Friday, 10 March 2023 1 2 (10.00 am)3 (Proceedings delayed) 4 (10.05 am)DETECTIVE CHIEF SUPERINTENDENT PATRICK CAMPBELL (continued) 5 Questions from MS GRAHAME (continued) 6 7 LORD BRACADALE: Good morning. 8 THE WITNESS: Good morning. 9 LORD BRACADALE: Ms Grahame. 10 MS GRAHAME: Thank you. Good morning, Detective Chief Superintendent. 11 12 A. Good morning. 13 Q. Just at the close yesterday, we were about to turn to Martyn Dick's house. 14 15 A. Yes. Q. And I asked you to explain why the house was of interest 16 17 to your investigation, and you talked about being aware at that time that Mr Bayoh had gone to watch the boxing 18 at Martyn Dick's, and you were looking at what 19 20 Zahid Saeed's position was at that time --A. Yeah. 21 Q. -- and you noted that the deceased was acting out of 22 character, there was mention of maybe someone, or 23 24 Mr Bayoh considering that someone had disrespected him? 25 Yeah. Α.

1 Q. And then he left that house, and you talked about 2 keeping an open mind in the investigation. We'd talked 3 about the various hypotheses that you were --4 Α. Yeah. 5 Q. -- considering. And you said at the end you thought: 6 7 "It's quite easy to say the fact there was no 8 relevance but we didn't know at that time how relevant the house would prove to be"? 9 10 Α. Yes. And that's why you were keeping an open mind. 11 Q. 12 Am I right in saying that you had delegated the 13 loci, including Martyn Dick's house, to Stuart Houston; 14 is that right? 15 Α. That's correct. And what would you have expected to be done by 16 Q. Stuart Houston in relation to the Martyn Dick house? 17 So, as I was saying yesterday, it was about keeping 18 Α. 19 an open mind, we were aware that Mr Bayoh's behaviour 20 was erratic, out of character, from what we got from 21 Mr Saeed. The mention of disrespectful. So again, with 22 that information, who disrespected him; was it someone within that house, had there been some sort of 23 altercation within there as well? Had his behaviour 24 25 deteriorated whilst within there due to intoxication or

1 taking something within that property? So again, it was about keeping that open mind, being 2 3 transparent and open around it, and ensuring that we 4 had -- we had control of that location at that time. 5 When you say "control", what do you mean? Q. Just we had secured it -- we'd secured it as such, we 6 Α. 7 had removed Martyn and his partner Kirsty from the 8 house, and we were thereafter just assessing exactly 9 what was required in it. So again, the options around 10 looking at crime scene manager deployment, do we need a bring a search adviser in, we're looking at do we need 11 12 any other specialists from the forensic side, 13 biologists, chemists and such. So again, that 14 discussion was delegated to DCI Stuart Houston in 15 consultation with the individual crime scene manager for 16 that location and they would have worked out a strategy around exactly what was required in it. 17 Q. Before we move on to that, let's look again at the 18 19 forensic strategy document which is PS01298, and I think 20 Mr Dick's house is on page 4 of 7. That's on the 21 screen. Listed as locus 4. 22 Α. Yeah. 23 Q. And it says here: "In this initial phase this locus will remain under 24 protection with a scene entry log in place." 25

24

25

1 Α. Yes. 2 So in the initial phase was the plan to seize the house? Q. 3 Α. Yes. 4 And that's the keeping control of the house? Q. 5 Α. Yeah. And seizing the house means removing the occupants, 6 Q. 7 effectively? 8 Yeah, it's maintaining the integrity of the house for Α. 9 any subsequent examination that we may want to carry out 10 on that property, but also removing the occupants, yeah. There's no mention in the forensic strategy log of 11 Q. 12 a search being conducted. Bearing in mind you're 13 keeping an open mind, explain that process where you 14 initially have a decision to seize the house, but then 15 you ultimately decide to search the house. Can you explain how that progression happens? 16 Yeah, so the locations that are identified within the 17 Α. 18 forensic strategy document are locations that the 19 deceased, through the timeline of his activity from 20 2 May into 3 May and thereafter, through to the 21 altercation in Hayfield Road, that he basically was involved in, so he came into contact with individuals 22 within each of the loci. 23

So it was important, as we would do for any

investigation, that relevant locations that are -- that

4

the deceased has been involved in throughout that timeline, that we basically secure as best we can the property at that time, or the street or the location or the motor vehicle, and thereafter we will thereafter pull together, as I say, the forensic strategy briefing around that.

Now, the forensic strategy document is a high level document, it does not go into detail round about, "Search the bedroom, make sure you search the bathroom, can you look at the back garden". So that would come with the briefing, the one-to-one, through the crime scene co-ordinator, with the crime scene manager who's waiting to be disappointed there, so they would have that more informal briefing round about exactly what do we have here and what exactly are we looking for here.

And ultimately what we are looking to do in any incident we deal with is return the house or the property back to the owner as soon as reasonably practical. We don't have any benefit of holding on to these properties because we have resources tied up securing them, standing by them in cordons. So again, as soon as we can stand some of these locations down and give them back to the owner, we do that.

Q. So when you were discussing the forensic strategy document with Houston, was the decision in relation to

- 1 Martyn Dick's house that you would take control of that 2 property?
- 3 A. Yes.
- 4 Q. Seize it?
- 5 A. (Witness nods).
- Q. So that decision was made before anyone had even gone to the property?
- A. No. So we'd already seized the house, once that

 document's developed. We had the property, we had

 secured the property and the occupants had been removed

 from it at that time.
- 12 Q. So tell me who had made that decision?
- 13 A. So that decision was -- it ultimately came to myself to
 14 make that decision.
- 15 Q. When did you decide that?
- So that was during the course of the morning, once we 16 Α. 17 basically began to have that more definitive timeline around the deceased's movements, and the relevant 18 locations thereafter became apparent. So my decision, 19 20 my overarching decision round about the relevant scenes 21 was to basically secure and maintain the integrity of 22 all the scenes at that particular time and thereafter basically stand back from it, pull together a forensic 23 24 strategy briefing with the PIRC, who were also round the 25 table at that time, and explain to them exactly how we

25

1 would plan to basically thereafter take on the examination of each of the locations. 2 Q. Looking at your daybook, that we looked at yesterday, 3 4 I think, page 5, do we see what time you made that 5 decision to seize Martyn Dick's house? 6 (Pause). 7 When we talked yesterday, you see on the left-hand side of this page Collette Bell? 8 Yeah. 9 Α. 10 Q. And we discussed the information she was sharing with 11 officers, and we see the names Martyn Dick and 12 Zahid Saeed. 13 Yeah. Α. Then can we see on any part of the other pages --14 Q. 15 No. Ultimately, because it's not written down doesn't Α. 16 really mean it didn't happen. I mean, these things are really fluid, so as we're going out to each of these 17 18 locations the direction from myself via Stuart and via 19 Colin Robson was, "Let's just secure what we can at this 20 stage", and thereafter, once PIRC become involved, 1.30, 21 1.35, we'll have a better assessment of it. And, as 22 I say, thereafter we went into a meeting with the PIRC 23 round about the assessment of the properties and who would do what, who would take the lead on each of the 24

different locations as such. And thereafter Gold Group.

1 Occurred after that as such. 2 As I say, a normal course of any activity for any major incident or major investigation is that we would 3 4 simply go through the aspect of identifying relevant 5 locations and thereafter securing. So you made the decision to seize the house --6 Q. 7 Α. Yes. -- before anyone's gone to speak to Martyn Dick or to 8 Q. 9 look at the house. What is the rationale for seizing 10 the house before anyone has gone to assess it? So we were aware from Zahid and from the earlier 11 Α. 12 discussion with Zahid that there was potential relevance 13 to Martyn Dick's house because of the issues I've 14 already discussed round about his attendance there and 15 him acting out of character, the fact that it appeared -- he indicated that someone had disrespected 16 17 him. So again, as I said before, we were unsure at that 18 time what that actually meant. 19 So again, it's a judgement call around various 20 locations such as this when you're involved in it, you 21 have to basically make that decision really based on the 22 evidence that you have at that particular time, because the danger is if you do not secure the property and 23 thereafter it becomes relevant for a particular matter 24 later in the investigation, it's extremely difficult to 25

go back retrospectively and thereafter emphasise why you didn't take it at the time and why you didn't maintain the integrity when you were aware there was some sort of relevance to it.

So again, it's about treating the scenario and the incident, as we would any such, as a homicide, so we start at the worst case scenario with any investigation and secure what you can, and thereafter look at it, and if you have to thereafter bring it back down to a more reasonable level as the day progresses or the investigation progresses, you've not lost anything at that stage, so it's easy enough to basically stand it down at that point.

- Q. So before any officers even attend at Martyn Dick's, the decision has been taken by you to seize that property, and what then was your thought process in terms of what would happen next?
- A. So basically we would assess through the forensic strategy briefing, there was a further meeting before that with PIRC around the scene assessment which we went into a meeting just before the forensic strategy meeting just round about the prioritisation of what we were looking at. So with the resources we had, in particular the resources for scene examination with SPA Forensic Services, we wanted to prioritise the

9

10

22

23

24

25

- 1 scenes that we deemed to be most significant. So Hayfield Road was obviously a significant scene, the 2 3 deceased, obviously we were looking to do what we had to 4 do in the hospital before conveying him to the City 5 Mortuary, so that was a significant scene. So again it was about that prioritisation and thereafter how we 6 7 would work through almost, this is a priority down to number 5, this is ... 8
 - Q. Where did Martyn Dick's house come in terms of your order of priorities?
- So it was further down the list of priorities, to be 11 Α. 12 honest with you. It was important, we didn't know how 13 significant it was, but regarding the various -- the 14 prioritisation exercise that I was taking in my head and 15 running through was that Hayfield Road was more significant, the deceased was more significant, 16 17 Collette Bell's house was more significant, and thereafter you had Saeed's house, car and also you had 18 19 Martyn Dick. So again probably to the end of that level 20 of kind of high prioritisation, they were at the lower 21 level as such.
 - Q. So when we look at the forensic strategy document and it is locus 4 but Zahid Saeed, his family home address and the car is locus 5, was the car more of a priority than Martyn Dick's house?

- 1 A. Not particularly, no.
- 2 Q. So was Martyn Dick's house and the car and Zahid Saeed's
- 3 home address were they on a par really --
- A. Yeah, and that's why they're locus 4 and 5, as you see,
- 5 it's that kind of level of prioritisation.
- 6 Q. Then what was your intention in relation to --
- 7 I appreciate this wasn't a priority, but what was your
- 8 plan in relation to actually searching the house?
- 9 A. Yeah, so my intention through discussion at the forensic
- 10 strategy briefing was that we would search all
- 11 properties.
- 12 Q. When did you make that decision?
- 13 A. So that was a discussion at the forensic strategy
- 14 meeting.
- Q. Was this the one that we looked at the minutes of --
- 16 A. Yeah.
- Q. -- at the end of the -- so that was 4.45 on 3 May,
- page 6 of 7. So had you made the decision to search all
- the properties at that meeting?
- 20 A. Yeah, so there was a general discussion that we had,
- 21 every location that was relevant to the investigation at
- that stage.
- Q. You had them all seized by then?
- A. Yes. So it was a case of, as I say, that prioritisation
- 25 exercise and also some of the work that PIRC would want

1 us to prioritise as well was discussed. But in general 2 through the membership that was there it was that we 3 would be carrying out a search on all the properties, 4 just about anything of any relevance. 5 We did not discuss that in detail, as I say, that was more delegated through to DCI Stuart Houston who had 6 7 a number of separate forums with crime scene managers, 8 with PIRC crime scene individuals, and thereafter kind 9 of drawn down into the kind of -- more the mechanics of 10 what they were going to do at each of the locations. I don't see anything in the minutes of this meeting 11 Q. 12 about a discussion to do with searching the properties. 13 Yeah. Α. But it may be that I'm missing --14 Q. 15 Α. No. 16 Would you help me see if there's anything in these Q. minutes? 17 18 Α. No, they're very, very brief, the minutes, and at that 19 time the priority was, as I say, Hayfield Road, which we 20 were progressing it. Even at that stage there was work 21 getting done at the scene at Hayfield. But the priority for ourselves and the discussion at the forensic 22 23 strategy meeting was round about the deceased and about ensuring integrity of the deceased and his remains and 24 thereafter the conveyance to the City Mortuary in 25

- 1 Edinburgh for the post-mortem examination. So you'll
- 2 see there's all that detail about what we were going to
- 3 do.
- Q. Yes, on page 6 of 7 there's some detail there.
- 5 A. So the aspect of the general search of a property, that
- 6 was just a general discussion that we would naturally
- 7 search a property to see if there was anything linked to
- 8 the investigation at that stage, unless it became clear
- 9 that there was no relevance and we would simply hand the
- 10 property back. But, as I say, the mechanics of each of
- the particular scenes was delegated through to Stuart
- and crime scene managers from both PIRC and from
- 13 Police Scotland.
- 14 Q. Is it pretty much automatic that once you've seized
- a property that you will search and see if there's
- anything of relevance?
- 17 A. No.
- 18 Q. No?
- 19 A. It's not the case. If we -- I mean, there's been
- 20 occasions whereby I can recall we've seized such as
- 21 multiple vehicles that we believe that the injured party
- 22 maybe touched or came across and there was maybe blood
- on, but thereafter when we've viewed CCTV the injured
- 24 party has not went that particular way and basically has
- gone down a side street. So again, if there's no

- 1 requirement we basically stand the area -- the cars
- down, we don't need any involvement in them at that
- 3 particular stage because they're eliminated.
- Q. So you've kept an open mind, you're not sure about the
- 5 relevance of Martyn Dick's house?
- 6 A. No.
- 7 Q. You decide to seize the house --
- 8 A. Yeah.
- 9 Q. -- which you do, and we've heard about officers and
- scene entry logs and things like that?
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 Q. We've heard evidence about that. At what point do you
- decide that there is relevance to the investigation and
- 14 you will instruct a search to be carried out?
- 15 A. That was delegated to DCI Stuart Houston just round
- about the mechanics of that.
- 17 Q. The decision, however, the decision to --
- 18 A. No, no, the decision was mine to basically search the
- 19 property so --
- Q. So when did you decide that?
- 21 A. So that was at the forensic strategy meeting. They were
- 22 all relevant scenes and we were going to search every
- one of them.
- Q. So it was at that meeting you made that decision?
- 25 A. Yes.

25

Α.

Yeah.

1 Q. Is there any record in any of your policy file or your daybook that would help us understand what you were 2 3 thinking the relevance was at that stage? I'd need to check my policy file again. 4 Α. Do you want to look at that again? You've got a hard 5 Q. copy of that. So it's PS17854. 6 7 (Pause) 8 A. I don't think there is any. I think there's certainly 9 mention of the house being given back to the householder 10 at the time. Well --11 Q. 12 Α. Through discussion with PIRC. But there's nothing at 13 all, no -- that discussion in the documentation, the 14 forensic strategy document we've produced, the minutes 15 are the footprint for that discussion. 16 Right. There's certainly mention of the forensic Q. 17 strategy --18 Α. Yes. 19 -- on decision 15, which is 61463, and you certainly Q. 20 note: 21 "Endorsement of the forensic strategy~..." 22 Α. Yeah. 23 Q. I think that says: 24 "... by DCI Stuart Houston."

- Q. And you told us yesterday that Stuart Houston had prepared it?
- 3 A. Yes.
- Q. It's 15, please, 61463. So then we see that that was endorsed and then the reasoning, perhaps you could read that for us, if we move down the page, please.
- 7 A. So:
- 8 "Governance/framework around investigation and 9 recovery of all identified loci".
- 10 Q. Right, so nothing really there about specific properties?
- A. No, and to be honest with you I would -- I was surprised

 if I would find it in my daybook or in my policy file,

 it is something that really is just discussed at the

 forensic strategy briefing. We wouldn't naturally

 detail, I mean, the reasons for search in a policy file

 or I certainly wouldn't.
- Q. Can you explain, between the decision to seize the
 property at Martyn Dick's house and your decision to
 then search it, what new information came to light or
 what crystallised your view that a search should be
 carried out?
- 23 A. There was no real change from what we had at the start,
 24 from the statement from Zahid and we knew that of the -25 the presence of the deceased there, his behaviour within

1 that property, and the aspect of being disrespected. So again, going back to the hypotheses and keeping an open 2 3 mind, exactly what did occur? Was there an altercation 4 within there with someone? Had he taken something, some 5 controlled substance within the property, either been given to him or taken by his own accord? Why had his 6 7 behaviour changed so dramatically whilst within 8 Martyn Dick's house? 9 So again, it was extremely reasonable and the 10 rationale was there to seize and search the property as far as I was concerned. 11 12 Q. We talked yesterday about the authority, and I think you 13 talked about consent --14 A. Yes. 15 -- as being a possibility, a warrant as being Q. 16 a possibility --17 Yeah. Α. 18 Q. -- and I think your Inquiry statement talks about having 19 common law power. 20 Α. Yeah. 21 Q. When you made the decision to have the property searched, tell us what your thought processes were about 22 how you would gain the legal authority to search 23 24 Martyn Dick's house? A. So that was with consent. 25

- 1 Q. With consent?
- 2 A. Yes.

9

3 Q. And did you make that clear to Houston?

application for a warrant.

- A. Yeah, so that was discussed at the forensic strategy

 meeting, that there was -- we had no indication from any

 of the householders that there was any conflict with

 consent to search the properties, and if there was that

 we would simply be referred to the Procurator Fiscal for
- Q. When you say that there was nothing to indicate they
 weren't consenting, were you satisfied that the officers
 had obtained consent for a search from Martyn Dick when
- they'd removed him and his partner from the house?
- Yeah. So, I mean, the forensic strategy meeting, as you 14 Α. 15 see the membership there, it is not with the officers who had dealt particularly with Martyn Dick, so the 16 17 information is coming second-hand to Colin Robson, 18 Stuart Houston and thereafter they're feeding into the 19 forensic strategy meeting which I'm chairing. So the 20 information I'm getting is that consent has been agreed for all the properties to search. 21
- Q. So when you say the information you're getting, does
 that mean somebody had said to you, "We've got consent"?
- 24 A. Yes, so there was a discussion --
- Q. Who was that?

- 1 Α. -- around about searching the properties and about the 2 powers around that, and, as I say, the discussion was 3 around the fact that every individual that we had, all 4 the properties that we'd seized, they were all 5 witnesses, there were no suspects, so they were categorised as witnesses, and the information as chair 6 7 of that forensic strategy meeting and as SIO was that 8 they were -- there was no conflict with the fact, that 9 they were quite content for us to search under their 10 consent, it had been explained to them by the individual officers the reason and the rationale why we were there. 11 12 So again, there was nothing coming back to me as SIO 13 causing me any concern round about what we were planning
- 15 Q. Where did you get that information from?
- 16 A. So that came through the forensic strategy meeting, from
 17 Stuart Houston.
- 18 Q. That was from Stuart Houston?

to do.

19 A. Yeah.

14

- Q. Who was the crime scene co-ordinator at the time?
- 21 A. Correct.
- Q. Would you have expected any issues about complaints or concerns to be shared by --
- 24 A. Yeah.
- 25 Q. -- the lower rank officers and come through Houston to

1 you? 2 Yes. Α. 3 So it's not a situation where you would have spoken Q. 4 direct to lower level --5 Α. No. Q. -- lower rank officers or --6 A. And I said yesterday there has been occasions where 7 8 consent has not been granted and we've had to basically 9 re-assess that and go for a warrant in respect of searching the property, at other investigations I've 10 been involved in. 11 12 Q. And if consent had not been sought or obtained from Martyn Dick --13 14 A. Yeah. 15 Q. -- you've explained the process would be to go to the Procurator Fiscal? 16 17 A. Yes. Q. And to seek a warrant? 18 19 Α. Yes. 20 Would that be done by lower rank officers as well? Q. 21 Α. Yes. Q. Would Houston have an involvement in that if a warrant 22 was ultimately to be sought? 23 24 A. He would have oversight of it but it was likely to be 25 the crime scene manager or one of his team who would

25

1 actually phone the Fiscal and basically ask for 2 authority for a warrant. Do you know who the crime scene manager for 3 Q. 4 Martyn Dick's house was? 5 I don't, apologies. Α. That's not in any of the paperwork --6 Q. 7 Α. No. 8 -- we have. What would the grounds of a warrant have Q. 9 been in relation to Martyn Dick? So the grounds would be --10 Α. Q. For searching his house. 11 12 Α. Yeah. So basically the location is extremely relevant and the fact that we had identified -- we were 13 14 investigating an unexplained death at that particular 15 stage, and again with the hypotheses that were still open at that point we really didn't know what we were 16 17 looking at in respect of restraint, drink, drugs overdose, medical condition. 18 19 So again, all of these hypotheses were still very 20 much open, so it was relevant that we searched that 21 property and again there would be that discussion with the Procurator Fiscal who would be on call around: this 22 is what we have at this particular stage. We would 23 24 probably need to put it on paper, I would imagine, to

them, saying: these are the circumstances and this is

1 the relevance of this location, identifying he'd been 2 there, he began to act erratically and out of character 3 whilst he was there. There was indication that there 4 was some aspect of he'd been disrespected whilst within 5 there. So again, we were unsure exactly how relevant it is and what is within there that we would be looking for 6 7 as such. So again, it was just -- there would be that 8 discussion with the Procurator Fiscal round about the 9 relevance of that and ultimately it would be the 10 Procurator Fiscal's decision whether or not that's 11 granted. 12 Q. And we understand that that would be a decision for the Fiscal? 13 14 Yes. Α. 15 It's not something the police can simply go to Q. a sheriff --16 17 No. Α. 18 Q. -- and seek a warrant? 19 Α. No. 20 In relation to the warrant, if it had been sought in Q. 21 relation to Martyn Dick's house, would you have been 22 seeking that for searching the whole entire house or 23 parts of the house? 24 A. It would be the whole entire house. It generally is 25 with any search warrant, it usually is the property plus

1

But that was not done --2 Q. 3 Α. No. Q. -- in relation to Martyn Dick's house? 4 5 Were you satisfied at the forensic strategy meeting that you had the necessary authority to search 6 7 Martyn Dick's house? 8 Yes. Α. 9 And that had been as a result of information you Q. received from Stuart Houston? 10 11 A. Correct. 12 I wonder if we can actually have a look at Q. 13 Stuart Houston's statement. He's given us an Inquiry 14 statement. So it's SBPI 00214, please. You'll see this 15 is a statement in the same sort of idea as the statement you've given us. It was taken by a member of the 16 17 Inquiry team on the dates on the screen, last year, and it's a number of paragraphs, it's been signed by him. 18 Can we look at paragraph 249, first of all. He's 19 20 been asked to tell us about his involvement with 21 the enquiry, and actually if we move up the page slightly, we'll see that the heading of this section is: 22 "Sheku Bayoh's address~..." 23 24 Which is also Collette Bell's address: "... and Martyn Dick and Kirsty MacLeod's address." 25

any outbuildings, that's usually how it's worded.

1 Which we're talking about. Have you had an opportunity to --2 3 Α. Yeah. 4 Q. -- have a look at this? 5 Let's start with 249. I'd like to just very quickly 6 refresh your memory on a number of paragraphs and then 7 I'll ask you some questions if that's okay. 8 Α. Okay. So at 249 you will see that he says: 9 Q. 10 "The legal basis is that they are scenes that may be linked to this death." 11 12 So he's talking about the legal basis for seizing 13 and searching the houses and they're linked to 14 Sheku Bayoh's death: 15 "As far as I was aware there were no warrants at the location." 16 That's confirmed, you've confirmed that today? 17 18 Α. Yeah. 19 "But you'd protect the loci in order to get warrants Q. 20 further down the line." 21 I think that's essentially what you've been telling 22 us? 23 A. Yeah. 24 Q. Then 250 he has said towards the end of that: 25 "I'm not sure if the occupiers were asked to move,

1		that was done before my involvement."
2		So it seems to be suggesting that he wasn't involved
3		at that stage, and he doesn't know if the occupiers were
4		asked to move. But he was made aware that police
5		officers were present at each location.
6	Α.	Yeah.
7	Q.	And then 251:
8		"The fact is, we're not going to get to them on
9		3 May. My thought process was, as long as they're
LO		preserved, I don't need to go there at this time. I'm
L1		making a guess, but I think they were secured by
L2		uniformed police, so you can seize anything that's
L3		relevant to an investigation. To be blunt, because
L 4		they're protected by police, I maybe didn't give those
L5		loci the attention they needed at that time. That's
16		prioritisation in doing the things that need to get
L7		done."
L8		Then 252:
L 9		"I can't speak to what happened before I was there.
20		My interpretation is if you've got something that might
21		be subject to an investigation, you'd tell them and ask
22		them to leave and examine it as a consensual crime
23		scene"
24		That's presumably a crime scene where you have
25		consent?

```
1
         Α.
             (Witness nods).
             "... or take a warrant. That would be from the people
 2
         Q.
 3
             who were there. I know the [redacted] one, something
             happened at that address, the [redacted] one I'm not too
 4
             sure about."
 5
                 253:
 6
 7
                 "There was a suggestion that the knife came from one
 8
             of the addresses. So, again, that would be your
             justification for shutting the scene down and seeing
 9
             what was in there."
10
11
                 254:
12
                 "My understanding is the searches were done long
             after I was done. I've no detail of anybody searching
13
14
             those houses in the time I was involved. I don't know
15
             what was found in the searches."
16
                 255:
17
                 "I've written in the forensic strategy document~...
             that the loci are under protection so it falls within my
18
             remit. But the SIO is in charge of the overall
19
20
             investigation. Ultimately the SIO agrees the forensic
21
             strategy."
22
                 Two to go. 256:
                 "I've been asked where the occupiers of [redacted]
23
24
             were relocated to. There will be something put in
             place, I'm not entirely sure, maybe went to family?
25
```

1 This specifically I don't know. I would expect who was there would make arrangements." 2 3 257: 4 "On some occasions I've taken houses for months. 5 I'd like to think it was the original attending officers. It's been seized and shut down by the time 6 7 I get there. Absolutely if the SIO or someone else is 8 wanting them to take their house there would be 9 a responsibility of who is securing their house. I don't know the answer to that on this occasion." 10 So I think if I can summarise what we've just read, 11 12 if we can go back up to the top of that, to 249 -- and 13 if you want to look at any of these paragraphs again 14 you're very welcome to do so -- there's no warrants, he 15 doesn't make any comment about how consent was sought from homeowners or even that he knows that consent was 16 17 definitely sought. He doesn't know if occupiers were asked to move. He says that was before his involvement. 18 He said they were seized and shut down by the time he 19 20 got there. He's given no detail of anyone searching the 21 houses in the time he was involved. He doesn't know what was found. He's not sure about where occupiers 22 were relocated to, and he expected who was there would 23 24 make arrangements. 25 So from his description in this -- we've not heard

evidence from Houston --1 2 Α. Yeah. -- but we've got his signed statement which constitutes 3 Q. 4 evidence. From this description it looks like these 5 houses, Collette Bell's house and Martyn Dick's house, were seized prior to his involvement, and he wasn't 6 7 aware of any searches being done. 8 Now, having gone through that with me, does any of this cause you concern? 9 10 Α. Not particularly, no. 11 Q. Right. Tell me why? 12 So Stuart Houston became involved round about half past Α. 13 11, 12 o'clock that first morning on 3 May. I'd 14 contacted him about 10 o'clock, back at 10 o'clock to 15 come through to deal with the crime scenes, and he quite 16 rightly points out by that time he came through, about 17 midday or thereabouts, both of those locations had already been secured. And again, I'm more than content 18 19 with that. That is -- as an SIO, one of my priorities 20 was to secure the scenes around that. 21 Again, the aspect of the searches of both those 22 properties not having been concluded while he was still involved in the investigation is accurate. Stuart stood 23 down on 4 May round about midday on the Monday or 24 25 thereabouts, so he was over for one of the morning

1 meetings with myself at Kirkcaldy and thereafter he 2 reverted back to his post within -- within Edinburgh at 3 that point. But by that stage we had a clear framework 4 for deployment at each of the locations, we had crime 5 scene managers, we had specialist resources to basically be deployed around that. 6 7 So regarding the strategy, although Stuart wasn't 8 aware of the initial seizure of the properties, he was 9 very much aware, as the day progressed, how significant 10 they were, and developed the forensic strategy around that as such. 11 12 So I don't have any real concern around that. The 13 discussion at the forensic strategy meeting was round 14 about the aspect of -- we discussed consent and about 15 the aspect of search, and at that point the decision was made that there was no requirement for warrants unless 16 17 there had been any conflict at each of the locations. But there wasn't, as far as I was aware. 18 19 Q. Does it cause you any concern that he doesn't give us 20 a clear description of consent being obtained from 21 Martyn Dick, for example? I don't know if he's actually been asked that. 22 Α. 23 Right. And you can see that he's been asked Q. questions --24 Yeah. 25 Α.

- 1 Q. -- about the authority, he says there was no warrants.
- 2 If he was asked that and wasn't able to give a clear
- 3 explanation that consent was obtained from Martyn Dick,
- 4 would that cause you concern?
- 5 A. I'm actually just assuming what you're asking. I mean,
- its' -- I don't know, I need to -- you'd need to really
- 7 ask Stuart Houston exactly round about the aspect of --
- 8 Q. Of course.
- 9 A. -- what he knows about concern.
- 10 Q. But if we interpret this statement as meaning that he
- does not know whether consent was obtained from the
- homeowner, does that cause you concern, as SIO?
- 13 A. No, because at that meeting there was a general
- 14 discussion around the fact that there was no issues with
- any of the locations that we had secured and that the
- aspect of search was going to be done with consent. We
- 17 didn't require any warrantry at that particular stage.
- 18 At that point if there was any issue with Martyn Dick's
- house, for example, we would have simply have reverted
- 20 to the Procurator Fiscal for a warrant. There wouldn't
- 21 have been any complications with that. As I say, that's
- 22 a normal course of events. I don't have any issue with
- 23 it.
- Q. We've heard evidence from Martyn Dick and I asked him if
- 25 he was asked for permission to allow the police to

- search the house and he said no, that that wasn't done.
- 2 Does that cause you concern?
- 3 A. It -- I mean, it does, and again with the balance of
- 4 that with what the officers who were involved with
- 5 Martyn Dick has fed back through to Colin Robson and
- 6 Stuart Houston, that it was quite clear that they were
- aware that we were going to search the property and the
- 8 relevance of it. So again, I do appreciate that
- 9 position of Martyn, that he doesn't believe that consent
- was given around that, but I can only base this on 2015
- and the information I had.
- 12 Q. The other thing I'd like to ask for your help with is
- why, when officers arrived at Martyn Dick's house, four
- 14 crews were sent. You've heard evidence about this.
- 15 A. Yeah, yeah.
- 16 Q. Can you explain to us why there were four crews of
- 17 officers?
- 18 A. I was unaware, to be honest with you, and that -- that's
- 19 not surprising that I was unaware because this was
- an issue that was getting managed by Stuart and
- 21 Colin Robson and the investigative team around that. So
- 22 the rationale behind that, I can only think that they
- 23 potentially thought that there were other persons within
- 24 that property and they would have to potentially remove
- other persons other than the two householders from it.

1 Q. Why would they think that? I've absolutely no idea, but again, with the limited 2 Α. 3 resources we had at that particular stage I was quite 4 surprised when I heard of the numbers that attended 5 there, but I can only think that there was some aspect, that there may have been other -- that there may have 6 7 been more than the two individuals within the property 8 at that point. But I don't really know because I wasn't involved in it. 9 10 Q. And you think that would have been from Robson or Houston? 11 12 Yeah, yeah. 13 LORD BRACADALE: Detective Chief Superintendent, could 14 I just pick up on something that you said a moment ago 15 in the context of consent in relation to Martyn Dick's house. 16 17 You said that: "Answer: ... the officers who were involved with 18 19 Martyn Dick has fed back through to Colin Robson and 20 Stuart Houston, that it was quite clear that they were 21 aware that we were going to search the property and the relevance of it." 22 23 Now, that doesn't sound to me like a statement of 24 consent. That sounds like they were made aware that the 25 house was going to be searched.

- A. I don't know if it's the language I have used there
 around that. What my understanding, not actually being
 and engaging with Martyn Dick at the time, was that the
 officers had explained the rationale and the reason for
 the necessary -- the necessity to basically search the
- So, as I say, there was no issues that I was aware
 of coming back, that that was refused, that the
 explanation given round about the reason why we had to
 search the property or were going to search the
 property, there was nothing at all coming back from the
 officers that Martyn Dick or his partner had refused or
 had questioned the reason for it.
- 14 LORD BRACADALE: Thank you.

property.

- MS GRAHAME: We've heard evidence from a DC Bellingham, who
 was one of the officers that was there. Are you aware
 of his evidence?
- 18 A. I know that -- I know the officer, yeah.
- Q. He said he wasn't searching the house, he was only there
 to secure the house and it would have been a decision
 for the SIO --
- 22 A. Yeah.

6

- Q. -- whether to search the house, but he wasn't there for searching the house at all.
- 25 A. That's correct.

- 1 Q. Is that correct?
- 2 A. That's correct.
- 3 Q. He didn't give the impression he was aware of the fact
- 4 the house was to be searched or who was doing that?
- 5 A. Mm-hm.
- 6 Q. He wasn't able to help us with any of that.
- 7 A. Right.
- 8 Q. So it appears that at least one of the officers there
- 9 wasn't aware that the house was to be searched or the
- 10 relevance of it.
- 11 A. Yeah, I'm unsure who actually led the attendance at
- Martyn Dick's house, to be honest with you. As I say,
- as SIO I wouldn't know the details of that, but whoever
- 14 attended there with, as you say, the four crews, someone
- would have been leading on that aspect of it, who would
- have explained to the householders why they were there
- and the requirement to thereafter search the house at
- some time and also remove them from it at that stage.
- 19 Q. We heard from Martyn Dick that there were about nine or
- 20 ten officers there --
- 21 A. Yes.
- 22 Q. -- that day, and I think we have a statement from
- 23 Kirsty MacLeod that thought there was about nine
- officers. I think from memory, and I may be incorrect
- on this, he said two of them at least were not uniformed

1 officers. 2 Α. Right. Would that give you any assistance in working out who 3 Q. 4 was leading that? 5 No, I really can't recall. I mean, it's -- as I say, Α. it's -- I was dealing more strategically with the 6 7 overarching investigation rather than going into the 8 details of individual searches. Q. We've also heard evidence from Martyn Dick that at 9 10 a later stage he became aware that the police had found what they described as "herbal matter", you may have 11 12 heard evidence about that, and they said they were going to take it, and he was concerned because he'd never been 13 14 shown a search warrant for the property. And his 15 evidence was: "They must have looked for the herbal matter because 16 17 they found it in a drawer under my bed that wasn't 18 laying out." 19 Were you aware of that evidence? 20 I was aware after --Α. 21 Q. After? 22 -- yeah, that it had been recovered, yeah. But not at Α. the time. 23 Q. So if Martyn Dick is correct in his evidence that 24 25 a search was conducted in his house, and herbal matter

As SIO, yes.

Α.

25

1 was found in a drawer under his bed, which had been 2 opened, it wasn't lying out in plain sight, so it 3 appears that a search was carried out on the property. 4 If he didn't give consent, which is what his evidence 5 is, and you've accepted there was no warrant, can you explain: would there be another basis on which that 6 7 search would be carried out on Martyn Dick's house? Not at that time. It was carried out, as far as I'm 8 Α. 9 aware, with consent. I'm aware of the herbal material 10 being recovered and at that time I believe the search was stopped and the Procurator Fiscal was contacted, as 11 12 we would normally do if we do find something which maybe 13 constitutes an additional offence. 14 So again, the discussion with the officers at the 15 location with the Procurator Fiscal on-call was around the necessity at that particular stage for a warrant 16 under the Misuse of Drugs Act, for example, so again 17 18 that discussion did take place and that is proper protocol and procedure what we would do. 19 Right. If a search is done without consent, without 20 Q. 21 a warrant, who -- in terms of the investigation -- is 22 ultimately responsible for that? That ultimately is me. 23 Α. So you would be ultimately responsible? 24 Q.

1	Q.	In your role as SIO?
2	Α.	Yes.
3	Q.	The other evidence that we heard from Martyn Dick was
4		that an officer was sent upstairs with him, when he got
5		changed, and he was asked to leave his clothes that he'd
6		been wearing the night before and to leave them out,
7		I think he said he had left them on his bed, and the
8		same happened with Kirsty MacLeod. And then they were
9		separated, taken into separate police cars and taken
10		back to Kirkcaldy Police Office. And he said that:
11		"The officer stood outside my room, not inside the
12		room, but it still strikes me as strange, especially in
13		hindsight now."
14		And Kirsty MacLeod has given a statement saying
15		that:
16		"They explained about the clothing, that they might
17		have to rule out my DNA from Shek, as I had earlier told
18		them that I had cuddled Shek when he arrived at the
19		house that morning."
20		And then:
21		"Martyn went upstairs to our bedroom to get
22		changed~"
23		As did she and an officer stood outside the bathroom
24		door on the upstairs landing while she was getting
25		changed.

- 1 Now, can you comment on that? You've said this is
- 2 all with consent.
- 3 A. Yeah.
- 4 Q. They are witnesses.
- 5 A. Yeah.
- Q. They're not suspects. They're in their own home, it's
- 7 a Sunday. Why would officers be following them and
- 8 standing outside a bedroom door or a bathroom door while
- 9 they were getting changed?
- 10 A. I know it may appear strange, as Martyn has indicated
- 11 there, but it's not. It generally is normal protocol
- that we would take on for any unexplained death or any
- investigation whereby we would -- it's about the
- 14 integrity of the scene, about the integrity of clothing
- that they're wearing at the material time. So in
- 16 respect of, did we follow major investigation protocols,
- forensic protocols, around aspects such as this? Yes,
- 18 we did. Was -- does it appear to be potentially over
- 19 the top? It probably does to someone who is not
- familiar with the processes involved in major crime
- 21 investigation. However, it was done with the best of
- intentions in respect of the process and the protocols
- we did follow.
- What you're telling me is very familiar to me, that
- happens, and it still happens today. So again, even

- though they were witnesses we were unsure exactly how
 relevant they were to the investigation, so it's really
 crucial that you do maintain the integrity, forensic
 opportunities around areas such as clothing, and they
 were right within -- and I totally endorse what they did
- Q. Does it cause you any concern that none of the officers were wearing forensic suits?
- 9 A. No. No. Not at that stage, no.

do, to be honest with you.

6

- 10 Q. Why did it matter to your investigation that
 11 Kirsty MacLeod had cuddled Sheku Bayoh when he arrived
 12 the night before?
- That wasn't the aspect of it, it was just we were 13 Α. 14 unsure, we didn't know, at that point of the day in the 15 investigation, exactly how relevant Kirsty or Martyn 16 were to it. And although it does, as I say, it appears 17 that we have almost managed them like suspects, it 18 wasn't meant to basically look like that, it was more to do with the fact -- to maintain the integrity of what we 19 20 were actually doing, to carry out the protocols and 21 processes that the officers are trained in, in respect of ensuring integrity, like seizure of clothing which 22 they would have taken and put into production bags and 23 24 so on and so forth at the location.
- 25 So what, as I say, you have described is normal

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 protocols for what we encounter on a day-to-day basis.

Q. Have you any comment on this explanation that

Kirsty MacLeod says she was given, that the explanation

was:

"... that they might have to rule out my DNA from Shek, as I had earlier told them that I had cuddled Shek when he arrived at the house that morning."

What about this explanation that they'd have to rule out her DNA; what would her DNA have to do with the events at Hayfield Road?

I can't really see any relevance, to be honest with you, Α. with it. But, as I said before, it's difficult retrospectively to go back and attempt to ensure the integrity of a scene or clothing or an individual two or three hours later when you've maybe not done what you had the opportunity to do at that time. So what was done was done with the best of intentions. I think maybe the description of the officers why we had to do it was maybe a bit flawed around the fact that they had to eliminate DNA because she cuddled him earlier on that evening. But as I say, that -- what was described there is normal protocol in respect of anyone through the course of an unexplained/suspicious death investigation that we would basically take on and deal with as such. And once it's eliminated, or once there is absolutely no

- involvement, we would return as soon as possible either
 the location, the clothing or mobile phones or whatever
 else to them.
- So again, it does appear strange to people who are not familiar with investigation of incidents such as this, but that is normal process and normal protocol.
- 7 Q. Was that the normal protocol or process in 2015?
- 8 A. It was, yes.

15

- 9 Q. Now has the position changed?
- 10 A. No, no, I think we -- I mean, from my understanding we
 11 would still do that with individuals involved, about
 12 taking the clothing, seizing their clothing, seizing
 13 their mobile phones and whatever around that, that would
 14 still take place.
 - Q. Just for witnesses like Kirsty MacLeod and Martyn Dick?
- 16 Yeah, as I say, at that time we are keeping an open mind Α. round about the relevance of them at that stage. They 17 are clearly witnesses, however what you do not know is 18 19 at some time later on that day or on subsequent days 20 that you get information or something comes in that 21 there has been a fight in a bedroom between 22 an individual and the deceased that we were unaware of 23 on day one but thereafter we can say: we seized their clothing so let's sit down with a biologist, a forensic 24 team and work out how do we look at transference of DNA 25

- and so on and so forth. So again, as I say, it was done
 with the best of intentions.
- Q. And if, in the days to come, it had proved to be the

 case that there had been a fight in a bedroom and the

 clothing was relevant --
- 6 A. Yeah.
- 7 Q. -- what impact would it have on that evidence that they
 8 had not been recovered using forensic -- forensically --
- 9 A. It's down to integrity. It's down to integrity, it's
 10 down to best evidence. So, as I say, that's the
- 12 Q. What would the impact on the integrity of the evidence
 13 be --
- 14 A. Well --

11

whole --

- Q. -- if the clothes had been recovered without any forensic clothing?
- A. So it's about maintaining integrity to ensure the

 optimum forensic capture during examination, so the

 decanting of the clothing into brown bags, the

 production bags that we have, thereafter they're sealed

 and thereafter we can submit them to the lab or wherever

 we are, submit them for examination at that time.
- Q. Was that done with Martyn Dick and Kirsty MacLeod's clothes?
- 25 A. I wasn't there, but I would imagine with the process

- you're saying that that's what would have been done around that, that is normal process.
 - Q. We heard evidence -- you've mentioned mobile phones, we heard evidence from Martyn Dick that his phone was seized. Again, can you explain why that was done?
 - A. I don't know. I was unaware of that. But again, that would probably have been normal, if he had indicated in his statement that he had had any conversations with the deceased in the lead-up to his death or on him coming round to the property. And I think from Martyn Dick's statement I think he's also contacted by Mr Saeed some time later that morning around the conduct of the deceased. So again the phone becomes relevant to paint that wider picture of contact and the discussions and perhaps text messages indicating what they believe has occurred.

So again, it's part of that evidential chain, it's about seizing while we can seize, while it's there, with the intention that we can return it as soon as possible. I think what I would say in 2015 the aspect of seizing mobile phones was, once we seized it, very little times they actually got it back in some sort of working condition.

Q. We did hear from Martyn Dick that he had never had his phone back.

A. Yeah. That's changed today. It's such an integral part
of your lifestyle, your mobile phone, so we do try to
return them as soon as possible. We have kiosks that we
can download the relevant information very, very quickly
and we return it as soon as practical. However, I take

your point, in 2015 that wasn't the case.

Q. We've also heard from Martyn Dick that he wasn't

permitted to get dog food from the house, and the

officers wouldn't provide him with the dog food for his

dog, and we've also heard that he wasn't permitted to

get his van keys, he needed his van, I think, for work

that night, but they wouldn't permit him to do that.

Can you help us understand what the normal process is, when people are removed from a house --

A. Yeah.

6

13

14

15

- -- with consent, if they've left something in the house 16 Q. or they've forgotten to take something, we've heard 17 evidence about various situations where sometimes the 18 19 officers will go back and get something for people, but 20 sometimes they won't. Now, with Martyn Dick they 21 wouldn't get dog food and they wouldn't get the van keys, and I'm wondering if you can explain the normal 22 23 procedure in 2015?
- A. Yeah, it's hard to describe any kind of normal procedure, it's almost on a case-by-case basis. I mean,

in 2015 we also did our best to accommodate people to get particular witnesses to get property from their house, I'm quite surprised round about the dog food or the car keys at that property because that would have been easy enough to do.

There are, however, more significant scenes when you look at -- and again, I keep going back to homicide where you have perhaps a deceased within a house, where there are perhaps bloodstained footprints and whatever else in that property, there will be occasions whereby because of the forensic opportunities that exist and to maintain the complete integrity of that scene, that we wouldn't permit anyone access to. So I think it's difficult to put in words that there's one rule for everything around that, it really has to be dealt with on a case-by-case basis. But Martyn Dick's house, from what you're telling me, I don't see any great issue with us attending, even if we're in forensic suits, to go in and remove keys and dog food.

Q. We've heard about one process which someone could adopt where if a request is made to get something from the house they can phone a more senior officer to -- effectively the officer can get authority to remove an item from the house. Was that something that was possible?

- 1 A. Yes.
- Q. Was any of this information made known to you?
- 3 A. What, the dog food and the keys?
- 4 Q. Well, any of the information we've been discussing about
- 5 the clothing and the --
- 6 A. No.
- 7 Q. -- keys and the dog food and --
- 8 A. No.
- 9 Q. -- the issues regarding consent and -- none of that?
- 10 A. And at that early stages of day one, I wouldn't have
- 11 expected it to be, I would probably get that at the
- debrief at the end of day one, round about what had
- taken place at each of the locations. So they usually
- 14 briefed me about what had actually taken place as such.
- 15 Q. So did you find out at the end of day one?
- A. So there was a Gold Group at 19.50, I think at
- 17 20.00 hours at the end of day one and I had a better
- 18 understanding -- there wasn't an actual briefing because
- 19 people were still out and about dealing with various
- 20 actions at that stage, but I had got a more thorough
- 21 update from Stuart at that time round about how each of
- the scenes were being progressed.
- Q. So did Stuart Houston, at the end of 3 May, give you
- a briefing that included information about what had
- 25 transpired at Martyn Dick's house?

- A. Not in as much detail as seizing clothing and dog food and keys, no, it was more high level, just round about what had been done.
- 4 Q. What briefing did he give you at the end of the day?
- 5 A. Just a synopsis of each of the five locations and where 6 we were with each of them at that particular stage.
 - Q. Now, you said yesterday about people staying overnight -- staying away overnight, we heard evidence from Martyn Dick that him and his then partner Kirsty did require to stay overnight from their property as well, and although he'd phoned the police four or five times he wasn't allowed back into the house that evening. He missed work that evening as a result.

Can you explain why the house was retained overnight? You've said it a moment ago actually, you try and return houses as soon as possible.

A. Yeah, and I think I've already said as well when you look at the kind of prioritisation of the various loci, Martyn Dick's house was quite far down, so there are limited resources particularly round about SPA Forensic Services and round about examination that we can put in over a period of time. So, as I say, the 16.45 hours forensic strategy meeting, other than Hayfield Road we weren't actually progressing anything until kind of early evening. So again I think, as

- 1 Stuart quite rightly points out in his Inquiry 2 statement, there was no way we were going to complete all the loci on the first day. 3 4 Q. Right. You mentioned going to the Procurator Fiscal for 5 a warrant earlier. We've heard evidence from 6 Dev Kapadia, who was the senior Fiscal on-call on 3 May. 7 Α. Yeah. 8 And this again is in connection with the herbal matter Q. 9 that was found in Martyn Dick's house. 10 Α. Yes. Are you aware of that evidence? 11 Q. 12 Α. Yes. Now, Dev Kapadia did not put -- there was a warrant 13 Q. 14 made -- sorry, an application or a phone call with the 15 Fiscal, with one of the officers, the officer was 16 seeking an application to be made to a sheriff --
- 17 A. Yes.
- 18 Q. -- for a warrant to recover the herbal material.
- Mr Kapadia explained that it was his view -- he refused
 that request, and it was his view that there was a, what
 he described as a tenuous connection between the death
 of Mr Bayoh and the property of Martyn Dick. And he was
 not prepared to put an application for a warrant before
 the sheriff. He described the offence relating to the
 herbal matter as being de minimis. We heard from

1 DC Finch that the quantity of the herbal matter was less 2 than one gram. It was never tested. And Mr Kapadia 3 said: 4 "It was so small, it would not be marked for 5 prosecution." 6 I'm interested in your comments on this situation 7 where this is apparently a search having been conducted with consent, in your understanding. 8 9 Α. Yeah. 10 Q. An application is made to get a warrant or a request was made over the phone to get a warrant from a sheriff. 11 12 That's refused by the Fiscal as de minimis and wouldn't 13 likely be prosecuted. 14 Yeah. Α. 15 Were you made aware of that situation where a request Q. had been made to the Fiscal and had been refused? 16 No, not until a number of days after that. I wasn't 17 Α. aware at the time. 18 19 When did you find out about this? Q. 20 I can't remember, I think it was the 5th I was aware Α. 21 that there had been a phone call to the on-call Fiscal 22 at that particular stage. However, what I would say, that's not unusual for us to do that. That's again 23 proper protocol, whilst we're carrying out a search 24 25 under consent, that we come across what we suspect to be

1 controlled drugs, a firearm, or, I mean, anything else which would appear illegal. 2

> So again, we would normally stop the search at that stage and contact the on-call Procurator Fiscal and give them the place around, are they happy for us to continue at that stage because -- and going back a number of years now, I mean, over the period, I distinctly recall contacting various Fiscals from various locations where we found what -- again, similar to this, what is described as personal amounts of controlled drugs, and at that stage the process was if there was no other evidence and nothing else that had been recovered that would indicate that there was any further controlled substances within the property or anything indicating -concerning supply, for example, they'd basically just ask you to seize it and report it as such but not to -no warrant was required. So I'm not surprised that that was the direction given.

- So you're not surprised at the Fiscal's refusal? Q.
- 20 Α. Yes.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

Q. And given the amount that was being discussed, I don't have the exact wording of Mr Kapadia's evidence in front 22 of me, but -- and it will be a matter for the Chair --23 but if he gave the impression during his evidence that 24 he'd really not come across situations where a request 25

- 1 was made for such small amounts, and he was a very
- 2 experienced -- he was a senior Fiscal with many --
- 3 A. Yeah.
- Q. -- years of experience. Does that, although you're
- 5 saying it's a normal part of the process, does it cause
- 6 you any concern that it was for such a small amount?
- 7 A. No, because we are searching under consent, and
- 8 thereafter if you do come across such as no matter what
- 9 quantity of controlled drugs or suspected controlled
- drugs, the normal process would be to stop the search at
- 11 that particular time and contact the Fiscal. That's, as
- far as I've been involved in drug searches for 25 years,
- that's been the normal course of events.
- Q. Can you help us understand why, if a search is being
- 15 carried out with consent --
- 16 A. Yeah.
- 17 Q. -- why you need to get a warrant?
- 18 A. Because although it has initially been with consent what
- 19 you come across is either a related or a non-related
- 20 aspect of criminality or suspected criminality, so you
- 21 would normally stop the search at that time and make
- 22 that call to the on-call Procurator Fiscal.
- Q. Again, looking at the -- in terms of what's going on or
- 24 what went on in Martyn Dick's house, would you again be
- 25 ultimately responsible --

1 Α. Yeah. -- for any steps taken by the officers? 2 Q. 3 Absolutely. Α. 4 Q. We've also heard, I think ... 5 (Pause). So given your last answer, there was no -- was there 6 7 any connection that you could see between the small amount of herbal matter and the ultimate death of 8 9 Mr Bayoh? 10 Α. No. No, there was no connection --11 Q. 12 A. No. Q. -- at all? 13 So there was no part of the investigation at that 14 15 stage that was looking for herbal matter --16 Α. No. 17 Q. -- in Martyn Dick's house? Can I move on to another property, the property of 18 Zahid Saeed? 19 20 A. Yes. Q. If we go to the forensic strategy document, I think you 21 have this, this property mentioned on page 4 of 7, so 22 this is PS01298 and we'll get this up on screen. Page 4 23 24 of 7, and this is locus 5. 25 A. Yeah.

1 Q. I think there's more detail given in this strategy document on this. 2 3 A. Yes. 4 Q. So we see it's: 5 "Saeed home address and ... motor car~..." 6 It says: 7 "From witness statements it was established that 8 Zahid Saeed had during the course of the evening [on the 9 2nd] and the early hours of [the 3rd], conveyed the 10 deceased within his Seat Toledo motor car ... It was also provided by Zahid Saeed that following 11 12 an altercation with the deceased he had driven himself home and had placed his clothes within a laundry basket 13 14 in the house." 15 Three bullet points: "To examine and forensically recover the clothing 16 17 and any other items within the scene as described by Zahid Saeed. 18 "To record and forensically recovery the Seat Toledo 19 20 motor car~... "To identify and maximise all forensic opportunities 21 at the crime scene." 22 Now, we've heard others say the crime scene is 23 24 effectively the house. A. Yeah. 25

1 Q. Can I look at bullet point 1: "To examine and forensically recover the clothing 2 and any other items within the scene as described by 3 Zahid Saeed." 4 So was this in connection with the statement that 5 you had obtained from Zahid Saeed by this time? 6 7 Α. Yes, that's correct. 8 Q. I'll come back to that in a moment, but you were -- you 9 were aware obviously by this stage, at the point that 10 this document was prepared, that he had placed clothes from that evening in a laundry basket --11 12 Α. Yes. 13 Q. -- in the house, and you were aware, I think, from your 14 earlier evidence, that he'd been in an altercation --15 Α. Yeah. -- with Mr Bayoh. So was that really the main relevance 16 Q. of this property to your investigation? 17 So it goes back to the hypothesis that I described 18 Α. 19 yesterday was: had he been involved in some sort of 20 physical altercation with an unknown male or Zahid, as 21 we are now aware that there was the altercation in the 22 rear garden of the address at Arran Crescent. So again, we are aware of that from the admissions 23 Zahid from his statement, and also with some 24 25 contributions from Collette Bell's statement as well.

- 1 So again what was that altercation? How -- to what
- 2 extent could that have contributed to Mr Bayoh's death?
- 3 So again it's about keeping that open mind, keeping that
- 4 hypothesis running at that stage and looking at what
- 5 relevance Mr Saeed is to the investigation.
- Q. And in terms of the -- looking at securing that house,
- 7 to what extent would you need to secure the house or
- 8 control the house in order to facilitate recovery of
- 9 those items for your investigation?
- 10 A. Yeah, again it was significant, it was crucial we did do
- 11 that, yes.
- 12 Q. Would that require you seizing the whole house or part
- of the house only?
- 14 A. The whole house, yeah.
- Q. And why would it be the whole house that you would need?
- 16 A. I don't think I've ever seized part of a house.
- Q. Oh, is that not commonly done?
- 18 A. No. I mean, if you seize a house, you seize a full
- 19 house.
- Q. So even though the focus seems to be clothes within
- 21 a laundry basket --
- 22 A. Yeah.
- 23 Q. -- you wouldn't simply seize part of the house?
- A. No, as I said before, you know, I mean, it's -- Mr Saeed
- 25 was interesting initially around not just what -- the

1 admissions he makes to ourselves with the statement, but also with the phone call to Collette Bell and he's 2 almost in a state of distress round about, "Don't go 3 4 back to your house", and so on and so forth. 5 So again, how relevant was Mr Saeed to the 6 investigation, had there been something more significant that we were unaware of at that time? So again, at that 7 8 stage we were unaware, so again it was really relevant 9 round about the: was there anything else in that house 10 that we had to recover that was relevant to the 11 investigation as such? 12 Q. When the strategy document was prepared, were you aware 13 that this was Mr Saeed's family home? I wasn't, no. 14 Α. 15 Were you aware that members of his family lived there? Q. 16 No, I wasn't. Α. And this is quite a different description of the 17 Q. 18 strategy in relation to this property --19 Α. Yeah. -- compared to the Martyn Dick one. 20 Q. 21 Α. Yeah. 22 In terms of the plan that you had in your mind about the Q. 23 authority for searching this house, or first of all the authority for seizing the house, what was your view on 24 25 how that would -- what basis would there be?

- 1 A. So the initial seizure was part of an investigation into
- 2 an unexplained death, so it was common law to seize the
- 3 property.
- 4 Q. Right.
- 5 A. And again, the power of search, as with all other
- 6 properties, my understanding was through consent.
- 7 Q. Right, so the actual seizing was common law?
- 8 A. Yeah.
- 9 Q. And I'll ask you in a moment to explain that further.
- 10 A. Yeah.
- 11 Q. But the searching was consent?
- 12 A. Yeah.
- Q. Can you explain from whom you would have sought consent?
- 14 A. So it would be naturally the householder, but, as I say,
- I wasn't involved in the intricacies of the engagement
- with the family at that address.
- Q. You mentioned a common law power, we've heard your
- 18 explanation of consent and warrants, can you explain to
- 19 us what you mean when you talk about a common law power
- to seize a property?
- 21 A. Yeah, I mean, just the general understanding that police
- 22 investigating any serious crime or any crime in general,
- there are common law powers for to seize -- not to
- 24 search -- anything that you deem to be relevant to that
- 25 investigation.

1 Now, that common law power has been developed through stated cases and through other legislative 2 3 processes. So again, any investigation that we're 4 involved in, it's very difficult to seize a property 5 under a warrant when you know and you appreciate the relevance to it, so again we would simply -- I think as 6 7 Stuart has indicated in his statement as well, any 8 investigation of a serious crime or an incident or 9 an unexplained death, we would simply secure it at that 10 time and thereafter go for consent or warrants to 11 actually search the property. 12 Q. So the first stage in your plan in relation to this 13 property would be using common law powers --14 Yeah. Α. 15 -- in 2015? And then when did you make the decision Q. 16 that this property should be searched? Because 17 obviously you said in this strategy document that you're looking for clothing in a laundry basket, so can you 18 explain when you made the decision in relation to this 19 20 property that there was to be a search? 21 Α. So that was at the forensic strategy meeting. 22 Why was it not done at the point that you've prepared Q. the document, because you do seem in this document to be 23

identifying things you're looking for?

Yeah. So the document was produced by Stuart Houston

24

25

Α.

58

1 and endorsed and signed off by myself. However, we 2 hadn't actually ran it by PIRC at that stage. So the 3 point of the forensic strategy briefing was to have 4 Keith Harrower and the PIRC representatives round the 5 table, and I chaired the meeting explaining the various locations and to ultimately get the sign-off of 6 7 Keith Harrower as SIO ultimately of that strategy moving 8 forward. Q. Do we see that Keith Harrower is named as present or at 9 10 that forensic strategy meeting? Yeah, I believe he is, yes. 11 Α. 12 Q. And that is in the agenda on page 6 of 7. Then is there 13 any -- when you see the overview on page 6 --14 Yeah. Α. 15 -- do we see paragraph 3 of that overview --Q. 16 Α. Yeah. Q. -- it says: 17 "It was agreed with the PIRC investigation team that 18 19 the priority scenes would be locus 1 and 2. It was also 20 agreed~..." 21 That's not the home of the family of Zahid Saeed: "... that in relation to locus 5 [which was the 22 family home] once the clothing of Zahid and the vehicle 23 24 had been secured this would be returned to the Saeed family~..." 25

1 A. Yeah.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

- Q. Can you give us a little more information about the discussion about Zahid Saeed?
- A. Yeah, I think it was really just to, it was ultimately
 to try to do this as quickly as we possibly could do.

 I mean, I appreciate with any -- the removal of any
 family from a family home is traumatic, it's difficult,

 it's challenging. I'm now aware of the more extended
 family, with the Saeed family and some of the issues

with the members of the family in respect to health.

So I wasn't aware of that at the time, to be honest with you. So I am aware now, but I can see round about the fact that it is obviously extremely traumatic, that they believe they're under suspicion, I would imagine, but that there was, as I'd indicated, a requirement to do that, to carry out the search for it. So it was something we had to do and we wanted to do quickly and return the property as soon as possible to the Saeed family and we did do that I think on the first day on 3 May.

- Q. Now, it seems to be agreed in that paragraph that loci 1 and 2 are the priority scenes?
- 23 A. Yeah.
- Q. We know from your earlier evidence that the Saeed family home, locus 5, is lower down in terms of priority.

1 Α. Yeah. So was there any part of the discussion about the 2 Q. 3 timescale when this home could be returned to the 4 family? 5 No, there was no discussion round about timescales, it 6 was just as soon as possible to get all the scenes back 7 to the relevant families. But again, I think there was 8 an appreciation by ourselves and PIRC that it was going to be extremely difficult to do that during 3 May. 9 10 Q. So that was something that you were conscious of --11 Α. Yes. 12 Q. -- at the forensic strategy meeting? 13 Yeah. Α. Q. And where it says: 14 "It was ... agreed~..." 15 So this is agreed with the PIRC team: 16 17 "... that in relation to locus 5 once the clothing of Zahid and the vehicle had been secured this would be 18 returned to the Saeed family~..." 19 20 It would suggest that, first of all, you seemed to 21 know about the Saeed family by the time of this meeting? 22 Α. Yeah. 23 And that they would be -- would have to be removed from Q. that property. And it also seems to very much focus on 24 25 getting the clothing. We've seen in the previous

Α.

25

Yes.

Q. -- for a search?

1 page --2 Α. Yeah. 3 -- he'd put clothing in a laundry basket. Q. 4 Α. Yeah. 5 There doesn't seem to be anything there suggesting that Q. it was a wider consideration of the property, it seems 6 7 to be focusing on the clothing. 8 Yeah, no, I mean, the focus would be on the clothing, Α. 9 that's obviously why we were going into the property, 10 but, as I say, we don't generally seize kitchens and bathrooms or living room areas, we'll seize the full 11 12 property and thereafter carry out -- I mean, I would 13 imagine -- I wasn't there but the seizure of the 14 clothing for the laundry basket would be done and 15 thereafter I would imagine a custody search would have 16 been carried out elsewhere in the property, but other 17 than that we were looking to return it as soon as 18 possible to the family. 19 Can you explain why you didn't seek a warrant in advance Q. 20 to search the property? 21 Α. Because it was through consent. 22 When you were at this meeting, were you under the Q. 23 impression that consent had been obtained --24

62

- 1 A. Yes.
- Q. Who told you that?
- 3 A. It was a general discussion between myself and Stuart
- 4 and other members of the forum that were there and there
- 5 was no issues identified to me on any of the locations
- for any warrantry and consent had
- 7 been granted in respect of all the properties.
- 8 Q. If consent had not been obtained --
- 9 A. Yeah.
- 10 Q. -- what would you expect to have been done?
- 11 A. So again we would have referred to the Procurator Fiscal
- 12 and considered a warrant at that particular time.
- Q. And would you have expected Houston to draw that to your
- 14 attention?
- 15 A. Yeah.
- Q. And the grounds for the warrant, can you explain what
- they would have been?
- 18 A. Yeah, I mean, the circumstances, the investigation of
- 19 an unexplained death, the circumstances of that, the
- 20 relevance of Mr Saeed to almost the last contact with
- 21 the deceased prior to the event on Hayfield Road, and
- 22 his actions in the aftermath through the phone call to
- 23 Collette Bell. And again, just by his own admissions
- 24 around the fact he'd been involved in
- an altercation/fight with the deceased a short time

1 prior to his death.

So again, just with the circumstances around that,
we would have explained -- needed to explain to the
Procurator Fiscal round about: he is a witness at this
particular stage, but we are looking at -- we don't know
very much more just now, but he's changed his clothing
when he's went into the house. Again, why has he
changed his clothing when he went into the house? So
again, that whole hypothesis around exactly what has
occurred in the lead-up to the coming together at
Hayfield Road.

- Q. And in terms of if you had been making an application for a warrant and giving that explanation to the Fiscal, what would you have expected or anticipated the warrant would permit you to do?
- A. Search for relevant property or items linked to the investigation. I mean, I don't ... I'm not trying to second-guess what the application would cover, sometimes the warrants we get are pretty wide-ranging in respect of incidents such as this, so they give a bit of scope in respect of what we can search and seize as such. So again, not having to do that, it's difficult to actually put in words exactly what would be on it. But we would be looking obviously -- the primary aspect would be the clothing from the laundry basket.

- 1 Q. Would you have anticipated the warrant being limited to
- 2 the laundry basket in the bathroom of that property or
- 3 would you have expected it to be for the whole house?
- 4 A. I would expect for the whole house. As I say, I'm not
- 5 aware of ever coming across a warrant for a particular
- 6 part of a house.
- 7 Q. You've mentioned earlier -- we see that you've mentioned
- 8 the family there, and you've mentioned earlier that you
- 9 weren't aware --
- 10 A. No.
- 11 Q. -- about particular circumstances. I'd like to ask you
- for your comments on that. In relation to evidence that
- we've heard from Mrs Rashid, we've heard that she was
- 14 staying at that address at the time on 3 May, that she'd
- recently had a caesarean section and had had a baby,
- I think she said it was eight weeks old, the baby had
- 17 also had surgery at the time, she was breastfeeding.
- 18 Was any of that information --
- 19 A. No.
- 20 Q. -- brought to your attention?
- 21 A. None at all, nothing like that, no.
- 22 Q. Who would you have expected to bring that to your
- 23 attention?
- 24 A. Either through the kind of line management of the
- 25 officers that were at the location dealing with it, so

1 the crime scene manager who was there, and probably through to Colin Robson and thereafter to Stuart, or 2 3 directly from Colin to myself, I would have expected to 4 have had that sort of information. But again, I didn't. 5 Had you known about that, would you have done anything Q. 6 differently? 7 Α. I mean, I would generally have tried to facilitate as 8 best we can, moving the family to a further location, 9 even if it's a hotel just short term, and the priority 10 obviously being -- and just from what's on the strategy document it looks as if there has been -- I can't recall 11 12 everything that was discussed but it looks as if there 13 has been some sort of discussion round about almost re-prioritising locus 5 to facilitate that. 14 15 Q. I think it's --I don't know if it's redacted out there. 16 Α. I was going to say, it may assist actually if we can 17 Q. 18 have a look at the unredacted version of that, I have 19 seen it, it won't be on the screen but it may be if 20 I can get a copy I can come back to you in a moment on 21 this --22 I think it's maybe something --Α. -- before I ask you questions about this. 23 Q.

That might~...

LORD BRACADALE: We will take a 20-minute break.

24

25

66

(11.30 am)1 2 (A short break) 3 (11.56 am)4 LORD BRACADALE: Ms Grahame. 5 MS GRAHAME: Thank you. Now, we were talking about the minutes of the 6 7 forensic strategy meeting and we've now provided you with a hard copy. Just to explain --8 9 A. Yeah. 10 Q. -- this document was redacted some time ago, and the 11 information in the last two lines of the paragraph we 12 were looking at was redacted for data protection issues 13 at the time. 14 A. Yes. 15 Q. Since that was done, we have heard evidence from 16 Mrs Rashid and Mr Ahmed about the house. You're 17 probably aware of that? 18 A. Yes. Q. We don't today have a copy of the unredacted version to 19 20 put on display? Yes. 21 Α. But I'll read out the full text of this, so we can go 22 Q. through and discuss. 23 24 Α. Okay. 25 Q. We've already seen the first sentence and it says:

1 "It was also agreed that in relation to locus 5 once the clothing of Zahid and the vehicle had been secured 2 3 this would be returned to the Saeed family due to the 4 requirement of a relative with a disability requiring to returned to the address." 5 So there's mention there of a relative who had 6 a disability, and you've mentioned before the break that 7 that was something you --8 Yeah. 9 Α. 10 Q. -- subsequently became aware of. Can you remind me, when did you say you became aware of the issue? 11 12 Obviously prior to this meeting. 13 Yeah. Α. Do you remember? 14 Q. 15 I can't generally remember discussing that in very much Α. detail, but it does -- it's coming back to me around the 16 17 fact that we did look at prioritising that scene as well because of the very nature of it. And it was 18 redacted -- I thought that's why it was redacted because 19 20 there was reference to a disabled family member. 21 Q. So locus 5 initially was low down on the --22 Α. Yeah. 23 -- order of priorities in terms of the actual strategy Q. 24 document? A. Yeah, yeah. 25

- 1 Q. We looked at that a moment ago before the break.
- 2 A. Yeah.
- 3 Q. But at this meeting it then became -- you had become
- 4 aware of the disabled family member, and the need to
- 5 have it returned, the house returned to the family?
- 6 A. Yeah.
- 7 Q. So although you don't remember today the extent of the
- 8 discussion --
- 9 A. Yeah.
- 10 Q. -- that was information that you had become aware of?
- 11 A. It was, and it's been important enough that we've noted
- it down in the minutes as well.
- Q. So just going through some of -- some other evidence
- that we've heard, can I ask you: were you aware -- and
- 15 this isn't noted in the minutes -- that -- we were
- 16 talking about Mrs Rashid's evidence, who is -- she is,
- 17 we heard, Zahid Saeed's sister. Sorry, Zahid Saeed is
- her brother, she is the sister of Zahid. We've heard
- 19 that she was breastfeeding. She's also talked about her
- 20 brother, who was disabled. She gave evidence that he
- 21 had suffered a brain injury when he was in the armed
- forces, that he was paraplegic, in a wheelchair, she
- 23 talked about him having a special bed that had been
- 24 supplied, and that he needed effectively special aids
- and equipment. He has carers three times a day coming

1 into the property, and his father helps to care for him. And he didn't really leave the home, his father, 2 3 Mr Ahmed, had given evidence that he had left the home 4 previously maybe sometimes to go in the garden and 5 sometimes to go to medical appointments. And there was evidence from both of those witnesses about his 6 7 difficulty coping generally. 8 You've mentioned the note in the minutes of the disability. Do you remember hearing about the -- the 9 10 evidence that we've heard about the special needs of the brother? 11 12 Α. No. No, it was very succinct, there was no detail at 13 all that I can recall around what you're telling me just 14 now. 15 Q. Would you have expected that type of detail to be provided to you? 16 A. Yes, if they had it at the time. I don't know if they 17 18 had it at that time or through the subsequent statements 19 from the family members. 20 You mean the officers maybe didn't have all that detail? Q. 21 Α. Yeah, yeah. 22 Would you have expected the officers, on being advised Q. 23 that the brother was disabled, to have sought more 24 detail? Yeah, but I don't actually know what they did actually 25

25

1 obtain. They've obviously obtained enough that it's come through to the strategy meeting for the forensic 2 3 side, so it's -- obviously they've been aware of the 4 requirement for a bit of urgency around this, to ensure 5 that they can return to some sort of normality as soon as possible. So I don't know exactly what information 6 7 the officers had at the time but I think what they have 8 done is they've managed to progress it through the line 9 management to this group meeting to highlight the 10 urgency around it as such. You're using the word "urgency"? 11 Q. 12 Α. Yeah. What would you have expected in terms of the timeframe 13 Q. 14 for steps to be taken? 15 As I say, the five different loci, certainly -- I mean, Α. we still had Hayfield Road, we had the deceased and 16 thereafter it would have been the house of Mr Saeed. 17 Would that then become the third --18 Q. 19 Yeah, yeah, yeah. Α. 20 -- most important priority? Q. 21 And in terms of timescale, what would you have wanted for returning that property to the family? 22 It's really difficult, I mean, we would try to get them 23 back within that kind of 24-hour window, I mean, if not 24

before that, to be honest. But it is really around the

1 resources to carry out any examination, to photograph the locus, to seize whatever we're going to seize, and 2 3 to ensure that we've done it as thorough and 4 professional as possible. 5 So there is a whole process that needs to kick in, in respect of the search of any property which 6 7 unfortunately does take a bit of time. It's not 8 quite -- I think Stuart Houston mentioned in his 9 statement sometimes we seize house for months on end for 10 some investigations. But again, to return it within that 24-hour window I would say would be reasonable, but 11 12 it may not look reasonable to the family, I appreciate 13 that. And knowing that the brother was disabled and needed to 14 Q. 15 return to the address, if you'd known more about that, 16 would you have been able to move things more quickly in relation to the house? 17 18 A. Yeah, I think if I had the information that you're now 19 detailing, I think it's just common sense that we would 20 have moved to a fast-track process for this and tried to 21 move resources around to facilitate it. But, as I say, I wasn't aware of that information at the time. 22 Q. You mentioned in your evidence earlier that you had 23 perhaps considered alternative accommodation for the 24 family. 25

- 1 A. Yeah.
- 2 Q. Can you tell us about that?
- 3 A. It was, again it was discussed around all the properties
- 4 that we were more than happy to put people into hotel
- 5 accommodation, as we generally do for any investigation
- 6 where we take people out for a period of time, so it was
- 7 round about the options locally, what hotels were
- 8 available, and if we had to put people in, so again it
- 9 was part of that general discussion round about taking
- 10 people from their home addresses.
- 11 Q. When was that discussion?
- 12 A. It was at the forensic strategy meeting.
- Q. At the 4.45 meeting that we see here?
- 14 A. Yeah, yeah.
- 15 Q. Is there something in the minutes that --
- A. No, I don't think it is, but generally the way we would
- work is if we were taking people out of their property
- for a particular period of time at the request of
- 19 Police Scotland we would first of all ensure that they
- 20 had somewhere to go. So this is officers actually
- 21 taking them from the property: one, they had somewhere
- 22 to go. If they didn't have somewhere to go we would
- 23 thereafter say to them, "Look, we can put you up in
- 24 hotel accommodation, how does that suit you just now to
- 25 basically take that? Of course you can take your

1 property with you and whatever you need".

So again, that would be first of all done with the discussion with the officers who are at the loci and thereafter it was discussed more generally at the forensic strategy meeting round about the use of potential hotel accommodation if we were going to basically take the property for a period of time — a significant period of time.

- Q. We've heard evidence from Mr Ahmed that his son had never stayed in a hotel, he actually needed -- we heard about his special bed and we heard about the equipment. What arrangements would you have expected to be made by the police in relation to handling the situation with the brother?
- A. Yeah, I mean, it's ... I'm looking at it with hindsight now, because I wasn't aware of that information you're giving me at the time. And again, we would have looked at various options, speaking to even medical practitioners round about what was the best way to facilitate the movement of this individual from the house over a short period of time, is it -- is there a bed elsewhere in that particular area that we can utilise within such as a hotel ward -- a hospital ward or whatever else, or is there a potential we can move the bed from the property short term to a hotel room as

- 1 such. So again, the options would be open for that.
- 2 But, as I say, it's based on what information we have at
- 3 that material time around it.
- Q. Would you have expected those arrangements to have been
- 5 made for the brother prior to him being removed from the
- 6 property?
- 7 A. It would really be dependent on what information we had
- 8 at the time. As I say, I'm speaking to you with
- 9 hindsight just now round about with that information and
- 10 with the fact that we were taking the property, I would
- 11 have expected that we would facilitate as best we could
- 12 his home living conditions with elsewhere in, whether
- it's a hotel or wherever, that we would try to mirror
- 14 exactly what he had at home.
- But, as I say, I'm saying that with best practice,
- 16 with hindsight, I'm not sure if they had that abundance
- of information that you have at this particular time
- 18 through the detailed statements of the family members.
- 19 Q. What bearing would it have on your decision-making
- 20 process, the fact that really you were looking for
- 21 clothing in a laundry basket in a bathroom? Would that
- 22 have any impact on the arrangements you could have made
- for the brother?
- A. Not particularly, no. I mean, we -- there is a process
- 25 we go through, I know it appears very sterile and very

25

search?

1 cold, perhaps, to people that are not familiar with it, but it is about maintaining the integrity of any scene 2 3 that we would basically bring people from it and, as 4 I say, I know it maybe does look unfamiliar and cold to 5 people that are not familiar with the processes that are involved. 6 7 Can I ask you about -- you spoke before the break about Q. 8 you understood that consent had been sought from the 9 householder. 10 Α. Yeah. And that would be the normal approach in a situation 11 Q. 12 like this. We've heard that Zahid Saeed's mother, she's 13 an older lady, and that she lived at the address, she 14 was in the house at the time the police arrived but she 15 didn't speak English, and my understanding of Mrs Rashid's evidence, the sister, was that she was 16 17 doing the speaking --18 Α. Okay. 19 -- initially. Q. 20 Can you tell us what the normal procedure would be if officers come to a house, the intention is to seek 21 22 consent to seize and search or to search the property, if the homeowner does not actually speak English, how do 23 they go about ensuring that they can get that consent to 24

- 1 Α. Yeah, so, I mean, there's probably two ways for that. It can be facilitated through a family member, that we 2 3 would explain what we were trying to do, and thereafter 4 relay via the family member to the householder exactly 5 what we were intending to do at that particular stage. The second option is we have a cadre of on-call 6 7 interpreters across the country, so through the 8 interpreting services we would ask for an interpreter to 9 attend at the location with the police, and thereafter 10 be involved in the dialogue with the individual concerned. 11 12 Q. So you would, first of all, facilitate it through 13 a family member? As I say, there are options. 14 Α. 15 Q. That's an option? 16 One or the other. Α. How would officers satisfy themselves that it could be 17 Q. 18 facilitated effectively through the family member? 19 Yeah, that would simply be through dialogue with the Α. 20 family member, saying, "Look, this is why we're here and 21 this is the reason why we have to remove you from the 22 property. We're going to carry out a search, we'll get 23 the property back to you as soon as possible, but this
 - Q. So there'd be an explanation of why they were being

is the reason why".

24

25

- 1 removed from the property?
- 2 A. Yes.
- Q. And an explanation, I think the words you used, to explain exactly what you intend to do, would that be
- 5 an explanation of what the police intended to do?
- 6 A. Yes.
- Q. So in a situation such as this, can you briefly explain
 to the Chair what you would have expected officers, what
 information you would have expected officers to be
 sharing with the family?
- Yeah, I think really just the rationale, the background 11 Α. 12 to the investigation, the relevance of their family 13 member, Mr Saeed, to the investigation, and the aspect 14 of recent contact with Mr Saeed and the fact that we 15 were looking at various options in the investigation at 16 that particular time. But also to emphasise that 17 Mr Saeed was a witness and that we were basically 18 looking for their consent to search the property and 19 recover in particular the clothing he had on at the 20 material time. So it would be something along the lines 21 of that.
- Q. We talked yesterday about evidence we've heard about notes being taken in notebooks about consent and signatures?
- 25 A. Yeah.

homeowner, her mother?

- Q. Would you have expected a record to have been kept
 somewhere of the involvement of the family member, in
 this case Mrs Rashid, in obtaining the consent from the
- 5 A. Yeah, I mean, in general that would be incorporated into 6 the officers' statements at the --
- 7 Q. Right.

4

25

A. -- that aspect of the dialogue and the consent being
given. In 2015, and I think we've touched on this, this
aspect of best practice about notebook notations, about
the right to refuse, and by all means that is best
practice and that is what takes place nowadays around
anything we do around search of properties under
consent.

15 It wasn't as familiar with that process back in 2015. It was -- a number of officers did do it, 16 17 a number of officers didn't do it as such. But it is 18 more common practice now that that would simply 19 incorporate part of either the statement taking or 20 also -- and/or something in a notebook which would 21 thereafter be signed as such. So that's the normal 22 process nowadays around it. Eight years ago it probably wasn't as -- a lot of the officers weren't as familiar 23 with that process as they are now. 24

Q. So the procedure itself you would have expected to be

1 followed but not necessarily a note of that within the 2 statements or the notebook; is that what you're saying? Sorry, could you repeat that? 3 Α. 4 So you would have expected officers to go through the Q. 5 process of seeking consent --6 Yes. Α. 7 Q. -- and providing the information you've given us, but maybe not necessarily noting that in a notebook --8 Yeah. 9 Α. 10 Q. -- and getting the signature --11 Α. Yes. 12 Q. -- of the homeowner or the family member or both? 13 Α. Yeah, yeah. Then you've talked about the possibility of getting 14 Q. 15 an interpreter to attend. Presumably if this is part of the process of seeking consent, would that be done 16 before the family are invited to leave or would it be 17 done after but before the search? 18 19 Ideally with -- whilst the family are still together Α. 20 within the house, we would look to get an interpreter to 21 attend and explain exactly what we were planning to do. 22 So again the issue or potential issue with that would be

round about timescales, how quickly we could get

be facilitated such as at one of the local police

an interpreter to the house and ... or was it better to

23

24

25

- offices or at a hotel or a separate area that we could explain exactly what the intention was.

 So my experience of interpreting services are
- sometimes we get them very, very quickly, sometimes
 there is a bit of a delay, they're coming from various
 parts of the country, so I think it would be due to
 timescale what we would do.
- Q. We heard evidence from one officer that they can use
 their radios to have access very quickly to interpreter
 services, so that they have someone effectively on the
 radio --
- 12 A. Yes.
- Q. -- who can assist?
- 14 A. That's now.
- 15 Q. Was that available in 2015?
- A. Not that I'm aware of at all.
- 17 Q. No?
- 18 A. No.
- Q. So again, in terms of your awareness, I think you said
 before the break as far as you were concerned there was
 consent from the homeowner to carry out a search?
- 22 A. Yes.
- Q. I wonder if I can ask you about some other evidence we heard about a suggestion that was made by Mrs Rashid -
 she has given evidence about this -- that she suggested

1 that the family could stay in one room while they searched, while the officers searched the house, carried 2 3 out the search of the remainder of the house, because 4 she was worried about the safety of her brother and 5 where he would go. Then we also heard from Mr Ahmed, who arrived at 6 7 a slightly later stage. He suggested that they could, 8 the family could stay in the sitting room and have 9 access to the kitchen and a toilet next to the sitting 10 room, and offered that the police could do anything they want to the rest of the house, and he was told, "No, we 11 12 have to seal it and you have to go". 13 I wondered if you had any views about that 14 suggestion? 15 Α. Yeah. Bearing in mind the situation with the brother? 16 Q. Yeah. It's a completely reasonable suggestion. There's 17 Α. absolutely no doubt around that. However, I go back to 18 my SIO role and about scene integrity and about best 19 20 evidence and about accountability, exactly what you're 21 recovering from that property. So again, the actions of the officers I deem to be 22 appropriate. We were unaware at that stage the 23 24 relevance of Mr Saeed because of the altercation. As 25 I say, the hypothesis: was the deceased assaulted prior

to coming to Hayfield Road and that was a consequence which led to his death? So again, was Mr Saeed involved in that altercation? We knew by his own admission he was, but how significant was that coming together with both of those that may have led to an injury which was thereafter deemed to be fatal.

So the actions of the officers at the scene, I think they're appropriate, the matter raised by the householders are -- is extremely competent as well, you know what I mean, but I think that -- well, I know from one perspective that it's -- as I say, it does appear very sterile and cold and that we're not taking into consideration the wishes of householders and other individuals, particularly when there is a disability or whether reasonable adjustments have to be made in respect to that, but it is ... it's a difficult decision you have to make, but at the end of the day it comes down to the integrity of the scene, the transparency, the accountability, how you can justify your actions around that.

If we put them all into the one room and we go to the basket, for example, and the clothing is not there anymore but they've moved it to the room that they're all in. So again, I know that never happened and they were extremely compliant with us around things but it's

of us to do around this".

- a judgement call, it's a difficult one sometimes to make
 around that, but it's done with the best of intentions
 for the integrity of the investigation that you have
 that accountability and the integrity that you can stand
 up and say, "Look, we've done everything that was asked
- Q. We certainly have -- we have looked at this earlier, we have a statement from Stuart Houston that says you wouldn't need the whole house to be secured, that you can focus on what is relevant.
- 11 A. Yeah.

6

- Q. And at that time, in relation to the house, can you tell us what was relevant at that time?
- Well, from my perspective the whole house was relevant 14 Α. 15 and that's why we'd asked the family to get out, we were 16 unsure exactly how relevant it was, as I've described, 17 round about the coming together of the deceased and 18 Mr Saeed, so with hindsight it's easy enough to say, "We should have done it this way", but at that time, on the 19 20 basis of the information we had, I believe the correct 21 decision was made. I know it sounds cold and hard and 22 that the police are making this decision without any consideration, but that's not the case. There is 23 a wider aspect to the investigation. Obviously the 24 welfare and the wellbeing of the householders is 25

1 significant, but so is the integrity of the investigation in finding out exactly what had occurred 2 on that morning and why Mr Bayoh is -- was deceased. 3 4 Q. Can I ask you, if you had known on 3 May what I've 5 shared with you from evidence we've heard, if you'd known that, would you have taken a different view on 6 7 3 May as to whether you needed the whole house or part 8 of the house? A. I think with the extensive information you have given me 9 10 now, I think we probably could have controlled it a bit better with putting the family into one part of the 11 12 house, maybe under some sort of controlled measure with 13 a police officer maybe present with them, for example, 14 and carried out the search of the remaining part of the 15 house, that may have been an option at that time. But, as I say, there's a significant amount of 16 17 information you've gave me round about that family unit which I don't think -- I certainly wasn't party to on 18 3 May, and I daresay I don't think my officers involved 19 20 in it may have been fully aware of the circumstances 21 that the family were facing. 22 Are you satisfied, from what you knew, that the officers Q. who were there on the day were obtaining -- asking 23 enough questions effectively, about the nature of the 24 brother's disability? 25

1 Α. As any senior investigating officer would tell you, you 2 have to trust your officers, you delegate 3 responsibility, they're trained in respect of what 4 they've been asked to do. It's not my role to basically 5 almost chase them up and ask them if they've done it. You know, there is that whole trust aspect that you're 6 7 dealing with a fast-moving investigation, so my 8 expectation is that they are professionally trained 9 police officers, detective officers, and I would have 10 expected them to look at that as any trained detective would. 11 12 Q. Can I ask you about some other evidence we heard from 13 Mrs Rashid. She describes a significant number of officers arriving at the house, and again was that part 14 15 of your responsibility dictating how many officers went 16 to --17 No. Α. 18 Q. -- the ... You're obviously aware of the evidence that we've 19 20 heard now. Given you were keeping an open mind but in 21 relation to this house there was an issue about the clothing --22 23 A. Yeah. Q. -- what would you have expected in terms of the number 24 25 of officers to be sent to that property?

- 1 A. So the number of officers -- I'm unaware how many went 2 to that property and I was unaware at the time. The
- 3 number of officers we'd put to a property is really
- 4 based on how many officers were required to control the
- 5 property. That's the kind of basic measures that we
- 6 would put in place around it, the rationale behind it.
- 7 I'm unaware what considerations were made by the
- 8 officers attending, through liaison either with Stuart
- 9 or Colin Robson and why -- sorry, did you say six
- officers were deployed?
- 11 Q. We haven't heard evidence yet from the actual officers.
- 12 A. Right.
- Q. We intend to seek further evidence --
- 14 A. Okay.
- 15 Q. -- from the officers who were present. So I wouldn't
- like to say a particular number.
- 17 A. Yeah, so I don't know how many attended that day, and
- that's, as I say, it's based on information that the
- 19 officers may have prior to attending round about how
- 20 many persons are within the house, how many officers it
- 21 will take to control the property. So again, that's
- a normal consideration by officers attending a property.
- 23 Q. When you were approving the forensic strategy document,
- 24 did you have any thoughts in your mind about the number
- of officers that would need to go to the house?

- 1 A. No.
- 2 Q. Did you have any concerns at that time about securing
- 3 the house, or gaining control of the house?
- 4 A. At that time we had control of the house.
- 5 Q. When you were preparing the forensic strategy document?
- A. Yeah, we had control of the house.
- 7 Q. Did you have any part in the decision about sending the
- 8 officers to the house?
- 9 A. No.
- 10 Q. We've heard evidence from Mrs Rashid about the way the
- officers came into the house, and she talked about being
- 12 intimidated, that they were -- presented as quite
- forceful, and she asked for a warrant and they did not
- 14 have one, and her evidence was that she did not receive
- an explanation.
- Now, I appreciate we've not heard from the
- individual officers, but is that the sort of approach
- 18 you would expect in the circumstances of this locus?
- 19 A. No, but again it's down to personal perception of the
- 20 individuals. Six police officers coming into your
- 21 house, there is that subliminal perception of en masse
- 22 almost, I could see why she's saying aggression almost
- 23 around that, but -- and I think it would be the same for
- 24 the majority of people, if six police officers came into
- your house, you would be a bit worried.

1 But, and again it's down to communication skills of 2 the officers involved to ensure that they put forward 3 the fact that there is no -- there's no suspicion on the 4 family at all around this but this is why we have to do 5 it, and it really comes down to interpersonal skills of the officers dealing with the householders. And again, 6 they're trained, officers are trained in interpersonal 7 8 skills, how to engage, body language and so on, so as 9 I say it is really up to the individual officers about 10 their interpersonal skills to ensure they put the householder at ease, they explain anything, any 11 12 questions that's been asked, and that's very, very 13 clear, I mean, to them. 14 As I say, but I can understand the initial 15 perception if a number of police officers come to the 16 house. I think you had answered this question in a sense when 17 Q. 18 we spoke about Martyn Dick's house, but we also heard from Mrs Rashid that she's a Muslim and she was 19 20 particularly concerned that a male officer stood outside 21 her room while she was changing, and that she had had to 22 make a special request that he stand outside. Does that 23 cause you any concern? Yeah, I mean, obviously, I mean, with hindsight, I mean, 24 Α. there could've been further research done on to the 25

family unit itself round about the fact that they were

Muslims, could we have taken some advice from our

diversity colleagues or a lay adviser as such, could we

have ...

Again it's really, it's difficult, I can see that point, as I've detailed there. However, we are responding to a live-time real incident which is really moving very, very quickly at pace and the aspect of, as I say, the hypothesis round about the relevance of Mr Saeed, it wasn't clear at that time round about what had actually occurred between him and the deceased. So again, as the SIO I was keeping an open mind, but there was an urgency to secure that property because of what I've already described.

So, as I say, if we're playing a tabletop exercise or we're looking at how we would deal with this in the best practice, as such, yeah, by all means, but put yourself there on a Sunday morning at the coalface when you're basically dealing with such a significant incident, it's really, really challenging to do everything that you would want to do as per standard operating procedure and as per guidance. I mean, you are actually dealing with so many different challenging pillars of the investigation, that's only one of them that you're actually taking into account.

- Q. You're talking about the officers being trained. As far as you were aware at that time, had they all been trained in issues of equality and diversity?
- A. Yeah. I mean, there's a number of -- a significant

 number of courses, as you will see in my training

 record, you go through over a period of time round about

 diversity and considerations and inclusion. So again,

 from probationer training all the way through to,

 I mean, detective training, it will have encompassed

 some aspect of that.
- Q. Would your officers be aware, as part of the training
 they receive, that Muslim women would wish to be
 separated from male officers in that scenario?
- 14 A. Yeah, I think they would have a general understanding
 15 and appreciation of that.
- 16 Q. That would be something you would expect officers at the house to know on the Sunday morning?
- 18 A. Yeah.
- 19 Q. And not need any special contact with --
- A. No, and if there was any no doubt, I mean, there was -we had a diversity representative on our Gold Group at
 that time, so again that was that link into, I think it
 was Jill Bolton who was the inspector who was involved
 in all considerations round about equality and
 diversity, so there was someone there that they could

- have contacted if there was any issue round about that

 or any wider concern that they had.
- Q. So individual officers in a house in the heat of the
 moment would be able to contact someone that could
 provide further guidance; is that what you're
 suggesting?
- A. Well, there is an aspect they can do that, or prior to
 going out to the house they can obviously liaise with
 Jill, who was obviously at Kirkcaldy on that morning as
 well. But again, I think the general acceptance and
 understanding that -- I would expect the officers would
 be fully aware of that, to be honest with you.
 - Q. Right. And we've heard evidence from Mrs Rashid that during the time the police were in the house she was trying to make a phone call on her mobile and she was speaking to another brother who wasn't in the house at that particular moment, and that an officer removed the phone from her hand when she was making that call and didn't wish her to make any phone calls.

Now, we've heard that this is being done with, as

I understand your position, consent of the householder.

You're seizing under common law but you're getting

consent of the householder. Would you have expected

an officer to be taking a mobile phone from somebody's

hand?

1 Α. Not particularly, no. I probably would have expected an officer to say. "Could be maybe just come off the 2 3 phone just now", just to explain further what's going to 4 happen. Different -- where there is aspects of 5 suspicion, for example, whereby we've had the occasions through investigations whereby we would take that 6 7 activity where there was suspicion, such as disposing of 8 evidential material, whether it's a phone call being 9 made or the potential to delete calls, text messages, 10 and so on and so forth. So there would be aspects where we would take that sort of activity if there was 11 12 suspicion. 13 But in this case there was not, so probably a more 14 general approach about advice to the individual, about, 15 "Could you come off the phone just now, you'll have time to make a call once we go through this process with 16 17 you", so we'd probably -- and that's back to the 18 individual officers' interpersonal skills around how they would manage that. 19 20 Q. So if Mrs Rashid had been under suspicion or had been 21 a suspect, that might be something that would be done, 22 but as a witness --23 No. Α. 24 Q. -- you would not expect that? 25 Α. No.

- 1 Q. Now, we've heard from Mrs Rashid that after the family
- 2 were moved from the house that she had forgotten to take
- 3 her breast pump and expressed milk for her baby, and
- 4 they had forgotten to take medication, and her mum had
- 5 forgotten to take medication.
- 6 A. Yeah. Yeah.
- 7 Q. Again, you've talked about this in relation to
- 8 Martyn Dick --
- 9 A. Yeah.
- 10 Q. -- but can you see any reason why, in this particular
- 11 house, that they would not be allowed to have those
- items removed from the house?
- 13 A. No. And the way it's normally done is that we would
- 14 normally ask the householder where the property is that
- they're looking for and we would send police officers
- into the house to remove it, rather than the householder
- going back in, to ensure the integrity of it. So that's
- the way it's normally done.
- 19 Q. As far as you're aware, was there any contact from the
- scene with officers saying, "Is it okay if we go and get
- these items for the family?"
- 22 A. Not to myself, no.
- 23 Q. You weren't aware later of any issues over that?
- 24 A. No, no.
- 25 Q. We talked before the break about a briefing at the end

1 of the day, and I think you said there wasn't one? No, there -- so, normally for any major incident or 2 Α. investigation that I'm running you would normally have 3 4 a briefing in the morning and then a briefing at close 5 of play in the evening, whenever that was, and you would just get an update from the detectives that were 6 7 involved in the investigation round about where we are, the number of actions. So again, all this in general, 8 we would go through the various scenes that we'd seized 9 10 and some other further enquiry we had done round about 11 witness statements. 12 Now, we didn't have a chance to do that on the 3rd, 13 because, as I say, it was so fast-moving and also we had 14 the Gold Group structures coming in, 11.30, 14.40 and 15 20.00 hours, and we also had PIRC taking on the 16 investigation at that stage, so the pressing need to have that briefing at that time, it wasn't there. What 17 we did do, we had the briefing the following morning at 18 19 10 o'clock at Kirkcaldy which I chaired, a briefing 20 between Police Scotland and PIRC around the activity 21 that we'd actually done previously. Was that the equivalent of the --22 Q. 23 Α. Yes. -- briefing you would have expected the night before? 24 Q.

It was, it was probably two-fold, so it was an update

25

Α.

- 1 round about the activity on 3 May but it was also to provide an overview for the new officers who were coming 2 3 on to the investigation, both from the Major 4 Investigation Teams of Police Scotland as well as PIRC 5 officers that were coming on that day as well. Well, let's have a look at those briefing notes, just 6 Q. since you've mentioned them, I'll turn to this now. 7 8 We'll probably come back to them later as well. I think 9 it's 784, the document. PIRC 784. We looked at these 10 with a previous witness, a DS Dursley. Do we see these are typed up notes, briefing notes, and they relate to 11 12 a briefing at 10 o'clock in the morning on 4 May in 13 Kirkcaldy, chaired by you? Is this the meeting? A. Yes, this is the meeting, but I was just going to 14 15 highlight through the disclosure of this document that was the first time I've actually seen it. I had never 16 17 seen it before, which is really unusual because 18 I chaired the meeting, the minutes would usually come to 19 myself for sign-off. 20 Q. Yes. 21 Α. But I had never seen this document at all. 22 Q. You've had a chance to read it since then --
- 23 A. I have had a chance to look at it, yes.
- Q. -- as a result of disclosure --
- 25 A. Yes.

- 1 Q. -- from the Inquiry, and were you satisfied that these
- 2 notes accurately --
- 3 A. No.
- 4 Q. -- reflected the meeting? No?
- 5 A. No.
- 6 Q. Right. Well, tell us, please, where you have concerns.
- 7 A. Erm~...
- 8 Q. Will we go through them briefly, let's have a look --
- 9 A. Probably as well going through it, I think there was
- only one or two issues where I had some concern round
- about the accuracy of it, to be honest with you.
- Q. So there's no -- often with minutes, and we've seen that
- with the forensic strategy document, there's a list of
- who's present first of all?
- 15 A. Yeah, yeah.
- Q. We don't see that here, but it would appear that PIRC
- have asked for all original manuscript statements to be
- given to them?
- 19 A. Yeah.
- Q. And what were those statements?
- 21 A. So this is your original operational statement and
- 22 it's -- I think the whole word "operational statement"
- 23 appears to cause some confusion. So basically
- 24 an operational statement is for a particular incident
- 25 that you came on duty at a particular time, you

1 attended, you managed, you dealt with a particular incident and thereafter you went off duty. Now, 2 3 an operational statement is usually pretty brief. So 4 I'll give an example, that -- sorry, an example of this 5 is that my operational statement for this incident, which I think is within the pack --6 7 We looked at that yesterday. Q. 8 So that's three pages long. Now, that is my original Α. 9 handwritten manuscript statement which details high 10 level, that I attended, I dealt with, I was SIO, I completed a policy file, I handed over to PIRC and 11 12 handed over to the Major Investigation Team and two or 13 three days later I had no involvement with the incident. 14 The more detailed account as such, when you look at 15 the PIRC statement, which is 254 pages --16 Is this the six separate statements that we looked at Q. 17 yesterday? 18 Α. Yes. So that whole manuscript statement is really a short -- a shortened version of what actually 19 20 occurred, and usually does require further re-interview 21 by either PIRC or by the Major Investigation Teams, if 22 that makes sense. It really is completed usually before they go off duty and handed to the incident room and 23 thereafter that is assessed, looked at by the incident 24 room and usually there's further actions round about 25

- clarity, round about certain points come from that original manuscript statement.
- Q. So when we see the minutes or these briefing notes, PIRC have asked for all original manuscript statements, is that original manuscript statements, ie operational
- 6 statements from officers?
- 7 A. Yeah, that's your handwritten statement, yeah.
- 8 Q. Together with typed copies and then it says this should 9 be done with a five-day turnaround; what does that mean?
- A. So that looks as if it's a direction that's come from

 PIRC around that, and again, I know you'll probably come

 on to that, it probably links into the post-incident

 procedures around timescales.
- Q. We will come on to that.
- 15 A. Yeah.
- Q. So PIRC are at this meeting, you're at this meeting, and then it says:
- "The deceased's family have intimated that they do

 not want contact with any officer from Police Scotland

 and any contact should be done through the PIRC."
- 21 A. Yes.
- Q. Was that your understanding at that time?
- 23 A. That was my understanding the previous evening.
- Q. Right.
- 25 A. Yeah.

1 Q. We'll come on to that as well. Then: "The PIRC lead is Billy Little." 2 Was he the person at the meeting representing PIRC? 3 4 Α. Yeah, so I'm not sure why but I think there was 5 a handover on the 3rd, the evening, very late in the evening on 3 May between Keith Harrower and I think 6 7 maybe Keith was going on annual leave so there was 8 a handover and I knew that Billy Little was coming in to basically take on Keith's role in respect of that, so as 9 10 I say Billy came on the following morning and he was at 11 this meeting. 12 Q. Then it says: 13 "As a result there is a problem with the 14 identification of the deceased prior to the 15 post-mortem." 16 Yeah. Α. "PIRC are going to make contact with Collette Bell to 17 Q. 18 see if she will attend and identify. "The post-mortem is taking place at 1400 hours today 19 20 and will go ahead regardless. Identification will be 21 ascertained through fingerprints~..." Can you give me a little bit of information about 22 23 this? When did you become aware there was -- it's described there as, "A problem with the ID of the 24 deceased prior to the post-mortem"? 25

- 1 Α. So that was on 3 May, that was the -- as we discussed yesterday, the particular issues we had with the FLO 2 3 deployment and some of the complications we had around 4 that and the engagement with, with the next of kin, the 5 information we got that they were unwilling to attend to identify Mr Bayoh, and obviously we had Garry McEwan 6 7 being deployed to the family unit at that time as well. 8 So kind of late into the evening there was a decision 9 after the evening Gold Group round about the aspect that 10 any contact with the family would now revert to PIRC and would not be Police Scotland officers. 11
 - And that basically thereafter highlights the issue round about identification. So the normal process for identification of a deceased prior to an unexplained death or a two-doctor post-mortem examination which is carried out for unexplained/suspicious homicides, would be for two family members to attend at the City Mortuary and identify prior to the post-mortem --
- 19 Q. That's the normal procedure?
- 20 A. That's the normal procedure. I think actually I noted
 21 in my daybook, I have noted down about identification
 22 at --
- Q. Let's look at your daybook.
- 24 A. Yeah.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

25 Q. We'll come back to the briefing notes. So the daybook

- is, I think you've got -- we've looked at pages 5 and 6.
- 2 A. Yeah. So it's just -- I think it's all -- it's when
- it's all redacted out, I think it's further down. That
- one, yeah. If you could go up to the top of that.
- 5 Q. Let me just -- the one with 1300 at the top?
- 6 A. Yes, identification 1300 --
- 7 Q. So that's page 6 --
- 8 A. -- and then 2pm for PM. So that resulted in a phone
- 9 call from myself to Dave Green --
- 10 Q. The Fiscal?
- 11 A. Yeah, the Fiscal, around what I was aware was the issues
- 12 that we had round about identification by -- or the
- normal or traditional method of identification by next
- of kin or family members of a deceased. So again,
- myself and Dave had discussed any other options around
- that. David explained that there was no flexibility
- 17 with moving the timing of the post-mortem examination
- due to the availability of pathologists.
- 19 Q. Was that the explanation that was --
- A. Yeah, yeah.
- 21 Q. -- given to you?
- 22 A. Due to the availability of pathologists and that it
- 23 would have to take place at that time, so we looked at
- 24 and discussed other methods of identification which we
- 25 had used previously, so there are aspects such as

1 fingerprints, there's a method such as what we call "two 2 in life and two in death", so police officers who knew 3 or were aware of the identity of Mr Bayoh prior to his 4 death and thereafter officers that potentially have 5 conveyed the deceased to the mortuary and done the necessary paperwork around that. 6 7 So again, there was discussion around a suitable 8 method of identification which would allow the 9 post-mortem examination to take place, and again that 10 was directed by Mr Green in his -- in his role as the fatalities --11 12 Q. We expect to hear more evidence from Mr Green. 13 Yeah. So, as I say, that aspect of the briefing note Α. 14 which you referred to coincides with my call to 15 Dave Green and the aspect at the top there round about the identification at 1300 hours. 16 Q. I'm interested in the entry that says: 17 "PIRC are going to make contact with Collette Bell 18 to see if she will attend and identify." 19 20 Is that back on the briefing note? Α. 21 Q. Sorry that is back on the briefing note, yes. If we can 22 go back to 784, page 1. We heard evidence from 23 Collette Bell that she was expecting to be asked to identify. 24 25 Α. Okay.

25

1 Q. She wanted to see Mr Bayoh before the post-mortem. Can 2 you tell me if you recollect at that briefing any 3 discussions with PIRC about what they were going to do 4 in relation to Collette Bell or how they were --5 Α. No. -- going to make contact? 6 Q. 7 So that whole aspect of family liaison and the Α. 8 post-mortem examination moved completely over to PIRC at that time. 9 10 Q. Right. We'll maybe hear --11 A. Yeah. 12 Q. -- more evidence about that. 13 Then moving on, there's a part of the briefing note 14 that says: 15 "Mr Campbell provided a brief summary of the known circumstances." 16 17 A. Yeah. 18 Q. Is it this area where you feel --That bit's a bit inaccurate. 19 Α. 20 Can you point to the areas --Q. 21 Α. I think it's -- so: "The deceased had a family party with Zahid, they 22 have had some form of verbal argument~..." 23 24 Which isn't the case, that's inaccurate.

I don't know if it's just been picked up wrong.

1 As I say, sometimes because of the briefing and someone unfamiliar with the incident notes down as best they can 2 3 the details of the briefing but sometimes there are 4 natural inaccuracies with it, but that's usually 5 resolved with the briefing note or the minutes being sent to the chair for checking, and, as I said, this 6 7 wasn't sent to me and that's why I've identified one or two inaccuracies around it. 8 Do you remember who prepared the notes? 9 Q. 10 Α. I don't and there's no name on it at all. 11 Q. No. 12 Α. No. Then were there any other concerns that you had about 13 Q. the accuracy of this description? 14 15 A. (Pause). I think it was just -- it's further down, I think there was one further one. (Pause). No, 16 17 I think it's just over the page. Yeah, I think it was that top line, there is that --18 The UKBA --19 Q. Yeah, it's completely inaccurate. I wouldn't have 20 Α. 21 actually -- I don't know why I would have said that when 22 we were quite clear we knew who he was as such, who the deceased was. So there was, I recall, a general 23 24 discussion round about notification to the consulate in 25 respect of Sierra Leone nationals, and a discussion even

- around potential repatriation if that was going to be
 required by the family, because we were unaware at that
 time regarding what their intentions were. So that was
 mainly the discussion around that, but contacting UKBA
 and the Passport Office is completely inaccurate, there
 is no relevance to that at all.
 - Q. So you think the minutes of this briefing where they mention the UK Border Agency and the Passport Office, you think that's completely inaccurate?
- 10 Α. Yeah. There was a discussion for -- as we've done on a number of occasions, I think it's actually in one of 11 12 the SOPs, that any foreign national who passes away on 13 Scottish soil, there is a general expectation we will 14 contact the consulate or the Foreign and Commonwealth 15 Office in respect of notification into that foreign state. So again that's just a normal process for it. 16 We've got an international unit based at Gartcosh that 17 18 we would normally go through to facilitate that, and 19 again we have links into Europol and Interpol that would 20 facilitate that as well, it is pretty normal, that 21 course of events. But I wouldn't direct -- why would we 22 contact the Passport Office? It's totally foreign to 23 anything we would do.
- 24 Q. I think you do mention the repatriation issue --
- 25 A. Yeah, yeah.

7

8

9

- 1 Q. -- in your own Inquiry statement. Maybe we could have a look at that briefly, paragraph 403. So this is 2 3 SBPI 256 and if we're looking at paragraph 403 you say 4 here: "The whole aspect of repatriation and the religious 5 6 aspects were discussed at the forensic strategy 7 meeting." 8 Yeah. Α. 9 "We also discussed consultation with the Foreign and Q. 10 Commonwealth Office and the embassy or consulate representing the interests of Sierra Leone nationals. 11 12 At this initial stage we were unsure if the body would 13 need to be repatriated. It was general conversation 14 around that, and the religious aspect as well - that 15 wider awareness of the diversity side of things. We knew from speaking to Collette that Mr Bayoh was 16 17 a Muslim so we also had to consider the requirements in consideration of his religion. Further consideration 18 19 was given about the family unit as such, and how to 20 engage with them." 21 I'm interested in -- you've mentioned this was part 22 of a discussion at the forensic strategy meeting. 23 Yes. Α.
- Q. If we -- you have the minutes of that meeting. Is there anything in the minutes that would help remind you what

25

1 the extent of that discussion was? I mean, you've 2 obviously got some detail in relation to the recovery of 3 Mr Bayoh's body. 4 Α. Yeah, I think it was actually in the ... 5 There's mention on page 7 of 7 that: Q. "Due to the religion of the deceased being 6 7 established as Muslim this was to be considered in the 8 recovery phase and highlighted to [the Crown]." 9 That would be the removal of his body from 10 Victoria Hospital to the mortuary, for the post-mortem. 11 Was there anything in the minutes that helps you 12 remember this? 13 No, but it was discussed at that forum, obviously we've Α. 14 highlighted it there. 15 Q. Highlighted it where, sorry? Just on the page you have up there, so is that the --16 Α. I am just trying to get my bearings on that. 17 This is the minutes of the forensic strategy meeting. 18 Q. 19 Strategy meeting. Α. 20 And those minutes, which are page 7 of 7, note that he Q. 21 was a Muslim. 22 Sorry, are you referring to consultation with the FCO or Α. 23 the consulate. Q. Yes, I think the paragraph of your Inquiry statement 24

that was read out talked about repatriation, discussing

- 1 consultation with the Foreign and Commonwealth Office?
- 2 A. Yeah.
- 3 Q. And the embassy or consulate representing the interests
- 4 of Sierra Leone nationals, and you say:
- 5 "At this initial stage we were unsure if the body
- 6 would need to be repatriated."
- 7 A. Yes.
- 8 Q. Tell us about that discussion you had?
- 9 A. So, yeah, the discussion around that was, as I say, it's
- 10 pretty normal for any death of any foreign national
- 11 within Scotland that we would, as per -- I can't --
- I think it's an investigation of death SOP, but I might
- be wrong with that, but there is a reference to the fact
- that the consulate or FCO, Foreign and Commonwealth
- Office, should be informed of the death of one of their
- 16 nationals, and again that would -- that was one of the
- actions that came from that meeting on the 4th around
- that. As I say, that's a pretty normal activity in
- 19 respect of the death of a foreign national within
- 20 Scotland.
- 21 Q. I'm interested in what prompted this discussion
- 22 initially, because --
- 23 A. Yeah.
- Q. -- you had information from Collette Bell that they had
- 25 been living together for a number of years in

Kirkcaldy --

1

2 Α. Yes. -- that he worked in Kirkcaldy, well, he worked in 3 Q. 4 Scotland, and that they had a child together in 5 Kirkcaldy. What prompted you as an officer to consider whether he was a national of another country? What was 6 7 the starting point of even thinking about this? I was aware he was a national of another country. 8 Α. You were aware of that? 9 Q. 10 Α. Yes. Where had that information --11 Q. 12 Α. That came from Collette. 13 That was --Q. Yeah. 14 Α. -- from Collette Bell, so it was Collette Bell that 15 Q. shared that information? 16 Yeah. 17 Α. Was that with Mitchell and Parker, the officers who --18 Q. 19 Mm-hm. And we also had other information held on police Α. 20 systems in respect of his nationality. 21 Q. All right. So that is what prompted the contact with 22 the Foreign and Commonwealth Office? Yeah, so basically the aspect of repatriation, it was 23 only a consideration because of the significant issues 24 that were -- that emerged through our engagement with 25

25

1 the family, that we could not have any dialogue with 2 them around that, and that is basically why there was 3 a wider consideration about anything that may emerge 4 eventually that the family may want to consider or ask 5 us to take on as such. So again, it was simply a consideration, it was nothing more than that. 6 7 Was there any consideration given to discussing this Q. 8 with the family? 9 Yes. So again, that aspect of family liaison moved Α. 10 completely over to PIRC on the evening of 3 May, as well as the post-mortem. So that aspect completely went to 11 12 the FLOs that the PIRC had identified that were --13 I think the FLOs were actually at that briefing that morning, I recall. 14 15 Q. They were also --I think they were at that briefing, yeah. 16 Α. So you say on the evening of the 3rd --17 Q. 18 Α. Yes. 19 -- PIRC took over issues --Q. 20 Α. Yes. 21 Q. -- regarding the issue regarding repatriation and the 22 body and matters with the family? A. Yeah, all liaison with the family was done, as you will 23 hear from Keith Harrower, he contacted the family on the 24

evening of 3 May by telephone and thereafter visited

- 1 them. And it was clear, even prior to his contact with
- 2 them, that the PIRC were going to be the link into the
- 3 family and to provide us with any additional information
- 4 we may require round about, such as repatriation or
- 5 notification into consulates.
- Q. So you had discussed the issue at the forensic strategy
- 7 meeting --
- 8 A. Yeah.
- 9 Q. -- on the evening of 3 May?
- 10 A. Yeah.
- 11 Q. All of those issues were effectively handed over to
- 12 PIRC?
- 13 A. So they were discussed also at the Gold Group meeting at
- 14 8 o'clock --
- 15 Q. Right.
- 16 A. -- chaired by Mr Nicholson, the ACC, and, as I say, as
- we began to move through to the kind of late hours of
- the 3rd, it was a competent decision that we would move
- 19 everything family related to PIRC. And also for the
- 20 management of the deceased and the post-mortem
- 21 arrangements we'd simply move away from ourselves to
- 22 PIRC.
- 23 Q. We'll come on to the Gold Group meetings later today.
- 24 A. Okay.
- 25 Q. So those issues, was this because of the issues the

- family had with police officers from Police Scotland?
- 2 A. It was a lack of communication and lack of engagement
- 3 that we were trying to cover every angle as such to
- 4 ensure that we were in a good place if we had to
- 5 basically take any action around the activity.
- Q. I'd like to ask you about Zahid Saeed, we've mentioned
- 7 him quite a bit today, and we were talking about the
- 8 search of his family home. But, as I understand the
- 9 position on 3 May, we've heard evidence from DS Dursley
- 10 that he'd made contact with Zahid Saeed by telephone and
- 11 he'd sent officers out to pick up Zahid Saeed. And they
- 12 were DC Telford and DC McGregor. They had taken him via
- the Victoria Hospital, to be checked over.
- 14 A. Yeah.
- Q. And then they'd brought him back to Kirkcaldy. What
- 16 involvement did you have in bringing Zahid Saeed back to
- 17 Kirkcaldy?
- 18 A. None whatsoever. However, if you can recall back when
- 19 I mentioned yesterday the engagement and statement from
- 20 Collette Bell was significant, providing us with mobile
- 21 phones for both Martyn Dick and Mr Saeed as well, so
- 22 again I knew and actioned -- obviously these two people
- 23 were, two males were a priority to trace and note
- 24 a statement from in respect of that, so that's how that
- action came about.

- 1 Q. We noticed in your daybook yesterday that you had
- 2 mentioned Zahid Saeed as part of --
- 3 A. Yeah.
- 4 Q. -- the events on 3 May?
- 5 A. Absolutely.
- 6 Q. Then we have some evidence before the Chair that he was
- 7 brought back to Kirkcaldy Police Office at roughly
- 8 around 2 o'clock in the afternoon, having gone via the
- 9 hospital?
- 10 A. That's right.
- 11 Q. Were you aware that he was in Kirkcaldy Police Office?
- 12 A. I was, after he had been there for a period of time, and
- I was made aware by Stuart Houston.
- Q. Did you know how long he was kept there?
- 15 A. No.
- 16 Q. Do you know on what basis he was brought back to
- 17 Kirkcaldy Police Office?
- 18 A. Significant witness.
- 19 Q. And did he do that voluntarily, was that with his
- 20 consent?
- 21 A. Yeah.
- Q. Or was it on some other basis?
- 23 A. No grounds, he was a witness and he was brought back
- 24 with his consent.
- 25 Q. Would it have been open to Mr Saeed at any point to then

- 1 walk away or to leave or to say, "I don't want to
- 2 continue"?
- 3 A. Yeah.
- Q. As far as you knew, was that an option open to him but
- 5 he was electing not to walk away?
- 6 A. It's an option open to any witness, we don't have the
- 7 power to compel people to remain to note a statement or
- 8 for interview if they're simply a witness, you know what
- 9 I mean, they're free to go about their business if they
- deem it appropriate.
- 11 Q. So there's no power or authority that the police have to
- 12 compel witnesses to remain in a police station --
- 13 A. No.
- Q. -- and give a statement?
- We have some evidence available to the Chair by way
- of a written statement, we don't have -- we haven't
- 17 heard the evidence of Mr Saeed.
- 18 A. Yeah.
- 19 Q. But we may have information that suggests he wasn't
- aware when he was in the police station that Mr Bayoh
- 21 had passed away, he wasn't initially aware.
- 22 A. Okay.
- 23 Q. Were you part of any discussion or decision not to share
- that with Mr Saeed at an earlier stage?
- A. No, nothing to do with me at all, no.

- 1 Q. Had you indicated that you didn't want people to know
- 2 that Mr Bayoh was --
- 3 A. No, absolutely no way, and particularly at that time of
- 4 the day, I mean, the information was within the
- 5 community.
- 6 Q. Can you explain, and it may be you have already answered
- 7 this in relation to Martyn Dick and Kirsty MacLeod, why
- 8 his DNA was taken?
- 9 A. Mainly for elimination purposes, we knew that he had
- 10 that close contact with the deceased, we knew there was
- 11 the physical altercation between both of them, so again
- it would -- again just to look for elimination purposes
- more than anything at all.
- 14 Q. We may have some evidence available to the Chair to
- suggest that when the information about Mr Bayoh passing
- away had been shared with Zahid, that he was very upset
- 17 about that.
- 18 A. Yeah.
- 19 Q. We've heard they were good friends, and that
- 20 Stuart Houston had actually spoken to him --
- 21 A. Yeah.
- 22 Q. -- and persuaded him to remain --
- 23 A. Yes.
- Q. -- were you aware of that?
- 25 A. I'm aware of that because Stuart spoke to me about that

after it. 1 2 When did he speak to you? Q. 3 It was some time -- I think it was round about Α. 4 6 o'clock, 7 o'clock in the evening, he made me aware of 5 erm ... his engagement with Mr Saeed. Do you have any concerns about Stuart Houston persuading 6 Q. 7 Mr Saeed to remain and to continue assisting the 8 officers with his statement? 9 A. Yeah, I don't, to be honest, no. I mean, he did, he did speak to him about remaining and about how essential it 10 was we got his version of events and exactly what had 11 12 occurred because it was an integral part of it. MS GRAHAME: I'm being reminded it's 1 o'clock. I'm sorry. 13 LORD BRACADALE: We'll stop for lunch there, then it's 14 15 2 o'clock. (1.02 pm)16 17 (The short adjournment) 18 (2.04 pm)19 LORD BRACADALE: Ms Grahame. 20 MS GRAHAME: Thank you. 21 I was about to move on to the events at 22 Victoria Hospital. 23 A. Yes. Q. And I was going to ask you about your strategy in 24 25 relation to the recovery of the body.

1 Α. Yeah. Will we begin by looking at the forensic strategy 2 Q. 3 document? 4 Α. Yeah. 5 I think there's some detail --Q. 6 A. Yeah. 7 Q. -- within that. So it's page 6, I think, of 7. Maybe 8 we should look at page 3 first of all, actually, because 9 this was the -- page 3 is the body of the actual strategy document itself. 10 11 A. Yes. 12 Q. We will see that the priority listed as locus 1 relates 13 to the deceased, and the intention to forensically 14 recover the body from the hospital, to recover clothing, 15 to maximise forensic opportunities, prioritise submissions to the forensic lab and SEB. Could you 16 17 explain what that means? Scene Examination Branch. 18 Α. When you say submissions, is that samples and the like? 19 Q. 20 Yeah, so the forensic lab would be the samples coming Α.

from the mortuary or from the hospital itself, and the

such as fingerprints, photographs, video around the

deceased at that time.

Scene Examination Branch would be anything we need to do

25 Q. Then:

21

22

23

1 "To work in conjunction and direction of the appointed PIRC investigating officer allocated to the 2 3 scene." 4 I'm interested at the time that you are preparing 5 this -- well, Houston prepared the strategy document, but at the time you're discussing it and approving it, 6 7 what was the nature of the connection with PIRC at that 8 stage? During the preparation? 9 10 Q. Yes, when you were discussing the -- by the time you've discussed the forensic strategy document with Houston 11 12 and you've approved it, it says here you're working in 13 conjunction and direction of PIRC? 14 Yeah. Α. 15 I'm just interested in how things were evolving between Q. 16 you and PIRC at that time? Yeah, and probably what's not documented is there was --17 Α. 18 after the 14.40 Gold Group there was a scene 19 prioritisation meeting between ourselves and PIRC which 20 was a pretty -- it's quite an informal meeting but it 21 was just round about as we moved towards the forensic 22 strategy meeting we were looking at the priorities, basically were we on the same page round about the 23 24 priority scenes and where they sat. 25 So I had a meeting with Keith and some of his team

1 prior to going into the forensic strategy meeting. That group was mainly Stuart Houston-led with a number of 2 3 reps from Police Scotland as well as the PIRC, and what 4 I mean by the members, it was crime scene managers from 5 both agencies as well as production officers and as well as Scene Examination Branch. And it was really a prep 6 7 meeting prior to going into the main forensic strategy 8 meeting, so we could basically identify where the 9 priorities were and very quickly at the strategy group 10 meeting. So at this stage you and -- you mentioned Keith, is that 11 Q. 12 Keith Harrower from PIRC? 13 Α. Yes. You would be working in conjunction with each other --14 Q. 15 Α. Yeah. -- in relation to the body of Mr Bayoh? 16 Q. Yeah, in relation to all the scenes. 17 Α. 18 Q. And then if we turn to the actual minutes, page 6 of 7, 19 so this is the minutes from the forensic strategy 20 meeting at 4.45, and do we see beneath the redacted passage you have there: 21 "With agreement of PIRC investigation team the 22 23 following strategy was established for the recovery of 24 the deceased." 25 And there's a number of bullet points, I don't need

to take you through --

1

2 Α. Yeah. -- each of those, but are those matters that you had 3 Q. 4 discussed with PIRC at that meeting? 5 Α. Yeah. Q. And the final bullet point is: 6 7 "Body to be removed from locus to Edinburgh City Mortuary." 8 A. Yeah. 9 10 Q. So it would appear from these bullet points that there was some detailed discussion about the deceased and 11 12 recovery of his body to the mortuary? 13 Correct, yeah. Α. And then it says beneath that: 14 Q. 15 "Any item that the body is recovered within is to be secured and forensically recovered." 16 17 Could you explain what that sentence means? 18 Yeah, so when the body would be removed to the City 19 Mortuary it's usually placed within some sort of, call 20 it a body bag as such whereby the remains of the 21 individual is placed within it, and it's just to ensure 22 when the remains are placed within this, within this bag, this article, that nothing falls from the body that 23 24 may be of forensic value. So it's just once we arrive 25 at the City Mortuary the body's removed from that and

1 thereafter placed within a freezer. So it's just 2 indicating that need, to ensure that we do seize the 3 article that the body's been removed in to ensure 4 forensic integrity at all times. 5 So forensic integrity was recognised as an important Q. element of the body being removed to the mortuary? 6 7 Α. Correct. 8 And that was with the agreement of PIRC? Q. 9 Α. Yes. 10 Q. And then on the next page you say: "It was agreed that PIRC investigator John Ferguson 11 12 would be present during the recovery of the deceased at locus 1." 13 14 A. Yes. 15 Q. Then there's a note -- an asterisk and the word "note", 16 and then an entry there: 17 "At 1940 hours a discussion was held due to the blood~..." 18 19 And a discussion about that. 20 Can I ask: when did that note become part of the 21 minutes of the meeting? 22 It's obviously been added after the meeting itself by Α. Stuart, I think he's probably better placed to detail 23 24 when it was noted but obviously just with the timing 25 there, it's quite normal for us to seize any medical

6

17

18

interventions such as an intubation tube and anything at all that medical staff have attempted to intervene prior to death. So anything at all attached to the remains of the deceased at that time would normally be seized or left in situ on the remains and removed at the PM by the

pathologist, so again it's pretty normal procedure.

- 7 Q. Then in terms of the procedure in Victoria Hospital,
 8 what was your understanding of how forensic integrity
 9 was being maintained at the hospital?
- A. Yeah, so after he was -- Mr Bayoh was pronounced life
 extinct or was deceased, we had detectives outside the
 resuscitation room at that time, and this was through
 early discussion with Colin when I became aware of the
 incident, so again we were -- I was aware that
 detectives had been within the ambulance with him as
 well en route to the hospital.
 - Q. We've heard evidence that PC Alan Smith drove the ambulance?
- 19 A. Yeah, that's correct.
- Q. And that DC Connell was in the ambulance with Mr Bayoh?
- 21 A. Yeah, and again, that's probably normal practice around 22 that, so --
- Q. Can I stop you there for a moment? We'd discussed -- we heard evidence from DI Robson about DC Connell recovering a knife from the scene, I think you're aware

- 1 of that --
- 2 A. Yeah.
- 3 Q. -- and we may have mentioned that earlier. And I asked
- 4 him about whether he had concerns that DC Connell was
- 5 then asked to go in the ambulance with Mr Bayoh, having
- 6 recovered that. Do you have any concerns about the
- 7 forensic integrity there?
- 8 A. No, I mean, the knife was recovered with gloves, I mean,
- 9 at that time, after being photographed by, I think,
- 10 a mobile phone if I recall. So, not in particular, you
- 11 know what I mean, it was really for continuity of the
- 12 evidential chain that we had an officer, a detective
- 13 within it, within the rear of the ambulance. There are
- 14 various reasons for that. I mean, sometimes it's due to
- a remark made by an injured party within the ambulance
- or something that's said which may again prove to be of
- 17 evidential value, so again that's best practice to have
- someone there and it's not unusual for a police officer
- 19 to drive an ambulance either.
- 20 Q. Sorry, I interrupted, we were talking about the events
- in the hospital.
- 22 A. Yeah.
- 23 Q. And you are under -- when did you become aware -- you
- 24 obviously became aware, you said previously DI Robson
- 25 contacted you to say that Mr Bayoh -- that life had been

- 1 pronounced extinct at 09.04 and he contacted you
- 2 thereafter to tell you?
- 3 A. Yeah, so there was an earlier call round about, I think
- 4 it was about 8.45 or thereabouts by Colin and it was
- 5 just really a quick call round about the update that
- 6 Mr Bayoh was poorly and at that time I'd just indicated
- 7 did we have sufficient resources at the hospital and
- 8 Colin would have known that would have meant did we have
- 9 detectives with -- outside the resuscitation room in the
- 10 event that he did succumb at that stage. So I knew that
- 11 the detectives were at the Victoria, and on Mr Bayoh
- 12 passing away we simply moved his remains to a side room
- which was secured and we had a uniform officer outside
- it at all times to prevent any access.
- 15 Q. So your understanding is they were initially outside the
- resuscitation room?
- 17 A. Yeah.
- 18 Q. And then outside the side room?
- 19 A. Yes.
- Q. What was the purpose of that?
- 21 A. It's really just to ensure integrity of the remains of
- the deceased.
- 23 Q. To make sure no one interfered with --
- A. Yeah, absolutely.
- 25 Q. When you became aware at 8.45, with your conversation

with DI Robson and then subsequently became aware that

Mr Bayoh had died, before you became aware that he had

died were you concerned about forensic integrity; did

you have a discussion with Robson about ensuring that?

- A. To be honest with you, not at that time, at 8.45, it was really just a quick call that Mr Bayoh's poorly and unlikely to improve at that time so it was about: do we have sufficient resources at Hayfield Road and at hospital to manage the deceased, if this does occur. So again, I mean, Colin -- the expectation from myself to Colin is that he's fully aware of integrity of any scene, so, I mean, I wouldn't at that time basically try to speak to him about scene integrity, I've worked with Colin before and I know how competent he is around such matters.
- Q. When you're trying to maintain forensic integrity, apart from having officers standing outside a room, are there any normal procedures with regard to how they're dressed or forensic clothing or anything along those lines?
- A. Not particularly at the hospital, no, they would probably just be probably in suits as they did turn up for duty that particular day, but it was more about making sure that once life is pronounced extinct there's no further interference, for want of a better word, with the remains by medical practitioners, once they've PLE'd

1 or pronounced life extinct, that thereafter they basically -- we would seize the remains at that 2 3 particular time. And, as I say, there would be aspects 4 of medical intervention, drips, intubation tubes and so 5 on and so forth probably still with the body at that time, but we would seize it as it is at that time rather 6 7 than the medical practitioners attempting to remove 8 them. So again it's just with -- and again, just with 9 the training and the detectives, they're aware of these 10 aspects of it, and through experience as well. So no, they would just be in suits, I think the answer to your 11 12 question is. 13 And you wouldn't expect the officers to interfere in any Q. 14 way with the body? 15 No, absolutely not. Α. Or to be involved in removing clothing or anything? 16 Q. 17 Α. No. 18 Q. What about if there's samples to be collected from the 19 medical practitioners? 20 That's quite common. So usually with incidents, usually Α. 21 homicides in particular, there is usually an aspect of 22 pre-transfusion blood -- there is usually 23 a pre-transfusion blood sample to be obtained, so again 24 part of the responsibilities of the detectives deployed 25 to the hospital would to be obtain that pre-transfusion

- 1 blood sample, to ensure that all the clothing has been seized, a lot of the time it is cut off and maybe left 2 3 on the floor or under the bed or whatever else, it's to 4 ensure that they don't lose anything at all at that 5 time. But again the samples, the main sample is usually
- 7 And is the recovery of, say the clothing that's been cut Q. off, would that be the responsibility of the officers?

a pre-transfusion blood sample.

9 Yeah. Α.

6

- 10 Q. Would they be expected to wear gloves while they did 11 that?
- 12 Α. Yeah, so what usually happens is the clothing which is 13 removed is usually placed within a bag by the medical 14 staff or whoever is assisting with the work within the 15 resuscitation room, so it's usually within a bag as such and it's usually we would seize the bag and thereafter 16 17 take it to a police office as such and bag it 18 appropriately through gloves, masks on, and put it in 19 production bags as such. That's the way it normally 20 does happen. It's not a case, we would get in there and 21 the trousers would be lying on the floor or the shirt 22 would be lying there, you know what I mean; they would 23 normally all be bagged within one hospital-type 24 polythene bag and we would thereafter take that and 25 thereafter, with the relevant precautions in place round

- about integrity, ensure that all the clothing was
 thereafter put into the relevant bags.
- Q. And the person putting items of clothing or suchlike into the bags, would that be the officers or the medical staff normally?
- 6 A. That would be the officers, yeah.
- Q. So they would be within the room at some point to maybe collect items of clothing?
- Yeah, so, as I say, a lot of the time the bag is usually 9 Α. 10 handed to the detectives by the medical staff, the body is thereafter removed on to a bed or trolley and removed 11 12 into a side room. We would secure the side room, 13 usually a uniformed officer stands outside that the 14 detective would thereafter deal with the pre-transfusion 15 blood sample, noting very brief statements from medical 16 practitioners at that time, who are they, when is the 17 best time to get a full statement from them, and there would be a bag usually of clothing that has been either 18 taken from the deceased or cut from the deceased and 19 20 that would be thereafter, usually within one single bag 21 and we would just seize that. But that would not be 22 interfered with at the hospital we would take that to 23 a sterile to location to basically divide and bag up as 24 such.
- 25 Q. There's some evidence available to the Chair that

- a DC Brown and Balsillie attended at Victoria Hospital
- 2 prior to the death of Mr Bayoh, and they essentially
- 3 relieved DC Connell from his attendance at the hospital.
- 4 Have you heard of them?
- 5 A. Vaguely. I've not met -- I don't think I've met them
- 6 but I recognise the names.
- Q. Could you explain what the sort of thinking behind the attendance of Balsillie and Brown was at the hospital?

 This is before Mr Bayoh passed away.
- 10 A. I genuinely don't know but I can only imagine that there
- 11 was further actions for DC Connell to take on at that
- 12 time and to put two detectives for that corroboration of
- 13 the seizure of any clothing and noting those statements
- 14 would -- again, that's probably -- they would need
- obviously the corroboration aspect of it so rather than
- just DC Connell there himself the two officers were
- obviously going up there to take that role from him, to
- 18 enable him to come back for further actions I would
- 19 imagine. I wasn't involved in that aspect of the
- decision-making but I can just imagine why it was done.
- 21 Q. And we have an Inquiry statement from DC Balsillie
- indicating that when he attended the hospital he was
- there hopefully to ultimately speak with Mr Bayoh, it
- 24 was before he was pronounced life extinct, and he
- 25 considered that his role changed after life was

1 pronounced extinct, and he was there then to protect the 2 deceased's body. 3 When Balsillie and Brown were sent to the hospital, 4 clearly DC Balsillie was under the impression they were 5 to go in and talk to Mr Bayoh, was there any view taken by you at that stage about maintaining forensic 6 7 integrity; if Mr Bayoh had survived were you still going 8 to try and maintain forensic integrity at that time? Yeah, you do your best at all occasions to ensure that 9 Α. 10 integrity, the timing and the sequence of that is that I'm obviously notified at 8 -- round about 7.45 by Colin 11 12 about the deterioration, 8.15 I'm informed by 13 Leslie Boal about -- she further updates that this 14 incident is ongoing, which obviously I say I'm aware of 15 and I should phone Colin back at about 8.30, saying I'm heading through. 16 17 So, yeah, it would be quite normal to deploy two 18 officers either to deal with Mr Bayoh at the hospital, 19 obviously, if he did survive, and if not, to deal with 20 the remains of the body at that particular time. So ... 21 I wasn't aware, this was obviously all going under the direction of Colin at that time. 22 Q. Colin Robson? 23 A. Colin Robson, although I obviously had spoke to Colin 24 round about quarter to 8 just about ensuring we had 25

1 sufficient resources to ensure the integrity remained there with it. But, as I say, I don't think -- I think 2 3 the DC Connell aspect, I think Colin's obviously --I don't know if he did say in his evidence round about 4 5 why he removed DC Connell but I would imagine there would be some justification around that. 6 7 Q. So at that time in the morning when Balsillie and Brown 8 are sent to the hospital, it was essentially Robson who 9 was --10 Α. Yes. -- dealing with that matter? 11 Q. 12 Α. Yeah. 13 The evidence you've just given, was that the extent of Q. 14 your involvement in relation to the attendance of 15 officers at Victoria Hospital? 16 Α. Yes. And at that time had you had any contact with PIRC by 17 Q. 18 then? 19 No, the first contact with PIRC was through --Α. 20 Q. 10.20 --21 A. -- Craig Blackhall at 9.35, it was Dave Green who contacted PIRC, DSI Keith Harrower thereafter contacts 22 me at 10.22 and that's the first contact I have with 23 24 PIRC.

Q. And that was something we looked at yesterday in your

- daybook? 1 2 It was, yeah. Α. 3 That you had a call with Keith Harrower? Q. 4 Α. Yeah. So in terms of maintaining forensic integrity at least 5 Q. up to this first call with Keith Harrower, PIRC had no 6 involvement whatsoever? 7 8 Absolutely no involvement. Α. 9 And it wasn't until we see the strategy document and the Q. 10 subsequent minutes that we see that you were conjoining with PIRC --11 12 Α. Yes. 13 -- in relation to the arrangements for Mr Bayoh? Q. 14 Yeah. To be honest it was a lot earlier than that, they Α. 15 came on, they came to the location at 1.30, sorry, came to the office at 1.30, so this -- it was really 16 17 fast-moving after that because there was a number of meetings, either -- as well as the Gold meetings there 18 were a number of meetings in side channels with myself 19 20 and Keith and some of the teams, just around about some 21 of the priority actions we've done which are not 22 detailed in minutes as such, but there was that
 - Q. So from around 1.30 PIRC arrive at Kirkcaldy Police

23

24

25

continuing engagement all the way through from the

arrival of PIRC between myself and Keith in particular.

25

Office? 1 2 Α. Yeah. And from that moment in time there's a lot more liaison 3 Q. 4 and communication with PIRC in relation to the body of 5 Mr Bayoh? Yeah, yeah. So obviously I had made Keith aware that he 6 Α. 7 was deceased, obviously at 10.22 the first call, and 8 I gave him the circumstances of the background to that, 9 so -- and Keith obviously highlighted and indicated was 10 the body secure, was the remains secure and everything, as naturally he would do, and I just obviously reassured 11 12 him that that was all in hand around that. 13 So, as I say, once they arrived at 1.30 they begin 14 to really drill down into some of the actions around 15 Mr Bayoh and about how we would thereafter remove the remains to Edinburgh City Mortuary for the pending 16 17 post-mortem. 18 I understand your evidence today is it was your Q. 19 understanding the officers were standing outside the 20 door to protect the body. We have other information 21 available, again from DC Balsillie, that the officers 22 were actually remaining within the side room with the body, and they remained with the body until they were 23 relieved by PIRC investigators Ferguson and Taylor, and 24

that was not done until 19.30 hours. So by my

25

1 calculations, I think, they were within the room with the body for around ten hours, from relieving 2 DC Connell. Does that give you any cause for concern? 3 4 Α. I mean, I wasn't at the hospital and I don't know the 5 size of the side room but, I mean, they're trained detectives, I'm sure that they would have maintained 6 7 integrity, there wouldn't be any interference at all 8 with the remains. My understanding was from speaking to Colin, as I recall there was a uniformed officer outside 9 10 that room, so I can remember -- I can recall Colin informing me around that. 11 12 But again, the aspect around integrity is paramount, 13 now whether the officers or the detectives are outside 14 the room or within a room, the main aspect is that 15 there's no interference at all with the remains of 16 Mr Bayoh. And information available to the Chair would suggest 17 Q. that they weren't wearing any forensic clothing at that 18 19 time. Does that cause you any concern at all? That would -- nine times out of ten that's the way it 20 Α. 21 usually happens, is that you're not attending at the 22 Accident & Emergency with your white forensic suit. On 23 a number of occasions you're basically there when the individual unfortunately passes away and you have to 24

thereafter take the action and the activity around that.

1 The main aspect is that there is no interference at all with the remains of the deceased and, as I say, the 2 3 detectives are trained around that, about that integrity 4 aspect of it. We have, as I said, an Inquiry statement from 5 Q. DC Balsillie, I can put it on screen, it's SBPI 262, and 6 7 it's paragraphs 24 and 25. This is an Inquiry 8 statement, the same sort of procedure as you've through 9 yourself. He says: "I am asked if there are standard forensic protocols 10 in place that need to be followed when you're conducting 11 12 this kind of locus protection and seizing these kinds of 13 productions. I wasn't aware at the time that all deaths 14 and/or deaths that are regarded as in police custody 15 have to be treated in such a manner that you had to be forensically aware. I wasn't aware of that, and at no 16 17 time was I instructed to wear any of that equipment whilst in the room adjacent to where the deceased was." 18 19 Can I just ask you: does this give you any cause for 20 concern as SIO, that officers didn't appear to be aware 21 about any need to observe forensic integrity? 22 I mean, I see from what they have, I mean, they're Α. simply wearing gloves, there is no --23 Just, that's in paragraph 25. 24 Q. So is it 24? 25 Α.

- 1 Q. Just so people can see it. We also see in paragraph 25
- 2 that he says there was a very limited police supply at
- 3 the hospital?
- 4 A. Yeah.
- 5 Q. "... so, other than wearing a pair of rubber gloves,
- 6 which is what we did, other than wearing those gloves,
- 7 we had no facility to wear a white suit or the boots,
- 8 hairnet et cetera and that, other than wearing the
- gloves, which we did."
- 10 So he definitely was wearing gloves?
- 11 A. Yes, yeah.
- 12 Q. From his statement.
- 13 A. I mean ultimately if they can have a white forensic suit
- there, I mean, that's obviously best practice, but the
- main aspect is that there is no interference with the
- body, they're there mainly for security and integrity
- more than to basically forensically interfere with the
- bodies. So we're not asking them to take samples, we're
- simply asking them almost just to secure the remains at
- 20 that particular time and not obviously to go near the
- 21 body or interfere with the remains in any way. So ...
- Q. Can I ask you about 25 -- and I appreciate you weren't
- 23 at the hospital --
- 24 A. Yeah.
- 25 Q. -- that day, I'm interested to see this reference to,

- 1 "Very limited police supplies at the hospital". Is it
 2 normal practice for there to be police supplies at
- 3 a hospital?
- A. Yeah, I can only speak from my own experience, and
 working within the kind of Glasgow area, we regularly
 would dispatch police supplies to the main hospitals
 within Glasgow, so there were that ready supply of
 gloves, boots, suits, masks, hairnets and so on and so
 forth, we would take them down to the hospital and give
- 11 Q. Why is that done?

them a supply as such.

- 12 It's mainly just, it's ... it's to ensure that -- it's Α. 13 mainly for a policing purpose, the fact is that if we do 14 spontaneously turn up at an incident which thereafter 15 involves the requirement for integrity of the deceased or the -- it ends up a homicide or there's a -- if 16 17 there's a sexual offence that's been occurred, that they 18 can basically, rather than having tae go to the car or 19 try to dig out or call for someone to come from a nearby 20 office, that there is a supply of potential kit that's 21 available there that we don't -- we can put hands on 22 almost right away.
- Q. Who in the police is responsible for making sure there are police supplies at a hospital?
- 25 A. So it was mainly the CID within the offices that

- I worked at, would basically be that liaison into the

 A&Es mainly of the hospitals.
- Q. I won't ask you about the resources in the hospital,
 I know you weren't there.
- 5 A. Yeah.

19

20

- Q. Can I ask you who then had overall responsibility for

 Mr Bayoh's body at the point the remains were taken from

 the hospital to the mortuary? At that point, had

 responsibility handed over to PIRC?
- 10 Α. Yeah. Well, yes, it did, because it was at 10.22 that PIRC -- well, 9.35 hours that PIRC basically get 11 12 directed by Crown, as they are the lead agency for it, 13 so by the time the body was removed to the City Mortuary 14 they had -- obviously there was a number of hours that 15 had passed since they had been given the direction to lead on it, so ultimately it would be PIRC. However, 16 17 the remains and the ownership sits with Crown, with PIRC 18 just being the agents obviously around that.
 - Q. Can I just be clear about one thing you say in your statement, and I don't need to put this on the screen, you say:
- 22 "The seizure and transfer of the deceased to the 23 City Mortuary is under my remit."
- I would just like to be clear, when you say "remit"

 but it's the responsibility of PIRC, can you explain --

1 Α. Yeah, I think I was just trying to say it's the responsibility of an SIO ultimately for the safe 2 3 transfer ensuring integrity of the remains moving 4 between the hospital and the City Mortuary. So, 5 for example, to ensure integrity and continuity we would put two detectives in a car behind the vehicle with the 6 7 remains of the deceased in it. So they would be at all 8 times present with the deceased en route to the City 9 Mortuary so we would not lose sight of that. 10 And again, once we're at the mortuary detectives would be there whilst the body's removed and thereafter 11 12

would be there whilst the body's removed and thereafter the forms and the various — the correspondence is basically completed for the entry of the body into the mortuary, so again that's all taken care of by the same detectives who would be within the hospital, conveying the remains and thereafter entry into the City Mortuary as such.

- Q. So all of that remains the responsibility of the SIO?
- 19 A. Yes.

13

14

15

16

17

- Q. Even where PIRC have effectively taken over the lead investigation?
- A. Yeah, sorry, I maybe confused things there. I think
 I was trying to say that either the SIO from PIRC or
 myself, so on this occasion it would be the SIO from
 PIRC who would have the responsibility because it had

24

25

A. Correct.

1 passed to Keith at 9.35. So when you've said in your statement: 2 Q. 3 "The seizure and transfer of the deceased to the 4 mortuary is under my remit." Do you wish to sort of clarify that slightly? 5 Yeah, I think it's the remit of the SIO for the 6 Α. 7 investigation. So, although I was the Police Scotland 8 SIO at the time, ultimately the lead SIO who had the 9 strategic oversight for the whole investigation was Keith Harrower, as actioned by Crown. 10 Can we look at the terms of the minutes of the first 11 Q. 12 Gold Group meeting. We've mentioned this a few times 13 today. 14 Yeah. Α. 15 Q. I'd like to look at PS06491. I'm not sure if you have a hard copy of this in your folder but it's certainly on 16 17 the screen. So this is the minutes from the 11.30, this 18 is the first meeting of the Gold Group? 19 Yes. Α. 20 Q. And we see there: "Present - ACC Nicholson~..." 21 22 He was chairing it, we've heard from you yesterday he was the gold commander? 23

Q. Chief Superintendent McEwan is present, he is the silver

1		command?
2	Α.	Yeah.
3	Q.	Then we also have present yourself and Leslie Boal,
4		Chief Inspector Shepherd and DI Robson, and then if we
5		look at the terms of reference, I'd just like briefly to
6		ask you about these. So this is listed as:
7		"Gold Strategy (CS Garry McEwan)."
8		And the final paragraph in black ink says:
9		"Ensure the integrity, interest and reputation of
10		the Police Service of Scotland and its staff is
11		maintained and safeguarded."
12		Then underneath that it says in red:
13		"Agreed that wording of terms of reference would be
14		considered and amended for future meetings to provide
15		terminology specific to circumstances of incident."
16		Are you able to explain to us a little bit about
17		this?
18	Α.	Yeah. So basically the terms of reference for the
19		majority of Gold Groups are almost a standard pro forma
20		as such, and it's mainly a lift from a previous
21		Gold Group that you would simply superimpose on to the
22		agenda for the incident you're dealing with, because
23		they mainly all impact on the integrity of the
24		investigation, support and reassurance to the family,
25		community impact, media, and ultimately to bring the

1 community back to some sort of normality at that time. 2 So again, I was slightly late into this meeting and 3 the discussion was ongoing, I can recall, when I came 4 in, round about the fact it was not specific to it and 5 I recall there was some discussion round about that last point about the integrity, interest and reputation of 6 Police Scotland is maintained and whether or not that 7 had to be basically -- that there had to be some -- it 8 had to be elaborated slightly. 9 10 Q. Why were you late? So I was -- I had a discussion at that time, just before 11 Α. 12 going into the Gold Group, with Amanda Givan. 13 We've heard she was the Federation representative? Q. Yeah, and that was round about the status of the 14 Α. 15 officers and the request for operational statements. We'll come on to that later. 16 Q. 17 So can I ask, the paragraph about ensuring the 18 integrity, interests and reputation of the police, did 19 that paragraph have any impact on the way you conducted 20 the investigation that day? 21 Α. Absolutely not. 22 It was part of the discussion on the day that that Q. 23 would -- at that meeting, that the wording would be considered --24 25 A. Yes.

-- further? 1 Q. 2 Α. Yeah. Then can we look at 2, you will see that says: 3 Q. 4 "Factual update - (Detective Inspector Robson)." 5 We've heard evidence from Robson that -- I think I spoke to you yesterday about this -- he saw this 6 7 meeting as a handover to you and he gave the update --8 Α. Yes. -- based on his awareness to that point, and if we can 9 Q. 10 come down slightly, it says: "The events relating to the deceased being conveyed 11 12 to the hospital, his treatment and subsequent PLE were 13 outlined and thereafter the process in an effort to 14 identify him." 15 And then: "The circumstances of the subsequent call from 16 17 Collette Bell ... also summarised to provide details of an incident that occurred prior to police and 18 involvement and which led to identification of male." 19 20 At this meeting were you clear about the 21 identification of the male at Hayfield Road as Mr Bayoh? 22 Α. Yes. Q. And as I understand it by that stage the death message 23 24 had been given to Collette Bell? 25 Α. Yeah.

1 Q. Then it comes on to item 3, "Investigative process", and your name and DCS Boal's name are next to this, can you 2 3 tell us about this item on the agenda? 4 Α. Yeah, it's basically the SIO will provide that 5 investigative update, it's quite normal, particularly at the first Gold Group or even subsequent Gold Groups, 6 7 that the initial aspect of how the incident developed is 8 usually by the on-call detective inspector, such as 9 Colin who gives the kind of preamble into it, but 10 thereafter when it comes to the investigative strategy it's usually handed over to the SIO at that particular 11 12 time. 13 So again, I provided the full update, as you can 14 see, around that. I think Leslie interjected with one 15 or two different points but in the main that was the -the bullet points there are all the aspects that I'd 16 provided updates on in that respect. 17 Q. We've heard some evidence about one of the bullet points 18 19 which says: 20 "CT considerations raised by ACC and to be reviewed 21 by NIB." 22 Can you tell us about the discussion surrounding 23 that? Yeah, I think I raised that yesterday as one of the 24 Α. 25 hypotheses around it which was quickly eliminated, but

1 with Mr Nicholson's background, he was a -- I think he was a CT commander, he kind of raised the issue again, 2 3 were we quite happy that there was no inference into --4 inference to any CT-related motivation or 5 counterterrorism-related motivation, which at that time I was pretty happy there wasn't but he just asked for 6 a further review by NIB, which is the National 7 8 Intelligence Bureau and that links thereafter into some 9 of the more sensitive intelligence areas that we can 10 basically have access to around that CT arena. So although you gave evidence yesterday about your own 11 Q. 12 thoughts about CT, and I don't need to go back to that, 13 was it again raised by ACC Nicholson at this meeting? 14 Yes. Α. 15 Rather than raised by you --Q. 16 Α. Yes. -- as part of a discussion? 17 Q. 18 Α. Yeah. 19 By this stage had you in your own mind eliminated the Q. 20 hypothesis? 21 Α. Yeah. 22 And did you have a discussion about why you'd Q. 23 eliminated --24 Α. Yeah. Q. -- with Nicholson? 25

- 1 A. Yes, at that forum.
- 2 Q. At the meeting?
- 3 A. Yeah.
- Q. Then I would like to ask you about, first of all:
- 5 "FLO Establish a working strategy."
- 6 A. Yeah.
- 7 Q. What was the discussion about in connection with that?
- 8 A. So again it was just such a high priority for the
- 9 investigation and obviously just the issues we
- 10 discovered yesterday around that, but it was just about
- 11 how we were going to take that on with liaison with PIRC
- and about some sort of kind of deployment model and the
- timescales for that, so it was about taking it off table
- and looking at the development of that working strategy
- for the deployment into the family.
- Q. And by this time the death message has been delivered to
- 17 Collette Bell?
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. And she had advised you about the next of kin as
- 20 Kadi Johnson?
- 21 A. Yes.
- 22 Q. And we discussed this yesterday but since we're talking
- about it now can I ask you to look at PS10991 which is
- a family liaison SOP, and just do you see that on the
- 25 screen, it's the family liaison, and it's just to avoid

1 any confusion arising about the evidence yesterday about 2 this. 3 Α. Okay. Could we look at section 6.2, please, and this relates 4 Q. 5 to delivery of death messages. So this is an SOP, I appreciate you said yesterday you're not a trained 6 7 FLO, but do we see here 6.2.1: 8 "Families of bereaved persons should be informed of 9 the fact of death as soon as is practical by 10 an appropriately briefed police officer." 11 A. Yeah. 12 Q. And then 6.2.2: 13 "As a general rule, a FLO should not be deployed to 14 deliver a death message as this may delay the process of 15 informing the family." Then 6.2.3 talks about a risk assessment being 16 17 carried out. 18 A. Yes. 19 Q. And 6.2.4 says: 20 "The deployment of a FLO to pass a death message 21 would conflict with this requirement ... compromising the risk assessment process." 22 And it goes on to make a number of points but: 23 24 "Where a decision is taken to deploy a FLO to carry 25 out this task, careful consideration as to the

- circumstances and reason for doing so must be made by

 the SIO and such decisions should be recorded in the SIO

 policy file and FLO logbook."
- So I think yesterday I asked you questions about why
 there wasn't a wait for an FLO to deliver a death
 message. According to this SOP that wouldn't be the
 appropriate procedure.
- 8 A. Yes, unless the circumstances dictate otherwise.
- 9 Q. And did you have consideration whether circumstances
 10 dictated otherwise?
- 11 A. Yes, and that came from the discussion with
 12 Keith Harrower, where Keith suggested it would be
 13 beneficial to deploy two FLOs from Police Scotland at
 14 this early stage.
- 15 Q. Right?
- 16 A. So again, as lead for the investigation I agreed with
 17 that.
- Q. So can you simply explain how the process panned out
 with your discussions with Keith Harrower? Because on
 the face of this SOP the recommendation seems to be, or
 the guidance seems be the families "should be informed
 as soon as is practical by an appropriately briefed
 police officer", rather than a FLO?
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 Q. And in fact the general rule is the FLO should not be

1		deployed?
2	Α.	Yeah.
3	Q.	So that's the general rule, but obviously there's
4		a process envisaged where that could be changed. Can
5		you explain to us the discussion with Keith?
6	Α.	The discussion was around the fact that we I think
7		because of the circumstances of the incident and the
8		fact that Police Scotland officers were involved in it,
9		to send two untrained officers to the family, as we did
10		do, we anticipated and Keith anticipated may cause, may
11		cause some sort of conflict, who would not be trained in
12		a manner to or have the experience to handle difficult
13		questions or difficult scenarios being asked of them as
14		such.
15		So again, through the discussion with Keith, Keith
16		made the decision at that time that we would look at
17		deploying initially Police Scotland FLOs and thereafter
18		there would be a handover later on either that day, or
19		I think it was the following day on the 4th, to PIRC
20		FLOs once they actually came on board with the
21		investigation.
22		So I think it was the circumstances of the
23		challenging incident that we were dealing with that was
24		the trigger for deploying Police Scotland FLOs.
25		Now, if we had the Police Scotland FLOs and we

1

I anticipate there would still have been significant 2 3 issues around that, to be honest, as I said, yesterday. 4 So I take what the SOP states there, it's always 5 extremely beneficial to get the message to the family, as I indicated yesterday, out as soon as possible. 6 7 The decision with Keith, through consultation with 8 myself round about the Police Scotland FLOs being 9 deployed, I could see the benefit of that, because it wasn't a normal situation, so I could see why we were 10 basically going down that route in respect of it, but 11 12 I do take the point that that's what's stated in the 13 SOP. 14 But again, standard operating procedure's there as 15 the way it should be done, but again there are some circumstances, as section 6.2.4 indicates, that not all 16 17 circumstances fit as they should on every occasion, so sometimes you have to have that flexibility around it. 18 19 We've heard that it was PIRC FLOs who ultimately made Q. 20 contact with the family --21 Α. Yes. 22 Q. -- late on 3 May. 23 Yes. Α. But yesterday you did talk about Police Scotland FLOs 24 Q. 25 being recalled to duty --

deployed them within the hour, I don't anticipate --

- 1 A. Yes.
- Q. -- and arriving at Kirkcaldy Police Office?
- 3 A. Correct.
- Q. Were they ultimately briefed by police -- Mitchell and
 Parker, we have heard, may have been involved with
- 6 briefing --

A. Yeah, so they were briefed -- what I did say yesterday, in respect of that matter is that the discussion after the second visit to the family and the conflict that that was causing with the family refusing to engage and not wanting to speak to Police Scotland officers at that time, or any local officers, I think it was as well, was the fact that the discussion with Ruaraidh Nicholson and myself, Leslie Boal, Garry McEwan, was around -- and Keith Harrower obviously involved in that as well, was that -- are we going to gain anything further here or is it just simply going to aggravate an already really sensitive matter by deploying now Police Scotland FLOs to the family.

So we were all in agreement with that. The fact is we didn't think there was any benefit at that stage of deploying Police Scotland FLOs because of the situation we found ourselves in at that stage and to move towards, at that stage it was Garry McEwan being deployed to the family to try to basically explain a bit more about the

1 incident, and that thereafter progressed through the evening, after the Gold Group, to Keith Harrower and the 2 3 direction at the time from the ACC around the fact that 4 the PIRC would deploy FLOs and Keith Harrower would make 5 contact with the family and, as I say, Keith made contact with the family I think about 10 o'clock that 6 7 evening. I think that's a kind of timeline in the 8 sequence of events, I don't know if that answers your 9 question. 10 Q. Thank you. So the Police Scotland FLOs were never deployed to 11 12 the family because of the tensions which you were aware 13 of? 14 Yes. Α. 15 Is there any note that we can look at in your daybook or Q. your policy file that would help us identify your 16 17 reasoning in relation to the FLOs, or ...? I don't think there is, but that was the -- that was the 18 Α. 19 feeling at the time, that because, as you've put quite 20 rightly, the tension between Police Scotland and the 21 family unit at that time was so significant, the decision was made not to deploy the Police Scotland 22 FLOs, although they were present at that time and they 23 24 were deployable, they had been briefed, however that was 25 not going to basically enhance the relationship with the

1 family and at that time it was obviously the decision 2 for Garry McEwan at that time to deploy due to his relationship with a member of the family. 3 4 Q. And the decision not to deploy the Police Scotland FLOs, 5 was that done in liaison with PIRC? 6 Α. Yes. 7 Q. And then we were going through the minutes of the 8 11.30 --Yeah. 9 Α. 10 Q. -- Gold Group meeting, if we could maybe return to those briefly, PS06491, and we were looking at item 3, and it 11 12 says there -- I've lost it: 13 "Police officer statements - Federation reps 14 providing advice to officers concerned regarding this 15 matter." Clearly this was part of item 3, and I'd be really 16 interested in your recollection of that discussion at 17 18 this meeting? 19 A. Yeah. So prior to coming to this meeting -- and, as 20 I said, I was slightly late into it -- I had 21 a discussion with Amanda Givan, and Conrad Trickett was there as well at the time, my intention was to address 22 23 the officers within the canteen area, and I explained 24 to --Q. You were aware in the morning the officers had returned 25

to the canteen? 1 2 Yeah, yeah they --Α. 3 That had been allocated the PIM suite? Q. 4 Α. They were there when I had arrived, they were already 5 present when I arrived. So because of the nature of the incident as SIO, and I know it's not detailed in any 6 7 strategy, I wanted to inform them regarding the 8 investigation where we were, the information that came 9 to me at that time was they weren't even aware that 10 Mr Bayoh had actually passed away and was deceased at around about 11.25, so I thought it would be beneficial 11 12 for myself to brief them in respect of a number of areas 13 but the main one obviously the fact that Mr Bayoh was 14 now deceased and that the PIRC were now leading the 15 investigation as such, that was the main areas. 16 So I'd spoke to Amanda Givan and said to her, "Look, 17 this is where we are with the enquiry just now, PIRC are coming on board, they're en route to the office just 18 19 now, they will lead on the investigation", and that from 20 speaking to Keith Harrower the status of the individual 21 officers just now is that of witnesses, and that I will 22 be requesting operational statements from them in that 23 respect. 24 So Amanda basically stated that her advice to them 25 at that time was not to provide any operational

- 1 statements prior to seeking legal advice, and I said to
- 2 Amanda, "I appreciate your position around that but I am
- 3 still going to request operational statements", because
- 4 they were witnesses.
- 5 Q. Where did this discussion with Amanda Givan take place?
- 6 A. Just inside the canteen or just outside the door of the
- 7 canteen, I think it was just inside the door of the
- 8 canteen.
- 9 Q. Was that the first time you had been down to the
- 10 canteen?
- 11 A. It was, yeah.
- Q. Did you speak to the officers at that time?
- 13 A. I did, yes.
- 14 Q. And can we see any reference in your daybook?
- 15 A. I don't think there is, because it was a very, very
- brief update that I gave them because I was running into
- the Gold Group at that particular time, and, as I say,
- that's why I was late into the Gold Group. But the
- 19 circumstances of it were such that I -- the notation
- within the minutes for the 11.30 Gold Group about the
- 21 Federation rep providing advice was given to me
- 22 five minutes before I actually went into the Gold Group
- 23 by Amanda, that that was the position at that particular
- 24 time.
- Q. Right.

- 1 A. I do however -- with the disclosure it is detailed
- 2 within Nicky Shepherd's daybook that I've provided that
- 3 update around the fact that the status of them was that
- 4 they were witnesses and that statements were going to be
- 5 provided but the Federation had advised until legal
- advice is sought not to provide statements.
- 7 Q. Right. It's five to 3, we will be shortly inviting the
- 8 Chair to have a short break for the benefit of the
- 9 transcriber. I will see if we can get a copy of that
- 10 daybook, but I do not have it at the moment.
- 11 A. Yeah.
- 12 Q. But in the next five minutes I would like to look at
- 13 your daybook --
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 Q. -- and maybe see if there is anything that we can gather
- 16 from this.
- Now, we've looked at page 5 previously. Your
- daybook is at 18269, and page 5. At the top of page 5
- on the right-hand side we can see the reference to the
- 20 Gold Group is that 11.40? The minutes say 11.30 but
- 21 roughly that's the time, is it?
- 22 A. I think that's the time I came into it.
- Q. Right.
- 24 A. I think that's why I was late into the Gold Group.
- Q. And it says next to that, "Chair ACC", and we know the

1 chair was ACC Nicholson?

2 A. Yeah.

16

- Q. So just immediately above the reference to the

 Gold Group meeting, you've got things written there; is

 there anything written there that helps you or refers to

 this discussion with Amanda Givan at all?
- 7 No. Because it was simply a very quick five-minute Α. discussion. I didn't actually expect to meet Amanda in 8 there at that time. However, I had met -- Amanda had 9 10 come into a room I was sharing with Colin Robson round about 10.05 that morning to introduce herself to me, 11 12 that she was there obviously to provide support to the 13 officers and she gave me her business card as such and at that time I said I'd catch up with her through the 14 15 course of the morning and such.
 - Q. So you were sharing a room with Colin Robson?
- So, on arrival at 9.15 I initially went to speak to 17 Α. 18 Garry McEwan and then, after speaking to Garry McEwan, 19 Colin took me to a room within the CID area where 20 basically at that time, as I said yesterday, within the 21 details on my daybook round about the call cards, we sat 22 and went through the call cards and the priority actions at that time. And, whilst doing that, Amanda Givan came 23 into the room at that time and introduced herself and 24 left a calling card as such around -- left a business 25

1 card saying that she was there, and I said I'd catch up 2 with her later on through the course of the morning. Q. We've heard evidence that DS Dursley shared a room with 3 4 Colin Robson, and Colin Robson gave evidence to that 5 effect, that he'd moved in and out. So were you sharing a room with Robson or --6 7 Α. No, I don't know whose room it was, I've been in 8 Kirkcaldy three times, and it was just a room I was using with --9 10 Q. Was DS Dursley there? No. No, I think I only spoke to DS Dursley once during 11 Α. 12 the course of the day and that was the death message. 13 But it was a room I was utilising as an SIO, 14 Colin Robson came in, Stuart Houston was in and out as 15 well, but I don't know whose room it was to be honest. 16 So the room you were using, was Robson coming in and out Q. of that --17 18 Α. Yes. 19 -- rather than sitting with you? Q. Yes, he wasn't working out of it. 20 Α. 21 Q. Right, thank you. 22 Just going back briefly to the -- well, actually, it's --23 24 LORD BRACADALE: Stop there then. 15 minutes. 25 (3.00 pm)

1 (A short break) (3.24 pm)2 3 LORD BRACADALE: Ms Grahame. MS GRAHAME: Thank you very much. 4 5 So just prior to the break we were talking about this meeting with Amanda Givan just prior to the first 6 7 Gold Group meeting. 8 A. Yes. Which caused you to be slightly late and arrive at 9 Q. 11.30. How long did that discussion with 10 Amanda Givan --11 12 A. Minutes. Q. Minutes? 13 14 And you've said that Conrad Trickett was present? 15 Α. Yes. And it was, you said inside and outside the canteen; it 16 Q. 17 was somewhere near the canteen? I'm sure it was -- I think it was just inside or just 18 Α. outside I'm unsure. But I know I spoke to both of them, 19 20 both of them were present when I was speaking. 21 Q. Anyone else present? 22 Α. No. Q. You also mentioned before the break that you had at some 23 24 point talked to the police officers, was that during 25 that --

1 A. Yeah.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. -- short period or was that later?
- 3 A. No, that was directly after speaking to Amanda Givan.
- Q. And how long did you spend with the police officers?
- 5 A. No more than five minutes.

legal advice.

- Q. Could you be mistaken about the time that this took
 place?
- I have thought about this thing really for a number of 8 Α. 9 years now and genuinely I'm pretty confident that it was 10 in the morning. There's a couple of reasons behind that, it is that on taking the investigation on as SIO, 11 12 I would not have waited four or five hours before 13 I spoke to the officers concerned around this, and also 14 I wanted to be in a position at the Gold Group to 15 provide an update around status of officers or if there was any issues that had been identified at that 16 17 particular stage. And there was an issue that had been 18 identified, the fact that the guidance or the direction

So from my recollection of events, Conrad was there at that time as well, and Conrad introduced me to the officers and I gave a very, very quick briefing to them around the fact that Mr Bayoh had sadly passed away and

from the Federation rep, Amanda Givan, was that officers

should not submit operational statements until they have

1 it was now -- on the instruction of Crown Office, it was 2 a PIRC-led investigation supported by Police Scotland, and thereafter very, very points round about their 3 4 welfare, round about the fact they shouldn't discuss the 5 incident together, and the fact that we would be requesting operational statements prior to the 6 7 conclusion of their duty, and it was as simple as that. 8 There was no questions from any of the officers involved in it. Amanda was present, Conrad was present, 9 10 and I thereafter left at that stage and went to the Gold Group and updated the Gold Group round about the 11 12 fact that there was likely to be an issue round about 13 the submission of statements from the officers involved in the incident. 14 15 Q. We'll come on to this in a moment, but you'll be aware that Conrad Trickett does talk about having a discussion 16 with you and you speaking to the officers --17 18 Α. Yeah. 19 -- but he doesn't say that was at 11.30 but at a later Q. 20 time, at 13.40, 13.41. So in relation to that, despite 21 knowing that, do you still feel confident about your assessment of the time? 22 A. Yeah, so again just to provide my position on that, it 23 is that at 13.35 we have the PIRC arriving at Kirkcaldy 24 office, the priority for me at that time was to brief 25

Keith Harrower and the team immediately on their

arrival. I met Keith round about that time and we went

into a discussion in the conference room upstairs, and

at that time we were waiting the arrival of various

other PIRC resources as well as some of my team to

attend within the conference room.

Now, this was between 13.45 hours and 14.00 hours whilst we were waiting the arrival of the other members of both Police Scotland and PIRC, and the intention was to provide an overview to PIRC prior to the second Gold Group.

Now, I think when I've looked at some of the Inquiry statements, Colin Robson details this as 14.05 hours, he thinks it's a Gold Group but it's not a Gold Group, it's an investigative briefing to PIRC on their arrival, at that particular time. And, as I say, that is my recollection of it.

The fact is that it actually runs into the Gold Group because Ruaraidh Nicholson, the ACC, actually comes in whilst we're actually speaking, because the room we were utilising was the room that the Gold Group was actually held in. So the ACC came into the briefing with PIRC and sat down and we began just explaining one or two things to him at that time prior to the Gold Group, which I believe is minuted as starting at

25

1 14.40 hours. 2 Yes, we've heard evidence that the second Gold Group Q. 3 meeting started at 14.40. 4 Α. Yeah. So my understanding at 13.35 hours and the 5 arrival of PIRC, my priority at that time wasn't speaking to Conrad Trickett and wasn't speaking to the 6 7 officers, it was about speaking to Keith Harrower as the 8 lead for the investigation and doing a more thorough investigative briefing to him round about where we were, 9 10 where the priorities were, before we went into the Gold Group. 11 12 And the only other thing, I think when you look at 13 Amanda Givan's evidence as well, she believes that the 14 briefing to the officers was in the morning as well, and 15 even -- I've thought about this continually around the fact that even for an introduction to the PIM, I mean, 16 17 for an SIO or an IIO to basically wait for the best part 18 of five hours before there's any introduction just 19 doesn't seem to be ... and again, I've looked at, as --20 are those -- am I getting my timings wrong or~...? 21 And I appreciate Conrad's policy log and his PIM log details it as 13.40 and 13.41 but I don't think it was 22 at that particular stage because I was with the PIRC at 23 that particular time because of their arrival which we 24

were waiting on for a considerable period of time, there

- 1 was an urgency around their arrival there and basically
- 2 briefing them as soon as possible round about the
- deployment, the joint deployment, and some of the
- 4 locations we had identified which we'd spoke about, so
- 5 again that was my priority at that particular time.
- Q. Well, I think before the break I asked you if there was
- anything in your daybook saying you'd had that
- 8 discussion with Amanda Givan, or the post-incident
- 9 manager, and you couldn't find anything at all.
- 10 A. No.
- 11 Q. You've obviously given this a lot of thought in advance.
- 12 A. Yeah.
- 13 Q. Is there anything in your policy file that you think
- would assist us with this?
- 15 A. No, I don't think there is.
- Q. No. So it's not noted in any of your --
- 17 A. No.
- 18 Q. -- documents we've looked at?
- 19 A. Yeah.
- Q. Before the break you mentioned you thought it was in
- 21 Nicola Shepherd's daybook or there was something in her
- daybook.
- 23 A. Yeah, and I think that's in relation to the request for
- 24 operational statements runs from the initial Gold Group
- at 11.30 to the one at 19.50 where there is still that

- 1 significant direction around the status of officers as
- witnesses and the submission of operational statements.
- 3 Q. Right. Well, we've obtained a copy of --
- 4 A. Yeah.
- 5 Q. -- Nicola Shepherd's daybook, and we would like you to
- 6 look at that and tell us what assistance the Chair may
- be able to glean from this. So this is PS09164, and we
- 8 understand this is Nicola Shepherd's daybook, and
- 9 I don't know if you have been given a hard copy --
- 10 A. No, I've not.
- 11 Q. -- we can certainly ... it may be easier for you
- 12 actually to have a hard copy, because you'll know what
- 13 you're looking for.
- 14 A. Yeah.
- Q. Now, on the first page there is reference at the bottom
- for the 11.40 Gold Group meeting. So it says:
- "1140 -- Gold meeting -- death of unidentified
- 18 male."
- 19 Do you see that?
- 20 A. Yeah.
- Q. And immediately above that, it doesn't appear to have
- 22 any entries regarding a discussion.
- 23 A. No, I think -- I don't know if I can maybe direct you to
- it. I think what I'm trying to say is that I only had
- one meeting with Amanda around operational statements,

- 1 and that came prior to me briefing the officers within 2 the canteen. I thereafter went directly from the 3 briefing of the officers and the engagement with 4 Amanda Givan into the first Gold Group. 5 So the notation on Nicola Shepherd's daybook whereby it states, "Police officers, co-ordinator, Federation 6 have advised there is no obligation to provide 7 statements", that's the 11.30 Gold Group. 8 Right, and can you -- is that on the second page --9 Q. 10 Α. Yeah. -- that you're looking at? 11 Q. 12 I think it's the third page actually -- ah, stop, stop, Α. 13 just there, "Police officers". Q. All right. Top of the third page, and it starts: 14 15 "Police officers -- co-ordinator. Federation have advised them there is no obligation to provide 16 statements." 17 18 Α. Yeah. 19 Q. Is this part of her -- we've not heard evidence from 20 Nicola Shepherd yet --21 Α. Yeah, so --22 -- but does this appear to be part of the notes --Q. For the 11.30 Gold Group. 23 Α.

Yeah. Well, she's put it down as 11.40 Gold Group on

Q. -- for the Gold Group meeting?

24

25

Α.

- page 1.
- 2 Q. Sorry, could you repeat that?
- 3 A. She's put it down as 11.40 Gold Group on page 1.
- Q. Yes, on page 1, yes, we've said that.
- 5 A. I think -- sorry, I think what I'm trying to say is that
- 6 the choreography and the sequence of events leads me to
- 7 the Gold Group to explain only due to the fact that
- 8 Amanda Givan has given me that advice and that direction
- 9 and I was only in the canteen on one occasion and that
- 10 was when I spoke to Amanda Givan and also the officers
- 11 at that time in the morning.
- 12 Q. So you talked before the break about having a -- did you
- 13 have a meeting with Amanda Givan --
- 14 A. No.
- 15 Q. -- or was that the only meeting with Amanda Givan?
- 16 A. I think I met her in the corridor later in the afternoon
- or something like that, but certainly that was the only
- 18 time that -- that was the first time she explained to me
- 19 that -- basically the advice that she was giving
- officers was that there was no -- that she advised them
- 21 to obtain legal advice prior to providing statements.
- 22 Q. So you met her once and had this discussion?
- 23 A. Yes.
- 24 Q. It was in the morning, and it -- as I understand your
- 25 evidence, it must have been before the 11.40 Gold Group

meeting? 1 2 Yes. Α. Or the entry on page 3 of Nicola Shepherd's daybook, 3 Q. which notes things that were discussed --4 5 Α. Yeah. Q. -- at that first Gold Group meeting could not have 6 7 contained the information: 8 "The Federation have advised them there is no obligation to provide statements." 9 10 Α. And also in the minutes of the 11.40 Gold Group I provide an update very, very similar to that. 11 12 Q. Let's just briefly go back to those minutes, then, and 13 also see ... and I think we were looking at this as one of the bullet points in item 3. 14 15 A. Yeah, yeah. So if we could go back to PS04691, page 2, item 3, and 16 Q. 17 we had looked before the break at the bullet point, "Police officer statements"? 18 19 Yes. Α. Q. Towards the end: 20 "Federation reps providing advice to officers 21 concerned regarding this matter." 22 Although we've not heard from Nicola Shepherd, your 23 24 view is that the comment that she's handwritten in her 25 daybook tallies with --

- 1 A. Corroborates what I've said.
- Q. -- the minutes that we see here, that the Federation
- 3 reps are providing advice. And that was in that first
- 4 Gold Group meeting and discussed at that meeting --
- 5 A. Yes.
- 6 Q. -- because you'd had this discussion with Amanda Givan?
- 7 A. Correct.
- 8 Q. Now, in the break we checked Amanda Givan's Inquiry
- 9 statement, and this is SBPI 00072. Now, it may not be
- on the -- we might not be able to put that on the
- 11 screen.
- 12 A. Yeah.
- Q. But my understanding is that she makes no mention of
- 14 a discussion just shortly prior to --
- 15 A. Yeah.
- Q. -- 11.30, prior to the Gold Group meeting in or outside
- 17 the canteen. But she does talk about coming up to
- 18 a room where --
- 19 A. Yeah.
- Q. -- she met with you, so nowhere near the -- I don't know
- 21 geographically but not in the canteen or outside the
- 22 canteen, but in a room, to come up and speak to you, and
- I think it was DI Robson?
- 24 A. Yeah, and that's what I explained before the break, that
- 25 myself and Colin had been through the call cards within

1 that room, and we had the discussion whose room was it 2 and I said at that time Amanda Givan comes in, 3 introduces herself and gives me her business card, and 4 that was round about 10.15/10.30. 5 So was that the first time you had met Amanda Givan that Q. 6 day? 7 Α. Yes. 8 And the second time was --Q. Was down in the canteen round about 11.30. 9 Α. 10 Q. And then you mentioned a moment ago that you maybe saw 11 her somewhere in the afternoon, in the corridor? 12 Α. Yes, yes. So three occasions where your paths crossed. Do you 13 Q. 14 remember that first meeting with Amanda Givan? 15 Α. Yeah. Tell us about that? 16 Q. The one in the room? 17 Α. Q. In the room. 18 19 A. So that -- Amanda came in, we were in the room -- myself 20 and Colin were sitting going through the call cards, 21 I was identifying the priorities, so as we've already 22 seen in the daybook round about what's the priorities, the call cards which we discussed yesterday, the three 23 locations, Arran Crescent and so on and so forth. 24 25 So Amanda comes in at that particular time and

introduces herself and she basically says that she's

there to support the officers, that she's been called

out and she's a Federation rep, she gives me her

business card and at that time I basically -- well, it's

really, really busy at that particular stage and I said

to her I'd catch up with her later in the morning around

it.

So again, with that it was my intention to speak to the officers prior to going into the Gold Group, the first initial Gold Group, around that, and that's the occasion I spoke to Amanda within -- within the canteen area. And again, there is -- when you look at Conrad's, I think Conrad details also in one of his statements the fact is he was there when Amanda had mentioned to me about the operational statements not being -- her advice was not to provide -- the officers not to provide operational statements at that time. But Conrad indicates at about 13.40 that occurred, rather than my suggestion it's at 11.35 or thereabouts. But, as I say, I wouldn't have had that information prior to going into the first Gold Group unless I had that engagement with Amanda Givan.

Q. And you've said a couple of times that her advice to the officers was not to provide operational statements prior to getting legal advice?

- 1 A. Yes.
- 2 Q. Now, we've heard evidence from Amanda Givan and when we
- discussed this with her, she indicated that it was the
- 4 officers should check what their status was, that if
- 5 they were suspects they shouldn't be getting --
- 6 A. Yeah.
- 7 Q. -- giving statements subject to obtaining legal advice,
- 8 and that effectively she hadn't got to the stage of, "If
- 9 you're only witnesses", but her focus was very much on
- 10 the situation where they may be suspects, and she talked
- 11 about being aware of a couple of memos that had been
- released relatively recently to May 2015, where officers
- 13 whose status was a suspect shouldn't be asked for
- 14 statements.
- 15 A. Yeah.
- Q. So bearing that in mind, I think Amanda Givan's position
- in evidence, as I understand it, was not that she was
- advising officers not to give statements or operational
- 19 statements prior to legal advice but she was actually
- 20 talking to them about checking their status.
- 21 A. Yeah, I mean, I spoke to them around the status and
- 22 I mentioned to Amanda round about the status, it was
- very clear from what we had at that particular time they
- 24 were witnesses, they would not have been involved in the
- 25 PIP process if they were anything other than witnesses.

There was no reasonable cause to suspect that they were involved in anything criminal or anything misconduct at that time, so at that time in the morning when I'm briefing them, their status is very clear and Conrad's very clear round about their status as well, invoking them within the PIP process.

And Amanda was aware of that as well, the fact that there wasn't -- their status didn't change across the whole period of 3 May, they were always witnesses, it was all documented within the Gold Group at 11.30, at 14.40, at 19.50, it's still that drive and demand round about confirmation of status, operational statements still required, so at 8 o'clock at night -- and again, it's detailed in Nicky Shepherd's daybook that we're still discussing the fact that we require operational statements.

So, as I say, that continued through the course of the day, their status was that of witnesses, and I was still looking for operational statements in that respect.

- Q. Did you have concerns, when you spoke to Amanda Givan at the canteen, about the advice that she said she was giving to the officers?
- A. So, I don't think Amanda gave legal advice, I think

 Amanda's advice was simply to seek legal advice before

- you provide any statements. So I don't think she gave
 legal advice. I think she gave that direction to the
 officers concerned. I don't think she gave -- actually
 gave legal advice as in the whole aspect of~...
 - Q. But did you have concerns that she was advising officers not to provide operational statements prior to seeking legal advice? That's what I have you noted as saying.
- 8 A. Sorry, when did I say that?

5

6

7

9

10

23

24

25

- Q. Before the break, I wrote it down. I can check the transcript if you want to see exactly what you said.
- Yeah, so they've every right to seek legal advice before 11 Α. 12 giving a statement under PIP. So no, I don't think 13 I would have said that. My concern was the fact that 14 this seemed to be a hold on their -- the direction 15 the Federation were giving at that time was to await 16 legal advice prior to submitting -- or submitting 17 an operational statement. The aspect of status was very 18 clear from myself, from Keith Harrower and the 19 discussions we had through the course of that morning 20 and through the Gold Groups, from the chair through all 21 membership, that at that stage there was nothing other 22 than they were -- their status was that of witnesses.
 - Q. If we've heard from Amanda Givan that there was uncertainty, confusion, about status, you would disagree with that then?

25

Α.

Yes.

1 Α. So I think there was confusion with the officers in 2 general. They were confused. I think -- I mean, even 3 the discussion I had with them very, very briefly, 4 I don't think very many of them can actually recall it, 5 as far as I recall. They were traumatised. There was so much information getting put to them at that 6 7 particular time, they were getting involved in a whole 8 new process under post-incident procedure, which they 9 had no training in and no awareness in, and in the back 10 of their minds they had obviously just come through such a traumatic incident that resulted in the death of 11 12 an individual. 13 So again, there was general confusion with the officers concerned, and that was clear when I was 14 15 speaking to them, you know what I mean, there was no 16 acknowledgement, there was no questions, it was just 17 basically, I was just giving them information and 18 whether or not they were taking that in, again it's 19 debatable. 20 We've talked about Conrad Trickett, you've clearly Q. listened to his evidence? 21 22 Yes, I have. Α. 23 But just for completeness can I ask you to look at the Q. 24 PIM log --

1 Q. -- which is PS00387. If we could look at page 13, 2 please. And if we look towards the bottom of that page, 3 there's an entry 13.40 and I spoke to Conrad Trickett 4 about this in evidence, and then on the next page, at 5 page 14, you will see an entry 13.41, and we'll go over the detail of this in a moment, but as I understand his 6 7 evidence he was saying this was his PIM log that he 8 noted at the table as you were sitting talking to the 9 officers. So it was a contemporaneous account. 10 Α. Yeah. I think with the 13.40 entry on the previous page, he 11 Q. 12 explained it hadn't lasted a minute but it had been 13 about five minutes and it had been prior to you actually 14 talking to the officers in the canteen, and that had 15 been prepared, if you like, retrospectively. 16 Α. Yeah. 17 So at 13.40 his notes in the PIM log are: Q. "Initial discussion with SIO -18 Superintendent Pat Campbell~..." 19 20 As I understand his evidence he said that was the 21 first time you'd spoken to him. "... PIRC enquiry. 22 "Take external clothing." 23 24 Then the entry on the last line: 25 "No need to take statements~..."

You see that? 1 2 Α. Yeah. Then on the next page, which follows on, so: 3 Q. "No need to take statements at this time." 4 His evidence was that: 5 "It was clear to me that he didn't want any accounts 6 7 to be provided by the officers at that time and that is 8 obviously what I've noted within the log". 9 And I asked him about that again, and he reinforced that "no operational statements at this time". 10 So we then also heard evidence from him about the 11 12 post-incident procedure SOP, and the four stages. 13 Yeah. Α. 14 That 2 is basic facts. Q. 15 Α. Facts. Stage 3 is initial personal accounts. 16 Q. Yeah. 17 Α. And stage 4 is more detailed accounts. And he explained 18 Q. 19 that, in terms of PIP procedure, that the word 20 "statements" isn't actually referred to, that it's 21 "initial personal accounts"; they would be up to or less than a page of A4; they're reasonably brief, briefer 22 than the normal operational statements; and that is 23 a stage 3 that can be done before officers leave their 24 25 duty that day.

1 He explained that stage 4 was a more detailed 2 account. 3 A. Yeah. 4 Q. And that that would not be required that day under PIP, 5 it would be required 48 hours --6 A. Yeah. -- or two sleep -- two periods of rest --7 Q. 8 Α. Yeah. -- up to seven days, and that was the language he was 9 Q. 10 speaking, and then he talked about you speaking a different language from him, that you were talking 11 12 about statements, which is the normal --13 Yeah. Α. 14 -- language that officers would use. Q. 15 A. (Witness nods). Q. So here he's noted -- and again if we can just move back 16 17 to page 13 -- the "No need to take statements at this time", he understood that you were not looking for 18 19 statements at that time --20 A. Yeah. 21 Q. -- and he didn't seek either initial or personal 22 accounts or more detailed statements, and he wouldn't have expected to be seeking detailed statements that 23 24 day. A. Anyway, yeah. 25

1 Q. So that's a summary of his evidence, as I understand it. Yeah. No, I mean it does conflict with my way of -- me 2 Α. saying what actually I believe happened around it, 3 4 unfortunately. 5 So, 27 years of being in the police, this is the first time that a police officer has refused to provide 6 7 an operational statement to me, up until 2015 and from 2015 onwards, the only occasion. 8 9 The normal activity or course of events for any SIO 10 is that you look for operational statements prior to the officers going off duty. Now, from Conrad's -- my 11 12 discussion with Conrad, the whole aspect of personal initial accounts, I think he reduced that down almost to 13 14 "operational statements" as well or "initial 15 statements", other than utilising the phrase "personal initial accounts". 16 17 However, the drive that day, which is documented in 18 all the Gold Groups, was the requirement for operational 19 statements. That didn't -- we did not stop that. There 20 was still a requirement for operational 21 statements/personal initial accounts. So that never 22 stopped. I mean, there was still that drive to basically obtain some sort of direction from the 23 officers round about the use of force, who did what, who 24 utilised PAVA, CS, who was involved in baton strikes, 25

who was involved in the restraint. 1 So, again, that just doesn't sit well with me, the 2 3 fact that I have stated that 13.40 -- now, 13.40 is 4 before the PIRC have actually arrived and been briefed 5 by me. I just wouldn't have that -- I mean, that decision is not my decision to make round about no 6 7 operational statements. That decision would rest with 8 Keith Harrower to bascially make that decision, as SIO 9 for the investigation at that particular time. So again --10 At 13.40? 11 Ο. 12 13.40. So Keith has only arrived at that particular 13 time and I thereafter get into a briefing at him. At 14 the 14.40 group we're still talking about their status 15 and operational statements, directly after this. Do you think the question of status had not been 16 Q. resolved by PIRC until after they arrived at Kirkcaldy? 17 No, no. No, the question of status was very clear from 18 Α. 19 my discussion with Keith Harrower at 10.20 and 20 thereafter through the course of the morning. There was 21 nothing to indicate any criminality or misconduct on the 22 part of the officers at that time, there was no reasonable cause to suspect, so myself and Keith were 23 very clear around that at that point. 24 25 So, as I say, the aspect of the 13.40, the quite

1		detailed, on a number of occasions, "no need to take
2		statements, no need for operational statements".
3		Ultimately I was not the SIO at 13.40 and I wouldn't be
4		able to give that direction. That would have to come
5		from Keith Harrower and from PIRC.
6		I don't know if I'm explaining this very well.
7	Q.	Do you feel that by 13.40 you were no longer the SIO?
8	Α.	At 13.40 I'm meeting with Keith Harrower.
9		Keith Harrower's just arrived at 13.35, and I'm going to
10		a briefing with Keith and with PIRC and with my own
11		team, which is detailed I think Colin Robson says
12		it's at 1400 hours, we get into the briefing before the
13		Gold Group, which is an investigative handover
14		briefing not handover, but an investigative briefing
15		around it.
16		So, again, that matter round about "no need to take
17		statements, no request for operational statements",
18		I cannot recall, and as an SIO I would it's something
19		I wouldn't actually say, because it was paramount that
20		we had and I think I've said it in my statement: the
21		critical aspect of what we were missing through the
22		investigation was who done what during the restraint on
23		Hayfield Road; the timeline, sequence of events from
24		Arran Crescent, from the previous night, to
25		Martyn Dick's house, all the way through to the members

25

1 of the public in the cars seeing Mr Bayoh with a knife; 2 and thereafter the restraint. It became very clear as 3 we move through that day round about what had occurred, 4 obviously keeping an open mind to the hypotheses that 5 we've already discussed. But the critical aspect, as an SIO, out of an IIO, what I was missing was what 6 7 actually occurred during the restraint, the use of force 8 and who did what. 9 So, to say that there is no need for statements is 10 totally against everything that I'm trying to drive round about: this is a gap, this is an investigative gap 11 12 that exists, as an SIO, which -- as I say, this was the 13 first time that I'd ever came across police officers 14 involved in an incident, when you ask them for 15 operational statements it's refused. 16 I'm going to come on to your own Inquiry statement, Q. 17 because there's a couple of paragraphs that are quite helpful, I think, in exploring this. But before we 18 19 leave the PIM log, if I may, can I just go through the 20 entries? When it says "take external clothing", do you 21 agree that that was something --22 Α. Yes. 23 -- that was part of the discussion? Q. 24 Α. Yes.

Q. So that part is correct?

1 Α. Mm. 2 And it was a PIRC enquiry? Q. 3 Α. Yes. 4 Q. And that's correct. 5 Can we move on to page 14, please. So this is 13.41, and we heard evidence from Conrad Trickett that 6 7 this is the part where you go into the canteen and speak to the officers, and he says: 8 9 "Detective Superintendent Pat Campbell speaks to 10 officers. "Provides initial circumstances of enquiry to date." 11 12 Do you remember if that is indeed what you did? It did, yes, it was a general overview, yeah. 13 Α. Then it says: 14 Q. 15 "No suspicion on part of any officer." Do you remember telling the officers --16 No, I think it was more about their status I detailed at 17 Α. this -- I said to them that the information and the 18 19 evidence we have at this point that your status is that 20 of witnesses. 21 Q. And while they were witnesses, was that because there was no suspicion on the part of any of the officers? 22 A. Yeah, there was no reasonable cause to suspect, with any 23 24 of the evidence that we had obtained at that time, that 25 suspicion fell on them in respect of criminal conduct or

1 even misconduct at that stage. Q. So could you have conveyed to the officers that there 2 3 was no suspicion on any --4 Α. Yeah, it could have been taken like that, yeah. Then you say, sorry, in the PIM log it says: 5 Q. "No injuries (visual) on deceased." 6 7 Does that say "occurred at the hospital"? Sorry. "Examined". 8 9 A. Examined. 10 Q. Thank you very much. Yeah. 11 Α. 12 Q. My ability to read handwriting isn't the best. So: "No injuries ... on deceased. 13 14 "Examined at hospital." 15 Do you remember if that was information that you shared with the officers? 16 I can't recall saying that, but I may have said that 17 Α. just through the -- I didn't have anything written down, 18 19 it was just a ... 20 So you don't have --Q. 21 Α. Just a recall --Q. -- any notes --22 23 A. No. Q. -- prepared --24 25 A. No.

-- as part of the discussion?

1

Q.

2 Α. No. 3 Q. And then it says: "5 loci of deceased movements during night." 4 5 Α. Yeah. Do you recall whether that was part of your discussion 6 Q. 7 with the officers? 8 A. Yeah, yeah, I basically explained that we had timelined 9 the movements of the deceased through the night and 10 there was a number of locations which were now being examined. 11 12 Q. And we've looked at your daybook and we've looked at the 13 other things that show the five loci --14 A. Yeah. 15 Q. -- the forensic strategy meeting. Then there's a line saying. 16 17 "Clothing in bags." Now, from my recollection of Conrad Trickett's 18 evidence, he wasn't exactly sure in his recollection 19 20 about what that went, but do you remember talking to the 21 officers --22 A. Yeah. Q. -- about their clothing? 23 A. Yeah, it was about the fact we were looking to seize 24 25 their clothing and their officer safety equipment.

- 1 Q. And if that clothing had been received and recovered,
- 2 would that have been placed in bags?
- 3 A. That was part of the forensic strategy which thereafter
- 4 happened later on when we brought them out individually
- 5 into the room and forensically recovered their clothing
- 6 and property.
- 7 Q. So, do you remember talking to the officers and
- 8 preparing them --
- 9 A. Yeah.
- 10 Q. -- for that possibility?
- 11 Then it says:
- "No operational statements at this time."
- 13 A. Yeah, and the only thing I can think of in respect to
- 14 that is that: has Conrad simply meant at this time, as
- in just now, whilst I'm speaking to them about actually
- detailing their operational statement there and then?
- Q. Because we see that phrase "at this time".
- 18 A. Yeah.
- 19 Q. Not only on page 14 in that section but also it's the
- first line, "at this time".
- 21 A. Yeah.
- Q. Which relates to the conversation prior to this.
- 23 A. Yeah.
- Q. Do you remember if you could have said or did say "No
- operational statements at this time"?

- 1 No, I can't recall saying that, because I did emphasise the fact we would be looking for statements from them 2 3 prior to them going off duty. 4 Q. So you did make a request --
- 5 Yeah, yeah. Α.
- -- at the canteen that day? 6 Q.
- 7 Absolutely, yeah. Α.
- Q. And after that, then I think there's an entry: 8
- 9 "DCI Stuart Houston."
- 10 Do you remember discussing Stuart Houston with the officers in the canteen? 11
- 12 No, I don't know if that's maybe Conrad detailing Α. 13 Stuart Houston would be involved in the forensic recovery of their clothing as crime scene co-ordinator. 14
- 15 Q. Now, we heard evidence from Conrad Trickett and we've heard evidence from you yesterday that you're -- and you 16 17 were on that day extremely busy, and you had a lot of things happening in a short period of time --18
- 19 Yes. Α.
- -- if I can summarise it that way. He did in evidence 20 Q. 21 talk about you having other pressures of time and he 22 thought you were going to meet with PIRC who were due to attend at Kirkcaldy. Is it possible, because you were 23 busy that day, that perhaps you did say "No operational 24 statements at this time" and you've simply forgotten 25

1 that you said that, or ...? 2 I just -- it's something I would -- would not say. As Α. 3 an SIO, as identifying the gap in the investigation that 4 I was still overseeing was the fact that we had no 5 indication of what the officers involved in the altercation at Hayfield Road did. 6 7 So, again, that discussion thereafter progresses into the Gold Groups, it progresses into -- I think, 8 Keith Harrower indicates I speak to him about 3.30 about 9 10 the fact that officers are still not willing to provide 11 operational statements. 12 So it just doesn't sit -- it doesn't sit right with 13 me, to be honest with you. It's something that I would 14 not and I have never done through my full service when 15 we're looking for statements. I mean, that's your bread 16 and butter, I mean, that's exactly what you're looking 17 for. 18 LORD BRACADALE: Just on that point, can I ask you this: you 19 said a little ago that for the first time in 27 years 20 officers had refused to provide statements; at what 21 point in the day did you understand that the officers 22 were refusing to provide statements? 23 A. So I think as the day progressed, sir, that the initial notification I believe was from Amanda Givan that the 24 direction that she was giving was until legal advice is 25

1 sought not to provide it. LORD BRACADALE: That's not a refusal in itself. 2 No, no. No, no. But through the course of that 3 Α. 4 afternoon, as I say, it became clear that the officers' 5 position was consistent with that advice from Amanda, that they would not be providing operational statements. 6 7 LORD BRACADALE: And how did that become clear? It came clear through discussions at the Gold Group 8 Α. 9 meeting, it came from some of the stuff that --10 Nicky Shepherd spoke to them as well, and also that -some of the information that I was getting from kind of 11 12 third parties back, saying that they would not be 13 willing to provide statements at this particular time. LORD BRACADALE: I'm sorry, when you say "from kind of 14 15 third parties", you mean --Yeah, so basically I was getting information coming from 16 Α. the canteen, via Colin Robson and one or two others, 17 18 that their position was that they would not be providing statements at that particular day. 19 LORD BRACADALE: Thank you. 20 21 MS GRAHAME: Just to be clear on that, in terms of providing statements, was it your understanding that what was 22 23 being discussed was the equivalent of initial personal accounts? 24 A. Yes. 25

1 Q. In terms of the PIP procedure? 2 Α. Yes. Rather than any other type of --3 Q. 4 Α. Yes. 5 -- statement, operational or witness or otherwise? Q. 6 Yeah, yeah. Α. 7 Q. And was it your understanding that statements of that 8 more detailed nature would not --Α. No. 9 10 Q. -- have been provided --11 Α. No. 12 Q. -- by the officers on that day? 13 Α. No. And you weren't expecting those more detailed statements 14 Q. 15 then, were you? No, no, it was just that initial account or that initial 16 Α. 17 statement round about what occurred in that focused aspect of Hayfield Road, what basically happened there. 18 19 I think it'd detail it in the SOP as this honestly held 20 belief around it. But, again, it was just about who was 21 there, who done what, what force was used, and justify 22 exactly what actually happened at that particular time.

Q. So when that language is used of "statements" or

"operational statements", looking back now, do you feel

there was any confusion in your mind between the nature

23

24

25

- of initial personal accounts and what was described as operational statements or statements?
- Yeah, I mean, I think there was a bit of confusion 3 Α. 4 around the whole aspect of that. When I spoke to Conrad 5 round about operational statements, Conrad came back to me with "operational statements" and not "personal 6 7 initial accounts", so I think both of us knew what we 8 wanted -- I mean, what I was saying I was looking for, 9 the information regarding the restraint and the incident 10 at Hayfield Road, and I think from Conrad's evidence, I think he even actually speaks to the officers as being 11 12 initial statements and not personal initial accounts, 13 because that wasn't actually -- I mean, the whole PIP 14 process was so new at that particular stage to 15 Police Scotland, I think this was the first time we'd ever actually utilised it for a non-firearm related 16 17 discharge as such. So, again, there were real 18 challenges round about the understanding and the 19 expectation of what we were looking for. But, as I say, 20 it was clear in my mind what the gap in my investigation 21 was round about initial statements or personal initial 22 accounts was where the gap basically lay.
- Q. We'll come to that in a moment.
- 24 A. Yeah.
- 25 Q. As I understood your statement, you hadn't actually had

1 training in PIP --2 Α. No. 3 Q. -- at that stage --4 Α. No. 5 Q. -- on 3 May? 6 So you weren't trained in post-incident 7 procedures --8 No. Α. 9 -- and the stages --Q. 10 Α. Yeah. -- that are set out within that SOP? 11 Q. 12 Α. That's correct. 13 Have you subsequently had that training? Q. I have, yeah. 14 Α. 15 Q. So does that mean that you're now, having had that training, available to be appointed as a post-incident 16 17 manager? No. So I'm trained due to the fact I'm a trained 18 Α. 19 strategic firearms commander. So as a firearms 20 commander, part of the inputs and the training you get 21 is around the process of PIP and the role of the PIM. So I've not trained in PIP or as a PIM, but I've got 22 that awareness training because I'm a strategic firearms 23 24 commander. Q. Right, so you have an awareness now of PIP --25

- 1 A. Yeah.
- 2 Q. -- the post-incident procedure, that maybe wasn't
- 3 available to you in 2015?
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5 Q. And do you think that lack of training and awareness
- 6 maybe has caused further confusion in relation to the
- 7 procedures in your own mind in May 2015?
- 8 A. So there was -- there was a distinct lack of awareness
- 9 in 2015 across Police Scotland around what PIP involved
- and the various stages of it. I was aware of the SOP.
- I came across it, I think it was about a year before, in
- 12 respect of -- I think I was on a mailing list for one of
- the agencies down south where the extension had been
- 14 utilised for non-firearm related discharge, and I was
- just kind of nosying, I was looking at the intranet
- 16 round about what the standard operating procedure up
- 17 here did say. But, again, looking at -- I looked at the
- stages, but I did not go into any detail with them. So
- 19 with limited knowledge I had at that particular stage,
- and again the understanding I had was that there had to
- 21 be a balance between the investigation and the welfare
- 22 and wellbeing of the staff around that, but again I was
- 23 relying -- I think the majority of the Gold Group were
- 24 perhaps relying on Conrad with -- as being the trained
- 25 PIM to come in and provide us with that direction,

- 1 oversight, governance, staged approach to it and basically how we could thereafter go through that. 2 We heard that Conrad Trickett wasn't part of the 3 Q. 4 Gold Group meetings --5 Α. Yeah. -- and would have had, as I understood his evidence, 6 Q. 7 difficulty in educating everyone in relation to 8 post-incident procedures on the day in a real live 9 situation. 10 Looking back now, do you think having -- for yourself and for others -- having more information and 11 12 education about PIP in those days might have been 13 beneficial? A. Without a doubt. No, I mean, it's -- with hindsight, 14 15 I mean, Conrad should have been part of that Gold Group with the crucial role that he was playing on that 16 17 particular day, to allow him to provide that more kind of thorough overview of what his role involved as well 18 19 as enhance his engagement with PIRC, who were leading on 20 the investigation as such. So I think with hindsight it 21 would have been more beneficial at that time for 22 a trained specialist, who has went through the PIP process and has experience, to brief less experienced 23 members of the team at that time.
 - Q. And we also heard that not just the individual officers

24

25

1 may have lacked training in relation to PIP, but 2 I wonder if you were aware to what extent the PIRC at 3 that time -- they later joined the Gold Group meetings, 4 not the first one but later -- to what extent were they 5 aware of post-incident procedures and this distinction between stage 3 initial personal accounts and the more 6 7 detailed stage 4 accounts? I think they were similar to ourselves, it was pretty 8 Α. 9 limited knowledge that they had, if any at all. There 10 hadn't been any awareness training across Police Scotland other than if they were an A4 firearms 11 12 officer or they were a PIM or they were a strategic firearms commander or a tactical firearms commander. 13 14 So, again, that wider awareness -- and again, when 15 you look at the officers involved in this, they had no awareness at all around this whole PIP process and what 16 17 that entailed. So, again, it was education to not just them but to the Gold Group as well round about some of 18 the intricacies of PIP and what it did involve. 19 20 So, again, at that time we had -- we had not 21 deployed -- I couldn't recall any other deployments of 22 PIM -- sorry, PIP within Police Scotland over the first two years frae 2013. This was certainly the first 23 deployment of PIP for a non-firearm related discharge 24 which we did not even have the standard operating 25

procedure for. We had -- Conrad on that day had to 1 2 adapt the firearms SOP to basically incorporate his 3 approach to it as such. So I think, in answer to your question, there was 4 distinct lack of awareness across both Police Scotland 5 6 and PIRC. 7 Q. Thank you. 8 You've mentioned a couple of times about you as SIO 9 identifying a gap in your knowledge. Yeah. 10 Α. Just for completeness today, can we look at your Inquiry 11 Q. 12 statement? 13 Yeah. Α. 14 And paragraphs 95 and 97 are -- we won't get both of Q. 15 them on the same page. If we start with 95, not quite halfway down, but the sentence begins: 16 17 "The gap in my knowledge was that I was not aware of exactly what had occurred with the key police witnesses 18 when they came into contact with Mr Bayoh on 19 20 Hayfield Road. In the absence of eyewitness testimony 21 at this stage, what were the actions and the use of force of the individual officers involved while 22 retraining and arresting Mr Bayoh? That was the gap 23 that I had identified and I believe that it was 24 25 operationally critical to the investigation. This was

24

25

1 why I was keen to seek the submission of their personal 2 initial account and/or operational statements. This is the aspect that crosses over with my role and that of 3 4 the PIM more than any other." 5 Looking at that paragraph, is there anything else 6 you want to add about the process of identifying that 7 gap in your knowledge? No, that was a significant gap in the investigation. 8 Α. And how did you believe at that time, as SIO, that you 9 Q. 10 would be able to plug that gap? Operational statements or personal initial accounts. 11 Α. 12 Q. And when you say "operational statements", we've heard 13 the personal initial accounts were less than an A4 --Yeah. 14 Α. 15 -- and just the sort of much less detailed --Q. 16 Α. Yeah. -- than a stage 4. 17 Q. 18 Α. Yeah. 19 Is that the type of thing you were looking for? Q. Yeah. I mean, we didn't have, with hindsight now, the 20 Α. 21 basic facts as part of the process. So there was no 22 basic facts, there was no personal initial accounts submitted. So, again, we had officers involved in the 23 restraint of Mr Bayoh at that time but the gap was, as

I said there, what did they do, what activity did they

take, what was the force that was used? And again, other than -- on that first day, you're talking -- as you run through the investigation, you'll get CCTV, you'll get eyewitnesses, you'll get stuff from house-to-house or door-to-door, you'll get other witnesses coming forward through media appeals. But to get some sort of account of what the officers actually did at that location, it was going to come from their testimonies at that stage. Q. How would that have helped you, as SIO, with the

- Q. How would that have helped you, as SIO, with the investigation?
- A. Because it would have filled that gap round about who did what. What we had was a group of police officers involved in some sort of restraint, but we did not know which either or each of the officers actually did whilst basically involved in the confrontation with Mr Bayoh.
 - Q. Then very briefly looking at a short paragraph, paragraph 97, where you talk about the PIP process sitting with Conrad:

"I explained in the briefing that there was requirement for operational statements/personal initial accounts (stage 3 of PIP). I told Conrad Trickett the requirement and the need for them to account for their actions and in particular their use of force. It sits with Conrad however it's important for me in my

1		investigation. With PIP activated, it is the remit of
2		the PIM to obtain this, not the IIO."
3	A.	Yeah.
4	Q.	And we understand that as SIO you were also the IIO.
5	A.	Yeah.
6	Q.	And so was it your understanding that, as post-incident
7		manager, Conrad Trickett would facilitate obtaining
8		those personal initial accounts?
9	A.	Yes.
10	Q.	And if that was your expectation, when would you have
11		expected that to be made available to you?
12	Α.	So before the close of play, before they went off duty
13		that day.
14	MS	GRAHAME: Now, I'm conscious of the time.
15	LOR	D BRACADALE: Yes, we will adjourn there, then, until
16		Tuesday at 10 o'clock.
17	(4.	16 pm)
18		(The hearing adjourned until 10 am
19		on Tuesday, 14 March 2023)
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1	INDEX	
2		PAGE
3	DETECTIVE CHIEF SUPERINTENDENT	1
4	PATRICK CAMPBELL (continued)	
5		
6	Questions from MS GRAHAME (continued)	1
7		
8		
9		
LO		
L1		
L2		
L3		
L 4		
L5		
L 6		
L7		
L8		
L 9		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		