1	Thursday, 18 November 2021
2	(10.30 am)
3	Lord Bracadale Opening Remarks and Assessor Introductions
4	LORD BRACADALE: Good morning and welcome to this
5	preliminary hearing in the Sheku Bayoh Inquiry. I am
6	Lord Bracadale, I am the chairman of the Inquiry, and
7	I am accompanied today by my Assessors, Raju Bhatt who
8	is on my right, and Michael Fuller who is on my left.
9	I shall introduce them more fully in a moment, but
10	before I do so, I would like to say this: that my
11	Assessors and I, and the Inquiry team, have throughout
12	been very conscious, and continued to be very conscious,
13	that the core subject of this Inquiry is the sudden,
14	unexpected and untimely death of Sheku Bayoh, who died
15	on 3 May 2015, aged 31 years.
16	We wish to take this opportunity to express in
17	public our condolences to all members of the family.
18	I want them to be at the heart of this Inquiry and,
19	in due course, before the evidence begins, I will give
20	an opportunity for members of the family to speak
21	publicly about the person that Sheku Bayoh was, what he
22	meant to them and the impact of his death on them.
23	I have already begun discussion with family members
24	about what form that might take.
25	I pause at this stage to mention two practical

1 matters in relation to today's hearing.

First, realtime transcription is available and the transcript will thereafter be placed on the website.

Second, the proceedings are being broadcast on the Inquiry's YouTube channel and again will be available later on the website.

Now, let me introduce the Assessors. I have the assistance of two Assessors appointed under section 11 of the Inquiries Act 2005. Assessors are persons who have a particular expertise which will be of assistance to the Inquiry.

Raju Bhatt is a solicitor and a partner in the London-based solicitors firm Bhatt Murphy. He has a particular history of work with families who have lost members through death in custody. He has regularly represented such families at inquests. Over a long period, he has been responsible for many significant developments in this and related areas. His expertise and experience has regularly been drawn on by various organisations. In 2009, he was appointed special adviser to the Parliamentary Joint Committee on Human Rights, in relation to its scrutiny of the Coroners and Justice Bill. He is one of the founding members of the Police Action Lawyers Group and INQUEST Lawyers Group.

He was appointed to the Hillsborough independent

1 Inquiry panel, which reported to the Home Secretary in 2 September 2012.

Mr Bhatt was a member of the reference group in the independent review of deaths and serious incidents in police custody, conducted by Dame Elish Angiolini QC, which reported to the United Kingdom Government in January 2017. And he represented the family of Daniel Morgan, whose murder in 1987 led to the establishment of the Daniel Morgan independent tribunal. The remit of the panel, which reported in 2021, included examining the conduct of the police.

Michael Fuller had a long and distinguished career in the Police Service. He rose to the rank of Deputy Assistant Commissioner in the Metropolitan Police, and in 2004 he was appointed Chief Constable of Kent Police Force.

During 26 years in the Metropolitan Police, he was instrumental in setting up the Racial and Violent Crime Taskforce. He drew up the Metropolitan Police action plan in response to criticism arising from the Stephen Lawrence Inquiry. This included recommendations as to how the Metropolitan Police should investigate racial hate crime and respond to critical incidents, along with race awareness training. All of Mr Fuller's recommendations were accepted and implemented.

He was the founding chairman of the Black and Asian Police Association and set up a support network in the Metropolitan Police to provide support to many black and Asian police officers who were victims of racism within the police.

Throughout his service as a chief officer, Mr Fuller chaired disciplinary panels and determined disciplinary sanctions in relation to charges brought against police officers. On retirement, he was appointed as Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of the Crown Prosecution Service and Serious Fraud Office. He currently runs his own criminal justice consultancy.

It will be clear that the combined expertise and experience of the Assessors has the potential to provide a formidable degree of assistance to my Inquiry. While I recognise that ultimately I must take responsibility for the decisions in the Inquiry, each of the Assessors has already given valuable assistance and I expect that support only to increase as the Inquiry progresses.

The purpose of this preliminary hearing is to allow me, with the assistance of senior counsel to the Inquiry, to make some general points in relation to the Inquiry, to identify the core participants and their legal representation, to update the core participants, members of the public and the media about the progress

of the Inquiry to date, and to outline the approach the
Inquiry intends to take as it moves towards public
hearings on evidence. In addition, the preliminary
hearing provides an opportunity for the legal
representatives of core participants to raise issues of
a preliminary nature.

I shall begin with a few general points about the Inquiry.

The purpose of the Inquiry is spelled out in the terms of reference. The full terms of reference are available on the Inquiry's website. They are stated in broad terms, which will allow the Inquiry to follow the evidence and thoroughly explore the issues.

In summary, they allow the investigation of the immediate circumstances leading to the death of Mr Bayoh, how the police dealt with the aftermath of the incident, the conduct of the Lord Advocate and the Police Investigations and Review Commissioner of the investigation into the death, and whether the issue of race was a factor at any stage.

The terms of reference include a requirement to examine the post-incident management process and the investigation, in terms of compliance with any relevant convention rights.

Article 2 of the European Convention on Human Rights

provides that everyone's right to life shall be protected by law, and has been held by the European Court of Human Rights to impose a procedural requirement on the state to carry out an independent, adequate and effective investigation when a person dies in police custody, and that includes a requirement that the family of the person must be involved in that process, in order to protect their legitimate interests. I am also conscious that these Article 2 requirements apply to the Inquiry itself. So I am required to report to the Scottish Ministers on these matters and make recommendations.

The next general point is that in terms of section 2 of the Inquiries Act, the Inquiry cannot make any determination as to criminal or civil liability. Its purpose is to seek to ascertain the truth, and to that purpose, I am fully committed. I am independent of government and have a responsibility to ensure that the Inquiry is carried out in an independent, impartial, fair and effective manner. Again, I am fully committed to fulfil that responsibility.

In that endeavour, I am supported by an Inquiry team, the members of which have already demonstrated commitment, dedication and efficiency in implementing the work of the Inquiry.

Next, I turn to the issue of core participants.
I have designated a number of individuals and
organisations as core participants. In general, having
regard to Rule 4 of the Inquiries (Scotland) Rules 2007,
core participants are likely to be individuals or
organisations who played, or may have played, a direct
and significant role in relation to the matters to which
the Inquiry relates, or who may have a significant
interest in an important aspect of these matters, or who
may be subject to significant or explicit criticism
during the proceedings of the Inquiry or in its report.

The full list of core participants is on the website and in a moment I shall ask senior counsel to the Inquiry to identify the core participants and their legal representatives. Before I do that, I wish to say something about the role of a core participant.

I would expect core participants to have a key role in the Inquiry, on the basis of their particular interest. Core participants and their recognised legal representatives may attend all or, depending on their particular interest, some of the sessions of the Inquiry. They may make opening and closing statements. They may suggest possible lines of enquiry and questioning to counsel to the Inquiry. They may, where appropriate, with my permission, ask questions of

1 witnesses through their own legal representatives.

In relation to that last issue, namely the examination of witnesses by representatives of core participants, it is important to bear in mind that the procedure is inquisitorial and investigative. It is not the adversarial procedure that is normal in the courts. I anticipate that, in the main, questioning of witnesses will be conducted by counsel to the Inquiry and there will not be routine cross-examination on behalf of core participants.

Core participants will have the opportunity to suggest lines of questioning for counsel to the Inquiry to pursue. Where a core participant does wish to examine a witness, it will be necessary to make an application under Rule 9.4 of the rules and, in due course, prior to the first hearing, I shall issue guidance in respect of the procedure for making such applications and for suggesting possible lines of questioning to counsel to the Inquiry.

I am now going to ask senior counsel to the Inquiry to identify herself and her own team, and thereafter the core participants and their legal representatives.

Ms Grahame.

Inquiry Counsel Introductions

MS GRAHAME: Thank you, sir.

1	My name is Angela Grahame. I am a Queen's Counsel
2	and my role is senior counsel to the Inquiry.
3	In carrying out this function, I will be assisted b

In carrying out this function, I will be assisted by Laura Thomson, junior counsel to the Inquiry, who is joining us remotely this morning, due to Covid restrictions; but she will be in person for the hearings and will normally sit to my left.

Sitting to my left today is the solicitor to the Inquiry, Sadif Ashraf. On occasion her deputy,
Ciara Pang, may be sitting in on the Inquiry.

We are supported by the Secretary to the Inquiry,
Chris Crowther, who is sitting directly opposite me.
His deputy is Pamela Beer, who may substitute for
Mr Crowther on occasion. To his right is
Gillian Wildgoose, evidence manager and head of our
evidence team, who will assist by displaying, via the
screens in front of everyone, each document to which we
refer during hearings. In addition, we will be
supported behind the scenes by our wider legal team,
evidence team and other administrative staff.

Appearing on behalf of family members of Sheku Bayoh are Claire Mitchell QC and her junior, Clare Connelly, advocate. They are instructed by Aamer Anwar and April Meechan, solicitors. And Mr Anwar is sitting with Mr and Mrs Johnson, the sister and brother-in-law of

1	Sheku Bayoh. They are sitting in the public gallery
2	today.
3	Other relatives and family members of Sheku Bayoh
4	are joining us remotely this morning.
5	Appearing on behalf of the Chief Constable of the
6	Police Service of Scotland is Maria Maguire QC. The
7	Chief Constable will also be represented by
8	Lisa Henderson QC and assisted by a junior, Vincent
9	Williams, barrister. They are instructed by
10	Erica Watson, solicitor, and also representing the
11	Chief Constable and present today is Assistant
12	Chief Constable Alan Spears.
13	Representing the Lord Advocate are Alistair Duncan
14	QC and Leigh Lawrie, advocate. They are instructed by
15	Karen Aitken, who is a solicitor with the Crown Office
16	and Procurator Fiscal Service.
17	On behalf of the Police and Information Review
18	Commissioner are John Scott QC and Simon Crabb,
19	advocate. They are instructed by Michelle MacLeod,
20	solicitor.
21	On behalf of the Scottish Police Federation, retired
22	Constable Nicole Short and Constable Craig Walker are
23	the dean of faculty, Roddy Dunlop QC and his junior,
24	Euan Scott, advocate, and they are instructed by

Peter Watson, solicitor.

25

Τ	Brian McConnachie QC and Laura Anne Radcliffe,
2	advocate are representing retired constable Alan Paton
3	and they are instructed by Paul Kavanagh, solicitor.
4	Representing Constable Ashley Tomlinson, Constable
5	Kayleigh Good and Constable Alan Smith are
6	Gordon Jackson QC and Carla Fraser, advocate, and they
7	are both instructed by Robert Vaughan, solicitor.
8	Representing Sergeant Scott Maxwell, Constable
9	Daniel Gibson and Constable James McDonough are
10	Shelagh McCall QC and David Adams, advocate. They are
11	instructed by Gordon McWilliams, solicitor.
12	Representing Chief Constable Garry McEwan,
13	Chief Superintendent Conrad Trickett and
14	Temporary Assistant Chief Constable Patrick Campbell is
15	Duncan Hamilton QC. He is instructed by
16	Callum Anderson, solicitor.
17	Finally, representing the Coalition for Racial
18	Equality and Rights is Mark Moir QC. He is instructed
19	by Ian Moir, solicitor, and present today from CRER is
20	Jatin Haria, executive director of CRER.
21	These comprise the legal representatives of all the
22	designated core participants and those attending in the
23	hearing room this morning, sir.
24	LORD BRACADALE: Thank you, Ms Grahame.
25	May I ask you now to deal with the next two items

1	that I mentioned earlier, namely to update the core
2	participants, members of the public and the media about
3	the progress of the Inquiry to date and outline the
4	approach the Inquiry intends to take in the future as it
5	moves towards public hearings and evidence?
6	MS GRAHAME: Thank you, sir.
7	In order to provide information to the public, on
8	30 April this year, you gave an update of the work of
9	the Inquiry, which is available online via the Inquiry's
10	website. Both prior to and since that date,
11	a considerable amount of preparatory work has been
12	undertaken by the Inquiry team. My comments will add to
13	the information given by you on 30 April.
14	In covering both an update on progress and the
15	approach we will take in the future, I would like to
16	address eight areas.
17	Number 1, gathering in documentation. On
18	30 November last year, immediately upon the Inquiry
19	commencing, the solicitor to the Inquiry issued
20	section 21 notices to Police Scotland, PIRC and the
21	Lord Advocate, seeking retrieval of documents related to
22	the terms of reference. Further, section 21 notices
23	have been issued since then seeking additional
24	information.

This year, the evidence team have gathered in over

25

21,000 items, as a result of this process, and we are continuing to do so. The evidence team are in the process of meticulously cataloguing every item and ascribing an individual identification number to each document. Much of this is done digitally and they are identifying duplicate items and items which cannot, for one reason or another, be opened and require engagement with the provider, to ensure that a working and accessible version is available, and this is a labour-intensive task.

At the same time, the legal team are examining the items retrieved to identify those that are material to the Inquiry's terms of reference.

Number 2, disclosure. There is no statutory obligation of disclosure on the Inquiry, but in order to further your aims that, first of all, this Inquiry act with transparency and openness and, secondly, to encourage core participants to engage with us and assist with the work of the Inquiry, we have started to disclose relevant and material documentation to the core participants at this very early stage.

Prior to commencing disclosure, it was clear that considerable work would be required to ensure that we have complied with our legal obligations, in terms of GDPR and data protection.

A protocol for redactions was prepared, together with a restriction order, and these are available on our website. This restriction order prevents items which are shared by the Inquiry with core participants and their legal representatives from being shared, published, revealed or communicated further. Every document which is disclosed must be checked and appropriate redactions made to ensure that data is not disclosed to others, unless necessary. That includes personal data and sensitive personal data. It also requires us to cross-reference multiple documents to ensure that jigsaw identification is not possible.

Complying with all of these obligations is an extremely complex and time-consuming task and involves careful consideration of thousands of pages.

In addition to GDPR and data protection, it has been necessary to seek the consent of the Lord Advocate to allow disclosure of certain documents. Much progress has been made as a result of the Inquiry team working together, and the process of disclosure has now started. This began on 7 October this year and is being rolled out on an ongoing basis as more and more documents become available.

In due course, we understand that it is your intention to make documentation available to the public

via the website and for this to be done at the time of the evidential hearings when witness evidence is being given. However, all of the documentation currently available to the Inquiry will not necessarily be led in evidence or disclosed to the public. This will be reviewed in due course.

Number 3, Article 2 and the framework document. As you have said, we understand that Article 2 of the European Convention on Human Rights is engaged, and from the outset of this Inquiry, we have taken practical steps to comply with those obligations. We have taken steps to ensure that the investigation carried out by the Inquiry is effective and steps have been taken to secure the evidence concerning the incident. This work has been ongoing since the date the Inquiry officially commenced, 30 November last year, and continues to date, and we have gathered in and considered substantial numbers of documents. We are now looking forward to taking witness statements, and I will come to that in a moment.

We have sought to ensure that those working in and engaged with the Inquiry are independent of the state bodies who are subject to investigation by the terms of reference.

As you have said, we also wish to ensure that the

investigation is public and accessible, particularly to the core participants. It is not necessary for anyone who is involved, or who wishes to view proceedings, to travel to Edinburgh and be present within the hearing room, due to the technology and facilities.

We have also made arrangements to accommodate the family members of Sheku Bayoh.

You have made clear from the outset that there must be a sufficient element of public scrutiny to secure accountability and family members should be involved and placed at the very centre of our work.

Another obligation, in terms of Article 2, is that the Inquiry must be reasonably prompt. With this in mind, I would like to provide a further update on the framework document which was discussed by you in your video statement in April. During the video, you spoke of the intention to prepare a framework document. At that time, our plan was to gather in all the documents, read everything and then provide core participants with a document which set out a summary of all events that we had identified from the terms of reference as requiring investigation.

For the six months of the Inquiry, we were gathering in documentation and followed the approach I have just outlined. As we gathered in more documentation and

assessed the rate at which our team was able to collate,
identify and read each item, it became clear that,
despite our best efforts, progress was too slow.
Following a review, we calculated that we would not be
able to complete our reading before the end of 2022. On
that basis, disclosure would not begin until well into
2023, and hearings would not start until after that.
This was not considered an acceptable rate of progress
for anyone involved. As a result, and with your
guidance, we embarked on a review. We reviewed our
methodology and we have adapted our approach.

Number 4, the current approach and planned hearings.

Rather than one framework document, we decided to refocus our preparation into a series of hearings. Each hearing will group parts of the original framework together to allow us to present the evidence in a chronological, cohesive and logical manner, and there will be no more than six hearings.

The first hearing will cover the events leading up to the death of Sheku Bayoh and will include events at Kirkcaldy police office on 3 May 2015. It will also touch on issues regarding the actual training received by individual officers, their use of equipment and use of force.

The second hearing will cover the cause of death and

will include expert medical evidence.

The third hearing will cover post-incident management, and this will cover post-incident management not just by Police Scotland but also the investigations of the PIRC and Crown Office, and will cover a considerable period of time. This will also cover liaison with the family, and it may be that this hearing will have to be split into two phases.

The later hearings will cover media engagement, investigations carried out in parallel to those carried out by Police Scotland, PIRC or the Crown Office.

And the final hearing will cover race.

Scoping documents were prepared, sketching out what topics would be covered and in which order. We then identified and prioritised the documentation required for hearing 1, and we prioritised redaction and disclosure of the documentation for this hearing.

Disclosing documents to core participants in stages, whilst prioritising the documents for hearing 1, has allowed us to make more progress at an earlier stage than would otherwise have been the case. By prioritising these measures for individual hearings, we are ensuring that the procedural requirements of Article 2 are complied with expeditiously.

Throughout each of these stages, we have had

discussions amongst the team, sought the advice and guidance of both yourself and the Assessors, and we have had meetings and communicated with the core participants and kept them up to date. We are taking a collaborative approach and intend to continue doing so as we approach the evidential hearings.

Instead of the framework document, in preparation for hearing 1, we have now prepared some specific documents, and these are a chronology of events, a paper covering the relevant law and practice, details of key individuals, including Sheku Bayoh and the police officers who attended the scene. This includes personal and medical information, but only insofar as is necessary for the work of the Inquiry, a document outlining key issues for consideration during the hearings, a list of the witnesses from whom we intend to take statements and who may be called to give evidence at hearing 1.

These documents will shortly be available for consideration by the core participants. They provide core participants with notice of the issues, which we expect will arise in evidence and in law, and which we shall be exploring in hearing 1. It is hoped that the core participants will assist us by considering these documents, identifying any further issues that they

consider significant and suggesting additional witnesses or other important documents we should cover. They will then have ample opportunity to comment on these matters in advance of the first hearing. We have placed no deadlines on their opportunities to engage with this Inquiry work.

At the conclusion of certain hearings, the core participants will be given an opportunity to make closing submissions to you on evidential and legal issues. These submissions will be made public on the website at the appropriate time.

This approach will be adopted in advance of each hearing. The exception to this will be the final hearing, which will focus on race.

The terms of reference require the Inquiry to consider the extent of any to which the events leading up to, and following, Sheku Bayoh's death, in particular the actions of the officers involved were affected by his actual or perceived race. At each evidential hearing, the Inquiry will consider the extent, if any, to which the events and actions of the officers involved were affected by his actual or perceived race.

Evidence will be sought at each hearing about this matter. In carrying out this task, particular regard will be had to any actions, steps, instructions,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

behaviours or omissions that fell below, or were contrary to, any applicable guidance, practice, training or legislation.

Any and all evidence obtained from the hearings will then be collated and marshalled prior to the final hearing. In the final hearing, we will seek to draw together all the evidence heard at each hearing regarding race. For this reason, I do not anticipate that a traditional chronology or timeline will assist. We will instead identify any evidence of overt racism, any failures or inadequacies and evidence of any aspect of events which could potentially give rise to an inference that decisions and outcomes were based on race. This evidence will be put before you in the final hearing, together with evidence about the findings of previous reviews, other inquiries, expert opinion and statistical evidence. This will be done to allow you to consider whether an inference may be drawn that race was a factor in the death of Sheku Bayoh, the post-incident management or the subsequent investigations. These categories will be drawn from all the evidence and brought together in the final hearing, and evidence from experts and statistical evidence is likely to be heard at that time.

The Inquiry team are working at a careful and steady

pace that allows us to make progress towards the hearings and we will continue to liaise regularly with the Assessors and the legal representatives of the core participants prior to the hearings. Our approach is always flexible and may be adapted, subject to comments or concerns raised by the core participants. Any future alteration to this plan of action will be brought to your attention and your guidance sought.

Number 5, witness statements. No evidence has ever been led about the events of 3 May 2015 in any forum. So hearing 1 will be the first opportunity to hear that evidence. With this in mind, the Inquiry are now moving to the stage of seeking witness statements. While letters to the doctors and nurses from Victoria Hospital have already been sent out, most letters will be sent out shortly. They will be to the other witnesses that we are prioritising for hearing 1. We would invite and encourage those who received letters to contact the Inquiry team, to make arrangements, so that statements may be taken as soon as possible.

Number 6, experts. We have also started the process of considering what expert evidence will be required for hearings 1 and 2. Steps will be taken to secure experts who are independent and impartial. It is for the Inquiry to select appropriate experts and to instruct

them to give opinions on the issues identified by us.
For that reason, we ask core participants to resist any
temptation to obtain their own expert reports.

Within the past few months, we have identified digital reconstruction experts, advanced laser imaging. The contract to secure their services has been agreed and they are currently working with a view to preparing a digital reconstruction of the events at Hayfield Road, Kirkcaldy, and the nature of the restraint of Sheku Bayoh which we wish to be available for hearing 1.

We have provided them with the relevant documentation and other information we have, including photographs, CCTV footage, airwaves recordings, a Leica scan of the scene, mobile footage, maps and sketches. In turn, they have identified other information they would wish to have, and the evidence team are gathering in these items. They will prepare a 3D image of the scene, which we understand will provide aerial views, show different perspectives, lines of sight and viewpoints from different locations and angles around the scene. They will also create images which demonstrate the height of key individuals within the scene. They will not be creating one version of events, but will provide the Inquiry with the ability to view the scene as it existed at the time. This will allow

the Inquiry to hear evidence from individual witnesses who may in turn be helped to explain their actions or their position through the use of these 3D images.

Work is ongoing, but details of the reconstruction will be shared with core participants, once it is available and in advance of hearing 1.

Number 7, Capital House. Today is our first hearing in Capital House. You mentioned Capital House in your statement in April, but it was in August of this year that the Inquiry team were able to take control of the premises. Since then, the team, led by the Secretary to the Inquiry, Mr Crowther, has worked to ensure sufficient facilities are available for the smooth running of Inquiry hearings.

The office comprises private spaces for

Sheku Bayoh's family, a waiting area for witnesses and

consultation rooms to allow private discussion between

legal teams and their clients. There are also two rooms

for legal representatives with locker facilities, Wi-Fi

and power points for laptop charging. Certain rooms

have television monitors which permit live-streaming for

those within the room.

The Inquiry has offered tours to all legal participants -- representatives, I should say, and core participants ahead of the evidential hearings. The same

will shortly be offered to witnesses with a view to
ensuring that everyone is as prepared and as comfortable
as they can be with these facilities before the
evidential hearings begin. If any legal representatives
or core participants have not yet had a tour and would
like to take up the offer, would they please contact the
Inquiry Secretary, Mr Crowther.

Similarly, any feedback in relation to the premises and services available should be directed to Mr Crowther.

The same applies to the legal representatives who are seated here today. This is the first time that they have had the opportunity to test the facilities, and any suggestions or comments they wish to make about their experience here today are welcome and again should be directed towards Mr Crowther.

Finally, if I may, I would like to turn to the use of language.

We are aware of the sensitivities of the use of certain language and we wish to avoid causing any offence. Equally, it is vital, if we are to get to the truth, that we use language that is basic, simple and understood by all witnesses when we are asking questions of them.

We have determined that Sheku Bayoh will be referred

to as a black man. We have discussed this matter with the legal representatives of the relatives and family of Sheku Bayoh and they have agreed that they are happy with that description for the purposes of the work of this Inquiry. For that reason, we will use the words and expressions "black" or "white" during questioning.

We do not want those engaged with the work of the Inquiry to shy away from asking probing questions or raising issues for fear of offending where particular terms may be used. So those engaging with the Inquiry should feel free to use the same terms during any discussions or questioning.

In this Inquiry, we will be carefully examining every choice made, every action and omission, and asking whether the fact that Mr Bayoh was a black man made a difference. We will be asking: had Mr Bayoh been white, would he and his family have been treated in the same way? Had Mr Bayoh been white, would the investigations have proceeded in the same way? Had Mr Bayoh been white, would different choices have been made about the appropriate course of action? At every stage, we will be making this comparison and asking ourselves that question.

Those complete my comments, sir.

LORD BRACADALE: Thank you very much, Ms Grahame.

between 10.00 am and 4.00 pm.

I shall now deal with some of the practical

arrangements for future public hearings on evidence.

I intend that during the evidential hearings, the

I have already mentioned that realtime transcription will be available and the transcripts will be posted on the website.

Inquiry should sit on Tuesday to Friday each week,

Also that the hearings will be broadcast live on the Inquiry's YouTube channel and will be available for subsequent viewing on the website. And I shall, in due course, give guidance in relation to the broadcasting of evidential hearings.

The Inquiry will be working with electronic evidence. We do not plan to display evidence on paper. Evidence will be displayed on monitors on the desk of the witness who will sit in the seat opposite me in the U-shaped table. It will also be displayed on the desks of the legal representatives and the Inquiry team, and documents will also be displayed on the large screens which you can see placed around the room.

I intend to permit opening statements, together with written and oral closing statements.

In respect of hearings 1 and 2, I intend that there will be one set of closing statements covering both

hearings to be heard at the end of hearing 2. I shall
take a flexible approach to later hearings.

Proposed witnesses, and the order in which they will give evidence, will be published on the website and any changes will be intimated with as much notice as possible.

Evidence will be given on oath or affirmation.

While, where possible, I intend that witnesses should be called only once, the nature of the evidence is such that it may be necessary to recall witnesses.

There is provision for taking evidence and making submissions remotely.

The standard of proof that I intend to adopt, when considering evidence, with a view to making a factual determination, will be the civil standard of balance of probabilities.

Moving on now to the final purpose of the preliminary hearing which I mentioned earlier, which was to allow legal representatives of core participants an opportunity to raise any issues of a preliminary nature. When the preliminary hearing was announced, the solicitor to the Inquiry wrote to the legal representatives of the core participants, indicating that it would be open to them to give notice of any preliminary issue which they considered could usefully

be raised at this preliminary hearing.

A preliminary issue has been raised on behalf of the family. The solicitor for the family has lodged the following motion. On behalf of the family, it is submitted that the chair of the Sheku Bayoh public Inquiry should exercise his power to request core participants to produce position statements as part of the Inquiry process. The motion was accompanied by brief supporting submissions.

I consider that this is a matter worth exploring further and, accordingly, I shall allow time for fuller written submissions in support of the motion to be lodged, and thereafter give other core participants an opportunity to respond.

So written submissions in support of the motion should be lodged by the solicitor representing the family by 8 December 2021. These submissions will then be circulated by the Inquiry, and other core participants who wish to make submissions should lodge their written submissions by 12 January 2022.

Ms Grahame?

MS GRAHAME: I apologise, sir. Despite my best endeavours,

I forgot to mention something.

24 LORD BRACADALE: Yes, certainly.

25 MS GRAHAME: If I may, the first hearing is scheduled to

1	commence on 10 May next year. I apologise for my
2	omission.
3	LORD BRACADALE: Thank you very much. That is clearly
4	an important matter which will be of interest to
5	everyone. So the first hearing will begin on Tuesday,
6	10 May.
7	Well, that completes the preliminary hearing and
8	I am grateful to you all for attending today, and that
9	includes those who attended remotely, and I bid you good
LO	day. The Inquiry will now adjourn.
L1	(11.23 am)
L2	(The Inquiry adjourned until Tuesday, 10 May 2022)
13	
L 4	
15	
16	
L7	
L8	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	INDEX
2	
3	
4	Lord Bracadale Opening Remarks and1
5	Assessor Introductions
6	Inquiry Counsel Introductions8
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	