1	Wednesday, 11 May 2022
2	(10.01 am)
3	LORD BRACADALE: Good morning. Today we have opening
4	statements. It would be helpful if counsel, when
5	they're called, could identify themselves and the core
6	participants whom they represent. We will begin with
7	Counsel to the Inquiry, Ms Grahame.
8	Opening statement by MS GRAHAME
9	MS GRAHAME: Thank you very much.
10	On 3 May 2015, a 31-year-old man, Sheku Bayoh, died,
11	having been restrained by police officers at Hayfield
12	Road in Kirkcaldy. Sheku Bayoh was a cherished son,
13	a beloved father to his two young sons, and loved by his
14	partner, his sisters and his friends.
15	Since his death, no evidence has ever been led about
16	what happened to him before a criminal trial, a fatal
17	accident inquiry or a civil proof, but his relatives,
18	family and friends have tirelessly campaigned to find
19	out the truth about what happened on that day.
20	As a result of their efforts, on 12 November 2019,
21	the then Cabinet Secretary for Justice, Humza Yousaf
22	MSP, announced that a public inquiry would be held to
23	examine the events surrounding the death of Sheku Bayoh,
24	the subsequent investigation, and whether race was
25	a factor and he appointed you as Chair to this Inquiry.

On 21 May 2020, after consultation with key parties, the Terms of Reference were announced. After further consultation, two Assessors were appointed, Raju Bhatt and Michael Fuller, and their expertise and experience will be available to assist you and support you in this Inquiry.

#### 1. The Inquiry.

The Inquiry formally commenced on 30 November 2020 and work began to recruit a team of staff to assist you and to secure suitable premises and to fit them out and these premises include not only this hearing room, but rooms for the family and the relatives of Sheku Bayoh, the legal representatives of core participants and members of the press and offices for the extended Inquiry team.

Throughout 2020 and 2021, despite the challenges faced by the Inquiry team due to the pandemic and lockdown, 29,765 documents were gathered in and collated by the team. These documents span material that covers our full Terms of Reference. In preparation of this, the first of a number of planned hearings, around 617 relevant documents have been identified, considered and disclosed to the core participants to assist them in their preparations.

The public continued to be updated by way of video

messages from you, along with public announcements,

press releases and rulings, all of which remain

available on the website.

At your invitation, a number of organisations and individuals applied to be core participants, some are represented in groups, others are separately represented. Each application was considered and 11 core participants were granted that status and they are all represented here today.

As noted by you in the first preliminary hearing on 18 November 2021, core participants have a key role in the Inquiry. They may attend all or some of the sessions of the Inquiry, either within the hearing room itself or remotely in the building, or elsewhere via the live links provided. They may make opening and closing statements. They may suggest possible lines of enquiry and questioning to Counsel to the Inquiry and they may, where appropriate, and with your permission, ask questions of witnesses through their legal representative. Detailed guidance has been issued to legal representatives on making an application to ask questions, and a copy of that is available on the website.

In addition, throughout this entire period, regular engagement, meetings and contact has taken place between

the core participants' legal representatives and the
Inquiry team to address questions, to share information
and to allow the Inquiry team to consider any issues
brought to our attention for investigation.

There have been two preliminary hearings:

18 November last year and 22 February this year. These were recorded and footage of both remains available on the website and on the YouTube channel, which is accessible through the website.

All core participants are aware that you wish this Inquiry to be transparent, thorough and comprehensive and you welcome any comments being drawn to our attention and that remains the position.

The Inquiry's Terms of Reference are broad. This is only the first of several evidential hearings and the focus of this hearing will be the events of 3 May 2015.

A detailed chronology of those events was sent to core participants on 19 January this year. The chronology was accompanied by a note on law and practice and a list of the issues, setting out the key events and the questions to be explored, and in respect of which evidence will be led at this hearing. Discrepancies, inconsistencies and conflicts in the evidence were highlighted. Core participants were invited to draw our attention to any matters they considered had been

overlooked by the Inquiry team and this gave core participants an opportunity, should they wish, to contribute to our work in advance of this hearing. I am happy to say that useful discussions have and continue to take place and we remain open to any matters being intimated to us at any stage, now and in the future.

Unlike a trial or a civil litigation, we have the option of returning to matters at a later stage, in the event that something unexpected comes to light during the course of any of the hearings.

# 2. The approach to witnesses.

Since December last year the Inquiry team have been engaged in securing witness statements for the Inquiry from key witnesses. We have carried out careful consideration of the paperwork. The Inquiry team has been interviewing the principal witnesses to the events and has been taking detailed witness statements. These statements have been obtained having regard to the chronology, the list of issues, relevant documents and any prior statements recovered. These Inquiry statements, once complete, are signed by the witnesses.

Statements taken by the Inquiry are evidence before you, available for your consideration, and may be relied on by core participants in their closing submissions.

Conscious that the key events took place more than

seven years ago, and that memories are bound to have faded to some extent, the Inquiry team has been particularly careful to tie in witnesses present recollections with the contemporaneous documents and any statements taken at the time.

The statements referred to in evidence will be made available on the website during the hearing, so that anyone with an interest in the detail will be able to access these.

3. The request for undertakings.

As part of our work, the Inquiry also sought statements from the attending officers. None of the attending officers confirmed their willingness to waive their right to exercise the privilege against self-incrimination and this led to a detailed discussion about whether some form of undertaking would be required for the officers.

A hearing was fixed on 22 April and after considering detailed written submissions and hearing further oral submissions, you sought undertakings on behalf of the nine attending officers and three senior officers. At the end of March this request was refused by both the Solicitor General and the Deputy Chief Constable, and copies of their letters explaining the reasons for their decisions remain on the website.

The Inquiry remained fully committed to ascertaining the truth of how Sheku Bayoh died on 3 May 2015 and wished to retrieve the fullest possible evidence in relation to the events of that day.

Detailed questions were then prepared, and statements, in the form of answers to those questions, were sought from each of the officers. That was to ascertain how much information they were willing to provide the Inquiry in the absence of undertakings.

As a result, the Inquiry has been able to secure written statements of varying detail from all of the attending officers. These statements made in response to a Rule 8 request are signed by the witnesses. Again, these are evidence before you, available for your consideration and may be relied on by core participants in their closing submissions.

The statements that have been secured from the officers will be referred to in evidence and published on the website in due course. In addition, it remains the intention of the Inquiry to seek oral evidence from all the attending officers.

4. Evidence at this hearing.

This hearing will be the first opportunity for the public, friends, relatives and family members of Sheku Bayoh to hear what happened to him on 3 May 2015

and they will hear this from individuals who witnessed the events at first-hand.

The Inquiry has secured a substantial volume of material and it is not the intention to rehearse all the evidence at the public hearings, let alone read out the contents of all the relevant documents; that would not be an efficient use of the Inquiry's time.

Witnesses called to give evidence at the public hearing will do so under oath. These witnesses have provided signed statements and for those witnesses it is not my intention to rehearse in full each witness's evidence, as set out in their statement.

The contents of the statements will be taken as read and on that basis, the examination in public may be restricted to certain passages, but the whole contents of the statement will be available to you and to core participants, whether or not the witness is asked about any particular passages.

There are some witnesses who will be asked more detailed questions in the hearings, and primarily these will be eye-witnesses to the events in Hayfield Road.

There are also some witnesses who may be called back at a later date to a later hearing and that's to give evidence about subsequent events such as the post-incident investigation after the death of

Sheku Bayoh, and this is to allow you to hear other relevant aspects of their evidence in the proper context.

We are grateful for the cooperation of those witnesses, which includes a civilian witness and senior officers, and we do appreciate the personal inconvenience that this may cause. I have endeavoured to keep those witnesses to the minimum possible. They have agreed to this arrangement at my personal request and for the benefit of the Inquiry.

For the purposes of hearing 1, insofar as we are able, we will be focusing on the circumstances surrounding the events in Hayfield Road leading up to the death of Sheku Bayoh. I would simply add at this stage that you may wish to defer consideration of certain issues until you have all the evidence before you, and I will remind you of the position regarding these particular witnesses when I come to make my concluding remarks at the end of hearing 2.

Not all witnesses will be called to give oral evidence. Many have provided these written statements to the Inquiry and they will be made available to the public via our website at the appropriate time. These statements will constitute evidence to the Inquiry in terms of the Inquiries Act, and may be relied on by you

when considering matters and preparing your report.

We may also take the opportunity to read some selected statements, including some taken by Police Scotland and PIRC, into the transcript of evidence for your consideration.

For the purposes of this hearing, I have selected the available witnesses I consider best placed to tell the story of what happened on that day: those who will assist you in providing key evidence, those who will assist you to allow you to consider the credibility and reliability of key witnesses, and those who allow you to consider the issues identified as relevant to our Terms of Reference.

#### 5. The website.

Public trust in the Inquiry is vital and we hope to enhance this through increased openness. With this in mind, our digital platforms are helping us to ensure this Inquiry is accessible to as many people as possible in Scotland and beyond.

Every public hearing session will be live-streamed via our website and the YouTube channel, with all recordings of the sessions and transcripts published on the site as soon as possible. Barring any unforeseen complications, evidence such as documents, statements, maps and photographs led in public hearings will also be

published on the website by 10.00 am the following morning. This evidence library will expand in the days and weeks to come and will be easy to use and fully searchable.

In due course we will also publish on the website an evidence timeline. This innovative approach to the digitisation of evidence will allow those visiting the website to access a minute-by-minute record of how the incident unfolded, using witness statements and media evidence. We will continue to use the website and the timeline during hearings to help maximise the availability and public understanding of the evidence.

# 6. Digital evidence.

The Inquiry team intends to lead evidence relating to the journey taken by Sheku Bayoh to Hayfield Road. In order to do so, we have gathered in footage from dash cams, CCTV, mobile phones, Snapchat footage, along with photographs and stills from mobile phones. This has been collated, along with audio recordings from 999 calls, 101 calls and Airwaves messages between police officers and the control room at the relevant time.

This footage has been collated by Advanced Laser

Imaging, or ALI. ALI have created and developed

different tools for the assistance of the Inquiry during

the oral hearings, and these tools will be used when
I take evidence from the witnesses.

The first is an Excel spreadsheet. It is a combined audio and visual timeline and this has been cross-referenced with the real time. It will be a quick, ready reckoner when listening to evidence and working out who said what on the Airwaves. I will be using this during hearings and all core participants will have access to this. A hard copy will be provided to you and the Assessors for your use during the hearings and I would invite you to have regard to this document when we're listening to evidence.

Secondly, the interactive 3D scene. The interactive 3D scene has been built up from two laser scans, one from 2015 and one from late 2021, Snapchat footage and other evidence. This has formed the base of an interactive scene at Hayfield Road. There is a 3D reconstruction of the scene at Hayfield Road and the 3D digital reconstruction of Snapchat footage which was recovered from a mobile phone. You will hear much more about this from ALI in their evidence tomorrow.

The 3D scene shows Hayfield Road and provides the ability to see bird's eye views, different angles, perspectives, and accurately places cars into the scene and allows us to place people into the scene. This will

assist as we listen to the eye-witness evidence of witnesses and it may allow us to explore the versions given and identify where differences arise and why. It should allow us to explore what a witness was at least capable of seeing.

During the hearing certain witnesses will be asked to identify their location and those of other individuals within the 3D interactive scene. ALI will attend these sessions and place the relevant persons within the interactive 3D scene based on the evidence they give.

The positions of the individuals placed within the scene by each witness will allow us to assess distances and lines of sight. The witness will be asked to confirm the placement of individuals within the scene and whether that accords with their best recollection of where those present at the time were positioned. The recording of their confirmation will be used to capture a screenshot of the agreed position.

The screenshots of the visual representation of this aspect of the witnesses' evidence will be made available to core participants and will be available to you when you come to consider each witness's evidence.

3. They have prepared an evidence video timeline.

This is a complementation of video and audio evidence,

set against a real-time clock. This will be a tool that will be used during the hearings and brings together all of the original video and audio footage, that is the Airwaves, the 999 calls, the 101 calls, CCTV, Snapchat and mobile phone footage that is available to us; all of that.

In addition, the screen will also show

a reconstruction tile or window that gives a bird's eye

view of the location of movement of vehicles or persons

and that will show a blue dot or a cylinder where

a person is located.

- 4. There will be a scene overview. This is a short overview of the scene, beginning with maps of the area and moving into the 3D representation of the scene.

  This will allow witnesses to identify the area in Kirkcaldy where they saw Sheku Bayoh.
- 5. There will be stills from the 3D scene. In addition to the above, ALI have also worked on another tool for use during the evidence of certain witnesses. They have created a number of stills from the 3D scene that will be used during evidence. These will show Mr Bayoh's orientation on Hayfield Road after he had been brought to the ground.

This position has been identified using the Gallaghers public house CCTV and the Snapchat footage

from Ashley Wise's(?) mobile phone. This information will be used to place Mr Bayoh within the 3D scene and the stills will show us different perspectives, including that from Ms Wise's window.

Some of the stills will contain measurements from certain key vantage points within the scene to allow distances to be more accurately assessed during the evidence.

Witnesses will be asked to identify their locations and those of other individuals within the stills from the 3D scene. A number of versions of each still may be marked up by the witnesses during their evidence to show locations at different times.

Certain witnesses only arrived later during the course of the events and will only give evidence about the restraint. The stills of the restraint are simply to be marked up by the individual witnesses and the individuals are not to be placed into the scene by ALI, unlike the position with the interactive 3D scene. ALI will not require to be involved in this aspect of the digital reconstruction and will not be present on those days where such witnesses give their evidence.

We also have bespoke software available to the Inquiry which will allow individual witnesses to mark locations on the screen on which they are viewing the

image, that is the screen in front of everyone. Again, their evidence will be captured by a screenshot and later made available.

ALI will provide a detailed explanation and demonstration of their work in their evidence tomorrow and although ALI will be the first witnesses at this hearing, they have also agreed to make themselves available to return later for the purposes of clarification should that be required.

#### 7. November.

After the current hearing ends in June, a further short evidential hearing will take place in November and this will include evidence in relation to officer safety training, use of force and forensic analysis of certain items of evidence that were recovered on 3 May.

Deferring this evidence until November will permit any expert to consider in detail the factual evidence led during this hearing, prior to finalising forensic tests and concluding their views. Further later hearings will be fixed to focus on the cause of death, post-incident management and race, amongst other things.

### 8. Race.

In this hearing we will begin the process of exploring the extent to which actions of the officers involved were affected by the actual or perceived race

of Sheku Bayoh. Race is a thread that will run through all of the public hearings. The final hearing will draw the evidence bearing on race together and place it into context.

Although questions in relation to the impact of race will be asked by me during each hearing, including this hearing, it is my intention that the answers will be collated and retained for use during the final hearing on race. We will not at this stage explore the full context. The context will not be fully addressed until the final hearing, at which time I will invite you to consider the factual evidence and to compare this with evidence such as statistical evidence, evidence about previous reports and findings of previous inquiries and inquests. No submissions on the issue of race will be required until after the evidence in the final hearing has been considered and the full context can be addressed.

In conclusion, debate continues about what happened and whether the actions of the officers were lawful. This Inquiry presents an opportunity to allow the factual evidence to be aired and considered by everyone with an interest. Relevant expert evidence will be led in November. Any final determination regarding that evidence, including whether any use of force was lawful,

1	will be yours and yours alone and, as I understand it,
2	will be presented in your final report.
3	Over the next few weeks and in the coming months,
4	myself and Ms Thomson and the entire Inquiry team will
5	do our best to present the evidence you need to allow
6	you to make those important determinations and to find
7	the truth about what happened to Sheku Bayoh on
8	3 May 2015.
9	That concludes my opening statement.
10	LORD BRACADALE: Thank you, Ms Grahame.
11	Ms Mitchell.
12	Opening statement by MS MITCHELL
13	MS MITCHELL: I am Claire Mitchell, I'm instructed by Aamer
14	Anwar and Co and assisted by learned junior counsel
15	Clare Connelly. This opening statement is made on
16	behalf of the family of Sheku Bayoh.
17	Sheku Bayoh died on 3 May 2015. He was 31 years of
18	age. He was the father of two sons. He was a loving
19	partner to Collette. He was a son, a brother,
20	a brother-in-law and an uncle. Sheku was a man loved by
21	his family and friends and was a respected member of his
22	local community in Kirkcaldy.
23	The Inquiry has seen the very moving pen portrait
24	made by those who loved Shek, and later in this Inquiry
25	we will hear from some of those who will give evidence.

Sheku's family have endured distress and anxiety in contemplation of his suffering before his death and grief and sorrow caused by his death that continues to be experienced daily.

Two young boys will grow up without their father.

A mother will live the remainder of her life without her only son. Sheku's partner and siblings suffer his loss.

The family have fought a hard battle and endured a long wait for this Public Inquiry. The families of Sheku Bayoh have experienced institutional failure which began with a failure to preserve the life of Sheku and thereafter properly to investigate his death. Following his death, Sheku's families endured the media smearing and stereotyping of Sheku and the use of racist stereotypes in connection with the circumstances of his death.

The Inquiry will hear evidence that about 7.14 in the morning on 3 May 2015, Police Scotland responded to reports of a man with a knife behaving erratically that had been received from members of the public and were called to attend in the area of Hendry Road and Hayfield Road, Kirkcaldy.

Nine officers employed by Police Scotland attended in five marked police vehicles and two police vans within minutes of receiving the reports. The attending

police officers were Scott Maxwell, Alan Paton, Ashley
Tomlinson, Nicole Short, Craig Walker, Daniel Gibson,
James McDonough, Kayleigh Good and Alan Smith.

Within a period of about 40 to 50 seconds, officers [Walker], Paton, Tomlinson and Short had all used force against Sheku in circumstances the family believes were not necessary, legitimate or proportionate.

About 7.21 minutes, approximately 46 seconds after the first engagement with police, Sheku was on the ground and at 7.23 was reported to Inspector Stewart(?) as "secured on the ground".

Whilst he was on the ground, Sheku was restrained and forced face-down onto the ground where he was handcuffed and leg restraints were applied to both his knees and ankles. Six officers were involved in restraining Sheku and during the time he was face-down on the ground, six officers lay on top of Sheku, crossing over him from both sides and covering the whole of his body.

One officer was seen to use a baton to hold Sheku down by pushing it on his body and other officers were also seen to be using their body weight in order to restrain Sheku by placing themselves on his upper back, shoulders and neck area, and by using their knees to hold him down.

Sheku Bayoh, whilst described as being extremely large, was actually 5 foot 10 inches, weighing 12 stone 10lbs, that being 81 kilograms; whilst the combined weight of the restraining officers was 100 stone 2lbs, that being 636 kilograms. Sheku was positioned lying on the ground, face downwards and a high degree of pressure was applied to his trunk prior to his breathing becoming restricted and stopping.

Sheku Bayoh lost consciousness at or about 7.25, approximately two minutes after Inspector Stewart was advised by radio that Sheku was secure on the ground. At or about 7.29, he stopped breathing. His heart stopped. An ambulance arrived at 7.42. He was officially pronounced dead at the Accident and Emergency Department of Kirkcaldy Hospital at 9.04 am.

For seven long years, the families of Sheku Bayoh have waited for their questions to be answered about what happened on 3 May 2015. Their suffering has been compounded when the public bodies who should have protected Sheku Bayoh, who should have properly investigated what happened and who should have sought justice for Sheku Bayoh did not do their job.

Police officers, Police Scotland, the PIRC, the Scottish Police Federation and Crown Office all have difficult questions to answer. Now is the time for the

truth about Sheku Bayoh's death to emerge. Nothing that this Inquiry can do will return Sheku Bayoh to his family, but what it can do is be relentless in getting to the truth about his death because without truth, there can be no justice.

In relation to hearing 1, here is a small sample of the questions the families want answers to.

Initial engagement. Why did attending officers not make an initial assessment and feedback straight away via radio to Inspector Stuart as they had been instructed? Why was no attempt made to communicate, contain, preclude or use any other reasonable option prior to deploying the use of force? Why was there no risk assessment that considered impact factors such as the availability of police officer support, the location, the risk posed to members of the public, the physical and mental and sensory condition of Sheku Bayoh, the seriousness of the imminent risk of attack and the presence of weapons, the impact factors affecting the situation? Why was no risk assessment carried out by those attending officers prior to any form of engagement with Sheku?

What could or should have been done to establish whether Sheku was carrying a weapon at that time and why, if it was believed that Sheku was carrying a knife,

was edged weapons training awareness not to approach and to maintain a safe reactionary gap of a minimum of 21 feet not followed?

The use of force. Why did police officers proceed to use force in the form of discharge of incapacitant sprays when Hayfield Road was quiet, when there were no members of the public on the road, and Sheku was walking along Hayfield Road with his arms at his side and his palms facing forward and had made no physical or verbal threats?

Following the use of incapacitant spray why did the officers fail to take steps to ensure the health and the safety of Sheku?

Interaction with PC Short. What is the explanation for the conflicting accounts given in police statements of the assault of Nicole Short and the contemporaneous communication that took place with the control room and the footage obtained viz the CCTV and the mobile phone recordings?

Restraint. What consideration should have been given prior to the use of physical restraint in this case? Was the method of restraint in accordance with training? Did the method of restraint used in this case carry with it a foreseeable risk of death? Was the method of restraint appropriately managed at the locus

and in accordance with training? In particular, was an officer identified and positioned at Sheku's head to monitor his breathing?

Post-event management. Why was the appropriate crime scene management not employed at the scene of Sheku's restraint to allow full and proper investigation and recovery of evidence to take place? Why were police officers allowed to remain together in the police canteen for hours? Why were police officers not separated and statements taken from them? Why were the relevant forms not completed in respect of use of force? What role did the Police Federation have in advising police officers in giving statements? What clothing and other items of evidence, for example, CS gas and PAVA spray, were seized from the attending officers at the station? If none, why not?

What action, disciplinary or otherwise, has been taken against individual police officers for their failure to follow instructions given on arrival at the scene, their failure to complete the use of force forms and any other breaches of duty? Were any of the attending officers known to have racist sympathies or alleged to have acted in a racially discriminatory manner prior to this incident. Were any of the attending officers previously investigated in respect of

suspected racist sympathies or racial discrimination prior to this incident?

What language was used to describe Sheku Bayoh by police and civilian witnesses and to what extent is this language informed by racist stereotypes, for example "a man deranged with super-human strength", "he was massive and is the biggest male that I have seen" and "could be part of a terrorist plot".

What the family want from the Inquiry. The family want the whole truth from this Inquiry: how and why did Sheku die? If there was wrongdoing on the part of individuals or otherwise, that wrongdoing must be identified, scrutinised and made public.

The Inquiry and the investigations that underpin it should ensure that the full facts are brought to light. That any culpable and discreditable conduct by police officers is exposed and brought to public notice, that suspicion of deliberate wrongdoing by police officers if unjustified is allayed. That any shortcomings in training or execution of duty by police officers is exposed, that the role Sheku Bayoh's race or perceived race played in his detention and death is scrutinised. That the actions of Police Scotland, PIRC, the Police Federation and Crown Office are scrutinised. That there is scrutiny of whether

institutional racism existed and informed the actions of the attending officers, Police Scotland, PIRC, Police Federation and Crown.

To achieve the foregoing, the Inquiry must without fear or favour identify and examine all the relevant evidence and be prepared to ask difficult questions of individuals and institutions who may not usually be the subject of scrutiny and to be tenacious to get to the truth. Sheku Bayoh and his family deserve no less.

This hard fought Public Inquiry is the final port of call for these questions to be answered. For this to happen, the Bayoh family wish to effectively participate in the Inquiry by having the relevant questions asked. This is not a request, but a right safeguarded by Article 2.

The Bayoh family is concerned that racial stereotyping may have been a contributory factor in the death of Sheku Bayoh resulting from restraint and use of force. The question of racism has from the very beginning been the elephant in the room. The Inquiry must scrutinise how this forms part of the investigation process.

The family wish the Inquiry to scrutinise the use of inappropriate language, unconscious racism, unwitting racism by police officers and those from the authorities

that followed in their footsteps. Whilst this undoubtedly adds to the burden the Chair and Assessors carry, the legal team representing the Bayoh families are here to assist wherever they can in supporting you to fulfil the Terms of Reference of the Inquiry.

The family need to ensure the issue of race is central, always posing the question: would this have happened if Sheku Bayoh was white? The real answer to that question is seen in the Stephen Lawrence Inquiry, the Chhokar Inquiry and others since, cannot however be achieved by simply asking questions of the witnesses "Would you have acted differently if Sheku was a white man?"

This Inquiry, having identified the centrality of race, has an opportunity to ensure that this is rigorously interrogated and to avoid the mistakes of prior inquiries such as the Stephen Lawrence Inquiry and that of the Chhokar Inquiry.

This Inquiry will have to be live to the difficult questions in relation to racism. This is because the context of the death of Sheku Bayoh dying in his encounter with the police is far broader than what happened in Kirkcaldy on 3 May 2015. The circumstances of his death are a reflection of a global issue.

When the Inquiry was set up after years of

campaigning by the family, Humza Yousaf, the then
Cabinet Secretary for Justice stated:

"For any independent scrutiny of this case to be rigorous and credible it must address the question of whether or not Mr Bayoh's race played a part in how the incident was approached and dealt with by the police."

In November 2020, the final report of Dame Elish Angiolini into a review on complaints handling and investigations on misconduct issues in relation to policing was published. She found evidence of racism within Police Scotland and reflecting upon that she quoted Sir William Macpherson of the Stephen Lawrence Inquiry and she said:

"Unwitting racism can arise because of a lack of understanding, ignorance or mistaken beliefs. It can arise from well intentioned but patronising words or actions. It can arise from unfamiliarity with behaviour or cultural traditions of people or families from minority ethnic communities. It can arise from racist stereotyping of black people as potential criminals or troublemakers. Often this arises out of uncritical self-understanding born out of an inflexible ethos of the traditional way of doing things. Furthermore, such attitudes can thrive in a tight-knit community so that there can be a collective failure to detect and outlaw

this breed of racism. The police canteen can too easily

this breeding ground."

She went on to say in relation to Police Scotland:

"Much of the evidence presented to me was
a chastening reminder that in the Police Service and in
the wider community, attitudes have not changed as much
as they should have since these words were written, or
as much as we would like to believe they have."

After the murder of George Floyd in 2020, the

Human Rights Council requested a report from the United

Nations High Commissioner For Human Rights. That

report, published in June 2021, stated:

"The murder of George Floyd on 25 May 2020 and the ensuing mass protests worldwide have marked a watershed in the fight against racism. In some countries there is now broader acknowledgement of the systemic nature of the racism that affects the lives of African people and people of African descent and of the need to address the past in order to secure future conditions of life that uphold the dignity and the rights of all. It is our collective duty to address these issues immediately and everywhere."

We invite the Inquiry to consider the terms both of this 2020 and 2021 report referred to above in the context of the death of Sheku Bayoh.

The Sheku Bayoh Inquiry will properly attract international interest. Against the background of the disproportionate numbers of deaths in custody of black people across the world, inquiries such as this are instrumental in exposing failures in individual incidents and the institutional racism that underpins, informs and empowers such incidents to occur again and again.

This Inquiry is an opportunity to expose institutional racism and hold those responsible to account. The Inquiry must be fearless in investigating the lack of accountability of our guardians of law and order.

Following Sheku's death, the Bayoh family tried desperately to keep an open mind on what happened on Hayfield Road, Kirkcaldy, on 3 May 2015. They have remained dignified but full of rage because they are not asking for anything special, just the truth, because without the truth there of course can be no justice.

The slogan that the family raised at the start of their campaign was "The dead cannot cry out for justice, it is the duty of the living to do so for them." To fulfil that duty, this Inquiry must ensure that nobody is allowed to evade accountability or frustrate the inquisitorial process.

1	Sheku Bayoh's family will never rest until they have
2	truth.
3	LORD BRACADALE: Thank you, Ms Mitchell.
4	Ms McGuire.
5	Opening statement by MS MAGUIRE
6	MS MAGUIRE: Yes, my name is Maria Maguire, I represent the
7	Chief Constable Iain Livingstone who is head of the
8	Police Service of Scotland. I am assisted by Lisa
9	Henderson and Suzanne Lambert.
10	I thank you, sir, for allowing me the opportunity to
11	make this opening statement on behalf of the
12	Chief Constable.
13	Yesterday we were privileged to hear from Mr Bayoh's
14	families who shared their memories of him. No one could
15	fail to be moved by the eloquence, courage and dignity
16	shown in that presentation, or fail to understand the
17	devastating loss they have suffered. The death of
18	a young person causes unimaginable grief and no mother
19	should have to suffer the loss of her son.
20	The presentation was a poignant reminder of what
21	this Inquiry is about. It is about the death of
22	Sheku Bayoh, a much loved son, father, brother, uncle,
23	cousin, nephew, partner and a good friend; a young black
24	man who was a member of the Scottish community, the
25	Kirkcaldy community, a fellow citizen, who died

following an interaction with officers of Police Scotland.

The Chief Constable who is present here today has asked that I address my first remarks to you, his family. You are at the heart of this Inquiry. The Chief Constable wishes to express his support for this Inquiry to you in person and publicly. Today he offers his condolences to you for the loss of your loved one.

The Chief Constable was powerfully affected by
Kadi's statement yesterday that she does not feel safe
in Scotland, that she fears for her children and for her
nieces and nephews. As Chief Constable, he leads
a police service whose purpose is to improve safety and
wellbeing of the people and communities of Scotland.
That mission is and must be for the benefit of all
citizens and, as Chief Constable, he is clear that
Police Scotland has a major role in ensuring that
Scotland is a safe, secure and welcoming place.

The Chief Constable has committed Police Scotland to support the Inquiry's aims and objectives with absolute candour. At his direction, extensive resources have been applied and continue to be applied to assist in the provision of material to the Inquiry and ensure the fullest possible engagement with the Inquiry.

He agrees that it is essential to understand all

that happened in Kirkcaldy on 3 May 2015 and whether or not race or perceived race played any part in the tragic outcome or the subsequent events.

You can be reassured that any omissions or failures on the part of the Police Service will be acknowledged, that lessons have been learned and will continue to be learned and that there will be a constant striving for continuous improvement.

There is no doubt about the importance of this

Inquiry to you and your families, to the communities of

Scotland, the black community and other minority

communities.

The Chief Constable knows how vital it is to maintain and build the confidence of all communities served by the police. It is for that reason that what he wishes the focus of this, his opening statement, to be is on the issue of racism and policing in Scotland. Whilst it is not a specific question for the first hearing, it will be relevant to all aspects under consideration as the Inquiry progresses. It therefore has its place properly now, at the beginning of the first hearing.

Sir, I turn now to address the Inquiry on that chapter of the written statement: policing in Scotland and the issue of racism.

Policing in Scotland is done with and by the consent of the public. The Chief Constable has consistently underlined that Police Scotland draws its legitimacy from the consent of and bond of trust it has with its fellow citizens. Effective policing is enabled and enhanced by the trust and confidence of the public. The main purpose of policing in Scotland is to improve the safety and wellbeing of people and communities and that purpose is of course to serve all people and all communities.

The Chief Constable regards this Inquiry as one of the most important opportunities to address the issue of racism and policing publicly. It is critical for the future of policing in Scotland. Without question, it is fundamental to furthering the aims of Police Scotland to serve all communities. The scope of the issue must be properly understood, acknowledged where it exists and zero tolerance of racism actively upheld and enforced.

The question of whether or not race or perceived race played any part in what happened on 3 May 2015 to Mr Bayoh and thereafter is a serious and grave matter for policing in Scotland and its relationship with the public.

The Chief Constable reaffirms his public position that racism or discrimination of any kind is utterly

deplorable, completely unacceptable and should have no place in society and no place in policing.

Police officers and staff are drawn from the different experiences and backgrounds of the public they serve. What unites them are Police Scotland's values of integrity, fairness, respect, a commitment to upholding human rights and a shared mission to keep people safe. He is clear that improving how policing reflects, represents and serves all communities is an operational necessity; it is a moral imperative.

The communities of Scotland can be reassured that the Chief Constable, as leader of Police Scotland, will continue to implement necessary change to build and maintain the bond of trust with all communities and provide everyone with fair, just and effective policing.

Accordingly, the onus is on the Police Service to reassure the public that such responsibilities will be exercised fairly, without malice or ill will based on race or perceived race.

Police officers have substantial powers.

The Chief Constable is aware that it is not enough to be alert to racism and deal with it on a case-by-case basis when it comes to light, nor is it enough simply to be non-racist. Police Scotland needs to be anti-racist. He has thought carefully about the actions which need to

be taken in order for an organisation to be anti-racist
He uses that term to mean that the organisation should
seek to address and challenge the existence and working
of racism at all levels: personal, cultural and
institutional. This goes beyond simply delivering
training in equality, diversity and inclusion, but
includes following that training up with a determination
to seek out and combat racism in any form. It means
developing policies, structures and systems, followed b
actions to deconstruct racism and address issues of
power, justice and inequality.

His message will be made clear at all levels of the organisation to ensure that the whole culture is anti-racist. Each individual needs to ask these questions of themselves: how can I be anti-racist? How can I combat racism? And how can I counter racism?

The Chief Constable has a duty and an opportunity to strive for a change now which is unquestionably and absolutely morally and ethically right. There is still work to be done to strengthen public confidence in the police. Recent events nationally across the United Kingdom and internationally have demonstrated that. The Chief Constable is listening to all communities, is committed to understanding their issues and is taking positive and effective action.

1	- 1 1 ·	1	and the second of the second			
	Disadvantage	and	inilistice	persist	ıη	SOCIETY.
-	Dibaavancage	arra	<b>T11</b> ) <b>GD C T C C</b>	PCTCTC		CCCTCC, •

Discrimination by individuals through cultural norms and in the structures of institutions remain.

Police Scotland is not immune from these challenges and that was underlined by Dame Elish Angiolini's review of police complaints in 2020.

The Chief Constable is acutely aware that given the essential role policing has in society, he has a duty to lead, uphold and inspire change that improves the experiences and lives of the public served by the police in Scotland.

In discharge of that duty he has determined that under his command and leadership, the Police Service of Scotland will become an actively anti-racist service.

Police officers take an oath of office, adhere to a code of ethics and must adhere to the standards of professional behaviour. Police officers are not simply employees: they are the holders of the public office of constable, subject to a strict regulatory framework which is essential for the preservation of public confidence and the proper discharge of their duties as police officers. The standards of behaviour include the obligation to report, challenge or take action against the conduct of other officers which has fallen below the standards of professional behaviour.

Accordingly, there is a clear obligation on officers to challenge colleagues who breach the standard of equality and diversity and exhibit racist behaviour.

The Chief Constable has personally ensured that there is renewed action on inclusion and diversity within Police Scotland which is subject to external, independent oversight, challenge and scrutiny.

Police Scotland has the benefit of an equality, diversity, inclusion and human rights independent review group with an independent chair. Diversity action plans have been introduced after consultation with diversity staff associations and working groups established to deliver on these plans. In addition, leadership development programmes have been reviewed to ensure equality, diversity and inclusion sit at the heart of them and there's a commitment to increase development opportunities for underrepresented groups.

The Chief Constable and the Deputy Chief Constable, Mrs Fiona Taylor, have led steps to direct and deliver real change. They recognise that training and espoused values are one thing, but to be really effective, what is essential is that the necessary core values are an integral part of the culture of the organisation at every level.

There is an awareness that culture can be defined in

many ways and that there will be more than one level of culture operating in any organisation. They understand that it is a complex matter. It requires the re-examination of the interrelationship between the basic assumptions of individuals and the core values of Police Scotland. It requires the embedding of core standards of behaviour to ensure that the culture of every division and department in Police Scotland is anti-racist and that all behaviours and attitudes are in line with that culture.

This will be achieved through action, leadership, campaigns, empathy-building, positive narratives and peer support, with a rigorous adherence to legal duties, all of which will be continually assessed and evaluated for effect. Each member of the organisation of Police Scotland needs to think and act in accordance with the shared core values in order to be anti-racist.

The Chief Constable is absolutely determined that processes set in train under his command will lead to progressive change, a trajectory that will one day lead to there being no question but that the Police Service of Scotland is an anti-racist service.

The Chief Constable is sending a very clear and strong message that if you hold racist, misogynist or discriminatory views, you are unwelcome in policing. It

1	is imperative that progress is made. Words and good
2	intent are not enough. There will be action, practical,
3	firm, progressive, visible action.
4	The Chief Constable declares that upholding the core
5	values of the Police Service of Scotland demands that it
6	be anti-racist, that Police Scotland will aim to become
7	a truly anti-racist service and that Police Scotland
8	will aim to act at all times in accordance with that
9	declaration.
10	Sir, I formally adopt the fuller written statement
11	on behalf of the Chief Constable which will be submitted
12	to the Inquiry today and I conclude by reaffirming that
13	this Public Inquiry has the full support of the
14	Chief Constable and Police Scotland. There is a shared
15	aim to understand the events and the causes and to
16	address matters as they arise. There will be absolute
17	candour from Police Scotland. The organisation will
18	continue to support the Inquiry in all its
19	investigations and aims.
20	Thank you, sir.
21	LORD BRACADALE: Thank you, Ms Maguire.
22	Mr Scullion.
23	Opening statement by MR SCULLION
24	MR SCULLION: My name is John Scullion and I represent the
25	Police Investigations and Review Commissioner, the PIRC.

Opening statement on behalf of the PIRC. The PIRC is grateful for the opportunity to make an opening statement at the outset of phase 1 of the public hearings in this Inquiry. Before I say anything else, I wish on behalf of the PIRC and those representing her to express my sincere condolences to the Bayoh family and to acknowledge the dignity and resilience they have shown whilst waiting for these proceedings to commence.

The PIRC is committed to assisting your Lordship in the chair and the Inquiry team in achieving its twofold aim of establishing the circumstances surrounding the death of Sheku Bayoh in police custody on 3 May 2015 and making recommendations to prevent deaths in similar circumstances and, secondly, examining the post-incident management processes and subsequent investigation, and considering the extent, if any, to which the events leading up to and following the death of Sheku Bayoh, in particular the actions of the officers involved, were affected by his actual or perceived race and to make recommendations. The PIRC welcomes the important Public Inquiry and is committed to implementing the lessons or learning that may arise from its findings.

As you are aware, the PIRC involvement in the investigation of the death of Sheku Bayoh began with the instruction from the Crown on 3 May 2015 to investigate

the interaction between the police and Sheku Bayoh at the time of his arrest and the events thereafter.

As a consequence, the PIRC holds relevant material. It is important that the material is placed before this Inquiry. It is for this reason that the PIRC has been designated as a core participant to the Inquiry. The PIRC has been actively engaged in the preparation, presentation and disclosure of relevant material to the Inquiry since its inception and has cooperated fully with all requests from the Inquiry team, including the provision of a significant number of documentary and physical productions.

The PIRC acknowledges that this work, which has been carried out since the Inquiry was announced and continues as required, was important and necessary. It is worth pointing out that the work undertaken in preparation for the Inquiry has been considerable and has involved the input of several members of the PIRC team, as well as the Commissioner herself.

On behalf of the PIRC, I wish to record my appreciation of the hard work and helpful approach of Senior Counsel to the Inquiry, the Solicitor to the Inquiry and the whole Inquiry team.

Regular discussions between counsel and different members of staff within the PIRC and the Inquiry team

have been key to ensuring good progress in addressing the many complex issues, including those relating to the sheer quantity of evidence.

Legislative framework. The Police and Fire Reform (Scotland) Act 2012 created inter alia a single Police Service for Scotland, the Police Service of Scotland, or to use its corporate name, Police Scotland.

Prior to 2012, there existed reciprocal arrangements among the eight legacy forces to allow for the independent investigation of the conduct of officers.

The introduction of a single service removed this opportunity. In accordance with the European Convention on Human Rights, with particular regard to Article 2, right to life, and Article 3, freedom from torture or inhumane treatment, there exists a requirement for an investigatory body with no hierarchical or institutional connection to those police officers under investigation.

To this end, the 2012 Act also established the

Independent Office for the Police Investigations and

Review Commissioner. The PIRC came into existence on

1 April 2013.

Role and responsibilities of the PIRC. Section 33A of the Police, Public Order and Criminal Justice (Scotland) Act 2006, as amended, sets out the general functions of the PIRC. One of those functions is where

directed	to do so by the appropriate prosecutor, to
investig	ate on behalf of the relevant procurator fiscal
the circ	umstances of any death involving a person
serving	with the police which that procurator fiscal is
required	to investigate under section 1 of the Inquiries
into Fat	al Accidents and Sudden Deaths etc (Scotland)
Act 2016	

Sections 1 and 2, subsection 4 of the Inquiries Into Fatal Accidents and Sudden Deaths Etc (Scotland) Act 2016 includes all deaths in legal custody.

A further function is where directed to do so by the appropriate prosecutor, to investigate any circumstances in which there is an indication that a person serving with the police may have committed an offence.

In carrying out an investigation on behalf of
the Crown Office and Procurator Fiscal Service, the PIRC
complies to comply with (a) any lawful instruction given
by the appropriate prosecutor who issued the direction
and (b) in the case of an investigation in which there
is an indication that a person serving with the police
may have committed an offence, any instruction issued by
the Lord Advocate in relation to reporting for
consideration of the question of prosecution of alleged
offences.

Referral by COPFS. Following the death of

Sheku Bayoh on 3 May 2015, the PIRC was instructed by the Lord Advocate in terms of section 3, 33A(b)(ii) of the 2006 Act to investigate the interaction between the police and Sheku Bayoh at the time of his arrest and the events thereafter.

Terms of Reference of the Crown instruction to the PIRC were expanded on three occasions. Firstly, on 5 May 2015, the Terms of Reference were expanded to include investigation of: 1, the circumstances leading up to the incident, namely the movements of Sheku Bayoh late on Saturday 2 May 2015 and during the early hours of Sunday 3 May prior to contact with the police, including his attendance at a house at Craigmount Kirkcaldy, and events following his attendance there; and 2, the incident in which the police became involved with Sheku Bayoh shortly after 7.00 am on 3 May 2015.

On 12 June 2015, the PIRC was further directed by the Lord Advocate to investigate concerns expressed by Sheku Bayoh's family, namely 3, allegations by the family that they were provided with misleading and erroneous information concerning the death of Sheku Bayoh by police and a concern as to why they were provided with that information; 4, concerns that the initial police investigations and attempts to secure evidence were not thorough, meaning that crucial

evidence was lost to the Inquiry; and 5, that there was inappropriate conferring between police officers.

Finally, on 2 July 2015 the PIRC was further directed by the Lord Advocate to: 6, to investigate the allegation of criminal conduct made by Zahid Saeed.

7(a) investigate issues of race and conduct, 7(b) investigate allegations of potential contraventions of the Data Protection Act 1998 and 7(c), investigate miscellaneous other matters.

Investigation. The PIRC undertook an extensive investigation. This included obtaining several hundred witness statements, a total of 512 statements were obtained, some taken by officers of Police Scotland, ten were obtained by the PIRC from expert witnesses, the investigation examined seven separate incident scenes and recovered in excess of 903 productions.

Between May 2015 and the announcement of the Public Inquiry in late 2019, it has assessed that in excess of 10,954 hours were worked by PIRC staff in relation to the investigation of the death of Sheku Bayoh.

Findings. The PIRC provided two reports to the Crown in relation to the investigation into the death of Sheku Bayoh: the first on 10 August 2015 and the second on 9 August 2016. The two reports considered

the original Crown-directed investigation and the additional Terms of Reference provided by the Crown. In addition to this, the PIRC provided three interim situational reports to the Crown to provide updates on the progress of investigations at 11 and 21 May 2015 and 30 October 2015.

PIRC. In May 2015, the PIRC was still a fairly new organisation, having been in existence for only two years. At that time, institutional learning within the PIRC was still at an early stage. It is fair to say that in the seven years since then there have been many changes. The organisation has grown in response to increasing demands, considerable experience has been gained as a consequence of undertaking its statutory roles in that period. Many opportunities have been taken to learn and develop processes, policies and practice. The current Commissioner, the third to hold the position, has been in post since June 2019.

To assist with some context, between 2014 and 2015 the PIRC undertook 31 investigations; in 2021 and 2022 the number of investigations undertaken was 124.

In May 2015, the PIRC's annual operating budget was £2,971,000; today it is £5,824,000. Prior to the investigation into the death of Sheku Bayoh, the PIRC had investigated a total of ten deaths in custody; today

the number of deaths in custody investigated is 31.

While I do not plan to explore in detail at this stage the lessons and changes already learned since 2015, I consider it appropriate to highlight key areas that will fall to be considered in the first hearing where there has already been considerable change. These include the post-incident process, the manner and timescales of referrals from Police Scotland, the provision of witness statements, the investigative processes, reporting procedures and how the PIRC deals with allegations of discrimination in investigations and complaint handling reviews.

I highlight these key developments in recognition of the fact that the PIRC is an evolving and learning organisation that has seen significant increase in demand and infrastructure since 2015. It is on this basis that, as I stated at the outset of my opening statement, the PIRC welcomes the Public Inquiry and the opportunity for further critical learning which is necessary to continue to provide an independent investigation and review function vital to securing public trust and confidence in policing in Scotland.

Thank you.

LORD BRACADALE: Thank you, Mr Scullion. We will take a break now and I will aim to sit again at 11.45.

1	(11.20 am)
2	(Short Break)
3	(11.47 am)
4	LORD BRACADALE: Now, Mr Duncan.
5	Opening statement by MR DUNCAN
6	MR DUNCAN: Good morning. I'm Alasdair Duncan and
7	I represent the Lord Advocate who you will be aware
8	represents the Crown. I'm assisted by Ms Bain who is at
9	the back of the room and Ms Aitken from the Procurator
LO	Fiscal Service who is a few rows behind you.
L1	There was an indication yesterday that condolences
L2	were not particularly welcome or helpful from
L3	organisations like the one I represent, and I have to
L 4	say I find that position entirely understandable, but
L5	please be aware you do have those condolences.
L 6	Sir, proceeding with my opening statement on behalf
L7	of the Lord Advocate, as has previously been explained,
L8	the present Lord Advocate, prior to her appointment,
L9	acted as senior counsel on behalf of the Sheku Bayoh
20	family. In consequence of this, the Lord Advocate has
21	recused herself from any involvement in the conduct of
22	the Inquiry, therefore, although the Lord Advocate was
23	designated a core participant by you, sir, the Crown's
24	engagement with the Inquiry is directed by the
25	Solicitor General and this opening statement is made on

her behalf and it focuses on hearing 1.

The Solicitor General welcomes the commencement of the Inquiry's oral hearings. She is committed to participating and assisting the Inquiry team where that is appropriate and likely to be useful, but anything the solicitor does to assist the Inquiry requires to be capable of being reconciled with the obligations she has in relation to the administration of criminal justice in Scotland.

It may be worth saying a little more about that just now in order to understand how it informs the Solicitor General's engagement with the important work of the Inquiry.

As Mr Scullion has already explained for the PIRC, on 3 May 2015, the then Lord Advocate instructed the PIRC to carry out an investigation in terms of section 33A of the 2006 Act and that was to investigate the interaction between police officers and Sheku Bayoh and the events thereafter and also, as Mr Scullion has explained, those Terms of Reference were expanded on three separate occasions up to July 2015. The PIRC submitted an initial report in August 2015 before submission of a voluminous final report in August 2016.

Further significant Inquiry was undertaken by the Crown, including the instruction and analysis of

multiple expert reports covering a broad range of medical and technical matters.

Against that background, the circumstances surrounding the death of Sheku Bayoh were carefully considered by Crown lawyers, including senior Crown counsel, for the purposes of considering criminal proceedings against individual police officers and against the Police Service of Scotland.

Senior crown counsel came to the view that there was insufficient evidence to bring criminal proceedings.

That determination was the subject of an application for review in accordance with rules made under section 4 of the Victims and Witnesses (Scotland) Act 2014. A review was undertaken by principal Crown counsel whose analysis and conclusions were reviewed by the then Solicitor General.

The outcome of the review was intimated by letter to solicitors acting for the families of Sheku Bayoh on 11 November 2019. The letter advised that the Crown considered there to be insufficient evidence to establish criminality on the part of police officers, whether individually or collectively, and that there was insufficient evidence to bring proceedings in respect of suggested wrongful acts and omissions by the Police Service of Scotland.

On the same date, the Crown wrote to solicitors acting for police officers involved in the restraint of Sheku Bayoh. The letter said that Crown counsel had instructed that no criminal proceedings should be instituted against any police officers in relation to the death of Sheku Bayoh based on "Current available information". The letter added the following and once again I quote:

"You will be aware that there is an obligation on the prosecutor to keep cases under review. This includes cases in which the prosecutor has decided to take no action. The Crown therefore reserves the right to prosecute any of the officers at a future date."

These comments underline the dual role that the Solicitor General requires to fulfil in relation to this Inquiry. She must do what she can to assist the Inquiry where that is appropriate, but she must also keep all evidence emerging from the Inquiry's work under review in terms of her role in the criminal justice system and she must be seen to act fairly as regards that.

Now, this may mean that in hearing 1, although seeking to assist the Inquiry team where we can, the principal role of the Solicitor General's legal team will be in listening to and analysing the evidence that emerges. Co-counsel and Crown solicitors will be in

1	attendance for that purpose and I should add that none
2	of us was involved in the investigation into the death
3	of Sheku Bayoh or the subsequent review.
4	We will listen to all of the evidence with care and
5	that began yesterday with the moving accounts by and on
6	behalf of the relatives and families and friends of
7	Sheku.
8	Later phases of the Inquiry, hearing 3 in
9	particular, will look at post-incident management. The
LO	Solicitor General and her team look forward to providing
L1	whatever assistance they can in relation to that phase
L2	of the Inquiry's work, but in emphasising that aspect of
13	the Inquiry's Terms of Reference, the
L 4	Solicitor General does not lose sight of another
L5	important aspect, in particular the
L 6	Solicitor General keeps in mind that at the preliminary
L7	hearing on 18 November 2021, and emphasised again this
L8	morning, Counsel to the Inquiry emphasised the
L 9	importance of race to the questions before the Inquiry,
20	that at all times the Inquiry will ask whether race or
21	perceived race made a difference.
22	The Solicitor General and her team will proceed in
23	the same way.
24	Thank you, sir.
25	LORD BRACADALE: Thank you, Mr Duncan.

Τ	Mr McConnachie.
2	Opening statement by MR MCCONNACHIE
3	MR MCCONNACHIE: Thank you, sir.
4	This is an opening statement on behalf of Police
5	Constable Alan Paton, now retired. My name is
6	Brian McConnachie and I appear alongside Ms Radcliffe,
7	advocate on behalf of Alan Paton. We are instructed by
8	Paul Kavanagh of KM Law.
9	This opening statement is made on behalf of Alan
10	Paton. He has been granted core participant status in
11	the Sheku Bayoh Inquiry. This statement will explain
12	who he is and outlines what he is seeking from the
13	Inquiry.
14	Firstly, on behalf of Mr Paton we thank the Chair
15	for affording us the opportunity to make this opening
16	statement.
17	Alan Paton was a police constable with
18	Police Scotland based at Kirkcaldy police office. He
19	was on duty on 3 May 2015. At approximately 07.20 he,
20	along with a colleague, attended a call relating to
21	several reports of a black male in position of a knife
22	on Hendry Road, Kirkcaldy.
23	They were the first officers to attend the scene.
24	On arrival he saw Mr Bayoh in the street directly in
25	front of the police vehicle. He was involved in the

subsequent restraint of Mr Bayoh. Thereafter, he assisted in administering CPR until the paramedics arrived.

We would, in common with others, wish to express our sympathy to the family and friends of Sheku Bayoh and our thoughts and condolences remain with them.

Alan Paton understands that Mr Bayoh's death has had a dramatic effect on the family. He also understands that the family hope to obtain answers to the many questions which they have surrounding the circumstances of Mr Bayoh's death and the aftermath, questions which remain despite the fact more than seven years have now passed.

The aim of this Inquiry is twofold. First to establish the circumstances surrounding the death of Sheku Bayoh and make recommendations to prevent deaths in similar circumstances. Secondly, the Inquiry will assess the post-incident management process and subsequent investigation, making recommendations, if appropriate, and consider the extent, if any, to which the events leading up to and following his death, in particular the actions of the officers involved, were affected by his actual or perceived race and make recommendations to address any findings in that regard.

In this initial part of the hearing, the issues to

be addressed are set out in the document SBPI00003.
Primarily in relation to Mr Paton these would appear to
be (a) risk assessment, (b) initial contact with
Mr Bayoh, (c) the restraint, (d) the calling of the
ambulance, and (e) the completion of paperwork.

It is hoped that with the assistance and cooperation of all core participants that the Inquiry will discover the truth of what happened and offer the family closure, that furthermore if there are lessons to be learned from any part of the Inquiry's remit, that these are highlighted and taken on board.

The Chair of the Inquiry has already stated that the family of Sheku Bayoh and their interests will be at the heart of the Inquiry and it is acknowledged that this is entirely appropriate. However, they are not the only people to have been affected adversely by the events of the early morning of 3 May 2015. The death of Sheku Bayoh has also impacted significantly upon the life of Alan Paton and his family. After a lengthy period of illness, he retired from Police Scotland due to ill health. He has not worked since. He has been diagnosed with post-traumatic stress disorder. He has been subjected to unjustified vilification on social media and in both written and broadcast media. He has been made the focus of attention from the

representatives of Mr Bayoh's family and his involvement in matters has been singled out falsely as being motivated by race. There has been extensive media coverage naming him as being involved in the incident and alleging racism and violence on his part. Mr Paton denies all these various accusations.

Members of his own immediate family, whilst accompanied by the representative of Mr Bayoh's family, have gone public with various allegations against Mr Paton. These allegations were it is believed motivated by a family feud and were false. In addition, they relate to matters which have no bearing whatsoever on the issues which this Inquiry has to deal with arising from the events of 3 May 2015.

Statements have been disclosed relating to historical complaints against Mr Paton arising from his time as a serving police officer with no attempt to balance these complaints with the many positive appraisals arising from that same service.

Alan Paton carried out his responsibilities as a police officer without fear or favour for many years. He carried out his duties diligently and properly. Alan Paton has confidence that the Inquiry can, and hopes that it will, deliver on its Terms of Reference and meet its objectives by exploring the evidence and discovering

1 the truth. Alan Paton believes that the Inquiry will be able to 2 establish on the evidence that there was no wrongdoing 3 on his part and that none of the decisions he made, nor 4 5 actions he took were affected in any way by Mr Bayoh's race or perceived race. 6 7 Alan Paton was faced with a dynamic set of circumstances where decisions had to be taken as 8 a matter of urgency. The Inquiry may find mistakes were 9 10 made and that with the benefit of hindsight, other decisions could have been taken. However, mistakes 11 12 made, if any, were honest ones in the context of the 13 circumstances which faced Mr Paton and his colleagues. It is hoped that the Inquiry will deliver on its 14 15 Terms of Reference and meet its objectives. Mr Paton and his representatives look forward to continuing to 16 work with the Inquiry team in this and subsequent 17 hearings in an effort to establish the facts and learn 18 19 any lessons arising from them. 20 Thank you. LORD BRACADALE: Thank you. 21 22 Dean of Faculty. Opening statement by the DEAN OF FACULTY 23

25 My name is Roddy Dunlop and I represent the Scottish

DEAN OF FACULTY: Thank you, sir.

24

Police Federation, retired PC Nicole Short and PC
Craig Walker and in that regard, I am assisted by Euan
Scott, advocate, and by PBW Law.

The death of Mr Bayoh was a tragedy for all concerned, but in particular for his family. Those I represent consider it appropriate to recognise that at the outset.

Ms Short and PC Walker welcome the opportunity to present their evidence to the Inquiry. In the absence of undertakings from the Solicitor General they have been advised to consider responding to requests for information and questions from the Inquiry with no comment. However, they have declined to follow that advice by choosing to provide full and frank evidence to the Inquiry. This is a decision that they have not taken lightly. It is a decision they have taken because they are determined to assist this Inquiry in every way that they can. They are determined to provide their evidence to assist the Inquiry, but also to dispel any suggestion of wrongdoing on their part. They are content for their evidence to speak for itself.

The Federation likewise welcomes the Inquiry. It is a statutory body whose purpose is to represent members of the Police Force in Scotland in all matters affecting their welfare and efficiency. It has a direct role in

representing members' interests, in the policies adopted
by Police Scotland, their members' training and the
resources available to them. It provides
representations on behalf of its members to the
government, Police Scotland and other related agencies
to ensure that the best interests of its members are
properly represented.

The Federation is wholly separate from

Police Scotland and is neither a training body, nor an
investigative body. In essence it is akin to a trade
union for the members of the Police Force in Scotland.

It is the representative body of the majority of
police officers in this country, including those that
were involved in the restraint of Mr Bayoh on

3 May 2015.

The Chair has indicated that he wants the family to be at the heart of the Inquiry. That is clearly correct and appropriate given what the Inquiry will consider and the likely emotional toll on the family. It would, however, be naive to think that the events of that day have not had a material impact on the lives and families of the officers who attended the scene that day.

As a representative body, the Federation did not play a role in the restraint of Mr Bayoh; it nevertheless has an interest in ensuring that lessons

can be learned from the matters to be addressed, for example, in relation to the resources provided to police officers or any changes to training. The Federation is aware that changes have since been made to training provided to police officers by Police Scotland, particularly surrounding how to recognise and approach individuals suffering from an acute behavioural disturbance. The Federation is keen to explore what further changes, if any, can be made. The Federation is keen to explore the resourcing that was made available to the officers who attended the scene that day and, in particular, whether the provision of additional officer safety equipment might have avoided the fatal outcome.

A representative of the Federation was involved in the immediate aftermath when they provided welfare advice to the officers involved upon request. As a result of providing that advice and by making arrangements for the officers to have the benefit of legal advice, the Federation has been vilified in the media. The Federation defended and will continue to defend their members' interests in order to fulfil its statutory obligation to represent its members on all matters concerning their welfare. This includes the provision of welfare advice, ensuring that its members' fundamental legal rights are respected.

Since 3 May 2015 there has been intense media speculation as to the circumstances surrounding the death of Mr Bayoh. There has been an active campaign to have the officers who attended criminally prosecuted. There have been allegations of criminality from the outset. This suggestion has persisted, notwithstanding a complex and thorough investigation and subsequent review determining that the officers would not face criminal prosecution.

At every stage the decision not to prosecute has been the subject of significant media attention and adverse comment. There have been accusations of racism directed against those officers, notwithstanding the lack of any evidential foundation for such an accusation. The officers have been individually targeted on social media. Such vilification has a lasting impact.

The human interest and the welfare of those officers has largely been ignored since May 2015. Their reputations have been tarnished. They will forever be associated with the death of Mr Bayoh, the accusations of racism, the accusations of brutality leveled against them. Ms Short and PC Walker are confident that these accusations are not fairly directed at them. They were simply doing their duty in trying and traumatic

circumstances.

It will become clear from the evidence that the events of that day and the aftermath have had a significant impact on both the physical and mental health of some of the officers, none more so perhaps than Ms Short.

Ms Short lost her career as a police officer following the injuries she sustained that day. She suffered both physical and psychological injury and has been diagnosed as suffering from post-traumatic stress. This rendered her permanently disabled from undertaking the ordinary duties of a police officer. She applied to retire from the police on ill health grounds in 2017 but it required a judicial review before she would be allowed to retire and begin a recovery. Even then, notwithstanding there being no suggestion of wrongdoing on her part, the decision of the Lord Ordinary to overturn the decision of the police authority regarding the retirement has been criticised in the media.

It is clear that this Inquiry will take some time. Neither PC Walker nor Ms Short can move on with their lives until the conclusion of this Inquiry. Until its conclusion, the Inquiry will no doubt take its toll on their health and mental wellbeing. They will continue to be under intense media scrutiny. This should not be

viewed as a criticism of the Inquiry. Both are pragmatists and acknowledge that the issues that this Inquiry will explore are important and complex and that a proper exploration of such issues will take time.

The reason for highlighting the impact is to stress that the human interest and welfare of the officers involved should not be forgotten as this Inquiry progresses.

A narrative of division is neither fair nor accurate so far as Ms Short and PC Walker are concerned. They did not join Police Scotland with a desire to be involved in the death of an individual; they joined Police Scotland to serve their local community and to protect the public, all members of the public, without fear or favour, without bias or preference. In doing so, they voluntarily put themselves in harm's way on a regular basis. This essential point is consistent with the experience of the Scottish Police Federation regarding the vast majority of its officers whom it represents.

Presenting this Inquiry as a fight for justice against a malign police force does not do the circumstances justice. The unutterable tragedy of this case should not cause us to ignore the bravery of the individuals who responded to a rapidly unfolding

Τ	situation on the morning of 3 May.
2	It is the sincere wish of the Federation, of
3	Ms Short and of PC Walker that this Inquiry will bring
4	closure to all concerned. The family of Mr Bayoh
5	deserve no less; so too do these officers. That being
6	so, the Federation, PC Walker and Ms Short welcome the
7	opportunity to provide their evidence and to assist thi
8	Inquiry in any way that they can.
9	I am obliged.
10	LORD BRACADALE: Thank you, Dean.
11	Mr Jackson.
12	Opening statement by MR JACKSON
13	MR JACKSON: Thank you, sir.
14	I'm Gordon Jackson. I represent core participants
15	Officers Smith, Good and Tomlinson. I'm assisted by
16	Carla Fraser, advocate, and instructed by RS Vaughan
17	& Co solicitors.
18	So I make this opening statement on behalf of those
19	core participants. In short, it is submitted they did
20	nothing wrong on 3 May 2015 and that race did not
21	influence their actions in any way. They are three
22	officers with good records who reported for duty that
23	day and found themselves responding to an evolving and
24	significant event. There had, we know, been several

reports by members of the public of a well built male,

25

around 6 feet, of muscular build, wielding a knife in public, walking in the middle of the road and acting aggressively towards passing cars.

The officers had no information regarding the identity of the man. They weren't privy to his motives or his intentions, they didn't know what kind of person he was, where he normally lived, how he normally behaved, or what he might have taken in terms of alcohol or other substances.

The only information they had was what had been received from the members of the public who had called Police Scotland and were clearly alarmed by what they saw of this man and his behaviour.

When the officers attended the scene they were faced with someone who they understood, on the basis of reports from the public, to be armed with a large knife. The knife was recovered approximately 20 metres from where the officers confronted Mr Bayoh, the blade about 6-inch in length, it was a kitchen knife.

PC Tomlinson arrived along with Nicole Short after
PCs Walker and Paton. PCs Smith and Good arrived
together thereafter. PC Tomlinson had about 17 months'
service.

From the moment of their arrival at the scene everything those officers did was in line with the

standard operating procedure in place at the time, their training and the law.

More than one member of the public had reported a knife. The officers were not able to disregard that simply because the knife was not visible to them upon arrival. It could, for all they knew, have been concealed on the person. At the very least they could not discount the possibility that it was being concealed. They had to act as if there was possession of a knife and that was in accordance with their training.

PC Tomlinson, when he arrived, was unable to see

PC Paton. He saw Mr Bayoh and PC Walker facing one

another, PC Walker had his hands covering his face.

PC Walker had in fact been contaminated by his own

incapacitant spray, but PC Tomlinson thought he had been

injured. His inability to see PC Paton gave him cause

to believe that too might be the case.

Officer Tomlinson tried verbal commands. Mr Bayoh

refused to follow them or engage with him and PC Short

and PC Tomlinson then tried incapacitant sprays but they

too had no effect.

Sheku Bayoh then chased and in fact attacked

Nicole Short. PC Tomlinson believed that there was real
danger to Nicole Short and in defence of her and himself

he used his baton and was then involved in the restraint of Mr Bayoh on the ground. The force used was reasonable, proportionate and necessary in the circumstances. This was a high risk incident. Nothing else could have been done in that situation.

Mr Bayoh displayed serious and aggravated resistance and the officers were entitled to use the force they did in the circumstances. It was, I repeat, proportionate and reasonable.

Tragic the outcome undoubtedly was, and those

I represent acknowledge that, and would add to what

others have said, but the final position is that tragic
as the outcome was, the officers themselves did nothing

wrong.

PC Smith was at that time a qualified officer safety trainer. He was delivering courses on that several times a year and he went there with PC Good who was a probationer. She completed her first shift on 6 April 2015 and had very little Police Service. She was under the supervision of PC Smith who was her helper in her training.

En route they heard the emergency Airwave button and Nicole Short's voice. That's rare that button being used, and they heard a further activation and a voice say "Officer injured". PC Good was initially concerned

that Nicole Short had been stabbed. She was shaking, injured. By that time, Mr Bayoh was on the ground.

PC Smith assisted with the restraint. PC Good assisted Nicole Short at first and then too assisted with the restraint.

At that stage PC Smith noted Mr Bayoh was unresponsive and thereafter administered CPR. He was unable to continue with breaths, but chest compressions were continued and he then drove the ambulance to the hospital, allowing paramedics to continue administering medical treatment to Sheku Bayoh in the rear.

Mention has been made about what happened thereafter at Kirkcaldy police office. When the officers got back to Kirkcaldy police station they were in a state of shock. PC Tomlinson arrived first; Good remained longer at the scene to secure the locus and Smith had to make his way back from the hospital after driving the ambulance. They were directed into the canteen and separated from others in the station, all of them shocked and distressed and indeed visibly upset.

Any suggestion that there was collusion between the officers at that stage is absolutely refuted, not only by the officers themselves, but by all the other evidence in the case. That evidence will confirm that these officers told the truth.

Race. The officers have been asked by the Inquiry about the extent to which Sheku Bayoh's race influenced their actions. It did not influence their actions at all and there is no evidence whatsoever to the contrary.

PC Good in particular was asked about a comment in a statement about a thought she had en route to Hayfield Road upon hearing the emergency button. The thought was that this might be an act of terrorism. She explained that was merely a fleeting thought she had at the point she heard the button and thought perhaps Nicole Short had been stabbed. It was prompted by a previous briefing on the level of the terrorist threat and rumours circulating about intelligence and the possibility of such attacks. It is clear what was actually foremost in PC Good's mind was the fact that a man was reported to be in possession of a large knife.

This was a very unusual call for a Sunday morning in Kirkcaldy and the man was causing fear and alarm amongst the public. It is only natural that the police officers would have considered any number of possible scenarios from the possibility it was terror-related to the possibility it was just a hoax. Police officers are trained to be aware, vigilant and professionally curious. Policing doesn't operate in a vacuum.

At that time, officers were under instructions to

avoid wearing uniform when travelling to and from work	
so as not to reveal that they were serving	
police officers. Terrorism is something they are	
trained to be aware of in the assessment of risk, an	
ever-present danger, and they are told to be mindful or	f
that at all times. Not at all surprising that that	
possibility no more that possibility was in	
officers' heads when they were attending the scene.	

In conclusion, the allegations which have been made against these officers, particularly regarding the import of race, are without foundation. They have nevertheless had a significant impact on the officers who have sought to continue in their duties in service to the public.

On that basis these participants welcome the start of this Inquiry. They are confident that this Inquiry will demonstrate that the accusations which have been made in the media against them are baseless and that their treatment of a high-risk, evolving situation with which they were presented on 3 May 2015 was appropriate, proportionate and in line with their training and the law.

Thank you, sir.

LORD BRACADALE: Thank you, Mr Jackson.

Could I ask the four senior counsel at the table to

1	return to their seats and once they have done that, if
2	Ms McCall, Mr Hamilton, Mr Macleod and Mr Moir could
3	make their way to the table, please.
4	MS GRAHAME: May I take this opportunity to mention
5	something. It has been drawn to my attention that when
6	Ms Mitchell for the Bayoh family gave her opening
7	statement, that she misnamed one of the officers and we
8	would like that to be that change to be recorded for
9	the purposes of the transcript.
10	When she gave the list of officers at the scene, the
11	first name that she gave was Scott Maxwell and she
12	misspoke due to a typo on her script. She should have
13	said PC Craig Walker. I have discussed that with
14	Ms Mitchell and she understands that I'm going to
15	address this so that the matter can be rectified in the
16	transcript.
17	LORD BRACADALE: Thank you, that's very helpful, Ms Grahame.
18	Ms McCall.
19	Opening statement by MS MCCALL
20	MS MCCALL: Sir, I'm Shelagh McCall and I represent the core
21	participants Sergeant Scott Maxwell, Constable Daniel
22	Gibson and Constable James McDonough. I'm assisted by
23	David Adam, advocate, and instructed by Gordon Williams,
24	solicitor.
25	Scott Maxwell, Daniel Gibson and James McDonough

welcome the opening of this Public Inquiry. The events of 3 May 2015 have clearly had a lasting impact on the family and friends of Sheku Bayoh. The loss of their loved one has changed their lives forever.

Mr Maxwell, Mr Gibson and Mr McDonough wish to extend their sympathy to Mr Bayoh's family and friends. They appreciate, of course, that that may be cold comfort, but nonetheless it is heartfelt on their part.

The past seven years have presented challenges for all those affected by what happened at Hayfield Road on 3 May and in its aftermath. The events have had a lasting impact on the police officers who attended at Hayfield Road that day, as well as on their families.

At that time, Scott Maxwell was an acting sergeant;

Daniel Gibson had three years service; James McDonough

was only a few months into his service as a police

constable. Turning up for work on a Sunday morning none

of them could have imagined how that day would pan out.

The Inquiry will hear of these officers' concern for Mr Bayoh, their shock at his collapse and their distress at news of his death.

The Inquiry will rightly scrutinise the officers' decisions and actions. What happened on 3 May will be picked over in great detail over the coming weeks and months as the Inquiry goes about its task.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

With the benefit of hindsight of course, the Inquiry has the opportunity to examine the officers' every thought, every decision, every action and the reasons behind them, but in that detailed examination it is important to remember that from the moment the police controller relayed the first call from the member of the public about an ongoing disturbance involving a male armed with a knife, to the moment the ambulance was called for Mr Bayoh was less than nine minutes.

Each officer who attended that day was required by their public duty as a constable to do so, no matter the danger they may have faced. As well as the further calls from the public corroborating the initial report of a man with a large knife, once Sergeant Maxwell, Constable Gibson and Constable McDonough were en route they each heard a colleague's emergency button being activated and the message communicated "Officer injured". At that point they did not know what had happened, which of their colleagues may have been injured or how seriously, and on arrival they needed to assess the situation and respond immediately. The Inquiry should not lose sight of the fact that these men were having to assess risk and make decisions in real-time, in a dynamic evolving situation, often in a split second.

That there was such a tragic outcome following the restraint of Mr Bayoh is something that these three officers would wish to but cannot change. However, Sergeant Maxwell, Constable Gibson and Constable McDonough believe that they acted that morning in accordance with their duty as police officers and in accordance with their training. I am grateful to Senior Counsel to the Inquiry and to Ms Mitchell for correcting the record of what was said this morning because as the Inquiry will hear, Sergeant Maxwell did not participate in the restraint of Sheku Bayoh and used no force against him at any time.

It has taken a long time for this Inquiry to be announced and to get underway and the passage of time has weighed heavily on each of the three officers

I represent. They, along with their colleagues, have been subject to much public and media comment and speculation over the years, to which as serving officers they cannot reply. Their hope now is that this will be a thorough and transparent process. They want the Inquiry to hear from all relevant witnesses to the unfolding events of 3 May 2015 and for the full facts to be aired.

All statutory public inquiries are set up because there is a matter of public concern. It is therefore

important too that the public has the opportunity to
hear and see a full account of the evidence which will
be available to the Inquiry and upon which you, sir,
will ultimately reach your conclusions and
recommendations.
Everyone with an interest in this Inquiry now has to
place their trust in you as Chair. Sergeant Maxwell,
Constable Gibson and Constable McDonough are prepared to
accept the scrutiny. They have indicated from the
outset of the Inquiry that they want the Chair to get to
the truth of what happened and why and that they will do
whatever is properly asked of them to facilitate that
outcome.
Thank you.
LORD BRACADALE: Thank you, Ms McCall.
Mr Hamilton.
Opening statement by MR HAMILTON
MR HAMILTON: Thank you, sir.
My name is Duncan Hamilton and I appear on behalf of
two core participants, firstly, retired Chief
Superintendent Gary McEwan and secondly, Chief
Superintendent Conrad Trickett and I'm instructed by
Levy & McRae solicitors.
Chief Superintendent Gary McEwan retired from
Police Scotland in 2021 after 31 years' service. Chief

1	Superintendent Conrad Trickett has 23 years'
2	Police Service and remains a serving police officer.
3	Both men are grateful for the opportunity to contribute
4	to the work of this Inquiry today and in the months
5	ahead.

At the outset both retired Chief Superintendent
McEwan and Chief Superintendent Trickett wish to place
on public record their sincere condolences to the family
of Sheku Bayoh for their enduring loss. It is apparent
from the evidence already available, amplified by the
compelling contributions shared with the Inquiry
yesterday that he was a much loved man who came from
a close and caring family. These hearings will be
difficult for all involved but will be most painful for
the Bayoh family.

In the vast range of issues this Inquiry will cover, the central tragedy remains that a young man lost his life. That is at the core of why this Inquiry was established and it is why Chief Superintendents McEwan and Trickett are committed to assisting the Inquiry in its vital work. Both have provided full statements and answered every question put to them by the Inquiry team.

These officers have dedicated a significant part of their lives to advocating policing which commands community confidence. They share the desire of the

family and of the public to build the fullest picture of events on 3 May 2015 in Hayfield Road. More widely, there is a unity of purpose in ensuring that communities across Scotland continue to trust and value their Police Service.

It is important for those following this Inquiry to understand from the outset that neither Gary McEwan nor Conrad Trickett had any part in the events leading to the death of Sheku Bayoh. Neither was present in Hayfield Road or ever came into contact with Sheku Bayoh. Rather their role involved with dealing with the aftermath of the incident and the procedures triggered by Sheku Bayoh's death.

On the morning of 3 May 2015, retired Chief
Superintendent McEwan was on duty in the capacity of
a strategic firearms commander overseeing a separate
operation. He was informed of the incident involving
Mr Bayoh and was responsible for declaring this to be
a critical incident.

At a meeting later that morning where the critical incident was explained to other senior officers, the decision was taken that a post-incident manager was required. Conrad Trickett, who was then a chief inspector and the on-call chief inspector for operational support division, proactively offered to

assist and perform that role in light of his previous training and experience. He was thereafter appointed as post-incident manager by the Assistant Chief Constable. His involvement was voluntary and driven by a desire to help.

All of the subsequent actions and decisions taken will be examined by this Inquiry in detail in the months and years ahead. For today it is sufficient to record that at every stage, both officers acted honestly, in good faith, with professionalism and to the very best of their ability in difficult circumstances.

Both retired Chief Superintendent McEwan and Chief Superintendent Trickett are clear that they will attend the Inquiry and will give evidence if asked to do so. The desire of the family for a definitive investigation and clear conclusions based on evidence is one which they share.

This Inquiry has a vital role to play in ensuring that the public continues to trust police officers and the wider Police Service in Scotland. Both Gary McEwan and Conrad Trickett have devoted their careers to that goal. Their hope is that through full and open participation in this Inquiry, not only will the Bayoh family have full answers to the questions they have posed, but in providing those answers, this Inquiry can

1	renew and refresh that essential bond of trust between
2	police officers and the public they serve.
3	I'm obliged.
4	LORD BRACADALE: Thank you, Mr Hamilton.
5	Mr Macleod.
6	Opening statement by MR MACLEOD
7	MR MACLEOD: Thank you.
8	My name is Murdo Macleod and I appear on behalf of
9	Chief Superintendent Patrick Campbell, instructed by
10	Mr Iain Cahill of Levy & McRae.
11	At the heart of this Inquiry is Sheku Bayoh. What
12	happened to him on 3 May 2015 was a tragedy, and
13	Mr Campbell firstly wishes to extend his condolences to
14	Mr Bayoh's family and friends for their very painful and
15	keenly felt loss.
16	Sir, Mr Campbell is grateful for the opportunity to
17	participate in this Inquiry and he is committed to
18	supporting its work in any way he can, whether by
19	providing material or by giving evidence during Inquiry
20	hearings.
21	He is also providing a full statement based on the
22	material that the Inquiry has been able to give him
23	regarding his involvement in the subsequent police
24	investigation of events in Hayfield Road.
25	As a duty detective superintendent for the east of

Scotland on 3 May 2015, he set-off from Livingstone police station to Kirkcaldy within minutes of being instructed to do so by Detective Chief Superintendent Lesley Boal.

When he arrived in Kirkcaldy, at about 9 o'clock in the morning, he was determined to carry out his role as the initial senior investigating officer in good faith and to the best of his ability in what were fluid, fast-moving and difficult circumstances.

Sir, Mr Campbell is acutely aware that the consent of the public is the cornerstone of modern policing in Scotland. People must have confidence in the Police Service and its officers. This Inquiry will hold a mirror up, not only to Police Scotland and other organisations in Scottish society, but also to individuals whose conduct will be carefully examined.

Should it be established in the course of the Inquiry that Mr Campbell, or indeed other officers, have made mistakes or errors of judgment, then he is committed to learning lessons from the process.

As an officer with over 25 years of experience,

Mr Campbell has always resolved to act with fairness,
integrity and respect, and he will assist this Inquiry
with these same values in mind. This way he can play
his part in ensuring that the Inquiry develops as clear

1	a picture as possible and fulfils its critically
2	important Terms of Reference.
3	Thank you, sir.
4	LORD BRACADALE: Thank you. Mr Moir.
5	Opening statement by MR MOIR
6	MR MOIR: Thank you, sir.
7	My name is Mark Moir. I represent the Coalition for
8	Racial Equality and Rights. I am assisted by Kevin
9	Henry, advocate, and instructed by Moir & Sweeney
LO	Litigation, solicitors.
L1	The Coalition for Racial Equality and Rights, which
L2	I will herein after refer to as CRER, wishes firstly to
L3	express its heartfelt condolences to the family and
L 4	friends of Sheku Bayoh.
L5	CRER is mindful of the hurdles that this family have
L6	faced from the day of his death to the opening of these
L7	Inquiry hearings seven years later. As the Chair has
L8	rightly stated, Mr Bayoh's family must be at the heart
L9	of this Inquiry.
20	CRER welcomes the opportunity to make an opening
21	statement to the Inquiry. Before turning to the matters
22	which the Inquiry is concerned, I would like briefly to
23	set out who CRER are and what they do.
24	CRER is a Scottish strategic racial equality charity
25	and anti-racist organisation based in Glasgow. It is

focused on working to eliminate racial discrimination and harassment and to promote racial justice across Scotland.

Taking a rights and evidence-based approach to its work, CRER aims to tackle structural racism at all levels at which such racism occurs: personal, social and institutional. Since its inception in 1999, CRER has had a relationship of trust with key stakeholders and public bodies across Scotland as a critical friend and centre of expertise on race equality within organisations in their roles as employers and service providers, with its clear focus on tackling institutional and structural racism.

CRER has been asked to undertake many projects focused on assessing equality and performance and supporting improvement in approaches. Its specialism on race equality in relation to organisational practice, theoretical and legal frameworks and in working alongside grassroot community groups has enabled it to support organisations to identify and take action on these issues.

CRER thanks the Chair for his decision to appoint it as a core participant to the Inquiry. This Inquiry will be examining the circumstances leading to the death of Mr Bayoh, in particular the actions of officers

involved, how the police dealt with the aftermath of his death and the subsequent investigation into Mr Bayoh's death.

The Inquiry team's Terms of Reference will require the Chair to consider the extent, if any, to which those events were affected by Mr Bayoh's actual or perceived race. Put short, the Chair will require to ask himself would it have made a difference if Mr Bayoh had been white?

It is this question and the examination of the role, if any, played by Mr Bayoh's race in the events surrounding his death which led to CRER seeking designation as core participant in the Inquiry. CRER does not wish to speculate on or pre-judge the evidence which may be led during the course of the Inquiry. It is not CRER's intention in this opening statement to make submissions on the impact, if any, of Mr Bayoh's actual or perceived race. Rather, CRER intends to critically and robustly examine all the evidence led during the course of the Inquiry and consider whether the actions of the various individuals and institutions would have been different had Mr Bayoh been white.

CRER considers that the issue of race permeates all aspects of the Inquiry's work. It welcomes the Chair's decision to examine the possible role of race at each

hearing, culminating in a final hearing focusing on race which will bring together and robustly examine the evidence led in order for the Chair to reach his conclusions and make any such recommendations as he sees fit.

CRER is confident that the approach which Senior

Counsel to the Inquiry has proposed will allow the

Inquiry to understand the nuances of racism. Racism

does not just extend to overtly racist language and

behaviour. It is often indirect, and understanding it

requires consideration of how individuals, organisations

and societies behave, and the impact of that behaviour

on people from minority ethnic backgrounds, rather than

simply focusing on open expressions of prejudice.

In this regard, CRER will seek to provide whatever assistance it can to the Inquiry in its consideration of the role, if any, played by unwitting or institutional racism.

While the Inquiry will no doubt, should such evidence emerge during the course of the Inquiry, be able to easily identify examples of overt racist language or behaviours, examples of unwitting or institutional racism may prove to be more difficult to recognise. The question of both unwitting and institutional racism were considered by Sir William

Macpherson of Cluny in his Inquiry into the death of
Stephen Lawrence. While these are of course matters for
the Chair, CRER would wish to raise at this stage
Sir William's definition of unwitting racism:

"Unwitting racism can arise because of lack of understanding, ignorance or mistaken beliefs. It can arise from well intentioned but patronising words or actions. It can arise from unfamiliarity with the behaviour or cultural traditions of people or families from minority ethnic communities. It can arise from racist stereotyping of black people as potential criminals or troublemakers. Often this arises out of uncritical self-understanding borne out of an inflexible police ethos of the traditional way of doing things.

Furthermore, such attitudes can thrive in a tightly knit community so that there can be a collective failure to detect and outlaw this breed of racism. The police canteen can too easily be its breeding ground."

Institutional racism can be seen whenever institutions fail to address racial inequalities and racism in their areas of work. CRER note that institutional racism is not simply an accusation to be leveled at any particular public service organisation, rather it is an explicit danger to the lives and wellbeing of Scotland's black and minority ethnic

communities. This issue of institutional racism was also considered by Sir William Macpherson who considered that institutional racism was:

"The collective failure of an organisation to provide appropriate and professional service to people because of their colour, culture or ethnic origin. It can be seen or detected in processes, attitudes and behaviour which amount to discrimination through unwitting prejudice, ignorance, thoughtlessness and racist stereotyping which disadvantage minority ethnic people."

While there exists positive political rhetoric on racial equality in Scotland, CRER's research work demonstrates that the lived experience of black and minority ethnic communities does not reflect these warm words. Black and minority ethnic communities and individuals continue to be held back by structural racism resulting in ingrained inequalities in employment, income, health and housing.

Racist hate crimes remain the most prevalent form of hate crime in Scotland, and under-reporting means that the true scale of this is likely to be far greater.

Scotland's black and minority ethnic communities
have high expectations of the Inquiry. This Inquiry is
the first such Inquiry in Scotland to consider a death

following an incident with police where there are
concerns as to the role played by the deceased's race.
It is not, however, the first time that matters of race
within the justice system in Scotland have been
investigated. Previous instances include those of Ahmed
Abukar Shekh, Simon San and Surjit Singh Chhokar. CRER
is aware of the problems which can arise when it is felt
that an inquiry such as this is not properly considering
the question of race. Where community confidence is
lacking this has a wider impact on community cohesion
and the overall confidence in services.

CRER wishes to provide any assistance it can to the Chair and to the Inquiry to ensure that the expectations of the black and minority ethnic communities are met and that the matter of race is fully and properly considered.

CRER will seek to bring its expertise and specific Scottish experience to assist in providing a rigorous and credible consideration of matters of race throughout the Inquiry.

CRER seek to work with the Inquiry in a positive and constructive manner to enable it to carry out a thorough, critical and fearless examination of the material available to it and to fulfil its Terms of Reference. To ensure that we remain focused on this

1	task, we will not be making public comment outwith our
2	input to the Inquiry at this time.
3	Finally, CRER again acknowledges the circumstances
4	which make this Inquiry necessary. It commends
5	Mr Bayoh's family and others involved in the lengthy
6	struggle in bringing this Inquiry forward. It can only
7	be hoped that the Inquiry can fulfil its Terms of
8	Reference, both in the interests of justice and for the
9	potential future implications for racial justice in
10	Scotland.
11	Thank you, sir.
12	LORD BRACADALE: Thank you, Mr Moir, and I'm grateful to
13	counsel for the careful and succinct opening statements.
14	Ms Grahame.
15	MS GRAHAME: Yes, I have no further comments at this time,
16	thank you.
17	LORD BRACADALE: Now, the first witnesses in the Inquiry are
18	the principals of Advanced Laser Imaging, is that
19	correct?
20	MS GRAHAME: Yes, that's correct. As I mentioned in my
21	opening statement, Advanced Laser Imaging are scheduled
22	to attend tomorrow. As originally scheduled, we
23	anticipated opening statements completing tomorrow
24	morning. We have obviously made much better progress
25	today than we had expected.

1	Advanced Laser Imaging are travelling to Edinburgh
2	this afternoon and will be available tomorrow. I would
3	wish a brief opportunity, if I may, to make sure that
4	the technology will work. There are a number of items
5	that will have to be played and demonstrated during
6	their evidence and I would welcome an opportunity to do
7	that perhaps tomorrow morning before we begin.
8	LORD BRACADALE: Shall we then just stick to the arrangement
9	that they were to start at 12 noon?
LO	MS GRAHAME: That would suit me very well.
L1	LORD BRACADALE: Well, the Inquiry will adjourn now and sit
L2	again at 12 noon tomorrow, so a later start tomorrow.
L3	(12.50 pm)
L 4	(The Inquiry adjourned until 12.00 pm on
L5	Thursday, 12 May 2022)
L 6	
L7	
L8	
L9	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	
2	INDEX
3	
4	Opening statement by MS GRAHAME1
5	Opening statement by MS MITCHELL18
6	Opening statement by MS MCGUIRE31
7	Opening statement by MR SCULLION40
8	Opening statement by MR DUNCAN49
9	Opening statement by MR MCCONNACHIE54
LO	Opening statement by the DEAN OF
L1	FACULTY
L2	
L3	Opening statement by MR JACKSON65
L 4	
L5	Opening statement by MS MCCALL72
L6	
L7	Opening statement by MR HAMILTON76
L8	
L9	Opening statement by MR MACLEOD80
20	
21	Opening statement by MR MOIR82
22	
23	
24	
25	