Wednesday, 15 March 2023 1 2 (10.00 am)3 (Proceedings delayed) 4 (10.07 am)DETECTIVE CHIEF INSPECTOR (RTD) KEITH HARDIE (called) 5 LORD BRACADALE: Good morning, Mr Hardie. Would you take 6 7 the oath? 8 THE WITNESS: Yes. 9 (Witness sworn) LORD BRACADALE: Ms Grahame. 10 11 MS GRAHAME: Thank you. 12 Questions from MS GRAHAME MS GRAHAME: Good morning. 13 14 A. Good morning. 15 Q. You are Keith Hardie? 16 A. Yes. Q. What age are you, Mr Hardie? 17 A. I'm 60. 18 Q. And as I understand it, when you retired, you retired as 19 20 a detective chief inspector; is that correct? 21 A. That's correct. Q. And you had been in the police service for 28 years --22 23 A. Yes. 24 Q. -- when you retired? 25 A. No, at the time of the incident.

- Q. Oh, at the time of the incident, sorry. How many years'
- 2 service did you have when you retired?
- 3 A. 31.
- 4 Q. Thank you. You were in the -- or attached to the
- 5 specialist crime division in the East Major
- 6 Investigation Team?
- 7 A. Yes, that's correct.
- 8 Q. And based in Leith, in Edinburgh?
- 9 A. Yes.
- 10 Q. Explain what area did your team cover?
- 11 A. Initially I was Lothian Borders Police so we covered
- 12 Lothian and Borders but obviously in 2013 we became
- Police Scotland, so I had responsibility for the east of
- Scotland although I was deployed throughout Scotland in
- my role as senior investigating officer.
- Q. We've heard from other witnesses that the MIT, as they
- 17 refer to your team --
- 18 A. Yeah.
- 19 Q. -- can be all over Scotland and deployed in different
- 20 areas; is that right?
- 21 A. That's correct, yeah.
- Q. And you say you were SIO?
- 23 A. Yes.
- Q. Is there only one team or are there different teams
- within the Major Investigation Team?

- 1 A. No, there are a number of officers who form enquiry
- 2 teams as and when a homicide, which is primarily what we
- dealt with, so when a homicide's reported we would bring
- 4 together a team from our resources all within the Major
- 5 Enquiry Team.
- Q. So any homicide, any murder, culpable homicide in
- 7 Scotland could involve members of the Major
- 8 Investigation Team?
- 9 A. It would involve, yes.
- 10 Q. Definitely would involve?
- 11 A. Yes 100%.
- 12 Q. And how quickly were members of the team brought in to
- deal with unexplained deaths?
- 14 A. As soon -- basically the initial response would be the
- divisional, the uniform, the CID. The minute there was
- 16 enough evidence to suggest it was a homicide or it was,
- 17 you know, suspicious, if you like, then there would be
- an approach to the Major Investigation Team to come and
- 19 oversee it, I suppose, and potentially take it on.
- Q. Tell us, in your work with MIT, how many unexplained
- 21 deaths or suspicious deaths were you dealing with?
- A. At one time?
- 23 Q. In general, how often would you be called into action?
- 24 A. I think we were always in action, you know, once you're
- deployed to a murder enquiry, for example, you can be

- 1 there for a number of months, even longer, you know, if
- 2 it's not easily resolved. So the team would always be
- in action somewhere but we would always have the
- 4 capacity to put a team together to attend and deal with
- 5 reported homicide or suspicious deaths.
- 6 Q. Can you give us an indication of how many deaths in
- 7 a year would you be dealing with?
- 8 A. It varies, probably somewhere in the region of 12, maybe
- 9 more than that, you know, depending on, you know, as
- 10 they were covered.
- 11 Q. Of course. Of course.
- 12 A. We would sometimes go into or take on an investigation
- and establish there were no suspicious circumstances, in
- 14 which case it would be passed back to the division to
- deal with and cede to that division. Our job within the
- Major Investigation Team, because we were a specialist
- 17 crime division, would be to take on homicides,
- 18 basically. That was the core of our workload.
- 19 Q. So you'd be dealing with multiple deaths every year --
- 20 A. Yes.
- 21 Q. -- in your work?
- 22 A. Yeah.
- 23 Q. And how many years, remind us, you worked in that team?
- 24 A. I think it was about seven or eight years I was in the
- 25 Major Investigation Team.

- ${\tt Q.}\,{\tt So}$ from that whole period of time that was what you
- 2 were -- that was your daily work?
- 3 A. That was my core role.
- 4 Q. And you were the senior investigating officer --
- 5 A. Yeah.
- 6 Q. -- in MIT?
- 7 A. Yes.
- 8 Q. And we've heard other evidence about the role of an SIO.
- 9 A. Yeah.
- 10 Q. So, I noticed in your -- I'll come on to your statements
- in a moment -- I noticed in your statement that you'd
- said you were SIO that day, and we've heard evidence
- that Colin Robson was a duty on-call SIO for Fife
- 14 division, we've heard evidence that Pat Campbell, the
- 15 detective superintendent --
- 16 A. Sure.
- Q. -- was appointed SIO. You weren't SIO for the
- Sheku Bayoh incident, were you?
- 19 A. No. No. It was a Sunday, I wasn't on call on
- the Sunday. We have obviously an on-call process where
- 21 somebody is available to come out and deal with anything
- 22 that's just been reported. I wasn't on call that
- 23 weekend but I was contacted by
- 24 Detective Chief Superintendent Lesley Boal, who asked me
- 25 to attend Kirkcaldy to assist in the investigation of

- 1 a death after police contact, obviously Sheku.
- Q. We'll come on to that in more detail, but I just wanted
- 3 to be clear, because we appeared on paper to have three
- 4 SIOs and we have heard there was only one
- 5 allowed really--
- 6 A. I was never appointed SIO for this.
- 7 Q. But that is your normal work?
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. Or was your normal work --
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 Q. -- at the time? Thank you so much.
- 12 Could I explain, first of all, there's a blue folder
- in front of you which you have opened.
- 14 A. Yeah.
- 15 Q. That contains hard copies of your statements.
- 16 A. Sure.
- Q. Please feel free to refer to them at any time if you
- 18 wish. If there's something you'd like me to draw
- 19 attention to, we can bring a section up on the screen.
- 20 A. Okay.
- 21 Q. But when I maybe ask you questions about your Inquiry
- 22 statement, if I need you to explain something in
- 23 a little more detail, it will come up on the TV screen
- in front of you.
- 25 A. Yeah.

- 1 Q. But you can use that blue folder throughout.
- 2 A. Okay, thank you.
- Q. Can we look, first of all, at a witness statement
- 4 PS00667. I think this is a self-penned statement.
- 5 A. Yeah.
- 6 Q. So others have called them operational statements, and
- 7 this is from yourself, Detective Chief Inspector
- 8 Keith Hardie, and it was -- the address given is Leith
- 9 Police Station in Edinburgh?
- 10 A. Yeah.
- 11 Q. And then if we can just move down that page, please, and
- 12 we see it's 27 May 2015.
- 13 A. Yeah.
- 14 Q. And it was at 8.00 in the morning by yourself?
- 15 A. Yeah.
- Q. So this is effectively your equivalent of an operational
- 17 statement?
- 18 A. That's correct, yeah.
- 19 Q. I think in your Inquiry statement, which I'll come on to
- in a moment, you said that you provided this particular
- 21 statement that's on the screen to PIRC?
- 22 A. Yeah.
- 23 Q. And you provided a true and accurate account to the best
- of your recollection at the time, and you say the
- 25 statement you have here would be the most accurate

1 because it was provided at the time as opposed to seven years later, which is when you've provided your 2 3 Inquiry statement? Sure, yeah. 4 Α. 5 And you say: Q. "Because my involvement was limited, I do have 6 7 a good recollection of what was involved in relation to 8 what happened." 9 We will come on to that. So I will ask you further 10 questions today about it, but I think from what you said in your Inquiry statement, this statement of 27 May was 11 12 prepared closest to the time, and if there's any 13 difference, should the Chair prefer this version? Yes, absolutely. 14 Α. 15 Q. Thank you. Can we look at your Inquiry statement now, please, 16 17 SBPI 00230. You will see on the screen this is the Inquiry statement taken by the Inquiry on 2 November 18 last year, and this is your Inquiry statement. If we 19 20 can look, it's 25 pages, I think, if we can look at the 21 final page, please, and we see there it's redacted on the screen but on your copy it may not be, and you've 22 actually signed it on every single page, and that was on 23 24 12 January this year. 25 Α. Yeah.

- 1 Q. You will see the final paragraph, 104, there says:
- 2 "I believe the facts stated in this witness
- 3 statement are true. I understand that this statement
- 4 may form part of the evidence before the Inquiry and be
- 5 published on the Inquiry's website."
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 Q. And you understood that when you signed?
- 8 A. Absolutely, yeah.
- 9 Q. I've asked you a little about your experience, and
- 10 you've explained, and you explained in this statement,
- 11 that you had quite limited involvement with the events
- 12 leading to Mr Bayoh's death. Could you explain to the
- 13 Chair how long you were involved in the investigation
- regarding Mr Bayoh's death?
- 15 A. A matter of days. Around about the time of my call-out
- 16 to Kirkcaldy, I became aware that the PIRC were coming
- out of -- I think, I can't recall whether they were
- 18 actually there before me, but my understanding was that
- 19 the PIRC were coming on to take primacy in the
- 20 investigation. So my role at the time was basically to
- 21 take an overview of that handover, if you like, of the
- 22 investigation from Police Scotland to the PIRC, and to
- facilitate any requests on behalf of the PIRC.
- 24 So other than -- my involvement in the enquiry was
- 25 a matter of days, and after I, I suppose, attempted to

1 interview the police officers, that is basically where my involvement ended because, you know, I suppose the 2 3 terms of reference agreement was set up by that time and 4 there was no requirement for me at Kirkcaldy. I still 5 obviously had my core job back at Leith. So a matter of days. After, I don't recall the 6 7 dates that, you know, I spoke to the police officers involved in an attempt to get a statement from them, my 8 recollection is I had no more involvement in the 9 10 investigation whatsoever. We'll come on that. We've heard about the roles of 11 Q. 12 Colin Robson and Pat Campbell, and we've heard about the 13 gold, silver --Yeah. 14 Α. 15 Q. -- the command structure that was put in place and headed by ACC Nicholson --16 Yeah. 17 Α. 18 Q. -- and others who were involved. 19 Yes. Α. You've mentioned Lesley Boal, who contacted you that 20 Q. 21 morning. 22 Α. Yeah. 23 Q. Can you explain to the Chair what your role was, did it have a special name, was it simply that you were to, as 24

you say, facilitate requests from PIRC?

25

25

Α.

Yes.

1 Α. It didn't have a special name. I wasn't called out for any particular role. I've known Lesley all my service. 2 3 I knew Lesley was on call that weekend. She contacted 4 me and obviously it was a major incident we were dealing 5 with here, a significant incident, and she asked if I could come out and assist with that. You know, it was 6 7 in its very early stages at the time, and obviously as 8 these enquiries evolve there can be specific parts of 9 the enquiry that take precedence over others. So my --10 I suppose my role at the time was to come out, oversee the handover to the police -- to PIRC basically -- and 11 12 to assist the PIRC with any requests that they made to 13 Police Scotland. 14 This was the first incident certainly I was involved 15 with where the PIRC came out and took precedence in 16 an enquiry, so it was kind of ground breaking, if you 17 like, so, you know, there was a process in place where it was -- this was a first, in my experience, and 18 I think -- I'm not exactly sure, but the PIRC were 19 20 fairly much in their infancy as an organisation at the 21 time, and it's certainly the first time I was involved 22 in an enquiry where they came out and took over. So it was the first time you'd been involved in 23 Q. an enquiry where PIRC took over --24

- 1 Q. -- an unexplained death?
- 2 A. Yes.
- Q. We've heard others say it was the first time --
- 4 A. Sure.
- 5 Q. -- that they'd been involved. When you were contacted
- and got involved, do you remember what time that was?
- 7 A. I don't, but my initial statement says 3 o'clock, and
- 8 I accept that. My belief was it was perhaps a bit
- 9 earlier than that, but if that's what I've noted in my
- 10 statement then that's probably accurate.
- 11 Q. And what resources did you bring with you? You're
- an SIO at MIT, you have been contacted to get involved,
- it's the first time PIRC have been involved, there's
- 14 an unexplained death; what did you bring with you to
- 15 Kirkcaldy?
- 16 A. Nothing, just me.
- 17 Q. Just you?
- 18 A. Yeah. Obviously Lesley Boal being on the ground and
- 19 being on call at that weekend, it would be her
- 20 responsibility to bring the resources together to assist
- 21 in this investigation, I'm one of the people she
- 22 contacted -- I never called out a team. This, this was
- 23 a unique event in my police service, if you like.
- I wasn't on call, for a start, and it was -- basically
- I was asked by one of my senior officers to come out and

- assist in an investigation, and once I'd been given the
- 2 briefing from Lesley Boal I understood the significance
- of it, so attended there to assist as requested by her.
- Q. Tell us about the briefing that you got from
- 5 Lesley Boal.
- 6 A. To the best of my memory, the briefing I got on the
- 7 phone from Lesley was there'd been a call in the early
- 8 morning in relation to a male in possession of a knife,
- 9 police had attended, the male had been apprehended and
- 10 had since died after Police contact that was the brief
- 11 summary of what -- so when I left to attend Kirkcaldy,
- in my mind that's what I was going out to assist to deal
- 13 with.
- 14 Q. Did you have any beliefs about the nature of the
- 15 situation, or was that simply the information you'd been
- 16 given?
- 17 A. No beliefs whatsoever. No. I mean, I based what I was
- going out to on the very short telephone conversation
- 19 I had with Lesley, because I think at that time,
- you know, as I said, I wasn't on call, so I wanted to
- get home, get changed, and get there as soon as
- 22 possible, get on the ground as soon as possible to
- assist in any way, that I could and obviously once you
- 24 get there you get a better idea.
- I mean, I'd never attended Kirkcaldy Police Station,

- I didn't have access to Kirkcaldy Police Station, and
- 2 I'm just saying that to explain how groundbreaking this
- 3 was. I knew nobody in Kirkcaldy Police Station because
- 4 obviously it used to be Fife and we had limited/no
- 5 dealings with Fife.
- 6 Q. Had you ever had any contact with Kirkcaldy Police
- 7 Office or Fife really in general?
- 8 A. Minimal. I might have -- I mean, years and years ago
- 9 I worked on an internal inquiry, and I do recall
- 10 visiting Fife to interview police officers, but not
- 11 really, no. I mean, it was all new to me. As I said,
- when I turned up at the station I had no way of
- 13 accessing the station because it was groundbreaking.
- Q. So you didn't really know anyone there?
- 15 A. No.
- Q. Or have any prior relationship with anyone there?
- 17 A. Not at all, absolutely.
- Q. And you wouldn't have known any of the officers who'd
- 19 attended at Hayfield Road or any of that?
- 20 A. No, no.
- 21 Q. Can I ask you to look at paragraph 28 of your Inquiry
- 22 statement. So you're obviously there to facilitate
- 23 requests from PIRC. I'm interested in what contact you
- 24 had with PIRC. Maybe you could tell us a little bit
- about that.

- 1 A. Yeah. Again, based on my recollection, there was
- 2 a Gold Group meeting which Mr Nicholson chaired, at
- 3 that --
- Q. We've heard there was one at 11.30 and we've heard that
- 5 you weren't at that meeting.
- 6 A. No, no.
- 7 Q. Is that the meeting you're referring to?
- 8 A. No, there would have been one later on. I was certainly
- 9 at one Gold Group meeting which Mr Nicholson chaired,
- and it certainly wasn't the one at 11.30 because
- I wasn't in attendance at Kirkcaldy at the time. So
- there was a meeting that Mr Nicholson chaired.
- I couldn't tell you the time, but I was present at that
- 14 meeting.
- Q. We've heard that you were present at a Gold Group
- meeting at 14.40 hours in the afternoon.
- 17 A. Possibly. Therefore the timing of the contact with
- 18 Lesley Boal is clearly wrong, if I did attend that
- 19 meeting. I always thought I was out earlier than that
- time, to be honest with you, and I can't explain the
- 21 discrepancy in my statement, but --
- Q. That's fine. So I think your recollection is it was
- earlier that you were contacted --
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 Q. -- and earlier you attended. If we've heard and the

25

1 minutes show that you attended a meeting at 14.40 at 2 Kirkcaldy, then that would seem to support your 3 recollection rather than the time in your statement. 4 Α. Absolutely. Clearly -- I can't explain why it's wrong. 5 I remember when I read my statement I thought it was earlier than that, but yes, if the minutes show I was at 6 7 that meeting, and I was at a meeting that was chaired by 8 Ruaraidh Nicholson, because that was my first meeting with the officers from PIRC. 9 10 Q. How long did you arrive at Kirkcaldy prior to that meeting; do you remember now? 11 12 Α. Not long. Not long. I would be guessing, but an hour 13 or so before it, perhaps. Right. And to go back to my question, I'd said you have 14 Q. 15 explained you were there to facilitate the requests from PIRC? 16 Yeah. 17 Α. 18 Q. And I'd asked you to tell us about the contact --19 Α. Yeah. -- the relationship you had with PIRC that day. 20 Q. 21 Α. So the first meeting I had with the officers, I don't know if that's the right term for them, but the 22 individuals who came out from PIRC was at that 23 24 Gold Group meeting with Mr Nicholson when I remember the

sort of senior officers from PIRC was present.

25

1 I thereafter spoke with him and a colleague to establish what they required of us, because by that time 2 I was aware that they were taking primacy in relation to 3 4 it, and ... I don't remember much about the meeting. 5 I'm being totally honest here. I notice there I said the relationship wasn't very good, I think. It wasn't 6 7 bad, but it was very much standoffish. This was, as 8 I say, groundbreaking that somebody was coming to take 9 charge. I had no issues with them taking charge, but I think it was groundbreaking for them. 10 Now, the majority of the PIRC were previous 11 12 detectives, retired detectives from the west, Glasgow, 13 that was my recollection of the individuals that I met 14 at the time. Not all, but there was a number of them 15 who were retired police officers. So I suppose the best way to describe it is maybe 16 a wee bit standoffish, you know, because we weren't 17 entirely -- I don't think either of us were comfortable 18 19 about this new groundbreaking process whereby we took 20 a step back and acted as agents for them, if you like. 21 No issues with it, we did, you know, if there was 22 a request came in to me, "We want this done or that done", or whatever, I would do it without any -- you 23 know, at the end of the day it was the 24

Procurator Fiscal's decision that the PIRC should come

- 1 out so I never had an issue with it, it was just something I wasn't used to. 2 Q. We've heard evidence that the officer, the 3 4 investigators, I think they're often called, from PIRC 5 that were at that 2.40 meeting, the 14.40, were 6 Keith Harrower and John Ferguson. Do you remember those 7 names? No, I don't remember. 8 Α. And you've mentioned their position, they were -- the 9 Q. 10 majority were retired police officers? That was it. I think they weren't, but it was 11 Α. 12 an impression I got anyway, and I think that was, 13 you know, something I might have been aware of prior to my attendance that day, that, you know, there was a lot 14 15 of retired detectives from Glasgow, the west of Scotland, who had since joined PIRC. And I did know 16 a couple of them, you know, from my police career. 17 18 What impact, from your impression of a number of people Q. 19 being former or retired police officers from 20 a particular area --21 Α. Yeah. 22 -- Glasgow and the west, what impact did that have on Q.
- A. No issue with it obviously, because, in my mind, they

the east. What was your impression?

23

24

you in your role, because you obviously were working in

1 were previous detectives. In my mind they were 2 experienced at doing what they were about to do, because 3 they were experienced investigators. 4 Q. Did you have any knowledge or awareness at that time of 5 what their rank had been in Glasgow, the west, when they 6 were officers? 7 Α. A couple of them, yeah, but generally speaking, no. 8 Again, I've -- my memory is, I think there was a retired 9 detective chief super, although I don't think he was 10 called out, I think he was the head of the PIRC who I knew from previous -- my time in the police. But 11 12 I would say probably my recollection was they were 13 senior officers prior to retiring and joining the PIRC... 14 15 And you've said the majority from Glasgow or the west; Q. 16 do you remember where the others came from? I remember speaking to a fairly young guy who had no 17 Α. police experience whatsoever, but again I don't --18 19 you know, I don't recall specifics, but I think it was 20 at the post-mortem, which I attended at a later time, 21 I ended up meeting this guy who wasn't a retired police 22 officer but was a member of PIRC. Q. We heard some evidence -- well, before I mention that, 23

do you remember how many people from PIRC were in

Kirkcaldy on the afternoon of 3 May?

24

25

- A. To be honest with you, I would be guessing. I think -I would be guessing. I knew there was one, I don't know
 if it was Keith Harrower or whoever, who was present at
 the Gold Group meeting, but I suppose they would have
 been called out as well and perhaps arrive not all at
 the same time but I couldn't tell you, I would be
 - Q. We've heard evidence from Pat Campbell that he thought there were about four or five?

quessing at four or thereabouts, something like that.

10 A. Yeah.

7

8

9

25

- 11 Q. Is that~..?
- 12 A. Yeah.
- Q. When you arrived at Kirkcaldy, were you introduced to the people who were there from PIRC?
- 15 Α. No. No. I don't think they were there when I got there. I don't know, but no, there was no introduction, 16 17 because -- no, I wasn't introduced. It was the meeting with Mr -- that Mr Nicholson chaired that I became aware 18 19 of who they were. Because they were in attendance ... 20 and I think there would only have been one, because 21 obviously a Gold Group meeting is -- it's not everybody 22 that's involved in the case that's -- I suppose your senior individuals from the different disciplines who 23 sat round the table for the meeting. 24
 - Q. We have heard evidence that Keith Harrower was from

- 1 PIRC, and the minutes show he was from PIRC, and we've
- 2 heard the name John Ferguson was also there.
- 3 A. Okay.
- Q. We've heard him in connection with PIRC.
- 5 A. Yeah.
- 6 Q. Do you remember if there was two people associated with
- 7 PIRC or ..?
- 8 A. I honestly can't remember.
- 9 Q. You've talked about this 14.40 meeting, and after --
- sorry, before that meeting, did you have a briefing from
- 11 anyone?
- 12 A. I probably had a discussion with Lesley Boal, you know,
- 13 and --
- Q. She was at Kirkcaldy when you arrived?
- 15 A. Yes, yes, she was.
- 16 Q. Tell us about that discussion.
- 17 A. This is -- I must stress this is from memory only.
- 18 Q. Of course, yes.
- 19 A. But my recollection of the briefing I had from
- 20 Lesley Boal was that the police had got called to a male
- 21 in the street in possession of a knife. When the police
- 22 attended, he went for or ran towards the female police
- officer, in possession of a knife. She ran away and he
- 24 tripped her which caused her to fall to the ground, at
- 25 which point the other officers arrived and, I don't know

1 if this is the correct word, but descended on the individual who had gone towards the female police 2 officer. That is 100% what I was told at the time. 3 4 Q. Thank you. 5 I think you were asked about this in your Inquiry 6 statement? 7 Α. Yeah. 8 So let's look at paragraph 34, and there's another one Q. 9 as well, 55, which we'll come on to in a moment. Let's look at 34 first of all, and it says: 10 "From my recollection only, when I got to Kirkcaldy 11 12 I established, now I can't be sure where I established 13 this, but I established that the male had been walking 14 along the road in possession of a knife. He'd been 15 stabbing the knife at parked cars, is my recollection. The police were called. They attended and they 16 17 attempted to apprehend him. One of the [police] officers was approached by the male and she turned and 18 19 ran off, at which point she clipped her legs and she 20 fell to the ground. At this point, he was still in 21 possession of the knife, and the other officers who had attended the scene overpowered him, and they were in 22 fear of their colleague's safety." 23 24 So that's paragraph 34. I'll look straightaway at 25 paragraph 55, because you give some further information,

```
1
             and then I'll ask you some questions about it:
                 "I had this clear picture in my mind of -- I met the
 2
             female who was assaulted, a very, very petite
 3
 4
             individual -- running away, being tripped by the legs of
 5
             the male and the other officers reacting to that because
             the male was in possession of a knife. So can I say,
 6
 7
             I'm not saying 100 per cent that's what happened.
 8
             I wasn't there, but that was the picture that I had in
             my mind and still do have because of what I was told on
 9
             that day."
10
                 So can we go back to 34, first of all, just to get
11
12
             you to clarify one or two points, please.
13
                 So as I understand it, this is the briefing you
             received prior to going into the Gold Group meeting?
14
15
         Α.
             Yes.
            At 14.40?
16
         Q.
            Yeah.
17
         Α.
18
         Q. And it says here:
19
                 "... the male had been walking along the road in
20
             possession of a knife. ... stabbing the knife at parked
21
             cars... The police were called. They attended and they
             attempted to apprehend him."
22
                 Then you mention the female officer. You say she:
23
24
                 "... was approached by the male and she turned and
25
             ran off~..."
```

1 Was that, as far as you recall, the first thing that happened, she approached the male and then -- sorry, the 2 3 female officer was approached by the male and she turned 4 and ran off? 5 Α. Yes. 6 And then you say: Q. 7 "... clipped her legs and fell to the ground." 8 Now, in paragraph 55 you then talked about: 9 "... being tripped by the legs of the male~..." 10 Α. Yeah. I wonder if you could just explain a little bit more to 11 Q. 12 the Chair --13 Sure. Α. 14 -- what your recollection is of that briefing? Q. 15 Α. The best way I could describe it, and as it was told to me, was a tap tackle, like the male using his leg to, as 16 17 the female's running away, to trip the individual, so to knock one leg behind the other to cause her to fall 18 19 over. That's how it was described to me, not in so much 20 detail, but, you know, when I say "tripped" or 21 "clipped", that's what I was referring. So that's how you understood --22 Q. 23 Yes. Α. 24 -- the description? Q. 25 Α. Yes.

1 Q. Do you remember exactly what Boal said to you in relation to that aspect? We've heard Lesley Boal wasn't 2 at the scene, so I'm quite interested in what she shared 3 4 with you. 5 Just exactly as it said there. You know, the picture in Α. my mind, and it's a picture I developed after the 6 7 information I got from Lesley Boal -- I wasn't there, 8 but the picture that developed in my mind was the police 9 attending because this guy was in possession of a knife, 10 the police approaching the individual, the individual 11 running towards the female, who ran away, he tripped 12 her, causing her to fall, and at around that time other 13 officers apprehended him. Apprehended him, descended on him, I know that's perhaps not the right terminology. 14 15 Q. Thank you. You say at paragraph 34: "At this point, he was still in possession of the 16 knife, and then the other officers ... overpowered 17 him~... in fear of their colleague's safety." 18 19 I think you say that again in paragraph 55: 20 "... because the male was in possession of a knife." 21 Was it your understanding from the briefing from 22 Lesley Boal that the man at the scene remained in 23 possession of a knife? 24 Α. Absolutely, that was my understanding from the briefing. But, you know, this -- the information was sketchy at 25

1 the time, but nonetheless -- I'm not saying that's what 2 happened, that's what I was told had happened --3 Q. Yes. 4 -- when I attended at Kirkcaldy. Α. 5 Thank you. Q. 6 What impact did that have on you and the role that 7 you played that day in the events? What difference did that make to you? 8 None. Nothing. Because at the end of the day, as 9 Α. 10 I say, I worked with Lesley all my service, huge respect 11 for her, the fact that she'd asked me to come out, 12 I knew -- obviously the circumstances dictate this is 13 a major incident. This is a -- however you want to call 14 it -- death after police contact, death in police 15 custody, but a serious, serious incident. A serious and tragic incident. 16 17 So ... and how did it happen, I suppose, would be my 18 job as an investigator to find out how it happened, if 19 I had been appointed the SIO in the role. And what 20 I got from Lesley was -- it had to be what she was told, 21 so you're talking about third or fourth-hand 22 information, but as far as I'm concerned for my 23 statement, that was the information I was given at the time. And, you know, nothing I did during my time at 24 Kirkcaldy -- you know, nobody came to me and said, "Oh, 25

- apparently this isn't what happened", you know there was nothing, there was no information I got in my role that would suggest anything different to me other than what I was told initially.
 - Q. And was it any part of your role to be involved in or to consider different hypotheses about what happened or to identify priority actions or lines of investigation?
- 8 It would have been, but the difference was the PIRC were Α. 9 taking it over, so therefore that was no longer my role. 10 If I'd been appointed the SIO, I would absolutely have been looking at scene protection, if you like, looking 11 12 at major lines of enquiry. They talk about the golden 13 24 hours when something's reported, the first 24 hours are massively significant because, you know, that's your 14 15 sort of best chance to secure any available evidence, so I would be looking at house-to-house investigations as 16 17 a priority, to get out there and try and identify 18 anybody who may have witnessed some or all of this 19 incident. But it wasn't my role at the time, because 20 the PIRC were ...
 - Q. Did anyone ask you to help with that type of thing, given your experience?
- 23 A. No. No.
- 24 Q. Er --

21

22

5

6

7

25 A. I don't recall anybody asking me.

- 1 Q. I'm interested, you've said the golden hours are the
- 2 first 24 --
- 3 A. Yeah.
- Q. -- is that a normal sort of~..?
- 5 A. It's a sort of recognised terminology when you're
- 6 dealing with an incident, that your first 24 hours are
- 7 the golden hours. They talk about the first hour, but
- 8 your first 24 hours are where your best opportunities
- 9 are to gather evidence that may be of significance to
- investigate what you're dealing with.
- 11 Q. Can I ask you, when you've said that you went into the
- 12 14.40 hours Gold Group meeting and you met at least one
- person from PIRC --
- 14 A. Yeah, yeah.
- 15 Q. We've heard that was Keith Harrower at that meeting.
- 16 A. Yeah.
- Q. Did you have a clear understanding at that time what the
- 18 remit of PIRC was? You've talked about them taking
- 19 primacy, I think was the word you used, over the
- 20 investigation. Did you have a good understanding of
- 21 what aspects of the investigation they were taking over,
- or not?
- 23 A. Yeah, my understanding was they were taking over
- everything, every line of investigation. They were
- 25 taking over the enquiry but we were to assist them as

1 agents to them, if you like. So, if Keith Harrower had 2 come to me and said, "I want this, this and this done", we would obviously have access to far more resources 3 4 than they do, I would then get officers -- we would 5 arrange to raise the action and get officers from Police Scotland to carry out these actions. 6 7 However, I can remember, for example, I think house-to-house investigations, the PIRC said they wanted 8 to do that themselves, which is absolutely fine, 9 10 you know. As far as I was concerned you're in charge, you tell me what you want done and I'll facilitate it 11 12 for you. That's what became my role on the Sunday and 13 thereafter. So we've heard that -- well, you used the word "we": 14 Q. 15 "... we have access to ... resources~..."? 16 Α. Yeah. And I'm interested, you said that you arrived yourself, 17 Q. 18 with your experience, on the 3rd. And when you talk 19 about access to resources, what did that mean for you? Well, for example, if you take the PIRC out of it, and 20 Α. 21 it's a normal, you know, a homicide enquiry, your gold 22 commander in the Gold Group process -- I, as SIO, would 23 go to the gold commander and say, "I want a team of 12 uniformed officers and a house-to-house co-ordinator to 24 be appointed by you and to be with me as soon as 25

1		possible so we can carry out house-to-house enquiry"
2	Q.	So if you were being brought in as SIO and you wanted
3		a team to work with you on an unexplained death, how
4		many officers would you or members of the police
5		would you be looking for to help you with that?
6	Α.	It would depend, I mean, it would depend on the nature
7		of the investigation, if you like.
8		If I mean, we had specialist roles, you know, so
9		me, as an SIO, I would always have a deputy, I would
10		always have a crime scene manager, who, you know, as the
11		title dictates, would manage the crime scene. We would
12		have family liaison officers who would liaise with the
13		family of the victim, all specially trained in their own
14		discipline. We would have a house-to-house co-ordinator
15		who would co-ordinate the house-to-house, and a CCTV
16		co-ordinator. His job would be or his or her job
17		would go to go and review the area and question to
18		identify any potential opportunities of CCTV.
19		So these would all be appointed by me immediately if
20		I was the SIO. And then after that you'd have your
21		enquiry teams, who would basically go out and interview
22		witnesses and carry out any other investigations in
23		relation to the crime itself.
24		So typically you would have all these experts,
25		family liaison officers, the ones I've referred to you,

- 1 I would have a deputy to act for me in my absence as 2 the enquiry progressed, and then enquiry teams -- you 3 might have six or seven enquiry teams which are reduced 4 later on dependent on how the enquiry goes, you know. If it's involved fairly quickly then you would be 5 talking about a reduction in your enquiry teams because 6 7 there's less to do and there's demands elsewhere. If --8 I mean, I've had -- I've managed enquiries when I've had 9 maybe 25 to 30 enquiry officers carrying out various 10 enquiries, but you would always have your core of experts there when you realise what you were dealing 11 12 with. 13 So at the sort of head of that investigation team you'd Q. 14 have yourself as SIO, a deputy SIO, crime scene manager, 15 family liaison officer, house-to-house co-ordinator, CCTV co-ordinator. 16 17 Yes. Α. 18 Q. You would have maybe six or seven enquiry teams? 19 Α. Yeah. 20 How many would be in the enquiry team? Q. 21 Α. Two, two. Two in each team? 22 Q.
- Q. And they would be doing different parts of the enquiry, taking witness statements, doing other investigations --

Yeah, yeah.

Α.

23

- 1 A. Yes.
- 2 Q. -- and that type of thing, and you could have maybe 25
- 3 to 30 people --
- 4 A. On a larger enquiry. Basically the way the police
- 5 operated, and rightly so, is the minute you solved it,
- if you like, you know, you've got the person in custody,
- 7 then I would review it as SIO to say: do I need this
- 8 amount of resources, because we're now satisfied we've
- got the person responsible? There's still a lot of work
- 10 to do after that point, but it would normally result in
- 11 maybe two enquiry teams staying with the enquiry until
- 12 the end, if you like, and the rest would be able to be
- deployed elsewhere.
- 14 Q. And if there were five separate loci, would that
- increase the size of that team or would that be
- accommodated within what you've described?
- A. When you say a loci, five loci, what do you mean by
- 18 that?
- 19 Q. Let me explain the circumstances that we have heard
- 20 evidence about here. So there was the Hayfield Road,
- 21 where Mr Bayoh was restrained, but in addition there was
- 22 the hospital that he was taken to where he ultimately
- 23 passed away, there was his partner's address and his
- 24 address --
- 25 A. Yeah.

- 1 Q. -- relatively near to the Hayfield Road area, and that
- 2 she had made a call in the morning saying he wasn't
- 3 there and there had been signs of a disturbance --
- 4 A. Yeah.
- 5 Q. -- and that house was seized. There was the property of
- 6 his friends, who he had been to in the early hours prior
- 7 to going to Hayfield Road, and there was -- we've heard
- 8 some evidence about an incident with a friend which had
- 9 occurred at roughly between 6.30 and 7 o'clock in the
- 10 morning where his -- there was evidence available, we've
- 11 heard from Pat Campbell, that he had -- the friend had
- 12 removed his clothing and put it in a laundry basket in
- the bathroom of his family home, and that was another
- 14 area where the police attended.
- 15 A. Yeah.
- Q. So that's the five, as I understand it.
- 17 A. Okay, yeah, yeah.
- 18 Q. So the actual incident itself at Hayfield Road was one
- 19 location, but there were other locations identified
- 20 where work needed to be done --
- 21 A. Yes.
- Q. -- by the investigative team?
- 23 A. Without a doubt, without a doubt, yeah.
- Q. So that's what I mean when I say five.
- 25 A. Yeah.

1	Q.	So in terms of the investigative team, if you'd been an
2		SIO in that situation, would that have expanded the team
3		numbers or would you have been able to accommodate it
4		within the numbers you've described?

A. Based on my experience -- and I totally get, you know, there's four addresses, places of interest to us, right. If I had been the SIO in that investigation my take on it would have been: Sheku Bayoh was walking along the road unharmed, right. After police contact he's dead. So your number one priority has to be around the scene of where he was apprehended.

The four other scenes I would describe as secondary scenes where I accept you might get witness evidence as to, for example, what Sheku had been doing or how he'd been acting, et cetera, et cetera, but because we had evidence of Sheku being fit and well, you know, not injured walking along the road, then the number one scene where I would be looking to put all my resources would be Hayfield Road where he was apprehended by the police. Albeit the other four scenes you described to me would be relevant as the enquiry progressed.

The problem with scenes is you have to have officers to protect a scene and it becomes really resource-intensive if you've got five scenes protected by police officers, you know, you run out basically. So

1 you need to do a quick assessment of: why are we 2 protecting that particular scene; are we likely to have 3 any forensic evidence? Because you're protecting it 4 I suppose forensically, to allow the forensic team to 5 come in and seize any forensic evidence. But based on the circumstances -- and I'm only saying this if I was 6 7 the SIO -- that's how I would have dealt with the 8 situation I found myself in. So in your experience as SIO, you would have classed 9 Q. 10 those as secondary --11 Α. Yes. 12 Q. -- scenes, and as a secondary scene does that need to be 13 generally forensically protected or secure in some way? 14 Not always, but, you know, in -- we always say you're Α. 15 far better scaling something up when it's reported to you, because it's easy to scale it down, it's not so 16 17 easy to scale it up if you scaled it down in the 18 first place, so I totally get, you know, the need for 19 that, but I think it would be important that we as 20 quickly as possible established how relevant these 21 scenes were to the investigation. 22 Now, my take on it would have been, at the time, 23 depending on your available resources, my number one scene, without any shadow of a doubt, was Hayfield Road 24 where Sheku was apprehended, arrested by the police, 25

1 because prior to that there was no evidence that any harm had befallen him whatsoever. 2 3 So you're not talking about somebody who had been 4 the victim of a serious assault who ultimately died of 5 his injuries after being apprehended by the police, if you get what I'm saying there. I know that's 6 7 hypothetical, but that's ... 8 So in my mind in the circumstances of Sheku Bayoh we're dealing with a male who was not injured in any way 9 10 until he encountered the police. When he walked along 11 that road, to all intents and purposes -- and there was 12 no evidence to the contrary -- he was, you know, 13 uninjured, shall we say. Or that was the information I 14 had at the time. 15 Q. So in relation to those secondary locations, what sort of resources would you have placed in relation to 16 17 those? 18 Α. I suppose until we knew exactly what we were dealing 19 with, it's just about scene protection, if it is 20 a scene, you know, if it is a crime scene. So again, my 21 memory is that we had to take some people out of houses that Sheku had been in to protect that scene, and that's 22 23 something that's just come to me now, actually, that I'm thinking about it. 24 25 So, you know, it might well have been as the enquiry

1 moved on we got evidence that there was a fight in the 2 house or something like that and then that house would 3 become significant. I'm not saying that happened, 4 absolutely, but these are the things you have to 5 consider. So you'd be talking about two officers at every scene to protect the scene, but you don't really 6 7 know what you're protecting until the enquiry evolves. 8 If you had got information that there was something that 9 happened in the house, then you would want a full 10 forensic team in that house for any evidence of assault, blood spill or anything. 11 12 Q. And in terms of the investigative team size, would you 13 need additional officers to protect secondary scenes? You would need --14 Α. 15 Would that be accommodated within the numbers you Q. described? 16 It would be two uniformed officers at every scene, and 17 Α. 18 their job would certainly be to prevent anybody -- or depending -- I'm talking about a house, for example, you 19 20 would have officers at the front and the back protecting

that house to make sure nothing -- anything evidential

ourselves that there's actually no relevance to that

cannot be changed or disturbed until we satisfy

Q. And in terms of, you know, you've talked about

scene, and it's not a scene.

21

22

23

24

- determining the relevance and how quickly you can maybe

 stand those officers down, how long -- what sort of

 information would you need before you could stand those
- 4 two uniformed officers down?
- 5 Well, you know, if Sheku -- and again, this is Α. hypothetical -- if Sheku was in a house with two other 6 7 individuals, the individuals had been interviewed and 8 said, "There was no problem, he left the house here, he 9 was fine at the time", then in my opinion that's time to 10 stand that down, it's not a scene, it's not a potential 11 scene any more. We've got two witnesses speaking about 12 Sheku's actions prior to the contact with the police, 13 but nothing else there that's going to assist the progression of the investigation. 14
 - Q. When you use the expression, "When he left he was fine at the time", what are you -- what do you mean?
- 17 A. That's a hypothetical.
- 18 Q. Right.

15

16

19 A. I'm just saying, you know, if we found out from the
20 witnesses who were in his company that there was no
21 incident of note in the house or whatever, and that he
22 left at a particular time, then that scene becomes
23 irrelevant to the enquiry. Therefore, you would be in
24 a position to stand the officers down and say there's no
25 longer a need to protect that as a potential crime

- 1 scene.
- 2 Q. If there was evidence that -- or no evidence to suggest
- 3 he was not physically fine, but there was evidence to
- 4 suggest he felt disrespected and left the property, is
- 5 that something that would cause you to continue to
- 6 preserve that scene, or --
- 7 A. Yeah.
- 8 Q. -- are you~..?
- 9 A. If you're saying to me that he felt disrespected, then
- in my mind that would be so there's been some sort of
- 11 argument, if you like, verbal or otherwise. If that
- information was fed back to me, I would say, "Let's hold
- on to this scene just now until we bottom this out one
- way or the other.
- 15 Q. And what way would you as SIO expect that to be bottomed
- 16 out?
- 17 A. Witness evidence. You know, if you're saying to me he
- felt disrespected where are we getting that evidence
- 19 from, can we corroborate it, if we've got two witnesses
- 20 to say that he'd been involved in an argument I would
- 21 absolutely want to keep that scene protected until we
- got to the bottom of has anything happened in that house
- which has led to his death.
- 24 Q. Right, and when you are talking about "has anything
- 25 happened", I appreciate we're talking hypothetically,

15

16

17

18

- but what type of thing are you thinking you would want to know about, for this "anything happened"?
- Physical confrontation, you know, what was going on in 3 Α. 4 the house, was there alcohol involved, was there drugs 5 involved, what -- you know, how were people's demeanour, were people there enjoying themselves? You know, you 6 7 said if he'd felt disrespected, that would immediately 8 be a warning word for me, if you like, disrespected, 9 there's been an argument there, we need to know what's 10 happened in that house and until we find out what has happened we will keep it protected as a potential crime 11 12 scene.
- Q. And a physical altercation, is that, what do you mean by that; is that a fight or ..?
 - A. Yeah, a fight, an assault, any physical coming together.
 - Q. If the information available to you was that there was no physical altercation, what impact would that have on your decisions about releasing the property?
- 19 A. If there was no evidence of physical altercation, then
 20 I would be -- somebody would have to justify to me why
 21 we're holding on to that as a scene, if you like. You
 22 know, what can we take from that house that we are
 23 protecting that's going to assist us in finding out what
 24 happened to Sheku?
- 25 But, you know, as I said before, in my mind, Sheku

16

17

- 1 was uninjured and, you know -- well, you know, he was 2 walking along the road, there was no evidence that I was 3 aware of that he was injured in any way. So I would 4 certainly be looking at putting all my resources towards 5 where the police contact was and get the surrounding area, any property that has a view on to that area, like 6 7 you would do with anything, you know, need to get into 8 these houses to establish if anybody's seen or heard 9 anything suspicious. Or that would assist the enquiry.
- Q. Talking about these houses, I'm interested in -
 obviously, in your experience with MIT, as SIO, you have

 had to consider the legal authority for seizing a house

 in a situation where it may be a secondary location.

 What processes do you go through or did you go through

 when you did that job to secure the proper authority?
 - A. I know you're talking about sort of warrants here, but -- well, I assume you are.
- 18 Q. We've heard that one of the options is consent and one 19 of the options is a warrant.
- A. Yes, I was just going to say that, the first thing we
 would do is we would ask the people present at the house
 we were interested in if they would mind moving
 elsewhere to allow us to protect the house until we
 establish what we're dealing with.
- Q. And how would you expect officers to obtain consent, in

- 1 2015, for example?
- 2 A. Just by speaking to the people in the house, explaining,
- 3 you know, "There may be something in this house that may
- 4 assist us in our investigation, so would you mind coming
- 5 with us? We'll make arrangements to house you elsewhere
- 6 until we've carried out our investigation to prevent any
- 7 disturbance of any potential evidence within the house
- 8 itself.
- 9 Q. We heard some evidence from an officer who said he would
- 10 give an explanation for the reasons behind the request,
- 11 explain that he was looking for their permission or
- 12 their consent --
- 13 A. Yeah.
- 14 Q. -- and that on that basis it could be withdrawn at any
- 15 time, and he would note that in his notebook and get
- 16 a signature if possible.
- 17 A. Yeah.
- 18 Q. What would you say about that approach?
- 19 A. Absolutely, 100%, that would be one -- you know, one of
- 20 the many options available to you, and certainly the
- 21 easiest option, and if you've got people who are on
- 22 side, you know, and willing to assist with the enquiry,
- I don't think they would have any issue with moving out
- of a property. I mean, we wouldn't obviously just say,
- 25 "Right, you're out now, thanks very much", we would

- 1 accommodate them and house them elsewhere until we were
- in a position to return the property to the individual.
- Q. And if a situation arises where that consent is not
- 4 given or that consent is not available for some reason,
- 5 you've mentioned warrant, what would the procedure
- 6 normally be? Would you just simply seize the house
- 7 without a warrant --
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. -- or what would you do?
- 10 A. Seize the house without a warrant and then apply for
- a warrant to search the premises.
- 12 Q. Why would you do it that way?
- 13 A. Because if you don't have control over the house then it
- 14 becomes almost pointless to, you know, control it at
- 15 a later time. You know, if you go to somebody and say,
- "Look, we would like to seize this house because it may
- be a potential crime scene", and they say "No", then the
- 18 process of getting a warrant -- it wouldn't be something
- 19 that happened in minutes, and the minute you leave that
- scene, you've lost control of it, so we would seize it
- and apply for a warrant.
- 22 Q. We've heard those applications are through an on-call
- Fiscal?
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 Q. And the police will then explain the circumstances to

- 1 the Fiscal, who will then, if he agrees or she agrees,
- go on to seek that from the sheriff?
- 3 A. Yeah.
- Q. And in relation to a secondary location, are the circumstances for obtaining a warrant any different?
- 6 A. No, I think you would have to justify why you were
- 7 applying for a warrant in the first place. You would
- 8 have to put some form of case together to go to the
- 9 Fiscals with, who would then go to the sheriff, to
- justify why you want to seize this, you know, property
- if you like.
- 12 I've never found myself in a position of applying
- for a warrant to seize a property just in case there
- might be something in it, you know. So there really has
- to be some sort of, even if it's circumstantial evidence
- to suggest there's a good reason for getting a warrant
- to search that house.
- 18 Q. Thinking about searching, we've been talking about
- seizing the house.
- 20 A. Yeah.
- 21 Q. In terms of searching, is the authority the same
- 22 process, seeking either consent or going to get
- a warrant?
- A. Yeah, yeah.
- 25 Q. And in terms of timing for a search, so assume you've

- 1 seized the property, would you want to get consent in
- 2 advance of a search, to make sure --
- 3 A. Yeah, yeah.
- 4 Q. And if you didn't have that consent, what would your
- 5 position be about a warrant?
- 6 A. We would apply for a warrant to search.
- 7 Q. Before searching?
- 8 A. Oh, yes, yeah, absolutely.
- 9 Q. And if you hadn't obtained consent or a warrant, would
- 10 your officers just simply search a property?
- 11 A. Again, it would depend on the circumstances, to be
- 12 honest. That becomes -- I wouldn't -- I wouldn't -- if
- I was in charge of the investigation I wouldn't want my
- 14 officers seizing items of property from a house without
- 15 consent from the owner or a warrant to do that. It
- 16 wouldn't happen, you know, because then that evidence
- 17 would become contentious at a later point. That's my --
- that would be my take based on that, if that scenario
- 19 was presented to me. When I say search the house, I'm
- 20 also talking about a forensic examination of the house
- 21 you know, our forensic team going in there to see if
- there's any evidence of assault or whatever.
- 23 Q. Would you want the warrant before you did that?
- A. Yeah, absolutely.
- Q. Or consent?

- 1 A. Yes.
- Q. And you said, when I asked you if you didn't have
- 3 consent or a warrant, and you said, "Well, it depends on
- 4 the circumstances", is there another power or authority
- 5 available to the police to carry out a search of
- a house, even if there's no consent or a warrant?
- 7 A. There are certain circumstances, you know, if somebody's
- 8 made off from the place, you have a common law power if
- 9 you're in close pursuit to enter a property and search
- it. But in a situation like this, which isn't a live
- 11 incident, if you like, we're well past that time,
- I would certainly be of a mind of: we're protecting --
- we're seizing the house, without a warrant or consent,
- 14 but we're applying for the warrant, because if you don't
- protect the scene it becomes a point -- potentially
- a pointless exercise.
- 17 Q. We did hear some evidence that the police have the
- 18 power, if they have concerns about preservation of
- 19 life --
- 20 A. Yeah.
- 21 Q. -- they could search a house. In a sense of urgency,
- 22 an emergency situation.
- 23 A. Yes, absolutely.
- 24 Q. And is that the sort of common law power you're --
- 25 A. Yes. I mean, you know, if the police attend an address

1 and there's screaming coming from the house or any 2 concerns for the occupants, then we have a common law power to force entry if we think somebody's in danger. 3 4 Q. I think the description was also not just preservation 5 of life but perhaps protecting or avoiding a situation where they're concerned that evidence, important 6 7 evidence is being destroyed. 8 Yeah. Α. 9 Would that be the same~..? Q. 10 Α. Absolutely. But assuming that situation or circumstances did not 11 Q. 12 exist, then you would still seek consent or a warrant? 13 Α. Yes. 14 Can I ask you about some evidence we've heard about Q. 15 a knife being recovered at the scene? 16 Α. Yeah. I think you were asked about this, I think in 17 Q. paragraph 35, actually, of your Inquiry statement. You 18 19 say: 20 "I learned from someone else that a knife had been 21 recovered at the locus of the scene of the incident, and 22 if I'm being personally honest here, the knife had been recovered already, forensically, and photographed by 23 24 an officer using his mobile phone. I had some 25 reservations around that, however no major reservations.

1 "When I saw the photographs from the phone I thought no, I had reservations about it. I do know why, but 2 3 obviously if you were going to protect that knife 4 in situ, it's lying on the ground, and you would have 5 two officers to protect it. There was a lot going on with limited resources available at the time and they 6 7 possibly thought, 'We can't afford to keep two officers 8 here purely to protect a knife on the ground. Let's 9 recover it forensically in one of the plastic tubes', 10 and the officer photographed it on his mobile phone prior to recovery." 11 12 I'm interested in a situation where maybe you'd been 13 SIO and you're looking at an incident in a particular 14 location; what steps would you normally take in terms of 15 recovering a knife forensically? I would get the forensic officers, the scenes of crime 16 Α. 17 officers, they were called, to come out and recover that knife, photograph it in situ and recover it 18 forensically. It's just how I would do it. 19 20 Why would you do it that way? Q. 21 Α. Because I was aware of the importance of the knife in the whole scenario. It was, you know, it was massively 22 23 important. 24 Q. Why do you say that, in terms of the scenario, of what 25 you were aware?

5

19

20

21

- A. Because if Sheku hadn't have been in possession of
 a knife or the male hadn't been in possession of a knife
 then he presents less of a threat to the officers who
 had attended.
 - Q. And that's what makes the knife important?
- In my opinion, crucial, and I get -- well, I kind of get 6 Α. 7 why it was done in the way it was done, but to 8 photograph it with your mobile phone and then recover it 9 in a tube, albeit forensically, I wouldn't have had 10 that, I wouldn't have -- you know, if I had any control over that I would have said, "I want two cops standing 11 12 by that knife and I want the scenes of crime, the 13 experts to come out, photograph it in situ", so you're 14 not only photographing the knife, you've got general 15 shots that show you exactly where the knife was, 16 you know, to put some context round about it and then to 17 seize it forensically so you're not potentially damaging 18 any evidence that's contained on the knife .
 - Q. And what are the benefits, you know, from an SIO perspective, of doing it forensically with a scenes of crime officer?
- A. The scenes of crime are experts, that's their job, so
 there would be no possibility whatsoever that that knife
 was contaminated during its recovery. Officers don't
 have that training. I know how they would do it, they

would put gloves on and they would put the knife in the
plastic tube so, you know, there's a good likelihood
they're not going to contaminate it. But because of the
significance of that item in this investigation, I think
it would be unprofessional for it not to be done by the
experts.

And to photograph a knife on a bit of grass isn't really, it doesn't tell you much, you know, you need the surrounding shots of the scene. I accept they could have been taken at a later date, but I would have insisted on the experts coming out to recover that knife and to take the photographs of it in situ and the general shots to allow you to put context on where it was recovered.

- Q. Would your position on that be the same, the evidence you've given be the same, if the person was not declared deceased at the scene but has been taken away in an ambulance, unconscious, not breathing? Would that change your evidence on that?
- A. If I was dealing with something that ultimately led to somebody's death, it wouldn't change no.
- Q. We've heard evidence that the officer who recovered the knife from the scene then travelled in the ambulance with Mr Bayoh --
- 25 A. Yeah.

- 1 Q. -- to go to a hospital. I wonder if you have any
- 2 comments to make about that?
- 3 A. I never knew that, but it's -- in my mind it's a no-no.
- 4 An absolute no-no.
- 5 Q. Why do you say an absolute no-no?
- A. Well, you know, what sort of inferences can be drawn
- from somebody being in an ambulance with the knife and
- 8 the individual who was allegedly in possession of it?
- 9 That's just another example of why, you know, you bring
- 10 two experts, scenes of crime experts to a scene. They
- 11 take that knife away and don't -- you know, they have no
- 12 contact --
- Q. I don't want to give you the wrong impression.
- 14 A. Right.
- 15 Q. We've heard evidence that the individual who recovered
- the knife went into the ambulance with Mr Bayoh but not
- 17 with the knife. Sorry, I've made --
- 18 A. Again, a potential of cross-contamination. I wouldn't
- 19 like it, I wouldn't have it, you know, I would have the
- 20 scenes of crime officers totally separate. I mean,
- 21 contamination is massive, you know, during a criminal
- 22 investigation. So, no. To me, it's not right. It's
- 23 not right, in my experience of dealing with major
- 24 investigations. I understand these things happen,
- I kind of understand why they do happen, but I'm sorry,

- but in my opinion that's not right.
- 2 Q. We've also heard evidence about officers going to the
- 3 hospital where Mr Bayoh died, and the SIO understood
- 4 they were standing outside a side room where his body
- 5 was retained, but we may hear that they were within the
- 6 room and they were not wearing forensic clothing.
- Now, again, I'm interested in your experience as
- 8 an SIO, whether you have any comments about officers
- 9 sitting in a room for, as we understand it, ten hours
- 10 without forensic clothing other than gloves?
- 11 A. Not officers who have attended the scene, different
- 12 officers who have never --
- 13 Q. Different officers.
- 14 A. I've got to be honest, I wouldn't really have much of
- an issue with that. No, I -- I wouldn't have an issue,
- to be honest with you.
- 17 Q. All right.
- A. I wouldn't see the need for these officers to be
- 19 protected forensically. If they'd been at the scene,
- yeah, absolutely, if they'd been at the scene they
- 21 should have no further contact or be at the hospital
- 22 anyway. But if these are officers who have not been at
- the scene and are just there, you know, to carry out
- a role, then personally I wouldn't have an issue with
- it. I wouldn't see the need for them to be forensically

1 protected. 2 And would the position be the same if they were Q. 3 collecting the samples that had been taken at that time 4 from the medical practitioners? 5 Sorry, I don't ... Α. So if the medical practitioners had taken blood samples 6 Q. 7 and things and ... would that cause any concern for you, 8 that those were handed to those officers? There's a process you have to go through when you're 9 Α. 10 doing that, you know, so by the time it's handed to the officers that sample should be secured in a bag or 11 12 a tube or whatever so that there's no issue around 13 contamination. So that process would negate the chance of contamination. 14 15 Q. Could I ask you about a couple of the Gold Group meeting minutes? We looked at these yesterday. PS06492. If we 16 17 don't have them at the moment, I can move on. I'll move 18 on. 19 Do you remember at any of the Gold Group meetings or 20 any of your discussions in Kirkcaldy that day about the 21 issue regarding obtaining initial personal accounts or statements, detailed accounts from the officers? Do you 22 23 remember anything about that? This is something I've thought about a lot, to be honest 24 Α. 25 with you, and ... (Pause).

1 To the best of my knowledge, when I attended Kirkcaldy, my number one priority would be to get the 2 3 statements from the officers who attended the scene, 4 because they are -- never mind house-to-house or 5 anything, they are 100% witnesses to what has happened. My understanding, when I got there, is I asked the 6 7 question, you know: have we got statements from the 8 officers? 9 The perfect scenario for me in these circumstances 10 would be two detectives to interview the police officers. Detectives are more experienced in taking 11 12 statements and tend to go into more detail, so that 13 would be the perfect scenario in my opinion. 14 I do recall getting told that they were preparing 15 their own operational statements. When were you told that? 16 Q. It would have been fairly soon after I got there, 17 Α. because, as I said to you, you know, common sense 18 19 approach would be: I want to hear what the officers who 20 attended there are saying, basically. So --21 Q. Do you remember who told you that? I don't remember, honestly I don't. There's another --22 Α. and this is what stuck in my mind, there's 23 a post-incident procedure called a PIP that I was 24 trained in many years ago and it involves when a police 25

officer's involved in shooting someone. Now, they'll get taken away, the officers involved, and they get -this was the training I was given, because it was sort of questioned at the time, it might have changed, but they get 24 hours to sort of come to terms with what they've dealt with and discuss it with their colleagues before they provide their statements, which as you can imagine from the outside looking in, you know, that would be like: well, why, if you like, why are they allowed to~..?

That was -- so I'm not saying that's 100% true, that was my recollection of my training from that, and I just had in the back of my mind that these officers might be afforded that same opportunity. But I do remember being in Kirkcaldy and I remember it well, and in my -- as far as I was aware the police officers were in the station preparing their operational statements. But that never ever came to fruition. But that was my belief very shortly after arriving at Kirkcaldy because it would be one of the first things I would want to know. I mean, you're talking about however many officers were there, six, they are your most significant witnesses in all of this, so to seize their evidence immediately would be my number one priority, if I was the SIO in the investigation.

- 1 Q. And if -- I mean, have you been faced in your experience
- 2 as an SIO with a situation where officers weren't
- 3 prepared to provide operational statements?
- 4 A. Other than this investigation, no. No.
- 5 Q. And is that in your full years of service or only up to
- 6 2015?
- 7 A. My full service, yeah. I worked in the
- 8 countercorruption unit for a while, and the -- there
- 9 were a couple of occasions that an officer refused to
- 10 provide a statement, but they were suspects as opposed
- 11 to witnesses, and obviously you have a right to remain
- 12 silent, but on this occasion these officers were
- 13 witnesses, that was made clear to them, and I never
- 14 experienced that in any other time in my 31-year
- 15 service.
- Q. Do you remember when -- you say it was made clear to
- 17 them that they were witnesses, do you remember how that
- was done?
- 19 A. Yeah, it was a sort of pre-arranged preamble, if you
- like, but I do recall attempting to take statements off
- 21 the officers concerned and making it perfectly clear to
- 22 them that it was a witness statement we were looking for
- and they weren't suspects.
- Q. And I think we'll come on to that.
- 25 A. Yeah.

- 1 Q. As I understand it, that wasn't on the 3rd.
- 2 I'm interested in your experience as SIO. If you
- 3 had been faced with a situation where your priority is
- 4 to get the statements of the officers but you haven't
- 5 obtained them, what techniques or tactics or leverage
- 6 would you use to obtain statements of some sort or
- 7 accounts from officers who had been told that they were
- 8 witnesses, not suspects?
- 9 A. I suppose my answer to that is I was never in that
- 10 position, so I don't know what tactics I would use.
- I would probably just -- if I'm being honest, and
- obviously what happened on that day was, I never
- accepted it, I thought they were coming, that was 100%
- my belief, and then, you know, as the day progressed
- I was no longer in charge of the investigation, so it
- was no longer my call.
- Q. When you say you were no longer in charge, you've talked
- 18 earlier about you facilitating --
- 19 A. Yeah.
- 20 Q. -- PIRC, who were leading the investigation; what do you
- 21 mean as the day went on you were no longer in charge?
- 22 A. Because PIRC had been called out to take over the
- 23 investigation and my job was to facilitate the handover
- and act as their agents, if you like, to carry out any
- 25 requests they made of me and my team.

- 1 Q. Initial requests?
- 2 A. Yeah.
- 3 Q. Did there come a point that day where you felt that you
- 4 were no longer required to facilitate requests from
- 5 PIRC?
- 6 A. Oh no, no, not at all, not at all, no, I was always --
- 7 until you're talking about the early hours of the
- 8 morning where everybody was like, you know, "People need
- 9 to get home here and have a sleep and get back out in
- 10 the morning". But no, I was always there for them to
- 11 carry out any requests that they would have asked. It
- 12 perhaps didn't have to come through me but, you know,
- I was there.
- 14 Q. Sorry, it's maybe me, I was trying to understand what
- 15 you meant when you said you were no longer in charge of
- the investigation.
- 17 A. Well, I suppose after the Gold Group meeting it was made
- 18 clear then that the PIRC had taken ownership of the
- 19 enquiry so I was no longer -- I -- in my opinion, I was
- 20 never in charge of the investigation, I was out there
- 21 to -- a unique set of circumstances, I was called out to
- 22 assist with an ongoing investigation and to assist with
- 23 the handover to the PIRC, who were taking primacy in the
- 24 investigation.
- 25 Q. Just to go back to the situation with the status of the

25

1 officers, were you ever part of any discussion about advising the officers about status or anything along 2 3 those lines? Did you ever speak to the officers in the 4 PIM suite or the canteen, as it was? 5 As per my statement, I spoke to them a couple of days Α. 6 later in an attempt to take their statements from them. 7 Q. I'm just thinking about 3 May at the moment. No, no, I never. I didn't know them, you know, it 8 Α. 9 wasn't as a -- I probably did pass them in the corridor 10 or whatever, but I didn't know who they were, because --I mean, if it was Lothian and Borders, there'd be every 11 12 chance I would know the individuals. Because I was in 13 a different force area, albeit we were Police Scotland 14 at the time, I didn't know them. But I certainly had in 15 the back of my mind the officers involved in this 16 investigation are away being given privacy to sit down 17 and prepare their operational statements. That's what 18 I had in my mind. And somebody's told me that, that 19 they were preparing their operational statements. But 20 it's because I asked the question. It was in response 21 to --22 (Pause) 23 LORD BRACADALE: I think we can carry on. Well, in fact, it's nearly half past, we usually have a break anyway at 24

this point. So we'll just take the 20-minute break now.

```
(11.28 am)
 1
 2
                                (A short break)
 3
         (11.48 am)
 4
                             (Proceedings delayed)
         (11.59 am)
 5
         LORD BRACADALE: Sorry you were interrupted there,
 6
 7
             Mr Hardie. The transcription is now, I understand,
 8
             working again.
 9
                 Ms Grahame.
10
         MS GRAHAME: You've explained to us, before the break, in
             relation to the status of the officers and their
11
12
             statements, as you understood the position on the day.
13
             I'd like to ask you something else about the gathering
14
             of the officers who had been at Hayfield Road. We've
15
             heard evidence that they were gathered together in
             Kirkcaldy in the canteen area. I appreciate you don't
16
17
             know Kirkcaldy Police Office. And we've heard some
             evidence about consideration being given whether to
18
             gather them all together, as they were, or to separate
19
20
             them. We've heard evidence about the PIP SOP --
21
         Α.
             Yeah.
22
         Q. -- and ...
                 I'm interested in your perspective. Obviously
23
24
             you've got a lot of experience as SIO. Where an event
25
             had taken place in a location like Hayfield Road and the
```

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

25

- officers are all from Kirkcaldy Police Office and they
 returned there and they're held in -- not held, gathered
 together in the canteen, what your views are on that
 decision?
 - A. I think you would have to take cognisance of the fact that these officers might be traumatised, for example.

 Being totally professional about it, and obviously with my job being securing the best evidence possible, what I would have liked in those circumstances was two detectives for each of the officers to interview them immediately before they gathered together. And --
 - Q. And why would you have taken that approach? If you had been SIO.
- It's the perfect scenario, you want to interview 14 Α. 15 a witness before they're influenced by other people's 16 version of events. If you take a room of people and 17 show them an incident, they'll give you totally different versions of what they've seen, that's just the 18 way it is, you know, it always has been. But in 19 20 a perfect scenario I would have had two detectives 21 interviewing each of the officers as soon as reasonably 22 practical to prevent any -- I'm not saying there's 23 conclusion, absolutely not, but to prevent being influenced by other witnesses' versions of events. 24
 - Q. So as an SIO, you would consider that approach to give

1 you the best evidence available?

- A. Yeah. But it's not necessarily considering the impact on the individuals who have been at the scene, and the possibility of them being traumatised in any way. But that, you know, in a sort of cold light of day that would be my preference as to how we would secure them, the witness testimonies of these individuals who were at the scene.
 - Q. If officers were traumatised, or there was a suggestion they were traumatised, how would you then accommodate that knowledge into this preference that you've described?
- A. I think it would be a matter of speaking to the officers concerned and just to try and grasp the impact this incident has had on them. You know, it will impact on different people in different ways, and to a different level, if you like. So it would be -- you would have to -- again, if you put two detectives in to interview a police officer, part of their expertise and their training would be to assess the state of the individual as to whether or not they're capable of giving a statement.

So, you know, again talking hypothetically, two detectives might go into a room to interview a police officer and come out the room and say, "Look, that

- 1 officer's not in the right state of mind to obtain 2 a statement". If that scenario presented itself, 3 I would be looking for the officers to say to the 4 officer, "Can you sit down and write down what you 5 remember happened in as much detail as you possibly can", that type of thing. And then revisit that at 6 7 a later point with that version of events and go over 8 that with the officer to perhaps add more detail where it was necessary. 9 10 Q. So that would have been another option, to simply 11 interview? 12 Yeah, yeah depending on the demeanour of the police Α. 13 officer. And on that basis -- would you have envisaged that on 14 Q. 15 a sort of one-to-one basis, so there may be some 16 officers that were traumatised and unable to assist and others who were able to assist? 17 I would -- rather than one-to-one I would say two Α.
- A. I would -- rather than one-to-one I would say two

 detectives taking the statement and if the officer

 wanted somebody else there to accompany them, it would

 be somebody who was not involved in the incident,

 for example a Federation representative or somebody like

 that. That's in an ideal world.
- Q. And is that the type of arrangement that can be put in place reasonably -- within a reasonably prompt time, or

- does it take time to get resources to do that?
- 2 A. No, I think that would be fairly easy to put in place,
- 3 other than, you know, the Federation representative
- 4 might be difficult because you might have to call them
- 5 out, but you could be talking about a colleague who
- 6 wasn't involved in the incident sitting with them, just
- 7 to offer them that reassurance, if you like, that it's
- 8 not two on one.
- 9 Q. And the benefits to an investigation if that approach
- 10 was taken, what would they be?
- 11 A. You're getting their version of events as soon after the
- event as possible, and they're not being influenced by
- any other persons who attended the scene and honestly
- 14 and legitimately saw things differently, if you like, or
- had a different recollection of the event.
- So the witness isn't being influenced by anybody
- 17 else, if you can get them as soon as possible.
- Q. We've heard evidence about paperwork, you've already
- 19 talked to us about statements and accounts. I'm
- interested in your perspective of the value of use of
- 21 force forms or use of spray forms. Now, we've heard
- 22 evidence that use of spray forms -- CS spray is treated
- as a firearm in terms of legislation, and we've
- 24 discussed with other witnesses about a memo that said
- 25 those forms should be completed before going off duty.

1 Α. Yeah.

4

9

10

11

12

13

23

24

25

- And then they are emailed to officer safety training and 2 Q. 3 then passed to PIRC within a short timescale. Have you experience of officers completing use of spray forms?
- 5 Limited experience, but I've been aware of it having to Α. be done and it's part of the process, because, as you 6 7 say, it's treated as a weapon, if you like. But not 8 overly so.
 - We've heard that officers didn't complete those forms Q. that day and didn't complete use of force forms that day. Did you have any awareness or discussion or impression of the position regarding the forms and whether they were going to be completed.
- If I'm being totally honest, it wouldn't have been 14 Α. 15 something that was high on my list of priorities, it's a process that has to be done. But my observation would 16 17 be there if they've given a statement then that would be 18 sufficient information to complete that form. But it 19 certainly wouldn't -- I mean, as a senior investigating 20 officer my job is to establish what's happened, it's somebody else's role to make sure all the forms are 21 22 filled out, if you like, not mine, if that makes sense.
 - Q. In the absence of statements or accounts being provided by the officers, would your interest in the forms be elevated in that situation as SIO?

- 1 A. If it was a way of getting evidence of what happened,
 2 yes, absolutely. Yeah.
- Q. Can I ask you about the situation, we've heard evidence
 that equipment and clothing was recovered from the
 police officers that day. Can you tell us about the
 type of approach you would normally take as SIO if you
 were recovering equipment from police officers who had
- 8 been involved in an incident?
- A. Yeah. I have been involved in similar type situations
 whereby we've had to take officers' clothes and personal
 effects, and it's always -- my attitude has always been
 to explain to the officers that it's in your best
 interests to hand over the clothing you were wearing at
 the time and your officer protection equipment for
 example.
 - Q. In terms of timescale, what would you be aiming for in relation to recovering that?
- 18 A. As soon as possible.
- 19 Q. Why?

16

17

A. Again, to protect any potential forensic evidence on
that clothing or on the pieces of equipment. So my
action around then would be: do you have a change of
clothing in the station? If not, get somebody to pick
up a change of clothing for that individual and get that
clothing seized as soon as reasonably practicable.

- 2 means, "as soon as reasonably practicable"? Could you
- 3 give us a sort of estimate of timescale?
- 4 A. It would depend -- in these circumstances, it would be
- 5 dependent on the availability of another set of
- 6 clothing, if you like. A lot of officers come to work
- 7 in civilian clothes and change into uniform when they
- 8 get to the station. If that was the case, I would want
- 9 it done right away. If it wasn't the case, I would want
- somebody despatched to the officer's home address or
- wherever to get a change of clothing for them and get
- 12 back, to allow us to seize the clothing that they were
- 13 wearing at the time of the incident. And that would be
- 14 a priority.
- Q. Right. We've heard some evidence a while ago now that
- in terms of threat levels that officers were being
- 17 encouraged to wear civilian clothing to work --
- 18 A. Yeah, yeah.
- 19 Q. -- in May 2015, round about that sort of time. So in
- 20 those situations, if officers had worn civilian clothing
- 21 and had it in their lockers, is that something that
- 22 could have been done reasonably quickly?
- 23 A. Almost immediately, yeah.
- Q. And "almost immediately", is that almost immediately
- 25 after return to the police station?

- 1 Α. There again you would have to have the officers available to seize the clothing and also to seize it in 2 3 a way that's protecting it for any further forensic 4 examination later down the line. So I'm talking about 5 bagging and sealing the clothing and labelling it and getting signatures on the labels. So it's a relatively 6 7 straightforward and recognised process, but it wouldn't 8 be a matter of, "There's my clothes there, thanks very much", it would be item per item, bagged separately and 9 10 protected for any necessary further future examination, forensic --11
- Q. And that would be a scene of crime person rather than a forensic medical examiner?
- A. No, a police officer. In an ideal world a scene of

 crime, but a police -- so it would be a matter of one

 detective, the officer himself, putting a jumper in

 a bag, putting the trousers in a bag, sealing them,

 signing them off, and then that's them protected for

 any -- so there's not a lot of expertise needed for that

 type of recovery, if you like.
- Q. Were you involved in any way in any discussions
 regarding the seizure of a house occupied by
 a Martyn Dick and his partner Kirsty MacLeod on the 3rd?
- 24 A. No.
- 25 Q. Were you involved in any way in recovering a property

1

2 Α. No. Was that part of any of your role or part of any 3 Q. 4 officers that you were bringing from Edinburgh? 5 No, I have no recollection of that whatsoever. Α. 6 Q. Okay. 7 We were going to turn to the Gold Group meeting, so 8 there was a couple of things I would like to ask you 9 about your recollection. I understand that they're 10 available. Could we look at the Gold Group meeting minutes of 14.40 hours, please. You'll see those on the 11 12 screen. And this -- you'll see the list of people who 13 were present. If we move down the screen, it was 14 chaired by ACC Nicholson, and we'll see that -- if you 15 keep going down please, you'll see: "Keith Hardie - MIT." 16 Yeah. 17 Α. 18 Q. So it would appear at this meeting at 14.40 you were 19 present. Do you remember this meeting? I remember being at a meeting that ACC Nicholson 20 Α. 21 chaired, yeah. 22 Could we look at page 2 of these minutes, and I'm Q. 23 interested in what's effectively item 3 of the agenda, "Investigative process", so it was part of the agenda in 24 the meeting which was discussed by DCS Boal and 25

that related to the family of Mr Zahid Saeed?

1 Detective Superintendent Campbell, and we've heard from Pat Campbell that he was SIO. 2 3 I'm interested in the bullet point which is at the 4 bottom of this page that says: "Witness strategy -- MIT to be deployed to note 5 statements from significant witnesses. (Update MIT to 6 7 progress with investigation, on going discussions re 8 witness strategy, to be discussed with PIRC, discussion re seizure of production from police witnesses." 9 10 Do you remember this part of the meeting? Vaguely, if at all, to be honest with you. Erm, I ... 11 Α. 12 Seeing those minutes, do they prompt any memories? Q. 13 My overwhelming memory of statements from officers Α. 14 were -- and seizing the clothing -- was that was work in 15 progress, if you like, it was being done. And ... to be honest, if I made any further comment I would be 16 17 guessing. I really don't -- I don't recall ever being 18 given an action to go away and ensure with my team that 19 the statements were being -- were to be taken from the 20 officers, or indeed to seize their clothing. My 21 understanding was that was being done, the officers were 22 preparing their own operational statements and their clothing was being seized. 23 Well, just to show you the complete section 3 of the 24 Q. 25 minutes --

1 Α. Yeah. -- there's, just before section 4, it's on the next 2 Q. 3 page, there's no task or action listed there in relation 4 to that item about witness strategy or statements. 5 So -- and again, at the end of the minutes there's nothing there that would suggest there was a particular 6 7 action allocated to you --No. 8 Α. 9 -- or MIT? Q. 10 Α. Yeah. All right, thank you. 11 Q. 12 Can I ask you to go back, please, to page 2 of the 13 minutes, again remaining with item 3 of the agenda, and 14 if we can move up the page, please, I'm interested in 15 the section that's at the bottom of the page there: "Seizure of productions from officers being carried 16 out today ..." 17 18 Α. Yeah. "... staff have been advised by Federation staff not to 19 Q. 20 provide any statements." 21 Do you remember that part of the meeting? 22 No, I don't, I genuinely don't. It's clearly, by Α. that -- I was aware of Federation representatives being 23 24 present at Kirkcaldy or being told they were present at 25 Kirkcaldy, but that, I would have to say -- I've no --

1 I've no recollection of that, but if that was the case, then you couldn't action a request to get the officers 2 3 interviewed because the Federation have already instructed them not to provide statements. 4 5 LORD BRACADALE: Ms Grahame, I interrupt again because the transcript has stopped. I think what we'll do is just 6 continue and the stenographer can complete the 7 8 transcript from the YouTube broadcast subsequently. MS GRAHAME: Thank you. 9 10 Then I'd like to move on to the NOK, next of kin strategy, you see the bullet point just towards the 11 12 bottom of that page? 13 Yeah. Α. Q. It says there: 14 15 "... Partner of deceased made aware and statement noted, no formal ID has taken place but ID has been done 16 17 by a Facebook image initially. NOK identified as sister and a FLO being identified. (2 \times Police Scotland FLOs 18 have been identified 1 x DI as FLO to brief and 19 20 co-ordinate." 21 I'm interested in two aspects of this bullet point. Do you have any recollection of a discussion about ID 22 23 having been done via a Facebook image? None whatsoever, no. 24 Α. Q. No? 25

1 Α. I'm not \dots I'm not sure how that could be done to serve 2 any purpose, to be honest with you. But no, I've no ... 3 I mean, I don't: 4 "... no formal ID has taken place but ID has been 5 done by a Facebook image~..." What does that mean? Somebody has looked at 6 a Facebook image of Sheku and said, "That's him"? 7 8 I don't know. That's my understanding, that a Facebook image or images 9 Q. 10 have been obtained and officers have gone to the hospital to carry out --11 12 Α. Oh, right, to compare the Facebook image with the 13 deceased? Yes. Can I ask you for your comments about that 14 Q. 15 approach, using a Facebook image to carry out an ID? Not a formal ID, obviously. 16 Never heard of it before. (Pause). I don't see a huge 17 Α. 18 issue with it, because it's informal, but just to 19 confirm, you know, that it is who we think it is, if you 20 like, I would be okay with it. I've never heard of it 21 and would consider it a wee bit unusual, but nothing ... identification's vital, obviously, but I've never heard 22 of it being done that way, to be honest. 23 Would you have any concerns about it being done that 24 Q. 25 way?

- 1 Α. My only concern would be that you're asking a police officer to say 100% either way whether an image of 2 3 somebody is the person who's now deceased, which, 4 you know, it might sound easy but it isn't easy, it 5 definitely isn't. I've been at post-mortems before for unidentified males and officers have come to view the 6 7 male because they've had numerous dealings with that 8 individual in the past and they've been unable to say with any certainty that it's the same person. 9
- 10 Q. They've not been able to say?
- 11 A. Not been able, absolutely.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. If that informal process was followed, how comfortable would you be about then sharing a death message on the back of that informal ID?
 - A. It would all be down to the wording of the death message, I think. You know, "We believe this individual may be your son/your husband", whatever, "But we haven't formally identified him". So it would be that -- you know, it's like if a person goes missing and a body's found, they'll tell the family immediately a body's been found, "The body of a female", for example, but there would be no definitive, "This is your daughter/son", or whatever until there was a formal identification through a number of ways: DNA, dental records or whatever, or formal viewing by the family of the deceased individual

1	to	confirm	that	identi	Lficat	cion,	which	is	required	before
2	the	e post-mo	ortem	would	take	place	e.			

3 Q. Thank you.

- Then the other aspect I'm interested in, in relation
 to this bullet point, are the comments about the next of
 kin strategy. What would your approach normally have
 been in relation to next of kin strategy, and
 particularly with regard to deployment of FLOs?
 - A. Yeah. First and foremost, the FLOs would never be responsible for passing on the death message to the next of kin. That would be done by somebody independently and then the FLOs would be deployed thereafter. It's just considered best practice, and I think it's to do with the relationship with the family or the next of kin and the FLOs themselves, because their job is to build up a very good relationship with the family, and I think if they delivered the death message it would be harder to build up that relationship. So it would always be somebody independent who would deliver the death message and then the FLOs would be deployed from there.
 - Q. Were you aware at that time of any discussions about difficulties deploying FLOs or getting FLOs in place, either in relation to Police Scotland FLOs or PIRC FLOs?
 - A. My recollection is that the PIRC had trained family liaison officers but I wasn't aware of any significant

difficulty on this occasion.

2

3

4

5

6

7

22

23

24

- Q. You mentioned a death message; what in your experience would the normal practice be for a death message? You talked about independent people delivering the actual death message. I'm interested in how a death message is drafted, whether there's a record of it, that type of thing. What's the normal procedure?
- 8 I suppose it would depend on the circumstances, but it Α. 9 would generally be -- two officers would attend at 10 a home address and inform them in the simplest of terms, without using police jargon or terminology, if you like, 11 12 whoever has died. But obviously in a situation like 13 this, or a homicide, the family liaison officers would 14 be ready to step in as soon as the people who had passed 15 the death message left the house, if you like, and the family liaison officers would be briefed by the SIO as 16 17 to what they can tell the family or what they can't tell them, because obviously it's important that all the 18 information passed to the family is correct and 19 20 accurate, to build that relationship of trust between 21 the FLOs and the family of the deceased.
 - Q. So you've talked about the FLOs going in as soon as possible after the death message is relayed. Is that something that has to be co-ordinated in advance in terms of the timing?

- 1 A. Yeah, yeah. As an SIO, I would always go and meet the
- 2 family of the victim. That would be facilitated by the
- 3 FLO. (Pause). Excuse me. And I would go and give them
- 4 an update as to the progression of the investigation.
- 5 Q. When would you do that?
- 6 A. It would depend on the -- again, the -- how upset the
- 7 family were. I would seek information from the FLOs,
- I would say to the FLOs, "Tell them I want to meet the
- 9 next of kin or the family and find out when it's
- 10 convenient and when they're ready to meet me", and
- I would take it from there. But I would always, every
- 12 time I've been deployed as an SIO I would go and meet
- the family as soon as I possibly could and when they
- 14 were ready for it, if you like.
- 15 Q. What have the benefits of that been in relation to
- family members of the deceased?
- 17 A. I think normally in an investigation like that there's
- 18 media coverage and I would do the media, and there was
- 19 quite often a request from the family to meet the
- officer in charge of the investigation, and I would go
- 21 and -- go there and introduce myself, explain what I was
- doing, what I was trying to do, and basically leave them
- 23 with the FLOs being the conduit to them contacting me if
- they wanted to speak to me about any particular,
- 25 you know, line of enquiry or what's happening with the

24

25

Α.

1 investigation. 2 So when you've acted as SIO, have you been accessible to Q. 3 families to provide information? 4 Α. Absolutely, yeah. I would tell them that at the first 5 meeting and I would get the FLOs to tell them that, "I will make myself available at any point, within 6 reason, but at any point if you want an update and I'll 7 8 do my best to tell you everything I can, but you have to 9 understand there's potentially specialist knowledge 10 involved which I wouldn't be able to impart to you". Have you felt that benefited the investigation, having 11 Q. 12 that good relationship with the family? 13 That's the role of the FLOs, it's the FLOs' role to Α. 14 ensure that we have a good relationship with the family, 15 but yeah, absolutely, I think it does. I think, 16 you know, to take the time to go and meet the family, 17 explain who you are, explain what we're going to do to 18 try and resolve this and bring the person responsible to 19 justice, it builds on the relationship that you have to 20 build up with the family, which is massive, as 21 the enquiry progresses. 22 Q. What impact does that have on building trust with the 23 family?

A huge impact. That's why the FLOs are there, the FLOs

are a conduit between the police and, you know, the

1 victim's family, if you like. It's ... it's not new as 2 a concept, it goes back to the sort of Stephen Lawrence 3 Inquiry and the importance of -- I mean, in some 4 investigations the family are an absolute minefield of 5 information which assists the investigation, if you 6 like. 7 A mine of information? Q. 8 Yeah, yeah, not a minefield. And you have to try and Α. 9 use that to your benefit as often as you possibly can, 10 so ... Your FLO deployment is one of the main deployments, 11 12 one of the most important deployments at the start of 13 an investigation, and they're all trained to a level 14 that, you know, if you're -- you have to be trained as 15 a family liaison officer and the training's quite intensive. 16 Does that relationship that's built up have wider 17 Q. implications, not just in terms of the benefits of 18 19 liaising with the family but in terms of the community 20 impact? What benefit is there in that? 21 Α. I think it ... well, the purpose of it is to show 22 an openness and a bond between the investigation team and the victim's family, if you like. The impact on the 23 community, I don't really know that it would necessarily 24 25 have a big impact on the community. But obviously if

1 the family are sharing their experiences of their grief and what the police have done to help them, then that's 2 going to spread throughout the community. 3 4 Q. Thank you. Can I move on to the next Gold Group meeting 5 6 minutes, these are at 2015 hours on the same day, and 7 the number I have is PS06493. But I think that's 8 incorrect. Again, we see, if we can look at those present at 9 10 this meeting, it appears from the list that you again were present at this meeting. Do you remember having 11 12 a meeting in the evening that day? Vaguely. Vaguely. 13 Α. And again, it appears Keith Harrower was there from PIRC 14 Q. 15 and John Ferguson. Could I ask you to look at page 2 of these minutes, 16 and it's item 3 on the agenda, and -- sorry, it's item 3 17 18 at the end, it says: "Task -- Keith Hardie MIT collate another enquiry 19 20 team outwith P Division for transparency/independence. 21 Liaise with PIRC." 22 Do you remember a discussion at the Gold Group 23 meeting about transparency and independence? A. I think it was an ongoing theme of the meetings. I do 24 25 have a vague recollection of that, for me to identify

1 another enquiry team. But I do remember it being, I suppose, transparency and independence, a theme of 2 3 both Gold Group meetings, if you like. As I said 4 previously, this was groundbreaking for me and the 5 majority of people in attendance there, that the PIRC 6 were coming in to take over an investigation which was 7 started by the police. 8 So yeah, a vague recollection. I mean, for 9 something like that, I'm just interested in the task. 10 By that time, you know, I don't have any responsibility by way of a senior investigating officer, I'm 11 12 accommodating the PIRC and my job is to ensure their 13 requests are met. And in terms of the issue of transparency and 14 Q. 15 independence, do you remember having an impression about why that was being discussed, in connection with this? 16 Yeah, well, my recollection was, you know, at the end of 17 Α. 18 the day, the police have arrested a black male and he 19 has died after police contact, so it's massive, 20 you know, it's significant, there's all sorts of 21 concerns round about that and rightly so. 22 When you say "concerns", can you explain to the Chair Q. 23 what you mean by that? I would say the most obvious one would be: is there 24 Α. 25 a racial element to it? You know. And there would be

concern -- at the end of the day, we are -- the police are meant to be here to protect, you know, protect communities, protect individuals. Now, something's gone wrong during that apprehension of Sheku which has led to his death, so the police are going to be scrutinised for it, and rightly so. So transparency is massive, we have to be seen to be transparent and not hide anything, or being as open and honest as we possibly can.

- Q. Being open and honest about the events at Hayfield Road, would that in some way damage the investigation that is being done?
- A. I don't see how it could. Sometimes you have to withhold information for the protection of the enquiry because it's specialist knowledge, if you like. That might be considered as not being open and honest, but there's a good reason for that. Other than that, I think openness, honesty and transparency is what we should be all about.

You know, in tragic circumstances, which has led to the death of an individual, we have to be open, we have to be transparent and we have to be honest. You know, a lot of the things that I've spoken about today, the recovery of the knife, I don't like being critical of the police because I was an officer for 31 years, but you have to be honest about it, these things could have

25

1 been done better, in my opinion. You're talking about a situation where there maybe 2 Q. 3 special knowledge you would withhold. For the 4 non-lawyers that are listening to your evidence, would 5 you be able to give an example to explain what you mean? It's difficult actually, but it's knowledge that belongs 6 Α. to one person which can't really get in the public 7 8 domain because it's no longer specialist, if you like. 9 So if it's published in a newspaper or media it's no longer specialist knowledge, and that specialist 10 knowledge might be significant in the inquiry. 11 12 Q. And that specialist knowledge could ultimately be 13 significant at a trial? 14 Yeah. Α. 15 Against that particular one person? Q. 16 Yeah, absolutely. Α. And if they were the only person that knew that special 17 Q. 18 knowledge --19 Α. Yeah. 20 -- that could be a significant piece of evidence at the Q. 21 trial? 22 Yeah. Yeah. Α. 23 You've talked about concerns, you've talked about the Q. 24 significance of being open and honest and transparent.

In relation to independence, can you explain why that is

- 1 important in an investigation?
- 2 A. It's always important, but I think on this occasion it
- 3 was to take away the investigative responsibility from
- 4 the police to an independent agency so that, again,
- 5 you know, there could be no inference of collusion,
- of -- you know, a police force investigating itself
- 7 doesn't sit well with the public. An independent
- 8 organisation coming in to investigate, or investigate
- 9 the police force or the actions of police officers sits
- 10 far better with members of the public because you have
- 11 that element of independence.
- 12 Q. Did you have any concerns about the independence of the
- investigation? Obviously you've talked about you not
- 14 having any contact with Kirkcaldy Police Office or the
- officers. Did you have any concerns about the
- independence in relation to PIRC's role?
- 17 A. No, I never, no.
- 18 Q. And the fact that many, the majority I think you said
- 19 this morning, were former police officers; did that
- 20 cause you any concern?
- 21 A. I'm not sure that's actually accurate, but it was my
- 22 perception of -- but no, I would say -- I know it can be
- 23 looked at in two different ways, but my interpretation
- of it is: these guys know what they're doing or,
- 25 you know, these individuals know what they're doing

25

1 because they've done it for a long period of time. They're experts in their field. That's how I would look 2 at it. 3 4 Q. And what about the -- we've heard evidence that there 5 was ongoing -- initially actions taken, we've heard Colin Robson was the Fife division --6 7 Α. Yeah. 8 -- SIO, and actions were prioritised, initiated, actions Q. 9 taken by Fife officers --10 Α. Yeah. -- on 3 May. What would your comments be about that, in 11 Q. 12 relation to this issue of independence? 13 My only observation would be: was that before the Fiscal Α. 14 had determined that it was going to be taken over by the 15 PIRC? There is, you know, in these type of enquiries, when there's a number of different people involved from 16 17 a number of different areas and organisations, it's 18 vitally important that everybody understands who is in 19 ultimate charge, who is the SIO. 20 It's an issue I had throughout my career, you know, 21 that we had to make -- especially when you are being 22 deployed to -- like, for example, I was deployed to Inverness on a homicide enquiry, there was a DCI in 23 Inverness and the officers involved in that enquiry were 24

reporting to him, so that had to stop and it had to be

made known that: here's the individual in charge of this investigation, to ensure not only independence but to avoid confusion. You know, there would be no point in somebody coming back and briefing the DCI at Inverness when I'm the officer in charge of the investigation. That was difficult at times because it was only natural for the officers there to go back to their manager but we had to put a strategy in place whereby, no, you go to me because I've been appointed as the SIO, you know, I'm appointed by the deputy chief constable or whoever, but, you know, it's me that's in charge of this.

- Q. Is that -- how, in the example you give about the

 Inverness case that you were involved in, how did you go
 about sharing with officers, all the officers, that you
 were the SIO and everything had to come through you?
- A. A briefing with the officers. I had a briefing with them all and explained to them, "I've been appointed here, I'm the SIO", and I also spoke to the divisional DCI and said, "Look, if anybody's coming to you with information in relation to this investigation, you have to direct them directly to me because it's ultimately me that's in charge", to avoid any confusion, and there was no point in him sitting with information that was vital to my investigation, it had to come through me.

So getting everybody together and explaining: look,

1 to avoid confusion here I'm the SIO and you report to 2 me. What would you do if some officers were out tasked with 3 Q. 4 priority actions already and only some were available at 5 the police office when you arrive? How would you resolve that issue? 6 7 Α. Before I had the briefing I would make sure everybody's 8 gathered together, I wouldn't necessarily take somebody 9 away from priority actions but I would put out 10 a message: the minute you're finished with that come back to Kirkcaldy for, for example, a 6 o'clock 11 12 briefing, where I would brief everybody involved in the 13 investigation and make the lines of supervision and 14 who's in charge of the enquiry perfectly clear. 15 You know, the best way of doing it with the DCI at 16 Inverness was I just said to him, it was after his tour 17 of duty, "You'd better not be in here", if he wasn't 18 there and present in the office nobody can go back to 19 him with information. Because that is quite often the 20 simplest and best way to do it, if there is confusion. 21 Q. So that's something that, could that be done -- how 22 quickly could that be done after you arrive and as SIO? I would -- very quickly, very quickly. So I can set out 23 the terms of reference set out what's important, what's 24

not important, highlight your priority actions,

1 highlight what you want done that day, immediately, and 2 what's a lesser priority. When we became Police Scotland it was about 3 4 introducing different people from different forces prior 5 to becoming Police Scotland, so we all could at least put a face to the name, type of thing. And obviously as 6 7 SIO I have a policy file I have to fill out and I would record all that to ensure that it stands scrutiny later 8 down the line, should it go to court. 9 10 Q. Tell us about your policy file as SIO, how would you fill that in? 11 12 It basically starts with a summary of what you are faced Α. with, if you like, so you would basically write a brief 13 14 summary of what you're dealing with and then from there 15 you would start documenting your policy decisions. That's not every decision, that's your policy decisions. 16 For example, appointing a crime scene manager. And you 17 18 would -- the way the form was set out, you would have to 19 justify that action, as to why you're doing that 20 particular -- or making that particular decision. And 21 that forms a document that would be available at any 22 court proceeding further down the line. 23 If you were doing a particular handover, for example --Q. 24 Α. Yeah. -- to another officer or to an organisation such as 25 Q.

- 1 PIRC, is that the type of decision that would be noted
- in your policy file?
- 3 A. I suppose because of the timings around this
- 4 investigation and the fact that I was never appointed
- 5 the SIO, I would never have started a policy file. But
- I'm sure it's been policied somewhere by Mr Nicholson,
- 7 Lesley Boal or whoever: Procurator Fiscal's decision for
- 8 PIRC to be called in to investigate the death of
- 9 Sheku Bayoh, and the reason for that would be
- independence, transparency, et cetera. And then it
- 11 would be over to the PIRC to -- for them to complete
- their policy files, or the SIO, if you like.
- Q. And if a handover was to be done with an SIO and PIRC,
- is that the type of level of decision that would go into
- 15 that file?
- 16 A. Yes. Yeah.
- 17 Q. We've heard evidence about things called daybooks as
- well.
- 19 A. Yeah, yeah.
- Q. And we understand they're different from policy files?
- 21 A. Oh yeah, yeah.
- 22 Q. Can you tell us, in your normal practice is a daybook
- something that you've used?
- A. All the time, yeah, yeah.
- 25 Q. So could you explain the distinction and how you use the

25

Α.

Yeah.

1 daybook as opposed to the policy file? Sure. A daybook, as it's called, is an A4 hard-backed 2 Α. 3 book of lined paper, and I would use that to --4 for example, at a briefing, I would note down, "This 5 witness has said this, this witness has said that", type of thing. And at some point later I would review what 6 I've written down and decide what needs to go into my 7 8 policy file. But the policy file was for sort of 9 strategic decisions, not the, you know, "Keith Hardie 10 was a witness and saw this". To go and interview Keith Hardie wouldn't be a policy decision but an action 11 12 would be raised on the HOLMES to go and interview that 13 witness, if you like. 14 So your policy is all about why you -- how you're 15 directing investigating the circumstances and why you're directing it a particular way. So you might have 16 17 a policy file with only ten, 12 decisions in it because they're at a strategic level, but you would make over 18 19 100 decisions around how the enquiry's being developed. In each of those areas? 20 Q. Yeah, yeah. 21 Α. We've heard about, as part of an investigation, as SIO 22 Q. 23 that hypotheses may be considered, possible reasons why someone has died. 24

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. And that these hypotheses will be then the subject of various tasks or priorities themselves. Would hypotheses be something that would be noted in the policy file or in the daybook?

 A. To be honest with you, and this is personal, I didn't
- like hypotheses, I didn't -- I never ever used it. 6 7 I know it was a tool that could be used. I never used 8 it because you can hypothesise as long as you want, 9 you know, at the end of the day my job was to try and 10 evidence and prove what's actually happened. You can sit and discuss all the potential -- hypothetically, the 11 12 scenarios that have brought you to that point. I've, in 13 my experience only, I know it's quite big and, you know, 14 investigative training, I've never really seen a huge 15 benefit in it, to, you know, consider could this have happened, could that have happened. 16

You know, the girl who was found, Nicola Bulley, who was found in the river and the hypothesis was she was in the river. I don't see how that helps an investigation, you know, you can hypothesise all you want, I want to stick to evidence and fact. That's my job, to provide evidence and fact to the Procurator Fiscal to allow them to consider a prosecution.

So it's very much personal, but I never really used it. I mean, you would often think, you know, in

an unexplained death: could this have happened, could
that have happened? But I wouldn't want to make that
the focus of my investigation. I would want to look at
securing evidence to prove that one thing happened
leading to where we are.

So, you know, a hypothesis for Sheku Bayoh, it's not something I would have necessarily considered if I'd been appointed the SIO.

- Q. And in terms of something you said a moment ago about briefing, if you were doing a briefing, you'd note down what a witness said; in terms of conducting a briefing as SIO, would you prepare notes in advance of that?
- A. The initial briefing, yes. The briefing -- so, the initial briefing when you bring the team together,

 I would have a summary of what we're dealing with to brief the team. Or it could be off the top of my head, you know, because it's fast-running, if you like. For that briefing, yeah. Thereafter, the briefing is more about the enquiry team's given me the information so I can decide where that information is taking the investigation. So I wouldn't have notes for that. It would be more about me looking for the enquiry teams to brief me so I can decide, based on what they tell me, where I'm going to take the investigation.
- Q. If the enquiry team brought you information which was of

significance to your enquiry, is that something that you would note down?

A. Well, possibly, probably, but it would all go into the HOLMES computer and from that you have an action raiser, somebody who raises actions from that. So I might say, "Right, that's really significant, can we get that logged on to the HOLMES computer and get the actions raised from that as soon as possible", then you would have a statement reader who would read that statement and say, "Right, I need to interview him, I need to raise an action to get him seen", or, "I need to raise an action to recover this", or whatever. So the actions would be raised through the statement reader.

But if it was vitally important I would say, "Right, based on that information I want you to go and do that, that and that immediately and you'll get your actions when you come back". So an action is something that's produced by the computer, to go and take a statement, go and recover this, and then the officers who carry out the action fill out the action log and complete the action and then it goes back into the HOLMES computer.

- Q. So once something's put on the HOLMES computer --
- 23 A. Yeah.
- Q. -- actions will be dictated through the system, the
 HOLMES system?

25

1 Α. Not the system, through myself or the person who's 2 inputting the information on. What we would call 3 a statement reader, if you like. So they would read the 4 statement and if one individual has named two other 5 individuals, then obviously we would need statements from them. So they would mark up the statements and 6 7 action what needs to be done based on that statement. 8 If it was high priority I wouldn't go through that 9 process, I would say, "Right, I want him seen and her seen tonight, if you like, if possible". 10 All right. And prior to a matter being put on to 11 Q. 12 HOLMES --13 Yeah. Α. 14 -- or if it's high priority, you would deal with that Q. 15 yourself? 16 Α. Yeah. Sort of --17 Q. 18 Α. Or -- yes --19 It would be dealt with immediately? Q. 20 Yes. But it wouldn't -- my deputy or my crime scene Α. 21 manager might come to me and say, "Look, I think this is 22 important", and I would say, "Yeah, go ahead and get that done as a matter of urgency". 23 24 Q. You're the one dictating the direction or the strategy

and I'm not suggesting you're going out and taking

1 statements yourself?

2 A. No, not at all, no.

Q. Can I ask you, we've heard some evidence about the
taking of statements from civilian witnesses, and in
particular we heard evidence about Collette Bell, who
was the partner of Mr Bayoh, being brought to Kirkcaldy
Police Office, and she was breastfeeding her baby at the
time, her mother arrived at Kirkcaldy with her with the
baby to assist.

I'm interested in your perspective in relation to how a breastfeeding mother would be dealt with in terms of an investigation, so someone who is the partner of the deceased, and I'm interested in your views about, first of all, passing a death message to that person.

Do you have any comments about that?

A. I think the overriding feeling would be sympathy towards the individual who's about to receive some tragic and life-changing information, it would be -- you know, sometimes you pass the death message and then you have to leave that individual for days until they're ready to -- you know, until they've started to manage their grief, got an understanding of what they're dealing with before you would be in a position to attempt to obtain any information from them which may be relevant to an investigation.

- Q. In terms of that timescale, how would you -- would you have any comments to make about a death message being
- 3 passed and then within a short period going straight
- into an interview, or to take a statement from that
- 5 person?
- A. It would depend on the demeanour of the witness, the
- 7 person who has received that information. I would
- 8 question it being done relatively quickly. I would
- 9 question somebody who's breastfeeding going to a police
- 10 station. But, you know, there might have been other
- 11 circumstances that dictated that was a good idea. But,
- 12 you know, again, in my mind breastfeeding, you know --
- was it Collette?
- Q. Collette Bell.
- 15 A. Collette would go into another room to breastfeed the
- baby before coming back and continuing to ... that's how
- I would perceive it. I wouldn't be comfortable with two
- 18 officers taking a statement off a mother who is
- 19 breastfeeding. Absolutely not.
- Q. I don't want to give you the impression that that was
- 21 happening in the interview.
- 22 A. Right, yeah, yeah.
- 23 Q. I'm telling you that in terms of the context of her
- 24 personal circumstances at the time. The evidence we
- 25 heard was that Collette Bell had breastfed the baby and

22

23

24

25

1 then gone to Kirkcaldy Police Office and then at the police station in the interview room was told the death 2 3 message. The baby was with her at the time and her 4 mother was there at the time. We've heard she was very 5 upset after the death message was relayed. I'm interested in your comments about the location, your 6 views on -- what are your views on interviewing a mother 7 8 who has a baby with her in an interview room in a police station? 9 10 Α. I don't like it, I wouldn't -- I would prevent it 11

- happening, if it was me. I don't understand why -- this 12 is my opinion, I don't understand why she was taken to 13 a police station to be given the death message, because 14 my take on it would be you're better in the comfort of 15 your own home with perhaps family round about you when that information is imparted to you as an individual. 16 17 I mean, to take somebody to a strange environment, if 18 you like, to pass on that message, I don't get it, 19 I don't understand, you know, what the benefits of it 20 would be. But there might have been circumstances that 21 I don't know about it, but ...
 - Q. We've heard evidence that Collette Bell called the police, had returned to her house looking for her partner, he wasn't there, and there were signs of a disturbance, if you like, and that was the reason that

- 1 the property was being seized.
- 2 A. Yeah.
- 3 Q. In that situation, would you maybe see cause not to keep
- 4 her in the house?
- 5 A. I would see cause not to keep her in the house but
- I wouldn't see cause to take her to a police station,
- 7 I would then be looking at alternatives like her mother,
- 8 a sister, a relative, let's take her there and then pass
- 9 the information on and then withdraw to give them
- a chance to come to terms with the information before
- 11 you would go back in with your family liaison officers
- 12 to start building up that trust and start getting any
- information by way of witness testimony which may assist
- 14 the investigation.
- 15 Q. In a situation such as we have here, would that cause
- 16 you concern -- if you'd been SIO, would that cause you
- 17 concern about any delay in taking a statement from
- 18 Collette Bell?
- 19 A. I think it's about priorities and what takes precedence,
- and I think the wellbeing of the individual, you know,
- 21 you could -- would take precedence over any delay and
- 22 how that might impact on the investigation. So for me,
- 23 it would be: we'll take a statement from her when she's
- ready and not before that point.
- 25 And if that has a negative impact on the

```
1
             investigation, personally I could justify that,
 2
             you know, and that's again -- that would be something
 3
             you would log in your policy file, would be, you know,
 4
             "Collette Bell, potential witness, informed of the death
 5
             of Sheku Bayoh, however no statement taken at the time
 6
             based on her traumatic state. Will be revisited
 7
             tomorrow by FLOs".
 8
                 So then, you know, if there is some criticism around
             the delay in taking her statement, should it go to
 9
10
             court, I would be able to justify why that decision was
             made. I mean, you know, the grief of somebody who's
11
12
             just been told information like that, I would question
13
             whether it's even possible to start taking a statement
14
             from somebody like that. You have to give her time
15
             to -- I'm not saying you ever come to terms with it, but
16
             at least to begin to come to terms with it.
17
         MS GRAHAME: I'm about to move on.
         LORD BRACADALE: If you are, that's a convenient point to
18
19
             stop.
20
                 So we'll stop for lunch and sit at 2 o'clock.
         (12.57 pm)
21
22
                            (The short adjournment)
23
         (2.00 pm)
24
                             (Proceedings delayed)
         (2.03 pm)
25
```

1 LORD BRACADALE: The transcription is now up to date and 2 running, so I'm grateful to the stenographer. Ms Grahame. 3 MS GRAHAME: Thank you. 4 5 We were looking through the Gold Group meeting minutes, and I wonder if we could go back to the minutes 6 7 from 20.15 hours, so this was the meeting in the evening, and I would like to ask you if you have 8 a recollection of some other matters. 9 10 A. Okay. Q. If we could look at page 2, I'd asked you about agenda 11 12 item 3 and the task; I'd like to move on to number 5, 13 please, and this relates to, "Family concerns", and 14 initially there's a discussion regarding 15 Chief Superintendent McEwan. 16 Α. Yeah. Q. He had attended with the family, we've heard evidence 17 about that, on 3 May. And there's a discussion about 18 19 McEwan and Shepherd attending at the home address of 20 next of kin. It was a highly charged environment: 21 "... deceased partner Collette and extended family 22 within, family [were] concerned that early contact they had was purposely vague. They were unhappy they had not 23 been told anything about who contacted the Police and 24 25 Ambulance. [Chief Superintendent McEwan] provided them

```
with an understanding of events. ... discussed the role
 1
             of the PIRC, and reassured them it would not be
 2
             P Division officers investigating the incident.
 3
 4
                 Then the task was:
 5
                 "Family crave reassurance and are asking about
             witnesses etc they do not wish anything publicised until
 6
 7
             they inform deceased Mother who is in London."
                 Then if we turn the page we will see that this item
 8
             continues:
 9
                 "Discussed that Police didn't know ... whilst
10
             Collette ... was at Police Station."
11
12
                 There was an:
                 "... initial decision to have Police Scotland FLOs
13
14
             but now hand over to PIRC FLOs for arrangement to gain
15
             entry of house of deceased re collecting belongings for
             child. Discussion re initial contact on phone from
16
17
             PIRC.
                 "[Chief Superintendent] discusses Family desperate
18
19
             to know about [post-mortem], and also arrangements on
20
             having them conveyed to mortuary in Edinburgh."
21
                 Then:
                 "TASK -- To address all family issues raised."
22
                 Now, I know your role was to facilitate what PIRC
23
             needed as they had primacy of the investigation.
24
         A. Yeah.
25
```

- 1 Q. Do you remember that being part of the discussion, the 2 family concerns?
- A. I was certainly -- I do remember concerns from the
 family, not specific concerns but I was aware the family
 had a number of concerns, yes.
- Q. In terms of this entry, we've heard evidence that these matters were handed over to PIRC in their entirety --
- 8 A. Yeah.
- 9 Q. -- and PIRC were going to lead on that, and I'm

 10 wondering if you have a recollection in your role of

 11 facilitating any matters arising out of this task?
- A. No, I don't have any recollection around the family,

 concerns they had or us being involved or being asked by

 the PIRC to carry out anything in these to these

 concerns. But my understanding by this time was that

 the PIRC FLOs were being deployed, therefore the PIRC

 would take ownership of all interaction with the family.
 - Q. Was that anything to do with your role, that day?
- 19 A. No.

- Q. No. Can I also ask you if you have any recollection of
 the comment which is at the bottom of the second page,
 so just go back, please, to the previous page, and
 you'll see there:
- 24 "TASK -- Family crave reassurance and are asking 25 about witnesses etc they do not wish anything publicised

1 until they inform deceased Mother who is in London." Do you have any recollection about part of the 2 3 discussion relating to the deceased's mother, who was in 4 London? 5 I do have a vague recollection of that, and I remember Α. thinking at the time how difficult it would be to 6 7 prevent the mother getting information about the 8 incident through social media and the likes, and, 9 you know, news reporting. I remember thinking that's 10 going to be really difficult to prevent her getting any information, not through the police but through 11 12 social media and, you know, media itself. And that was your concern at that time? 13 Q. It was just an observation, it was going to be 14 Α. 15 difficult -- albeit she was in London, so I don't suppose it would have had national coverage, although 16 17 I don't know, but social media became, latterly in my 18 service, a massive issue around imparting information, 19 because of, I suppose, how quickly social media spreads. 20 So we would -- on occasion I've experienced family 21 phoning in saying, "There's a body been found at this 22 house, I think it's my son, I've heard on social media 23 it's my son", so we would then have to deploy people immediately to there. It is, I suppose, the power of 24 media and social media. 25

1 Q. Going back to the next page, the minute notes that 2 a comment regarding: 3 "... arrangements on having them [the family] 4 conveyed to the mortuary in Edinburgh." 5 Do you remember any part of the discussion being about those arrangements? 6 No, I don't, I'm sorry. 7 Α. 8 Do you remember any discussion or involvement with you Q. 9 regarding the post-mortem and the family going to the 10 mortuary? Not -- not the family going to the post-mortem -- or 11 Α. 12 transportation, no. By that time that wasn't my --13 you know, it was the PIRC's responsibility. I did 14 attend the post-mortem along with the PIRC, but that was 15 part of the handover, I suppose. But around 16 facilitating the arrangements for the family to attend the mortuary, I had nothing to do with that. 17 18 Q. Can you tell us, what would -- normally what 19 arrangements would you make in relation to families 20 attending the mortuary as an SIO? 21 Α. It would be done through the family liaison officers. 22 The family liaison officers would, under normal circumstances, pick the family up and take them to the 23 mortuary to facilitate the identification of the victim 24 25 before the post-mortem took place.

1 So a pathologist wouldn't start the post-mortem 2 until a member of the family had identified the individual, if you like, so that that would be the role 3 4 of the FLOs. Whether -- if the family wanted to 5 transport or make their way themselves, then the FLOs would be there to meet them, but under normal 6 7 circumstances the family liaison officers would take the 8 family to the mortuary and be present when the family identified the victim and then take them back to their 9 10 home address. In terms of the arrangements for this family, that 11 Q. 12 wasn't anything to do with you? No, no. 13 Α. Can I move on, then, please, to 4 May. Could I ask you 14 Q. 15 to look at some briefing notes. We've looked at these previously, and it's, as I understand it, PS00784. 16 17 We'll have these brought up on the screen. You'll see 18 that this is a document typed up. The briefing notes, 19 as they're called, the first ones are 10 o'clock on 20 4 May 2015, and it was a briefing chaired by 21 Detective Superintendent Campbell. 22 There's no list there of who was present at that. 23 From your recollection do you remember if you were there? We can show you more of the --24 Yeah. 25 Α.

1

Q. -- notes on the screen if that would assist. 2 (Pause) I don't think I was present at that meeting. I don't --3 A. 4 I've no recollection of it. That's all I can say. 5 I don't recall. I might have been there, but I don't ... was that the day of the post-mortem? No. 6 7 4 May was the day of the post-mortem. Can I ask you to Q. 8 look at the second page. Now, your name is mentioned, 9 DCI Hardie, unless there was another Hardie? 10 Α. No, that's me, I think. And it says there, "Social media is being researched", 11 Q. 12 it doesn't indicate on the face of it whether that's 13 a comment about you or by you. Does that help prompt 14 any memories? That was just after it says: 15 "Mr Campbell -- UKBA [Borders Agency] and Passport Office are being contacted to confirm the 16 17 spelling of the deceased's name." I don't see that on the --18 Α. 19 If we can bring that just slightly down, you will see Q. 20 the top line --Yeah, yeah. 21 Α. 22 -- says that and then your name and, "Social media is Q. 23 being researched", is underneath that. That's the only 24 reference to you --A. Yeah. 25

- 1 Q. -- that I can find in the document.
- 2 A. There wouldn't have been another DCI Hardie, I can --
- 3 I'm confident of that, but it might well have been that
- 4 the PIRC had asked me to research social media and I'd
- 5 given that task to one of the enquiry teams. I'm sorry,
- but I don't have a recollection of doing that, but,
- 7 you know, if that's what the minute says, that -- I'm
- 8 pretty sure that would be me that's being referred to,
- 9 but I don't recall it, sorry.
- 10 Q. Not at all.
- Can we then move on to the -- we'll stick with
- 12 4 May. I understand there was another Gold Group
- meeting at 12.30 that day, so we'll just move away from
- 14 these briefing notes initially and if we could look at
- the Gold Group meeting minutes, PS03161, and you'll see
- this appears to be a minute from the 12.30 hours meeting
- on 4 May. There's no reference to who was present at
- that meeting, as there had been in other minutes we've
- 19 looked at.
- 20 A. Yeah, yeah.
- 21 Q. Do you remember if you were present at that meeting?
- 22 A. No, I don't remember. The only thing I would say is if
- 23 that was the day of the post-mortem, the chances are
- I would have been in Edinburgh because I was attending
- 25 the post-mortem, but I don't have a recollection of that

1 meeting. If we look at page 2, actually, this is part of agenda 2 Q. 3 item 3, which relates to the investigative process, and 4 it's named as being discussed by a DI Stuart Wilson? 5 Aye, okay. Α. Do you remember him? 6 Q. 7 Α. Yes, yeah. And then on page 2, just towards the end of 3, there is 8 Q. 9 a task that says, well, you can see that on the screen 10 at the bottom: "... Advice to be gained from PIRC regarding the 11 12 disclosure of the PM results to the officers involved in 13 the incident. Supervisor to be identified to carry this 14 disclosure out." 15 Do you remember attending a meeting where that was 16 discussed? No, Stuart -- I spoke previously about, you know, if 17 Α. 18 I was -- albeit I wasn't appointed as the SIO, I would 19 have a deputy. Stuart Wilson was on paper my deputy for 20 our involvement in this investigation. Stuart was based 21 at Kirkcaldy, knew the officers at Kirkcaldy, so I still think I would have been in Edinburgh that day but Stuart 22 was carrying out the role of assisting the PIRC in any 23 requests they had of us. 24

Do you remember any discussion about disclosing PM

25

Q.

- 1 results to the officers who'd attended the incident?
- 2 A. No, I don't.
- 3 Q. Do you remember being part of any discussion, either on
- 4 that day or the next day, regarding whether the results
- 5 of the post-mortem should be disclosed to the officers
- 6 who were at Hayfield Road?
- 7 A. I'm pretty confident I was never involved in any
- 8 discussion in relation to that.
- 9 Q. And as an SIO, I'm interested in your perspective about
- 10 advising officers who have been at the scene --
- 11 A. Yeah.
- 12 Q. -- after the post-mortem, the day after he's died, about
- the results of the post-mortem. I'm interested in any
- 14 comments you have on that.
- 15 A. I think it would be unusual, but if there was a request
- from the officers, you know, if it was a traumatic
- incident that they attended and if there was a request
- from the officers to find out the result of the
- 19 post-mortem, once it's sort of -- once the result is
- 20 determined, I wouldn't have an issue.
- 21 I've never ever been involved in an incident where
- 22 the police have asked if they could be informed of the
- 23 result of a post-mortem. But I wouldn't necessarily --
- you know, sometimes it's about the officers being able
- 25 to deal with -- they've been involved in an incident

- 1 which has led to the death of an individual, they might want to know, to reassure themself or others, what the 2 result of the post-mortem had been. But I probably 3 4 wouldn't -- I wouldn't have an issue with the officers 5 being made aware of that, shall we say, once it became -- you know, once we had the result and it was in 6 7 the -- well, when I say in the public domain, the family were informed. 8 Q. Would the family being informed first be a priority for 9 10 you? Absolutely, yeah. I think for something like that, 11 Α. 12 I think we would refer -- in my position I would refer 13 that decision to the Procurator Fiscal, because they, 14 you know, own the body or they have the custody of the 15 body for a period of time, so I think that would be something that I would look to speak to the 16 17 Procurator Fiscal about and see if they had any opinion 18 as to whether they thought it was relevant or fair that the officers should be made aware of the result of the 19 20 post-mortem. But family first on every occasion. 21 Nobody outwith the pathologists and the police in 22 attendance should get to know the result of that
- Q. Do you have a particular view about why the family should always be first to know?

post-mortem before the family.

23

- A. I suppose it's to continue the trust that you're trying
 to build with the family, to ensure that they're not
 hearing it from a third party, which in my mind would be
 totally unprofessional, you know, they should hear
 everything first, everything. And then if they hear it
- from other sources that's fine, but to maintain that
- 7 trust that's hopefully been built between the police and
- 8 the family, all the information they get about the
- 9 investigation should come from us, and if it doesn't,
- 10 then that trust is perhaps breaking down.
- 11 Q. Now, this is 4 May --
- 12 A. Yeah.
- Q. -- so we've heard that on that date there had been no initial accounts, no operational statements, no detailed accounts given, no forms completed.
- 16 A. Yeah.
- 17 Q. And you've explained your views about the importance of the officers' accounts?
- 19 A. Yeah, yeah.
- Q. Would you have -- through the lens of an SIO, would you
 have concerns about sharing the results of a post-mortem
 with officers where those accounts haven't been
 provided?
- A. Yes. Absolutely.
- 25 Q. Why?

- 1 Α. Good question. If they haven't provided their version of events, the cause of death could influence their 2 3 version of events, that would be my concern. Albeit it 4 might be, you know, a wee bit extreme to consider that, 5 I would certainly have reservations about providing that information to officers who were at the scene and hadn't 6 7 provided their statement, prior to them providing the 8 statement. If they had provided their statement, I would have probably less or no concern about it, but 9 10 I would have concerns around how that could be 11 perceived.
 - Q. And in terms of how that might be perceived, either by the family or in a wider --
- 14 A. Yeah.

12

13

- Q. -- view, the public, what would your concerns be about perception?
- My concerns were -- and I'm talking about the officers 17 Α. 18 not providing statements and other issues -- it's adding 19 fuel to the conspiracy or it's adding fuel to the fire 20 of some type of -- maybe conspiracy is the wrong word, 21 some type of cover-up, if you like. I think it would be 22 difficult for members of the public to understand why these officers hadn't provided statements two or 23 three days later into the enquiry, and all that does, in 24 my opinion, you know, and others', is why? You know, 25

- 1 explain that to me, why don't we -- why haven't these officers -- I know the reason, because their legal 2 3 advice from the Federation solicitor was to not provide 4 a statement, which is fair enough, I suppose, but it 5 doesn't take away from the suspicion that that might cause in the general community. 6 7 And in terms of -- if we imagine you as SIO -- carrying Q. 8 out an investigation, what concerns would you have if 9 suspicion is being generated in the community or with 10 the family? How would that impact on your investigation? 11 12 Α. Massively, I think. You know, any suspicion towards 13 an investigative team has to have a detrimental effect 14 on the future relationship between the police and the 15 family but also the community, you know: how can we believe what you're telling us when you're saying, 16 17 you know, the most important witnesses to this have not yet provided a statement? 18 19 Q. Can I look again briefly at the briefing notes that we 20 looked at, and if we can return to these, page 2 of 4, 21 and you'll see halfway down that page it says: "Briefing: 0915 hours. 05/05/2015. AM briefing 22 Tuesday - Hall Kirkcaldy. Chaired by DCI Hardie." 23
- 24 A. Yeah.
- Q. Do you remember this meeting?

- 1 A. Yes, I do, yeah.
- Q. Tell us a little bit about this, you obviously chaired a briefing on that day.
- 4 Α. It was about moving forward and it was about briefing 5 the officers who were assisting the requests from the PIRC, to let them -- and it's to save that confusion and 6 7 ambiguity about who's in charge here. So the briefing 8 was to update officers from Police Scotland as to what 9 our role was as this investigation progressed, and 10 I think at the start it refers to, you know, the primary investigators, and we're working under the instruction 11 12 of the PIRC. And that was an instruction from the Procurator Fiscal David Green. And after that it's 13 14 just, you know, what -- giving them an update as to what 15 we were dealing with and as to what the PIRC expected of us. And what it was -- I suppose what was expected of 16
- Q. Who was present at that briefing?

17

A. My guess, and it is a guess, would be officers from the

MIT who were now working with me to carry out the

requests given to me by the PIRC. So a team of MIT

officers.

us by way of service of the PIRC investigation.

- Q. Can you describe that team of MIT officers to us, even generally?
- 25 A. They would all be detectives with various expertise,

- for example I know there was productions officers there,

 that was for the purpose of the post-mortem, to seize

 the productions during the post-mortem. There were

 some -- when I say a local, there was the MIT team at

 Kirkcaldy, so there would have been some of them. So it

 was a make-up of officers from the Major Investigation
- 7 Team who, for a period of time, were working under me, if you like, so I had people to delegate the tasks that
- 9 the PIRC gave to me.
- 10 Q. How many officers did you have working underneath you by
 11 this date? This is 5 May.
- 12 Α. I would -- again, I'm guessing but I would say about 13 six, maybe three enquiry teams -- I know there was two 14 productions officers who were I think identified to 15 attend the post-mortem to take the samples during the 16 post-mortem and then another two enquiry teams. By this 17 stage my understanding was the lead PIRC officer had changed -- in fact, I know it did -- it changed from the 18 19 guy who came out on the Sunday to another PIRC
- 20 officer --
- 21 Q. We've heard that initially it was Keith Harrower.
- 22 A. Yeah.
- Q. And then it became Billy Little.
- 24 A. Yeah.
- Q. Would that accord with your recollection?

- 1 A. Yes, yeah.
- 2 Q. This is 5 May, these notes, the PM had been on 4 May.
- 3 A. Oh, right, okay.

like.

- Q. So when you talk about production officers being present, did they continue to work as part of the MIT
- 6 team?

9

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- 7 A. Yes. They can be deployed in another role as 8 an enquiry -- excuse me, as an enquiry team, if you
- 10 Q. I'd like to briefly look at a memo, but before I do
 11 that, can I ask you, in relation to your role during
 12 that period, did you have any direct liaison with the
 13 legal representation of the officers? Were you involved
 14 in any way with exploring that or discussing that?
 - A. From memory, I think I had a discussion with -- well, there was an inspector at Kirkcaldy Police Station who was a Federation representative. And I did have discussions with him. But that was around attempting to take statements off the officers who were involved and I think he was present at the request of the officer on a couple of occasions.

I have a vague memory of speaking to the solicitor, the Federation solicitor, to confirm with him that his advice was they should not provide statements. But, as I say, it's a vague, vague memory. I was certainly

- 1 aware before I attempted to note statements that it was 2 highly unlikely any of the officers were going to 3 provide a statement to me and Stuart Wilson who was my 4 deputy. 5 But you, despite knowing -- your thinking it was highly Q. unlikely, why did you then go on and make that attempt? 6 7 It was at the request of the PIRC, and I understand why, Α. 8 because the PIRC wanted to ensure that these officers 9 were -- it was made perfectly clear to them that they 10 were being interviewed as a witness, as opposed to a suspect. Just to see if that changed their position 11 12 around giving a statement. And as each of the -- as 13 Stuart and I interviewed each of the officers, that's
 - So that, that request came from the PIRC. I totally understand why they made the request, just so, you know, any time looking to the future there couldn't be any sort of suggestion, "I didn't know whether I was a suspect or a witness", type thing.

the first thing we did, we informed them that they were

here to give a statement as a witness and not a suspect.

- Q. And that would also allow you to check whether people wanted to follow their legal advice or not?
- A. Yes, absolutely.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Q. Did you, at any point during that week, consider the possibility that the officers' status may change, either

1 when PIRC came on board and became more involved, or 2 even at a later stage? No, to be honest with you, I didn't. I didn't think 3 Α. 4 that far ahead, to be honest, no. Certainly at that 5 time they were witnesses as far as I was concerned and certainly as far as the PIRC were concerned. Yeah, 6 7 I accept that as the enquiry progressed it may well have 8 been that, you know, one or more than one officer became 9 a suspect, if you like, but then they would be entitled 10 to the same rights as any other suspect. I think you said earlier before lunch that if they had 11 Q. 12 become suspects, they would not be obliged to give 13 statements? Yes. 14 Α. 15 Q. Thank you. Can we move on to Thursday 7 May, please, and we 16 17 don't need to carry on with the briefing notes, thank you. Now, there's reference to this in your 18 19 operational statement, PS00667, and if we look at 20 page 2, paragraph 5, we see here reference -- and you 21 have a hard copy of this -- that you: 22 "... received a request from the PIRC to make contact with all officers who were known to be involved 23 in the arrest of Bayoh and establish whether they were 24 willing to provide an operational statement." 25

1 Then throughout this part of your operational 2 statement, you talk about: 3 "From 1335 hours DI Stuart Wilson and I spoke with first of all PC Craig Walker~..." 4 5 And the paragraph reads: "At 1335 hours, same date, DI Stuart Wilson and 6 7 I spoke with PC ... Craig Walker, P Division within 8 Kirkcaldy Police Station. PI Alan Seath was also 9 present. PC Walker was asked if he was willing to 10 provide a statement regarding his involvement in the arrest of Sheku Bayoh and the events leading up to his 11 12 death. It was clarified that the position of PC Walker was that he was to be treated as a witness. PC Walker 13 14 provided that he did not wish to provide a statement, on 15 the advice of his solicitor at this time." 16 Α. Yeah. And I think, without going through every single 17 Q. 18 paragraph, you then replicate --19 Α. Yes. 20 -- that paragraph for each individual officer? Q. 21 Α. Yeah. The Chair can consider that in his own time. But on 22 Q. 23 page 3, do we see, if we look at page 3, paragraph 3, 24 this relates to Scott Maxwell --A. Yeah. 25

1 Q. -- we've heard evidence that he was the acting police sergeant at Hayfield Road or T/PS, a temporary role, and 2 3 it says: "About 0920 hours on Tuesday 12th May 2015, 4 5 DI Wilson and I spoke with [Temporary Police Sergeant] 6 Scott Maxwell ... [He] was asked if he was willing to 7 provide a statement regarding his involvement in the 8 arrest of Sheku Bayoh and the events leading up to his ..." 9 10 And then there's the word "death" is missing there: "T/PS Maxwell provided that he did not wish to 11 12 provide a statement, at this time, on the advice of 13 his solicitor." 14 I'm interested in the phrasing of that paragraph and 15 whether or not temporary Police Sergeant Maxwell was 16 also advised that he was being treated as a witness, or if the position was somewhat different for him? 17 18 Not different at all, that's -- each and every one of Α. 19 the officers got furnished with exactly the same 20 information after agreement with the PIRC, so that's 21 an omission in the statement, but there was no 22 difference between Scott Maxwell and the other police 23 officers. So that's an omission in the statement? 24 Q. 25 Α. Yeah.

- Q. And if there wasn't that omission or typo or whatever,
- 2 would that paragraph have read the same as all the
- 3 previous other~..?
- 4 A. Exactly the same.
- 5 Q. Can I ask you about the arrangements for the officers
- 6 coming in that day? Many came in on 7 May. We see
- 7 Maxwell, he was 12 May.
- 8 A. Yeah.
- 9 Q. So not all of them were dealt with on 7 May. But I'm
- interested in the arrangements that were made for the
- officers to come in. It may have been suggested during
- the first hearing of the Inquiry last May that a number
- of officers were under the impression they were
- 14 attending the police office for the purposes of TRiM, so
- 15 trauma --
- 16 A. Yeah.
- Q. -- and they were not given notice that they were going
- to be asked for statements. They were brought in to
- 19 speak to you and DI Wilson, the senior officers from MIT
- in Edinburgh --
- 21 A. Yeah.
- 22 Q. -- and they weren't told about that. I'm wondering if
- 23 you can tell us a little about the arrangements and why
- the officers weren't told?
- 25 A. I ... I don't ... well, I wouldn't have been involved in

making the arrangements personally. That would have been somebody else's job, probably through the Federation. The person referred to there, Alan Seath, I think it is, was the Federation representation for that area and I spent a lot of time with him. And I think because he was a local police inspector, it would be him that made the arrangements to bring the officers in.

I would have certainly explained to him why I wanted to speak to the officers, and I'm ... I can't say they're not being truthful, not at all, but I'm not so sure that they didn't know they were going to be asked to provide a statement at the time. I certainly -- none of them expressed surprise to me or Stuart that, "Nobody told me you were going to ask for a statement", none of that.

So my assumption from that was that the proper arrangements had been made. I know or my understanding is a lot of them weren't -- didn't return to duty immediately, and it was all about availability. But there were -- certainly none of the officers who I spoke to expressed surprise or concern that they were being asked to provide a statement. And I'm not saying -- you know, I was firmly of the belief that none of them were going to provide a statement to me at the time

1 because of the advice had been given by the Federation solicitor which had been fed back to me. 2 3 So I really can't say any more on that, you know, to 4 say they were surprised that they were asked to give 5 a statement, I can't really comment any more, other than none of them said to me -- it was very much, "I've been 6 7 advised by my solicitor that I'm not going to provide a statement". 8 Q. If we assume they hadn't been advised, would that cause 9 10 you concern, that they weren't given advance notice? 11 Not overly, not overly, no. I wouldn't want to spring Α. 12 it on somebody, you know, and if ... if it was a case 13 that, "Look, I'm in for a TRiM process, nobody told me, 14 I haven't got time to give you a statement just now", or 15 whatever, then we would have facilitated that further down the line. 16 17 So I would never want to spring that on somebody, 18 but ... I'm not sure I can say any more about that. You 19 know, my memory doesn't serve me overly well around 20 specific arrangements, but all I can say to you is 21 I know 100% sure none of the officers expressed surprise 22 that they were being spoken to by me and Stuart, a DCI 23 and DI, with the hope that they would provide a statement. 24 Then I think if we remain with your original operational 25 Q.

1 statement --2 Α. Yeah. 3 -- do we see that you later spoke to PC Paton and, if Q. 4 we move up the page -- that was on 13 May, and then 5 PC Short on Monday 18 May? 6 Α. Yeah. 7 Q. And again, it appears that it was the same process 8 carried out in terms of your statement? Yeah. 9 Α. 10 Q. Was that again the approach that you took with both those officers? 11 12 Α. Yes. 13 Thank you. Q. 14 Can I ask you to go back to -- we'll go back to your 15 Inquiry statement now, please, and I would like to just, first of all, look at paragraph 19, 19/20, if we can 16 17 have those on the screen, please, and you were asked by 18 the Inquiry team about experience you had of investigating complaints against police officers. 19 20 Yeah. Α. 21 Q. And you explained that as an inspector you were 22 routinely allocated complaints against the police and you worked in the countercorruption unit as a DI --23 24 I think you mentioned that before lunch actually --25 Α. Yeah.

1 Q. -- for a couple of years and that during that time you investigated allegations of criminality against police 2 officers. 3 4 Then you mention in paragraphs 20 and -- if we look at 20, first of all, you do comment: 5 "I have been asked if race was a factor in any of 6 7 these previous investigations." 8 And you investigated a number of ethnic minorities in relation to criminality, and you comment about that. 9 10 And then at 21 you talk about being involved with 11 an incident of a black male who was arrested when you 12 were a sergeant, who made a complaint against you, and 13 you carried out an investigation and reported the complaint that had been made against you? 14 15 It wasn't made against me, it was made against the Α. officers who dealt with him. 16 Q. Sorry, I've misread that: 17 "I was involved with an incident of a black male who 18 19 was arrested when I was a sergeant in [redacted] and he 20 made a complaint to me~..." 21 Not "about me", sorry, I misread that? 22 That's fine. Α. 23 Q. "... that he'd been arrested purely because he was black and it was racist." 24 25 So it was a complaint about racism by a gentleman

1 made to you? 2 Yes. Α. 3 About another officer? Q. 4 Α. Yes. Or officers? 5 Q. About the officers who arrested him. 6 Α. 7 Thank you, I apologise. Q. That's okay. 8 Α. 9 I am interested, now if we can turn to paragraph 98, and Q. 10 you say: "I have been asked about equality and diversity 11 12 within Police Scotland. Diversity was absolutely 13 massive in the police for obvious reasons and rightly 14 so. There was such an awareness of diversity." 15 Then 99: "I've investigated a cop for alleged racism, if you 16 17 like so. But, you know, gone were the days that people were reluctant to come forward and make any form of 18 complaint in relation to mistreatment or any influence 19 20 of racism. People were coming forward left, right and 21 centre, and rightly so. The canteen culture, if you like, had gone. With, I would have to say, 22 unfortunately, the odd exception but, generally 23 24 speaking, because of the massive training programme [and 25 if we could move down the screen, please] that was

1 undertaken and the diversity courses that I attended, and others, were so impactive." 2 3 So I'm interested in this aspect of your Inquiry 4 statement. You've talked about investigations that 5 you've conducted, you've mentioned the countercorruption unit and a specific example, and then in this paragraph 6 7 you talk about the canteen culture having been gone. 8 Could you explain, first of all, what you understand as the canteen culture? 9 10 Α. Yeah. Comments that -- it became known as the canteen 11 culture because generally speaking officers, constables, 12 if you like, had their lunch separately from 13 supervisors. So I can, you know, I was a supervisor for 14 most of my service, but generally speaking any sort of 15 inappropriate -- I'm talking about sexism more than 16 racism, to be honest with you, sexist behaviour towards 17 female police officers, the ones that were reported were reported when there was no supervisors present. 18 I suppose for obvious reasons, because the individuals 19 20 concerned wouldn't behave like that when a supervisor 21 was present because it's more likely they would be taken 22 to task by the supervisor, if you like. So I've always said, you know, in my service that 23 I'm not convinced I've ever witnessed racism, sexism or 24 25 whatever, but because I was a manager, a supervisor,

1 that perhaps doesn't suggest that it wasn't going on, 2 it's just that it never went on in my presence, because 3 I would absolutely challenge it at the very least or 4 report it if it was serious enough to report. 5 So you think that perhaps other officers, whether in Q. a canteen or otherwise, would feel more able to say 6 7 things along those lines if you weren't present 8 yourself? Or any other supervisor. 9 Α. Or any other? 10 Q. Yeah. Not in all -- I mean, not in every police station 11 Α. 12 on a daily, you know, a daily occurrence, but I've no 13 doubt that it did happen. But, as I say, the massive 14 training programme we undertook around not just racism, 15 diversity, you know, and treating everybody fairly, it had a huge impact on the culture within the police, 16 17 without a doubt. 18 When was the massive training programme? Q. 19 I can't remember. A long, long time ago. I remember Α. 20 attending diversity training when I was either 21 a sergeant or a PC, so you're talking about going back, 22 you know, a number of years, a number of years. Q. And the comment here that you make about: 23 24 "... gone were the days when people were reluctant

to come forward and make any form of complaint in

25

1 relation to racism. People were coming forward left, right and centre, and rightly so." 2 3 Can you give us some understanding of what you mean 4 when you say "Left, right and centre"? 5 I think, you know, comparing the past with the present, Α. female officers, ethnic officers would allow, you know, 6 7 comments which were maybe on the edge or not --8 inappropriate, they would let it pass. Where I think 9 because of the campaign we went through, the advertising 10 campaign, the posters on noticeboards, that message of reassurance that, "If you come forward you'll be 11 12 listened to and we'll do something about it", we started 13 anonymous reporting, if you like, so people didn't have 14 to put their head above the parapet, they could actually 15 report something anonymously, and we had a process that allowed us to investigate that, if you like. 16 17 So I think we just -- the organisation moved on, as 18 I'm sure all organisations have. And there was 19 a realisation that these comments, although they should 20 never have been acceptable, were certainly not 21 acceptable now and would be challenged and the person 22 would be taken to task. Q. Can you remember when the facility for anonymous 23 reporting came in? 24 I don't, but I worked in the countercorruption unit and 25 Α.

1 we had it then, so we would -- when I worked in there, 2 we would get what you would call an intelligence report 3 and we employed Crimestoppers to provide that facility 4 to us, so whoever phoned -- it's like whistleblowing, if 5 you like, whoever phoned that line could remain anonymous and they wouldn't be speaking to a police 6 7 officer, they would be speaking to an employee of 8 Crimestoppers. Crimestoppers would note the detail and 9 then report it to us in the countercorruption or Professional Standards Department and we would --10 Is countercorruption akin to Professional Standards? 11 Q. 12 Α. Similar, yeah. 13 Q. Yes. Countercorruption is investigating criminality. 14 Α. 15 Professional Standards is more about misconduct and 16 discipline-type things. But they're run in the -- the same department. 17 18 Q. Thank you. 19 Can we look at this paragraph. You've talked 20 about -- in light of the previous paragraphs we looked 21 at and this paragraph, you've talked about carrying out 22 investigations where there's been allegations of racism, 23 and I'd be very interested in hearing about the -- how you go about investigating a situation or a complaint 24 25 where there has been an allegation of racism or racial

- discrimination or something along those lines. What sort of steps would you take to investigate that?
- The same steps you would take investigating any 3 Α. 4 allegation. There really is no difference, other than 5 in incidents like this it might be about having to spend time with potential witnesses to offer them the 6 7 reassurance and understanding that by coming forward 8 they're doing the right things -- the right thing, if 9 you like. And, you know, a lot of people would have 10 reservations about coming, coming forward. But, so you might have to spend time with a witness just reassuring 11 12 them that they're doing the right thing, there's --13 protection's probably not the right word, but there's 14 support and mechanisms in place. And just to offer that 15 reassurance that to come forward and actually put your name to a statement was the right thing to do to root 16
 - Q. In the situation that we had in Hayfield Road, we've heard that on 3 May the family raised concerns about potential racism or racial discrimination or race having been a factor.
- 22 A. Yeah.

17

18

19

20

21

Q. And there was mention of events which had, prior to

May, taken place recently in Baltimore and other

matters along those lines. In terms of investigating

these type of things out.

1 those concerns, or those allegations, was there anything particular that you as an SIO know you could have done 2 3 on those days in relation to investigating those 4 concerns that had been raised? 5 Er ... I think when your starting point is your most Α. significant witnesses are not giving you a statement, 6 7 then where do you go with it, you know, to try and go 8 back to the family and offer them reassurance that this 9 wasn't a racist -- you know, there was no -- and how can 10 you possibly give that reassurance at the start of the investigation? You can't because you don't know until 11 12 you've investigated it. 13 The number one sort of line of investigation for 14 this would be to get the take on what had happened from 15 the officers themselves, which wasn't immediately available. So you had to look elsewhere, if you like. 16 17 But I still -- you know, I still think the officers were called there because of the behaviour of Sheku Bayoh 18 19 that, you know, there's no -- there's no doubt about 20 that. They didn't happen upon him, you know, in the street. They were called to him because of his 21 22 behaviour. And I think it would be dangerous to lose sight of that as well. I know that's probably not the 23 best of answers, but it's all I can --24 No, absolutely not, I'm happy to hear all your answers. 25 Q.

- 1 A. Yeah.
- 2 Q. If we're looking at things that can be investigated in
- a situation where you cannot procure the initial
- 4 accounts or the initial statements, would you have
- 5 considered accessing call cards showing the STORM
- 6 records in the lead-up to the events at Hayfield Road to
- 7 consider what information you could glean from those?
- 8 A. When you say call cards, you mean somebody phoning in
- 9 and reporting something?
- 10 Q. Yes, that's what I mean, we've heard they're called call
- cards, we've heard they're called STORM records, that
- 12 type of thing.
- 13 A. Absolutely, yeah. Look at the history of, you know,
- 14 Sheku's house, if you like, to see if the police have
- been called there previously, to see if there's any
- evidence of allegations of racism, that would be
- a routine -- when you start a major enquiry you get
- a list of round about 50 actions which are, I suppose,
- 19 your bread and butter, if you like, so as an SIO you get
- given that sheet and invariably you tick every one, and
- 21 that would be -- one of these actions would be to
- 22 research the properties and the individuals to see what
- 23 we as an organisation hold on record in relation to the
- 24 addresses or the individuals.
- 25 Q. Would you consider looking into the records of the

1

24

25

Q.

disciplinary, misconduct, any records? 2 At some point down the line, yeah, yeah, you would have 3 Α. 4 to. I think you would have to, yeah, because it's 5 information that may or may not be relevant to the 6 investigation. But yes. And in these circumstances, 7 yes. 8 When you say "somewhere down the line", do you have in Q. 9 your mind a timescale? 10 Α. Not really, but because anything that isn't going to change wouldn't necessarily be priority. So if, 11 12 you know, one of these officers had a record of 13 discipline, it's not going to change, so, you know, 14 whether we'd carry it out on the Monday or a week on 15 Monday we're still going to get the same answer. And would you consider looking at the Airwaves to 16 Q. 17 consider what was said? Again, that would be in the list of the 100 actions to 18 Α. 19 seize all communications that were made around the time 20 of the incident to hear exactly what each officer has 21 transmitted over the radio, yeah. 22 Q. And presumably also CCTV that was maybe available? 23 Yeah. Α.

Would these be actions, when you talk about 50 or 100

actions, would those be generated via the HOLMES system

officers themselves who had attended the scene,

25

1 or something that you would have reference to yourself? I think it -- from memory, it's called document 1 or 2 2 Α. 3 in the HOLMES system, so that is a list of 100 actions, 4 some of which may not be relevant to your investigation, 5 and one of the first jobs as the SIO would be to go through that list, tick the ones off you wanted done, 6 7 which was normally at least 90% of them, and then feed 8 that back into the HOLMES team and they would generate 9 the actions. And I would also prioritise the actions, 10 if there were some that I thought I want them high, 11 medium or low basically. 12 So the comment you made a moment ago about disciplinary Q. 13 or misconduct records, that wouldn't be the number one 14 priority? 15 No, no, and that would perhaps not sit on the -- it Α. probably wouldn't sit on the, you know, that list if you 16 like, that would be something that would be unique to 17 18 this investigation. 19 Can we look at paragraph 100, which is on the screen, at Q. 20 the bottom: 21 "I was involved in two big inquiries, massive 22 inquiries, around institutionalised racism. We never uncovered it, if it existed at the time, we just didn't 23 and my feeling was that the conclusion of the Inquiry 24

that it didn't exist."

24

25

1 Can you tell us a little bit more about the 2 background to this? Yeah, it was an officer who got arrested for attempting 3 Α. 4 to pervert the course of justice whilst giving evidence 5 at court, and he was given a custodial sentence, and he made -- at that point he made allegations of 6 7 institutionalised racism within the police culture in 8 the station he worked at, and significant allegations. I was part of the investigation in relation to that 9 10 allegation and, like I say in my statement, I mean, that was an investigation I worked on for a number 11 12 of weeks/months, and we never ever got any corroborative 13 evidence of the officer's allegations. That's not to say he was making it up, what I'm saying is we never 14 15 managed to capture corroboration of his allegations. Were these allegations by other officers of racism shown 16 Q. towards this individual who made the complaint? 17 18 Α. Yes. 19 You've said that you were involved with two big Q. 20 inquiries; were they in relation to separate matters, 21 separate allegations or were they both in relation to 22 this one individual? Both in relation. So there was an investigation around 23

him and the fact that he was given a custodial sentence

for perjury, and he then made the allegations of

- institutionalised racism which we investigated.
- 2 Q. So this was in relation to one individual rather than
- a Police Scotland-wide or a regional investigation?
- 4 A. Yeah, one individual, and it was Lothian and Borders
- 5 Police at the time, as opposed to Police Scotland, not
- 6 that that matters.
- 7 Q. Thank you.
- 8 Can I just ask you one or two final questions.
- 9 You've talked in paragraph 58, if we could go back to
- 10 that, that as at 3 May, I think you've given a comment
- 11 earlier that you -- I'm interested in whether you had
- had any formal training on race at the point of
- 13 3 May 2015.
- 14 A. Sorry, can you say that again?
- 15 Q. Sorry. Had you had any training specifically about
- 16 race --
- 17 A. Yes.
- 18 Q. -- by 3 May? You had?
- 19 A. Yes.
- Q. Do you remember anything about that or the impact it had
- on you?
- 22 A. Yeah, I do, I remember it. I remember it well, for
- a number of reasons, but yes. Yeah.
- Q. Do you want to tell us what the reasons were?
- 25 A. I can, it involves I suppose racial speech, not

- particularly bad, but it's one of the many things that

 stuck in the mind of my training.
- Q. Right. When you talk about racial speech, we've heard
 evidence about comments being made regarding Mr Bayoh
 being the size of a house or that type of thing, being
 a very strong individual, very large individual compared
 to others.
- 8 A. Yeah.

- 9 Q. We've described that variously as potentially racial
 10 stereotypical language. Is that the type of speech that
 11 you're talking about?
 - A. I would never ever describe him as the size of a house,

 I would describe him as a very, very fit individual. To

 me the size of a house is somebody who is overweight, if

 you like. But no, I would never describe him as that.

What I'm talking about is a reference to Chinese people, but referring to them as a shortened version of Chinese, and it's something before my training I was guilty of myself, and my young daughters used to refer to Saturday night being "Chinky night", because we had a Chinese meal, and I always thought it was a reference to a Chinese meal. There was a Chinese lady at the diversity training who spoke about being referred to in that manner, and the reason I refer to this is my daughters were young at the time, 9-year old, 6 or

```
1
             whatever, and when I finished the training and went back
 2
             and said to them, "Look, you don't refer to them by that
 3
             name and you don't refer to Saturday being Chinky night,
 4
             it's Chinese night", and I always use it as an example
 5
             of, if you can educate young kids at that age to stop
             using that word, because it's offensive to others,
 6
 7
             although it was never meant towards a Chinese person,
 8
             then it's pretty easy to educate everybody else to do
             the same thing, in my opinion.
 9
10
         Q.
            So the education that you received, although you were
             an adult, that had an immediate impact on your own
11
12
             behaviour?
13
             Absolutely, and I would never ever refer to Sheku as
         Α.
14
             being -- he was a fit, strong, very much in shape guy,
15
             if you ask me.
         MS GRAHAME: I'm conscious of the time and of the
16
17
             transcriber.
         LORD BRACADALE: Yes. Well, we'll stop for 15 minutes
18
19
             there.
20
         (3.01 pm)
21
                                (A short break)
22
         (3.21 pm)
         LORD BRACADALE: Ms Grahame.
23
24
         MS GRAHAME: Thank you very much.
                 I've two final matters. Can we go back to
25
```

25

1 paragraph 100 of your Inquiry statement, please. And I've already asked you about this, and this related to 2 3 your investigations into what's described as 4 institutional racism. How do you or how did you go 5 about investigating institutional racism, or institutionalised racism? 6 7 Α. The same as you would investigate any other allegation, 8 is go to the witnesses or those who the allegations were 9 made against, then look around the periphery for any 10 other opportunity of evidence. I mean, these allegations were all about verbal comments, if you like, 11 12 so, you know, forensics, CCTV -- well, CCTV could come 13 into it, but they were very much historical, so it was 14 really all about interviewing witnesses and going beyond 15 that, you know, interviewing people who may have been present who were not necessarily -- so this one, 16 17 for example, the guy made allegations at a particular time somebody made some comment to him. We would then 18 19 identify those who were on duty at the time and go and 20 interview them and find out if they heard the comment or 21 if they were aware of, you know, any inappropriate 22 remarks or comments made towards this individual. So it would be very much a -- not a fishing exercise, but you 23 would go out there and speak to as many people as 24

possible to try and get corroboration of the allegation.

1 Q. And then at paragraph 102, I asked you -- this says: "Prior to May 2015, if there was racism in the 2 3 workplace, there were processes in place to report this. 4 I mean anybody could report. We had like 5 a whistleblower type which was used fairly regularly, I would have to say, to report anything where somebody 6 7 never had the courage to put their name to 8 an allegation. After that it would be dealt with 9 anonymously thereafter. There were so many processes in 10 place that would allow you to report that." And you gave evidence just before the break about 11 12 that anonymous reporting facility? 13 Yeah, yeah. Α. Can I ask you about the word "courage" there? Are you 14 Q. 15 aware of what reasons there may be why officers or staff or others may be reluctant to put their names to 16 an allegation of racism? 17 18 A fear of being ostracised, I suppose. You know, Α. 19 sometimes -- I personally believe it takes courage to 20 put your head above the parapet and come forward, 21 because you're fighting against what could be the norm, 22 if you like, so that's what I'm referring to as the 23 courage to come forward. And we would always, you know, 24 offer reassurance when we did our briefings and that, that, "You will be fully supported if you want to come 25

1 forward". So I suppose that's what I meant by courage. 2 MS GRAHAME: Thank you. 3 I have no further questions, thank you. 4 Sorry, can I just clarify one thing, if that's okay? 5 LORD BRACADALE: Yes. In relation to my previous evidence. 6 7 Going back to the very start when I told you the 8 briefing I was given about the female officer's running 9 away and Sheku clipping her legs, I'm not 100% sure 10 I can attribute all of that to Lesley Boal, it may have been something that I picked up once I'd arrived at 11 12 Kirkcaldy. I think it would be unfair on her, you know, 13 to say that she told me -- she definitely gave me 14 a briefing and she may well have told me exactly as 15 I described, and she certainly told me most of it, but the bit about the female officer running away and having 16 17 her heels clipped may have come from somebody else once 18 I got to Kirkcaldy. LORD BRACADALE: Thank you. 19 20 Are there any Rule 9 applications? 21 Thank you very much, Mr Hardie, for coming to give evidence to the Inquiry. I'm going to rise briefly to 22 23 allow the next witness to be introduced, and you will then be free to go. 24 THE WITNESS: Okay. 25

1 (The witness withdrew) 2 (3.26 pm)3 (A short break) 4 (3.29 pm)5 LORD BRACADALE: Good afternoon, Superintendent Shepherd. DETECTIVE SUPERINTENDENT INSPECTOR NICOLA SHEPHERD 6 7 (affirmed) 8 LORD BRACADALE: Ms Grahame. 9 Questions from MS THOMSON 10 MS GRAHAME: This witness is going to be taken by my learned 11 junior, Ms Thomson. 12 LORD BRACADALE: Ms Thomson. 13 MS THOMSON: Thank you. 14 What is your full name, please? 15 A. Nicola Shepherd. 16 Q. And I understand that you're a superintendent with Police Scotland? 17 A. I am, yeah. 18 Q. May I ask your age? 19 20 Α. 48. And your years of police service? 21 Q. A. 29. 22 Q. Superintendent, there's a blue folder in front of you, 23 24 if you open that up you should find inside a copy of the 25 statement that you gave to a member of the Inquiry team,

1 that's got reference 00261. We can pull that up on the screen as well, please. If we go to the very final 2 3 page, we will see that you signed the statement on 7 February of this year. 4 5 I did, yes. Α. Q. You will see that on the screen your signature has been 6 7 blacked out, but I think your signature's on the copy in 8 front of you. If we can go briefly to paragraph 63 of 9 your statement, you say: 10 "I believe the facts~..." 11 Sorry, do you have that? It's very at the end. 12 Α. Yeah. Q. "I believe the facts stated in this witness statement 13 14 are true. I understand that this statement may form 15 part of the evidence before the Inquiry and be published on the Inquiry's website." 16 17 You should also find in the folder in front of you 18 a copy of your operational statement, that's PS00643, which you prepared yourself, I believe, on 18 May. If 19 20 we scroll down, we should see the date, 18 May 2015, at 21 Kirkcaldy Police Station. Leaving that to one side, you gave a number of statements in addition to your 22 operational statement, a statement that you gave to the 23 24 PIRC on 18 June, that's PIRC 00208. There we are, taken 25 on 18 June by investigator John Clerkin and

1 Alistair Lewis at Kirkcaldy Police Office? 2 Α. Yes. And finally a supplementary statement that you gave to 3 Q. the PIRC on 11 January 2018, that's PIRC 00209. Noted 4 5 on that occasion by Investigator Garry Sinclair at police headquarters? 6 7 Correct, yes. Α. 8 Anything that I refer to will pop up on the screen in Q. 9 the way that the statements have done in the last few 10 moments but there are also hard copies in the folder in front of you, and if you would find it helpful at any 11 12 point in your evidence to look at them, please feel free 13 to do so. If there are any paragraphs that you would 14 like to come up on the screen, please just let me know. 15 If we can return briefly to your Inquiry statement, and look at paragraph 3, paragraph 3, please, where you 16 17 were referring to your operational statement and the two 18 statements that you gave to the PIRC, which we have just looked at very briefly, and you went on to say: 19 20 "These statements I have given to the best of my 21 memory at the time and I did my best to be truthful and accurate in what I said. I've read over the PIRC 22

statements and confirm the content is correct. I'm

statement and my earlier statement, which statements

asked if there was any discrepancy between this

23

24

25

145

- I would prefer. I would say my operational statement
 and PIRC statements because they were given at the
- 3 time."
- Also in the folder, and we don't need to bring it up
- on the screen just yet, but they're there in case you
- 6 need them, Superintendent, you should find copies of
- 7 your daybook, which is a series of pages, the first one
- is PS09169, it might be that the numbers are on the tabs
- 9 on the side.
- 10 A. Thank you.
- 11 Q. There should be four pages, but they are individually
- 12 numbered. They appear to be there.
- 13 A. Thank you.
- Q. Grand. And your notebook. Again, it's a series of
- 15 separately numbered pages, they're sequential this time,
- and they begin PS18479. They should be there too.
- 17 A. Yeah, I have them, thank you.
- Q. Grand. And again, if you want to make reference to them
- 19 at any time you can do that. And if there's anything
- 20 that you would like to be put on the screen, let me
- 21 know.
- If I can take you back to May of 2015, what was your
- position at that time?
- 24 A. So my position on 3 May was the local area commander for
- 25 Kirkcaldy and Glenrothes.

- ${\tt Q.}$ And in terms of rank, were you a superintendent at that
- 2 point in time?
- 3 A. I was a Chief Inspector.
- 4 Q. So you were a Chief Inspector and local area commander,
- 5 are these one and the same thing or are the rank and the
- 6 role different?
- 7 A. I think I'm correct in saying so every local area
- 8 commander has the rank of Chief Inspector.
- 9 Q. But would every Chief Inspector also be a local area
- 10 commander?
- 11 A. No.
- 12 Q. No, is that a specific role?
- 13 A. Yes.
- 14 Q. Can you tell us a little, then, about the role and the
- responsibilities as local area commander?
- 16 A. Yeah, of course. I think the easiest way to describe
- it, then, so in an operational -- there's an operational
- sense, there's a local area committee sense in terms of
- 19 the partnership and then there's a national aspect to
- it. So if I take the operational, the day-to-day
- 21 policing response is a duty that I would oversee, so
- 22 I've got a -- I'm overseeing a cadre of constables,
- 23 sergeants, inspectors that are delivering on the
- 24 policing priorities in the local area. So the community
- 25 teams, the response teams, that's -- they fall within my

1 remit. 2 Into the local area there is a local area committee 3 that sits in terms of the partnership. So I'm the 4 conduit for the local area partnership. So community 5 safety, local authority, that's the kind of more strategic landscape that I'll operate in, and again 6 7 delivering on those local priorities. So, Kirkcaldy 8 would have a local plan in terms of priorities for 9 Kirkcaldy, and then nationally clearly the force, and 10 prior to Police Scotland Fife Constabulary had priorities for Fife and then obviously Scotland, so I'm 11 12 the conduit for national priorities. 13 So I suppose I'm the most senior officer in 14 an operational sense at Kirkcaldy Police Office and I'm 15 overseeing the deployment of staff, how we perform against those both very local, those partnership 16 priorities, and also those national priorities. 17 18 Q. Thank you. 19 We can perhaps go to your statement, the Inquiry 20 statement that is, and look at paragraph 6 where you say 21 a little more about your role back in 2015: "I'm asked about the remit of my role as at 22 3 May 2015. As the local Area Commander for Glenrothes 23 and Kirkcaldy, my remit was to oversee the delivery of 24 25 our local and national policing priorities."

1 As you've just explained: "I was responsible for the operational delivery of 2 3 policing in both areas and that included the deployment 4 and co-ordination of resources and generally managing 5 overall performance in the area~..." Which again, you have explained to us. 6 7 "... The local area commander also plays a lead role in community planning with multi-agency partners and 8 9 reports on local performance to local authority scrutiny boards on a quarterly basis." 10 I'd like to ask you just a little more about 11 12 community planning. You've told us about your local and 13 national role in terms of policing response, but tell us 14 what your role as -- or indeed lead role in community 15 planning with multi-agency partners involved? So in effect Kirkcaldy had a local plan, so the service 16 Α. leads across local authority, health, health and social 17 care, you know, we would collectively come together to 18 look at what the priorities are for Kirkcaldy as 19 20 an area. So there's local co-ordinating groups that sit 21 at, you know, a senior partnership level looking at 22 everything from educational attainment to health to 23 unemployment. So the police play, you know, a significant role in that, that partnership. 24 25 So the role of the local area commander will be,

1 you know, that service level manager with the equivalent partners within the local area. So those -- we all 2 3 co-ordinate and share resources and assets to deliver on 4 the priorities for Kirkcaldy. Not always policing 5 priorities, but they should complement one another. So that's probably the community planning role, but it's 6 7 a statutory role as well. 8 Q. If we can scroll down a little to paragraph 7, please, 9 you explain that: 10 "In terms of the incident itself [on 3 May], my duties were to effectively continue to perform my role 11 12 as Local Area Commander but with the additional 13 responsibility to monitor community impact as well as 14 the impact on staff. In addition, my role was to ensure 15 we were able to continue to provide a policing service to the communities in the Kirkcaldy area and a visible 16 17 and responsive police service." I would like to ask you some questions about the 18 19 additional responsibilities that you took on, on 3 May. 20 You mentioned there being an additional responsibility 21 to monitor community impact as well as the impact on 22 staff. 23 So let's begin with community impact. What is community impact? 24 The role of a local area commander is to, you know, work 25 Α.

1 within that partnership to look at community relationships, community tensions, you know, 2 3 successfully delivering the priorities I've mentioned 4 come with, you know, a cohesive set of public and 5 certain voluntary sectors working together, but also with our communities. So community impact, certainly in 6 7 the sense of the enquiry, was obviously in the aftermath 8 of the incident, but the actual role of the local area 9 commander is actually looking at any community tensions 10 from really, not a lower level but maybe less notable acts of antisocial behaviour to neighbour disputes, 11 12 to -- you know, these are all things that happen within 13 a local community and a single reported incident might 14 not appear significant but clearly if they were to 15 become more frequent or profound then there's potentially an issue for either the police or those 16 17 local partners. 18 So the community impact is probably just looking in 19 a general sense, that's what the local area commander 20 will do with their teams, make sure they're picking up 21 on any -- well, any community concerns, really. 22 I suppose for the enquiry in terms of the community impact, so I suppose when I use the word "addition", 23 it's because there was a very specific community impact 24 25 over and above these local more day-to-day issues that

- 1 happen within communities.
- Q. You say there was a very specific community impact, what do you mean by that?
- A. Well, in terms of the incident that took place on 3 May
 the impact in relation to that was going to require
 a significant individual focus as well as managing the
 day-to-day impact of other incidents, crimes, anything
 that might be happening in that area, so this was going
 to be an additional community impact that I was going to
 go and oversee.
 - Q. Would it be fair to say that from a very early stage you recognised that there would be an impact on the local community as a result of the death of Sheku Bayoh?
- 14 A. I did, yes.

11

12

13

- Q. At an early stage did you anticipate what that impact might look like and how policing might play a part?
- 17 I think it would be fair to say when I'm first notified Α. of this incident, I was informed it was a critical 18 19 incident, so the sheer mention of that term to describe 20 what it was let me know that it was going to be 21 significant community impact, because to be a critical 22 incident or be assessed as such it's assessed as having, you know, a significant impact on the confidence of 23 24 families, victims and the community. So I took from 25 that assessment that it would be significant.

- Q. And what is meant by community; what community are we talking about here?
- A. Everybody, you know, not just community in terms of geography: people that visit, work, live, have associations with. Not just communities of geography.
- Q. It goes beyond a geographical border around Kirkcaldy or perhaps even Fife and it would encompass anybody perhaps who would have reason to come into that geographical area?
- 10 A. Absolutely, yeah.
- Q. And within that sort of broadly geographical sense of community, did you take a cognisance of there being communities within that community? So, for example, we've heard some evidence about the black community within Kirkcaldy.
- 16 Yeah, absolutely, you know, we would look in the Α. 17 community in the sense of, you know, those that -- like 18 I said, that are employed there, the demographic of 19 Kirkcaldy. And not just Kirkcaldy, as you've 20 highlighted, you know, Kirkcaldy's the urban centre of 21 the local area, but we had smaller, you know, areas that 22 are still within the local area but don't actually fall 23 within Kirkcaldy.
- So absolutely, you know, communities, you know, when we look back, the police were almost a community,

- another community to be considered as part of that
 community assessment as well.
- 3 Q. So there's the police as a community --
- 4 A. An additional --
- Q. -- as an example, there's the black community within the
 wider geographical community that makes up the Kirkcaldy
 or Fife area. But should I understand that, in terms of
 community impact, your interest wasn't restricted to the
- 9 black community, it was the community in the wider sense
- of the word?
- 11 A. It was, yes.
- Q. You had additional responsibility in relation to
 monitoring community impact. How do you monitor the
- impact on the community?
- 15 A. Again, you know, going back to that, that was my core
- 16 role, you know, was to work on a daily basis. So it's
- 17 looking at, you know, media reporting; it would be,
- 18 you know, information that would come to me from elected
- 19 members, who are clearly representative of their
- communities; they would raise, you know, issues,
- 21 you know, complaints to the police in terms of calls for
- 22 service, you know, reported crime, intelligence, all --
- 23 you know, a multitude of systems, processes and
- 24 information feeds allow me to -- and the officers and
- 25 staff that work, certainly in Kirkcaldy, because that's

1 what we're talking about, tell me of anything that would heighten concern, of any incidents that, you know, 2 3 clearly would give concern to communities. 4 So there's lots of different ways to do it. It 5 could be the staff coming in having spoken to, you know, members of the community, to any groups that we attend. 6 7 So there's a number of ways that we would look right 8 across that spectrum to get a sense of, you know, what's 9 normal, and then how do you then get an assessment of 10 when something happens that's out of the norm, how do you recognise it? It is things like media, intelligence 11 12 and actually just being out and about and speaking to 13 people. Q. Let me ask you a few questions about those different 14 15 strands across the spectrum, as I think you described them. Some are self-explanatory: media, being out and 16 17 about and speaking to people, staff reporting concerns 18 to you. What about intelligence? You mentioned 19 intelligence. What do you mean by intelligence in this 20 context? 21 Α. You know, in that context, you know, community intelligence, it just -- you know, it can come through 22 23 about -- you know, one of the common things that used to come through could be drug dealing, you know, and in 24 a community, or antisocial behaviour. And those local 25

1 issues that have quite a pervasive impact on those that, 2 you know, live, work and operate round about it. 3 So some of that -- if we take drug dealing as 4 an example -- would come through, you know, our 5 intelligence systems to suggest that either people are affected by it, that it's as blatant as they think, 6 7 you know, drugs are being dealt. 8 So it's, you know, that in itself would be a recognisable impact for me, especially if we started 9 10 to get, you know, complaints about it, then that would come probably through as an intelligence entries. 11 12 Q. So media, out and about, staff reporting concerns, 13 intelligence, and you also mentioned elected members. 14 We'll probably discuss the elected members in quite a lot of detail, but perhaps give us an overview at this 15 juncture. Who are these elected members? 16 Again they're a broad selection right across, you know, 17 Α. 18 a range of political parties that sit, you know, in each 19 local area. So the police, and certainly my role within 20 Kirkcaldy, I had regular contact with all the elected 21 members and ultimately, you know, as a policing service, 22 you know, I would report to elected members via scrutiny 23 on a quarterly basis. 24 So they would -- the scrutiny that sat on -- sitting at Kirkcaldy would assess our policing performance 25

- against the priorities that I mentioned right at the start of my evidence.
- 3 So the elected members would write or would contact 4 me, as the local area commander, to say one of their 5 constituents has an issue or a problem that they would seek police support for, or maybe question as to how 6 7 something had been dealt with because it had been raised 8 with them. So they would route that through me, and 9 clearly I would, you know, try and either solve or glean information to put back to them. 10

So the elected members have got a real sense of community and their individual community, and members of the public would clearly approach them with issues and more often than not they would either come to me or the community inspector to let us know.

- Q. You describe them as elected members. They're elected to what? What's the name of the body or the group that they're elected to?
- A. They're obviously elected to their ward area, so a kind of -- you know, they are multi-member ward areas. So they're elected in -- as -- to represent that ward area.
- 22 Q. Elected by constituents --
- 23 A. Yeah.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

- Q. -- from that ward?
- 25 A. Yeah.

- Q. So they're separate from the police, as it were?
- 2 A. Yes. Sorry, yeah.
- 3 Q. They're not elected to a group that is a part of
- 4 Police Scotland in any way?
- 5 A. No. No, no.
- 6 Q. They're elected by their constituents for the particular
- 7 ward in which they sit.
- 8 You've explained to us what is meant by community
- 9 impact and how you go about monitoring community impact
- 10 through the various strands that we have discussed, and
- in a very general sense -- because we will explore this
- in your evidence -- where you realise as a result of
- monitoring that you have carried out that there has been
- 14 an impact on a particular community as a result of
- an incident, how do you go about addressing and
- responding to that impact?
- 17 A. I suppose there are various ways and it would depend on
- 18 what the impact is. You know, the whole point of the
- 19 community impact assessment would be, you know, what may
- 20 happen, what has happened and what can happen, and we
- 21 structure that assessment on a community impact
- 22 assessment template. It's a national template, it gives
- 23 you, I suppose, a structured and coherent way to make
- sure we can record, you know, that assessment, and it's
- an evolving process. So to begin with, and because it's

1 evolving, it would depend on the amount of information that you've got. As the situation develops, you clearly 2 3 gather more information, and then you would clearly look 4 at mitigations. So ultimately you're looking at: where 5 do we think the risks are? And then: what would the mitigations be that we would look to -- we would look to 6 7 put into place? 8 So it could simply be communication, and how we would do that. So again, depending on what you 9 10 identified as the risk and the potential community impact would then -- you know, would dictate how much 11 12 information you would need to communicate and who you 13 would need to communicate with. 14 So it would vary, depending on what your -- who the 15 target audience was, depending on where your risk was identified. It could be -- it could just be community 16 17 reassurance patrols, you know, we've identified that, 18 you know, a certain community may feel vulnerable because of the incident that's happened and would --19 20 you know, a visible reassuring presence would be 21 required. So it would be a proactive deployment of officers to that particular area, if there was 22 23 a particular area. 24 So there's lots of different staged ways that we can do it. Always behind the scenes is this continual 25

gathering of information, evidence, intelligence, what's coming in from the enquiry itself, what's coming in from members of the public, letters, correspondence, back to the elected members. You know, anything that people feel they want to discuss, we're including in that assessment because it gives us a method to assess how people are feeling about it. And we'll then look at: okay, if it's because they don't understand or they don't have enough information, then we would look at: is it an information feed that we would need to consider?

So it very much is an evolving process, and it continues and continues until you get to the point that you're satisfied that you've either mitigated it to the point that the risk no longer exists, at which point, you know, that community impact, certainly for a particular incident, you might be able to pause it at that point.

Q. Thank you.

I believe in fact you were involved in preparing a community impact assessment in the wake of Sheku Bayoh's death, and later in your evidence -- probably tomorrow -- we'll look at that in some detail, but that's a very helpful overview of how you go about responding to the identified impact within a particular community.

Т		Recurring to paragraph / or your statement, you
2		mentioned the additional responsibility to monitor
3		community impact, which we've discussed.
4	Α.	Yeah.
5	Q.	And your statement continues:
6		" as well as the impact on staff."
7		I would like to ask you about that. What do you
8		mean by the impact on staff?
9	Α.	Erm, that's the impact on, you know, staff directly
10		involved and then staff that are not involved but are
11		equally impacted. So I think it would be fair to say
12		all staff at Kirkcaldy were absolutely impacted, those
13		that had, you know, had a first-hand involvement and
14		those that were off duty. I would probably stretch that
15		to it went way further than Kirkcaldy, but certainly
16		from my role as local area commander I'm overseeing
17		Kirkcaldy and Glenrothes. And I'm not just thinking of
18		the staff that were working, that were on duty on,
19		you know, 3 May that morning. I'm thinking of: how is
20		this going to impact on staff that, you know, I'm going
21		to oversee and task them to go and deliver policing
22		services to our communities and to continue to respond
23		to 999 and, you know, attend to people's needs?
24		So I'm very conscious of the fact that they are
25		going to be impacted by the events, notwithstanding that

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

1 they haven't been directly involved to date.

2 So the impact on staff was going to have to be all encompassing.

- Q. What did you anticipate that impact would look like?
- A. I'm not sure if I did anticipate it. I think I've got enough service to know that, like I say, those that weren't directly involved would be concerned about what they'd heard and also concerned about what they didn't know, which in this case, you know, was significant, because they clearly wanted to understand what had happened to their colleagues, what had happened in the incident itself, and then -- as I'm sure we'll discuss throughout -- my evidence is that at times that wasn't possible.
- Q. How do you monitor impact on staff?
- Again, it's very similar to how you monitor impact on 16 Α. 17 communities. It's speaking to them, they've got representation through unions, our officers and staff, 18 so you give them opportunities to -- and an avenue to be 19 20 able to raise concerns. More often than not they'll 21 voice concerns, they'll raise it through line 22 management. That will come through, in many cases, to me as the local area commander. So it's very much 23 24 what -- you know, not so much in media and intelligence in terms of the communities, but certainly for the staff 25

- 1 it's, it's listening to the concerns that they've got,
- 2 and more often than not they did voice them.
- 3 Q. Where concerns are voiced, how do you go about
- 4 responding to those concerns, in a very broad and
- 5 general way?
- 6 A. Not in this case?
- 7 Q. In general.
- 8 A. In general. It depends what it was. Sometimes people
- 9 raise concerns in a general sense because they feel
- 10 that, you know, they maybe don't know enough about
- 11 something or a particular subject or training matter;
- they'll raise concerns because they maybe would request
- more training on a certain aspect or they don't have
- something that they feel would be helpful for their
- 15 role.
- So, you know, you'll hear things from the individual
- and you'll hear things quite regularly through the
- 18 Federation reps because, you know, they feed it in to
- 19 say -- it might not just be in Kirkcaldy, it might be
- 20 wider than that, and is there something that we can do
- 21 to support them or assist them or make their job easier.
- 22 So ...
- 23 Q. So with both communities and staff where there has been
- 24 a measurable impact, your response would depend very
- 25 much on the circumstances and the concerns that are

1 being fed back to you? 2 That's fair, yeah. Α. Yeah. Can we turn to paragraph 8 of your statement, please. 3 Q. 4 Taking you back to the events of 3 May 2015: 5 "I have been asked about the initial phone call from Chief Superintendent Garry McEwan at 0930 hours on 6 7 3 May 2015. As per my statement, I was informed of 8 an ongoing incident in the Kirkcaldy area whereby 9 a local man was deceased having been involved in 10 an altercation with police officers. Due to the potential impact and high profile nature of the enquiry, 11 12 I was asked if I could resume duty. I am asked how 13 I was appointed to my role relating to the death of 14 Sheku Bayoh. Because it was a Sunday I was off duty and 15 due back to work on the Monday. The request to return to duty was in effect to resume my role as Local Area 16 17 Commander and take the lead on managing the community impact, lead on our local policing resource deployment 18 and ensure resilience to deliver services to the public 19 20 in the area. If my memory serves me correctly, at the 21 point I received the call, it had been declared 22 a critical incident - I think that was conveyed in the telephone call from the Chief Superintendent. 23 24 I recognised that by it being declared a critical 25 incident that it was assessed as likely to have

1 a significant impact on the local community, clearly the family of the deceased and the police officers and staff 2 3 involved. I don't specifically recall any other details 4 provided by Garry McEwan during that call other than what is noted in my statements." 5 So you were contacted at home when off duty at about 6 7 9.30 in the morning, and asked to resume duty because of 8 the potential impact and high profile nature of the 9 enquiry? 10 Α. Yes. In terms of the potential impact, you've explained to us 11 Q. 12 earlier in your evidence, and we see it set out in 13 paragraph 8 here, that the incident had been declared 14 a critical incident and so you were anticipating 15 a significant impact in the local community? I was, yes. 16 Α. You refer to the nature of the enquiry being high 17 Q. profile. By high profile, do you simply mean that it 18 was likely to attract media attention? 19 20 Sorry, did I say that in there, do I? Apologies. Α. 21 Q. Yes, let me find it. 22 Yeah, I do. Α. It's the third or fourth line down: 23 Q. 24 "Due to the potential impact and high profile nature 25 of the enquiry I was asked if I could resume duty."

1		I'm just wondering if you could explain what you
2		meant by, "High profile nature of the enquiry"?
3	Α.	Probably just as described, because it was described as
4		a critical incident, because it involved a death
5		involving police contact, I knew it was going to be high
6		profile.
7	Q.	High profile in the media sense?
8	A.	Yes, and just in the community as well.
9	Q.	You explain in that paragraph that you were asked to
10		take the lead on managing the community impact, lead on
11		local policing resource deployment and ensure resilience
12		to deliver services to the public in the area.
13		You've already explained what managing the community
14		impact would involve. What would your role as leading
15		on local policing resource deployment entail?
16	Α.	So, in effect, that morning the entire team that had
17		been working that day had effectively been removed from
18		operational duties, clearly to facilitate the PIM
19		procedure which took place. So my role as local area
20		commander is to ensure we have the right number of
21		resources in the right place at the right time, the
22		right skills and training to deliver those services.
23		I knew the impact on the resourcing because of the
24		incident, because of the impact on that team of staff
25		and the fact that they would in effect certainly not be

1 deployable that day and, you know, I'm experienced enough to know that I didn't think they'd be back the 2 3 following day either. 4 So it's looking at how we were going to forecast to 5 make sure we have enough resilience within our teams to be able to continue to respond to calls for service. 6 7 We have heard evidence that the entire team, team 4, Q. 8 I think they were called, attended at Hayfield Road, and 9 that following the incident made their way back to the canteen, the PIM suite, at Kirkcaldy Police Office. 10 That was an entire team that had been taken away from 11 12 frontline --13 Yeah. Certainly the team that were on that day, yeah. Α. 14 That was a team that wouldn't have been available to Q. 15 respond to, say, a 999 call in the area or anything of that sort? 16 Yeah. 17 Α. 18 Was that the sort of gap that you were looking to --Q. 19 Yeah. So that, to fill the gap that was left by them, Α. 20 and also knowing that the significance of the event 21 would require locus protection points, it may require 22 resources to be -- in terms of that community reassurance patrols. It was going to draw in a lot of 23 staff, this enquiry, so it was started to look at: how 24 25 resilient are we to continue to be able to respond, to

- be able to give people their days off, to -- you know,

 everybody -- there was other incidents still happening

 at the same time, and it's just to make sure -- that was

 going to be one of my roles is: how are we going to

 deploy staff and continue to deploy them?
 - Q. There was a question of replacing, for want of a better word, the officers who were now in the canteen, team 4, not just for the duration of that shift but you said from experience likely into the following day, also ensuring that you had other resources to stand by loci and respond to other things that were going on in the community, and that task fell to you as well?
 - A. In a wide sense, ultimately, you know, I got help from other parts of the division, of Police Scotland to start looking at: how do we draw on national resources to come in and help Kirkcaldy and Fife, because we were pulling resources in from other areas? So ultimately, yeah, I task that out and rely on other colleagues to come in and support me there as well.
 - Q. Again in a fairly general sense at this stage, how would you go about drawing on those other national resources?

 Where do you look? Do you look to adjacent police offices or further afield? Does it depend on --
- 24 A. Yeah.

25 Q. -- what capacity they have? How would you go about

1 bringing in the resources that you need?

We are blessed, thankfully, with a resource deployment 2 Α. 3 unit that look at all, you know, where resources are of 4 a day and they clearly forecast months, years ahead at times. So thankfully, you know, I was able to call upon 5 resource deployment colleagues who will look at how our 6 7 resources are positioned right across the country, call 8 people out, adjust shifts. You know, that's fairly 9 routine in policing, if I'm going to be honest. But 10 clearly because of the number of staff that were involved, this was clearly more significant than just 11 12 day-to-day sickness absence, facilitating people going 13 to court. You know, so we've always got abstractions to 14 certain events, but this was going to be more 15 significant. So ultimately, you know, what came out of, you know, some of the Gold Groups when you start to see 16 17 it is resourcing, and then we start looking at appealing and putting requests in to our resource deployment unit 18 19 central function that looks at all the resources right 20 across Scotland, we'll start pulling resources towards 21 us and then starting to look at, you know, the team 4 22 as, you know, were day shift that day but they're supposed to be night shift in four days' time, so we 23 need to start -- who's going to potentially, if they're 24 not back, fill that. 25

- So we'll look at what national resources we've got,
- and we've got a co-ordination unit, thankfully, that
- 3 came in to help me that day.
- 4 Q. You deal with the immediate need in terms of replacing
- 5 team 4, also contingency planning into the future if
- 6 they weren't back on night shift --
- 7 A. Yeah, absolutely.
- 8 Q. -- in a few days' time, as well as the additional
- 9 resources that required to be brought in to support the
- investigation?
- 11 A. Yeah.
- 12 Q. You mentioned or you used the word "resilience" in your
- evidence. Why is resilience in policing important in
- 14 this context?
- 15 A. Because it's important in terms of an organisational
- resilience. It's, you know, even disaggregate that
- 17 slightly into, you know, personal resilience, you know,
- and team resilience, station resilience, as to how --
- 19 have we got the ability to cope? You know, and not just
- 20 cope because, you know, we've -- it's almost that: are
- 21 still people, you know, going to be able to facilitate
- and thrive within what we're asking them to do. So
- 23 resilience in numbers, but resilience in capacity and
- 24 capability to keep responding, because we're a 24/7
- 25 service. And so I suppose resilience in, yeah, capacity

and capability to make sure we've got what we need, and knowing that everything still has to be serviced.

Q. You say in paragraph 8, and have said in your evidence, that by being declared a critical incident it had been assessed as an incident that was likely to have a significant impact on the local community, and you used the words "high profile" elsewhere, four lines down from the top, due to the potential impact and high profile nature of the enquiry, you were asked to become involved.

When we spoke earlier about the impact and high profile nature of the enquiry, you made reference to this being a death following police contact. Were there any other features of the case as known to you on the morning of 3 May that made you think that it would be high profile and that there would be a significant community impact?

A. Yeah, it's clearly not in there but I knew because the Chief Super had mentioned that the deceased was black, the death in custody and death following police contact. Those on their own are significant incidents in terms of that criticality, and I won't speak for the Chief Super as to why he declared it as a critical incident but, because of that, then the whole nature of it, you know, lended me to believe that these matters were

1 significant. You've explained that you were recalled to duty, having 2 Q. 3 not been on duty, on 3 May and the phone call from the 4 Chief Superintendent at 9.30 in the morning. At what 5 time did you arrive at Kirkcaldy Police Office? I think between 10.30 and 11, approximately. 6 Α. 7 Q. Scroll down to paragraph 9, please. 8 (Pause) 9 Apologies, I think I might have the wrong paragraph 10 number. Can you explain what happened on arrival at 11 12 Kirkcaldy Police Office? 13 I think when I arrived -- you know, I worked in Α. 14 Kirkcaldy, my office was there, I had an office in 15 Kirkcaldy -- I made my way into my office, the -- I knew because I'd met Garry McEwan, we had a brief 16 17 conversation, because I'd only had that conversation over the telephone at that point, and within a matter --18 I think a matter of 30 minutes that first Gold Group had 19 20 been convened and I was attending that. So it was --21 I don't remember it being a significant passage of time 22 between arriving and then that first Gold Group 23 starting. We've heard the first Gold Group was at 11.30? 24 Q. That'd be about right, yeah, that'd be right. 25 Α.

- 1 Q. And would that fit with your recollection that you
- 2 arrived about 10.30/11 --
- 3 A. Yes.
- 4 Q. -- or thereabouts.
- 5 You mentioned speaking to Garry McEwan on arrival;
- 6 was that a formal briefing or an informal conversation?
- 7 A. Yeah, it was an informal conversation following on from
- 8 that initial telephone call.
- 9 Q. What was the purpose of that conversation?
- 10 A. I think it was actually just -- it was probably
- 11 repeating the same information, I don't remember being
- given any new information at that point, it was simply
- a case of the gold, and I think he told me that the gold
- 14 meeting was taking place at 11.30 and that clearly
- I would be required to attend, and it would be round
- about that community impact, that local resilience in
- terms of officer deployment, that was going to be my
- 18 role. So I think it was just almost a reiteration of
- 19 what I'd already been told.
- Q. In terms of what you were told on the phone by
- 21 Garry McEwan or on your arrival at Kirkcaldy Police
- 22 Office, do you recall today what you were told about the
- 23 circumstances of what had happened at Hayfield Road?
- A. During the conversation with the Chief Superintendent?
- 25 Q. Yes.

- 1 A. Not now, sorry, no.
- 2 Q. So you were made aware that there was going to be
- a Gold Group meeting and that you were to attend and
- 4 your involvement was going to be around community
- 5 issues.
- 6 We've heard a little about the Gold Group meetings
- and about the structure that's put in place, and we've
- 8 heard evidence that there was one gold, that I think was
- 9 Assistant Chief Constable Nicholson?
- 10 A. That's right.
- 11 Q. There was one silver, and that was Chief Superintendent
- 12 McEwan. We know that Detective Superintendent Campbell,
- who was SIO, was bronze and he told us that there were
- in fact a number of bronze commanders.
- Were you a bronze commander within that structure of
- Gold Group meetings?
- 17 A. Yeah, there can be multiple bronze, you know, leads and
- it's usually portfolio function based. So only one
- 19 gold, one silver, and there would be a number of bronze
- leads. I would be, I suppose, in current terminology,
- 21 or if it even was the correct and it would almost be for
- 22 community impact or, you know, or local area lead. It
- 23 would be something along those lines. But bronze for
- 24 community impact, community ... yeah.
- 25 Q. For the same sort of portfolio issues, as you put it,

1	that fell within your remit as the area divisional
2	commander?
3	A. Area commander, yeah.
4	Q. Area commander.
5	So you were made aware, on arrival at Kirkcaldy
6	Police Office, that there was going to be a Gold Group
7	meeting and that you would be taking on that role, and
8	we should understand that you were one of the bronze
9	commanders for a particular portfolio that your work
10	involved?
11	A. Yeah.
12	MS THOMSON: I'm mindful of the time, sir.
13	LORD BRACADALE: If that's a convenient point, we'll stop.
14	We'll continue with your evidence at 10 o'clock tomorrow
15	morning, Superintendent.
16	(4.15 pm)
17	(The hearing adjourned until 10 am
18	on Thursday, 16 March 2023)
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	INDEX
2	PAGE
3	DETECTIVE CHIEF INSPECTOR (RTD)1
4	KEITH HARDIE (called)
5	
6	Questions from MS GRAHAME1
7	
8	DETECTIVE SUPERINTENDENT INSPECTOR143
9	NICOLA SHEPHERD (affirmed)
10	
11	Questions from MS THOMSON143
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	