply cover the same wording and the same questions to each doctor.  Do you have any concern looking at that?  A. Well, I mean I wasn't involved in it, no knowledge of it, certainly contrary to my understanding. I don't know why and I don't have a recollection of why this expert was instructed.  Q. Right. But in terms of your expectations regarding instructing further experts, would you have expected their letters to be tailored to each particular specialism that they have and seeking an opinion from each expert within the realms of their areas of skills qualifications, expertise?  A. I would and, further, I would expect in addition to letter of instruction, I would expect conversations to			
3 same wording and the same questions to each doctor. 4 Do you have any concern looking at that? 5 A. Well, I mean I wasn't involved in it, no knowledge of 6 it, certainly contrary to my understanding. I don't 7 know why and I don't have a recollection of why this 8 expert was instructed. 9 Q. Right. But in terms of your expectations regarding 10 instructing further experts, would you have expected 11 their letters to be tailored to each particular 12 specialism that they have and seeking an opinion from 13 each expert within the realms of their areas of skills 14 qualifications, expertise? 15 A. I would and, further, I would expect in addition to 16 letter of instruction, I would expect conversations to 17 take place with the expert in advance of the letter of	1		Dr Karch are different work in different fields, but
Do you have any concern looking at that?  A. Well, I mean I wasn't involved in it, no knowledge of it, certainly contrary to my understanding. I don't know why and I don't have a recollection of why this expert was instructed.  Q. Right. But in terms of your expectations regarding instructing further experts, would you have expected their letters to be tailored to each particular specialism that they have and seeking an opinion from each expert within the realms of their areas of skills qualifications, expertise?  A. I would and, further, I would expect in addition to letter of instruction, I would expect conversations to take place with the expert in advance of the letter of	2		the letter of instruction appears to simply cover the
A. Well, I mean I wasn't involved in it, no knowledge of it, certainly contrary to my understanding. I don't know why and I don't have a recollection of why this expert was instructed.  Q. Right. But in terms of your expectations regarding instructing further experts, would you have expected their letters to be tailored to each particular specialism that they have and seeking an opinion from each expert within the realms of their areas of skills qualifications, expertise?  A. I would and, further, I would expect in addition to letter of instruction, I would expect conversations to take place with the expert in advance of the letter of	3		same wording and the same questions to each doctor.
it, certainly contrary to my understanding. I don't know why and I don't have a recollection of why this expert was instructed.  Q. Right. But in terms of your expectations regarding instructing further experts, would you have expected their letters to be tailored to each particular specialism that they have and seeking an opinion from each expert within the realms of their areas of skills qualifications, expertise?  A. I would and, further, I would expect in addition to letter of instruction, I would expect conversations to take place with the expert in advance of the letter of	4		Do you have any concern looking at that?
know why and I don't have a recollection of why this expert was instructed.  Right. But in terms of your expectations regarding instructing further experts, would you have expected their letters to be tailored to each particular specialism that they have and seeking an opinion from each expert within the realms of their areas of skills qualifications, expertise?  A. I would and, further, I would expect in addition to letter of instruction, I would expect conversations to take place with the expert in advance of the letter of	5	Α.	Well, I mean I wasn't involved in it, no knowledge of
expert was instructed.  Q. Right. But in terms of your expectations regarding instructing further experts, would you have expected their letters to be tailored to each particular specialism that they have and seeking an opinion from each expert within the realms of their areas of skills qualifications, expertise?  A. I would and, further, I would expect in addition to letter of instruction, I would expect conversations to take place with the expert in advance of the letter of	6		it, certainly contrary to my understanding. I don't
9 Q. Right. But in terms of your expectations regarding 10 instructing further experts, would you have expected 11 their letters to be tailored to each particular 12 specialism that they have and seeking an opinion from 13 each expert within the realms of their areas of skills 14 qualifications, expertise? 15 A. I would and, further, I would expect in addition to 16 letter of instruction, I would expect conversations to 17 take place with the expert in advance of the letter of	7		know why and I don't have a recollection of why this
instructing further experts, would you have expected their letters to be tailored to each particular specialism that they have and seeking an opinion from each expert within the realms of their areas of skills qualifications, expertise?  A. I would and, further, I would expect in addition to letter of instruction, I would expect conversations to take place with the expert in advance of the letter of	8		expert was instructed.
their letters to be tailored to each particular  specialism that they have and seeking an opinion from  each expert within the realms of their areas of skills  qualifications, expertise?  A. I would and, further, I would expect in addition to  letter of instruction, I would expect conversations to  take place with the expert in advance of the letter of	9	Q.	Right. But in terms of your expectations regarding
specialism that they have and seeking an opinion from each expert within the realms of their areas of skills qualifications, expertise?  A. I would and, further, I would expect in addition to letter of instruction, I would expect conversations to take place with the expert in advance of the letter of	. 0		instructing further experts, would you have expected
each expert within the realms of their areas of skills qualifications, expertise?  A. I would and, further, I would expect in addition to letter of instruction, I would expect conversations to take place with the expert in advance of the letter of	.1		their letters to be tailored to each particular
qualifications, expertise?  A. I would and, further, I would expect in addition to letter of instruction, I would expect conversations to take place with the expert in advance of the letter of	.2		specialism that they have and seeking an opinion from
15 A. I would and, further, I would expect in addition to 16 letter of instruction, I would expect conversations to 17 take place with the expert in advance of the letter of	.3		each expert within the realms of their areas of skills,
letter of instruction, I would expect conversations to take place with the expert in advance of the letter of	. 4		qualifications, expertise?
take place with the expert in advance of the letter of	.5	A.	I would and, further, I would expect in addition to a
	. 6		letter of instruction, I would expect conversations to
18 instruction.	.7		take place with the expert in advance of the letter of
	. 8		instruction.
In my experience if you're instructing an expert y	.9		In my experience if you're instructing an expert you
would have had detailed conversation with the expert.	0		would have had detailed conversation with the expert.
You would want to see the expert's CV. You would	1		You would want to see the expert's CV. You would
22 want do some research yourself to check expertise of	2		want do some research yourself to check expertise of
23 the expert. You would also, again, do some research of	3		the expert. You would also, again, do some research on
whether there's issues with a particular expert. You	4		whether there's issues with a particular expert. You
would speak to the expert having done that homework.	5		would speak to the expert having done that homework.

You would identify from speaking to them what their area

- of expertise is, what they could add if anything, what
- they would need if an expert was appropriate, what
- 3 information they would need, what is the limit of their
- 4 expertise, and whether or not they would accept the
- 5 work, timescales in reporting, all these things you
- 6 would -- I mean there's a process. It's just not --
- 7 I wouldn't suggest it's formulaic. Instruction of an
- 8 expert is an important thing.
- 9 Q. Thank you.
- 10 A. And takes time.
- 11 Q. I would like to move on to an issue regarding what was
- 12 known and described in evidence as a reviewing
- pathologist. Can I just explain a little of the context
- of the evidence that we've heard so far.
- We've heard that there was a forensic pathologist
- instructed called Dr Lawler and there were a number of
- 17 letters of instruction and reports sent to him and we've
- 18 heard evidence from Les Brown that -- about the genesis
- 19 of that idea that there would be this reviewing
- 20 pathologist and I would like to -- he thought you were
- 21 the Lord Advocate at the time that this issue arose and
- I would like to ask if you remember this.
- A. So when was Dr Lawler?
- Q. He wasn't instructed when you were still Lord Advocate,
- 25 but I'll tell you what the evidence of Les Brown is, and
- 26 see if it prompts any memories. So he talked about a

reviewing pathologist: 1 2 "This was a course of action that had been I think 3 suggested by the Lord Advocate at an early stage in the investigation." 4 And he later clarified that he meant it was 5 6 Frank Mulholland, as he recollected, that raised the question of the benefit of having a reviewing 7 8 pathologist. And he talked about identifying a 9 reviewing pathologist and identifying Dr Lawler and, as 10 I understood his evidence, it was to have a pathologist 11 come in and review all the reports that had been 12 obtained by the crown. And I'm wondering if in light of Les Brown's 13 14 suggestion that you were the Lord Advocate that came up 15 with the idea and suggested the idea and discussed it with him, do you remember that? 16 I don't. He wasn't instructed during my time. 17 Α. No, not at that time. 18 Q. If I'd suggested it, he would have been instructed at an 19 Α. early stage I would imagine, but I don't -- I don't --20 when you put it to me, I don't think it's necessarily a 21 bad idea in a complex case such as this. Someone can --22 23 an experienced pathologist who's reviewing matters can 24 identify issues that you haven't thought of or give 25 information to you and expertise on areas that perhaps

you've not considered.

- So if a sort of overview, third person pathologist 1 2 overview, was to happen you would want that person in 3 pretty close to the start so he's not been instructed so 4 and I mean I have got a decent memory, I don't recollect 5 that, and the fact that he wasn't instructed during my 6 time would maybe -- would support the fact that maybe it 7 wasn't me, but I'm not sort of departing from that could 8 be a good idea. It would depend on the circumstances.
- 9 Q. Have you in your experience used a review -- a

  10 pathologist in this way as a reviewing pathologist --
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 Q. -- prior to the involvement with --
- 13 A. Yes.

23

24

25

26

- 14 Q. You have. Can you explain to us how that works.
- 15 Well, cold cases, for example. In cases where the Α. 16 pathology -- at the time you have a postmortem report 17 and, you know, 20 years down the line you're looking at 18 a case, there may be issues with the pathology, the 19 general pathologist at the time. You might want someone 20 to look at that, not to become an expert witness, but to 21 look at it to give you an understanding of what the issues are, could be, what the defects are. 22

I mean you've got to remember, we all deal with medical evidence, pathological evidence, but we're not pathologists so it can assist in those types of cases.

I have seen it done in complex -- in cases of complex

- 1 pathology to give you a reassurance, but I mean I'm just
- 2 going kind of setting out in general terms when it can
- 3 be of use.
- Q. Is that a pathologist who would -- other evidence we've
- 5 heard is a pathologist could become part of the team to
- 6 help the prosecutors understand evidence and work
- 7 through that evidence?
- 8 A. I'm not sure part of a team in the sense of the
- 9 prosecution investigators but without instructing that
- 10 pathologist as an expert witness, it can help to
- identify to give a commentary on what's went on before
- and identify any issues, any flaws, any defects,
- anything that you need to address.
- 14 Q. Right.
- 15 A. So there is benefit to it but it depends on the
- 16 circumstances.
- 17 Q. Well, given your own experience of having a pathologist
- 18 assist, would you expect that pathologist, that forensic
- 19 pathologist, to then be asked to comment on the opinions
- of a consultant psychiatrist, a consultant in emergency
- 21 medicine or a consultant clinical toxicologist so
- 22 separate areas of specialism.
- 23 A. It's out with their expertise.
- 24 Q. Sorry?
- 25 A. It's out with their areas of expertise.
- Q. And would you agree if it's out with their areas of

- 1 expertise it would not be admissible?
- 2 A. What's the point.
- 3 Q. What's the point.
- A. But I mean I wouldn't even do it, ask an expert witness
- 5 who's a for example a reviewer, to comment on areas out
- 6 with their expertise, what's the point.
- 7 Q. Thank you.
- 8 A. If I wanted someone to comment on toxicological
- 9 evidence, it would be a review toxicologist.
- 10 Q. Right. Presumably if you wanted someone to comment on
- 11 toxicology evidence, you would want them to have formal
- 12 qualifications in toxicology.
- 13 A. Of course, and experience.
- 14 Q. And experience. The combination would be required?
- 15 A. Yes.
- Q. Can I move on, please, to another matter. If we look at
- 17 SBPI 00476, there we are, back to your statement and
- paragraph 80, please.
- "PIRC and the Scottish Police Federation media
- 20 releases are of course a matter for PIRC and SPF. I was
- 21 aware that the family were concerned and upset at such
- 22 releases and anonymous briefings and as a result I wrote
- 23 to the Chief Constable on 21 May 2015 expressing concern
- about SPF press briefings. The following is an extract
- from this letter."
- And then you quote:

- "I share your concern in relation to the briefing of 1 2 the press and agree that it is very unfortunate that the 3 Police Federation saw fit to put information into the public domain at such a sensitive time and when the 4 facts had still to be established. This was in my view 5 6 unhelpful and caused the family of the deceased 7 considerable distress on the day that I met with them at 8 Crown Office together with their solicitor ..." Can I ask you, obviously you have expressed concern
- 9 Can I ask you, obviously you have expressed concern
  10 there about comments made by the SPF, why did you elect
  11 to write to the Chief Constable rather than SPF?
- 12 A. I think from recollection the Chief Constable had raised
  13 it with me as well, so -- I mean the action I took was
  14 to put something out in the media, I think you have got
  15 the media release.
- Q. We'll come on to that.
- 17 A. Yes, so I didn't see -- I thought the Chief Constable
  18 was an appropriate person to write to to express that.
- 19 Q. Did you copy that to SPF?
- 20 A. No, I don't think I did.
- 21 Q. Why not?
- 22 A. Not sure.
- Q. Was there any reluctance to address matters direct with the SPF?
- 25 A. Not on my part. I wouldn't hesitate in addressing
  26 issues but I can't remember the circumstances at the

- 1 time but what was agreed.
- 2 Q. At that time was there any reason not to write to the
- 3 SPF?
- A. No, I mean you have made the point to me and I think
- 5 it's a good point.
- Q. All right. Let's look at some other paragraphs, 99, 100
- 7 and 102 and I think you also make comments about media
- 8 issues. 99:
- 9 "I wrote to the Chief Constable on May 2015
- 10 expressing my concern at the SPF briefing."
- Is that the same matter that you addressed in the
- earlier paragraph at 80, if we look back at 80?
- 13 A. Yes, I think it is.
- 14 Q. I think it seems to be the same date, it seems to be --
- 15 A. Yes.
- Q. Is that the same?
- 17 A. I think it is.
- 18 Q. That's the same, all right, thank you. Then if we can
- 19 look at 100, 102. I think 100 is just the same
- quotation.
- 21 A. Yes.
- 22 Q. And you say at 102:
- "I was so concerned about the press briefings and
- the effect that that was having on the family that I
- 25 unusually issued a press release on 22 October 2015 ..."
- 26 A. Yes.

- Q. "... calling for restraint and to allow the crown and
- 2 PIRC to get on with their jobs."

before or since.

- And I think is it fair to say you did have concerns

  about what was happening in the press during?
- A. Yes, I mean out of the blue you're reading stuff in the

  press that about the case and, you know, the case was

  under investigation, it seemed to me it was not helpful

  and at one of the meetings the family expressed their

  concern, their upset at it. And I have never done that
- 11 Q. Right.

- 12 A. So it indicates the importance I regarded to it and it
  13 did quiet -- I think from memory it quietened it down.
- Q. So what in particular was it that prompted you actually issuing your own press release?
- A. Well, to do something about it, to try and, you know,
  kill it. It wasn't just the Scottish Police Federation;
  there was others that were in the press as well.
- I don't know the source of it but there seemed to be a

  steady stream of information that seemed to me the best

  way to deal with it to lance the boil would be to issue

  the press release that I did.
- 23 Q. Did you ever find out who the others were?
- A. No, and I wouldn't be -- how would you find out that
  with confidentiality of journalists, that type of thing.

  I wouldn't even attempt to go down that road; it's not

my business. My business is to deal with a drip in the 1 2 media and that's why I did what I did. 3 Q. We'll remain on this topic but I'm conscious of the 4 time. LORD BRACADALE: Stop for lunch, sit at 2 o'clock. 5 6 (1.01 pm)7 (Luncheon adjournment) 8 (2.03 pm)9 LORD BRACADALE: Ms Grahame. MS GRAHAME: Thank you. We were dealing with the press 10 11 release that you issued just before lunch. Could we have that on the screen, COPFS 00975. So this is from 12 October 2015 and it's listed here, Lord Advocate, 13 Frank Mulholland QC said: 14 15 "The investigation into that death of Sheku Bayoh is being conducted by PIRC under the direction of the crown 16 17 and both are well aware of all the evidence, the lines 18 of inquiry and the issues surrounding this case. The 19 crown and PIRC are not influenced by comments made in the media and that is how it should be. However, 20 21 speculation and a running commentary on the investigation can be upsetting to the family of 22 23 Sheku Bayoh as well as the families of the officers 24 involved. 25 "A decision will be taken at the end of this 26 extremely complex investigation as to whether or not

criminal proceedings should be raised. An inquiry will also be held at which all the relevant evidence will be heard, open to the public and the media, and it is right that it this forum where the evidence will be rigorously tested and judicially assessed.

"PIRC and the crown should be allowed to get on with their job."  $% \label{eq:condition}%$ 

Do you see that and that's where it ends?

And if I can to go back to your first Inquiry statement. And if we look at paragraphs 84 and 85, and you have been asked to comment on a statement from Mr Ade Johnson:

"He states that me calling publicly for calm and commentary to stop made the family feel that they were put in the same bracket as the SPF."

85:

"I was not intending to put the family in the same bracket as the SPF. In the media release I stated, however, speculation and the running commentary on the investigation can be upsetting to the family of Sheku Bayoh, as well as the families of the officers involved. I was not suggesting the family were leaking information and briefing the press. The terms of this media release is pored over by officials and that head of communications to get it right. I am sorry if Mr Johnson is upset by this, but in my opinion it could

1 not have been phrased better. It was not directed at 2 the family." 3 And I think probably I missed the first couple of lines of the press release actually when I read it out. 4 I wonder if we could go back just for a moment to 5 6 COPFS 00975. I didn't read out the top line: 7 "The Lord Advocate has today called for restraint 8 from all parties in the provision and publication of 9 information in respect of the death of Sheku Bayoh." So you call for restraint from all parties in regard 10 11 to that. 12 It wasn't the family. It was not my intention -- I Α. never thought that the family were leaking information 13 14 to the press, it never crossed my mind, it still 15 doesn't. I don't think they were and I was concerned about the family of Sheku Bayoh and the effect it was 16 17 having on them and I was also concerned about the families of the officers involved and it was with the 18 best of motivation to try and put -- put a stop to it. 19 20 Q. And was that your aim in speaking out in this way which 21 you said before lunch you had never taken this step before? 22 Yes, that was essentially it. And if you just scroll 23 24 down a bit: 25 "The crown and PIRC are not influenced by comments 26 made any media and that's how it should be."

- I mean there was one view that the information in

  the media was with a view to putting pressure on PIRC

  and the crown, so I just wanted to make that point

  absolutely clear, but there's reference to the family;

  "it can be upsetting to the family of Sheku Bayoh as

  well as the families of the officers involved".
- I never -- it never crossed my mind that the family
  were leaking information to the press. I still don't
  believe it.

10

11

12

- Q. Looking at this press release with the benefit of hindsight, do you think it could have been phrased differently?
- A. Well, the press release is -- you know, the point I was
  making is it's not just me, this is communications input
  and officials input. Maybe a call for restraint from
  all parties in the provision, "all parties" where
  there's a -- you know, could that be taken as implied
  criticism of families in some way? All I can say it was
  never intended that way, and it never crossed my mind.
  - Q. So who was this directed to, this call for restraint?
- A. It was directed at the information that was appearing in
  the media and I was hoping that the people that were
  leaking that information to the press would read this.
- Q. And were you aware of any particular source of information?
- 26 A. Well, I wouldn't like to say. I mean I didn't know who

was leaking to the press. It wasn't my business to find out and if I tried to find out, then I wouldn't find out because of journalistic confidentiality protection of sources and all that type of stuff so it was pretty pointless to even to attempt to find out.

Did I know who? No, I didn't know. All I know was that there was information in the media, and it looked as if some of that information had been leaked by persons who knew so that is -- I mean I could have written -- you are right, I could have written to the SPF and others, I don't know, but I thought that the best way to deal with this would be to deal with it head on and put this and I did give consideration to this.

And it had been raised by the family and, as I said to you earlier, it's very important that you listen to what the family has said and I listened and tried to do something about it. It did from memory quieten it down somewhat so I think it was the right thing to do.

Q. Thank you. Can I ask you about some comments that have been made in another statement the Inquiry has, a statement from Aamar Anwar, SBPI 00549. And I'm interested in paragraphs 224 and 226. 224 and this is Mr Anwar:

"I have been asked what my or the family's expectations were of the Lord Advocate when we requested that he take action in relation to the media releases

that the SPF were issuing. I think the family's 1 2 expectation was that they would be robust with the 3 Scottish Police Federation whether it was material that they were putting in a public domain or whether it was 4 letters they were writing to people threatening them or 5 6 whether it was the media statements that they were 7 making was interfering with the integrity of the 8 investigation, that it was inflammatory, that it was 9 prejudicing an ongoing live criminal investigation, whereas the Federation were just simply propagating the 10 11 idea this was a fatal accident inquiry. That was a 12 constant mantra, 'there will be a fatal accident inquiry at which all these issues will be discussed', almost 13 14 excluding completely and utterly that there's supposed 15 to be a live criminal investigation." 16 Was it your recollection that that family's expectations of you was that you would be robust with 17 18 the Scottish Police Federation in relation to their 19 engagement with the media? 20 Α. No, that's not my recollection. Can you remind us, please, what was your recollection? 21 Q. Were the SPF included within that or not? 22 23 Well, they were included with all parties, so it was all Α. 24 the people that were leaking, all the bodies, 25 organisations, leaking information to the press, it was 26 directed at them.

- 1 Q. But not exclusively to the Scottish Police Federation?
- 2 A. Not exclusively, no.
- 3 Q. Right. And can we look at paragraph 226, please:
- "The family feel that the media has been used by the

  SPF to smear Sheku and attempt to bully the family into

  silence, to call them or their representatives liars and

  complicit in this process has been the Crown Office and
- 8 PIRC."
- 9 Do you wish to make any comment about that 10 suggestion?
- 11 A. It's not the case for my time when I was at the crown.
- 12 Q. Right. And just to go back briefly to 224 --
- 13 A. But I mean the family are entitled to express their
  14 views. If they thought that they can express their
  15 views, but you asked me, is that correct? No, it's not.
- Q. Right. And given the family's concern, as is expressed in 226, do you consider there was anything more you could have done to address that concern?
- A. Other -- I mean I was absolutely committed to liaising,
  speaking, keeping up a regular dialogue with the family
  and the family solicitors. I was hoping that in that
  process it would give them confidence in the
  independence, objectivity of the crown.
- 24 Smearing, it's not my style. I have no -- certainly
  25 my time with the crown, I know of no one that would
  26 engage in that type of behaviour and I certainly --

- there was no attempt to bully the family into silence.
- 2 They had -- they had Aamar Anwar acting for them. They
- 3 had me. They could speak to me at anytime. It would be
- 4 arranged the meeting of course, but there was a regular
- 5 dialogue with the family and I would never even -- never
- 6 thought, never called, their representatives or them
- 7 liars in any way, they were certainly not liars and all
- 8 I wanted to do was to help them navigate through a very
- 9 difficult distressing process for them that's not been
- of their making, they were thrust into this and on a
- 11 human level I wanted to help them.
- 12 Q. It will of course be a matter for the Chair, but it may
- be one interpretation of this paragraph that the
- 14 concerns of the family are that SPF were attempting to
- smear Mr Bayoh, bully the family and calling the
- 16 representative liars, rather than asserting that it was
- 17 the crown doing those things. Was that something that
- 18 was drawn to your attention in relation to the SPF?
- 19 A. I can't say it wasn't, but I don't have a recollection
- of it. The SPF will need to answer for that themselves,
- 21 I can't answer on their behalf, but the press release
- 22 was designed that the people that were leaking this
- information into the press should be aware of it and  ${\tt I}$
- 24 honestly hoped that the press release would result in an
- end to this.
- 26 Q. And then specifically in relation to the concern that

- the Crown Office were complicit in this process, this
  mearing by SPF?
- 3 A. It's not the case.

- Q. And is there anything that you reflecting on the events at this time, anything you can think of that could have been done by Crown Office to make it absolutely clear that the crown were not complicit in these matters?
  - A. Well, you can make it clear directly to the family if you needed to. I didn't think that I needed to do that and the crown weren't complicit, weren't in any way smearing or complicit in smearing the family. I had great respect for the family and I felt for the position that they had -- that they had -- were in that had been thrust upon them.

What else could the crown -- I mean it's a matter of trust. Even a statement that we'll not doing it, if they don't believe it then it's a matter for them, but it won't deal with it. What you have got to do is build up trust in how you're dealing with the case, with the investigation.

- Q. And if we can go back briefly to 224, the paragraph we looked at a moment ago, where the family's expectation was you would be robust with the Scottish Police Federation. I'm interested in the comment at the end of that paragraph:
- 26 "The Federation were just simply propagating this

idea this was a fatal accident inquiry. That was a constant mantra, 'there would be a fatal accident inquiry at which all these issues will be discussed', almost excluding completely and utterly that there's supposed to be a live criminal investigation."

I'm interested in this aspect of the family's impression that there was perhaps an overemphasis, if I can put it that way, on the FAI rather than the live criminal investigation?

A. Well, I mean I can't speak for the family and what their perception is, but I can reassure you it was a live criminal investigation and in support of that I think in the documentation that certainly I was shown there was -- I instructed Les Brown or the investigator team to speak to the Health and Safety Division of the Crown Office and also the Health and Safety Executive to place them on notice that in addition to individual criminality we were looking at systemic criminality under the Health and Safety at Work Clause and I think there's documentation I have seen to confirm that that was carried out.

The Health and Safety Executive said that thank you very much, we'll keep a watching brief. So what I was doing was ensuring that the relevant health and safety unit, the Crown Office and the investigators, health and safety investigators, were placed on notice that they

1 had an interest.

I had years ago prosecuted Transco, I knew health and safety law in great detail, I had set up the Health and Safety Executive -- a Health and Safety Division in the Crown Office to bring expertise in health and safety matters. There's also reference -- I mean I can't put my finger on it just now, but from what I've read PIRC had obtained standard operating procedures, training, the extent of training for police officers in restraint arrest techniques, deployment of sprays, and all that was of a view to be in a position to assess that aspect of the criminality.

And what I do is I use that as an example to point out that this was a live criminal investigation. It was mandatory to hold an FAI, that's parked, that will happen, but this is about a live criminal investigation and that's all about reassuring the family, reassuring the public that this is being extensively properly investigated, but, you know, if it was just to facilitate a fatal accident inquiry it could have been done in months, quite frankly.

Q. I think there may be an issue about whether an FAI was mandatory in terms of the legislation, but I think from your perspective, as I understand your statement, it was anticipated that there would be a public interest in holding an FAI?

- 1 A. Well, I saw it as mandatory. It's a death in custody.
- 2 Q. And as I say, it may be the position that there is a
- 3 disagreement about whether this was truly a death in
- 4 custody.
- 5 A. Well, whoever disagrees, I was Lord Advocate, I saw it
- as a mandatory fatal accident inquiry at the very least.
- 7 Q. And at the very least, it is a death following police
- 8 contact and --
- 9 A. Well, it was in custody, was it not? That's the point.
- 10 Q. That will be a matter for submission.
- 11 A. Well, a matter for submission, I can tell you how I saw
- it. I saw it as a death in police custody.
- 13 Q. All right. Talking about the Health and Safety
- Executive, we have heard evidence and there's other
- evidence available to the Chair that the crown and PIRC
- 16 would have welcomed the involvement of the HSE in
- 17 relation to this matter. The HSE declined to engage in
- the investigation.
- 19 And I'm interested in evidence we've heard that it's
- 20 not open to the crown to direct the HSE to investigate.
- 21 If they decline, that is the end of the matter. I'm
- 22 interested in any perspective you have about whether
- 23 that is something that the crown would have wished to
- 24 pursue if they had had the power to do so?
- 25 A. Well, I'll go back to Transco and the debrief coming out
- of the Transco trial. I made the point that it would be

- helpful to have the power to direct the Health and
  Safety Executive and that was fed in and, I can't swear
- 3 to this, I think there was some correspondence with
- 4 either the Health and Safety Executive or the UK
- 5 Government with someone who was a looker who had
- 6 responsibility for this area and it was decided to leave
- 7 things as they are.
- 8 Q. Was this at the time of Transco?
- 9 A. Post -- the debrief coming out of Transco.
- 10 Q. All right. Thank you. Can I ask you to look at another
- paragraph in your statement, 476, if we can go back to
- 12 that, and look at paragraph 124. You were asked about a
- 13 handover of the investigation between you and your
- 14 successor, Mr Wolffe, and you say:
- "I spoke to James Wolffe by telephone and reiterated
- 16 the importance of this inquiry including the need to
- maintain good and regular liaison with the family."
- 18 I'm interested in your recollection of that
- 19 telephone conversation.
- 20 A. Well, I have a very good recollection of the telephone
- 21 conversation. I can tell you how it came about.
- Q. Please do.
- 23 A. Having been appointed the Solicitor General and then
- 24 Lord Advocate, I know from personal experience that on
- 25 taking up office there is a lot of detailed briefing
- 26 which is provided to the new law officer by senior

officials at the Crown Office. I remember when I first took up post as a Law officer that briefing took the best part of a week. It's not only the Crown Office in relation to criminal matters. It's also SGLD, Scottish Government Legal Directorate, in relation to the array of civil cases so and you also get briefing from the crown agent about -- I've forgotten the phrase now -- it's about treasure and various other matters, Cramond Lion -- finds that the public make. So there's a vast array of briefings, quite onerous actually to go through it, it's very detailed and officials are there to present it, explain it, you can ask questions.

So when I demitted office the first thing I did was hand the BlackBerry in without deleting anything and handed that over to the crown agent. What I then did was my personal mobile I gave the number of that to the private office and said to the private office that if James wishes to telephone me about anything, just pick up the phone. If I'm not available at that time, I promise I'll get back to you.

Three weeks -- three weeks into James' post as

Lord Advocate he phoned me, I was at home, it was in the

evening and the call took about an hour. We went

over -- I gave James advice, a lot of advice, as to what

to look out for, how to deal with certain situations,

about Cabinet, his attendance at Cabinet, about dealing

with the crown officials. I mean James didn't have the 1 2 background that I had, I had worked for the crown for 3 30, 40 years, so I wanted to be as helpful as possible to him. Including in the telephone call went through a 4 number of high profile cases, the Sheku Bayoh 5 6 investigation was one of them, and I said, look, James 7 you really need to ensure that you maintain good regular 8 liaison with the family. I described the family, where 9 they were from and how to deal with it and I suggested that he dealt with it personally to ensure that the 10 11 family have -- know that it's being dealt with at the 12 highest level. There were other matters which are irrelevant to here, but it was a lengthy conversation 13 14 and what I wanted to do was to help James in his new job 15 as Lord Advocate and that was an important case which --16 I didn't go into the evidence in detail, but I did 17 mention the liaison with the family.

Q. And when you described good and regular liaison with the family, did you give any indication of what that had been -- how that looked under you?

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

A. Well, in a general conversation I would be talking about the meetings that I had with the family and Aamar Anwar and I think, although I can't swear to it, but I think I would have said I met with them around about every two months or so, I may have mentioned that, so -- but I didn't go into detail in here. That's not my business

- 1 to go into the evidence: one, because we didn't even
- 2 have the final report at the time and, two, the crown
- 3 really hadn't embarked on its own investigations, but I
- 4 wanted him to know that it was important because I knew
- 5 it was important and James being a new Lord Advocate it
- 6 was important to him as well and I didn't want him to,
- 7 you know, be on the receiving end of criticism for not
- 8 doing that job. And I wanted to ensure that the family
- 9 were -- continued to be helped.
- 10 Q. Thank you. Can I ask you about the use of the word
- where the "reiterated"? You "reiterated" the importance
- of this inquiry. Can I ask why you selected that word
- or did it mean anything beyond --
- 14 A. It didn't really.
- 15 Q. No.
- 16 A. It's just I suppose my words.
- 17 Q. Is it essentially you emphasised the importance?
- 18 A. Yes, that's essentially what --
- 19 Q. Thank you.
- 20 A. -- what it meant. I think from recollection James was
- 21 very receptive to that, fully understood that, so I
- tried to help James as much as I could.
- 23 Q. Thank you. Now, can I go back to one thing that you
- 24 mentioned earlier before lunch regarding the interim or
- 25 PIRC report, the first PIRC report --
- 26 A. Yes.

- Q. -- that you received. You had that in August 2015?
- 2 A. Yes.
- 3 Q. And you talked earlier in your evidence about you hadn't
- 4 read the appendices?
- 5 A. No.
- 6 Q. But you had read -- did you read the whole report or --
- 7 A. Well, I can't swear to -- I certainly read the narrative
- 8 of what happened, I certainly read the pathology, and
- 9 there will be other the introduction and that type of
- stuff.
- 11 Q. We've heard that this was a substantial document, over
- 12 350 pages in length. There was no reference in that
- document however to race, racism, discrimination, racial
- 14 discrimination, anything of that sort, not even to raise
- it and exclude it, although it was recognised that
- Mr Bayoh was a black man. Did you notice when you
- 17 reviewed that report that that was missing?
- 18 A. Well, no, I didn't stick out. As I have said before,
- 19 race was front, left, centre. PIRC were alive to it.
- 20 This was an interim report, the final report still to
- 21 come in, so it wasn't particularly -- it didn't stick
- 22 out. I wasn't concerned about it, nobody drew that to
- 23 my attention. I just was under the impression that in
- the final report, which would be more comprehensive than
- 25 the interim report it would be dealt with.
- Q. Was it not something that you noticed? Given your views

- on the importance of race and race being front and

  centre or race being at the heart of this that it was -
  was it not noticeable by its absence?
- A. Well, I knew from Les Brown conversations,

  correspondence, that race was under investigation given

  examples of that, so I just assumed that as an interim

  report that race will be dealt with in the final report

  so, no, I didn't have a concern about that.
- 9 Q. Are you saying there was correspondence you had from 10 Les Brown that said race was under investigation?
- 11 A. Well, there was -- I think I referred this morning to
  12 the letter from Les Brown --
- 13 Q. Yes.
- 14 A. -- to Jim Fleming.
- 15 I am interested in the period up to the first PIRC Q. 16 report which was August 2015, so in that period from the 17 death of Mr Bayoh on 3 May 2015 up to August 2015, 7 August, when the PIRC report, first one, was sent to 18 the crown, during that period, as the evidence we've 19 heard indicates that the first time race was mentioned 20 21 by the crown in correspondence with PIRC was dated 22 2 September 2015, so that's at a later date, that's after the first report? 23
- A. Well, I mean I can only tell you about conversations and
  my perception and the perception of senior lawyers at
  the Crown Office, including Les Brown, and in

- 1 conversations with PIRC that race was front, left,
- 2 centre.
- 3 Q. Certainly we have evidence that there were meetings
- between you and, as we said earlier, Kate Frame and
- 5 John Mitchell, and you've talked about conversations
- 6 with PIRC regarding race and the importance of race, did
- 7 it not strike you as odd that race wasn't mentioned in
- 8 the first PIRC report?
- 9 A. It didn't strike me, because it was an interim report,
- or whatever terminology. You know, I've dealt with a
- 11 number of interim reports on various matters. It's the
- 12 final report that matters. And if there's any
- deficiences in the final report, then it will be
- 14 highlighted because then the crown has got a duty to
- investigate it as well and if there's any deficiences in
- the PIRC investigation, then that should be remedied by
- 17 the crown and instructions to PIRC to do X, Y and Z in
- 18 relation to the investigation of race if they've not
- 19 dealt with it. So at that stage in reading that report,
- 20 no, I didn't, it didn't strike me as particularly
- 21 unusual or noteworthy.
- 22 Q. Did you have any hand at that stage in instructing
- 23 Les Brown to address the issue of race with PIRC to make
- 24 sure that this wasn't being left out of account?
- 25 A. Well, it was my understanding that it was being
- 26 addressed through Les and the crown team and I'd made

absolutely clear -- I didn't need to make it clear that 1 2 race was an issue, you know, right at the heart of this. 3 So I mean the journey through this, from Day 1 the people in the crown, including myself, knew this was a 4 key issue in this, absolutely critical, along with a lot 5 6 other issues. I don't want to say it was this and 7 only -- along with other, but it was absolutely the key 8 issue as far as I was concerned and as far as Les Brown, 9 Lindsey Miller and others working on it and the conversations with PIRC, discussions with PIRC through 10 11 Les and my discussions, I was under no misapprehension 12 that PIRC were ignoring race. It was my impression that they knew it was an important issue in the case. So 13 14 when I read the interim report, it didn't strike me 15 because I knew that my understanding that it was being 16 investigated by PIRC. 17 Q. Right. Could you give me a moment, please. Thank you very much. I have no further questions. 18

LORD BRACADALE: Lord Mulholland, can you help me with one thing, taking you back to the first issue that you discussed this morning, which was the issue of disclosure of expert reports and the like to the family, and the difference of approach between you and your successor Mr Wolffe, and one point that you made in the context of Mr McGowan's minute was that Mr McGowan and James Wolffe were dealing with a different situation:

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1		"The final report was in and the crown was now doing
2		its precognition preparation. When I made the decision,
3		it was a different set of circumstances."
4		Can you explain to me what the significance of the
5		different stages is?
6	Α.	Well, the different set of circumstances is the fact the
7		final report is in so it's now under the crown for
8		investigation, so that's a different set of
9		circumstances and at that stage the crown will review
10		what the evidence is, review the expert evidence, review
11		whether further experts should be instructed, and at
12		that stage so that is different from the stage that I
13		dealt with was before the final PIRC report had been
14		received and indeed before the interim report was
15		received so that's what I meant by a different set of
16		circumstances.
17		I don't know their thinking at the time that
18		Steve McGowan's minute and the Lord Advocate
19		James Wolffe Lord Advocate made that decision. I can
20		only tell you how I saw it. I didn't see I saw there
21		was little prejudice to potential criminal proceedings
22		and I took the view that to facilitate the family
23		family's solicitor instructing their own experts that I
24		should do that.
25	LOR	D BRACADALE: And if you had still been the Lord Advocate
26		by the time the crown were preparing the precognition,

1	would you have changed your position as a result of the
2	changed circumstances?
3	A. I would only have changed my position if there was a
4	particular reason to do it. I would have kept the
5	undertaking I gave unless I could rationalise a change
6	in approach, a change a set of circumstances or
7	something of that nature.
8	LORD BRACADALE: Thank you.
9	A. So it's difficult to project yourself because I had
10	stepped down at the time.
11	LORD BRACADALE: I appreciate that.
12	Now, are there any Rule 9 applications?
13	Ms Mitchell. Nobody else.
14	Lord Mulholland, would you mind withdrawing to the
15	witness room while I hear a submission.
16	A. Okay.
17	
18	Submissions by MS MITCHELL
19	MS MITCHELL: I just have one issue that I would like to
20	raise and it relates to some evidence the Inquiry has
21	heard into the murder of Simon San.
22	As the Inquiry will have heard, Lord Mulholland in
23	writing gave evidence about this matter and he also gave
24	evidence today at the hearing. He was he spoke on
25	whether or not the crown considered the matter racially
26	motivated and he explained about placing information

before the court about the family identifying it as a 1 2 racist matter even though the crown did not do so. And 3 just for the purposes of the Inquiry, it's at page 53 of evidence and following. 4 In writing at paragraph 24 of his statement, which 5 6 is recorded by my learned friend again this morning 7 reading it out, the question was whether the crown was 8 racially motivated. The answer in the evidence was 9 that: "It was not racially aggravated. We made sure that 10 11 the information was placed before the court. We also 12 ensured this was fully explained to the family of 13 Mr San. 14 "So again you raised a number of issues here. This 15 was a case that you yourself prosecuted, was it, or involved in?" 16 17 And he said it wasn't. He didn't think he was the person who had presented it. And my learned friend goes 18 19 on: "Right. You've talked about placing the information 20 before the court and explained the purpose of that." 21 And what he said is: 22 23 "Well, there's a number of purposes. Firstly, it's 24 to allow the court -- to give the court the information 25 so they can take it into account in the sentence. 26 Secondly, it places the information in a public [I'm not

1 sure how that's been translated] Domain [thank you] so 2 the public, the media and the family are well aware of 3 it so it's not expressed, not hidden. It gives accountability, public accountability, in the sense that 4 5 this is your assessment of the evidence and it allows 6 anyone who disagrees with that assessment to challenge 7 it, to make it known, challenge it in writing, for 8 example, or whatever." 9 Now, unfortunately the report -- so what happened after this hearing is that Lothian and Borders, who were 10 11 the police service dealing with the case, did a 12 year-long review of their involvement in this matter and I'm now reading from a newspaper article saying what the 13 14 outcome of that was and I have given -- passed these on 15 to my learned friend. The newspaper article on 23 August 2011 indicated that: 16 17 "After a year-long internal inquiry overseen by Deputy Chief Constable Steve Allen, Allen confirmed that 18 the force should have treated Mr San's death as a racist 19 murder." 20 21 And then he goes on to make various different further apologies. 22 23

After that time it appears but on the same day, the Crown Office issued a statement indicating that it was alert to the question of racial motivation from the

beginning of the investigation and after careful

24

25

consideration of all the available evidence provided to the crown by the police Crown Counsel concluded that there was no evidence to show that the attack on Mr San was racially motivated.

Thereafter, it appears at some point Mr Anwar called upon the Lord Advocate to -- at some point in that day called upon the Lord Advocates to itself carry out a crown inquiry in relation to the handling of the case and there seems to be an additional press release by the crown that said:

"In addition to CO's statement 23 August, we can confirm the Lord Advocate will not be instructing an inquiry and is satisfied with the crown's prosecution of the case. Mr John Logue, the area procurator fiscal for Lothian and Borders has offered to meet with Mr San's family to discuss any questions which they might now have."

After that very long explanation -- hopefully I won't have to go into that detail with the Former Lord Advocate, but after that very long explanation, what I would like to ask is whether or not -- why he didn't call for inquiry into the way the Crown Office had dealt with the issue of race in the present case of Mr San.

And I say that's important because this inquiry has evidence before it that Crown Office were trained in

1	respect of issues of race, this was an incident that
2	happened relatively soon before the incident in this
3	case and that might have been an opportunity for for
4	the crown to engage with the matter and consider it. In
5	particular, as it is quoted in one of the newspaper
6	articles, it might have saved another family in the
7	future from having to fight for answers from the
8	authorities and I just would like to ask be there was a
9	reason there wasn't an inquiry, given the very clear
10	distinction between the year-long investigation and what
11	Lothian and Borders had identified and what the
12	Crown Office's position was.
13	LORD BRACADALE: Yes, very well, I shall allow you to ask
14	these questions.
15	Can we have the witness back, please.
16	Lord Mulholland, Ms Mitchell, who's senior counsel
17	for the families of Sheku Bayoh, has some questions for
18	you.
19	Questions by MS MITCHELL
20	MS MITCHELL: It just relates to one issue that I want to
21	ask you about and, in fact, it's about the case of
22	Simon San, which you referred to earlier in your
23	evidence and you gave evidence this morning the question
24	was whether or not the crown was racially motivated and
25	you said the answer on the evidence was that it was not
26	racially aggravated and then you went on to explain

- about the crown having put evidence about what the
  family thought in front of the court and that allowed
  that to be made public, as it were.
- Do you recall that after Mr San's case was in court
  there was an investigation done by Lothian and Borders
  police into their handling of the case?
- A. Very vaguely. When I say there was -- the crime wasn't racially motivated, what I mean was that there was no evidence that the crime was racially motivated. There's a fine distinction there. But to answer your question directly, I've got a vague recollection of it so -- but I couldn't give you chapter and verse as to what it involved.
  - Q. Do you remember the outcome of that --
- 15 A. No.

14

25

- 16 -- inquiry? The outcome of that matter was that after a Q. 17 year-long inquiry by Lothian and Borders Police, Deputy Chief Constable Steve Allen confirmed that the force 18 should have treated Mr San's death as a racist murder 19 20 and he apologised to the family and explained the 21 various different things that were going to be done by Lothian and Borders Police in respect of that, one of 22 23 which include the force's procedures being significantly 24 overhauled.
  - At that time, there was a call by Mr Anwar asking the Crown Office for it to review its handling of the

- 1 matter. Do you recall that?
- 2 A. No, I don't.
- 3 Q. No.
- A. I'm not saying that that didn't happen, but I don't
- 5 recall that.
- 6 Q. There appears to be a Crown Office release about it so?
- 7 A. Well, I don't recall it is the answer.
- 8 Q. Okay.
- 9 A. But in relation to the prosecution, we were dealing with
- 10 what the evidence was at the time.
- 11 Q. Yes, indeed.
- 12 A. Evidence available at that time. Lothian and Borders
- Police had an investigation, am I right in thinking that
- that was post the criminal prosecution?
- 15 Q. It appears to be so.
- 16 A. Yes, so that -- the findings of that wouldn't have been
- 17 available at the time that the case was dealt with,
- disposed of.
- 19 Q. Yes, indeed, it was a year later.
- 20 A. Yes.
- 21 Q. I don't suggest in any way that the crown could have
- 22 gone back and revisited the prosecution issue. What I'm
- 23 wondering is whether or not in light of that finding
- 24 that after a year's investigation Lothian and Borders
- 25 Police took the view that they ought to have dealt with
- 26 that in that way and the crown was asked by Mr Anwar to

- 1 review its practices and procedures --
- 2 A. I don't remember that. I'm not saying it didn't happen,
- 3 but I don't remember that.
- 4 Q. Indeed. What appears to be said in a document online
- and, again, in fairness to you, you don't have it before
- 6 you, but perhaps in a future hearing that might become
- 7 available, but this document purports to say:
- 8 "We can confirm the Lord Advocate will not be
- 9 instructing an inquiry and is satisfied with the crown's
- 10 prosecution of the case. Mr John Loque, the area
- 11 procurator fiscal for Lothian and Borders, has offered
- 12 to meet with Mr San's family to discuss any questions
- 13 which they might now have."
- 14 A. What was the date of that?
- 15 Q. That appears to be 23 August 2011.
- 16 A. Right. Okay well, John Logue is now the Crown Agent, so
- 17 that means, from what you tell me, that that was looked
- 18 at in some detail to generate that response. I can't
- 19 speak to that, because I have no recollection of it, I
- 20 need to see the paperwork and that may jog my memory,
- 21 but I genuinely have no recollection. I remember there
- 22 was a bit of a furore at the time that Deputy
- 23 Chief Constable made certain statements. I think he
- gave a Newsnight interview, if I remember rightly.
- 25 Q. You know more than me in respect of that matter.
- A. Well, there was a bit of -- let me put it this way,

- 1 without knowing the intimate detail, there was a bit of
- 2 a controversy about what was said.
- 3 Q. But in any event, the crown didn't conduct an inquiry?
- A. Well, I think it's confirmation of that in this
- 5 statement, but I can't -- I can't explain why, because I
- 6 can't remember. I need to see the paperwork.
- 7 Q. That may be something that could be done. I'm obliged.
- 8 A. Okay.
- 9 LORD BRACADALE: Thank you. Lord Mulholland, thank you very
- 10 much for coming to give evidence to the Inquiry. I'm
- 11 very grateful for your time. When the Inquiry adjourns,
- 12 you'll be free to go.
- 13 A. Thank you.
- 14 LORD BRACADALE: That brings this hearing to a close, though
- it is likely that some further evidence in relation to
- 16 the subject matter of this hearing will be introduced at
- 17 a later stage.
- 18 The next hearing will begin on 4 June 2024 when
- 19 the Inquiry will hear evidence, including evidence in
- 20 relation to the issue of race.
- 21 My assessors and I and the Inquiry team are very
- 22 conscious that tomorrow is the ninth anniversary of the
- 23 death of Sheku Bayoh and we know and understand that
- 24 each anniversary is a difficult and distressing time for
- 25 members of the families and friends of Sheku Bayoh.
- I want to take this opportunity to recognise the

1	continuing commitment of the families to the Inquiry and
2	I renew the commitment of the Inquiry to a thorough and
3	independent examination of the evidence.
4	The Inquiry will now adjourn.
5	(2.53 am):)
6	(The hearing was adjourned to 10.00 am on 4 June 2024)
7	
8	
9	INDEX
10	1 FORMER LORD ADVOCATE FRANK MULHOLLAND
11	(sworn)
12	1Examination-in-chief by MS GRAHAME
13	114Submissions by MS MITCHELL
14	118Questions by MS MITCHELL
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	