1	Tuesday, 30 April 2024
2	(10.04 am)
3	LORD BRACADALE: Good morning, Mr Wolffe.
4	A. Good morning.
5	LORD BRACADALE: Before your evidence begins, may I remind
6	you that the terms of reference of the Inquiry exclude
7	the prosecutorial decision and review and at the
8	beginning of this hearing, I set out my interpretation
9	of how the Inquiry should approach that exclusion.
LO	The Inquiry will not examine your prosecutorial decision
L1	and reasoning, the prosecutorial decision and reasoning
L2	of Crown Counsel, and the recommendations and advice
13	given by the Procurator Fiscal in reporting the case to
L 4	Crown Counsel. In addition, the Inquiry will not
L5	examine in detail which particular potential crimes you,
L 6	Crown Counsel and members of the Crown Office and
L7	Procurator Fiscal Service considered could be relevant.
L8	Subject to these exclusions, the Inquiry will
L 9	examine the post-incident management process and
20	investigation conducted by the crown. As the vehicle
21	for the crown's investigation was a criminal
22	precognition, that examination will include the work
23	carried out in preparation of the precognition.
24	So perhaps you could bear that approach in mind as
25	you give your evidence.

- 1 THE WITNESS: Yes, thank you.
- 2 LORD BRACADALE: Would you now take the oath.
- 3 THE WITNESS: May I affirm?
- 4 LORD BRACADALE: Certainly.
- 5 FORMER LORD ADVOCATE JAMES WOLFFE KC (affirmed)
- 6 Examination-in-chief by MS GRAHAME
- 7 LORD BRACADALE: Ms Grahame.
- 8 MS GRAHAME: Good morning.
- 9 A. Good morning.
- 10 Q. You are James Wolffe?
- 11 A. I am.
- 12 Q. And what age are you? That wasn't designed to be a
- 13 trick question.
- 14 A. Sorry. Born in December 1962 so 61.
- 15 Q. Thank you. You are a barrister?
- 16 A. Yes.
- Q. You're a member of faculty and you're Kings Counsel?
- 18 A. I am.
- 19 Q. And you were Lord Advocate from June 2016 to June 2021?
- 20 A. I was.
- Q. So a period of around five years?
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 Q. And in that capacity you were involved with the
- investigation into the death of Mr Sheku Bayoh and you
- 25 had involvement with the family of Mr Bayoh?

- 1 A. Indeed.
- 2 Q. Have you had any opportunity to watch any of the
- 3 evidence that we've taken?
- 4 A. I'm afraid I haven't. I've had a chance to look briefly
- 5 a lot some of the transcripts, but not to actually
- 6 observe the proceedings.
- 7 Q. Thank you. Well, I only ask because there is a blue
- 8 folder sitting in front of you on the desk which will
- 9 contain a hard copy of your statement.
- 10 A. Thank you.
- 11 Q. And, please feel free to use that or refer to it at any
- 12 time. Some people do prefer a hard copy.
- Now, as I go through some of the questions today,
- 14 there will also be perhaps paragraphs put up on the
- screen in front of you. If you're happy to simply use
- those, we'll proceed that way, but at anytime if you
- 17 wish, please use the hard copy.
- 18 A. Thank you.
- 19 Q. And if there's a section in your statement that you
- 20 would like to refer to which I've not got on the screen,
- 21 please let me know and we'll arrange to have that put
- 22 on.
- 23 A. Thank you.
- Q. Equally, occasionally witnesses may recall a document
- 25 that they would find helpful and if you let me know, we

- can look for that over the break if we don't have it on the list for today.
- 3 A. Thank you.
- Q. Let's look at the first document which is SBPI 00438.
- Now, you were sent a request by the Inquiry team called
- 6 a Rule 8 request to -- with a series of questions which
- 7 you were asked to consider and reply to.
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. And this is the document we see on the screen. It was
- sent to you in January of this year and as we move down
- 11 the page we will see that a series of questions appear.
- 12 That's the covering letter and then there's the
- 13 questions start with your role and experience.
- 14 A. Yes.
- Q. And in response to that, you prepared a response to that
- Rule 8 request which is SBPI 00529. Do you see that on
- 17 the screen? That is your response to the request from
- 18 the Inquiry team.
- 19 A. It is.
- Q. I will probably refer to that as your statement, if I
- 21 may. And this -- if we look at the final page, first of
- all, we'll see it's dated 14 April 2024 and it's 66
- 23 pages long and the last paragraph that we see on the
- 24 screen is 157. It reads:
- 25 "I believe the facts stated in this witness

- statement are true. I understand that this statement 1 2 may form part of the evidence before the Inquiry and be 3 published on the Inquiry's website." 4 And you understood that to be the case? 5 I did, yes. Α. And you signed your statement? 6 Q. 7 I did. Α. Thank you. We don't have your signature on the screen. 8 Q. 9 And were you doing your best in the statement to give a 10 true and accurate account of your recollections of the events? 11 12 Α. I was and, sorry, I should just be clear, I signed it in 13 just by typing my name because of the logistics of 14 returning the statement.
- Q. That's fine, thank you. But that was appended as your signature in any event?
- 17 A. Indeed, absolutely.
- Q. Thank you. Can we talk about your role for a moment as

 Lord Advocate. You became Lord Advocate on 1 June 2016

 and that was we've heard shortly prior to the final PIRC

 report being received by Crown Office in relation to

 Mr Bayoh's death?
- 23 A. Yes.
- Q. We've heard that that arrived in Crown Office in around
 August 2016?

1	A.	Yes.
2	Q.	You were asked some questions about whether there was
3		some sort of handover from the previous Lord Advocate
4		and I would like to begin with that.
5		Could we look at your statement and look at
6		paragraph 22, please. And you explain that you were
7		responsible for the investigation into Mr Bayoh's death
8		in terms of your role as Lord Advocate. You say:
9		"I did not receive any briefing or induction on this
10		or any other matter from the previous Lord Advocate,
11		such as a handover on the appointment of a new
12		Lord Advocate from the previous incumbent would not
13		I believe be usual."
14		You then mention this earliest involvement you had.
15		You mention an email from PC Paton's wife. You mention
16		your weekly law officers' briefing, and you mention
17		maybe an oral briefing from senior staff. So you became
18		aware of the investigation into the death of Mr Bayoh
19		through those means, through that contact?
20	Α.	As far as I recall, I mean I think I was probably aware
21		of the case simply from the fact that it had been in the
22		media at some point previously. On taking office, those
23		are the as far as I can now remember, so far as I
24		have been able to identify from the documents that the
25		Inquiry has given me, the introduction that I had to the

1		case.
2	Q.	Thank you. We have an Inquiry statement from
3		Frank Mulholland who was the Lord Advocate prior to you
4		taking on the role.
5	Α.	Yes.
6	Q.	And he has indicated, and we don't need this on the
7		screen, but it is SBPI 00466124:
8		"I spoke to James Wolffe by telephone and reiterated
9		the importance of this Inquiry, including the need to
10		maintain good and regular liaison with the family."
11		Do you remember having a conversation with
12		Frank Mulholland in connection with the family of
13		Mr Bayoh?
14	Α.	I'm afraid I have no memory of that, but if he says it
15		happened, then I have no reason to contradict that.
16		It's fair to say my, as it were, active memory is of
17		the events is limited and I have relied to quite a large
18		extent on documents, so I absolutely wouldn't dispute
19		his evidence.
20	Q.	Thank you. Can we look at some comments you make in
21		your statement, let's start with 153, because I think
22		it's fair to say that you've reflected on the issue of a
23		handover or the lack of a handover and you had some
24		thoughts that you wished to share with the Chair, so
25		let's begin with 153. You say:

1 "With hindsight and with the benefit of the reflection which responding to the Inquiry's questions 2 3 has provoked, it seems to me that it would have been 4 helpful if at the outset I had been given or had 5 proactively asked for a full, clear and detailed written briefing setting out in particular the way that my 6 7 predecessor had approached the case, identifying any commitments which he had given, any understandings and 8 9 expectations to which his approach had given rise, and 10 any other relevant considerations, with a view to formatting a strategy for this case going forward. 11 12 Whilst I of course inherited responsibility for very many significant cases, and it would likely have been 13 14 impractical to expect briefing of this sort for all such 15 cases, the previous level of law officer involvement in this case, as well as the substantive considerations 16 17 which had prompted that law officer involvement, would have justified treating this case differently." 18 I'm interested in your reflections here on what the 19 20 important factors were and why you think this case 21 should have been treated differently, was it just simply the law officer involvement? 22 Well, I suppose it's, as I say there, the underlying 23 Α. substantive features of the case which had led to my 24 predecessor's involvement in the case. That included 25

the -- well, first of all, we have an individual who died in contact with the police; secondly, there was the issue of race which was an aspect of this case, and thirdly, there was, as I understood it and I think I did understand this at the time, that the family had been bad -- if I put it this way, not well treated at the outset of events immediately after the death of their loved one and my understanding was that that was -- these were part of the considerations that had led my predecessor to take quite an active role at an early stage.

I can't now recall precisely what I knew about that

I can't now recall precisely what I knew about that role and that's part of what's invited this or led me, you know, inevitably one reflects back on events and goes through the material, something which could have made a difference to the way the case would have been handled thereafter.

- Q. And so you've said a full, clear and detailed written briefing setting out your predecessor's approach would have been assistance to you in developing a strategy, as you say, for the case going forward?
- A. Yes, it would have highlighted this case because, as I say in that paragraph, when I took up the role, of course I inherited responsibility for a large number of cases. I took on responsibility for a wide range of

1 functions. There were many issues, many cases, that were clamouring for attention and I think the reality 2 3 was that at the outset one is reacting to the material 4 that's brought to one in terms of the focus that one is 5 bringing to any particular -- particular issue and I suppose one of the benefits of our written briefing in 6 7 the context of the role that I had was that, you know, a written briefing would in a sense focus one's attention, 8 9 require one's attention to a particular case or issue or 10 matter and would call for a response and, you know, the practical reality of the role was that on any given day 11 12 I might be receiving, you know, a box or more of written 13 briefings on a variety of different issues, all of which 14 would require our response. Had there been such a 15 briefing, it would have called for a response, consideration and potentially thinking in a more 16 17 considered way from the outset how matters should be taken forward. 18 And you indicate that your predecessor's approach --19 Q. 20 identifying any commitments at which he had given. Why 21 do you specifically mention that? Were there issues 22 that arose? Well, as it became evident and as -- well, it's evident 23 Α. from the material I reviewed for the purpose of 24 25 preparing the statement that there were -- my

- predecessor's involvement with the case had given rise to expectations and certain commitments. There was the issue of an inquiry and how that interacted with any question of criminal prosecution and there was the question of disclosure of material to the -- to Mr Anwar as the solicitor for the family and there were also questions of expectation in terms of the role of the incumbent in the office.
 - Q. Because you've said this type of handover would have been of benefit, looking back now, in the absence of having that full detailed written briefing, do you -- having reflected on how it was handled at the time, do you have any comments that you would wish to make?
 - A. Well, I suppose I'm looking at it very much from the role that I had in the process and I think, you know, looking -- looking at the materials I had to prepare the statement, I was reacting to particular issues as they were brought to my attention. I was dealing with the matters that, as it were, came up to my office, came across my desk and, you know, as I say, I think there was perhaps a missed opportunity to from the outset thought about how the case should be managed going forward. I relied very heavily on the experienced people around me.
 - Q. Thank you. Can we also look at paragraph 154:

1 "Such a briefing would have been valuable not simply from the point of view of ensuring a consistency of 2 3 approach. It could well have prompted a planned 4 approach to communications with Mr Bayoh's family and 5 their solicitor, which would have identified in advance the different levels of meeting and correspondence which 6 7 might be appropriate and the point or points at which, or the issues upon which, it would be appropriate for 8 9 law officers to become personally involved." 10 And you've mentioned consistency there, was there a concern looking back that you were not dealing with the 11 12 family in a consistent way? 13 Well, I think certainly as I reviewed this that a strong Α. 14 sense that I was approaching it in perhaps a different 15 way from the way that my predecessor had done in relation to the active involvement of myself. 16 Did you have --17 Q. And perhaps a sense, and I can't now say to what extent 18 Α. 19 this was a sense I had at the time or to what extent I'm 20 drawing it from the material, but I suspect I probably 21 had a sense of it at the time, was, you know, that I was approaching the role in perhaps a slightly different way 22 from the way that my predecessor had done. 23 Right. Were you aware of issues with communication 24 Q. between the family and yourself? You've talked there 25

1 about a briefing would have prompted a planned approach 2 to communications? Yes, I mean I -- I, you know, once I was, as it were, 3 Α. 4 sighted on the case, I was expecting that there would be 5 a meeting with the family at an appropriate stage. I had a letter from Mr Anwar inviting such a meeting. 6 7 I was very happy to have such a meeting. I think I was actually interested in look at the documents to see 8 9 there were discussions between Lindsey Miller and 10 Mr Anwar about when it would be, you know, appropriate for me to have a meeting with the family. I -- and I 11 12 suppose thereafter, you know, the communications were by 13 way of correspondence with Mr Anwar. 14 Reflecting back, there might have been a benefit in 15 being more proactive in terms of thinking through the way in which communications should be handled and also 16 17 looking forward to the arrival of the PIRC report, the crown investigation, and, you know, the different roles 18 19 that people would have in the context of that 20 investigation and how one should -- one might think 21 through communication and family liaison with, you know, 22 bearing that in mind. Q. You go on in your statement where we left off "Had the 23 24 crown done this", so you do make a suggestion: "Had the crown done this, it would have enabled a 25

1 much more substantive initial meeting, perhaps at an earlier stage, directed to finding out before the 2 3 strategy was finalised what interaction with that 4 process within the necessary institutional constraints 5 Mr Bayoh's family would find valuable and supportive and ensuring that arrangements were put in place for 6 7 consistent liaison at the right level and at the appropriate points in the process." 8 9 And so are these your views about how improvements 10 could have been made had that initial briefing been 11 provided? 12 Α. Indeed, indeed. 13 Thank you. And do you think the suggestions you've made Q. 14 here would have got your relationship and the 15 communication with the family on the right footing from the beginning? 16 Well, I would like to think so. As I say, I have tried 17 Α. to reflect back on, you know, what I think perhaps was 18 an opportunity missed to -- in relation to this case to 19 20 take a more considered approach from a much earlier 21 stage. 22 I suspect we may come on to it, but the first meeting with the family was a very high level meeting in 23 a sense from my perspective in the sense that my24 understanding was that it was a meeting to in effect 25

introduce me to the family, to add my own commitment to a thorough investigation to that which they had already received, but on the eve of that meeting I received a very lengthy, very detailed letter from Mr Anwar raising a whole host of specific issues which clearly couldn't be dealt with within the framework of that meeting. I think there would have been an advantage in perhaps having had a more -- having considered more fully in advance at an earlier stage just how the crown should proactively be seeking to find out what would be most supportive to the bereaved family.

- Q. And had arrangements been put in place to plan that meeting perhaps in a more structured manner at that -- in that framework, would you have been willing to address some of these issues that were raised by Mr Anwar?
- A. Well, there may still have been an issue about timing, but I suspect thinking more -- yes, thinking more positively about things like the structure of the crown investigation going forward, the -- perhaps setting up another meeting to address some of the issues that had been raised. You know there are different -- you know with hindsight, there are no doubt different ways in which one could have been more, you know, taken a more structured approach to it than with hindsight I think

1 was taken.

17

18

19

20

21

22

- Q. Was there an agenda for that meeting? Was there any sort of structure imposed on that meeting?
- 4 Α. So far as I can -- I mean I should say my active 5 recollection of the meeting is very limited so, you know, I'm afraid -- but from the documents and so far as 6 7 the documents go, it would be consistent with what I -such recollections I have the purpose was in effect an 8 9 introduction to Mr Bayoh's family and an opportunity to 10 give them an assurance that I was committed to a thorough investigation of the facts and circumstances in 11 12 which Mr Bayoh had died. So that was really the -- that 13 was the purpose of the meeting as it had I think been 14 initially envisaged and as the briefing that I was 15 provided with advised me that was what was expected and 16 appropriate.
 - Q. So you envisaged the meeting would be an initial meeting, an introduction to the family, you were new to the role of Lord Advocate and reassurance being given, but the evening before the family had through their solicitor provided a list of issues so perhaps there was a mismatch between expectations there between you and the family?
- A. There may have been I mean and I can't remember how I dealt with the list of issues. I suspect that -- but

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- this is not on the basis of any recollection, I suspect

 I had to be clear that those, you know, that I couldn't

 respond to the detail of the issues that had been raised

 and that there would be correspondence subsequently.
 - Q. Would you have been in a position at that first meeting to respond to detailed questions or issues that were raised from your own knowledge of the case at that time?
 - Probably not. You I think -- again, I'm afraid I can't Α. now reconstruct precisely what I knew at different points of time, but, you know, my role, my responsibility as head of the system of prosecution and investigation of deaths was to put in place arrangements that would secure a thorough investigation, first of all, with a view to addressing whether or not there should be a criminal prosecution and, secondly, to an investigation more broadly into the circumstances, if that was required, and I approached -- I suppose I approached my role generally as head of a system where I was responsible for a very large number of cases, many of them significant cases in for different reasons, and where, you know, I was, you know, my fundamental responsibility was to have the arrangements in place that would -- would secure the investigation that was required in each of these cases and of course very particularly in this case.

- Q. So was there -- from your recollection was there an approach agreed at that meeting whereby others would go and seek out the information that the family were interested in?

 A. I don't remember whether there was any discussion or
- agreement at the meeting about how matters would unfold 6 7 I'm afraid. Looking at the documentation, it looks to me as though what happened was that, as would be 8 9 entirely usual with correspondence that came in to my 10 office, that the letter was passed by my private office to the staff directly involved in the case, in this case 11 12 Mr Brown, and he was asked to provide briefing and a 13 draft response and that was an entirely, you know, 14 normal approach to the way in which correspondence that 15 came into my office would be dealt with.
 - Q. And we've heard that the head of CAAPD at that time was Les Brown?
- 18 A. Yes.

16

- 19 Q. Is that who you're referring to?
- 20 A. That's right.
- Q. Can we look at the next paragraph, 155. You mentioned earlier the issue of disclosure and I think you addressed this here:
- 24 "Such a briefing could well also have prompted
 25 proactive consideration of the question of disclosure in

light of the previous decisions. I remain of the view that the crown is entitled to decline to disclose material where such disclosure poses a risk of prejudice to criminal proceedings, but the issue of how to balance that with the understanding or commitments which had already been given in this case would have been grappled with proactively and the approach which would be taken going forward could have been addressed directly at an initial meeting."

I'm interested in this reference here to balancing.

To what extent was this a balancing or would it have

been a balancing exercise if you had that briefing?

A. Well, the starting -- I suppose the starting question is what is the substantive requirement in relation to disclosure and, as it were, what's the margin for questions of judgment. I took the view and this was an issue which did come in a sense to me to take the view on, I took the view that the Article 2 obligations on the crown in relation to participation of the victim's family, the deceased's family, did not oblige the crown to disclose in the context of a criminal investigation the -- as it were, the ongoing investigative work that, at least where such disclosure could pose a risk of prejudice to any possible criminal proceedings, that was a view I took as a matter of substance.

I was made aware in I think -- I think pretty
general terms, I was aware that my predecessor had
approved the disclosure of certain materials at an
earlier stage. I had to take a decision on the issue as
it came across my desk under my incumbency and to do
what I thought was the right thing in my tenure.

Having taken that decision, of course at a later point a question arose as to whether there were documents that were encompassed within the understanding or commitment that had been given by my predecessor that had not in fact been disclosed at the time and whether those should now be disclosed. And so having taken the view I had in relation to the crown's obligation in relation to its investigation, I then had to consider advice in relation to certain materials that were encompassed, as I understood it, within that earlier understanding.

Now, looking at that sequence with the benefit of hindsight, it would have been far better had I right at the outset had and indeed, you know, asked for clear briefing about what had been committed to, what understanding had been given, and that that issue -- and also I suppose that faced up with the question of what are we going to do forward ahead of the question being put on my desk by the letter from Mr Anwar and that

1 would have enabled, you know, the issue to have been addressed proactively, perhaps at an earlier stage, 2 3 whether at an introductory meeting or thereafter. 4 I'm very conscious with hindsight, you know, while 5 one is imposing on oneself and on a system potentially a level of expectation which, you know, may not be right, 6 7 but I think it is right but that's one of the purposes an inquiry such as this is to -- for individuals and 8 9 institutions to reflect on how they have dealt with 10 certain issues and whether there are things that could have made a difference in terms of improving the way in 11 12 which things were dealt with. 13 Thank you. So in relation to this change from Q. 14 Frank Mulholland to yourself, one Lord Advocate to 15 another, you've talked about previous commitments being 16 made by Frank Mulholland to the family in relation to 17 disclosure and then you took a decision on disclosure 18 when you were Lord Advocate in relation to whether 19 disclosure should be given primarily to the family? 20 Α. Yes. 21 And those were different approaches? Q. 22 Yes, I should say I'm not sure if I was -- I'm not --Α. first of all, I'm not sure whether what had been given 23 was, you know -- and Mr Brown's minute in October, 24 I think it was October 2017, is a bit equivocal about 25

- 1 whether we're talking about a commitment or an 2 understanding and I'm not sure what I understood about 3 that when I made the decision in I think it was March or 4 February so, you know, I think --5 I was going to ask you, when you made your decision in Q. 6 relation to disclosure to the family, were you aware at 7 that time that there had been previous commitments or previous undertakings or previous assurances given to 8 9 the family about disclosure? 10 Α. I'm not sure that I was -- if I was aware of that. 11 I think I was probably aware that material had been made 12 available to them and that in -- to that extent I was 13 taking a different approach, but I'm not sure if I was 14 aware that or of in effect how that previous disclosure 15 should be characterised in terms of any sort of ongoing 16 expectation --And were you aware of any expectations that the family 17 Q. 18 may have had that disclosure would continue and be 19 ongoing? 20 I suppose if I, you know, looking to -- looking at Α. 21 Mr Anwar's letter that perhaps reflects an assumption 22 perhaps that there would be further disclosure. Right. But your view was that there should not be at 23 Q.
- 25 A. Well, I took -- I took the view that I had a -- my

that stage?

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

overriding responsibility was to, first of all, have an independent thorough investigation and in the context where as I understood it it was a -- at that stage an investigation into potential criminality, that nothing should be done that could prejudice any future criminal proceedings. It would neither serve the public interest nor the interest of Mr Bayoh's family if things were to be done in that context and there were to be a prosecution and there were then to be problems as a result of disclosure and so that was the primary driver. I think I was probably also alive to the consideration that, you know, anything done in one case in a sense has to be capable of being generalised and, you know, we don't have a system of criminal investigation and prosecution where the crown discloses its investigation as it's ongoing and I suspect I had a question in my mind as to what, you know, looking beyond this case, you know, what the implications would be if one were to accept that the level of principle that there was an obligation of disclosure or even that the crown should disclose or however one might characterise it in the context of a crown investigation of a potential criminal case.

Bearing in mind that, you know, we're thinking about an investigative obligation that applies in Article 2

4

5

6

7

8

23

24

25

- cases, potentially Article 3 cases, you know, one has to
 be alive to the, as it were, systemic consequences of
 any individual decision.
 - Q. Were you concerned to some extent that allowing disclosure to the family of Mr Bayoh that that may open the floodgates to other demands and requests by victims or families for disclosure during the period of a criminal investigation?
- A. Yes. Yes, I wouldn't put it in terms of floodgates, 9 10 it's more the level of principle that the crown, as I viewed it and it may be one of the issues that 11 12 the Inquiry -- this Inquiry will want to consider, you 13 know, the crown has an obligation, responsibility, to 14 investigate potential criminality, unexpected sudden 15 deaths, to investigate those independently in the public interest and in a context where there is a potential for 16 17 criminal proceedings, the crown has to be exceptionally 18 careful not to do anything that could possibly prejudice future criminal proceedings and, at least historically, 19 20 that's involved a high level of care about what the 21 crown reveals or discloses while those investigations 22 are ongoing.

And as I say, I wouldn't put it in terms of floodgates, it's more in terms of principle that if, you know, if one -- I was I suspect very conscious as head

of a system that if you take a decision in one case, that has to be a decision you would be prepared to take in another case and that if we were to shift to a system of a great much more open disclosure of the crown investigation to victims, and the families of deceased persons, that would be a very different system and one would need to think very hard about the implications and where the boundaries might be.

- Q. And we've heard evidence that shortly after you came into the role of Lord Advocate that the final PIRC report was received and at that stage the crown then moved into this phase of crown precognition where you are -- we'll come on to this, where you're looking at issues of criminality at that stage?
- A. Yes, that was certainly my understanding.
- Q. Yes, all right. Could we look finally at 156. 156:

"Such a briefing would also perhaps have led me to address at an early stage the fact that a commitment had been given to hold an 'inquiry' apparently whether or not there were criminal proceedings. That would have provided an opportunity to consider whether, once the PIRC report had been received, the crown should in this case depart from the normal sequential approach, which I have described above to death investigations, where an issue of criminality has to be addressed with a view to

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

undertaking the investigations required to provide the foundation for an inquiry (whether a fatal accident inquiry or a public inquiry) in parallel with a criminal investigation."

So you think that a detailed briefing would have actually allowed you to address the issue of an inquiry and you mentioned that earlier that that was another issue that was a factor in relation to this period of handover where you took over the role of Lord Advocate and perhaps expectations existed in the family?

Yes, I mean I suppose at the -- yes, when I took over my Α. first awareness was that the case was with the PIRC and in due course the crown would receive the PIRC report. I then had briefing and I suspect it may have been my assumption in any event that the crown was then proceeding to in effect a criminal investigation, investigation of potential criminality. The normal -the normal case -- the normal approach in a death case is for issues of criminality to be addressed first and dealt with, disposed of, before you look at a potential fatal accident inquiry. And in many death cases if there is a criminal prosecution that will exhaust what is required in terms of investigation and public disclosure of the circumstances so there's a logic to that sequential approach in the ordinary case.

1 I don't think I was aware until very shortly before 2 the meeting with the family that my predecessor had 3 given a commitment in terms which -- a public commitment 4 in terms which suggested there would be an inquiry 5 regardless of whether there were criminal proceedings or not and as I say this is with the benefit of hindsight, 6 7 you know, trying to construct, as it were, an alternative approach. Perhaps had I recognised that, it 8 9 might have raised the question about the way in which --10 you know, whether that normal sequential approach was the right approach in this case, particularly bearing in 11 12 mind that one wants to get to, you know, whatever the 13 procedures are that the things should happen with the 14 least duration of time, if I could put it that way. 15 Q. I think we'll come on to that issue again. So before I move on to that process, you've 16 17 described here sequential process, can I ask you a preliminary issue. You may or may not be able to assist 18 us with this. The final PIRC report came in on 19 20 10 August 2016. We've heard evidence that the crown 21 investigation took place over a period of two years, and 22 during that period when the crown precognition was being prepared, you were Lord Advocate for the whole period. 23

A decision was taken at some point that this investigation would be handled by CAAPD, not SFIU.

24

1 We've heard from various witnesses about that. And do 2 you know why that choice was made to allocate the Sheku Bayoh investigation to CAAPD? 3 4 Α. I don't. I think my information about the setting up of 5 the team comes from a minute which the Inquiry drew my 6 attention to from Stephen McGowan to me which -- and to 7 the Solicitor General, to law officers, basically advising us of the way in which the crown proposed to 8 9 take the matter forward and dealing with certain other 10 matters. We've heard from Mr McGowan on that. 11 Q. 12 Yes. But, you know, I don't recall being involved in Α. 13 any discussion about which part of the system the case 14 should be allocated to. 15 Now, I should say I can understand the logic of it 16 sitting with CAAPD. You know that's, you know, the part 17 of the Crown Office structure which is specifically looking at allegations of criminality against police 18 19 officers. The procurator fiscal in that particular part 20 of the system had to deal with questions of excessive 21 force, reasonable use of force, and the like, you know, 22 as part of their day-to-day work, so I can understand the logic. I don't remember why the decision was made. 23 Thank you. Let's move on to the approach that was 24 Q. 25 taken. We've heard -- I think you have mentioned and

we've heard from John Logue that the normal approach is what would happen, what he would expect to happen in an investigation is they would identify a number of issues which need to be considered, the question of criminality was an immediate and an obvious issue which would need to be explored in the investigation and, in simple terms, that was an immediate priority.

There may be wider issues which relate to broader learning which could come out of a fatal accident inquiry or an inquiry such as a public inquiry, but the priority would be to reach a decision on the criminal aspects as quickly as possible. And he said:

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

Do you follow that, do you --

Α. I absolutely follow that and I can well understand. You know, one would hope that that's the way that things might be done. My understanding at the time was that it was normal, as Mr Loque observes, to seek to deal with any questions of potential criminality in a death case first and that, you know, decisions in relation to whether or not to have a fatal accident inquiry and, speaking generally, not in this case, whether or not there were issues that had to be dealt with or should be dealt with by a fatal accident inquiry would be often addressed after the question of criminality had been dealt with and there are good reasons for that usual sequence.

I certainly don't in the least dissent from the proposition that, you know, one would hope that anyone engaged in an investigation is alive to the range of issues that might be -- might arise, but my understanding would be that the initial focus would be on has a crime been committed, can a prosecution be brought, should it be brought, and very often there may be cases where, you know, that raises a set of focused issues and there are wider issues about system, about the background and context which entirely reasonably get left until the issue of criminality has been disposed of.

- Now, in this case, you know, I think looking back on it, I think this was a case where there was -- would have been good reason to take as broad an approach from an earlier stage as one could and, you know, as I say, with the benefit of the hindsight, I can see that.
 - Q. And you talk about criminality, and then broader, wider issues in relation to an FAI and you've talked about system. Could you help those listening understand the distinction between the issues the crown are looking at in relation to criminality and the type of broader issues or wider issues that would be covered with an FAI?
 - A. Yes, I suppose if one is looking at a criminal prosecution or a possible criminal prosecution question of criminality, one is looking at that in -- within the framework of the criminal law, one is -- and the admissible evidence that's available so one has to ask, you know, one is investigating the case, securing the evidence, and then asking oneself does that evidence disclose that a crime has been committed, that there's an accused person who can be prosecuted and I suppose ultimately, although in a death case would be unlikely to be a question, you know, where the public interest lies. So it's an investigation that is focused through the lens of the substantive criminal law and the law of

criminal evidence. 1 2 When one comes to a fatal accident inquiry, a fatal 3 accident inquiry may examine a much broader range of 4 questions in relation to the circumstances of a death 5 and the principal purpose of most fatal accident inquiries is to examine whether things have happened 6 7 from which lessons can be learned in terms of avoiding deaths in similar circumstances in the future. That's 8 9 not the only circumstance, but that's a very common 10 circumstance for a fatal accident inquiry and that's not constrained by questions of substantive criminal law. 11 12 One is looking in a much more proactive, wide-ranging 13 way at the circumstances that led up to a death; are 14 there things from those circumstances from which we can 15 learn lessons for the future? So a trial would not be looking at recommendations on 16 Q. 17 how to avoid a death in the future? 18 Α. No. 19 Because an FAI can clearly look at those aspects? Q. Absolutely, so the whole lens and focus is completely 20 Α. 21 different. You know, the lens of a criminal trial is, 22 is this accused person guilty of the offence charged; whereas the fatal accident is ranging in a much wider 23 way to ask, are there circumstances here which, you 24

know, with the benefit of hindsight, are, you know, the

- 1 system as a whole should learn lessons from. So there are, you know, there's quite a different focus and 2 3 for -- the normal focus, as I understood it at the time, 4 and I don't know if it's changed since, would be to seek 5 to dispose of any questions of criminality first because there are real difficulties in holding, you know, sort 6 7 of wide-ranging inquiry that could be undertaken in a fatal accident inquiry if there are individuals with 8 9 potential criminal charges that haven't been dealt with.
 - Q. But some aspects will be common to both regardless of the procedure, such as the circumstances surrounding the death and the cause of death?
- 13 A. Absolutely.

10

11

12

14

23

24

- Q. They would be relevant to whatever the outcome?
- 15 Absolutely, and that's why in some cases the public Α. interest, and indeed possibly the Article 2 obligations 16 17 if it's a case to which Article 2 applies, may be exhausted by the criminal process and then, you know, in 18 the case of most -- I don't know, someone will have the 19 20 statistics I would guess -- in most criminal cases 21 involving deaths don't result in a subsequent fatal 22 accident inquiry.
 - Q. So if a criminal trial covered the full circumstances of the death and the full sort of details of the cause of death, that may in itself be sufficient to satisfy the

1 public interest? 2 Α. Yes. And the -- so in terms of the crown precognition and the 3 Q. 4 work being done by the crown in a criminal investigation 5 or an investigation into criminality, you would expect there to be a full and detailed investigation and 6 7 analysis into the circumstances and the cause of death and that would be of benefit to the crown regardless of 8 whether there are proceedings directed towards a 9 10 criminal trial or an FAI or no proceedings in the future? 11 12 Α. Yes, although I think if the precognition is being 13 prepared through the lens of, as it were, of a criminal 14 investigation, I -- I'm not sure that I'm the person you 15 should ask about what the crown rules and instructions 16 are in relation to preparation of precognitions, but it 17 wouldn't surprise me if the precognition was in the context, as it were, of the criminal investigation stage 18 was focused squarely on questions of potential 19 20 criminality. 21 Q. So what would be excluded from a crown investigation 22 into the circumstances of the death where you're only looking at criminality? What would be excluded from 23 that in terms of the circumstances of the death? 24

I suppose I'm -- I suppose I have been speaking in

25

Α.

1 generalities so I'm now trying to think of examples. 2 I mean certainly if I go back to the 3 Rosepark Inquiry, which is the substantial fatal 4 accident inquiry that I conducted for the crown, that 5 looked into aspects of the legal regime. It involved multiple deaths in a care home. You know, the fatal 6 7 accident inquiry looked at aspects of the legal regime for regulating fire safety in care homes as well as more 8 9 specifically the regime within the particular care home 10 and the more, as it were -- the circumstances that were more directly focused on the events so one could 11 12 envisage a fatal accident inquiry or indeed a public 13 inquiry looking at a much wider range of the surrounding 14 circumstances than would be appropriate to a criminal 15 investigation that's focused on questions of whether a crime has been and whether an individual accused can be 16 17 prosecuted. 18 Does this come back to what you said a short while ago Q. 19 about systems that may be in place, may be something 20 more of interest to an FAI rather than a criminal trial? 21 Α. Generally speaking, of course once we've got health and safety at work, you know, one shouldn't be excluding 22 questions of system and insofar as questions of system 23 might disclose breaches of health and safety at work or 24 rather statutory regulations, but in terms of whether 25

1 that wider regulatory system was fit for purpose or not, you know, that's not something that would be within the 2 3 ambit of a criminal investigation. 4 Q. Thank you. I've been speaking very generally --5 Α. Of course. 6 Q. 7 Α. -- in generality. Of course. Can I ask you to look at a paragraph in an 8 Q. 9 inquiry statement from Les Brown, please, this is SBPI 00419 paragraph 105. 105. And this relates to 10 what he referred to as "an incremental process". 11 12 I think you've -- it may be that you've referred to it as a "sequential process", but if we could look at that 13 14 and it begins with the words "a key element", 105. 15 Sorry. Some of the answers went over a number of pages. 16 Here we are: 17 "A key element of the incremental strategy approved 18 by the Lord Advocate was to separate out and resolve the issue of potential criminality and to get to a point 19 20 where Crown Counsel could take a decision in this regard 21 with the necessary confidence, thus permitting the 22 investigation to move forward to other areas in anticipation of an inquiry whose forum had yet to be 23 determined. It had been hoped initially that the 24 necessary further inquiries could be completed 25

1		relatively quickly."
2		So he describes this as an incremental strategy.
3		And then moving on:
4		"The precognition that was requested by
5		Crown Counsel was created for the limited purpose of
6		enabling Crown Counsel to take a decision on potential
7		criminality, but was not intended to be the end of the
8		investigative process by the crown, particularly in
9		relation to race and implicit bias, and further detailed
10		inquiry would likely have been undertaken had an FAI
11		been instructed. This would in my opinion have been
12		highly likely to have required precognition of the
13		police officers involved, where their approach to the
14		incident would have been probed, scrutinised and
15		evaluated."
16		So if we can look at the top there, you see it says:
17		"Incremental strategy was approved by the
18		Lord Advocate to separate out and resolve the issue of
19		potential criminality."
20		Do you remember approving that strategy for the
21		investigation into Mr Bayoh?
22	Α.	The only recollection that I have, and I think it's
23		probably been prompted by the reading the documents, is
24		the there was a minute from Stephen McGowan which
25		invited law officer approval of the proposition that was

1 put in that minute. I think from memory that minute envisaged specifically that what was to take place was a 2 3 criminal investigation. I don't now recall whether it 4 went on to discuss any subsequent or what would happen 5 subsequently and it may -- I don't know whether that's -- that's what Mr Brown is referring to. 6 7 And where he refers to this as "an incremental strategy" Q. potential criminal proceedings first and later FAI, is 8 9 that what we have been talking about as what would have 10 been the normal approach at the time, the linear or the sequential? 11 12 Α. If I put it this way, reading Mr McGowan's minute now, I 13 suppose I read it for the purposes of preparing my 14 statement, it didn't surprise me that the law officers 15 were being asked to approve the arrangements for what was I think described in that as a criminal 16 17 investigation, because I would have assumed at that time 18 that the right approach would normally be to seek to 19 deal with any questions of criminality before moving on 20 to consider what, you know, whether there were broader 21 issues that would merit an inquiry. 22 And can we look at the second paragraph of 105. It Q. talks about the crown precognition: 23 "It was not intended to be the end of the 24 investigative process by the crown, particularly in 25

1 relation to race and implicit bias, and further detailed inquiry would likely have been undertaken had an FAI 2 3 been instructed." 4 Was it your understanding that race -- issues of 5 race and implicit bias would have been undertaken at a later stage only if an FAI was instructed? 6 7 No, I mean I would have assumed -- I mean I understood Α. that race was an issue that would have to be addressed 8 at all stages, the potential relevance of race. I don't 9 10 think I had any -- certainly at that stage, I had no sort of, as it were, preconceived view about what that 11 12 might involve but, you know, one -- you know, it was 13 clearly an issue that had to be properly investigated 14 and consideration given to what impact it might have, 15 first of all, on any question of criminality and then, you know, potentially more wildly. 16 Q. Fiona Carnan came into the team in CAAPD, to work on the 17 analysis primarily, in about December 2017 and she has 18 explained in evidence it wasn't part of her remit to 19 20 consider whether there were grounds for an FAI, but her 21 role was restricted to an analysis of evidence in 22 respect of any potential criminality for -- by the 23 police. In relation to this aspect, we've heard evidence 24 from Stephen McGowan, and he talks about being aware of 25

1 this -- the approach that was taken regarding criminal proceedings in fatal accident inquiries and he said: 2 3 "We would try and address the issues of criminality 4 first and make as a decision on that criminality, which 5 would include, if required, running a trial before we concluded our consideration of the way in which we would 6 7 present the evidence before an FAI. That was typical." He calls it a linear approach. It was subject to 8 some criticism because of delays that were built in. He 9 has indicated that and I quote: 10 "I was not of the view that what was being held back 11 12 was consideration of race. Race insofar as it was 13 relevant to the question of criminality was something 14 that would be covered, but there was always going to be 15 a further inquiry and I think we had stated probably from an early stage that there had been an FAI." 16 17 So he -- would you agree with his view that race was 18 not something that was to be held back until a later 19 stage? A. Certainly not and I would have -- I mean, I suppose I 20 21 assumed that the team that was put in place would be 22 addressing all issues that could be relevant to questions of criminality and, you know, including in 23 this case any issues of race. 24 25 Q. We've heard from John Loque who spoke of the challenges

1 in relation to delay that this linear or sequential or incremental approach created or worsened. He said: 2 3 "One of the challenges we found in recent years has 4 been that with creating the specialist units we may find 5 ourselves with an investigation perhaps where more than one team is involved and therefore there needs to be 6 coordination. We've learned that you may need to 7 progress parallel investigations in two separate teams 8 9 at the same time, rather than allowing one team to reach a conclusion before the other team then takes over. 10 That simply builds in delay into the process as well. 11 12 So for example you wouldn't want a team looking at a 13 criminal investigation and no one dealing with the 14 broader aspects that I have referred to until that team 15 has finished. You would try to make sure that there was sharing of information and progress on all aspects at 16 17 the same time." 18 Was that an approach where there was parallel teams 19 perhaps working on the same issue -- same matters, is 20 that an approach that developed during your tenure as 21 Lord Advocate? I can't now remember whether it did. I mean it's fair 22 Α. to say that through the course of my tenure I became 23 quite focused on a number of issues, one of them being 24 25 delay and in particular delay in relation to death

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

investigations and the various things were done but perhaps the most -- what they call the modernisation project was undertaken in relation to SFIU, which was a pretty significant review of the way that SFIU undertook its work, coupled with what was really important was securing the resources to enable that changed approach to be put into effect. Because what became very evident -- and inevitably as one is in a role one is able to become more proactive in terms of identifying issues that need to be addressed, what became very evident to me was that there were significant resourcing challenges for the crown in various areas and in particular in death investigations for a variety of reasons. So, you know, the work was done to review the work of that unit, the resources were secured. I secured resource -- quite significant additional resources over the course of my tenure to do a number of reforms, if I

of that unit, the resources were secured. I secured resource -- quite significant additional resources over the course of my tenure to do a number of reforms, if I can put it that way, and I certainly recall that in the context of the work of SFIU one of the things that we -- we were keen to do and were putting in place, as I recall it, was for example a degree of joining up and consistency of the investigations into deaths in custody, so there was a consistent learning being built in, rather than treating each case as an individual

1 case. 2 Whether part of that involved, as it were, the 3 cross-departmental working and the parallel working at 4 that time, I'm afraid I can't now remember. 5 All right. Thank you. We have also heard from Q. John Logue that, and I think he agreed in response to 6 7 questions from the Chair: "That even though an incremental approach or a 8 9 linear or a sequential approach had been taken, you 10 could not consider the question of criminality without considering the question of race." 11 12 You're nodding. Would you agree with that? 13 Absolutely. Α. 14 Yes, and John Loque said he would have expected CAAPD to Q. 15 investigate race as part of their exercise of investigate criminality; would you agree? 16 17 Yes. Α. 18 Q. And he said: 19 "You would have to look at race in order to 20 ascertain whether there was any evidence that did have a 21 bearing on criminality relating to race." 22 Α. Yes. Q. Would you see that -- you've mentioned Article 2, would 23 24 you see that as part of a thorough investigation by the 25 crown into the death of Mr Bayoh to consider questions

of race? 1 In the Article 2 context, yes. In the context of the 2 Α. 3 criminal investigation, obviously insofar as race bore 4 on questions of criminality, and there are various ways 5 in which it might do so, and I suppose I -- you know I had no particular preconceived view as to the ways in 6 7 which race would turn out to be relevant. Q. And would you have considered whether -- whether that 8 9 process of considering race and investigating race from 10 the outset would have had an impact on the confidence of the family and their engagement with Crown Office? 11 12 Α. Well, I mean it seemed to me I mean race should be being considered and taken into account as relevant at the 13 14 various stages in the investigation and the family 15 should have, you know, should be able to have been assured that that was the case. 16 Thank you. I think you talk about further reflections 17 Q. that you've had in your statement. Could we look at 18 19 paragraphs 146 and 147, please. Here we are, 146: 20 "With hindsight it is for consideration, given the 21 commitment which had already been given in this case to 22 an inquiry, whether the crown's investigation might from the outset have encompassed both the question of whether 23 a crime had been committed and wider questions which 24 would fall to be addressed in the context of an FAI. 25

1 Whilst there is, as I have explained, a logic to the sequential approach which is normally taken where a 2 3 decision has already been taken that there will be an 4 inquiry, it may be that this should be departed from." 147: 5 "There may be a learning point for Crown Office to 6 7 consider. Whilst there is, as I have explained, a logic to the usual sequential approach, there may be some 8 9 cases (where Article 2 is engaged and there are 10 potential reasons for holdings a fatal accident inquiry even if there are criminal proceedings) where there 11 12 would be merit in a criminal investigation and a SFIU 13 investigation running in parallel (potentially within 14 the same team). This could likely expedite any fatal 15 accident inquiry." Would you like to expand on your thoughts in this? 16 Yes, and I'm reassured that Mr Logue -- if I have picked 17 Α. up correctly the quote that you gave me from Mr Logue's 18 evidence that that -- it sounds as though that's already 19 20 the approach being taken. It's actually a reflection 21 that if -- if a case -- if it's clear that it's or it's 22 likely that there's going to need to be a process of inquiry that goes beyond criminal proceedings in any 23 particular case, typically by a fatal accident inquiry 24 but potentially in other ways, that if you in effect are 25

1 doing -- dealing with those different aspects or that the sort of narrow question of criminality and any 2 3 broader questions in parallel, there are a number of 4 advantages. 5 I think when he wrote this I was thinking 6 particularly about a potential advantage in terms of the 7 overall timescale, but I can see there would be other advantages as well in terms of cross -- any possible 8 9 cross-fertilisation between different issues. One would 10 hope there wouldn't be a need for that, but I can see that as well. 11 12 And this really goes to the point that Mr Logue, if 13 I picked it up correctly, was making that there are certain cases where, you know, you perhaps want to step 14 15 back and ask in a -- rather than following that --16 that's the normal sequential approach, as I have 17 described it, step back and ask, you know, more broadly how do we get to -- how do we secure the state's 18 19 obligations under Article 2, if it's a case to which 20 Article 2 applies, in a way that is complete and 21 exhaustive and reaches a conclusion at the earliest 22 practicable point, recognising that these processes take a period of time. 23 The reference by Mr Loque was to the parallel 24 Q. investigations allowing progress to be made and 25

1 effectively avoiding delay and he also said: "You would try to make sure there was a sharing of 2 3 information and progress on all aspects at the same time." 4 5 So he talks about that sharing between parallel 6 teams. 7 Α. Yes. Well, I think that -- the crown is ahead of the thoughts that I had had on reviewing this case. 8 Thank you. And looking now from what you know of the 9 Q. 10 investigation into Mr Bayoh's death, you talk about cases where there would not just necessarily be a 11 12 criminal trial but there may be wider issues of learning 13 available and a possible FAI. Was the investigation to 14 Mr Bayoh's death the type of case that would have 15 benefitted from this parallel investigation? I think it's implicit from the fact I put in the 16 Α. 17 statement that it seems to me that it is and I think that's probably -- you know, in part this thought was 18 19 prompted by the fact that a commitment had already been 20 given to an inquiry if -- I think in terms that was a 21 commitment that applied regardless of whether there was 22 a criminal prosecution or not and, from my understanding of the case, it's not surprising that one would expect 23 this to be a case where there would need to be some 24 wider process of inquiry. 25

```
1
         Q.
             Thank you. I would like to move on slightly from the --
             this discussion about the incremental process and the
 2
 3
             parallel process and talk about the investigative
 4
             strategy that was adopted within the CAAPD team in
 5
             relation to progressing the crown precognition.
                 I'm -- could you give me a moment. I'm conscious of
 6
 7
             the time. Would that perhaps be ...?
         LORD BRACADALE: We'll have a 20-minute break at this point.
 8
 9
         (11.27 am)
10
                                (A short break)
         (11.53 am)
11
12
         LORD BRACADALE: Mr Wolffe, just before we move on, could I
13
             pick up on an aspect of the discussion that you were
14
             having with Ms Grahame just before the break and perhaps
15
             we could have on the screen paragraph 147 of your
16
             statement.
17
                 Now, Mr Logue seemed to be contemplating two
18
             different departments working in parallel on the same
19
             case in the two aspects and sharing information. At
20
             paragraph 147 you say that:
21
                 "There may be some cases where Article 2 is engaged
22
             and there are potential reasons for holding a fatal
             accident inquiry, even if there are criminal
23
             proceedings, where there would be merit in a criminal
24
             investigation and SFIU investigation running in parallel
25
```

[and you say] (potentially within the same team) and
this would likely expedite a fatal accident inquiry once
questions of criminal responsibility have been
addressed."

And I wanted to pick up on your parenthesis there,

"potentially within the same team", and I wondered if

you thought there may be advantage in the same team

working with the two different aspects of the work, as

opposed to two different departments?

A. Yes, I think the key thing it seems to me is that the -when I was thinking about this as an approach is that
in -- and thinking about the questions of criminality
and prosecutors with the experience of thinking about
the broader issues that are involved in a fatal accident
inquiry who within -- at least in the time that I was
Lord Advocate would be located in the SFIU part of the
system working together.

I think the key thing is having the right mix of skill and expertise to cover the range of issues that need to be addressed and having them working together constructively. Whether that involves or is best achieved by having, as it were, two little teams in separate units working independently or, as it were, putting them together in a single team probably has to be resolved on a case-by-case basis but one wants -- one

1 wants constructive working within the -- between the 2 individuals who are working on the same case bringing their different expertise to bear. 3 4 I should say that I can't speak to the sort of, as 5 it were, the micro-details of how it would work, but I would imagine that in most cases these will not be 6 7 individuals who are necessarily devoting themselves to the single case as the only case they're working on. 8 9 Sometimes that will be true, but very often I suspect it 10 won't be. LORD BRACADALE: And the essential thing is really that we 11 12 work together rather than operate in separate silos. Absolutely, that's really what I was trying to 13 Α. communicate by the words in parenthesis. 14 15 LORD BRACADALE: Thank you very much. Ms Grahame. MS GRAHAME: Thank you. I was -- I would like to move on to 16 look at the approach taken within CAAPD. 17 We've heard that Les Brown was the head of that unit 18 19 and in terms of the crown precognition, Alisdair McLeod 20 and Erin Campbell came in to work on the -- initially to 21 do work to help with preparing the narrative and then, 22 at a later stage, Fiona Carnan came in in December 2017 to work on the analysis and at some point 23 Ashley Edwards, then QC, now KC, who was assistant 24 25 principal Crown Counsel became the dedicated advocate

25

1 depute to this matter. 2 Now, we've heard evidence from Les Brown that he 3 prepared a minute which he sent to Alisdair McLeod and others, Lindsey Miller, on 15 September 2016 and this 4 5 looked at the investigative strategy, if I can put it that way, and let's look at a passage from his Inquiry 6 7 statement, SBPI 00419, and this is on pages 47 and 48 of his Inquiry statement. Some of the answers span a 8 9 number of pages. And the passage I'm looking for is the 10 one that begins: "On receipt of the second PIRC report" 11 12 There we are: 13 "On the receipt of the second PIRC report the 14 dedicated team at Crown Office agreed an investigative 15 strategy to facilitate the decision-making process in relation to potential criminality. The investigative 16 17 strategy approved by the Lord Advocate instructed that all eye witnesses to the restraint process should be 18 19 precognosed by the investigative team. It was agreed 20 that all witnesses should be jointly precognosed by two 21 investigators to safeguard against any criticism of the precognition technique, following criticism by the 22 family of the deceased of the approach taken by PIRC 23 investigators." 24

Was this a strategy that you approved in your role

21

22

23

24

25

as Lord Advocate? 1 I think -- I don't either recall or and I haven't seen 2 Α. 3 in the documents ever seeing what one might describe as 4 the investigative strategy. I received a minute from --5 the minute from Stephen McGowan, which I think is referred to in paragraph 49 of my statement, which 6 7 basically invited law officers to agree the various steps identified in that minute with a view to taking 8 9 the investigation forward and among those steps was the 10 allocation in that of assistant principal crown counsel to the case. 11 12 I picked up from the documents and it was a minute 13 that -- I can't remember which one but a minute came to 14 me, so it's something I would have seen at the time and 15 it's what I would have expected in any event, that she had approved an investigative strategy of the 16 17 investigative strategy. I don't myself recall, I have 18 to confess, even ever seeing the investigative strategy. The -- let's have the minute on the screen, 19 Q. 20

Q. The -- let's have the minute on the screen,

COPFS 03853A, and I don't believe you were copied in to

this. You'll see this minute. We've heard evidence

from Les Brown about it. 15 September 2016 and it's

sent to a number of people, including Alisdair McLeod

and Erin Campbell and Ashley Edwards, amongst others,

but there's no suggestion this was going to the law

officers or to you in particular.

- 2 Yes, and there may be some -- within Crown Office when Α. 3 something is approved by Crown Counsel sometimes it may 4 be taken to have the imprimatur of the Lord Advocate, 5 because, you know, one of the features of our system is that every advocate depute, every Crown Counsel has --6 7 is clothed with the functions and responsibilities of the Lord Advocate and, to that extent, approval by 8 9 Crown Counsel is approval by the Lord Advocate, the 10 individual who holds the office remaining answerable of 11 course for whatever is done by Crown Counsel in their 12 name.
- 13 And just so people can follow, the Lord Advocate has a Q. 14 number of deputes who act on your behalf in that role, 15 they're known as "advocate deputes", and they take decisions in cases. It wouldn't be possible for the 16 17 Lord Advocate to prosecute every High Court trial that 18 comes to fruition, so they prosecute on your behalf, 19 argue appeals in the Appeal Court, take decisions on 20 which cases should be going to trial or FAI, that type 21 of thing?

22

23

24

25

A. Yes, I mean it's -- it's a central feature of our system that in effect the Lord Advocate is -- gives by a commission to advocate deputes power to take any decision the Lord Advocate might take and routinely

- 1 across the whole range of Crown Office work advocate deputes or Crown Counsel, as they're often described, 2 3 take decisions which constitutionally are decisions of 4 the Lord Advocate, but which, you know, in practice are 5 being taken by an individual advocate depute on behalf 6 of the Lord Advocate.
- 7 Q. Okay.

21

- And, you know, it would be and we may come to this -- it 8 Α. 9 would be -- at least in my experience in the role, it 10 would be absolutely routine for an advocate depute or Crown Counsel to run a case to take all the decisions 11 12 that require to be taken and for the Lord Advocate or 13 the Solicitor General to have no active direct 14 involvement in the case and in effect to have that 15 ultimate answerability for everything that's done in their name. 16
- And of that group of advocate deputes the most senior of 17 Q. 18 those is the principal advocate depute known as 19 Principal Crown Counsel and Ashley Edwards at this time 20 that we're talking about was the assistant principal Crown Counsel?
- 22 That's right. She was one of the three, as it were, Α. senior leadership team, if one can use that terminology, 23 within the wider cohort of Crown Counsel. 24
- Thank you. And, in fact, prior to becoming 25 Q.

1		Lord Advocate, you have yourself held the role of
2		advocate depute and senior advocate depute?
3	A.	Yes, I spent I think just under three years as an
4		advocate depute and then spent some time prosecuting
5		conducting the Rosepark fatal accident inquiry, again
6		technical, I think as an advocate depute.
7	Q.	Thank you. Could I ask you to look at COPFS 05119B, you
8		mentioned that a moment ago, if we have that on the play
9		list. COPFS 05119B. And this is a minute from
10		Stephen McGowan, 29 August 2016, and it's headed
11		"Lord Advocate and Solicitor General" and it's also
12		copied to a number of other people, including the head
13		of CAAPD.
14		Is this the minute that you received from
15		Stephen McGowan that you referred to a moment ago?
16	Α.	It is.
17	Q.	And if we can go down the page, it says:
18		"The purpose of a minute is to update law officers
19		in relation to progress in this case and to propose a
20		timescale for further work."
21		And then it gives a background, and it talks about
22		the work required, the number of witnesses of fact that
23		are required, requirement to consult with nine experts,
24		we propose to consult with experts, their answers are
25		reduced to writing, and then subsequently, I think with

1 resources, you talk about: 2 "Two senior procurator fiscal deputes with 3 experience of large and complex cases have been 4 allocated under the supervision of the head of CAAPD and 5 assistant principal Crown Counsel has been nominated as the allocated advocate depute in the case and we propose 6 7 that we will keep her up to date at all stages with the ongoing work." 8 9 Indeed. Α. 10 Q. And is that the minute you were referring to --11 Α. It is. 12 -- a moment ago? And just go to the bottom of that. Q. 13 There's also mention of other matters that were being 14 addressed at that time. 15 Α. Yes. Thank you. Could I confirm that after the team is 16 Q. 17 allocated to work within CAAPD on the investigation into the death of Mr Bayoh, I think as I understand it from 18 the minute we looked at before this -- we can take that 19 20 minute off the screen. When we were looking at 21 Les Brown's minute that he sent to the team, it became 22 clear that a strategy was agreed where -- whereby 23 Alisdair McLeod and Erin Campbell would precognosce key 24 eye witnesses and we have other information available to the Chair, primarily a briefing note prepared by 25

1 Alisdair McLeod at a subsequent date in 2020, which summaries the work that was done by Crown Office and he 2 3 said that precognition started at the beginning of 4 October 2016 and, apart from one, were all completed by 5 the 23 November 2016. So between October and November of 2016 the 6 precognitions were taken from the eye witnesses and we 7 understand they were taken jointly by Alisdair McLeod 8 9 and Erin Campbell. Were you involved in any way in that 10 strategy? Not that I recall. As I say, as I understand the 11 Α. 12 investigative strategy was approved by assistant 13 principal Crown Counsel, entirely routine, as I 14 understand it, for that to happen and then it's for the 15 team that's been put together to pursue the investigation. 16 Q. So at this stage that the team had been allocated the -17 18 Ashley Edwards had been allocated, who was in charge of 19 the team and the direction of that team, because we have 20 heard that the members of staff are working within CAAPD 21 and Les Brown is in charge of CAAPD, he's the head of 22 that department, and we've heard about Ashley Edwards who's independent Crown Counsel. 23 So who would you say was in charge of direction? 24 Well, I mean as I would see it and the responsibility of 25

1 Crown Counsel is to provide such direction to the investigation as the team might require. Now, the 2 3 extent to which Crown Counsel requires to give 4 instructions in the context of an ongoing investigation, 5 certainly in my own experience when I was an advocate depute, would vary. You know, once an investigative 6 7 strategy has been agreed, those involved may simply pursue that and implement it without reference --8 9 needing to refer back to Crown Counsel. 10 Equally, there are cases where Crown Counsel's instruction might be required as the case goes on and so 11 12 in terms of providing what one might call strategic 13 direction or instruction on any particular issues that 14 require to be addressed, that would sit, I would expect, 15 with Crown Counsel, but of course the procurators fiscal undertaking the investigation itself are, as I certainly 16 17 understood in this case, very experienced prosecutors themselves. They're lawyers with experience of 18 undertake investigations. You know they have their own, 19 20 as it were, professional autonomy. Because this was 21 being undertaken within CAAPD I would regard -- I 22 certainly understood Les Brown to be, as it were, the leader of the investigative team. 23 24 And this was also a case where, as I saw it, the senior professional leadership within Crown Office, in 25

1 the person initially of Stephen McGowan and then also Lindsey Miller, were quite actively engaged with the 2 3 case. And I have to confess I had never -- I probably 4 didn't interrogate in my own mind who was, as it were, 5 had line manager responsibility in that sense for what 6 was going on, but I think from my perspective, you know, 7 the key point that I would have taken from Mr McGowan's minute and which I would have sort of carried forward 8 9 was that the crown had put in place a team of 10 experienced procurators fiscal who, as I say, bring their own professional skill and experience who were 11 12 under the direction of assistant principal Crown Counsel 13 who, you know, had all the authority that came with the 14 role of Crown Counsel. 15 Q. Thank you. And as well as precognoscing eye witnesses, the minute that Les Brown prepared, and was subsequently 16 17 discussed as we understand it amongst the team, also 18 referred to precognoscing ambulance personnel and 19 indicated that other aspects would be looked at, 20 airwaves, broadcasts, transcripts provided by PIRC, so 21 that the crown could be satisfied as to the state of 22 knowledge of the officers attending. I'm interested in the phrase "the state of knowledge 23 of the officers attending", could you explain to people 24 what that would encompass briefly? 25

1 Α. I'm taking it, and I'm afraid I'm reacting to the question on the hoof rather than having any -- being 2 3 able to speak to anything that I might have had at the 4 time, but I take it that one is referring to the information that the officers had available to them when 5 they were -- when they attended at the scene. I'm 6 7 assuming that's what would be involved. Thank you. I would like to ask you some questions about 8 Q. 9 the role of an allocated advocate depute or 10 Crown Council when they have been allocated to a specific case such as this investigation. 11 12 Let's look at a statement we've received from Ashley Edwards, SBPI 00445. And if we could look at 13 14 paragraph 13, please. As you know, I'm not asking any 15 questions about the prosecutorial decision, but I would like to ask you about her role in the precognition 16 17 process. So 13: 18 "I was provided with two PIRC report, and the expert reports that had been instructed by PIRC." 19 20 For your information, that's from Dr Karch and 21 Dr Payne-James: "I do not recall if I had any further documents at 22 the point of instruction. In September 2016 I met with 23 the case preparation team, at that time Erin Campbell 24 and Alisdair McLeod; two deputy crown agents, 25

1 Lindsey Miller and Stephen McGowan, and the head of CAAPD, Les Brown. At that meeting an outline 2 3 investigative strategy was agreed, in particular the 4 civilian witnesses who required to be precognosed were identified." 5 6 Is that the type of step you would expect to take 7 when the team are planning how they wish to carry out the process of crown precognition? 8 You mean in terms of agreeing an outline investigative 9 Α. 10 strategy? 11 Q. Yes. 12 Yes, and again I'm casting my mind back, my recollection Α. 13 is that at that point it was standard procedure to have 14 an investigative strategy which would be approved by 15 Crown Counsel. And then I think, going back to your own statement, you 16 Q. 17 do address this at paragraph 25 of your Inquiry statement, SBPI 00529. Here we are. And you say: 18 19 "At the time of this investigation only the most 20 significant and complex cases had a specific advocate depute allocated to them." 21 22 And at that stage was Mr Bayoh's investigation one of the most significant and complex cases being handled 23 by Crown Office? 24 25 It was certainly a significant and complex case. I mean

24

25

1 there were a number -- a number of significant and complex cases ongoing, but I would certainly have 2 3 regarded this as one of the most significant and complex 4 cases. 5 Thank you. Q. And just in terms of the allocation of advocate deputes, 6 Α. 7 again, others would be better able to speak to this than me, but there were many fewer advocate deputes then than 8 9 there are now and it was a resource that had to be used 10 effectively and, as I recall it at any rate, the allocation of advocate deputes to particular cases was 11 12 the exception rather than the rule, but, as I say, 13 others may be better able to speak to that. 14 And we see that Ashley Edwards was assistant principal Q. 15 Crown Counsel so in a position of some seniority --16 Α. Yes. 17 -- in relation to other advocate deputes? Was that also Q. 18 a reflection of the way that Crown Office viewed this 19 case? 20 I should say so, yes. Α. 21 Q. And you say further down the paragraph: "I expected that APCC would provide such direction 22 as might be required by the investigation team. I can 23

see from Mr McGowan's minute that consistent with that

expectation Crown Counsel had agreed the investigative

1		strategy and had instructed further investigations."
2		And was it part of the role of assistant principal
3		Crown Counsel, Ashley Edwards, to instruct further
4		investigations that she saw fit at that time?
5	Α.	I would certainly have regarded that as part of the
6		role.
7	Q.	And you then go on to say:
8		"I can also see from other documents that there were
9		meetings between APCC and the investigative team in July
10		and November 2017 and there may have been others."
11		So unlike a situation where there may be very
12		limited contact between Crown Counsel and the
13		investigative team, it would appear that there were some
14		meetings as well as the investigative strategy being
15		agreed?
16	Α.	Yes, certainly as time went on and just looking to the
17		documents that I have been able to review for this
18		Inquiry, I was made aware that there were the
19		meetings that I have identified there between APCC and
20		the investigative team.
21	Q.	Were you involved in selecting Ashley Edwards for this
22		role of allocated AD or was that something that perhaps
23		Mr McGowan was more involved in or Lindsey Miller?
24	Α.	So far as I can I have no recollection of being
25		involved. The minute came up to law office as in effect

1		presenting us with the team that was proposed.
2	Q.	Right.
3	A.	I suspect there would have been discussion with
4		presumably with APCC herself and potentially also with
5		principal Crown Counsel before. So I suspect that was a
6		decision, as it were, made in putting the team together
7		and then it was presented to the law officers in the
8		minute we looked at for, you know first of all to
9		inform us, but also to ensure that law officers were
10		content that the approach that being taken was
11		acceptable.
12	Q.	Could we look at paragraph 87, please, of your
13		statement. You say:
14		"The requirement to report a case to Crown Counsel
15		ensures insurers that, once the investigation has been
16		completed, the case as a whole is reviewed and assessed
17		by an experienced and independent prosecutor."
18		And that would be Crown Counsel.
19		You talk about Crown Counsel giving directions and
20		such like. I'm interested in the final sentence of
21		paragraph 87, which begins:
22		"Ultimately, the purpose of the precognition"
23		There we are:
24		"Ultimately, the purpose of the precognition is to
25		draw all the material together so that Crown Counsel can

1 review and analyse the evidence as a whole and reach a conclusion." 2 3 And is that the intention of preparing what we've 4 heard is a document called the crown precognition which 5 contains both a narrative and an analysis to permit Crown Counsel to review and analyse the evidence as a 6 7 whole and reach a conclusion? A. Yes, and of course lying behind the -- there's the 8 9 precognition in the narrow sense, which is the narrative 10 and analysis, but in the broader sense includes all the supporting statements, expert reports and other 11 12 materials that Crown Counsel may need to consider in order to reach a decision. 13 And they're all bound up in what's known as the crown 14 Q. 15 precognition? Yes, and that's a very, very long-standing approach to 16 Α. 17 the preparation of causes which is designed to seek to 18 ensure that cases are prepared to a certain standard and with a measure of consistency so that, ultimately, 19 20 Crown Counsel can reach an informed decision. 21 Q. You've talked about a situation where there may not be 22 an allocated advocate depute or there may be, as there was in this case, an allocated advocate depute. Does 23 the approach -- the crown approach to preparation of the 24 crown precognition differ if there is an allocated 25

1 advocate depute? I mean you have talked about standard consistency, does it change in format and content if you 2 3 have an allocated AD compared to no one? 4 Α. I'm not sure I'm the best person to ask that question. 5 I would expect the basic structure and in effect the protocols and guidance in terms of the way the 6 7 precognition is put together to be consistent, regardless of whether there's an allocated advocate 8 9 depute or not, not least because circumstances may arise 10 where somebody else has to, as it were, pick up a case. But of course in a case where there's an allocated 11 12 advocate depute who may have been, for example, involved 13 in consulting with expert witnesses as the preparation of the case goes along, I can see that in practice the 14 15 allocated advocate depute may bring to the precognition information which is not there on the face of the 16 17 document. 18 If the allocated advocate depute has consulted with Q. 19 experts, would your expectation be that the analysis 20 would simply not include information about that on the 21 assumption that the allocated AD would know all about 22 the experts or would you still expect the analysis to

A. I would expect the analysis to cover the expert evidence

cover the expert evidence that was available to the

23

24

25

crown?

- that's available. I suppose the point I'm making is
 simply that, you know, if counsel has been directly
 involved, she or he will bring to the reading of the
 precognition, you know, the experience they've had of
 considering the case over time.
 - Q. Right, thank you. In terms of your expectations of the APCC in relation to Mr Bayoh's investigation, you've talked about she determined what further investigations were to be carried out and and would you also have expected her to dictate certain approaches in relation to expert evidence, identifying experts?
 - A. She might well do. You know, in effect to provide

 the -- such direction as the investigative team required

 as the case goes on and that might include identifying

 lines of expert evidence that ought to be pursued. It

 might include lines of or issues that should be raised

 with a particular expert, but I don't want to impose too

 heavy an expectation on APCC.
 - You know, this would be a process where, you know, she's giving direction to individuals who are themselves very experienced professionals and just what she would be called on to do would depend on the progress of the investigation and the circumstances.
 - Q. All right. Thank you. Let's look at the information we have about the approach taken by APCC. Could we look at

1 the statement from Ashley Edwards, SBPI 00445, and I'm interested in paragraphs 14 and 15. So this is 2 3 Ashley Edwards' statement. She says: 4 "The initial picture raised the possibility that 5 there was criminality involved. For my part, I approached the matter looking for criminality. As an 6 7 advocate depute experienced in criminal advocacy, I looked at all possible adminicles of evidence and how 8 9 those adminicles could be strengthened, supported, 10 evaluated and corroborated. The investigation team explored and examined every potential source of 11 12 evidence. A fuller understanding of the circumstances 13 of Mr Bayoh's death could only be achieved after the 14 detailed exploration and with subsequent legal 15 analysis." And does that description accord with what your 16 expectations would have been at the time? 17 Absolutely, yes. 18 Α. 19 And then she goes on to say: Q. 20 "I have read my page 3 of my notebook too. I'm not 21 sure if it was just Mr Nelson's account [this was one of 22 the key eye witnesses] that was being discussed at that time. I also wanted to explore what the witness 23 Ashley Wyse could see from the windows. In addition, I 24 wanted to explore a number of other witnesses' 25

1 sightlines. When I wrote the abbreviation 'recon', I presume I was thinking about a reconstruction to assess 2 3 and review all available sightlines. Because of the 4 differing recollections of witnesses and sometimes how 5 those recollections changed over time, I wanted, insofar as possible, to establish fixed reference points as a 6 7 crosscheck to either support or challenge the witnesses' evidence." 8 9 And again does that -- I appreciate you might not be 10 fully apprised of the particular circumstances, but does that accord with the type of work you would expect 11 12 Crown Counsel to be looking at? 13 Yes, I mean I -- it doesn't surprise me that someone Α. 14 with the experience of then assistant principal 15 Crown Counsel that she's identifying a line of investigation which will assist in the overall 16 17 assessment which she describes in the earlier paragraph. All right. And did you expect her as Crown Counsel to 18 Q. 19 apply an independent perspective to the case as 20 independent Crown Counsel? 21 Α. Absolutely. You know, I think there are two levels of 22 independence, if I can put it that way. I mean the crown institutionally and through all prosecutors acts 23 independently and one of the things I -- you know, 24 I don't buy the idea in a sense that Crown Counsel are 25

1 uniquely independent in a way that procurators fiscal aren't, for example. It's institutionally the 2 3 responsibility of every prosecutor to bring to bear an 4 independent and objective view to the cases that they 5 assess and take forward, but Crown Counsel culturally, and often by virtue of their professional background, 6 7 bring an added layer of experience but also a sense of independence from the -- as it were, from the day-to-day 8 9 aspects of the investigation and it's part of the, as it 10 were, the responsibility of all counsel to act independently in the functions they fulfil. 11 12 Q. And would you have expected the crown precognition, and 13 particularly the analysis, to consider adminicles that 14 were relevant to race or racial motivation? 15 Α. Certainly to the -- you know to the extent that those issues were relevant to the question of criminality 16 which were being considered at that stage. 17 18 Q. What -- can you explain the position what happens if something isn't in the analysis? Do you expect 19 20 Crown Counsel to look behind the analysis if they had 21 been in that position of allocated AD? 22 I suppose if there was a gap in the analysis, there are Α. perhaps two courses of action. One would be for 23 Crown Counsel to in effect instruct further 24 investigation, but I can imagine a case where 25

1 Crown Counsel is able to bring to bear his or her own awareness of the case, the access that -- you know, the 2 3 access to the primary material that they have and, in 4 effect, to be able to address whatever the issue might 5 be, you know, because one has to remember one has the narrative and the analysis, but lying behind that, as we 6 7 discussed a moment ago, is the body of primary material and Crown Counsel can, you know, go behind the analysis 8 9 and if there's an issue that Crown Counsel wants to 10 think about independently, they have available to them the primary material to do just that. 11 12

- Q. And would you expect Crown Counsel to be looking at and assessing adminicles of evidence that may have had a bearing on the state of mind of the officers?
- A. I would -- I mean I would say so, yes.

13

14

15

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q. We've heard evidence from Mr McGowan when he spoke to the Inquiry. He said:

"This comes down to questions of mens rea, which are again basic concepts in criminal law. So in any case we don't know what's going on in the mind of, you know, the suspect, the potential accused. You get that from everything that goes around about it, whether it's things they have said, whether it's things they've done and the surrounding circumstances. I don't understand we were asking for anything complex or novel in that

respect." 1 2 And is that your understanding of how the crown will 3 look into the issue of what's in the mind of someone 4 who's a potential accused by looking at the surrounding 5 circumstances, things they've said, things they've done? Well, you certainly need to look at -- I mean I suppose 6 Α. 7 by the nature of it if you're thinking about issues of mens rea, one is often having to infer from facts and 8 9 circumstances that are available. I suppose in the 10 context of a case of this sort you asked me earlier, you know, about questions of what were or, you know, issues 11 12 of what was known to the officers attending, when they were attending the scene, could be relevant to an 13 14 assessment of the way they then responded. 15 Q. So you don't disagree with Mr McGowan's comments? 16 Α. No. No. Could we look at paragraph 90 of your Inquiry 17 Q. 18 statement. You say: "I have been provided with the narrative and 19 20 analysis sections of the crown precognition. The 21 narrative describes, albeit in summary form, the findings of the PIRC in relation to both the allegation 22 of racist behaviour on the part of one of the officers 23 and the question of racism within the former 24 Fife Constabulary. I had no involvement in directing or 25

1 influencing the content of the crown precognition. I had no preconception or expectation about the way that 2 3 the issue of race would be investigated and analysed. 4 This was, in the first instance, for the professional 5 prosecutors charged with preparing the precognition, subject to any direction or instruction from 6 7 Crown Counsel." You had no involvement in the preparation of the 8 crown precognition? 9 10 Α. No. But I'm interested in this line that you had no 11 Q. 12 preconception or expectation about the way that the 13 issue of race would be investigated and analysed. 14 I would like to look into that to see what the limits of 15 your expectation were effectively. Yes, I mean I suppose what I'm saying there is that 16 Α. 17 I would have expected race to be considered, you know, in the context of the ways in which it could be relevant 18 to the issue. You know, I did not myself -- I wouldn't, 19 20 you know -- I would not myself have had any -- been 21 setting any limits to what that would be, if I put it that way. It was for the professional prosecutors 22 involved to, you know, consider and raise that issue in 23 the ways that, you know, properly. I certainly would 24 have expected that to be considered at all relevant 25

- 1 stages. Thank you. We have an Inquiry statement from 2 Q. 3 Lord Mulholland and he said: "Race was front and centre from the outset of the 4 5 investigation. A black man has died in police custody. It was obvious." 6 7 Do you disagree with that? I don't disagree with that at all. 8 Α. 9 Thank you. Q. 10 Α. I'm sorry. I wouldn't want that sentence to be taken as suggesting I wasn't, you know, fully alive to and 11 12 cognisant of the issue of race. It's more that, you 13 know, in the, as it were, role I had relative to the 14 investigative process, it's not for me to be setting 15 parameters or, you know, at least in the way that I 16 approached it, you know, I had a very experienced team 17 in place and, you know, I was content to -- to trust to their professional -- professional judgment and, you 18 19 know, ultimately I'm answerable for the approach that 20 they took. 21 Q. And I think a moment ago you said you were not placing any limits on their investigation --22 23 Α. No.

-- insofar as it related to race or racial motivation?

24

25

Q.

Α.

No.

1 Q. Or any aspect of that. Can we look back at Ashley Edwards's Inquiry 2 3 statement, SBPI 004445 and look at paragraph 16. Here 4 she says: "Race was looked at as part of the investigation, 5 with particular emphasis on the previous disciplinary 6 7 record of the restraint officers. Race did not really feature in the examination of the actual restraint or 8 9 the medical evidence, except with regard to the prevalence of the genes associated with sickle cell 10 anaemia in the Afro-Caribbean population." 11 12 Leaving aside the fact that Mr Bayoh was not a 13 member of the Afro-Caribbean population, do you have any 14 comments about the statement here from Ms Edwards that 15 race did not really feature in the examination of the actual restraint? Was that in line with your 16 17 expectations of how race would be dealt with and considered within the precognition? 18 19 Well, I think, as we said a moment ago, I'm not sure I Α. 20 had any particular expectation. I do remember that 21 there was an issue about things said by one of the officers that needed to be looked at and considered. As 22 I say, I'm not sure I had any particular expectation or 23 anticipation about, you know, where that issue might go. 24 Q. So on the face of it you take nothing special from that, 25

1 you're not concerned about that, that may have just 2 simply been where the investigation took the 3 precognoscer? 4 Α. Yes. 5 Right. Q. I mean I think that's -- that's right. 6 Α. 7 We've heard evidence from Fiona Carnan. She worked on Q. the -- primarily on the analysis, as I have said, and 8 9 the countersignatory was Les Brown, the head of CAAPD. 10 Fiona Carnan has given evidence that she took a two-stage approach to matters and if we could perhaps 11 12 look at her Inquiry statement that may make it easier, SBPI 00379, and if we look at paragraph 45. There we 13 14 are and she was asked to what extent was race a factor 15 in her analysis of the actions of the officers: "I was concerned with considering whether the 16 17 actions of any of the officers, either individually or collectively, amounted to criminality. My focus was on 18 the actions of the officers during the period of their 19 20 engagement with the deceased and the evidence of how 21 they conducted themselves thereafter. I did not identify criminality on the part of any of the officers 22 involved. Had I identified criminality, it would then 23 have been part of my analysis in respect of criminality 24 to consider whether the conduct was racially aggravated 25

under section 50A(1)(b) of the Criminal Law 1 (Consolidation) (Scotland) Act 1995 or whether race was 2 3 a motivating factor that would amount to an aggravation of the conduct of the accused officers in terms of 4 section 96(ii) of that Act." 5 And then I wonder if we could look at paragraph 38 6 7 where she was asked to explain her involvement in gathering and analysing evidence in relation to the 8 9 extent to which race was a factor in the actions of the police officers. And she said: 10 "I was not involved in gathering evidence about 11 12 race. If my analysis of evidence had established that 13 there was sufficient evidence to support criminal 14 charges against any of the officers, the question of any 15 racial motivation or intention would have been addressed at that stage. Since the analysis of evidence did not 16 17 identify criminality by any officer, the question of racial aggravation did not arise since no offence had 18 been identified." 19 20 That description of her approach, how did that fit 21 with your expectations of the crown's approach to scrutinising evidence for indicators of racial 22 motivation or racial issues? 23 I suppose the question I'm asking myself reading that is 24 Α. why questions of racial motivation wouldn't be at least 25

1 potentially relevant to the question of whether or not the evidence supported criminal charges. I'm putting it 2 3 in that way because, you know, I would want to think through -- think that through, but that's the question 4 5 that occurs to me reading that. Right. Let me explain a little bit more about 6 Q. 7 Fiona Carnan's approach and perhaps we can talk about those reflection at the end. In relation to -- she was 8 9 asked questions about racial tropes. Perhaps we could 10 look at paragraph 8 of her second statement, which is SBPI 462: 11 12 "At the time of your involvement in the 13 investigation were you aware of any racial tropes being 14 used by any of the response officers in their 15 statements?" And she was asked about that aspect. And she -- her 16 17 answer in her statement there says: "I have made no reference in my analysis of evidence 18 to the use of racial tropes or negative stereotypes 19 20 being used by any of the response officers in their 21 statements. However, it is unlikely that I would have done so since the use of racial tropes is not criminal. 22 Apart from the statements of PC Paton and PC Good, I 23 have not been provided access to all the police 24 statements, so I'm unable to comment on their content as 25

to whether I am now aware of racial tropes within police statements. PC Good and PC Paton both made reference to thinking about the attack on Lee Rigby and I can see now how such reference could on one view be interpreted as a racial trope. On another view their comments reflect their knowledge of intelligence briefings provided in recent months. As police officers who had been so briefed, they were alive to the possibility of the incident being terrorist related. I would not necessarily view their comments as racial tropes.

"Evidence about negative attitudes of officers to
Mr Bayoh's race would not be relevant to the analysis,
unless criminality was identified. From rereading the
narrative and analysis, it's my sense that the officers
perception of threat to themselves and the public was
based on the reports of Mr Bayoh's knife carrying,
chasing someone, his physique and their observations of
his demeanour on arrival. Although the report certainly
considered the perceptions of the officers, such
perceptions were relevant to the question of whether
their actions amounted to criminality.

"PC Good's actions were very limited. Her role was in assisting and securing leg restraints during the restraint of Mr Bayoh. PC Paton's perception of threat on his approach to the locus in the context of his

1 actions in confronting Mr Bayoh and his subsequent role in the restraint was examined in the analysis. No 2 criminality was identified in respect of these officers 3 or indeed of any officer involved in the incident." 4 5 And then in evidence Fiona Carnan said: "I have made no reference in my analysis of evidence 6 7 to the use of racial tropes or negative stereotypes being used by any of the response officers in their 8 statements. It's unlikely I would have done so since 9 10 the use of racial tropes is not criminal. Evidence about negative attitudes of officers to Mr Bayoh's race 11 12 would not be relevant to the analysis, unless 13 criminality was identified." 14 Do you have any concerns about the approach being 15 taken here? I think reading that I mean I suppose, as I said a 16 Α. moment ago, the question in my mind is whether the 17 points that were being picked up in that part of the 18 19 statement should have been looked at through the lens of 20 the way it bore on the officers' motivation and, again, 21 I put that in the sense of a question, which no doubt 22 the Inquiry will consider because, you know, I'm, as it were, we're reacting to that as you put it on the screen 23 in front of me. 24 25 Q. Just to be clear, would you have considered it to be a

1 relevant question for Fiona Carnan to be asking whether 2 these matters were relevant to the question of the officers' motivation? 3 Α. Yes, I mean if questions of motivation are relevant, 4 5 then one wants to, I suppose, at least ask oneself what evidence one has that could bear on that question. 6 7 Regardless of the outcome --Q. Indeed, indeed. 8 Α. -- the question should be asked? 9 Q. 10 Α. Indeed, you know, it on the face of it strikes me as a 11 question that one would want to ask. 12 Q. Thank you. And then picking up further on the issue of 13 terrorism and Lee Rigby, evidence was available to 14 Fiona Carnan that some officers were concerned they were 15 attending a terrorist incident, some made reference to an increase in the terrorist threat level to severe and 16 17 in her evidence Fiona Carnan explained she had fact-checked that, fact-checked that, and confirmed that 18 there had indeed been an increase in the threat level to 19 20 severe. 21 First on the scene were PC Walker and PC Paton and statements were available to Fiona Carnan from those 22 officers. PC Walker said: 23 24 "It did cross my mind that he was doing this to get at the police there, bearing in mind we're on a severe 25

1	level from an attack on the police."
2	And Fiona Carnan agreed that the severe threat level
3	referred to by PC Walker referred to a threat level
4	involving a possible terrorist attack.
5	And PC Paton's statement said:
6	"It also ran through my mind that this male could be
7	part of a terrorist plot. I kept thinking about the
8	Lee Rigby boy, the soldier who was killed."
9	Now, in evidence Fiona Carnan was asked as part of
10	the process that she went through in her analysis and
11	ensuring Articles 2 and 14 compliance:
12	"Did you consider why the possibility of terrorism
13	crossed their minds?"
14	She said:
15	"I asked the question, although I think it had
16	already been answered why they had considered terrorism
17	because they had a briefing.
18	"Did you consider whether they would have thought
19	about terrorism if Mr Bayoh had been white?"
20	She said, "no". She was asked:
21	"Did you consider whether they thought about
22	terrorism every time they went to a knife call?"
23	She said, "no".
24	"Did you consider why Constable Paton thought about
25	Lee Rigby in particular?"

1		She said:
2		"I simply noted his position."
3		She was asked:
4		"You didn't give thought as to why he thought about
5		Lee Rigby."
6		And she said:
7		"I didn't interpret it as being influenced by his
8		race, no.
9		"Did you consider whether Constable Paton would have
10		been thinking about Lee Rigby if Sheku Bayoh had been
11		white?
12		"I didn't ask that question.
13		"Did you consider whether there was evidence from
14		which the inference could be drawn that the colour of
15		Mr Bayoh's skin was relevant to their concern that the
16		incident was related to terrorism?"
17		And she said:
18		"I did not make that assessment."
19		Again, listening to that, and I appreciate I'm
20		reading it out to you just now, listening to that
21		evidence from Fiona Carnan, do you have any concerns
22		about that approach being taken where it would appear
23		the questions or consideration in relation to these
24		aspects was not being given by Fiona Carnan?
25	A.	Well, I suppose again just, as it were, reacting to what

- you're reading to me I -- one can identify questions

 that one might like to have seen asked, as you said a

 moment ago, without sort of prejudging what the answers

 to those questions would have been or where they would

 have gone I can understand the -- yes, I mean it strikes

 me there are questions that that material raises.
 - Q. And in terms of Article 2 and Article 14, would you have expected those questions to be asked as part of an investigation into the death of Mr Bayoh?
- 10 A. I mean certainly ultimately and also, you know -- well

 I think, yes, they're questions that one would want to

 12 see asked. Where they would go in terms of an analysis

 13 from the point of view of a criminal charge, you know,

 14 is I think another matter and I'm conscious it's not

 15 within the Inquiry's remit.
 - Q. And I'm not asking you to predict where those -- where the answers might have led.
- 18 A. Yes.

7

8

9

16

17

- Q. But certainly in terms of the questions, it's the type
 of questions you would have expected to be asked as part
 of the analysis?
- A. Well, in terms of -- well, I suppose that's an interesting question. Questions that one would want to -- one might want the team to be asking, whether it would need to appear patently on the face of the

17

18

- 1 analysis, you know, I suppose might depend on where the 2 questions took one. Right. But where, and it will be a matter for the Chair 3 Q. 4 to interpret the evidence of Fiona Carnan --5 Α. Yes. 6 -- but where it may be that she did not consider certain Q. 7 questions --Mm-hm.8 Α. 9 -- is it fair to say that your view is those should have Q. 10 been considered?
- A. Certainly reacting to what you are saying, they're

 questions I would -- one would want to have seen asked.

 As I say whether -- whether the -- whether asking the

 questions would result in, you know, how that would play

 into the analysis, I think is -- is a different

 question.
 - Q. Thank you. We've heard the evidence of Mr McGowan and he said:

incident, that was available at a very early point in
the case and I recall that. My own views is it would
have been relevant to ask why it was that they thought
it was terrorism and to consider whether Mr Bayoh's race
had anything to do with that and whether or not, had

Mr Bayoh been white, they would have wondered the same

Τ	thing. That's a relevant question."
2	Do you agree with Mr McGowan's evidence?
3	A. Yes.
4	Q. We've also heard from Ms Carnan in relation to
5	Kayleigh Good's statement. And I'm conscious of the
6	time. Could I have a moment? Are you happy for me
7	to I probably won't finish in five minutes. Do you
8	wish me to start and carry on?
9	LORD BRACADALE: I think you could probably make a start.
10	MS THOMSON: Thank you.
11	Kayleigh Good was one of the constables that arrived
12	at Hayfield Road and she also described in her statement
13	that she gave to PIRC about Lee Rigby and she said:
14	"I was also thinking at that point of the Lee Rigby
15	incident in London, mainly due to the fact of the
16	coloured male and the potential terrorist connotations."
17	And so it would appear on the face of it that she
18	made a direct link between the colour of Mr Bayoh's skin
19	and the potential terrorist connotations and
20	Fiona Carnan was asked about this and she said she
21	was asked:
22	"Did her statement [that's Kayleigh Good's
23	statement] not perhaps cause you to wonder whether
24	others who also thought about terrorism and Lee Rigby
25	had done so because of the colour of Mr Bayoh's skin?"

1 And she had -- she said: "I have to say, no, I didn't." 2 3 So in this regard Fiona Carnan was saying she didn't 4 consider this aspect. 5 Again, is that something that causes you any concern that this was simply not considered? 6 7 Well, I'm going back to the -- Mr McGowan put it perhaps Α. more succinctly than I did. You know these are 8 9 questions that perhaps -- well, questions that one would want to have seen asked and addressed. 10 Q. We asked Lindsey Miller about this passage yesterday and 11 12 she was asked whether Fiona Carnan's response concerned 13 her and she replied: 14 "Yes, it is to me indicative of at least unconscious 15 bias on the part of the police officer." Would that be any part of the concerns that you had? 16 Well, precisely. I mean the whole, you know, the nature 17 Α. of the, as you put it, tropes is that they feed into 18 19 unconscious bias. Q. And Lindsey Miller was also asked whether this could 20 21 also be indicative of unconscious bias on the part of 22 Ms Carnan and she said: "I think I would have to say potentially, yes." 23 Have you any concerns about that? 24 A. Well, I don't -- I can't disagree with Ms Miller, you 25

1		know.
2	Q.	Ms Carnan was asked in evidence if she had considered
3		whether the link was being made by Ms Good was
4		reasonable or indicative of racial stereotyping. She
5		was asked:
6		"The link made between the colour of Mr Bayoh's skin
7		and the potential terrorist connotations, did you
8		consider whether the link she made was reasonable or
9		whether it might have been indicative of racial
10		stereotyping?"
11		And Ms Carnan's answer was:
12		"I considered it was not unreasonable, given the
13		briefings.
14		"Was it indicative of racial stereotyping?
15		"Possibly."
16		She was then asked:
17		"Are you saying that now, with the benefit of time
18		to reflect, did you think that at the time?"
19		And she said:
20		"I don't think I thought it at the time."
21		And then she was asked:
22		"Even though she said in terms that she had made a
23		link between the colour of his skin and terrorism?"
24		She said "yes". And she was asked:
25		"At the time you didn't think that of racial

1 stereotyping? With the benefit of hindsight and reflection your evidence today is that it could be 2 indicative of racial stereotyping?" 3 4 And she said "yes". And she was asked: 5 "If it had occurred to you at the time or if you had 6 thought that way about it at the time, is it something 7 that you might have included in the analysis?" 8 And her answer was, "It's possible, yes". 9 10 And Lindsey Miller gave evidence about this passage of evidence yesterday and she said: 11 12 "I think that is something that should have been 13 included in the analysis." 14 And she's obviously reflected that with the benefit of height. 15 "I don't think necessarily that it would have made 16 17 any difference in relation to the consideration of criminality, but it is something that should have been 18 within that document for the consideration of 19 20 Crown Counsel." Would you agree with Lindsey Miller in relation to 21 22 that? A. Yes, I don't think -- I wouldn't disagree with that. 23 Q. Then there was further questions asked of Fiona Carnan 24 in relation to the use of language in the officers' 25

```
1
             statements and I would like to move on to that, but I
             see it's --
 2
         LORD BRACADALE: We'll stop now for lunch and sit at
 3
             2 o'clock.
 4
 5
         (1.00 pm)
 6
                             (Luncheon adjournment)
 7
         LORD BRACADALE: Ms Grahame.
         MS GRAHAME: Thank you.
 8
 9
                 Before lunch we were talking about Fiona Carnan and
10
             the approach she had taken and I would like to carry on
             in relation to some other evidence that she gave
11
12
             the Inquiry. A topic was raised with her about her
13
             awareness of racist stereotypes in society such as black
14
             men are more violent, unpredictable or aggressive and
15
             she said that she had come across those types of
             stereotypes. She was asked:
16
17
                 Did you examine the officers' statements for
             language of that sort?"
18
                 And she said, "no". She was asked if she had
19
20
             considered patterns of behaviour, for example, whether
21
             they had used their sprays or drawn their batons at
             knives at previous incidents and she said, no. Did she
22
             consider whether they treated all knife calls as
23
             potentially terrorist related and she said, no, that
24
             wasn't a question that was asked. She was asked if she
25
```

1 had considered looking for comparator evidence, for 2 example, looking at Walker, Paton and Tomlinson's 3 history of the use of spray or Tomlinson's history of 4 the use of force involving a baton with a view to 5 establishing whether those officers had ever used sprays or batons before and she said, no. 6 7 She was asked whether they had used sprays or batons when defending -- sorry -- detaining a white suspect and 8 she said, no, and she was asked if she had considered 9 10 whether the speed with which officers elected to use force against Mr Bayoh was because he was black. In 11 12 that regard she said: 13 "That wasn't my understanding. I think I have 14 explained in one of the answers my understanding of 15 their perception was based on a whole lot more than the colour of his skin." 16 17 She was then asked whether she considered whether Constable Walker and Paton decided to opt for a 18 19 hard-stop may have been influenced by Mr Bayoh's race 20 and she said "it wasn't a consideration per se" and she 21 was then asked about the process which she adopted, a 22 two stage process, looking for evidence of criminality: "You didn't find any, so you didn't get past first 23 24 base." 25 And she said:

"That was right. 1 2 "And it would only have been if you'd found evidence 3 of criminality that you would have scrutinised the 4 evidence for evidence that might allow you to draw an inference of racial aggravation." 5 And she said "yes". 6 7 Now, in light of that evidence, we asked Stephen McGowan what he thought of that and it was his 8 9 view that in relation to those questions posed that they are all relevant questions: 10 "So I have referred to looking at the totality of 11 12 the evidence and that would be -- those would be 13 questions that you would ask and the answers to those 14 questions would be part of that totality which would --15 which I would expect her to look at because they're all relevant questions." 16 17 Would you agree with that? I would certainly agree with ${\tt Mr}\ {\tt McGowan}$ that those are 18 Α. 19 all relevant questions, the questions you have 20 identified. 21 Q. Thank you. I'm uncomfortable about being drawn to criticise a 22 Α. member of staff, you know, my --23 All right. 24 Q. 25 Α. -- approach to my role was to trust the professionalism.

25

1 I thought that was a way that one gets the best out of staff and, ultimately, for me to take the responsibility 2 3 and answer for what they did, so I'm, you know, but I 4 entirely agree those are all relevant questions and the 5 questions you asked me before the break are also all relevant questions. 6 7 Thank you. Lindsey Miller was also asked about the Q. approach that was taken and she said she thought that 8 9 was too prescriptive an approach: 10 "It's clear from what you've read to me that she was focusing solely on the actings of the officers in 11 12 relation to establishing whether or not there was evidence of criminality, but it was clear from certainly 13 14 my understanding of what the Lord Advocate wanted, and 15 the discussions more generally about this investigation, and particularly what the family had asked for, that we 16 17 should be examining the issue of race and the approach of the officers to Mr Bayoh because of his race." 18 Would you -- would that accord with your 19 20 understanding? 21 Α. Yes. 22 Does she fairly reflect what you wished to be done in Q. relation to race? 23 I would have expected race to be examined fully in 24 Α.

its -- where it's relevant to the issues that had to be

- 1 addressed.
- 2 Q. Right.

- A. And I can see that that could cover a wide range of possible issues.
 - Q. As you can see, we've discussed with a number of witnesses in relation to Article 14 in conjunction with Article 2 and looked at the issue of compliance with those articles. We've talked with witnesses about whether the crown took all reasonable steps to unmask any racist motive.

In light of the excerpts of evidence that I have heard out to you today and the comments that have been made, looking at the picture that I presented to you, are you satisfied that all questions of race and race motivation were explored appropriately during that period of crown precognition?

A. I think given what you have read to me, I can't think that they were. They were quite clear -- from what you've said, there were clearly a set of questions that to be asked. Where those would have gone in terms of a criminal investigation, that's obviously a different question, and I'm conscious it's not within the remit of the Inquiry, but these were relevant questions and even if they didn't bear on the criminal decision, would ultimately be relevant in the context of any fatal

1 accident inquiry or public inquiry that might be held. Thank you. Certainly the evidence from Mr McGowan was 2 Q. 3 that he was of the view that further steps could have 4 been taken in relation to this and Lindsey Miller said 5 in evidence that with the benefit of -- she was asked, with the benefit of height, what did she think about 6 7 whether all reasonable steps were taken and she said: "I think on the basis of Ms Carnan's evidence, no." 8 So it would appear that you agree with Mr McGowan 9 10 and Ms Miller in that regard? I do. 11 Α. 12 Now, earlier I asked you to look at a comment that was Q. 13 in Ashley Edwards' Inquiry statement and I wonder if we 14 can look at that again briefly, SBPI 445, and it was 15 paragraph 16, and I would just like to go back to this where: 16 17 "Race was looked at as part of the investigation 18 with particular emphasis on the previous disciplinary record of the restraint officers. Race did not really 19 20 feature in the examination of the actual restraint or 21 the medical evidence, except in relation to the sickle cell anaemia." 22 In light of what you have now heard regarding 23 24 Fiona Carnan's approach and the content of the crown 25 precognition, the analysis which Fiona Carnan prepared,

25

1 do you have any reflections on that comment that 2 Ashley Edwards has made, race did not really feature in 3 the examination of the actual restraint? 4 Α. Well, I think what you have identified is a series of 5 questions that could and should have been asked in the context of examining the question of restraint. 6 7 Right. And earlier I said I would come back to a Q. question I asked you. You had said you wanted to 8 9 reflect on that. I said I was going to talk to you 10 about evidence we had heard from Fiona Carnan and I referred to two paragraphs within her Inquiry statement. 11 12 Maybe we could have those on the screen, SBPI 00379 and 13 it was paragraphs 45 and then 38 and I'll just remind 14 you of those. 15 If we could look at 45 first, please. And you'll remember I asked you about this. This is Fiona Carnan's 16 17 statement. She was asked about to what extent was race a factor in her analysis of the actions of the police 18 19 officers and she talked about being concerned with 20 criminality, her focus was on the actions of the 21 officers during the period of their engagement with the deceased, and the evidence of how they conducted 22 themselves thereafter. She did not identify criminality 23 on the part of any of the officers involved. 24

And towards the bottom of that chapter, paragraph,

she says she -- if she had identified criminality, then she would have gone on to look at whether race was a motivating factor.

And then if we could look at paragraph 38 again. She was asked to explain her involvement in gathering and analysing evidence in relation to the extent to which race was a factor in the actions of the officers engaging Mr Bayoh. And she said she wasn't involved in gathering evidence about race:

"If my analysis of evidence had established there was sufficient evidence to support criminal charges against any of the officers, the question of any racial motivation or intention would have been addressed at that stage. Since the analysis of evidence did not identify criminality by any officer, the question of racial aggravation did not arise since no offence had been identified."

And having drawn that sort of two-stage approach being adopted by Fiona Carnan, I asked you did that fit with your expectations of the crown's approach to scrutinising evidence for indicators of racial motivation or racial issues and your reply was:

"I suppose the question I'm asking myself reading that is why questions of racial motivation wouldn't be at least potentially relevant to the question of whether

1 or not the evidence supported criminal charges. I'm putting it that way because I would want to think 2 3 through, but that's the question that occurs to me 4 reading that." And I said afterwards I would explain a little more 5 about Fiona Carnan's approach and then I would come back 6 7 to you and we could maybe talk about your reflections at the end. 8 9 So having gone through that process and looked at 10 the approach taken by Fiona Carnan now, do you have any reflections about this idea of a two-stage approach 11 12 being taken where race and racial motivation is not 13 considered unless criminal charges are identified or criminality is identified? 14 15 A. Well, you know, having had the benefit of the process we have been through I -- I mean it doesn't seem to me to 16 17 be right to treat it as a -- as a two-stage process in 18 that way. You know, we've identified a series of 19 questions that would have been relevant to ask as I say. Q. Thank you very much. I would like to move on now to 20 21 deal with the issue of experts. 22 LORD BRACADALE: Just before you leave that, could I ask you this, Mr Wolffe: given what you said earlier about the 23 ability of Crown Counsel to identify gaps by reference 24 to primary material in the precognition and having 25

1 regard to what Crown Counsel said at paragraph 16 of her statement, would you have expected Crown Counsel herself 2 in reading the materials to have identified the kind of 3 4 issues that would give rise to these questions that 5 Ms Grahame has been discussing with you? I think having identified them as relevant questions to 6 Α. 7 ask, I mean I suppose I ask it this way, if -- and I mean I'm not sighted on the interaction between 8 9 Crown Counsel and the team so I don't want to -- again, 10 I want to be cautious about being critical in individuals, but it's -- yes, these are the kinds of 11 12 questions that one might hope would be identified, if 13 there was a gap in the analysis or if the analysis was 14 structurally flawed that these are questions that would 15 be asked. And Crown Counsel, of course, may herself, you know, 16 might herself, you know, she could ask for further work 17 to be done or she herself could apply her mind and take 18 19 a view as to whether the issue that -- the gap is one 20 that in her judgment is one that is going to take 21 the Inquiry anywhere. LORD BRACADALE: Perhaps I need to explore this with 22 Crown Counsel herself. 23 A. Yes, I mean I -- I -- as I say it's -- I'm acutely 24 conscious that I have immensely experienced 25

25

1 Crown Counsel who exercises professional judgment and, 2 you know, makes judgments on the basis of the material, 3 you know, available to her or him in any individual case 4 and, you know, we have identified in the material that 5 Ms Grahame has put in front of me a series of questions that I have accepted are on the face of it relevant 6 7 questions to ask and would be relevant questions to ask, you know, at all stages of the Inquiry. Having done 8 9 that, yes, one might want to think about whether 10 Crown Counsel should have identified those questions or 11 not. 12 LORD BRACADALE: Thank you. Ms Grahame. 13 MS GRAHAME: Thank you. 14 I would like to ask you some questions around the 15 issue of experts. We've heard evidence a number of 16 experts were instructed by the crown as part of this 17 process of the crown investigation. And I wonder if we can look, first of all, at COPFS 05687, and we've heard 18 19 evidence that there is a knowledge bank available in 20 Crown Office for staff, we've heard about a Book of 21 Regulations, Precognoscer's Handbook. This is a 22 document that is part of the serious and complex case quidance and this particular chapter relates to expert 23 evidence and the role of the expert. 24

I don't know if you recognise this guidance that was

25

1		available?
2	A.	I would be aware there was guidance. I'm not sure I can
3		say that I recognise this particularly.
4	Q.	But you'll recognise there was guidance available to
5		staff in relation to the expert evidence?
6	Α.	Well, certainly in relation to a wide variety of issues
7		I would have expected it to include expert evidence.
8	Q.	Okay. I wonder if we can just very briefly look at a
9		part of this, page 8, it's a 14-page document, page 8
LO		that I'm interested in and it's section 8.6.1, and this
L1		guidance says:
12		"The use of the consultation to establish and
13		confirm expertise is discussed at paragraph 8.1. This
L 4		is a vital step and must not be overlooked or rushed
L5		through and there is a presumption that crown experts
L 6		will be consulted with in High Court cases.
L7		"Case investigators should aim to consult with the
L8		crown expert witnesses prior to the case being reported
19		to Crown Office for Crown Counsel's instructions and
20		indicting. Where an allocated AD has been identified,
21		then the consultation should ideally be conducted with
22		that allocated AD and the case investigator both
23		present."
24		And as a general statement of principle, would you

agree with the comments within this guidance?

- 1 A. Yes, it certainly makes sense.
- 2 Q. For example, using a consultation to establish and
- 3 confirm expertise, would you agree it's important that
- 4 an expert has the necessary expertise --
- 5 A. Of course.
- 6 Q. -- before he or she gives opinion evidence to the court?
- 7 A. Yes, of course.
- 8 Q. And the presumption that crown experts will be consulted
- 9 with in High Court cases, do you have any comments about
- 10 that?
- 11 A. Well, it's always sensible to consult with an expert if
- 12 circumstances permit, whether that -- I mean I suspect
- that in the generality of High Court cases there are
- 14 probably many situations where for a variety of reasons
- that won't happen. It may be because the evidence is of
- 16 a relatively standard nature or for other practical
- 17 reasons.
- 18 Q. There is other guidance available, I won't take you to
- it, but in a trial if the defence agree the expert
- 20 evidence and it's incorporated into a joint minute,
- 21 there wouldn't be any need to consult necessarily in
- that regard.
- 23 A. Yes, and I have to confess, as an advocate depute, I
- 24 will have prosecuted High Court trials involving, let's
- 25 say, you know, relatively standard forms of expert

1		evidence, if I can put it that way, where I may not have
2		consulted with the expert.
3	Q.	All right thank you. And then it talks about:
4		"Case investigators should aim to consult with
5		experts prior to reporting or where an allocated AD has
6		been identified, ideally the consultation would be with
7		the allocated AD."
8		And is that the type of approach you would expect to
9		be taken in a serious and complex case?
10	A.	Absolutely makes sense and, you know, the opportunity
11		for the prosecutor who one expects to conduct the trial
12		to have met the expert and have the opportunity to test
13		and ask questions is a valuable one.
14	Q.	We will we have heard that there were consultations
15		with the allocated AD and then it says:
16		"An advocate depute may conduct a consultation
17		without the presence of the case investigator if he or
18		she considers that appropriate."
19		And why would that be a matter of comment in the
20		guidance?
21	A.	It may be because in the normal if one takes the
22		situation away from the prosecution of crime to other
23		parts of the justice system, counsel would normally
24		consult with a solicitor present and I suspect that this
25		is signalling that in this context an advocate depute

1 may, if he or she considers it appropriate, conduct the 2 consultation without the case investigator being 3 present. Q. Thank you. And then can we look at the bottom of page 4 8. In fact it mentions here: 5 "In solemn cases there is a presumption that a 6 7 consultation should be conducted with all crown expert witnesses, including expert medical witnesses, unless 8 the evidence relates to routine forensic analysis of 9 10 drugs, confirmation has been provided by the defence that the evidence will be the subject of agreement, or a 11 12 satisfactory statement from a medical witness has been 13 submitted by the police in accordance with the Serious 14 Crime Protocol." 15 In terms of when you were the Lord Advocate, was there a presumption that a consultation would be 16 17 conducted with all crown expert witnesses, including 18 medical expert witnesses? Is that something you were 19 aware of in practice? I'm afraid I can't say what the guidance was when I was 20 A. 21 Lord Advocate. 22 Q. Right. The examples given there are situations where one might 23 Α. not conduct a consultation are generally consistent with 24 what I described earlier. 25

all crown experts?

- Q. All right. So outwith those exceptions or examples
 where a consultation wouldn't be required, would you
 expect an allocated AD to conduct a consultation with
- A. Well, it's stated as a presumption, so assuming that was
 the guidance at the relevant time, then, you know, that
 would be I suppose if one put it this way the norm, but
 not an absolute rule.
- 9 Q. Thank you.

4

20

21

22

23

24

- 10 A. It's what I take from that. I should say I'm simply
 11 reading what's on the page.
- 12 Q. Now, we've heard evidence that after the final PIRC 13 report was received in August 2016 and initially that in 14 2017, from March to August 2017, Crown Office instructed 15 three experts: a Professor Anthony Freemont, who was an osteoarticular pathologist; a Dr William Lawlor, who was 16 17 a forensic pathologist, and Professor Michael Eddleston, who was a clinical toxicologist and pharmacological -- I 18 mucked that word up -- pharmacologist. 19

I would like to ask you about some evidence we've heard from Les Brown about the instruction of experts and particularly in relation to the involvement of Dr Lawler who was a forensic pathologist and I'm hoping you can help us with something.

25 Mr Brown in evidence referred to the Lord Advocate

1 and he talked about guidance or advice or a discussion with the Lord Advocate about the instruction of an 2 3 expert who could be a reviewing expert. Now, he said it 4 may have been Lord Mullholland, but obviously at the 5 point in time when Dr Lawler was being instructed, you were the Lord Advocate at that stage. 6 7 So Dr Lawler was instructed for the first time on 28 March 2017, so not quite a full year after you had 8 9 been in the position, but almost a year, and I would 10 like to tell you about the evidence of Mr Brown and see if you think it was you or if it was not you. 11 12 Α. I can say now I have absolutely no recollection of it, 13 but if it emerges from other evidence then, you know, so be it. 14 15 Q. Mr Brown talked about Dr Lawler being instructed, a forensic pathologist, and he's described him as a 16 reviewing pathologist and he said: 17 "That was the course of action that had been I think 18 19 suggested by the Lord Advocate at an early stage in the 20 investigation. It was within the consideration that 21 there would be some advantage in having a pathologist 22 who would be able to take a view independently on all of the pathology evidence that had been obtained with a 23 view to, I suppose, coming to a conclusion as to what 24 this amounted to and, if there were differences, which 25

1	area they could offer useful comment on and this was the
2	context in which Dr Lawler was ultimately instructed."
3	And he said:
4	"That is how Professor Lawlor's name came up and at
5	the time that Crown Counsel were wanting to identify a
6	reviewing pathologist, the full CV of Professor Lawlor
7	was forwarded as I recollect it to Ashley Edwards and
8	Ashley Edwards considered that and approved an approach
9	being made to Dr Lawler."
10	So again, it appears at the time Ashley Edwards was
11	the allocated AD in place which is when you were
12	Lord Advocate.
13	He said:
14	"I can only say that I personally have not had
15	experience of that, but, as I indicated, the intentional
16	to consider and approach a reviewing pathologist was
17	something that was clearly considered by the
18	Lord Advocate."
19	And he said he thought it was Frank Mulholland as he
20	recollected it and that raised the question of the
21	benefit of having a reviewing pathologist.
22	So I just wonder if that description or that
23	evidence from Mr Brown, does that prompt any
24	recollection on your part of having a discussion about
25	this role?

1 Α. I'm afraid it doesn't ring any bells. As I say, I do have a poor recall. I found when I was doing statements 2 for the UK Covid inquiry that I had poor recollection of 3 4 events which one might think were significant, so the 5 fact that I don't remember something, you know, the -is not necessarily -- doesn't necessarily mean it didn't 6 7 happen, but none of that rings any bells to me. All right. Well, I have got a few questions to ask you 8 Q. 9 about Dr Lawler who was instructed at the time you were 10 Lord Advocate and I'll see if you can assist. I wonder if we could look at his first report. This 11 12 is COPFS 00033. You'll see there at the top of the page 13 his name, Dr William Lawler, he's a forensic pathologist 14 and it's dated 22 May 2017. It's sent to Mr MacLeod, 15 senior procurator fiscal depute in Crown Office; do you see that? 16 Yes. 17 Α. 18 If you move down the page, please, he refers to the Q. 19 invitation to review various reports and he's being 20 asked, you'll see at the bottom of the first paragraph, 21 sorry: "Whether and to what extent I agree with the 22 conclusions and findings of the others who have been 23 instructed." 24

He then lists the materials and if we can look

25

1	further down, please, and then the background is noted
2	by him. He's been sent a number of documents to assist
3	with that.
4	And then if we could look at page 8, please, and it
5	says:
6	"I have been asked"
7	If we could maybe go to the top of page 8:
8	"I have been asked as a forensic pathologist to
9	comment upon the pathological aspects of this case,
LO	including methodology and approach adopted, and
L1	specifically whether or to what extent I agree with the
12	conclusions and findings of the others who have been
13	instructed."
L 4	And if we can then look at page 9, he says:
L5	"May I say at the outset that I have no criticisms
L 6	of either the methodology or the approach adopted by
L7	Dr Shearer and Dr Bouhaidar in this case or indeed of
18	anyone else instructed."
19	And we have heard evidence that Dr Shearer and
20	Dr Bouhaidar were the pathologists who carried out the
21	postmortem in relation to Mr Bayoh.
22	And then if we can look at page 11, please. I'm not
23	going to take you through the whole report. I would
24	like to look at section that deals with Dr Lipsedge
25	which is here we are:

"Dr Maurice Lipsedge. Dr Lipsedge is an emeritus 1 consultant psychiatrist and he addresses the deceased's 2 mental state, particularly in the context of the drugs 3 which he was known to have taken." 4 And then if we can look on to page 12, he summaries 5 Dr Lipsedge's reports and he says in "Comments": 6 7 "This expert confirms that I (as an acknowledged non-expert in this field) had concluded." 8 9 And I don't want to ask you about the conclusions or 10 the comments that are given, but you'll see there that Dr Lawler, as a forensic pathologist, is being asked to 11 12 comment on the report of a consultant psychiatrist and 13 I'm interested in any views you may have about the value of that to the crown. You're smiling. 14 15 A. Well, simply as a matter of the law of evidence, an expert is qualified to give opinion evidence only in 16 areas in which the expert has expertise, and to the 17 extent that a witness offers opinion evidence on matters 18 where they don't have expertise, that evidence is not of 19 20 any evidential value or it's not evidence I suppose. 21 So it's not of any evidential value, in fact is it Q. admissible evidence? 22 23 Α. No. Thank you. And do we see on page 14 he's also asked to 24 Q. comment on the report of a Dr Bleetman, a consultant in 25

1 emergency medicine and -- sorry, in the comment section. It may be that I have -- I'm talking about the PDF. 2 3 There it is, "comments": 4 "Dr Bleetman provides what I, as a nonexpert, consider to be" 5 So again he's not an expert in consultant -- an 6 7 expert consultant in emergency medicine, but again he's being asked to comment. Is the position the same in 8 relation to this specialism? 9 10 Α. Well, he says he's a nonexpert. I suppose it slightly depends what the -- as it were, what one -- the 11 12 reviewing expert is being asked to do. 13 I have been involved in a case entirely in a 14 different context in a civil case where the -- we had 15 the benefit of a what one might call a coordinating expert who drew together -- was helpful in the 16 17 instruction of other experts who was able to provide some informed commentary from the perspective of someone 18 19 skilled in a scientific discipline on the quality of 20 what had been provided, so not in a position to provide 21 opinion evidence, but in a position to give some quality 22 assurance, or not, of the quality of what was being done by others so that's -- I think that's a different 23 exercise from the one that, you know, you're looking at 24 25 here, but I offer that simply as a -- something from my

1 own practising experience. Thank you. And then on pages 23 and 24 of 26 we should 2 Q. 3 say the heading "Professor Anthony Freemont". There we are. Professor Anthony Freemont, who is an 4 5 osteoarticular pathologist. You may know this, we've heard evidence from Professor Freemont and he 6 7 specialises in bone pathologist, so it's a very -- as I understand it, quite a particular area of specialism in 8 9 that field. And we also heard evidence from 10 Professor Freemont that when he decided to retire, the Home Office asked him to assist training others in 11 12 the field because the UK did not have a lot of 13 osteoarticular pathologists. 14 And again Dr Lawler, if we can look at the comments 15 section, says: "Admittedly this is not a matter within..." 16 17 Yes. So look at the overview section, sorry, and if we can look number 1: 18 19 "Although admittedly not within my field of 20 expertise ..." 21 So again, he's highlighting that again this is not an area within his particular expertise. 22 Sorry, that's maybe the wrong page. Can we look 23 further up, please. I think I have missed the section. 24 I'll have to come back to that. I think I have -- oh, 25

1 can we look at -- no, I have lost my number, my page number. I'll come back to that in a moment. 2 3 But again, do you have any concerns about Dr Lawler, 4 a forensic pathologist, being asked to comment on a 5 specialism of osteoarticular pathology? I don't know enough about the interaction between those 6 Α. 7 two disciplines, as to whether there's any value to a pathologist of one nature commenting on views by a 8 9 pathologist of another related discipline. 10 Q. All right. Thank you. But if he says he himself he's not an expert in the 11 Α. 12 field, then that's -- that answers the question I think. Yes. And then can we look at a supplementary report by 13 Q. 14 Dr Lawler, which is from 13 August 2017, COPFS 00034, 15 and page 2 of 6. Again, there's reference there to Professor Freemont. Here it is: 16 17 "Although I readily accept that I am not a 18 specialised osteoarticular pathologist, I do have a 19 career background of diagnostic histopathology, albeit a 20 long time ago." 21 So again he acknowledges that he's not a specialist 22 in that field, but he did have a background in diagnostic histopathology. Is that something you would 23 have expected would be explored in some detail in 24 relation to the value of any comments Dr Lawler makes in 25

relation to Professor Freemont? 1 2 Yes, on the face of it, it's something one might want to Α. 3 explore with the author, what one might take from any 4 comment that he makes. 5 And is one of the possibilities that he simply isn't in Q. 6 a position to comment on Professor Freemont's opinion 7 because --8 Α. Yes. -- he doesn't have that specialism himself? 9 Q. 10 A. Either he doesn't have the specialism or his -- to the extent has an expertise, it is out of date or to the 11 12 extent he has an expertise, it's at a lesser level than 13 that of the person he's commenting on. There could be various possibilities. 14 15 Q. Thank you. And can we look at page 4, please, and I'm interested in the comments about 16 17 Professor Michael Eddleston. You'll see there's a section relating to him. There we are. 18 Professor Eddleston who's a consultant clinical 19 20 toxicologist and had been asked to consider effects of 21 drugs taken by the deceased prior to his death. And then if we looked at page 5 and you'll see that 22 there's a comments section: 23 "Although Professor Eddleston's area of expertise is 24 significantly different from mine, I found his report 25

very interesting." 1 2 Again, can you help us with understanding the value 3 of that to the crown? 4 Α. I'm not quite sure what the context is, but I suppose 5 one expert -- an expert in one discipline may read a report from an expert in another disciplinary and find 6 7 that illuminating in terms of what they have been asked to comment on, but whether that's what he's saying or 8 9 simply a more general observation about it being interesting, I can't say. 10 Certainly at the outset in relation to his instructions, 11 Q. 12 he was asked to comment on methodology and approach adopted and whether to and to what extent he agreed with 13 14 conclusions and findings of others. 15 Α. Mm-hm. Would you have concerns, given the area of expertise of 16 Q. 17 Professor Eddleston is significantly different from that of Dr Lawler, would you have concerns about the value of 18 any comments he did have regarding methodology or the 19 20 opinion of Professor Eddleston? 21 Α. Well, again, I'm as it were speaking very much in the abstract, I mean he clearly can't give expert evidence 22 in an area of expertise that is not his own area of 23 expertise. Whether as a skilled scientist or medical 24 scientist he's in a position to provide useful comment 25

- on, as it were, issues of general methodology, I can't say.
- Q. All right. Dr Lawler did not disagree with any of the forensic pathologists who were of the same specialism as he had and that included Crane, Carey, Dr Shearer, and Dr Bouhaidar. Do you have any recollection now of why so many forensic pathologists were instructed by the crown?
- 9 A. I don't I'm afraid.

19

20

21

22

23

24

- 10 Q. Right. Dr Lawler was instructed between the period of -- instructed, first of all, in March 2017. His 11 12 final report was received in May 2018, some 14 months 13 later. Considering Article 2 obligations and avoiding delay, and in light of what I told you, do you have any 14 15 concerns about the period of time that this reviewing pathologist -- the involvement of Dr Lawler had in 16 17 relation to the period of time that the crown 18 investigation took?
 - A. I suppose the starting point is a general concern about the time that the investigation took. As I have said in my statement, not unusual and I'm not sighted on the detail of why the investigation took the time that it did. I am aware from subsequent work that was done generally into death investigations that the availability and response of expert witnesses is often a

significant factor in delay. It sounds like a very long period of you know to await this expert's view.

I'm afraid I haven't quite been following sufficiently the points you've been taking me through to really comment on the value or otherwise of his -- you know what he's got to say in the area in which he is an expert, so I'm not sure I can really assist beyond that.

Q. I would like to move on then and ask you about another expert who was instructed by the crown, Dr Steven Karch, and you have been asked about Dr Karch in your Inquiry statement and certainly Dr Lawler was also asked to comment on Dr Karch.

Could we look at your -- could we look actually at the questions that were posed to you in relation to the Inquiry statements. So this is the Rule 8 request, which is SBPI 00438, and could we look at question 20. And it says:

"Were you aware of any issues relating to

Dr Steven Karch that were apparent from a time prior to

your involvement in the investigation? Were you aware

of Mr Bayoh's family views of Dr Karch and were you

aware of any media statements attributed to Dr Karch?

What were the previous Lord Advocate's views of Dr Karch

as far as you were aware and how, if at all, did any of

these matters affect your understanding of Dr Karch and

his opinion?" 1 And you'll remember being asked about that and then 2 3 if you look at your response, you relate response, which 4 is 529 and paragraph 53: "I have no recollection of the issues referred to in 5 this question. If they were drawn to my attention, 6 7 I would expect that to be apparent from the documentary record." 8 9 So do you have any recollection at all about issues 10 being raised with you regarding Dr Karch and his instruction? 11 12 A. I'm afraid I have no such recollection. Now, I suppose 13 I should qualify the second sentence that, you know, 14 I wouldn't -- if something was mentioned to me in 15 some -- in an oral briefing or orally, I wouldn't necessarily now remember it. 16 Right. All right. 17 Q. 18 But I have absolutely no recollection of any of the Α. 19 points or issues raised in that question. 20 Q. We've heard evidence from Stephen McGowan and from 21 Mr Les Brown about Dr Karch in connection with there 22 being issued about the funding, the source of funding of his research, and whether that had implications in 23 relation to his objectivity. We've heard evidence from 24 them in relation to a newspaper article which appeared 25

1		where Dr Karch had made comments about Mr Bayoh and the
2		investigation to the press and we've heard evidence that
3		I think the then Lord Advocate, who was
4		Frank Mulholland, had been concerned about Dr Karch,
5		about his engagement with the press, about engagements
6		with his instruction, and that had also been reflecting
7		a concern that the family had about his his
8		instruction, his views on excited delirium, and those
9		views had been reflected to Crown Office through their
10		lawyer, Mr Anwar.
11		And we've also heard other evidence that in fact
12		Dr Karch is not a forensic pathologist, he's not carried
13		out any autopsies, he has no formal toxicology
14		qualifications.
15		And does any of that, the information I'm giving
16		you, prompt any memories or recollections on your part
17		of being advised about Dr Karch or any of the previous
18		concerns?
19	A.	I'm afraid it doesn't.
20	Q.	Right. You have said that you would have:
21		"If they were drawn to my attention, I would expect
22		that to be apparent from the documentary record."
23		Thinking about when you were Lord Advocate, are
24		these the types of things you would want to know about
25		an expert if he was being instructed by the crown?

25

1 Α. I expect it depends what was being done about them. I would not expect to be routinely or indeed at all made 2 3 aware of concerns about an individual expert in an 4 individual case. I would rather expect Crown Counsel 5 to, you know, make a decision about what should be done 6 in relation to that expert if there were particular --7 if there was a particular reason to do so, then either the crown generally or Crown Counsel could raise the 8 9 issue with me and, you know, I can imagine there might 10 be a situation where there -- you know, let's say, again 11 speaking generally, there are concerns about an expert 12 but Crown Counsel takes a view that, you know, for good 13 reason that the expert should be instructed but wants to 14 have in effect reassurance of law officers are aware of 15 the issue. I can see that happening. 16 I don't remember it happening in this case or indeed 17 in any other, you know, it's the kind of issue that I would expect counsel in effect, you know, routinely to 18 19 be alert to questions of independence, expertise and for 20 counsel to, you know, who have the full authority to do 21 so and are allocated to the case to make the decision 22 that is appropriate and to make the judgment. The judgment call is for them, unless there's a good reason 23 to bring it to the officers. 24

Given the particular sensitivities of this case, I

- could see such an issue being brought to law officers

 potentially, but, as I say, I'm afraid I have no memory

 of that happening.

 Q. If your predecessor had indicated the crown would not
 - rely on an opinion from Dr Karch, for many of the reasons that I have discussed with you, would you expect that to be an issue that was raised within the crown precognition, either in the narrative or the analysis, when it came to highlighting issues regarding Dr Karch?
 - A. I mean if it was known to the authors, I would have thought so, but if my predecessor had taken a view that particular experts should not be instructed or relied on, then I would have a question in my mind about why it features in the crown precognition at all.
 - Q. And would you expect that sort of information, that a

 Lord Advocate has said we're not relying on this expert,

 to be drawn to the attention of the precognoscers?
- 18 A. I would have thought so, yes.
- 20 Q. And would that be the case even if they didn't get
 involved until after the comment had been made by the
 Lord Advocate, sometime after?
- 22 A. I can see how -- I suppose when you put it that way,
 23 I can see how the precognoscer might not be aware of the
 24 point and I suppose that leads me to a set of questions
 25 about how within Crown Office that information would be

disseminated.

- Q. And I'm interested in your thoughts about how that sort of information could be disseminated and not just those involved at that moment that the comment may be made or the decision taken, but for the future staff who may come in at a later stage. Do you have any procedures in place or did you have any procedures in place or was there any process whereby something like that being said by a Lord Advocate could be noted and had regard to by others?
 - A. I can't -- I don't recall any, as it were, specific process or procedure. I can envisage I suppose might depending on the context in which the statement was made. If it was written down, one might expect it to be -- the written record to be available. If it was said in a meeting, I suppose it would depend on the record and the recollection of those in the meeting.

There's an interesting question I suppose about how one ensures that in a case which is being investigated within the police or the PIRC, but with crown engagement and then a subsequent crown investigation, how one ensures that there's a sort of continuity of knowledge and understanding and appreciation of any points that have arisen from one to the other.

I have to confess, I suspect that didn't even occur

- to me at the time. I would have assumed that the system would ensure there was appropriate continuity.
- Q. So there's not just the issue of a Lord Advocate saying we're not using this particular opinion from this expert, and the issue of how that is communicated to subsequent precognoscers, who may or may not become involved in the matter, but also the other implications about how would Crown Office ensure that that expert --if there are serious concerns about an expert, how that would be communicated amongst the wider staff in Crown Office that maybe this is not an expert we would be inclined to go to again? Is there a blacklist of experts that's prepared?
 - A. I have to confess I'm not aware, but when you put the point to me I'm entirely -- I can entirely see that there should be that if there's an expert who for one reason or another has proved to be not acceptable that there should be a way of making sure they're not used subsequently. You know, let's say there's an expert who has been, you know, found to be or been the subject of serious criticism by a court, crown might well not want to use that expert at all, because of the risk that that would present to criminal proceedings and having some form of database or record that allowed that to be disseminated and doublechecked I suppose would be a

1 useful thing. 2 Q. Right, thank you. I'm conscious of the time if that 3 might be a ... 4 LORD BRACADALE: We'll take a 15-minute break. 5 (A short break) LORD BRACADALE: Ms Grahame. 6 7 MS GRAHAME: Thank you. I would like to move on to the instruction of further experts that took place in the 8 9 Crown Office in 2018. And there's evidence available to 10 the Inquiry that at that stage a Professor David Rees, a Dr Elizabeth Soilleux and a Dr Sebastian Lucas were 11 12 being instructed by the crown and they were looking into 13 histopathology, sickle cell anaemia, issues of that 14 sort. 15 It was during 2018 that, as we understand it, consultations took place between the allocated AD and 16 17 the head of CAAPD with various experts and I would like 18 to ask you again about something that we addressed prior 19 to the break. When we were looking at the guidance 20 available in relation to expert evidence, you may 21 remember the use of the consultation to establish and 22 confirm expertise was described as a vital step that must not be overlooked or you rushed through; do you 23 remember I asked you about that? 24 25 A. Yes.

21

22

23

24

25

1 Q. I won't put it back on the screen unless you wish. We have copies in the Inquiry of consultation notes that 2 3 were taken during the course of a number of 4 consultations with experts. It would appear from those 5 notes that qualifications and experience was not part of the discussion. 6 7 Now, I fully appreciate we've not yet heard from Ashley Edwards in relation to how she led at 8 9 consultations, but would you have expected, at consultations with an allocated AD and someone from 10 CAAPD, to consider issues of qualifications and 11 12 experience in relation to each of the experts? 13 Well, as a generality, I can really only speak to my own Α. 14 practice, if one consults with an expert, the first 15 thing one wants to address is their relevant experience, expertise, qualifications, and so on. Obviously in an 16 17 individual case that may be so obvious that it doesn't 18 need to be addressed; in other cases it may not to be 19 explored in detail. 20

That does strike me as the sort of thing that's ultimately a matter of judgment for -- for Crown Counsel and I appreciate the guidance is sound guidance, but, you know, one is dealing with an extremely, extremely experienced professional advocate who will have dealt with many, many expert witnesses and will have made her

- own judgment about what she needed to cover.
- Q. And in your own experience, what are the types of
 situations where you would feel comfortable not going
 into detail with an expert about their qualification or
 experience?
 - A. I suspect if it's a relatively routine area of expertise where, you know, the expert's qualifications are patent or possibly in other cases where the expert has set out you know in -- you know in reasonable detail in their report or otherwise their qualifications. You know, I can easily envisage cases or think of cases where I wouldn't think it was necessary to explore those issues, yes.
 - Q. And presumably if an expert is regularly appearing in the High Court in Scotland and you perhaps have questioned that witness on a number of occasions, presumably that's another occasion when you may not need to go into their qualifications and experience?
 - A. Indeed. I mean it's -- it's -- I wouldn't be prescriptive and I think the -- as I say, the guidance is very sound guidance and one has to I think bear in mind that that's probably guidance being directed at staff, professional staff, but professional staff at all levels. You know, when one has very experienced counsel, it's not that they throw the guidance out by

- 1 any means, but experienced counsel exercises judgment and experience all the time in relation to the way they 2 3 conduct particular matters. 4 Q. But in the absence of the examples we've discussed now, 5 the guidance is good guidance, good practice and it's always worthwhile checking the expert has got the right 6 7 experience and expertise? Absolutely, and the starting point is an expert -- you 8 Α. 9 know, any witness can only give evidence of opinion if 10 they have appropriate expertise and so, you know, you want to confirm that if it's not -- if it's not clear. 11 12 Q. And an expert -- it's only admissible evidence, the 13
 - opinion evidence, if they do have that -- those skills and qualifications and expertise?
- 15 Α. Absolutely.

14

20

21

22

23

24

- And one of the obligations of an advocate depute would 16 Q. 17 be to satisfy the court that that evidence from that 18 expert in relation to their opinion would be admissible 19 and relevant to be heard in the court proceedings?
 - Well, indeed, you would need to establish the witness' Α. expertise before leading their evidence of opinion.
 - Thank you. So in relation to consultation notes which Q. we have, which do not explore issues of qualifications and skills and expertise, if those issues were not addressed, would you be concerned that that wasn't being

- 1 thoroughly looked at, subject to leaving aside,
- 2 obviously, all the examples where it might not be
- 3 necessary?
- 4 A. Well, I think all I can really say in the abstract is
- 5 that it perhaps invites a question as to whether it was
- 6 necessary to do that exercise.
- 7 Q. All right. Thank you. And if the allocated AD was
- 8 conducting the consultation with the expert, that
- 9 question should probably be directed to her rather than
- 10 you?
- 11 A. Well, I mean I wasn't present, you know, I can't speak
- 12 to what was done and, equally, you know, I -- I had an
- immensely experienced senior Crown Counsel conducting
- 14 the case and it's the nature of that role that one is,
- 15 you know, exercising professional judgment all the time
- and I would not expect to have to interrogate the way in
- which she is exercising that professional judgment,
- I would rely on that and trust that, accepting of course
- 19 that I'm answerable constitutionally when I was
- 20 Lord Advocate for that trust.
- 21 Q. Where there is a consultation and it's conducted by
- 22 Crown Counsel, and we have heard that Les Brown would
- 23 often attend with the allocated AD, however Fiona Carnan
- 24 would not attend. And I'm interested in your views on
- 25 the precognoscer who's preparing the analysis is not at

- consultations with the allocated AD with the experts,

 and whether you think reflecting on that approach,

 whether that's a disadvantage for the precognoscer who's

 not been party to those discussions, often about complex

 issues?
- A. Put in the abstract, I can certainly see that it could well be a disadvantage, yes. If the issues in the report are being explored and investigated at consultation, it's going to be helpful for any member of the team who's then going to have to, as it were, use that information to have been party to those discussions, but I put that very much in the generality, you know. Again, not having been party to that kind of -- precisely who was attending what meeting, I'm not sure I can be more specific.
 - Q. I'm only asking in the generality. And then where in this case Les Brown attended with the allocated AD, what would your expectations be in relation to sharing information about that consultation, either by the allocated AD or by the head of CAAPD with the precognoscer who was working on the analysis? Would you expect there to be some sort of discussion or meeting or handover or would you be comfortable with them relying on consultation notes? Do you have any thoughts about that?

1 Α. I suspect it depends very much on the particularities of any individual -- individual case, and there may be 2 cases where, you know, a note of the meeting is 3 4 sufficient or whether the issues explored didn't reveal, 5 as it were, new material which needed to be drawn to the attention of the precognoscer. 6 7 Equally, there might be other cases where, you know, one would -- if the individual hadn't been present, you 8 9 might in the ideal world want some form of oral 10 explanation. I think it's very hard to be prescriptive and I think it would be quite wrong of me, you know, 11 12 from the role of head of system, to be put in a position 13 of seeking to comment on what one might regard as matters of very fine case management. 14 15 Q. Thank you. One other aspect in relation to the experts. We've heard evidence from Les Brown about consultations 16 17 which he attended with Ashley Wyse and on his own. And then I asked him about some other experts who there were 18 no consultations notes in relation to them and should we 19 20 assume there were no consultations and he thought that 21 was a reasonable approach to take. 22 Do you have a concern about the fact that it appears that nobody from the crown consulted with these experts, 23 so Dr John Parkes, Dr Maurice Lipsedge, 24 Dr Sebastian Lucas, Dr Payne-James, Dr Mary Sheppard, 25

1 Professor Jack Crane, Dr Nat Carey, Professor Anthony Freemont or Professor Michael Eddleston? So there's 2 3 quite a large number of experts there where we have no 4 consultation notes and it would appear, from Les Brown's 5 recollection, that they were not consulted with. Do you have any thoughts about the absence of consultation with 6 7 experts where they have been instructed? It very much depends on the nature of their evidence, 8 Α. 9 the issue they're addressing and the clarity and, you 10 know, clarity of the opinion that's being expressed. I'm not sure I can really answer the question in any 11 12 sort of abstract way. 13 Again, it perhaps invites a question about why there 14 wasn't a consultation with particular experts but, you 15 know, I have certainly in the past been in a position of taking a view that, you know, there was nothing I could 16 17 usefully spend time with the expert asking -- asking the 18 expert because the issue was clear and the, you know, 19 the expert -- their expertise and everything else was 20 adequately -- adequately patent from a written document. 21 Again, do you think that perhaps if the Inquiry is Q. looking for further information about this and further 22 explanation that Ashley Edwards would be the person to 23 speak to about that? 24

I think you would have speak to those who were involved

25

Α.

1 in setting up the consultations, deciding whether or not to consult with particular experts and, you know, 2 3 I would, you know, I would be relying on their 4 professional judgment. Thank you. 5 Q. I would like to move on and ask you about a 6 7 different type of expert. Perhaps we could look at paragraph 52 of your Inquiry statement, and this relates 8 9 to an expert in relation to restraint. There we are. 10 Can we just see the question just above that. Again, it's about expert witnesses and you were asked what 11 12 involvement, if any, you had in the instruction of 13 experts and then if we can move down and your paragraph 14 52 says: 15 "The documents which have been provided to me by the Inquiry contain an email exchange between my office and 16 17 APCC in December 2017 in relation to the identification of a suitable qualified restraint expert, in which I 18 suggested that inquiries might be made with police 19 20 forces elsewhere in the UK and with police training 21 institutions north and south of the border. Otherwise, so far as I can recall, I had no personal involvement in 22 the matters referred to in this question. These were 23 all matters for the investigative team under the 24

direction of APCC. As I have already noted, when I

1 received APCC's report with a recommendation in relation to prosecution of the officers, I had a discussion with 2 3 her which resulted in further consultation with a 4 restraint expert before a final decision was taken. 5 I cannot now recall the specific point upon which I considered that further work was required." 6 7 So you had some involvement in relation to the restraint expert? 8 Yes, I mean my -- the exchange which is recorded in the 9 10 documents indicates that the team had been having difficulty identifying a suitable restraint expert and I 11 12 had suggested the inquiries that are to described there 13 and then I think there is -- if I remember it correctly 14 from the documents, I think there's then an exchange 15 where there's a question of whether I had someone in particular in mind and I didn't. You know, it was 16 17 simply that I was encouraging the team to look firth of Scotland and to those institutions described in order to 18 find somebody who could suitable and independently 19 20 comment from a restraint point of view. 21 Q. Thank you. It may assist if we look at the moment at 22 COPFS 02126A, and this was a briefing note that was prepared by Alisdair McLeod at a later stage and you'll 23 see it's dated 28 February 2020, but it covers the 24

period of the crown investigation from 3 May 2015, which

1 is the date of Mr Bayoh's death, to 11 November 2019. I wonder if we could look at page 13 of this. And 2 3 it deals with what's called the OST expert, so that's 4 officer safety training expert, and it summaries the 5 issues that the crown experienced during this time: "The crown encountered considerable difficulty in 6 7 identifying a suitable OST expert and a number of inquiries were made in England and Northern Ireland and 8 9 the approaches were made to the 10 Metropolitan Police College in Hendon." Do you see all of that? 11 12 Α. I do, yes. 13 And there's mention of details of a known and trusted Q. 14 former training office, Martin Graves, now operating as 15 an OST expert in the private sector. Were you aware that Martin Graves had been instructed by the crown? 16 Well, I was certainly aware that an expert had been 17 Α. instructed. I don't now remember the name. 18 Mr Graves was contacted in December 2017 and the 19 Q. 20 following day he forwarded his CV and confirmed he would 21 be in a position to start reviewing materials. And then 22 during January 2018, there seems to have been a view that he would be able to provide a report. He was 23 contacted by telephone in January and given specific 24 details about the case, and then you'll see he was given 25

a detailed letter of instruction and then if we can move 1 2 on: 3 "The original materials provided to him in January included documentation in relation to the training 4 delivered to the material officers." 5 And then there was further communication with 6 7 Mr Graves over a period of time and the there appears to have been some issues about whether he could provide the 8 9 report as instructed within that period of time. 10 If we can move on. And then it says: "This was with a view to finalising the report to 11 12 Crown Counsel by 23 May 2018. Although the consultation 13 with Mr Graves was very useful, he advised the crown 14 that his report would not be completed until April 2018 15 and, as a result, it was decided not to submit a report to Crown Office until Mr Graves' report was received and 16 17 assessed and other investigation were ongoing." And then if we move on, it says: 18 19 "The report was received on 14 April 2018. There 20 were a number of typing and dictation errors and a 21 number of points about factual accuracy that were also raised with Mr Graves. After consideration of the 22 points raised by the crown, his initial report was 23 treated as a draft and he submitted his final report at 24 the end of April 2018 and he was then precognosed by the 25

precognoscers on 11 May 2018." 1 2 So he was initially instructed, he prepared a what 3 became known as an interim report, after further 4 discussion there was a final report, he was consulted 5 with by Crown Counsel, and he was also precognosed by the precognoscers in May of that year. 6 7 And is that the type of engagement with crown that you would expect an expert in relation to restraint or 8 9 officer safety training would have in this type of 10 investigation? Again, there's nothing there which strikes me as 11 Α. 12 surprising, if I can put it that way. The -- you know, 13 again, the precise approach to any particular expert 14 will obviously depend on the circumstances and the 15 judgment of the professionals involved as to what -what's required but, you know, there's nothing in what 16 17 you've shown me that I find unusual or surprising. Thank you. Could you now look, please, at the letter of 18 Q. instruction to Mr Graves, COPFS 00008, and this is a 19 20 letter of instruction to Mr Graves dated 24 January 21 2018, and on page -- there's a reference to recent email 22 correspondence and telephone calls with Alisdair McLeod, who was the precognoscer at that time, and an 23 introduction to the work that the crown were doing. 24 Could we look at page 2 of 12, please, and there's a 25

1 passage in bold there: 2 "Given your expertise, the crown wish to instruct 3 you to prepare a report commenting on the actions of 4 police from the point of engagement with Mr Bayoh and 5 particularly providing opinion on whether the method of engagement with and restraint of the deceased by 6 7 officers was reasonable and justifiable, taking into account the requirement for their use of force to be 8 9 necessary, accountable, proportionate, legal and 10 ethical. In general in providing your opinion please comment on whether the officers concerned seem to have 11 12 followed their OST training. We would ask that you 13 consider all of the materials supplied to you in 14 reaching your opinion." 15 And so he was instructed in this letter to prepare a report in relation to those matters and then you will 16 17 see that there is a list of materials that were enclosed. You will see a large number of documents 18 19 included. I don't want to go through these in any 20 detail, but if we can scan down the page, and a number 21 of statements are also provided to the expert that we 22 can see listed, a composite disc, maps, 999 calls, airwave recordings, photographs, that sort of thing. 23 24 It's all detailed in this letter. 25 And could we look at page 7 of 12, please, at the

1 section "Restraint on the ground". There we are: "Restraint on the ground. You will notice that on 2 3 the composite CCTV timeline a stop-clock appears on the 4 left of the screen at the moment when the now deceased 5 is taken to the ground and stops at 4 minutes and 2 seconds when PC Smith contacted force control to ask 6 7 an ambulance for the now deceased." So there's some description there of what can be 8 seen on the CCTV timeline that's been provided by the 9 10 crown to Mr Graves and then there's also reference in the second paragraph to: 11 12 "Snapchat footage taken by Witness Wyse contains a 13 brief glimpse of the methods of restraint being used at 14 that time. Six officers are in various positions 15 on/around the now deceased. From that Snapchat footage, it appears Mr Bayoh that was lying on the south southern 16 17 pavement on Hayfield Road surrounded by five police officers, namely PCs Smith, Tomlinson, Paton, Gibson and 18 19 McDonough. A sixth officer, believed to be PC Walker, 20 appears to be lying lengthwise on top of or beside 21 Mr Bayoh, his high-visibility clothing visible momentarily." 22 And then it goes on to describe other matters, and 23 24 also talks about handcuffs and fastraps. Could we -- so do you see that section there that we 25

was on his back."

25

1 can see on the screen? It appears that in sending the letter of instruction to Mr Graves the crown have 2 3 highlighted within the Snapchat footage that it appears 4 Mr Bayoh was lying on the pavement, five officers were 5 surrounding him, and a sixth officer, believed to be PC Walker, appeared to be lying lengthwise on top of or 6 7 beside Mr Bayoh; do you see that? 8 Α. Yes. That's raised specifically by the crown. 9 Q. 10 Could we look now, please, at Mr Graves' report, COPFS 00024, and you'll see that this is instructed by 11 12 Mr MacLeod, the expert is Mr Graves, and the date of it 13 is 13 April 2018 and I would like to go through some 14 aspects of this report with you and then I'll ask you 15 some questions at the end. Could we look at page 30 of 41, please. And if we 16 17 look at letter S, so it will just be at the bottom 18 there, he notes -- this is a section in the report where Mr Graves is beginning to draw out factors that he's 19 20 taken from the documents prepared by -- produce to him 21 by the crown, and I'll just go over these very quickly: "S talks about PC Walker fell to the ground at this 22 time dropping the baton he had taken from his colleague. 23 24 He states he ended up on his knees next to Mr Bayoh who

1		And then if we can look at page 31, and I'm
2		interested in D and E:
3		"The whole restraint period appears to have been no
4		longer than four minutes. While this may look like a
5		long period for three of four officers to get someone
6		under control, I have examined many such incidents and
7		this is by no way a prolonged period of time."
8		Do you see that?
9	Α.	Yes.
10	Q.	And then E:
11		"At the start of this process PC Walker describes
12		the subject lying on his left side with him behind
13		[that's Walker behind] on his knees. He states he
14		attempted to get hold of Mr Bayoh and he was placing
15		some downward pressure on his shoulder with his upper
16		body."
17		So this is a description given by PC Walker in
18		documents that have been sent to Mr Graves for
19		consideration. And then H, I, please:
20		"At this time there are differing accounts of the
21		body position of Mr Bayoh. PC Tomlinson, Smith and
22		Mr Nelson appear to have him on his front with PC Walker
23		lying over his upper body. PC Walker describes this as
24		being on his knees with his upper body over the
25		subject's right shoulder with him lying on his left

side." 1 2 So this is where Mr Graves notes that there are 3 differing accounts that are available to him in the 4 Crown Office papers and on the one hand there are 5 statements from PC Tomlinson, Smith and a statement from Mr Nelson who have Mr Bayoh on his fronted with 6 7 PC Walker lying over his upper body and a differing account, however, is given by PC Walker who describes 8 9 this as being: 10 "He was on his knees with his upper body over the subject's right shoulder with him lying on his left 11 12 side, him lying on his left side." 13 And then if we can look at L, please, which is on 14 the next section: 15 "I would also be very surprised that during this time PC Walker was not at times lying across the upper 16 17 body of Mr Bayoh and putting a degree of pressure onto him. I do not think this could have been sustained or 18 19 prolonged pressure due to my comment in the next 20 paragraph. 21 "PC Tomlinson provides an example of this when he 22 states that Mr Bayoh was bench-pressing PC Walker who is a substantial weight, off the ground. In this position, 23 24 the fact that PC Walker was on his back would not have placed any pressure on his chest if this was not on the 25

1 ground and Mr Bayoh would have been able to breathe in this position." 2 3 Then V for victor: 4 "Whilst I am not a medical expert in such matters, I 5 have dealt with and reviewed many such cases and this is not one that jumps out as a typical case of positional 6 7 asphyxia. It does have some of the hallmarks, but due to the short time of restraint, four minutes, the 8 9 constant movement of Mr Bayoh and his opportunity to 10 take breaths during the restraint process, I do not believe this was a major contributing factor to his 11 12 unfortunate death." Then I would like to look at the summary of 13 14 conclusions in section 8 which is on page 38. Thank 15 you. And if we look at F, please: "In relation to all the variations in body position 16 17 of Mr Bayoh and the officers, I would suggest this fits with my explanation as to the fluidity of the control 18 and restraint process and that there were indeed times 19 20 when Mr Bayoh was face down and the officers were at 21 times placing pressure on him to keep him on the ground. 22 However, I do not believe this was constant or prolonged." 23 24 Now, I would like to -- I appreciate that I'm taking you through this reasonably quickly and I have taken a 25

1 snapshot of the restraint, but from this do you see that Mr Graves recognises that there are alternative versions 2 3 that have been given: two police officers and Mr Nelson, 4 who we've heard was an eyewitness, who talk about their 5 impression of what happened during the restraint and PC Walker on the other. And on the basis of the statements 6 7 of Tomlinson, Smith and Nelson, Mr Bayoh was remembered to be on his front with PC Walker lying over his upper 8 9 body during the restraint. PC Walker's description was 10 of PC Walker being on his knees with his upper body over the subject's right shoulder with Mr Bayoh lying on his 11 12 side. 13 Now, do you remember the letter of instruction that 14 I drew to your attention? 15 Α. I certainly remember you drawing it to my attention and generally the points that you drew my attention. 16 Let's have that back on the screen for a moment. If we 17 Q. could go back to COPFS, there it is, and if we can look 18 19 at the section on page 7 out of 12, which was the 20 restraint on the ground, and if we could look at the 21 restraint on the ground, yes, thank you. 22 The very bottom of that there's a reference to the Snapchat footage that was available and the crown 23 specifically drew attention to the fact that: 24 "From that Snapchat footage it appears Mr Bayoh was 25

1		lying on the southern pavement of Hayfield Road,
2		surrounded by five police officers, and the sixth
3		officer, believed to be PC Walker, appears to be lying
4		lengthwise on top of or beside Mr Bayoh "
5		Do you see that?
6		"His high visibility clothing visible momentarily."
7	Α.	Yes.
8	Q.	So the crown precognoscer who instructed Mr Graves,
9		Alisdair McLeod, drew his attention to the Snapchat
10		footage, drew his attention to what he gave an
11		indication or what it appeared he could see. Obviously,
12		Mr Graves had the versions of Tomlinson and Mr Nelson
13		and PC Walker available and he recognised as part of his
14		report that there was let me just see what he said
15		differing accounts.
16		In relation to this aspect of the restraint,
17		restraint is obviously a very significant matter in
18		relation to the crown precognition, it's a very
19		significant matter that you've sought expert opinion on
20		from Mr Graves, and the precognoscer, Mr MacLeod, has
21		drawn attention to the Snapchat footage which some could
22		view as very significant and has drawn attention to
23		Mr Graves to the fact that it would appear to show
24		PC Walker lying lengthwise on top of or beside Mr Bayoh.
25		I'm not asking which is right or which is wrong, but

would you agree that this is a very significant matter that should be addressed as part of a consultation with Mr Graves looking at the differing accounts, looking at the Snapchat footage and what's been said by the crown that it shows and resolving that issue in terms of working out what Mr Graves' evidence and what his opinion is in relation to the restraint, because you have these different hypothesis? Do you think that would be something that you would really want to discuss with Mr Graves at consultation? Well, obviously, you have taken me to a series of Α. passages. I noticed in passing in his report he

passages. I noticed in passing in his report he actually makes a -- as it was flicking through, he makes a point about there being different factual hypotheses and it being ultimately for the -- I think if I caught it as it went past -- for the crown to resolve those, but certainly if I were faced with an expert who was expressing a view on one hypothesis but I had evidence that supported a different hypothesis, I would want to explore that with the expert.

Equally, if I have got an expert who's expressing a view on different hypotheses, I might want to explore that at a consultation, but I do go back to the comment I made earlier, you know, I have got immensely experienced Crown Counsel who's both exercising her

25

1 professional judgment in how to approach these issues and questions and, I'm afraid, other than recalling in 2 3 very general terms that there was some -- an issue that 4 arose from her report to me that invited some further 5 inquiry, I'm afraid I can't remember what that was, with 6 the restraint expert, I'm not sure I can really assist 7 much further. I don't want you to think I'm criticising Mr Graves. He 8 Q. 9 recognises within his report that there are --10 Α. Yes. -- differing accounts. And would you agree that one of 11 Q. 12 the ways that those differing accounts can be resolved 13 is you mentioned the word "hypothesis" is that a 14 recognised technique where lawyers can explore one 15 factual hypothesis and the implications of that, but they can explore another. On the assumption this --16 17 these facts exist, what would your opinion be? 18 Α. Perfectly usual way to approach issues with an expert. 19 Right, and so if that hasn't been specifically set out Q. 20 in a letter of instruction, is that the type of approach 21 you would expect to be explored during a consultation? 22 Yes, I mean a consultation would be an obvious way to Α. tease out the implications of different hypotheses. You 23 know, there may be other ways of doing it, but, you 24

know, one may well get the best out of it by way of an

1 exchange at a meeting. 2 So you wouldn't expect the expert to decide which Q. 3 version is correct, but you would ask the expert to help 4 you understand if version one is correct, what's your 5 opinion; if version 2 is correct, what's your opinion? Yes. Unless you've already -- you have a view as to 6 Α. 7 which is the correct hypothesis. I mean, equally, I would expect if you've got a view of a hypothesis and 8 9 the expert appears to be proceeding on a different 10 hypothesis, you would want to bottom that out. Right. So if your view of one factual hypothesis was 11 Q. 12 that the officer was lying lengthwise on top of or 13 beside Mr Bayoh, that is a hypothesis you would want to 14 explore with the expert, even if he had not fully 15 addressed that in his report? Well, I mean one would certainly want to make -- one 16 Α. 17 would want to make sure one had the expert's opinion on the, as it were, the best hypothesis that the crown had 18 of the -- of the factual circumstances. 19 20 And so in relation to any consultation with Mr Graves, Q. 21 would you expect the issue of restraint and the 22 positions to be addressed perhaps in some detail as part of the consultation? 23 Well, I mean taking what you've shown me, you know, I 24 Α. 25 can see that there are issues there that could be

to the APCC?

25

1 resolved at consultation and I should say I'm not trying 2 to be sort of, you know, I'm just, you know, conscious 3 I'm being asked to, you know, express a judgment on or 4 express a view about things which were done by 5 experienced professionals on the basis of being taken very quickly to documents. 6 7 Q. Yes, I know and there's a lot of detail on the screen. I'm not asking you to form a concluded view on the 8 9 outcome obviously. 10 Α. Yes. Just asking you if it's the sort of issue that you think 11 Q. 12 questions should be asked? 13 Well, it's certainly the sort of issue that, you know, Α. 14 in my own professional practice I would seek to, you 15 know, resolve, unravel through a consultation with an 16 expert. Thank you. And we know also that there was a 17 Q. 18 precognition and is it the sort of issue that may also 19 be addressed at precognition? 20 A. Yes, indeed. 21 Q. Thank you. And we have consultation notes in relation 22 to the consultations with Mr Graves. If that issue does not appear to be addressed as part of that consultation, 23 24 would I be right in thinking you would direct us perhaps

1	A.	I would ask a question, yes. I mean I'm $$ you know and
2		I shall, you know, I'm I hope not being yes, I'm
3		very conscious I had an immensely experienced prosecutor
4		engaged in this case, you know, I'm you know, upon
5		whose judgment, you know, I placed and place reliance.
6		You know, if there are questions about the judgments
7		that she made in the course of the Inquiry, then, you
8		know, it's really for her to explain her thinking.
9	Q.	Thank you very much. I would like to move on. Could
10		you give me a moment, please. I would like to move on
11		now and I wonder if it would be possible to rise early
12		today to allow me a chance to reflect on further
13		questions. I will not finish the remainder of my
14		questions tonight, even if we continue, and because
15		I would like to move on to a completely different
16		chapter, I wonder if it would be possible?
17	LOR	D BRACADALE: Very well. We'll continue with your
18		evidence tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock, Mr Wolffe.
19	A.	Yes, thank you.
20	LOR	D BRACADALE: Thank you.
21	(The	e hearing was adjourned to 10.00 am on Wednesday, 1 May
22		2024)
23		
24		
25		

1	INDEX
2	2FORMER LORD ADVOCATE JAMES WOLFFE KC
3	(affirmed)
4	Examination-in-chief by MS2
5	GRAHAME
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	